Museums and tourism have had a long and interrelated history. In this paper this relationship is reviewed in general, and the contemporary issues common to them both in the 1990's are discussed. This relationship is also explored in the context of the Oregon Coastal Zone. Two projects set on the Oregon Coast, involving museums, tourism and other organizations, the Bandon Community Archaeology project and the Lincoln County Interpretation project, are presented as alternatives to existing tourism opportunities. Both projects provide an alternative type of tourist experience where education and interpretation are the primary vehicles for creating benefits not only to tourists, but to the host community as well. These benefits may reduce possible negative impacts from tourism.
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MUSEUMS AND TOURISM: ON THE OREGON COAST

Introduction

In Oregon, and especially in its coastal region, where tourism has been perceived in recent years as a great panacea for economic instability, alternative forms of tourism, with emphasis placed on public education and planning, need to be pursued. The Oregon Coastal Zone is an immensely popular destination area for tourists. One of the big attractions for visitors there are its numerous museums.

This paper is an exploration of the relationship between museums and tourism. The history of this relationship in a broader context is first reviewed in chapter one to provide a background. Historically museums and tourism have had a closely related path of development. The focus then shifts to the general relationship in the latter part of the twentieth century in chapter two, discussing the different genres of museums in relation to tourism, and some of the contemporary issues facing museums and tourism. For example, since the 1970’s it has become clear that certain types of tourism development can negatively impact communities. An issue for museums relating to tourism in the 1990’s is whether or not museums are meeting their educational goals plus the expectations of their different audiences.

After raising these issues there will be an exploration of alternative forms of tourism with a discussion of how museums can interact with them to benefit local communities by reducing the negative impacts of other types of tourism. By reviewing how museums and tourism currently co-exist in Oregon, and more specifically in the Oregon Coastal Zone in chapter three, a background will be
provided for the discussion of two different projects involving museums and alternative forms of tourism set in two different communities along the Oregon Coast. This comparison takes place in chapter four.

These projects, the Bandon Community Archaeology Project and the Lincoln County Interpretive Project, will be contrasted through an examination of their general costs and benefits to their respective communities. In the conclusion a summary analysis of these projects will be presented. The overall discussion of the relationship between museums and tourism in the Oregon Coastal Zone will be reviewed. Finally, suggestions for further studies in this topic area will be offered.
CHAPTER 1
Overview and Historical Background

To develop a perspective with which to understand the relationship between Oregon coastal museums and tourism in the 1990's, one must look to the past to see their interdependent and relational evolution. In this chapter, the term museum first will be discussed. An overview of the historical development of museums and tourism up to the Post WW II era will be discussed, as well as changes in the characteristics of the general museum visitor and tourist. Finally, there will be some discussion of the interconnected relationship of museums and tourism.

The word museum comes from the Greek mouseion. The mouseion was originally a temple dedicated to the nine muses, the goddesses of epic, music, love, poetry, oratory, history, tragedy, comedy, the dance, and astronomy. Ptolemy I founded such a museum in Alexandria in the third century B.C. This museum actually had objects or collections, "but it was chiefly a university or philosophical academy-a kind of institute of advanced study with many prominent scholars in residence and supported by the state" (Alexander 1979: 6). Both the Greek and Roman civilizations maintained museums and collections, but they were not open to the public, and were seen only by the nobility.

The Greek and Roman nobility were also the first recorded tourists in the history of the Western civilization. For recreation, health and pleasure, they went to villas, resorts, and spas in the country. The Roman nobility also traveled to Egypt to see the exotic sights and the temples and statuary of the pharaohs (Gunn 1979: 50). This was the beginning, as far as we know, of what we now call heritage tourism.
During the Middle Ages, museums as they were known in Greece and Rome basically disappeared (Alexander 1979: 7). Institutions of the Church maintained collections, but of religious relics, not objects of art, history, or natural history. Most people during this time were preoccupied with survival, not enlightenment. Also, because of economic hardship, people did not tend to travel unless it was for mercantile business, war, or for religious pilgrimage. Marco Polo, the Crusaders, and Chaucer’s pilgrims in the Canterbury Tales all exemplify the "Tourists" of the European Middle Ages.

In the preindustrial era, during and after the Renaissance, both museums and tourism were revived. The Renaissance Italians developed the "gallery", a long lit hall for the display of hangings, and the "Cabinet", a square room where one could observe objects such as statuary and other three dimensional objects. However, "both types of collections rarely were open to the public and remained playthings of princes, popes, and plutocrats" (Alexander 1979: 8).

Tourism was likewise limited to the elite. It was during the late 1600's that the "Grand Tour" became popular. "The route that was prescribed for this tour...was a three year exploration of the capitals, politics, culture and society of western Europe" (Murphy 1985: 17). One can imagine that those on the Grand Tour would visit galleries and museums as part of their elite education and experience.

With the Renaissance and the Age of Enlightenment, the idea of the museum took on new importance in European culture and society. Wanting more than galleries and cabinets for the observation of collections, a University museum was opened in Basel, Switzerland in 1671, and in 1683 the Ashmolean museum was opened in Oxford, England. The latter was Europe’s first public museum. In the eighteenth century the British Museum and the Louvre were
founded as national institutions. Also, America had its first museum open in 1773, and the Philadelphia Museum of Charles Wilson Peale was founded in 1794. The democratic revolutions of both France and America in the eighteenth century set a precedent for museums being public institutions with education as a primary goal (Alexander 1979: 2).

Tourism also experienced democratization, but not until after the Industrial Revolution. In the mid-nineteenth century Industrialism in Europe, and shortly thereafter in America, brought about changes in social structure with the advent of the middle class, with its higher level of income, education and discretionary time. With the concentration of people in urban centers, and all the associated problems of squalor and pollution, came the desire to escape the city to natural areas or resorts for renewal and health. Finally, the Industrial Revolution effected a significant change in mobility, with the application of the steam engine in shipping and railroads.

As a result, more and more people, no longer just the elite, began to travel for recreation, health, pleasure and education. The new middle class took holidays to the country, and the working class, also receptive of higher incomes, took day trips closer to the urban centers (Alexander 1979: 8). Transportation had become cheaper, faster and more reliable, and the tourist industry grew to meet the demand. New resorts sprang up in natural areas, such as on the Coastline or in the Mountains, as soon as railroad tracks could be laid. Travel agencies, such as Thomas Cook's of England, sprang up to organize itineraries and to arrange accommodations.

By the turn of the century many new museums, especially in America, had opened to serve the general public as well as the elite and the scholar. The Smithsonian Institute, established in 1846, began actively collecting in
1873. Others to open in the 1870's were the American Museum of Natural History, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Boston's Museum of Fine Art. World Fair Exhibitions, from which museums sometimes evolved, also attracted the general public as a major recreational event. The first World Fair was held at London's Crystal Palace in 1851.

Historic preservation of buildings and sites, and house museums also started in America during this era. Independence Hall was preserved in 1816, and Washington's Headquarters was preserved as the first house museum in the country in Newburgh, New York in 1850. Also during the 1850's Mt. Vernon and Andrew Jackson's house were both restored. The Government of the United States began to support such efforts after 1906 when the Antiquities Act was passed. It also established the National Park Service in 1916, providing vast areas of land and designated national monuments for the recreation and enjoyment of the general American public. Other projects and legislation in this area were the restoration of historic Williamsburg in 1922, and the 1935 Historic Sites Act (National Trust for Historic Preservation 1983: 14-15). Though much had been accomplished in the field of preservation, in the development of museums, and the expansion of the tourist industry, nothing affected and changed all of them as much as the introduction of the automobile in the 1920's, and the emergence of the consumer society which generated the mass market after World War II.

Before the automobile became available to the mass market, people had to rely on transportation schedules and designated routes for the most part. After the second World War, mass marketing, the backbone of free market society, encouraged everyone to buy a car. With a car one could arrange one's own schedule, and pick one's own routes. Moreover, the post-war economy pro-
duced even higher incomes, more discretionary time, and thus a greater ability for more people to travel. It was not long before it became possible for almost anyone to jump in a car to go off on a week-end excursion with numerous accommodations and attractions to suit one's particular recreational needs.

As roadways and bridges were developed to accommodate this new form of transportation and type of touring, the number and variety of attractions increased to draw the tourist and his dollars. Novelty became a major focus for the modern tourist. "It was in the seeing of sights that the world was put into perspective and individuals given a sense of social fulfillment through travel" (Jakle 1985: 302).

Part of the fulfillment for the tourist was achieved by being comfortable and unburdened. The tourist wanted to get the most out of his or her discretionary dollars as well. The automobile helped the tourist achieve these things, because one could get quickly from one point to the next at one's own desired rate, with food, lodging, and recreational services becoming ever more convenient en route.

Another effect of the automobile was that it changed the tourist's values and expectations towards the leisure experience. Before the car, a tourist would more likely go to one location for a longer duration, because actual travel time would be longer. Those with automobiles on a road trip generally were able to cover numerous locations with a shorter amount of time spent at each. As a result, the "tourist attraction" evolved to meet this change in taste or preference. It was a place easily accessible to the auto traveler along routes from one destination to another. Jakle, author of The Tourist, believes that the auto has reduced history, "to isolated attractions at destinations separated by landscapes of inattention" (Jakle 1985: 305). In other words, whether or not a museum was
established as a tourist attraction, auto tourists tended to view it as one.

The museum, like the tourist accommodation industry, was affected by the introduction of the automobile in that museums and resorts no longer had to be located only in urban centers or around railroad destination areas. Any town along a well traveled road could open what would be called a museum. It was especially common for personal collectors of dolls or fishing lures, for example, to establish "museums" more as tourist attractions than as serious institutions of education, conservation and preservation.

In his classic book, The Management of Small History Museums, Carl Guthe states, "Tourist attractions, capitalizing on regional history, and catering to entertainment and curiosity of the traveling public, are widely distributed. Unfortunately, these agencies are often primarily sources of entertainment in which no clear distinction is drawn between fact and fiction" (Guthe 1969: 9). In the preface of the same book, in criticism of small American history museums, it is noted that "Too many small history museums still belie the name of museum. Many are little more than depositories of historical objects...Their exhibits are little more than organized confusion. Too often they are proud to own relics that are meaningful only to them and a small body of associates" (Guthe 1969: 5). In a sense then, automobiles may have also had a negative impact in the field of museums, because they made it possible for people to travel to more locations, and made it possible for more facilities called museums to open whether or not they actually qualified as museums.

The field of Historic Preservation in the United States was especially impacted by the advent of the automobile, in that many sites and houses that had previously been difficult to reach, because of transportation costs and time, became more accessible to the public. In 1966 the National Historic Preservation
Act was passed, enacting the National Register for Historic Places and grants to the states. Also that year the Department of Transportation established a policy for the preservation of historic and natural sites along highway routes (National Trust for Historic Preservation 1983: 15).

In sum, historically museums and tourism have evolved parallel to one another, experiencing growth and decline, and in the last century vast expansion and development. Likewise, the characteristics of museum visitors and tourists have also followed a similar path, from the elite to the democratized general public. In a report by a special committee from the American Association of Museums (AAM) published in 1969, this interrelationship is discussed:

We are not accustomed to think of a museum as having economic value to a city or to the nation. Museums are not established for this purpose. They develop economic value almost in spite of themselves. It becomes evident when business executives discover—as they have—that a city with good museums is a better place for them and their employees to live in than a city without adequate museums. But the economic value of museums is most apparent in their contribution to tourism, which turns museums into a factor of considerable importance in the economic health of a city and of the nation, inasmuch as tourism involves the expenditure of billions of dollars each year in the United States (American Association of Museums 1969: 43).

In the 1990's museums and tourism are still interconnected and interdependent. Museums and historic sites are often major attractors for tourism in a particular town or region, and tourists may often make up the largest percentage of a museum's audience.
CHAPTER 2

Contemporary Issues In Tourism and Museums

Having reviewed the development of museums and tourism in general, it is now useful to address some of the contemporary issues in which both the industry and the institution are involved in the late twentieth century. In this chapter the significance of museums in relation to tourism in the 1990's will be considered. With regard to museums, one way to gauge their significance is in terms of their numbers, while tourism is often gauged by amounts of money generated. Next, there will be discussion of the different types of museums, tourism, and tourists. Specific attention will then be given to alternative forms of tourism that attempt to deal with the negative impacts that in part have resulted from traditional forms of tourism. There will also be an examination of some of the contemporary issues involving museums as tourism facilities: authenticity, balancing the functions of education, entertainment, interpretation; and evaluation.

According to the 1984 AAM report Museums For A New Century, there were close to 5000 museums in North America at that time (American Association of Museums 1984: 17). Furthermore, the American Association of State and Local History (AASLH) 1990 Directory has nearly 13,000 listings for historically oriented museums and organizations alone in North America and Canada (AASLH, 1990 Directory). This latter figure does include scholarly history departments and research oriented societies that probably do not have museums. Nevertheless, the number is significant.

