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Abstract

Located south of the South Island of New Zealand, separated by Foveaux Strait, Stewart Island is the southern-most of New Zealand’s three main islands. Stewart Island's magnificent landscapes and wildlife provide excellent opportunities for hiking and hunting. The nature of these experiences, however, is quite distinct from one another. The vast majority of hikers visiting the island are international tourists and first-time visitors, while most hunters are New Zealanders, who have been visiting the island for several years. This difference in background facilitates experiences of place that are distinct from one another, and the performances of these visitors are highly modulated by how place is constructed by themselves and by others with whom they share their experiences. This article explores these constructions of place and the production of a space that allows for these distinct experiences to occur simultaneously and in the same location. It investigates the roles a remote island destination plays in the experience of visitors/tourists, and how these roles are constructed and subsequently performed.

[Note: The photographs used in the latter sections of this article provide an affective context for the reader based on a reflexive and creative methodological approach. A full discussion of this affective narrative can be found in Reis (2011)]

Keywords

Cold water islands, hunting, hiking, tramping, place, space, tourism, host-guest relationship

Introduction

Social science researchers have been discussing the impacts of tourism on island communities for several decades (Conlin and Baum, 1995; Lockhart and Drakakis-Smith, 1997). These impacts range from economic to cultural changes in the lives of community members. In the cultural realm, discussions have varied from loss of traditional language and customs, to increase in prostitution, drinking and crime, and also to the different relationships established between locals and tourists, or between the hosts and the guests, and how empowering or disturbing these experiences may be. Attention has been paid also to the allure attached to islands, particularly tropical islands, as tourism destinations, with the idea of escape, paradise and the exotic being central to this fascination (Gössling, 2003). Less research has concentrated on the attraction of what have been referred to as ‘cold water islands’, their appeal and the
tourist experiences in these remote destinations. According to Baldacchino (2006), cold water islands tend to be characterised by their remoteness, wide open spaces and extraordinary natural environment. Despite these distinctive features, they are considerably less visited and, possibly as a consequence, less studied. There are several reasons why tourism numbers in these islands are significantly smaller than in tropical, warm water islands, and these are well covered in Baldacchino’s (2006) discussions. My argument here, however, does not require an understanding of these reasons, but simply an acknowledgement that cold water islands do possess quite different characteristics to warm water islands and, therefore, attract a different type of visitor.

Stewart Island, the so-called ‘third island’ of New Zealand, features is a cold water island that although characterised by similar physical features as other similar cold water islands (pristine nature, low population numbers, remoteness, etc.), is significantly different from most of them due to its high visitor numbers and dependency on the tourism industry (Baldacchino, 2006). With more than 80% of the island being a National Park, the local population of about 400 people have the nature-based tourism industry as one of their main source of income (together with commercial fishing) (Lovelock and Robinson, 2005). Similarly to most cold water islands, tourists to Stewart Island are mainly attracted to its unspoilt natural environment, and activities such as tramping (the New Zealand practice of overnight hiking) and hunting dominate the schedule of visitors while on the island. The nature of these experiences, however, is quite distinct from one another, not only because of the activity itself but also because of the type of visitor engaging in each of them. The vast majority of trampers visiting the island are international tourists, with about 40% females and 60% males, and first-time visitors. Hunters, on the other hand, are almost all male New Zealanders who have been visiting the island for several years (Reis & Higham, 2009). This difference in background facilitates experiences of place that are quite distinct from one another, and the performances of these visitors are highly modulated by how place is constructed by themselves and by others with whom they share their experiences. This article explores these constructions of place and the production of a space that allows for these distinct experiences to occur simultaneously and in the same location. It investigates the roles a remote island destination plays in the experience of visitors/tourists, and how these roles are constructed and subsequently performed. By doing so, this article provides a contribution to the still small body of literature that deals with tourism experiences in remote, cold water island destinations.

**Place and Space**

Central to my discussion of the experiences of hunters and trampers on Stewart Island are the constructs of place and space. Space and place as metaphysical concepts have been used in different ways, both in the more specific geography literature and, more widely, in social science research. In general, there have been three main approaches to the place/space debate: the first favouring place over space; the second favouring space over place; and the third attempting to merge the two concepts as being mutually constituted (Wainwright and Barnes, 2009). The first approach to the place/space distinction was predominant in the 1970s, mostly as a reaction to spatial scientist John Hudson’s comment that “places... were dots, and spaces were the white areas enclosed by geometrically drawn black lines” (Wainwright and Barnes, 2009: 968). According to Wainwright and Barnes (2009: 968), Tuan expresses this approach well
when he writes that, “what begins as undifferentiated space, becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value.” From this perspective, space is inferior to place as “space provides the context for places [and] derives its meaning from particular places” (Relph, 1976: 8). Space, therefore, cannot have meaning if place-making does not occur.

In the 1980s, geographers began to conceptualise space and place in more dialectical terms. However, space was now implicitly favoured over place, possibly in an attempt to overcome the previous conceptualisation of the space/place distinction, as presented by Tuan (2001). David Harvey clearly emphasised the predominance of space, positioning space as where the action occurred and places as merely posts for spatial transformation (Harvey, 1982). Later, Harvey refined his position and discussed place as being in dialectical tension with space. However, although attempting to argue for a balance between conceptions of place and space, Harvey privileges space when he affirms that place-making is a process that “carve[s] out ‘permanences’... that are not eternal but always subject to time as ‘perpetual perishing’.” (Harvey, 1996: 261). Hence, while spatial change is constant, place can easily dissolve.