Many have defined the term museum, but I believe the most appropriate to be that a museum is "an organized and permanent non-profit institution,
essentially educational or aesthetic in purpose, with professional staff, which owns and utilizes tangible objects, cares for them, and exhibits them to the public on some regular schedule" (Burcaw 1983: 10).

Museums are also characterized by their type of collections and exhibitions. There are museums of art, natural history, science and technology, including planetaria, botanical gardens, aquaria, science centers, and zoos. Historical museums may be national, state, regional, or locally oriented, or may emphasize maritime, outdoor or living history, historic houses, or specific types of historic objects, (such as a museum of glass or automobiles). More recently, corporate museums have been established that explain the history of a particular corporation and/or industry.

Interpretive centers, which may or may not fit the definition of museum, may blend many of the types of collections pertinent to a particular site, theme, or region. For example, four new interpretive centers are being built along the historic Oregon Trail in the 1990's to educate the public about its importance in regional history. The Flagstaff Hill Interpretive Center near Baker, Oregon, which is scheduled to open in 1992, has six basic themes which are:"emigrant life-ways along the Trail, pre-emigrant Trail travelers, natural history, Native Americans, mining and settlement of Northeast Oregon, and General Land Office and Bureau of Land Management" (Oregon Historical Society, Hale ed. 1990: 2). In this case this center will combine history, anthropology, natural history, and institutional history in its exhibits.

Museums may also be characterized by their different major funding bases. Some are national, primarily federally funded, or state, or county, or city. Some are private, funded either by individuals, corporations, or societies. Whatever the funding base, or genre of museums, all those that are in accor-
dance with the AAM definition listed above are alike in their basic major func-
tions. These are: management of collections, conservation, research, interpreta-
tion and exhibition; and acting as social instruments and community centers, in-
cluding educational programming and entertainment. In a report from an AAM
Task Force on Museum Education delivered at the 1990 AAM Annual Meeting, it
was concluded:

The community of museums in this country shares
the responsibility with other educational institutions to
enrich learning opportunities for all individuals, to
nurture an enlightened, humane citizenry who appreci-
ciate the value of knowing about their pasts, are re-
sourcefully and sensitively engaged in the present,
and are determined to shape a future in which many
experiences and many points of view are given
voice. In this endeavor, museums will play a power-
ful, beneficial role for the people of the next century
(American Association of Museums 1990: 12).

In the past, museum professional organizations such as the American
Association of Museums, the American Association for State and Local History,
and the Institute of Museum Services, have placed emphasis on collection man-
agement. In light of the above report, however, that emphasis seems to be shift-
ing toward emphasizing the museum's public dimensions. If so, tourists will fig-
ure strongly into the future of museums, as they are part of that public dimen-
sion.

Tourism is also significant as an industry. According to World Tourism
Organization reports, "more than 1,500 million people i.e. over a third of the
world population, travel away from their place of residence...[and] give rise to
expenditure of about $2 thousand billion ($2 trillion) U.S. dollars for transporta-
tion, accommodation, catering, and other goods and services" (Waters 1989: 9).
According to Somerset Waters, these figures indicate that tourism has become
the world's largest industry, and, "one of the top constituents of world trade alongside oil and motor vehicles" (Walters 1989: 10). As both museums and tourism have grown both in numbers and significance, they have also evolved into different sub-groups as a process of specialization.

As there are now different genres and characteristics of museums, there are also different types of tourism and types of tourists, and characteristics that differentiate them. Not all tourists go to museums, and some who do may only frequent art museums, while others may only go to zoos and aquaria. Ultimately, the choice is a matter of preference, educational background, accessibility and taste. Because tourists have and will continue to be an important constituency of the museum's audience, it would be useful to gain an understanding of who these tourists are, and what they expect from the museums they visit.

Before discussing the subgroups of tourism and tourists I will define the terms as I will use them in this paper. Tourism is the industry or business of providing accommodations for tourists. As with the term museum, there have been many different definitions for the word tourist. Professionals in the tourism industry, who tend to be primarily concerned with marketing and economic impacts, define tourists in relation to how many miles are traveled away from the place of residence, the duration of travel, the amount of money spent, and the activities in which tourists engage. Even so, there is no clear standard definition among this group alone. According to Mathieson and Wall, "A survey of eighty travel and tourism studies conducted by Frechtling (1976) yielded forty-three definitions for the three terms, traveler, tourist, and visitor. Such results indicate the lack of coordination in travel research and hamper comparisons between travel research data" (Mathieson and Wall 1982: 10).
Social scientists, environmentalists, and anthropologists, who are more concerned with social, environmental, and cultural impacts of tourism respectively, often have other definitions of tourists relative to their fields. For example, one anthropologist figures social acceptance of travel as a necessary factor in her definition (Smith 1989: 1). For the purposes of this paper, it will suffice to use the very broad definition of tourist, that is interchangeable with the term visitor, each defining a person who travels away from his or her place of residence temporarily for some physical and/or psychological change for recreation, pleasure, and/or education. This definition is paraphrased from one used by Smith in Hosts and Guests (Smith 1989: 1). Recreation is the activity associated with the pursuit of pleasure in unobligatory time. Leisure is discretionary time not spent in the pursuit of making a living. In sum, a tourist engages in recreation during leisure, usually with discretionary income. The tourist is a “seeker of novelty, pleasure, and relaxation” (Jakle 1985: 14).

As shown in Table 1, tourists can then be further characterized into “interactional” types based on the interaction between the tourist and the destination area, or “cognitive-normative” types based on the psychological motivations of the traveler (Murphy 1985: 5). As an example, someone motivated to travel as described by the experiential or allocentric models will probably be a non-institutionalized traveler, an explorer, elite, or off-beat. This person would most likely not be a mass or charter tourist requiring full western amenities.

This typology of tourists can be used to relate to the different genres of tourism. In her book Hosts and Guests, Valene Smith describes the following tourism types: Ethnic, Cultural, Historical, Environmental, and Recreational. Ethnic tourism is the type in which customs and ceremonies of indigenous peoples are observed, and crafts representing these cultures are purchased. In this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactive Model</th>
<th>Tourist Typologies</th>
<th>Destination Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohen (1972)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td><strong>Demands</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Institutional</td>
<td>Drifter</td>
<td>Search for exotic and strange environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traveler</td>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>Arrange own trip, off the beaten track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized</td>
<td>Individual mass tourist</td>
<td>Arrangements made through tourist agency Search for familiar, travel in security of own environmental bubble and guided tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traveler</td>
<td>Organized mass tourist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith (1977)</strong></td>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>Quest for discovery and desire to interact with host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elite</td>
<td>Tour of unusual places, using prearranged native facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-beat</td>
<td>Get away from the crowds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unusual</td>
<td>Occasional side trips... more isolated area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incipient mass tourist</td>
<td>Travel as individuals or small groups; seeking combination of amenities and authenticity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>Middle-class income and values leads to development of a “tourist bubble”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>Search for relaxation and good times in a new but familiar env.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-normative</td>
<td>Allocentric</td>
<td>Adventuresome and individual exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>models</td>
<td>Mid-centric</td>
<td>Individual travel to areas with facilities and growing reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plog (1972)</strong></td>
<td>Psychocentric</td>
<td>Organized package holiday...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohen (1979)</strong></td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Leave world of everyday life...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern pilgrimage</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Quest for alternative lifestyle and to engage in life of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diversionary</td>
<td>Escape from boredom and routine of everyday...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for pleasure</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>Trip as entertainment, relaxation to restore physical and mental powers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Murphy 1985: 6)
country, attending a “Pow Wow” of a Native American culture, and purchasing a piece of beadwork or basketry there, would fit this genre (Smith 1989: 4-6).

Cultural tourism is similar to ethnic tourism, but the focus of observation is more on general lifestyle as opposed to a particular ethnic group. Going to a fishing town’s waterfront district to take in the local color, or to a rodeo to see cowboys and cowboy culture, are examples of this genre of tourism.

Historical tourism is what Smith calls the “Museum-Cathedral circuit that stresses the glories of the past” (Smith 1989: 5). Other destinations or attractions of this genre would include sites or monuments of historic preservation. More recently this type of tourism has also been called Heritage tourism. For example, this term was frequently used during the 1990 annual meeting of the Oregon and Washington Museums’ Association, during which the focus was on museums and tourism.

Environmental tourism is primarily geographic in scope. The attractions can be quite remote, such as the observation of a certain wildlife species in a wilderness area; or they can be urban, such as tours of industrial plants to observe man-land relationships. The Hanford nuclear plant on the Columbia River has a visitor center which depicts this type of industrial environmental tourism.

Recreational tourism according to Smith is often, “sand, sea, and sex-promoted by beautiful color pictures that make you want to be there” (Smith 1989: 5). It also includes activities for those who wish to commune with nature and participate in leisurely sports such as fishing, skiing, golf, and hiking. Another sort of recreation mentioned by Smith is the indulgence “in a new morality” (Smith 1989: 5). In this case, gambling and other forms of nightlife feature as the attractions.
Again, in reference to Table 1, one can postulate a relationship between the type of tourist and the different genres of tourism. The Drifter, Explorer, Elite, Offbeat, and Unusual or Allocentric, Existential, Experimental, and Experiential are more likely to engage in the Ethnic, Cultural, and Environmental genres of tourism. On the other end of the spectrum, Incipient mass, Mass, and Charter, or Diversionary and Recreational tourists are more likely to engage in Recreational tourism. Historical tourism is likely to be engaged in by all types of tourists, depending on where the particular historical attraction, museum, or cathedral is located, whether rural or urban, and thus how accessible it is.

To a great extent the reason for explaining of all these types and genres of tourists and tourism is to facilitate the study of their respective impacts upon economies, societies, cultures, and environments. As the tourism industry has grown world wide, these impacts have become extremely important, for not all of them are positive. As Butler states, "The nature of tourism to some degree determines the nature and pattern of growth, and unless checked and controlled, will inevitably create a set of problems" (Butler 1990: 40).

Research conducted in tourism in the late 1970's and 1980's, including Smith's Hosts and Guests (1989), Rosenow and Pulsipher's Tourism: the good, the bad, and the ugly (1989), and Mathieson and Wall's Tourism: economic, physical and social impacts (1982), looked beyond the possible financial benefits of tourism, and sought to make readers aware of tourism's negative impacts to local cultures, societies, economies, and environments. These negative impacts have been particularly prevalent in tourist destinations in foreign third world nations and especially to their indigenous cultures. However, they can also be found in tourist oriented communities in more developed countries.
Destination areas where recreational tourism is most prevalent in the United States, such as Florida, Southern California and Hawaii for sun and sand, Colorado, Utah and Wyoming for winter sports, and Las Vegas, Reno and Atlantic City for the gambling and nightlife, one can see the most extreme negative impacts. Very often these negative impacts are the result of too many tourists in a particular area, effectively surpassing its carrying capacity. Yet, as one author humorously but realistically comments, "To have some tourism but not too much is like being a little bit pregnant. Fun getting there but an increasing problem living with it as the product grows and changes almost independent of the parents' influence" (Butler 1990: 44).

Some of these not necessarily desirable but commonly occurring changes that result from uncontrolled growth are congestion, including traffic, pollution, environmental degradation, local animosity towards tourists, commercialization of culture, stereotyping between tourists and locals, loss of cultural authenticity, predominance of the service industry in the local economy and resultant out migration of young locals, and inflated prices of consumer goods (Mathieson and Wall 1982). One critic phrases his concern of tourism's ability to go wrong as:

A paradox of tourism, however, is that the industry carries within it the seeds of its own destruction. Successful development of a resource or amenity can lead to the destruction of those very qualities which attracted the visitors in the first place. The development of tourism is occasionally undertaken in such haste and without proper planning that it simply outstrips the local infrastructure and resource base, resulting in unexpected costs which further reduce its overall economic benefit to the community (Murphy 1985: 32).

Most often this paradox and the symptoms of negative impacts are the result of
ineffective planning and a lack of a complete understanding of the complex nature of the tourism industry.

Tourism is like other industries in that it has a life cycle through which it evolves in a destination area in a sequential order. From its conception, it is in the entrepreneurial stage when there is a great deal of creativity. Following, there are the collectivity stage, the formalization stage, and the elaboration stage, through which the industry grows, and becomes larger also in terms of its impacts. After this final stage the industry may revitalize and continue, or it may decline and reach obsolescence (Daft 1989: 191).

Uel Blank, author of *The Community Tourism Industry Imperative*, describes some of the other factors involved in the tourist industry cycle:

> Many areas started as an upscale area, appealing to the wealthy. But there is a strong tendency for mass to follow class. Area quality and appeal often deteriorate as increasing volumes are served. Adding to the effect are technological developments in travel marketing; technological and marketing innovations almost always have differential effects upon TDA’s [Tourist Destination Areas]. Cyclical change is also produced by competing areas, coupled with failure of the given destination area to renew adequately (Blank 1989: 37-38).

So we see that the tourism industry has become a complex one, as it is affected by many different elements in its external environment just as it affects other elements in the same realm. Again, this complexity testifies to the necessity of careful planning, not only to minimize negative impacts from it, but to insure the continued well being of the industry itself.