The third and most current approach to the discussion of the space/place distinction is discussed in terms of relationality. This approach aims to overcome dualisms and wishes to merge the two concepts, arguing that there is “no clear division between space and place because both are cut from the same cloth of multiplicitous relations. Their difference is one of degree, not kind.” (Wainwright and Barnes, 2009: 970). This approach, therefore, refutes any critical difference between place and space.

Contrary to all the above positions, Wainwright and Barnes have recently proposed a new, more nuanced, understanding of the distinction between space and place. Their position is that place and space should indeed be understood as inter-dependent, but not as the same. The distinction is necessary, but not the supremacy of one over the other. “They require each other because they are different in ways that shape how we think them... Space is meaningful as not-place, and vice versa.” (Wainwright and Barnes, 2009: 974). This approach has implications for the conversations around nature, and therefore for this article. As Wainwright and Barnes have argued, the concept of nature has largely been influenced by conceptions of place and space. Thus, the amalgamation of the two into one ‘entity’, like Doel's (1999) idea of ‘splace’, hinders a contextualised understanding of the historically contingent constructions of nature in modern Western societies. Also, by favouring space over place, or vice versa, one cannot fully analyse concepts of nature when nature has been conceptualised as both space and place. “While both space and place constitute nature, they do so in radically different respects. Nature is at once infinite and totalising (as space) yet everywhere infinitely particular and differentiated (as place). As nature in this dual respect, space and place are articulated, joined in difference, and frame our experience of nature and existence.” (Wainwright and Barnes, 2009: 979). It is this approach that better defines my understanding of the concepts of place, space and of nature.

Furthermore, the importance of space and place for the study of tourism and recreation has largely been supported by authors such as Crouch who argues, and I concur, that the embodied tourist experience can be understood only if situated and contextualised in space, which is not inert but “transformed by the presence and practice of bodies” (Crouch, 2004: 204). The experiences of hunting and tramping are extremely sensorial and the involvement of the body is crucial to their practice (Green, 2009; Marvin, 2005). Through such bodily practices and active intersubjectivity one can add meaning to
spaces and also constitute places (Crouch, 2002). The meanings of specific hunting and tramping places and spaces are created and transformed during the experiences of hunters and trampers, in this case, located on Stewart Island. Therefore, place and space cannot fully be understood separate from the experience.

Stewart Island

Located south of the South Island of New Zealand, separated by Foveaux Strait, Stewart Island is the southern-most of New Zealand’s three main islands and is home to the country’s newest National Park, Rakiura National Park. The park covers about 157,000 hectares and comprises 85% of the island (Figure 1). Stewart Island is the home of several native wild fauna and flora species and it is known by outdoor enthusiasts for its challenging terrain and unspoilt nature. The island has only a small permanent settlement of approximately 390 inhabitants (Statistics New Zealand, 2002) and its major sources of income are commercial fishing, aquaculture and tourism (Lovelock and Robinson, 2005).

Stewart Island’s landscapes and wildlife provide excellent opportunities for tramping and hunting. It is on Stewart Island that one of the most demanding tracks in New Zealand is found: a 10-12 day circuit around the island’s northern coast through diverse landscape and challenging topography. For hunters, it offers the only readily available population of White-tailed deer in the Southern Hemisphere (Lovelock and Robinson, 2005). Apart from hunting and tramping, diving, fishing, kayaking and sailing opportunities are readily available. More importantly, the island’s rich natural environment is able to provide intense experiences of the sublime and of the picturesque. According to Cronon (1996: 72, 76), the sublime is “one of the most important expressions of that broad transatlantic movement we today label as romanticism” and he summarises this move by saying that nature “ceased to be a place of satanic temptation [to] become instead a sacred temple, much as it continues to be for those who live it today.” Small secluded beaches, calm inlets, little creeks and their little waterfalls, during Stewart Island’s less than frequent calm and sunny days, portray the essence of the picturesque, that which can be painted in a Romantic style (Glickman, 2000). On the more frequent stormy and grey sky days, the island can provoke feelings of the sublime, through its awe-inspiring landscapes, with thick bush, deep mud, marshlands, vast sand dunes and beaches, and open seas. In fact, as Gilpin asserted in his Three Essays: On Picturesque Beauty, On Picturesque Travel, And On Sketching Landscape, “nothing can be more sublime, than the ocean” (1792: 43); and the vast open seas that surround Stewart Island certainly can inspire such a feeling. This important aspect of the Stewart Island environment, and therefore experiences, will be the subject of my discussions in the later sections of this article. For now, it is important to highlight that it is a place of longstanding and growing popularity for outdoor recreationists and is thus suitable for engaging ‘first-hand’ with tramping and hunting experiences.