It is interesting to note that not only the tourist industry experiences a cycle, however. G.V. Doxey, in researching the social impacts of tourism, discovered that the host-guest relationship also tends to follow a cycle, quite similar in
fact to that followed by the industry. Doxey developed an index of tourist irritation, or "irridex" which is reproduced in Table 2. As the tourist industry grows in an area, and if it is not planned and controlled, there is the tendency for local irritation to grow in response, though the rate and intensity of this cycle is case specific. For example, an area with a single season tourist industry will show a different level of irritation than one with year round tourism.

**Table 2** Index of tourist irritation

1. The level of euphoria
   People are enthusiastic and thrilled by tourist development. They welcome the stranger and there is a mutual feeling of satisfaction. There are opportunities for locals and money flows in along with the tourist.

2. The level of apathy
   As the industry expands people begin to take the tourist for granted. He rapidly becomes a target for profit-taking and contact on the personal plane begins to become more formal.

3. The level of irritation
   This will begin when the industry is nearing the saturation point or is allowed to pass a level at which the locals cannot handle the numbers without the expansion of facilities.

4. The level of antagonism
   The irritations have become more overt. People now see the tourist as the harbinger of all that is bad. 'Taxes have gone up because of the tourist.' 'They have no respect for property.' 'They have corrupted our youth.' 'They are bent on destroying all that is fine in our town.' Mutual politeness has now given way to antagonism and the tourist is 'ripped off'.

5. The final level
   All this while people have forgotten that what they cherished in the first place was what drew the tourist, but in the wild scramble to develop they overlooked this and allowed the environment to change. What they now must learn to live with is the fact that their ecosystem sill never be the same again. They might still be able to draw tourists but of a very different type from those they so happily welcomed in early years. If the destination is large enough to cope with mass tourism it will continue to thrive.


**Alternative Tourism**

As tourism and its negative impacts have gained more recognition in the
realm of tourism research, alternative types of tourism have been explored recently, as forms of “sustainable” tourism. Sustainable is a term that has also become popular in recent years in extractive industries such as agriculture and forestry. In a conference report on alternative tourism, it is defined as:

a broad term covering such notions or strategies as appropriate tourism, soft tourism, responsible tourism, people-to-people tourism, controlled tourism, small-scale tourism, cottage tourism, green tourism, and more... is regarded as offering a wide range of developmental options or strategies which are (1) more sensitive and sympathetic to the host communities and their total habitats, (2) more cognizant of the tourists and the quality of their experience, and (3) more rewarding for people involved in the operational structure of tourism (Academy for the Study of Tourism 1990: 39).

One researcher defines the “alternative traveler” as one who is “likely to be a self-catering individual, who travels alone or in small groups and who can also be a responsible traveler, inducing little adverse impact on local communities” (Minerbi 1988: 3).

Alternative tourism sounds too good to be true, and in fact it is. It is not an unconditional panacea for the problems associated with tourism development. As one author explains:

the alternative traveler, wandering in local area and settlements may be disruptive to people’s lifestyles. Large scale commercialized mass tourism and charter tourism is often disruptive because of the sheer number of visitors descending on local communities and fragile coastal environments. But group tourism, to the extent that it is confined in resort areas and along clear tourist bus routes, may impact local communities less than the free and independent car renting individual tourist wandering in unpredictable ways and localities (Minerbi 1988: 3).

Another critic of alternative tourism comments that it is “really a disguised class
prejudice. Large numbers of middle and lower class tourists are not wel-
come...but small numbers of affluent, well educated and well behaved tourists
are welcome* (Butler 1990: 42).

Alternative tourism and the alternative traveler are actually not new in
concept. The alternative traveler is really none other than the elite, explorer,
drifter, etc. as defined by Smith. What is different about alternative tourism is
that there are some who wish to see mass tourism be replaced by forms of non-
institutionalized tourism. In Table 3 one finds the possible implications of alter-
native tourism. In comparison to the implications of more conventional tourism
(incipient mass, mass, and charter), we see that there is a trade off between the
social/environmental and the economic, and there still are potential negative
impacts to the social and environmental arenas. Nevertheless, the negative im-
pacts of mass tourism are far greater and are quite real. Though the alterna-
tives may not be perfect either, they at least address the problems, and seek
other ways and means for the tourist industry to exist in a world of ever diminish-
ing diversity, both in natural and cultural resources.

Ecotourism is one of the subtypes of alternative or green tourism. In her
report to Conservation International titled "Ecotourism: The Uneasy Alliance",
Karen Ziffler states that, "Ecotourism, is by definition a planned approach which
carefully discusses the impacts and benefits before development begins" (Ziffler
1989: 3). She defines Ecotourism further as:

A form of tourism inspired primarily by the natural
history of an area, including its indigenous cultures.
The ecotourist visits relatively undeveloped areas in
the spirit of appreciation, participation and sensitivity.
The ecotourist practices a non-consumptive use of
wildlife and natural resources and contributes to the
visited area through labor or financial means aimed
at directly benefiting the conservation of the site and
the economic well-being of the local residents. The
Table 3

Possible Implications of Alternative Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourists Numbers</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>Slightly Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Slightly negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Fragility</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Slightly positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy Sophistication</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leakage</td>
<td>Slightly positive</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Local control</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning extent</td>
<td>Slightly negative</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Butler 1990: 43.

Visit should strengthen the ecotourist's appreciation and dedication to conservation issues in general, and to the specific needs of the locale. Ecotourism also implies a managed approach by the host country or region which commits itself to establishing and maintaining the sites with the participation of local residents, marketing them appropriately, enforcing regulations, and using the proceeds of the enterprise to fund the area's land management as well as community development (Ziffler 1989: 5).

Though Ziffler emphasized the nature based, or what Smith would call the environmental or nature tourism, I would like to add to her definition of this genre, heritage or historical tourism, for heritage implies not only history, but preservation and representation of culture. What planned environmental or nature tourism can do to conserve nature, I believe historic sites, museums, and interpretive centers can do to preserve cultures, living, endangered and extinct.
Furthermore, they can help to minimize the negative social and cultural impacts to those cultures that are extant.

**Contemporary Issues in Museums Relating to Tourism**

Examples of museums already in existence that perform the role of model cultures are living history museums such as Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts, Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia. In addition, tourist attractions such as the Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC) on the island of Oahu have been developed with themes for ethnic tourism, which also act as model cultures.

In an article on the Polynesian Cultural Center in *Hosts and Guests*, Max E. Stanton states that:

> The Center is basically an attempt to reconstruct lifestyles that are vanishing or have disappeared in the wake of the vast flood of technological gadgetry of the twentieth century. The model caters to ethnic tourism, providing to the tourist to see in one afternoon what many of the indigenous residents of the various Polynesian societies themselves, rarely, if ever, see. The visitor is, through the model-culture experience, able to gain a brief insight into a selective array of Polynesian cultures without the necessity of traveling throughout the Polynesian Triangle. Another PCC purpose is to keep alive (even revive) traditional art forms and practices, giving the guest a chance to view some limited historical aspects of a life-style as it once was (Stanton, 1989: 252).

According to Stanton, one of the primary purposes of a model culture, and how one qualifies whether an institution such as a living history or culture museum performs as one, is that it draws visitors or tourists away from the "real" culture, so that they do not interfere with it and its people. Without this interference, or through the minimization of contact with extant cultures, the negative impacts of the more mass oriented types of tourism can be minimized.

A problem that often arises with the model culture theorem is one of por-
traying cultures and history authentically. Authenticity is a problem inherent to museums, because exhibits are composed of objects taken out of their natural context. It is a dilemma not easily solved, however, because the unauthentic setting of a museum is the price paid for the preservation of that object. Moreover, sometimes unauthenticity may be due to the unreality of the general visitors' expectations. As was mentioned earlier, the general tourist has a strong leisure orientation, and does not want to have to participate in being entertained. Furthermore, the tourist is not likely to spend more than a few hours at any one facility, if that long. As a result, much of what can be interpreted about a culture in that brief time also tends to be superficial.

Another problem with authenticity relates to the visitor's values, which form his expectations. At PCC, Stanton says that, "many visitors have preconceived ideas of what Polynesian 'should be' and are sometimes disappointed when their expectations are not met" (Stanton 1989: 254). As examples, he mentions, "Some visitors are critical because no one lives in the houses at the Center. One visitor, who claimed to be a trained social scientist, observed that the women were 'over-dressed', that there was not one bare-breasted woman at the Center" (Stanton 1989: 254).

The qualities inherent to museums as retainers of objects lead to difficulties in authenticity as well. In his book The Tourist, Dean MacCannell remarks:

> Modern museums and parks are anti-historical and unnatural. They are not, of course, anti-historical and unnatural in the sense of their destroying the past or nature because, to the contrary, they preserve them, but as they preserve, they automatically separate modernity from its past and from nature and elevate it above them. Nature and the past are made a part of the present, not in the form of an unreflected inner spirit, a mysterious soul, but rather as revealed objects, as tourist attractions (MacCannell 1976: 84).
The issue of authenticity is particularly significant in relation to historical museums, whether living, or not. Weingartner, in his article "What Museums Are Good For", comments:

Museums, in this familiar world bring us into the presence of objects that belong to lives different from ours and give us an opportunity to become directly acquainted with them (Weingartner 1984: 35).

So, in a history museum, the visitor may become acquainted with objects of the past within the scope of the particular museum. Jakle states, however, that, "Historical attractions are as much a product of the present day values and needs as a product of past history" (Jakle 1985: 289). Thus, in a very real sense, the history museum is contrived, "a substitute reality instead of authentic experience", because its objects are out of their natural context, and are portrayed within the realm of the values of the particular museum operators of the present time (Watkins 1989: 43).

Therefore, if the cultural center/model culture, museum, interpretive center, historic site, or historical museum operators are concerned primarily with meeting the tourist's recreational needs and expectations, then it is very likely the particular facility will portray some or all of Thomas Schelereth's "Distortions in History". These distortions satisfy the romantic perceptions that the average person has of a particular culture or of the past. For many people it is that very romanticism that attracts them to the museum in the first place. It is, therefore, imperative that a museum go beyond the entertainment value of its collections and exhibits, to educate with accuracy, in order not to perpetuate myth for the sake of commercial success (Schelereth 1980).

The issue of authenticity is thus part of a larger dilemma with regard to museums' general functions of education and entertainment. Education is an
imperative goal for a museum in order for it to be socially and publicly responsible. However, it must also be entertaining in order to attract visitors with a leisure orientation, and this includes children and locals, as well as tourists.

Burcaw, in his book, *Introduction to Museum Work* states that:

The museum must attract visitors and give them a pleasant experience while educating them. The entertainment aspect must be neither too much or too little. It must be appropriate to the kind of museum, the kind of visitors, the kind of subject matter (Burcaw 1983: 130).

To educate and to entertain simultaneously is the process of what is called interpretation.

In the now classic work on the subject of interpretation, Christopher Crittenden, in the preface to Tilden’s book *Interpreting Our Heritage*, says,

To excite curiosity, to open a person’s mind, there is a challenge for anyone who seeks to communicate ideas. I know of no one more sensitive to the challenge than the interpreter, for he is a teacher in the purest sense of the word. He works with people who are at leisure, at the special places of beauty and history which have been dedicated and set aside. He seeks to translate vividly, the language of the earth, and of the earth’s inhabitants (Tilden 1967: v).

Tilden himself defines interpretation subjectively as the “inspiration and spiritual meaning that lie behind what the visitor can with his senses perceive”, or, more objectively as, “An educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of original objects, by firsthand experience, and by illustrative media, rather than simply to communicate factual information” (Tilden 1967: 4,8).

In the context of a historical museum as an example, a display of objects such as a set of dishes from the mid-nineteenth century, so labeled, is basically
sterile and uninteresting. However, the same set of dishes could be in an exhibit about the settlement of a town in the West, and labels and graphics could illustrate how these dishes came with a family by covered wagon from the East, and were passed down from generation to generation as family heirlooms. In this scenario the dishes become a part of a human story that visitors can relate to their own lives and families. This is an example of how interpretation can be utilized in a museum setting, and ultimately, how entertainment can be combined with education.

In actuality the idea of educated entertainment is not so new. Charles Wilson Peale, mentioned earlier, in the nineteenth century understood the necessity of educating in the museum. "Peale worried...about the image, integrity, and long range effects of some entertainment. Ultimately, he sought to combine information and entertainment through what he called 'rational amusement'" (Flint 1990: 65). Michael Spock of the Field Museum in Chicago, a contemporary museum professional, expresses the same concerns today. He says:

> Excitement is only one of dozens of human emotions that learning and experiencing things engender. So I don't see excitement alone as a goal. I am willing to play to anything that is within a normal range of human behaviors and that is not obviously mere pandering to inappropriate human qualities. So I keep worrying about the use of words like excitement or entertainment, because they sound like end points rather than parts of the spectrum of strategies that museums deploy (Spock 1990: 68).

In general, the dilemma of context, education, and entertainment persist in the modern museum. As yet, interpretation is the best tool available to alleviate the problems of this dilemma.

There are two major requirements for authentic effective interpretation or
communication. One is extensive research into one's collections; one must know the facts and have correct information on which to base a valid story. The second major requirement is to know the audience to which the story will be told. Children, senior citizens, urban residents, residents from small rural communities, and tourists may all have different levels of understanding and experience, or what is called cognitive models, and therefore, needs and expectations. Museums and other attractions must strive to be authentic while simultaneously addressing various different audiences, each with its own background and expectations. One may have to tell a story somewhat differently to each of these groups in order to get a message across effectively and appropriately.

Museum evaluations through surveys help museum operators and exhibit designers understand the needs and expectations of its audience. Exhibit evaluations determine whether the museum is meeting those needs. After all, it is the exhibit area, not the storage rooms or administrative offices, with which the visitor interacts.

By determining what the visitors, including the tourists, want from a particular museum, by surveying them and observing their behavior in the museum environment, exhibit design becomes a better communicative device. Communication is the essence of both interpretation and education. The more a museum knows about its audience of visitors, the better messages can be conveyed and transferred, and the easier a museum can meet its basic public oriented functional goals and objectives.

Furthermore, it is also the evaluation of attendance and visitor satisfaction that can assist to justify a museum's budget, the award of a grant, and public support in general. In an article that promotes the idea of museum evaluation, one author says:

Funding from public and private sources is becoming
more difficult to obtain, and attention in the museum community has begun to shift from the educational ideal to the real need to increase earned income. Evaluation can lead to educationally effective exhibits that create visitor satisfaction, favorable word-of-mouth publicity, and increased attendance. It's worth a try (Borun 1989: 40).

Another purpose of museum evaluation, as another author states, is, "not only does evaluation of museum attendance provide evidence of community use, it can also help document the impact of changes in museums, such as new or expanded collections, new buildings or galleries, publicity campaigns, special events, educational programs or experiments in marketing" (Loomis 1987: 35). In sum, surveys and evaluations can be used to determine a museum's impact, depending on the focus of the survey, on the individual visitor or to the community at large. Aside from the usefulness of the museum visitor survey to the museum itself, these surveys can also be utilized in tourism planning in a community when a large segment of the museum's audience consists of tourists.
CHAPTER 3

Tourism and Museums in Oregon: The Oregon Coast

Now that I have illustrated the relationship between museums and tourism in a broad sense, I will now focus on this relationship as it exists in the late 1980's and 1990's in the state of Oregon, and more specifically, in that state's Coastal Zone region. In this region tourism has become a leading industry, and museums, though many are quite small, are numerous in this region. For many of these museums, if not all of them, tourists compose a major portion of their audiences. In this chapter I will first present data on tourism in Oregon, distinguishing between out-of-state and resident visitors. Next I will present data and some analyses of tourism in the Oregon Coastal Zone. I will also explore the state of museums in this region.

As many of Oregon's natural resource dependent and extractive industries, such as forestry, agriculture, and fishing, have faced setbacks and declines in recent years, tourism has become an increasingly important economic sector for the state. Tourism has not just happened, but has been planned and marketed through agencies such as the Oregon Tourism Division, the Oregon Tourism Alliance, and through regional groups such as the Oregon Coastal Association, and local chambers of commerce.

One author describes this process as the "Oregon Comeback Plan." He explains further:

Since public resources are too limited to spur economic development in all parts of the economy, regions formulate regional economic strategies...Much of the hopes for economic growth on the central and southern coast also center on tourism (Rettig 1990: 1).
This comeback plan has been successful in the short run for the state, as well as for specific regions, such as the Oregon Coastal Zone.

In order for tourism to be successful for the state and its coastal region in the long run, however, one must ultimately understand who the visitors are, what they do, where they go, and what they want, so that their needs and the state’s needs can be fruitfully and compatibly met. Essentially, these questions are those that are found in visitor evaluations, not unlike those posed by evaluations made in the museum context. Therefore, evaluation is indeed as important in the context of tourism planning as it is to that of the museum.

Between 1988 and 1990 several such surveys have been conducted on the local site specific, regional, and state levels. Examples are the BLM report, Visitor Profile and Impact Analysis... (1990) for the Yaquina Head Outstanding Natural Area site in Newport, the Washington Sea Grant report titled, Tourism in the Columbia Gorge: A Profile of Visitors, Accommodations, and Economic Impacts (1988) and the Oregon Tourism Division report, Oregon Travel and Tourism (1989), summarized below.

Out-Of-State Visitors

According to a report by the Oregon Tourism Division, 92% of the out-of-state visitors to Oregon are American; 30.2% of these are from California, 12.5% from Washington, 4% from Texas, and 3.4% from Florida. Most of these are repeat visitors, coming to the state for pleasure, or for visiting friends and relatives. Fifty-five percent of Oregon’s visitors travel by automobile, and most stay three to five nights (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 4-5).

Demographically, only 16.6% of Oregon’s visitors are under thirty five years old. Just over eighteen percent are over sixty-five. The remainder are ba-
sically evenly distributed between the two extremes. These visitors are also fairly well educated, 58.3% holding a bachelor’s or a graduate degree. Most have a family income evenly distributed between twenty and seventy-five thousand dollars per year (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 6).

Visitor activities in the state are predominantly geared toward sightseeing (79.6%), shopping (51%), or visiting friends and relatives (42.8%). Oregon Tourism Division data indicate that 44.8% of visitors visit historic sites or areas, 48% on the first visit and 42.8% on the second or return visit. Only 35% of the visitors indicated that they chose to hike and picnic. Of those who travel for pleasure, 49.3% responded that they went to historic sites, of those who travel for business and conferences, 24.4% went to historic sites, and of those who travel for business and pleasure, 51% went to historic sites. The business-oriented visitors responded they preferred to shop, which makes sense since they tend to be located primarily in the urban areas. These figures indicate, then, that historic sites and areas are a significant attractor for the state’s visitors (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 60).

Though 73.6% of Oregon’s visitors said they were very satisfied with their stay in the state, and 23.7% said they were merely satisfied, only 12.5% of those who went to the historic sites found them to be exceptional. In contrast, 37.1% found them very good, 28.7% found them about average and only 0.5% combined found them disappointing or very poor. These results send a very clear message: Oregon’s historic attractions, which most likely include museums and interpretive centers, are not meeting the highest expectations and needs of visitors. Cultural activities, which probably include visits to art galleries, art museums, and other non-historic museums, also did not fare well, as only 7.9% of those who visited them found them to be exceptional, 25.3% felt they were both
very good and about average. Nearly half, 40.9%, did not know what they thought of Oregon's cultural activities (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 65). This could mean that the visitors did not go to existing cultural sites either by design or by choice, or did not understand what the question meant.

The attractions that were rated the most satisfactory by Oregon’s visitors, were the scenery, along with the closely related recreational opportunities, and the coastal and mountain regions of the state. In fact, 62% of these visitors go to some part of the coast during their trip, 42% of those to the central coast, 34.3% to the south coast, and 36.3% to the north coast. The other major destination area attractor in the state is the Portland-Metro area (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 45).

Resident Visitors

The Oregon Tourism Division report also studies Oregon’s resident visitors. Like the out-of-state visitors, they primarily seek relaxation and sightseeing. They predominantly travel by automobile, and take shorter but more frequent day or weekend trips. The Coastal region again figures as one of the most popular destination areas for pleasure trips, both for overnight and day trips (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 74). In terms of activities, 72.2% chose relaxation and sightseeing as their prime objective. Visiting friends and relatives was second. Nearly thirty-three percent chose to visit museums and historic sites. In sum, Oregon residents are much like out-of-state visitors in terms of their activities, but, “are more likely to focus their trips around specific activities...since they are more familiar with the state, travel shorter distances, and take a larger number of shorter trips...” (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 75).
The Oregon Coast

As the Oregon Coast is one of the most popular destination areas in the state for resident and out-of-state visitors alike, it is appropriate to analyze this particular region in more depth. As shown in Figure 1 the Oregon Coastal Zone consists of the following counties from north to south: Clatsop, Tillamook, Lincoln, Western Lane, Western Douglas, Coos, and Curry.

In 1972 Lincoln County ranked first in the region in terms of income generated by tourism, followed by Tillamook, Clatsop, Curry, and Coos (Oregon Coastal Conservation and Development Commission 1974: F-15). In 1987 Lincoln County still ranked first with $59.1 million in tourism generated personal income, but Clatsop County ranked second at $36.8 million. Coos County ranked third with $33.8 million, followed by Tillamook, Coastal Lane, and Curry Counties, each with $11 million, and lastly, Coastal Douglas County with $5 million (Radtke and Davis 1990: 14).

The characteristic common to tourism in all of these counties is its seasonality. Based on traffic counts, it was found that the winter months, January especially, were lowest, and the summer months, August especially, were the highest for visitor traffic (Oregon Coastal Conservation and Development Commission 1974: F-32). Today, "the peak season begins just before Memorial Day and drops off after Labor Day" (Rettig 1990: 5). The seasonal nature of tourism in the region, combined with the fact that so many travel by auto, means that there is a high level of auto congestion in the peak season, in combination with high economic activity. In contrast, the winter months bring relief to local motor vehicle drivers, but they also bring a definite economic lull to tourist oriented businesses and facilities.

Because of the large volume of people passing through and stopping in
the region during the peak season, it verges on incipient mass tourism, although mass tourism with charter tours have not yet gained in popularity in the region as it has in California. Nevertheless, in general these visitors, who travel as individuals or in small groups, do expect amenities such as they would find at home, and for the most part, seem to fit the Mid-centric model of tourist as defined in Table 1. A majority of these visitors also can be described as recreational, as opposed to ethnic, or even environmental, even though it is the scenery that attracts them. It is their strong pleasure and relaxation orientation which makes them recreational tourists. During the summer months, the economic, physical, and social impacts of these tourists, both positive and negative, can be quite high on individual communities and environments, depending on how many of them are in one locale at a time. Beaches become noticeably more trash-covered, parks are crowded, restaurants are packed, and for the local person, antagonism can get quite high.

Interviews with several Newport residents of various ages, sex and occupations last year provided evidence of cultural conflict and extreme stereotyping of tourists by coastal residents. One local fish plant worker said the only good thing about the "terrorists", as he called tourists, were the "sweet sixteen year-old blonds who gawk at us when we're hanging out in front of Point Adams [a fish plant on the town's bayfront]" (Pool 1990: 3). A medical surgery nurse responded, "Tourism: Just Say No" (Pool 1990: 3). Even waitresses at a popular restaurant in town stated their distaste with the tourists. One said she wanted their money, but then wished they would go away. In comparison to the "irridex" in Table 2, it appears that these locals are certainly at the level of irritation, if not antagonism.

On the other hand, however, tourism does generate money through
sales, and income through jobs for the communities along the Oregon Coast. Room tax receipts for Central and Southern Oregon were approximately $1.9 million each in fiscal year 1987-1988 (Oregon Tourism Division 1989: 11). Overall, tourism generated approximately $1.8 billion for the state of Oregon.

Rebecca Johnson, of Oregon State University's Forest Resource Recreation Department, did a study of "The Role of State Parks in Oregon Tourism" (Johnson 1986) as a basis for a later study, focusing on the Oregon Coast (Johnson, Obermiller, Radtke 1989). In the first study, through surveys of State Park visitors, she found that "58% of the coastal respondents stayed at least one night in a State Park" (Johnson 1986: 3). She also evaluated these visitors' expenditures, separating them by resident and out-of-state. Resident expenditures, she says, "represent a type of import substitution since [they] are not 'sending' their dollars out to other states for vacations" (Johnson 1986: 4). Tourist dollars from out-of-state visitors, on the other hand, "represent 'new' money to the state of Oregon and initiate the multiplier process in the state's economy (i.e. they represent an Oregon export)" (Johnson 1986: 4).

As was discussed earlier, tourism impacts, whether positive or negative, depend a great deal on the numbers of tourists utilizing a destination area. For the Oregon Coast, the numbers seem to depend on ease of access to the particular destination in the region. According to Bruce Rettig's report on Oregon Coastal recreation with regard to resident visitors, "people take the fastest and easiest route to the coast" (Rettig 1990: 9). This tendency is also probably found in Californian visitors, in that they most likely use I-5 or Hwy. 101. Rettig's study shows that people from the Portland area primarily use Highways 30, 26, or 18 to get to the coast, which lead to Clatsop, Tillamook, and North Lincoln counties respectively. Residents from the central Willamette Valley use
Highways 18 or 20, which go to Lincoln City and Newport in Lincoln County respectively. Eugene-Springfield residents tend to use Highway 126 to the Florence area. Roseburg residents use Highway 42 to go to Coos Bay or Bandon. This southern route to the coast, with access even farther south into Curry County from the interior, where the major resident population centers are, is neither as quick nor convenient as the coastal routes farther north mentioned above. Perhaps this explains in part why tourism plays a smaller role in the economies of Coos and Curry counties than it does for Clatsop, Tillamook, and Lincoln counties.