Tramping opportunities around the island are several. In terms of multiple-day tramping trails, Stewart Island offers three formally constituted tracks, and other unmaintained tracks. The most popular, the Rakiura Track, is a 29 km circuit that starts and ends in Oban, the island’s permanent settlement. It is an easy, well-formed track, with two high-quality backcountry huts. It receives a ‘Great Walk’ classification by the Department of Conservation, which means that it is promoted to people of all levels of tramping.
experience (Standard New Zealand, 2004; Department of Conservation, 2011d). According to Cessford (2000: 71), ‘Great Walks’ serve as the bridge “between the wilderness user and the front-country user,” providing a less demanding overnight tramping experience that is suitable for most tourists. According to Great Walks’ visitor statistics, during the period of this study the Rakiura Track was consistently amongst the three tracks in New Zealand with the highest rate of international visitors, varying from 64% to 72% of all trampers on the track (Department of Conservation, 2011a).

Figure 1 – New Zealand Map and National Parks (map not to scale, based on material from the Department of Conservation, New Zealand)

In contrast, the North West and Southern Circuits are considered more arduous tracks, offering remoteness, physical challenge and solitude. These tracks, 125 km (10–12 days) and 105 km (7–9 days) respectively, can be partially combined to form a 13-14 day-track, a challenge that only a few are willing to undertake (Figure 2). This combination forms the longest tramping track in the country, and even the Northwest Circuit alone is longer than any other track in New Zealand. Such a status definitely enhances the ‘product’ and attracts visitors from different countries to engage in what
might be considered as a quintessential New Zealand experience. However, with long sections of deep and thick mud, constantly undulating country and very remote bush areas, only more experienced trampers are advised to adventure on these tracks. Nevertheless, with relatively well-managed trails, several markers and a few signs, even ‘first timers’ are able to complete the journey safely, although good level of fitness and appropriate gear are essential.

Figure 2 – North West, Southern and Rakiura Tracks, Stewart Island (map based on material from the Department of Conservation, New Zealand)

Hunting has been an important recreation and tourism activity on Stewart Island since the beginning of the 20th Century (Lovelock and Robinson, 2005; Stewart Island Promotion Association, 2007). White-tailed deer were introduced to the island in 1905, specifically for hunting, and today hundreds of hunting parties visit the island every year searching for this deer species (Yerex, 2001). The first ‘official’ hunting season on Stewart Island, with two licences being issued, was in 1921. The number of participants increased steadily, particularly in the late 1970s, and in 1982 a hunter usage survey conducted by the New Zealand Deerstalkers’ Association reported that some 1,200
hunters had hunted on the island during a one-year period. In 1997 this number had doubled reaching 2,370 hunters. In 2003, a year after the establishment of the Rakiura National Park, 2,800 hunters were reported to have been hunting on Stewart Island (Banwell, 2006). White-tailed deer are usually found in larger numbers in areas around the coast of the island, and hunting blocks therefore also are concentrated in these areas, particularly the northern and eastern coastal regions. In addition, the coast provides hunters with a more attractive landscape, one that is able to replicate the sublime and picturesque ideals.

In this article the understanding of the sublime of the picturesque is based on the works of Edmund Burke, Immanuel Kant and William Gilpin. Burke, with his *Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* in 1757, was the first one to suggest that fear in the presence of wild nature could be felt as awe and exultation, affirming that the terror felt by some in the presence of the sublime landscape did not necessarily stem from dread. Burke polarised the sublime and the beautiful, where the former provokes awe and the latter calmness. Kant’s *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and the Sublime* (1769) built on the same ideal but in more complex ways, providing justification for the admiration of dramatic natural formations and phenomena, such as great mountains, open vast seas, and storms. Kant also provided a distinction between the sublime and the beautiful, reducing the beautiful to a limited and lesser experience, and exulting the sublime.

In 1792, Gilpin introduced the idea of the picturesque as the enjoyable characteristic of wild, irregular and somewhat chaotic nature, shifting from the previous aesthetic presumption that linearity and ease were more pleasing and beautiful. According to Glickman (2000), Gilpin’s description of the picturesque as what is paintable, led inevitably to the construction of the picturesque as a third concept, ‘in between’ the sublime and the beautiful; the sublime could not possibly be represented in a painting, and the beautiful would not always be worthy of a painting representation. For this reason, the picturesque came to be known as the ‘middle way’ between the sublime and the beautiful, almost like transforming the irregular and chaotic forms of the sublime into something aesthetically pleasing and acceptable. As Nash (2001: 46) asserts, “[t]he wilderness remained the same, but a change in taste was altering attitudes toward it”.

The sublime, however, is understood as that which inspires, provokes awe and feelings that are almost inexplicable. An environment need not be a high, snow-clad, mountain to provoke such feelings, as Glickman (2000: 11) explains; it needs only to install feelings that are “indefinable for the understanding,” and are “more easily [found] in ‘raw nature’.” The sublime, as a characteristic of wild nature, still predominates today in descriptions of wilderness experiences, and it is certainly present on descriptions of Stewart Island.

Many hunters from other parts of New Zealand envisage Stewart Island as a small, bush clad lump rising from the sea off the southern end of the South Island. Visitors quickly realise that the land mass is far more extensive than first imagined. The island has an area of some 425,000 acres (650 square miles), most of which is covered in dense bush. Its many waterways are just as dangerous to negotiate as backcountry rivers elsewhere. The high points, up to 3,200 ft, are snow clad in winter, and even during the remainder of the year sudden storms raging in from the Antarctic can make the island wilderness extremely inhospitable and dangerous for the unwary or poorly equipped (Harris, 1970: 14).
This portrayal of the sublime is typical of hunters’ descriptions of the island and certainly adds great impact to the hunting experience on Stewart Island. Hunting areas inland are also available but are not as prized or sought after, probably because they do not provide such an attractive landscape, where one can immerse oneself in the bush and that, at the same time, one can easily reach by boat or plane. Most areas around the coast of the island are managed by a ballot system through which hunting blocks are defined and can be booked for pre-determined periods of time. This system is administered by the Department of Conservation and divides the coast into 35 blocks. At these sites, hunting parties can stay in huts or may camp, depending on the area chosen. The inland hunting areas are not divided into blocks and do not require pre-booking, due to the lack of demand for them.

Together with this history of ‘use’ of the island shared by hunters and trampers, there is a more recent record of conflicts and tensions between the two groups. A significant proportion of the areas where hunters stalk their targets are near tracks where trampers are usually hiking. In addition, some hunting parties use as their base huts located on famous tramping tracks. These close encounters and shared huts and tracks have triggered, or witnessed, complaints, tensions, and sometimes conflicts, between the groups.
Methodology

The material presented in this article is part of a broader research project that explored the constructions of nature of hunters and trampers on Stewart Island, New Zealand. As an emergent finding of this project, the creation of places and spaces of significance for both these groups were explored and are discussed in this article. My methodological approach was based on my embedded engagement with the study using critical reflexive narrative, within an interpretive qualitative inquiry approach, as my tool for the analysis of the material collected.

My embedded engagement with hunting and tramping practices in New Zealand, and more specifically on Stewart Island, led me to choose narratives and performances as the main sources of material for my analysis of the experiences of hunters, as well as of international trampers. My use of narrative refers mainly to a type of discourse that frames social action. Consequently, the narratives are the material that constitutes the “phenomenon of interest” to this research, material which was interpreted using critical analysis (Pinnegar and Daynes, 2007: 5). In this sense, performances also are understood as forms of narratives, “[i]n other words, performance pivots on the enacted nature of human activity, the socialized and shifting norms of human sociality, and the active processes of human sense-making.” (Alexander, 2005: 414). It is in this way then that ‘ordinary’ performances, meaning day-to-day enactments of human sociality, constitute important forms of narrative about oneself and the discourses with which one engages. More importantly, performance also refers to an embodied practice, one that calls for a multi-sensorial relation with place and space. In understanding practice as performance and performance as a form of narrative, we move beyond what Crouch defines as “a one-dimensional reading of texts and representations across an inert space” and we are, therefore, able to perceive that places and spaces are “transformed by the presence and practice of bodies” (2002: 212, 214). Thus, involving performances in my analysis of what I referred to as the ‘phenomenon of interest’ of this research allows for a more nuanced understanding of the hunting and of the tramping, experiences, beyond vocality and written text, once they are fully embodied practices situated in time, place and space (Franklin, 2001; Green, 2009; Marvin, 2005).

My first trip to Stewart Island was in March 2007 and since then I have been to the island on several different occasions. On every visit I explored the National Park as well as the community, taking day-walks, visiting the stores, pubs, visitor centres, beaches, talking to different people, locals and tourists alike. I took water taxis to remote areas where hunters are the only ones who usually go and I walked, more than once, all the marked, and some unmarked, tracks on the island.

My tramping trips on Stewart Island varied greatly in length, with the longest one lasting 24 consecutive days spent in huts, completely immersed in the activity. Spending nights in these backcountry huts allowed me to share them with trampers and/or hunters on most of the nights I spent in the National Park. Also, being ‘in the bush’ for consecutive days made it possible for me to meet several trampers and hunters on tracks. Either in huts or on tracks, I constantly tried to make contact, however brief, with the people I encountered. My interactions with trampers and hunters ranged from short to long hut conversations, sharing information about the tracks, the island, and the daily ‘adventures’, as well as more ‘philosophical’ conversations about the nature of Stewart Island, the feelings of remoteness, human-wildlife relationships, etc. On a few occasions I joined individual trampers or small tramping groups and tramped one or more parts of
the long tracks with them. While in the company of hunters, and most notably when sharing huts with them, I was able to participate actively in their daily routines, including some hunting ‘rituals’. On these occasions, I had several meals with hunting parties, sometimes with them serving freshly-hunted meat or recently-caught fish, I went for short walks in the ‘bush’ with individual or small groups of hunters, and on more than one occasion went fishing and collecting *paua* (abalone) with groups or individuals. All these experiences, including my walks alone, inform my analysis of the tramping and hunting experiences on the island.

I was able also to arrange formal conversations (interviews) with nine hunters and seven trampers at their - sometimes temporary - home locations (mainly Dunedin and Christchurch). Following Holstein and Gubrium’s (1995) understanding of ‘active interviews’, the conversations formally arranged with hunters and trampers I met on the island were carefully planned but not overly structured, allowing the Other to actively participate in the construction of meaning. My intention with these purposeful conversations was to further explore the themes that emerged from my experiences on Stewart Island. The recordings of these conversations were transcribed verbatim following the encounters and were repeatedly read throughout the course of my research as well as of my writing. Remarks were constantly added to my notes on the experiences of my readings and sections were frequently highlighted in the search for common themes.