Although efforts have been made to determine the economic impacts of tourism to the Oregon Coast and its communities, no studies of the impacts of tourism on coastal museums or museum programs have been conducted. However, such studies have been conducted elsewhere. For example, a Museum of New Mexico study, designed to determine visitor economic impact and the impact of the museum's revenues and expenditures, found that, in 1985-1986, the museum had an overall impact of $10,319,500. This was more than two and a half times its revenues (American Association of State and Local History, History News 1987: 9).

While there are no large museums in the Oregon Coastal Zone, there are museums of many different sizes and types. There are museums of art and history, including city, county, maritime, newspaper, lighthouse, logging, and railroad history. There are historic home museums. There are aquariums; and there are interpretive centers, many of which combine history and natural history. No comprehensive list of coastal museums has been made; while the AASLH 1990 Directory (Bray 1990) lists ten historical museums from Astoria to Gold Beach, a brochure titled "Historical Museums: Oregon South Coast" lists
eight from North Bend to Brookings alone (See Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Historical Museums of the Southern Oregon Coast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Coos County Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos Bay</td>
<td>The (Marshfield) Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandon</td>
<td>Bandon Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Point</td>
<td>Coos County Logging Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powers</td>
<td>Wagner House and Railroad Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixes</td>
<td>Hughes House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Beach</td>
<td>Curry County Historical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>Chetco Valley Historical Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical museums are the most numerous of the various types, and the largest on the coast is the Columbia River Maritime Museum in Astoria. In 1982 its annual budget was $150,000. In 1990 it had twelve full time employees and a membership of 1,653. The Clatsop County Historical Society, also in Astoria, is relatively large for the region. In fiscal year 1982 it had a budget of $75,000, and in 1990 it had four full time employees and a membership of 1,200. Many of the others by comparison are quite small. In the 1983 Oregon Museums Association Directory, the annual budget for the previous year for the Lincoln County Historical Society was $55,000, for the Tillamook County Pioneer Museum it was $46,019, for the Coos County Historical Society it was $15,000, for the Curry County Museum it was $12,750, and for the Siuslaw Pioneer Museum it was $5000 (OMA 1983, Directory). Some of the smaller museums have only one full time paid employee and many have only one part-time paid employee. Some only have volunteer staff (AASLH, Bray, ed. Directory 1990: 556-565). The number of paid employees generally reflects the size of the museum's budget: the smaller the staff, the smaller the budget. Memberships for these society oriented museums tend to range between approximately one and three hundred. Membership size also tends to reflect financial strength of a mu-
seum, though few museums are completely dependent on dues.

It is ironic that so many of the museums along the Oregon Coast, where a majority of the state's visitors go, are so limited. This is largely due to the low availability of funding for the facilities and the small number of museum professionals among their staffs. It could be that these are some of the museums that the state's visitor surveys indicated did not meet visitor expectations (Oregon Tourism Division 1989).

One way these small museums can help themselves to overcome their limitations is to collaborate with other agencies or entities involved in attracting visitors. Since so many visitors come to the Coast for recreational opportunities, it would make sense for these museums to collaborate with state and national park programs in their areas. Another avenue would be to collaborate with ethnic groups and/or other specialized groups, who are interested in the preservation of their heritage.

On another scale, museum staff could have a higher degree of relationship and collaboration with other museums in the Oregon Coast region through personal contact, and through professional organizations, such as the Oregon Museums Association.

It is also through this sort of collaboration that alternative forms of tourism become possible in a community. One local institution or entity alone cannot affect mass forms of tourism, let alone stem the tide of tourism and its negative consequences. However, a group of entities cooperating together and following a regional interpretive plan can, I believe, have at least some positive effect.

If several entities, such as local museums, state parks, and other major attractions, collaborate with signage, brochures, and a common thematic approach and message communicated through their various programs and ex-
hibits, it may be possible to attract and influence visitors in such a way as to minimize negative impacts to the environment, economy, and culture/society of a particular community and/or region. This concept has been realized in the state of Hawaii where the State has established a cooperative program with community groups who act as Curators for different historic sites as part of that state’s historic preservation program (Minerbi 1988: 4). Because these efforts have been small-scale and in some sense experimental, little research has been done on their effectiveness or on their costs. Such research, even though inconclusive and tentative, is important for the rational development of alternative tourism on the coast.

In conclusion, in this chapter it has been shown that tourism is an important industry for the state of Oregon and its Coastal Zone region. The numerous museums in the region suggest their potential importance to the tourism industry. The issues for tourism and museums, discussed in chapter two, have been shown to be relevant for this region in the late 1980’s and 1990’s. There is concern that negative impacts from tourism will increase in the area along with the number of people who travel there. For many of the region’s museums, many of which are quite small, there is concern about constraints in financial and human resources, and about the improvement of their visitors’ satisfaction with museum programs.
CHAPTER 4

Alternative Tourism on the Oregon Coast: Two Projects

In this chapter I will describe two cases within the Oregon Coastal Zone in which two museums are involved in different forms of alternative tourism. The first to be discussed is the Bandon Archaeology Project which took place during the summer of 1990 in Bandon, in southern Coos County. Bandon is a small river port with a population of 2,490, which relies on forest products, the dairy and cranberry industries, fisheries, and tourism for its economy. The second is a regional interpretive plan proposed by the Otter Crest Scenic Loop Association for all of Lincoln County. This proposal, the time of this writing (February, 1991), is still awaiting approval from the National Coastal Resources Research & Development Institute. Both projects are included, because the main goals of the first are scientific, while the goals of the second are more tourist oriented.

The Bandon Community Archaeology Project

The Bandon Community Archaeology Project took place between August 26 and September 23, 1990 at a site on First Street in Old Town Bandon. This project was organized and directed by Roberta Hall, Oregon State University anthropologist, and was conducted in coordination with several groups: a team of Oregon State University archaeologists, Earthwatch volunteers, the Port of Bandon, the City of Bandon, the Coquille Tribe, and the Bandon Historical Society.

This site is especially interesting, because it combines historic archaeology, the remains of Old Town Bandon which was twice destroyed by fires in
1914 and 1936, and prehistoric archaeology of the "Na-So-Mah" village of the Coquille Tribe (Hall, Lindsay & Vogel 1990; Hall 1986; Vogel & Hall 1986). Findings from excavations in the area have been dated to 2200 years ago (R.L. Hall 1991: personal communication).

Other excavations had been conducted in the site area in the years 1978, 1986, and 1988. The 1978 excavation tested the site with several pits. The 1986 excavation occurred to salvage the human remains discovered when the city of Bandon dug trenches for underground power lines. The Coquille Tribe was contacted, according to state law, and it asked Roberta Hall to direct a salvage project. The city paid the expenses of student volunteers. Because of good weather during one May weekend of the excavation many tourists stopped at the site. Hall, assisting volunteers, and members of the tribe realized that excavations offered an opportunity to educate the public about the value of historic and prehistoric research. After the project was over, representatives of the city, the Port, the tribe, and Oregon State University met to discuss continuation of the project.

This led to the 1988 excavation, a two week project, conducted again with volunteer labor, and other expenses were paid by the City and the Port. Following the 1986 excavation, an exhibit, based on the findings and analysis, was fabricated and placed on display at the Bandon Historical Museum. The museum contracted with an Oregon State University museum studies graduate student to design and build the display, with Hall as a scientific consultant.

In a recent article on historical archaeology and historical museums, coincidentally published during the time of this particular excavation, Jan Busch says:

The relationship between history museums and historical archaeology works to the advantage of archaeologists as well as to that of museums.
Museums are important sponsors of archaeological excavation: witness the critical role of the Bermuda Maritime Museum in marine archaeology in Bermuda. Museums provide historical archaeologists with the greatest outlets for presenting their work and the results of their work to the general public. It is no surprise that historical archaeologists find history museums a congenial and sympathetic working environment. The goals of the two are identical (Busch 1990: 8).

This symbiotic relationship between the museum and the excavation will be provided further in subsequent sections.

The 1990 excavation in Bandon differed from those of previous years in that there was more publicity in the media, because there was a more formal interpretive approach developed and applied for the benefit of the general public. Hall’s experience with the 1986 and 1988 excavations convinced her that the work offered many opportunities for public education. After obtaining approval to plan the 1990 excavation she applied to the Center for Field Research, which authorizes Earthwatch volunteers and funds, for support. Earthwatch publicized the excavation nationally, while the Oregon State University information office also did a news release on the project, and the cooperating groups notified their members and put out announcements in magazines and newspapers that reach coastal residents and tourists. As Busch again states:

When excavation takes place at a museum on a site accessible to the public, interpretation of the archaeological process is unavoidable; people want to know what the archaeologists are doing. Whether during excavation or in a post-excavation exhibit about archaeology, there is opportunity to present the process of historical research in an interesting and comprehensible manner (Busch 1990: 8).

At this excavation, in order to attract visitor attention, a sign was posted inform-
ing people of the project, and flyers explaining its purpose were distributed at
the site (See Appendix A). Except when extremely busy, there was someone
available during the working day to address questions and comments of visi-
tors. In addition a tribal member, who camped at the site for security as well as
other reasons, also spoke with visitors who happened by after working hours.
Since his ancestors were from the village at the mouth of the River, his informa-
tion provided special insights to visitors.

Visitors were also welcomed and encouraged to participate in the exca-
vation, to volunteer for the experience of archaeology. Furthermore, each day a
more formal interpretive talk on local history, the site, and archaeological proce-
dure, was given at 2:00 PM, followed by an interpretive tour of the Bandon
Historical Museum. Many school groups from Bandon and other towns visited
the site and were given special talks and tours.

The Bandon Historical Society Museum, which is also known as the
Coquille River Museum, was founded in 1976. It is located on the second floor
of the town’s historic Coast Guard Building, which faces the Coquille River, and
is also located on First Street in Old Town Bandon. As the map in Figure 2 indi-
cates, the museum is located quite close to the excavation site, certainly within
walking distance for most people. Relative to other museums in the Oregon
Coastal Zone, this museum is on the small end of the scale. It attracts approxi-
mately 5000 visitors a year. In 1988 there was a peak registration count of
6,841 according to its guest register. These figures are actually probably some
what lower than actual counts, because the curator indicated that not all visitors
sign the guest register. I also noticed this to be the case while I was present in
the museum. Hall estimates that those who register represent only 10% of
those who actually visit the museum based on observations conducted over
Figure 2  Old Town Bandon
a period of thirteen years (Hall 1991, personal communication).

In any case, the highest visitation rates for most museums in the region occur in July and August, with over 1000 guests per month. Conversely December and January have had the lowest.

For example, in December 1989 there were only 89 visitors recorded (BHSM, "Guest Registers", 1978-1990). Another characteristic feature indicated by these records is that during the peak season, approximately 50% of the visitors are from Oregon, closely followed by Californians (30-40%), then Washingtonians (6%). The remainder of visitors are residents of states spread throughout the nation and other foreign countries. Of the latter, Western Canadians logically predominate.

My involvement with this project was to gather data, with which to describe the social impact of the project. I used surveys of site visitors, museum visitors, site volunteers, including those from Earthwatch, and the archaeology team, and obtained data from the museum's guest registration records, Bandon Chamber of Commerce registration records, and Hall's excavation field notes. I also used my own general observations for the days that I was present. From this data I hoped to be able to describe how this project may have impacted the community of Bandon in a general sense, and how it, with its relationship to the historical museum, may have fit into the "ecotourism" scheme. In other words, I did not focus on the specifics of economic impacts, or even social, cultural, and environmental impacts. Those are studies which need to be made in regard to projects such as this, but by specialists in those fields. Rather, this study seeks to provide an overview perspective of the project and its relationships with those fields.
Earthwatch Volunteers

All the field costs of the excavation project, excluding later analysis of materials discovered, were provided by the Earthwatch organization of Watertown, Massachusetts. Earthwatch is a non-profit organization that coordinates volunteers for projects such as this, and other nature based projects, for the purpose of education and research support all over the world. Earthwatch is mentioned in Ziffler's report on ecotourism, along with institutes such as the Nature Conservancy and the Smithsonian, as being the type of organization which promotes ecotourism (Ziffler 1989: exhibit 9).

For the Bandon Archaeology Project, which was titled "Oregon Origins" in the Earthwatch catalog, twenty-six people chose to volunteer, twelve in the first team and fourteen in the second. Each group participated for two weeks of the project. The first team arrived on August 25 and departed September 9. The second team arrived on September 10 and departed on September 24. Not including travel expenses, each volunteer paid Earthwatch over $895 for the project, of which the project leader received approximately 40%.

The principal investigator for the project, Roberta Hall, a physical anthropologist from Oregon State University's Anthropology Department, arranged to rent a house in the residential district of Bandon for the duration of the project. The participants pitched tents in the large backyard for their overnight lodging. The main purpose for tenting was that the house was too small to sleep up to twenty people at a time. However, as Hall noted in a concluding letter to all the team members,

I feel also that the way in which we lived-partly outdoors and partly communally-gave us some insight psychologically and socially into the way native people lived (Hall 1990: 4).
Though individuals or couples had their own tents, meals were shared communally, either in the large kitchen or outdoors on the patio. Indeed, this lifestyle contributed to the essence of the project, “Oregon Origins.” The experience would have been very different were the volunteers to dwell indoors in the total privacy of a hotel room.