All of these encounters, formal and informal conversations, and sharing of spaces and experiences offered me a chance to gain detailed insights into the “complicated character, organization, and logic of [the] culture” I was immersed in (McCracken, 1988: 17). In all my visits I carried a notebook where I would write down my daily experiences, emotions, encounters, notes on my conversations, and other events of the day. These notes constitute an important part of my methodology as they are an important effort to embed myself into the hunting and tramping spaces of Stewart Island, and also are part of my reflexive engagement with my research. Moreover, from these notes I extracted significant information about my experiences and of the Others’, also constituting important material for my analysis. For this effect, apart from repetitive readings of, and reflections on, the material written in my diary, I have selected passages and organised them into themes of interest. These themes often intermingle with themes that emerged from in-depth, recorded conversations. This article will present a detailed analysis of one of these emergent themes: the host-guest relationship between hunters and trampers on Stewart Island.

Hunters and Trampers on Stewart Island

Kate Hunter (2009) notes that hunting in New Zealand is constructed as an expression of national identity. The hunting ethos is constantly reinforced by practices that highlight culturally significant and historically mediated performances deeply connected to a distinctive way of *being* a New Zealander (Reis, 2009). On Stewart Island, these performances are intensely experienced, due particularly to the significance of the sublime environment in which hunters immerse themselves, but due also to the length of their stay, which allows them fully to engage with such a sublime landscape. International trampers on Stewart Island, on the other hand, tend to reproduce a standardised tourist performance that disconnects the individual from the environment, and where sensual involvement tends to be limited to visual engagements. For these trampers, the natural environment, a commodity in a tourism *modus operandi* that sells...
the experience, is no more than the setting for their performance, and is constitutive of identity only to the extent of confirming their personally unacknowledged status of demanding consumer. This demanding consumerism is what militates against a sensual/sensuous engagement (Crouch and Desforges, 2003; Edensor, 2001; Marvin, 2005) with the ever-present mud on the island, for instance. Although the mud is repeatedly mentioned in conversations and hut books, and involves the senses of touch and smell, it is reported as an unwanted by-product of the main product, the tourism experience. This wholly negative engagement is not how the term sensual is generally understood (Crouch and Desforges, 2003). However, trampers do engage with a distinct New Zealand way of framing nature, as nature is an essential part of New Zealand national identity and it is sold to the tourist accordingly (Bell and Lyall, 2002; Young, 2004; Ross, 2008).

These two contexts for the constitution of identity, although distinct, take place in the same location. Contemporaneously, hunters produce the hunting space, closely connected with the construction of place, particularly ‘camp as home’, while trampers operate within a tourism space that is produced and provided by others, specifically tourism agencies and tourist service providers, as part of the country’s tourism product. This provision of space does little to facilitate place making; tramping huts, as used by these trampers, and in contrast to the hunters, are not constructed as home. In the case of hunters, the historically and culturally situated concept of the sublime may be argued to be an external factor in producing the hunting space, but since it is so deeply acculturated within these individuals it may better be considered internal. Therefore, hunters may collectively produce a space that is meaningful and that allows place making and the perpetuation of a collective identity.

The production of space is a means to reaffirm a collective identity, creating an imaginary boundary where a repertoire of narratives and performances are expected to take place (Maier, 2007). Hunters, then, are involved in a performance that emphasises a collective identity that, in turn, legitimises the hunting practice and its significance to a ‘New Zealand sense of self’, or what is portrayed as being essentially New Zealander. A positive social identity plays a significant role in the development of a positive self identity and therefore is of extreme importance to individuals (Cook-Huffman, 2000). Practices that challenge one’s social identity have the potential to disturb (Polkinghorn, 2000). It is this disturbance, created by the production of these distinct and potentially conflicting spaces, that the hunters’ produced from within and the trampers’ were supplied with from without, that this article aims to discuss. Central to any understanding of this conflict over the production and utilisation of these distinct spaces are the philosophical positions to which the protagonists subscribe, however unselfconsciously.

Here I argue that conflict, at least insofar as it concerns hunters and trampers on Stewart Island, is deeply bonded to the notion of space. The production of space, in the case of hunters, is modulated by shared philosophical positions that connect individuals and the environment, and produce a collective identity that is in turn significant to oneself. For international trampers, in contrast, philosophical positions might not be shared and there is no group identity that unites and guides the production of the tourism space in which they operate. Such an approach has not been incorporated into current academic discussions of recreation conflict, despite (superficial) mentioning of social identity and place attachment in the conflict literature. Therefore, this space-centred approach serves to advance the discussions in this field. In order to present my
argument, I have opted to analyse the production of these spaces by contrasting some ways of performing ‘hunting’ and ‘tramping’ on Stewart Island.

At this point an important clarification needs to be made. Due, in particular, to the scope of this paper, one issue that I do not engage with is gender relations and how these may influence the performance of hunters and trampers on Stewart Island. First, gender did not emerge, to me, as crucial in the construction/production of place and space, and was not overtly present in the narratives of hunters and trampers on the island. This is not to imply that gender roles are insignificant in this context. McLeod (2004), for instance, as well as several ecofeminist scholars (cf. Collard and Contrucci, 1988; Luke, 1998; Kalof, Fitzgerald and Baralt, 2004; Mallory, 2001), discuss at length how masculinity is central to some forms of hunting performances and discourse. Although their focus was not on the relationship between hunters and other recreationists such as trampers, or on issues of space and place, their arguments nonetheless point to a complexity that would certainly need to be drawn out in a separate analysis. Hence, the exploration of this issue falls beyond the limits of my analysis and I raise it here to suggest that further research is done to thoroughly investigate the part that gender roles play in the experiences of hunters and trampers in similar contexts.

Performing the Norm

'Performing the norm' here refers to how the characteristic behaviours of these groups affect their experiencing of the hunting/tramping spaces. I understand that individuals may not fully subscribe to some of these norms, and neither is this an attempt to generalise from idiosyncratic behaviours. I understand also, nonetheless, that the creation of norms and adherence to them is part of the process of collective identity building, and therefore opposition to, or subversion of, these norms may be considered as acts of resistance6. According to Brewer and Gardner, “the collective self... reflects internalizations of the norms and characteristics of important reference groups and consists of cognitions about the self that are consistent with that group identification” (2004: 68). It is in this sense that I discuss certain performances as normative, as they are vehicles for the reinforcement of self and of collective identity.

A survey conducted in my first few trips to Stewart Island confirmed what anecdotal evidence was indicating: that hunters travel to the island in large groups of between 4 to 12 people, and stay based at one hut or campsite for periods of 6 to 10 days. This behaviour is in contrast to trampers, who tend to travel solo or with a friend/partner and although they may stay on the island for several consecutive days, will not stay based in one single place, but walk from one hut to another every day, or every other day. More importantly, the hunting trip frequently is considered the highlight of the year, being planned in detail, with months in advance. These basic trip characteristics lead to some other, more complex, trip norms that are performed by both groups in stark contrast. As hunters stay in only one location they are relieved of the constraint of carrying all food and equipment each day from hut to hut, as trampers need to do. Thus, hunting is associated with considerable volumes of all different sorts of supplies that are considered luxurious, bordering on excessive, by other visitors, particularly trampers. Indeed, backcountry luxury items, it emerges, are an important element of hunters place-making on Stewart Island; part of the construction of home.
We do take a lot of crap, though, God!... I mean... yeah, like last year we had a shower out, you know, we had hot water and it was great. You know, we had a shower there and we took a fridge to keep our beers cold, I mean, that’s all part of it... yeah, we enjoy the roughness but we don’t wanna do it too hard... (Marty)

One could argue that such a behaviour in fact detracts from the idea of ‘going back to basics’ so promoted in hunters’ narratives and, as a consequence, from nature itself. It seems indeed contradictory, but it does not invalidate the close, sensuous experience of the environment however. In fact, the artefacts that are taken to camps and huts are there to provide a sense of home for hunters who are mostly urban dwellers, but who make an effort to ‘re-connect’ in an essentially Romantic way.

Hunters’ place-making effort certainly contrasts with the ephemeral nature of the tramping experience of place in these huts. Trampers tend to wake up early in the morning to get ready for the tramp, eat a quick breakfast, and depart for the track. The location for lunch is usually chosen beforehand, by looking at the map and finding a ‘half-way-through-spot’ in a seemingly pleasant setting to stop at, such as flat open country or by the beach, and typically not more than 45 minutes will be spent in the location. The walk continues until trampers reach the final destination, the hut, where they settle in, prepare a simple dinner, may play some cards, talk a little, and retire to bed not long after sunset. The next day the process is repeated, and the hut and its surroundings are left behind, leaving little chance for place-making to occur.
Tony, a hunter, expresses well this contrast between the effort to create a meaningful place and the fleeting experience of most trampers:

When we go hunting we usually stay in one hut for a period of time and it is usually somewhere where we will transport all of our supplies in by boat, which means we will have a lot of supplies, gas cookers, a lot of meat, vegetables, stuff like that. So when the trampers come through and they have got their freeze dried foods and things like that, and you see somebody, they have got a big pot on the fire... maybe some trampers feel a little bit hacked off [annoyed] because they see you with the food bubbling away on the stove and there is maybe a couple dozen beer sitting in the corner or something like that and all these sort of luxuries that you can't have and or cart round with you when you are tramping... So we have ample lighting and all the rest of it, so we can do our cooking at night when it is dark because we have still got lights as well as cookers, whereas I think with most trampers they have only got the one little bottle, so they will get their cooking done, all in one pot and when that’s finished, they have to do it before it gets dark, because when that’s finished, they will have to put on the gas lights. I do think they sort of get a little bit hacked off, with that, in that respect.

There are some interesting elements of host/guest and home/visitor relationships inherent in the use of huts by hunters and trampers. As a consequence of hunters bringing large amounts of supplies to huts or campsites on the island, hunters are able to ‘make themselves at home’ in shared public-use huts. Huts that are used by hunters as bases can become cluttered with hunting equipment and supplies. A comment made by Linda, a tramper, highlights how huts seem to play the role of second homes to
hunters, which can make trampers feel a bit uneasy when arriving at a hut at the end of a long day:

The life with hunters’ groups was strange because you seem to arrive in their house, so it doesn’t give you a good impression.