I also camped out the first couple of days of the project at this house. Observations during that time give a good idea of the daily routine of the volunteers and the nature of their experience. After most of the volunteers of the first team arrived, they casually got to know one another on the patio after setting up their tents in the yard. Their first official task, a tedious one I might add, was to sharpen their trowels which they would use on the site. After dinner, Roberta Hall gave an orientation talk and slide show as an introduction to the project. Afterwards I handed out surveys for them to complete, the results of which will be discussed shortly.

The next morning breakfast was served between 7:00 and 7:30, and by 8:00 the team was transported to the site by van. The team worked solidly until noon, when approximately a half an hour was taken to eat bag lunches that the volunteers had prepared in the morning. Work was resumed until about 2:00 PM, as it had started to rain. In general, according to Hall’s field notes, work would normally continue until 4:00 PM each day, weather permitting. For the duration of the project, the weather was fair 72.3% of the time. It was overcast 10.87% of the time, and partially rainy 16.3% of the time (Hall 1990: Field Notes). Volunteers put in a full day, and the labor was by no means easy.

The survey I conducted of the volunteers (See Appendix B) was brief. The questionnaire contained four questions concerning their choice of the project, whether extra time and money would be spend in the area and how much,
and whether they would participate in a project like this again. The volunteers were also asked to provide gender and age information. Other demographic information about the group was obtained from Earthwatch and Roberta Hall. The following discussion presents the results of the surveys, discriminating between team 1, team 2, and the staff, who also filled in the same surveys. All of the tables and figures provided below show results of all the surveys combined. As I mentioned above, I gave the questionnaires to the first team on their first night in Bandon, and to the staff. Three in this group failed to return their questionnaires to me. I gave the questionnaires to the second group after they had been on the project for a week, and all of these questionnaires were returned. Nine questionnaires were returned from the first group, three from the staff, and fourteen from the second group.

Reasons for choosing the project: Volunteers

Of the members of the first team, three said they chose this project because of their interest in Native Americans; one because of his interest in the project location, the Oregon Coast; four for both of the above reasons; and one, as he said, "for fun." In contrast, only one of the members of the second team stated that interest in Native Americans was the prime motivating factor, and eight said the location was their main interest. One said both of the above reasons motivated the choice, and three stated other reasons, all in the realm of personal development. For the staff members, their reason for choosing the project was of course professional (See Table 5, Figure 3).

Willingness to remain in the area: Volunteers

Of the first team, only two responded they had or would spend more time
### Table 5  Why volunteers chose this project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the area; one for two extra days and the other for one extra day. In the second team, seven responded they would spend extra time; two for one day, two for two days, one for three days, and one for four days. As it turned out, one stayed an extra two weeks, through the second team’s period, and four stayed an extra two days at the site, during which they continued to volunteer. Overall 56% of the volunteers indicated that they had spent or would spend additional time in the project area. Of the three staff members surveyed, one responded he would spend one extra day, and one other would spend five extra days.

**Expenditures by Volunteers**

In team 1 it was estimated that $950 total would be spent on extras, with a range of $30 to $400. In team 2 the respondents estimated they would spend a total of $3700, with a range of $50 to $1500. The extreme difference between the amounts estimated by the two groups can be attributed in part to the fact that team 1 filled their surveys on their first night, and therefore did not yet know the town, or the opportunities available to them. Since the second team was surveyed a week after they had been in the area, they had a better idea of these opportunities and the costs. Furthermore, Roberta Hall commented that the second team was far more gregarious than the first, and that they went “out on the town” at night quite often. The staff members estimated that they would spend a total of $275, though one who said she thought she would spend $100, later told me she actually spent $200.

**Willingness to participate in future projects: Volunteers**

In team 1 all but one responded they would like to participate in a project such as this again and over the long term. One said she did not know. In team 2
all but three answered positively. One said she did not know, because of her age. Another said she would choose a different kind of Earthwatch project. The third said, "probably not", with no further comment. The staff of course said they would all like to be in projects such as this, as archaeology is their profession.

**Demographics: Volunteers**

Biographical data from Earthwatch indicated that the volunteers were primarily composed of middle to upper middle class, white, middle aged women from the Mid-West and East Coast. In the first team there were ten females and three males. There was one seventeen year old woman, and the rest of the volunteers were over thirty. In the second team there were nine females and four males, the youngest of whom was thirty five (See Table 6, Figure 4). The staff members consisted of three females and three males, one twenty-one, three in their thirties, one approximately forty-five, and two in their fifties, though two of them did not stay the duration of the project.

Place of residence, occupations and interests of volunteers was obtained from Earthwatch biographic information. Five lived in California, three in Michigan, two in Maryland, and one each in Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin. Their occupations are equally as diverse. Five were retired, three were teachers, three were nurses, one a MD, one a psychotherapist, one a librarian, one an actuarian, one worked for the CIA, one worked for the National Guard studying air quality, two were artists, and one was a high school student. Though their interests and hobbies are too varied to list in detail, a common theme among them was the enjoyment of the outdoors and learning.
Table 6  Age of Earthwatch volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar:</th>
<th>From: (x)</th>
<th>To: (&lt;)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4  Age of Earthwatch volunteers
Survey of Project Visitors

In order to investigate tourism at the Bandon Archaeology site, a survey was conducted (See Appendix B). The goal of the survey was less to find out how much actual money was spent in the area that to find out how they discovered the project, whether their attendance was intentional, and whether they participated. Basic demographic information was also sought by asking about their accommodations and the length of their stay in the area. Estimations could be made about how much money was being spent in general. The rationale for this was to keep the questionnaire as brief and inoffensive as possible, so that it could be completed at the site without too much of a burden to the visitor. The results of this survey are, therefore, mainly descriptive; as are the results of the previous survey. I also tested for a comparison between the day of week and numbers of visitors, and these results will be discussed further on. First I will review the descriptive results.

All of those who attended the daily interpretive talk were asked to participate in the survey. In addition, some of the visitors were given surveys to complete, but this depended on whether the principal investigator or the tribal representative had time to visit with them and ask them to complete the survey. When I could be present, I made less formal observations and conducted interviews with some of the visitors, as did some of the Earthwatch volunteers and Roberta Hall, who recorded her observations in field notes. For the written questionnaires there was a 100% response rate, meaning that not one person declined to respond when asked.

One hundred and eighty-four questionnaires were filled out. The highest number completed in any one day was twenty-five; the lowest, two. Based on my own and other’s observations, the actual number of visitors per day before
Labor Day, per day, was approximately between one hundred and one hundred and fifty, with between ten and twenty-five people at the interpretive talks. Therefore, during the first two weeks, those surveyed represent 10 to 20% of the total number of visitors per day. After Labor Day weekend, the numbers begin to drop, and no volunteer in team two counted the total daily overall number of visitors at the site. The day I observed visitors during the second part of the project, on August 15 (a Saturday) four people filled out surveys, but I counted forty-four visitors between 9:00 AM and noon. Based on the estimates, and on the estimated number of visitors from Hall's records, there were about 1,950 visitors during the month, and of these 9.5% were surveyed.

**Socio-Demographic Characteristics: Project Visitors**

Of the one hundred and eighty-four respondents, over one quarter of the respondents (29.35%) were over sixty-one years old. Forty-one to fifty year olds were the next most numerous at 25.5%. The least represented age group were those under twenty (1.1%) (See Table 7, Figure 5). Males were slightly more numerous than females. There were 57.2% males. However, in consideration of the total number of males and females recorded in the respondents parties, there were eight percent more females. There was also a tendency for there to be more than one female per party, whereas approximately 86% of the parties had only one male (See Figures 6 and 7).

Most of the parties had between one and three people overall (See Table 8, Figure 8). It is also interesting to note that as the age of individuals increased, there would be more per party. For example, for those under twenty, 83% were the only ones of that age group in their parties. In contrast, for those over 61 only 36.4% of them were the only ones in that age group in their parties,
### Table 7  Age of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Element:</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.087%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Betw 21-30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Betw 31-40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Betw 41-50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.543%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Betw 51-60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Over 61</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.348%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.087%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 5  Age of respondents
Figure 6  Females per party

Figure 7  Males per party
Table 8  People per party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>From (x)</th>
<th>To (&lt;)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.674%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54.348%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.326%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.326%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.261%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.174%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.717%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.087%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.543%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.543%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8  People per party
and 56% were in pairs.

Approximately 65% of those surveyed were Oregon residents, half of those being from towns outside of Coos County. As would be expected, in relation to other surveys of visitors to the Oregon Coastal Zone as discussed earlier, the most numerous out-of-state visitor was from California, with tourists from Washington being the next most numerous (See Table 9, Figure 9).

**Reason For Visit & How the Site Was Discovered: Project Visitors**

Only 26% of those surveyed (48 individuals) responded that the excavation was the reason that they came to the Bandon area. Approximately 36% of those surveyed stated that they had no previous knowledge of the project, and discovered it as they happened by, it is to be expected that this number would be fairly low. Interviews with visitors indicated that most of them were in the area for vacation because of the locale, and either happened by the project or heard about it from others or in local media once in the area. As the results show, the second most common method of discovery was reading of the project in the local newspaper. The third most common source of information about the project was through local friends and relatives (See Table 10, Figure 10).

These results indicate the importance of signage and advertising to the project.

Several of the exceptions were particularly interesting. One high school boy from Roseburg had read about the project in a national archaeology magazine and convinced his family to take a five day vacation camping at the state park just north of Bandon so that he could take part. Each day his family left him at the site after breakfast, picked him up for lunch, and then returned him to the site for the afternoon's work. He had read about archaeological methods and, according to Hall's field notes, he proved to be a good volunteer.
### Table 9  Where respondents live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar:</th>
<th>Element:</th>
<th>Count:</th>
<th>Percent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bandon</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.848%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other Coos</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Other Oregon</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33.696%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.217%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.174%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.696%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.174%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 9  Where respondents live
Table 10 How respondents discovered project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Element:</th>
<th>Count:</th>
<th>Percent:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Local paper</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.435%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Happened by</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36.957%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local friends</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.239%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-local paper</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.978%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tourist info</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.065%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Museum</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.261%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Earthwatch publ.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.174%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other media</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.348%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.543%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 How respondents discovered project
Day and Overnight Visitors: Project Visitors

Nearly 20% of the respondents were day visitors only. The greatest number of respondents who stayed at least one night, stayed at Bullard’s State Park, which is located about a mile north of Bandon (See Figure 2). Another 22% of the overnight visitors stayed at motels. Another 16% used accommodations, whether parks, motels, or homes of friends and relatives, in other towns in Coos County, such as Coos Bay or North Bend (See Table 11, Figure 11). Nearly all the respondents who stayed overnight (87.5%) indicated that they stayed between one and seven nights. A few rented homes in the area, and stayed for three months (See Table 12, Figure 12). In general, these results are comparable to those of other Oregon Coast visitor surveys. For example, Rettig’s survey showed that the mean number of nights spent by his respondents was 2.45 (Rettig 1990: 4).

Participation: Project Visitors

The participation rate of those surveyed was quite low, as 93.5% responded that they observed only while at the site. It is understandable that many of those who happened by would hesitate to participate since it is fairly dirty, dusty work, and they might not have wanted to soil their clothing, let alone perform physical work while on vacation. Even though most of the Earthwatch volunteers, whom the visitors observed at work in the pits, were not young people, I observed that the most common participants from the visitor audience were young males between the ages of ten to fourteen. These boys especially seemed interested in the seining of earth dug from the pits, probably in order to find what if anything had been uncovered. Much of the initial attraction to archaeology is considered to be the sense of personal discovery (Hall 1991, per-
### Table 11  Where respondents were staying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.323%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bullards St. Park</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.622%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Passing thru</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.685%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.024%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other Coos</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.598%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other RV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.087%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hostel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.362%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.299%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 11  Where respondents were staying
### Table 12  How long respondents were staying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>From (s)</th>
<th>To (&lt;)</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.429</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.429</td>
<td>13.857</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.125%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.857</td>
<td>20.286</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.208%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.286</td>
<td>26.714</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.083%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.714</td>
<td>33.143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.042%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.143</td>
<td>39.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39.571</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52.429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.429</td>
<td>58.857</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.857</td>
<td>65.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>65.286</td>
<td>71.714</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>71.714</td>
<td>78.143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>78.143</td>
<td>84.571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>84.571</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.042%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 12  How long respondents were staying
sonal communication).

**Attendance by Days of Week: Project Visitors**

Comparisons might be drawn between visitation to the site and day of the week to determine when the most tourist activity occurred. Friday was the day with the most recorded visitors, followed by Saturday, Sunday, Thursday, Monday, Tuesday, and lastly, Wednesday. Nearly one third of all the visitors were surveyed at the site during Labor Day weekend, counting from Friday through Monday.