This supports my suggestion that the place-making effort, and the performance of place, ‘hut as home’, is simultaneously part of the production of the hunting space and interferes and contrasts with the experiences of trampers, which in turn interferes with the experience of hunters and their place-making effort. At ‘home’ you do not expect to host complete strangers, and accommodating trampers when they arrive at ‘base camp’ can be frustrating. Nonetheless, several hunting parties, being aware of the shared location, perform as hosts, providing clear evidence of their construction of place.

An important point regarding the host/guest performance refers to the performance of localism enacted by hunters and the general acceptance of trampers to perform as fleeting tourists. Franklin (2008) indicates that hunters, in general, tend to choose locations that are known to them, and in New Zealand this is no different. In fact, as I have been arguing, the hunting experience is inextricably connected to place-making.

In comparison with other tourists, the consumptive practices of hunters and anglers tend to form around known places, even if they are not locals themselves. While there are certainly those hunter and anglers who do travel widely, it also true that both traditions place great emphasis on knowing their country, nature and landscape. In their writings, hunters and anglers tend to emphasize their knowledgability and love of place in terms of its particularities. These tend to be embodied experiences and are expressed in visual terms, colours, landscapes, light and shade, but also in terms of smells and tactile experiences. It is also about knowing where things are (local bush foods, birds’ nests, water, wallows, snake infested areas etc) and how they change over the season. Hunters cultivate an association with particular areas because in hunting the knowledge of these particularities becomes greater than a sum of the parts and are a tangible factor in the successful hunt (Franklin, 2008: 41).
As Franklin (2008) argues, the sensuous engagement with the natural environment, and being knowledgeable enough to have the ability to engage with place-making, are essential parts of the hunting experience. Without those elements, hunting would not provide a fully satisfying experience for most Stewart Island hunters. Conversely, for trampers the search for novelty, being on different tracks, seeing different (and spectacular) scenery, spotting different animals – all essentially visual engagements – is more important than the sensuous engagements that these elements could provide. Place-making, therefore, is not indispensable for the tramping experience.

An interesting comment by one tramper indicates that this place-making behaviour is characteristic of a style of travel that hunters, more than trampers, tend to have. In the case reported by Carla, a non-hunter had been staying in a Southern Circuit hut for a week by the time she arrived with her friends: “I felt like we were intruding a little bit because he sort of made himself quite at home.” For her, it was unexpected to see such a behaviour coming from a tramper “so much like ourselves,” but who was, nonetheless, not performing the norm. He had, like hunters, created a strong connection to that place, which seemed to be alien to the tourist tramping experience. Here, it may be appropriate to infer that the lonely tramper was creating a site of resistance by ignoring the tramping norms that have been created and ‘imposed’ on tourists by the New Zealand tourism industry (Edensor, 2001). Maybe more importantly, for this tramper as well as for hunters the natural environment is indeed “coconstituent of place-making”, as Cloke and Perkins (2005: 904) suggest, and not a mere setting as I have argued is the case for most trampers on the island.

Another factor which relates to the large amount of gear taken by hunters to the huts concerns their mode of access, that is, the use of motor boats, helicopters and fixed-wing planes to reach hunting grounds, more precisely, the camps and huts where they will usually spend a week. For trampers, seeing motorised vehicles during their stay in a
remote island like Stewart Island, devalues their experience (Booth, 2006; Booth, Jones and Devlin, 1999; Mace, Bell and Loomis, 1999; Sutton, 1998).

I was lucky to have 2 days/night at Doughboy Bay with nobody there because a group of hunters flew in as I was leaving. I think it’s good to get rid of the deer but it ‘cheapens’ the experience with them flying/boating in all over. (Kurt)

On the other hand, trampers’ style of travelling and general characteristics might also affect hunters’ experiences. Despite the Stewart Island tramping reputation, the island does attract a large number of trampers who are inexperienced and this is frequently criticised by hunters. Again, the hunting performance is a reinforcement of a national identity, extremely bonded to place. Such a performance therefore needs to contain elements of ‘localism’, or proving local knowledge. It is through the conscious noting of the Other’s inability to perform in an environment that is familiar to hunters that they are able to emphasise their own ‘ownership’ of the place, legitimising them as hosts.

We have had trampers staying on extra days, they actually stayed on two or three days to come out and fish with us and, one guy, a Canadian guy came, on the day of that deer I told you that we couldn’t find, when we found it he carried it the way back to the hut, so that sort of thing, he loved it, we trying to talk him into having a break, but he wanted to say, I carried a deer back, so that’s one thing he wanted to do it, so obviously you can carry it out, so that’s more our experience. We took a German guy out fishing one day and he caught a big blue cod and he was just buzzing, he was just over the moon and he said “oh that’s the first fish I ever caught”, he said, I live miles from the sea, so when you think he had that experience it’s quite nice to be part of that. It’s quite nice to think, well he’ll remember that, that will be a memory for life, you know, the fact that we could take him out in our boat let him experience that, is quite cool you know, yeah. (Garth)
Episodes like this illustrate dramatically the potential for host and guest performances, as well as the distinctiveness between the hunters’ space and that of the trampers. Another cause of criticism, but not necessarily a reason for conflict, comes from the fact that trampers remain on tracks and go only from one hut to another and therefore, hunters say, do not experience the environment as much as hunters do. This characteristic, according to some hunters, leads trampers to have a poor understanding of the problems and necessities of the ‘bush’ and therefore contributes to a lack of tolerance and understanding between the two groups.