**Museum Attendance**

Many of those surveyed (62.5%) responded that they had been, or planned to go, to the Bandon Historical Museum. Another 14% said that they had been to the museum at a previous time or times. Several of the local respondents said, for example, that they went to the museum at least once a year (See Table 13, Figure 13).

In order to determine what impact the project may have had on museum registration, a separate questionnaire for the Bandon Historical Museum's visitors was also conducted and administered (See Appendix B). Unfortunately, only eighteen of those questionnaires were actually filled out. The reason for this low response was that there was only one attendant at the museum at any time, and with the busy summer season, there was not enough time to insure everyone filled out a survey. A related factor is the actual layout of the museum, which consists of several separate rooms spread along a long hallway, with no particularly clear reception area. This layout was neither conducive to conducting a survey with such a small staff, nor to getting all visitors to sign the museum
Table 13  Did respondents visit museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar</th>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.739%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Previous</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13  Did respondents visit museum
guest register, according to the curator (Dorothy Mills 1990, personal communication).

So even though there were so few questionnaires completed that no significant inferences can be made from them, I will summarize the results. All but two of the respondents had heard of the project from these sources: an Earthwatch brochure, the museum, the local newspaper, local relatives, tourist publications, project workers, and from passing by. All but four had been to the site. Nine respondents were residents of Oregon, and nine were from out-of-state. One party each was from Utah, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, and Washington. Three parties were from California. One party was from Vancouver, B.C. Fifteen of the respondents were in parties of two, two were in a party of four, and one was in a party of five.

Four parties were passing through; four were staying at Bullard's State Park, one party for 30 days, two for two days, and one for four days; three parties were staying with relatives locally for three, three, and four nights respectively; five parties of two were staying at a motel, three for two nights, one for three nights, and one for seven nights; one was staying at a State Park outside of the county for one night, and finally, one party of two stayed one night at the Youth Hostel in Bandon.

In terms of demographics, 63% were female and 37% were male. Twenty-three percent were over 61; 13% were between 51 and 60; 2% were between 41 and 50; 31% were between 31 and 40; 21% were between 21 and 30, and 10% were under 20. For four of those in one party, their gender and ages are unknown. These results, though limited, do correspond somewhat, in terms of percentages, with those from the project site visitor questionnaire results. In this group there was a higher number of out of state visitors, a higher
percentage of females, and a higher percentage of those who stayed at motels. These people were also younger overall than those surveyed at the site. It is unfortunate that there were not more of these museum questionnaires completed, because it is difficult to assess what kind of impact these visitors may have had on the museum specifically. As a consequence, we must look to the museum's registration records to determine if there was any significant change in visitation numbers between the time of the project and other periods. However, as noted previously, only a small percent of visitors sign the register and the museum volunteers who work at the desk are not consistent in asking visitors to sign the book. As a result of this lack of uniformity, more visitors may register in some periods of relatively low attendance, simply because the front desk volunteers at quiet periods are likely to ask visitors to register.

The registration numbers recorded in the Bandon Historical Society guest books from 1985 through 1990 are illustrated below in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>Registration at the Bandon Historical Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total for 1990 is lower than previous years, in part because the museum was closed for two of the spring months for remodeling. It appears, however, that registration never caught up to previous levels for the rest of the year. However, it is notable that registration rose sharply up in September 1990, the month of the excavation. This never occurred in the other years. In late September Bandon has its annual Cranberry Festival, which draws large numbers of visitors to the town, but does not appear to cause higher registration at the museum. Thus, the 1990 increase could very well be attributed to the relationship of the museum to the archaeological project.

In comparing the numbers of visitors recorded at the museum to the number of visitors recorded at the Bandon Chamber of Commerce Visitors Center, one finds comparable increases and decreases of visitation in 1986, 1987, and 1989. In 1990, however, the Chamber of Commerce shows an increase of 14% from 1989, but the museum shows a 28% decrease from 1989. These figures are shown below in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
<th>Bandon Chamber of Commerce Registration</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td>459</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td>443</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>746</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td>2584</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td>3277</td>
<td>3821</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2786</td>
<td>3385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td>3644</td>
<td>4094</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>4053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2543</td>
<td>2329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>1366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td>795</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>17582</td>
<td>19813</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16593</td>
<td>18973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another thing these figures illustrate is the relative percentage of visitors that sign in at the Chamber of Commerce compared to the number of those who sign in at the museum. Of course these are not necessarily the same people. In 1986 the museum's total registration represented 21% of the registration at the Chamber of Commerce. In 1987 it was 26%; in 1989, 31%; in 1990, it was 19%. When one considers that not all of Bandon's visitors are signing in at the Chamber of Commerce, it means even a smaller percentage of them are signing in at the museum.

One must take into account the area's other attractions, the museum's competitors, in understanding its visitation trends. Bandon's beautiful beaches and parks draw many visitors, especially in fair weather. There are also the West Coast Game Park, the Bandon Cheese Factory, and numerous shops and galleries in Old Town Bandon. Also, during the summer months there are many special events which draw visitors, such as golf tournaments, kite flying contests, and the Bay Area Fun Festival held in Coos Bay. This year the Fun Festival was held the weekend of September 15. In late September Bandon has its annual Cranberry Festival as well.

In sum, then, overall museum registration, and possibly visitation, did not increase in 1990. The summer month registration levels in 1990 were actually quite a bit lower than in the previous year, a trend that was not seen in the Chamber of Commerce registration records. In September, however, registration at the museum was not only higher than it was for the month of August, but it was higher than the month of September in the previous year. It seems as though this increase can be attributed to the impact of the archaeological project, more than other events in the area during the month, such as the Cranberry Festival, because those events happen every year, unlike the archaeological
Project Impacts

The project had a definite economic impact on the community of Bandon in that approximately $4500.00 was spent for food, rent, hardware, gas and sanitation for the Earthwatch volunteers and project staff accommodations alone. As was discussed earlier, the volunteers also spent money individually in the community on extra food, gifts, entertainment, and the like. The sum of their and the staff's estimated expenditures came to $4925.00. Since a number of the volunteers in the first team did not know what they would spend at the time of the survey, the actual amount spent was probably a few hundred dollars higher.

Of those visitors who responded that they came to Bandon specifically because of the project, twenty two of them were locals. Of the out of town visitors, four parties stayed at motels, four at Bullards State Park, six at accommodations in other towns in Coos County, two with friends or relatives locally, and five were passing through.

Based on figures given in the Bandon Chamber of Commerce "Lodging and Dining Guide", motel rates in the summer range from $20.00 to $150.00 a night. The average room rate for a couple was approximately $50.00. Considering that four parties, which represented five couples, stayed a combined total of eight nights, there was an expenditure of at least $550.00 (Bandon Chamber of Commerce 1990: Lodging and Dining Guide).

At Bullards Beach State Park the rate for overnight camping was $10.00 a night for electricity only, or $11.00 for full hook-up. For those who stayed there, their accumulated expenditure was between $90.00 and $99.00, or approximately $95.00. For those who stayed with friends or relatives, their expen-
ditures for lodging were most likely negligible. All of these visitors probably spent additional money on food, entertainment and purchases in gift and other tourist related shops, though it is not possible to estimate that amount. See Table 16 below for the listing of approximate expenditures in the Bandon area as a result of the project. The listing of overnight visitors in this table refers only to those who stated that they came to the Bandon area because of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
<th>Money Spent in the Bandon Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>How Money Spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>Rent/Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers and Staff</td>
<td>Extraneous food/gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Visitors</td>
<td>Motels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bullard's State Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,070.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to having an economic impact, the excavation also had positive social and cultural impacts on the community of Bandon. In general, people were excited about the attention given to their community heritage, and were interested in new information that could be learned. Many, especially local children, were fascinated with the archaeological process in itself, and were offered a truly educational experience through observation, as well as participation. Having never seen an excavation before myself, I can testify that I learned a great deal about the process of excavation, and the importance of that process in interpreting pre-history and history alike.

Finally, the cultural heritage of the Coquille Indians was brought to the fore to be shared by modern tribal members and non-tribal members alike. In Coastal Oregon this reawakening of cultural heritage is especially important,
because so much of that heritage was lost in history to disease and dislocation before the region was ever substantially settled by European cultures.

Overall, I believe the impact of this project on the community was positive. Though the specific impact of the project on the historical museum was not accessible, over the long term benefits are likely, because the excavation will provide artifacts and knowledge that the museum can share with the public on an ongoing basis in the future. Furthermore, a certain amount of prestige attaches to the museum because of its involvement in research. There may also have been a positive economic impact on the museum due to increased monetary donations and gift shop sales as a result of the project. For example, all available copies of Hall's book, The Coquille Indians: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow (1984) were sold out at the museum gift shop (Hall 1991, personal communication).

The Lincoln County Interpretation Project

The Lincoln County Interpretive program is at the time of this writing (February 1991) in its early planning stages, as it awaits to be awarded grant monies in May 1991. Even though it has not yet begun, the project suggests the role museums can play in a cooperative relationship between entities that are involved with tourism.

This project was initially developed by the members of the Otter Crest Scenic Area Association in 1990. Otter Crest is located in Otter Rock, a small community about ten miles north of Newport in Lincoln County, Oregon. This association originated in order to develop and implement an interpretive signage program about local history and natural history along the Otter Crest driving loop. In time the idea to provide interpretation for tourists and locals alike
grew, expanding its scope to the entire county. The rationale behind this idea is essentially to devise an interpretive plan for tourism in Lincoln County in order to preserve and maintain the quality of life and environment in the county while increasing tourist revenues.

It is intended that the project's goal for preservation would be achieved through education about the fragile nature of the natural and cultural resources, and through the containment of tourist activity to the interpretive sites. It is hoped that greater revenues from tourism will come from visitors staying longer in the area during their visit, rather than from an increase in the overall number of tourists passing through. The plan for a network of related interpretive programs, such as guided tours, brochures, and visitor centers, is to be implemented through shared expertise and resources of several existing tourism related entities in the area.

These entities include the Hatfield Marine Science Center, the Oregon Coast Aquarium, the Otter Rock Marine Gardens, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, Oregon State Parks & Recreation, the Oregon Highway Division, the Lincoln County Historical Society, the Oregon Covered Bridge Society, county wide Chambers of Commerce, and other commercial entities such as representatives of tourist accommodation businesses (Otter Crest Scenic Area Association: 1990).

Besides creating new interpretive programs such as signs or visitor centers, an overall interpretive plan for the county will be designed for the aforementioned entities' use. For example, a common theme with multiple topics will be provided to these groups for use in their own programs. The purpose for this plan is to prevent duplication of the messages presented to tourists when they visit several attractions in the area, and to prevent contradictory messages.
This plan expects that the tourist having a leisure orientation does not want to hear the same message about marine life at every beach park and aquarium he sees, or the same story about local pioneer history at every historical museum and historical site either. This repetition quickly becomes boring. The tourist also does not want to hear or see one story about pioneer history at one museum and find a contradictory story at the next museum in the next town. Contradiction gives the impression of confusion and disinformation, and ultimately can lead to tourist dissatisfaction. Elimination of contradictory or repetitive information would be an important step in improving the service provided by institutions in the state.

In order to provide a clearly understandable and interesting experience for the tourist, the organizations which accommodate them must act together to insure that this duplication and or contradiction are avoided. Most of the types of entities that will be involved in this project in Lincoln County already have independent interpretive programs. It will be necessary for them to adapt their programs to the overall interpretive plan, so that existing duplication and contradiction can be eliminated.

In conjunction with the master interpretive plan there will also be a marketing plan whereby these organizations can mutually take advantage of joint advertising for the program. There will not only be specific joint marketing publications such as brochures and signage, but each entity will also carry individual brochures of other organizations, and be encouraged to recommend other entities' programs for the distinctive messages they provide. For example, the historical museum will encourage its visitors to go to the Oregon Coast Aquarium, among other facilities, to learn about the region's natural history, and the Oregon Coast Aquarium will encourage its visitors to go to the museum to learn
about the region's history and cultures.

This type of cooperative relationship between a museum and other attractions in its area can be of great benefit to the museums, especially for museums which are limited in staff and other resources. It provides an arena for shared knowledge of interpretation and interpretive techniques. It provides access to an expanded audience with less financial burden to any single organization, because the cost of advertising through brochures is shared. Finally, if successful, the project will replace competition between these organizations with cooperation so that emphasis can be placed on what message is being presented to visitors overall, not on who is giving the biggest or fanciest message.

To achieve the main goal of this operation, the preservation of quality of life and environment in a region, the message given to tourists about the natural history, history, and culture of an area must be clear and forceful. As has been discussed at length earlier, tourism often has highly negative impacts as it grows beyond the carrying capacity of a particular location. To control these negative impacts, while maintaining an environment for growth of the industry, there must be some constraints placed upon the nature of that industry. In the case of this project, it is hoped that a strong educational message reinforced by as many tourist oriented facilities as possible, can manage not only what the tourist learns about Lincoln County, but also where that tourist goes, and how he or she spends his time.

Once the interpretive and marketing plans have been implemented there will be an evaluation of the project to see if its objectives have been met. The evaluation will consist of analysis of area attendance and traffic, surveys of the interpretive programs' users and area attractions' managers, plus analysis of
the program's overall economic impact. One the evaluation is completed, the results will be made available to the general public, and workshops will be held in order to share this information with representatives of other counties that have similar needs.

In this chapter two different projects located in the Oregon Coastal Zone, the Bandon Archaeology project and the Lincoln County Interpretation project, have been presented as examples of alternative types of programs which involve both museums and tourists as participants and beneficiaries. The similarities and differences between the projects will be addressed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 5

Analysis and Conclusions

The Bandon Community Archaeology project and the Lincoln County Interpretive project are alike in that they are examples in which museums and other organizations have come together to provide an alternative type of tourist experience where education and interpretation are the primary vehicles for creating benefits not only to tourists, but to the host community as well, thereby intending to mitigate possible negative impacts from tourism. Through visitor education the Bandon project intended to foster proper and ethical archaeological practices, to dissuade tourists and others from unethical and illegal activities such as pothunting. Also through education the Lincoln County project hopes to reduce negative impacts from tourism on natural and cultural resources in the region.

However, the two projects also have many differences. In this final chapter these differences will be addressed. In this discussion the question of who benefits from these projects, and who pays for them will also be raised. In relation to these costs there will be suggestions for other possible funding scenarios. Ultimately, further research needs to be done in this area. In conclusion, suggestions for future studies will be presented.

The two projects discussed in the previous chapter differ in objectives and scope. The Bandon project first and foremost was a scientific one based on fifteen years of work and research by the principal investigator, Roberta Hall, at the request of the Coquille Tribe and the community of Bandon. This project seeks to answer historic questions and to involve the public and the museum in the excitement of discovery and in the effort of preservation. The Interpretation
project is not a scientific one. Instead of seeking new knowledge and answers to questions, it seeks to interpret existing knowledge in an integrated manner through the cooperation of several organizations that already provide education and entertainment for the general public.

For the Bandon project the role of the tourist, whether as casual visitor or the ecologically minded tourist volunteer, is an incidental component. For the Interpretation project the role of the tourist is non-participatory. Rather, the tourist is an observer or receiver of the interpretation provided by the involved entities, but he does not have the opportunity to participate directly in the project. Though non-participatory, the role of the tourist in this project is purposeful, not incidental. One of the main reasons for the coordinated interpretation is to provide a quality experience for the tourist who travels in the county. Whether incidental or not, tourists benefit from both projects.

As was discussed earlier, the local communities also benefit from both of the projects. Businesses in Bandon benefited from the visitors who came to the area specifically to see the project, and especially from those who stayed overnight. Businesses in Lincoln County will benefit if the project results in an increase in the number of tourists in the area, again, especially if more of the tourists stay overnight. Bandon residents, especially the Coquille Tribe, benefit from the historical and cultural knowledge resulting from the project. Lincoln County residents will also benefit from the interpretation of the natural, cultural and historical resources in their area. Finally, if the Interpretation project reaches its long term goal of controlling negative impacts from increased tourism, local residents and the natural resources will benefit as well.

In analyzing the benefits of these projects, one must also consider their costs, and how those costs are paid. For the Bandon project, in 1990, the costs
of the excavation were paid by Earthwatch volunteers. However, as was men-
tioned earlier, Earthwatch only contributed 40% of what the volunteers paid,
meaning the other 60% was kept for overhead. This overhead goes to
Massachusetts where Earthwatch headquarters reside. The costs for the analy-
sis of the excavation, which will generate academic and social benefits through
an increase in knowledge, are not paid for by Earthwatch, the community of
Bandon, or its tourists. Rather, the principal investigator with help from students
and colleagues, is doing the analysis on an extra-curricular, non-funding basis.
Oregon State University provides space and supplies for the analysis. Because
it is done on a volunteer basis, the analysis will take several years to complete.
For the analysis of materials from the 1988 excavation the University contribut-
ed $2000 for student wages and C-14 testing through a College of Liberal Arts
research fund.

It is now useful to address the question of who should be paying for this
project. Ultimately the beneficiaries of the project should pay. The tourists who
benefit could conceivably pay through an admission fee to the site, but it would
not be enough, in part because tourism is seasonal on the Oregon Coast, and
for the same reason, winter weather, excavations cannot be conducted there
year round. Furthermore, excavations and analysis costs are very expensive.
Tourist dollars could certainly assist in contributing to the project, but one could
not cover all costs with them, nor should they, since tourists are not the only
beneficiaries.

Probably an agency in the community of Bandon should manage the pro-
ject. Oregon State University and its anthropologists are located in Corvallis, a
considerable distance from Bandon. Transporting excavation materials away
from Bandon only increases the cost of analysis. Ideally the Coquille Tribe
could manage the project, as they are certainly beneficiaries of the historical knowledge, by performing a similar function as Earthwatch did in organizing paying volunteers. If this were so, the overhead would stay in Bandon, and not go out of state. The tribe, already receiving federal funds for the development of employment opportunities and for the preservation of their culture, would probably be able to obtain grants for such a project. In a sense then, the general taxpayer would be paying, which I also believe is appropriate, because those of the general public who go to the site, the museum, or read of the results are beneficiaries of the historical knowledge as well.

Finally, the museum is also a beneficiary of the project, but in the case of the Bandon Historical Museum, its budget and current scope are too small to be able to manage this project. Large museums such as the Smithsonian can afford this type of project, and do offer many special tours and programs already for its membership and the general public. The Bandon museum can, however, continue to offer its facility for exhibition of excavation results. Through its gift shop it can offer pertinent reading material for those who wish to learn more. It can also offer in kind labor to the project by providing interpretive tours of relevant exhibits. I believe that these cooperative contributions will strengthen the museum in the long run, and perhaps help it to grow.

The initial costs of the Lincoln County Interpretation project will be paid by the National Coastal Resources Research and Development Institute, a federal foundation, thereby representing the dollars of the taxpaying public. Many of the representatives of the various organizations involved are paid with federal dollars as well. When I contribute my time to the project, representing the Lincoln County Historical Society, my salary is primarily paid by Lincoln County taxpayers through a county property tax levy.
Since out-of-state tourists, local residents, and local businesses are the expected beneficiaries of this project, it seems fair that federal and local tax dollars are used for this purpose; the beneficiaries are, in general, federal, and in some cases local, taxpayers. However, federal funding may not be the most effective or appropriate source in the long run. The federal grant money is only for the initial stages of the project: the cost of consultation, the creation of the interpretive plan, the marketing plan, and the eventual economic impact study. It is unknown at this point where exactly funds will originate for the cost of implementing and continuing these plans. Essentially, implementation will be the responsibility of the individual agencies involved. With so many agencies with different individual missions outside of this project, I foresee some difficulty in determining which of these agencies will pay for what, and how much.

As has been discussed earlier, tourism has external costs as well as direct economic benefits. If it is the case that greater numbers of tourists in an area increase the chances of negative social, cultural and environmental impacts, then I would think that it should be the tourists who pay directly for programs that attempt not only to improve the quality of the tourist experience, but to manage those negative impacts as well.

As federal taxpayers, tourists are paying for natural resource management already through organizations like the Bureau of Land Management, but I believe that the tourists should also pay directly to the local communities they visit when on vacation, through some type of tourist tax. In my experience traveling in Hawaii I found that many businesses there had two price schedules, one for tourists and one for locals. In a way the tourist price acts as a tax for non-residents who benefit from the goods and services offered by the particular community. This idea of extra taxation may seem unfair, but ultimately, traveling
for pleasure is a luxury, and if this luxury creates external costs, I believe that those experiencing the luxury should be responsible for balancing the costs, not the resident host community. The resident host community already pays through local and federal taxes. I believe the tourist should carry the extra burden. This idea of having tourists placing money back into the host community or environment is one of the basic principles behind ecotourism.

In this paper I have discussed the general nature of the relationship between museums and tourism, historically as well as in terms of some of the contemporary issues which face them in the 1990's. I discussed alternative forms of tourism and the problems of authenticity, and education and entertainment in museums. I have also presented two examples of projects in which these issues are addressed. In both projects, which are set in the Oregon Coastal Zone, museums and other organizations have come together to provide an alternative type of tourist experience where education and interpretation are the primary vehicles for creating benefits not only to tourists, but to the host community as well, thereby intending to reduce possible negative impacts from tourism. Furthermore, public education is now considered to be a primary function or goal for museums by major museum organizations such as the American Association of Museums. The type of cooperative project described here can also help museums to fulfill this objective.

Because tourism is an important industry in Oregon, and especially in the Coastal Zone, alternative forms of tourism need to be pursued in order to prevent the development of negative impacts to the very resources that sustain that industry. Furthermore, other studies of the impacts of these types of alternative tourism projects need to be made. For example, in the case of the Bandon project a more detailed economic impact analysis needs to be conducted. Local
business people and residents need to be surveyed for their attitudes about the project. More generally, studies need to be conducted regarding what alternative forms of tourism are in practice in Oregon and in the Oregon Coastal Zone in the 1990's. The question of how well they perform in providing benefits for local communities and minimizing negative impacts must be addressed. Finally, the relationship between museums and tourism and the issues relating to this relationship as discussed in this paper need further attention, and in other contexts than in the Oregon Coastal Zone.

Tourism as an industry has its ebbs and flows, and can diminish and even abate in the generation of income for an area as easily as it developed, depending on external factors such as transportation costs, world political climate, or tourist preferences and taste. However, once tourism development has grown to a point that host cultures and environments are damaged, or even worse, destroyed, then there is no regaining what has been lost. At that point, what once attracted the host and tourist to a place no longer exists. It is imperative that studies be done, and that other avenues of development be taken, before that point is reached in the Oregon Coastal Zone.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Bandon Community Archaeology Project 1990

The Bandon Community Archaeology Project is part of a continuing effort to document the history and prehistory of the Coquille Indians, the community of Bandon and the Coquille Basin. Under the direction of the Oregon State University Department of Anthropology, the project is sponsored by the Coquille Indian Tribe, Port of Bandon, City of Bandon, the Bandon Historical Society, and Earthwatch.

The season’s work focuses on an area on First Street in Old Town Bandon known to have been used as a native food-processing site for probably 1,800 years as well as being the center of Old Town Bandon before the 1914 fire. We will be looking for more details of historic and prehistoric life including any indications of native dwellings. Field workers include OSU graduate students, Earthwatch volunteers from a wide variety of places, and local volunteers. Brian Harrison, Clatsop County Community College archaeologist, is the project’s excavation coordinator. Kevin Sherer is the archaeological field foreman, Jill Potter is manager of the field laboratory and Sylvia Lindsay is supervisor of records and maps. Dr. Roberta Hall is the project’s principal investigator.

Volunteers who wish to help this season in the field or in the lab may do so by signing up with Roberta Hall at the site. The Coquille River Museum across the street in the old Coast Guard building displays many artifacts from earlier research in and around Bandon. A permanent native village is known to have existed on the north bank of the Coquille where Bullards Beach State Park is now located and another was directly opposite this year’s site. Coquille Indians traveled freely up and down the river and its main branches to get maximum use of the many food resources available from the river, the sea, the forests and the meadows.

An eventual goal of this project is to fully document the life of the people who lived here at the mouth of the Coquille River and also on its upper reaches. Careful research is always expensive, and tax-deductible contributions can be put to good use. Checks can be made to the OSU Foundation, Bandon Community Archaeology Project, and given to Roberta Hall at the site, or sent to R.L.Hall, Dept. of Anthropology, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331-6403.
Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE
BANDON ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION
SUMMER 1990

1. How did you find out about the excavation?

2. Is the excavation the reason you came to the area?

3. Did you participate in the excavation, or observe only?

4. Where do you live?

5. If not from the Bandon area, where are you staying here?

6. How long do you intend to stay?

7. Will you go, or have you gone to the Bandon Historical Museum on this trip?

8. How many people are in your party?

9. Please indicate:

   ___ Male ___ Under 20 ___ 41-50
   ___ Female ___ 21-30 ___ 51-60
       ___ 31-40 ___ 61+
QUESTIONNAIRE
EARTHWATCH VOLUNTEERS
BANDON ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION
SUMMER 1990

1. Why did you choose to do this project?

2. Did you spend time in the area before the project, or do you intend to spend more time in the area after the project is completed?

3. How much money do you estimate you will spend in the area while here (gifts, purchases, etc...)?

4. Would you consider participating in a project like this more often, over the long term?

5. Please indicate:

   ___Male   ___Under 20   ___41-50
   ___Female ___21-30     ___51-60
                  ___31-40     ___61+
1. Do you know about the archaeological excavation taking place in Bandon this summer? If so where did you learn about it?

2. Have you been to the site on First Street?

3. Where do you live?

4. If not from the Bandon area, where are you staying here?

5. How long do you intend to stay?

6. How many people are in your party?

7. Please indicate:
   
   Male
   Female
   Under 20
   21-30
   31-40
   41-50
   51-60
   61+