You could cut, say, from the track back 10 meters and then from 10 meters beyond cut the whole forest down, no one will know… no one will know, except for the hunters that get to go there hunting, ‘cause all the trampers do is walk on the track. That’s it. They’re not enjoying the nature, ‘cause they’ve never being into it. So they’re walking on the main railway track, or whatever that is, a state highway. (Marty)

It can be argued that hunters perceive trampers, in comparison to hunters, as less embedded in the Stewart Island natural environment when engaging in their outdoor activity. I argue that most trampers on Stewart Island, due to a lack of sensuous connections with the environment, the provision of a pre-defined tourist space, and the relative inability to create an attachment to place, consume nature as detached from oneself. The experience does require the natural environment, but its participation is limited to a visual, ideal (and idealised), setting. Despite all the differences, hunters and trampers on the island found a commonality through the need to share huts, tracks and their experiences, and few general negative comments were ever-present in their narratives. In fact, both groups reported more positive experiences than negative ones.
There was these two guys, one from Switzerland and one from Germany, I think they were, they thought it was quite amusing, I think, to be honest to turn up to a hut and have these guys seemingly in the middle of nowhere, and made themselves so at home, and I think they sort of watched with a bit of wonder, but no, they definitely didn’t have any negative comments to make or anything, they quite enjoyed it... I mean, they were really good company so it was quite nice to... I think they were very open to meeting new people on the track, so quite aware that there would be other people using the huts. (Caroline)

Once again, with place-making being such a central part of the hunting performance, and with its being constructed through their rituals and through the necessity of legitimising their practice as an expression of national identity, when sharing huts with trampers hunters perform as hosts, creating a hunting space that trampers can be part of only as fleeting guests who respect their hosts’ rules. On the other hand, due to trampers’ lack of a collective identity binding them together, and the provision, from the outside, of a tourist space that they feel compelled to accept and situate themselves within; trampers tend not to make an effort for the creation of a meaningful place. Hence, trampers accept the distinction between the two spaces and perform, towards hunters, as guests.

Clearly, precedence is being given here to the hunters’ space, with trampers deferring to the hunters’ more established position. Accordingly, hunters seemed very pleased to meet different trampers every day, especially overseas visitors, as they could reinstate their status as hosts. “Trampers are interesting to get to know and learn of their home countries and experiences” (Callum). In addition, hunters on Stewart Island are usually more attached to the setting than are trampers, contributing to this host behaviour. This sentiment of place construction and attachment is consistent with the political organisation of hunters and their active involvement in discussions on issues related to the management of the island (Department of Conservation, 2008, 2011c). Stewart
Island is highly valued by this group and most users are recurrent visitors who pass the ‘legacy’ of Stewart Island hunting from generation to generation. Trampers were less attached to the location, had few opportunities for place construction and predominantly were first time and one-off visitors (Reis and Higham, 2009).

Another important element of the hunting and tramping context is hut etiquette, which forms a significant part of New Zealand’s outdoor recreation norms. There are over 950 public backcountry huts spread around conservation areas in New Zealand providing an excellent and frequently visited facility for outdoor recreationists in the country. Because of such an immense network, and what it represents to New Zealanders and outdoor enthusiasts from around the world, a code has developed with some simple points that hut users usually follow: a hut-use etiquette that is well established in the recreational context. This etiquette includes practices such as signing the hut book on arrival and departure for safety reasons, keeping huts clean and tidy, removing all non-biodegradable material on departure, replacing all firewood used, sweeping floors, cleaning benches, propping up mattresses and paying hut fees.
Non-compliance with hut etiquette is frequently reported as a cause of conflict between park users (Wray, Harbrow and Kazmierow, 2005). It is my argument here that hut etiquette, particularly on Stewart Island where the production of space is differentiated between the two most common user groups, is inextricably linked to place-making and the production of a particular recreation or tourist space. Common complaints raised by hunters related to trampers not restocking firewood supplies and not cleaning tramping boots before going into huts, a clear performance of hosts operating in their familiar place.

Trampers are quick to whinge and moan about things but I’ve never seen a tramer restock the wood pile, go out there with a bloody saw and cut up some wood or anything, they’re quite happy to use our wood. You know, that pisses me off. I’ve never seen them… the people that I do see cleaning huts up are generally kiwis [New Zealanders], experienced trampers that as they leave their bunk room they give their bunk room a sweep out and, you know, is all nice and clean. (Marty)

Here, New Zealand trampers are referred to as knowledgeable as they too have a historical and cultural connection to the ‘outdoorsy’ performance expected from New Zealanders and one which is an inherent part of the hunting performance (Ross, 2008). It is evident that international visitors are not as familiar with such norms and might not follow them as New Zealanders generally do, in that they are the expected performance in the New Zealand backcountry. As tourists who are provided with only minimum information about local behavioural expectations, specifically backcountry ones, due to the commodity status of the tramping activity in New Zealand tourism strategies, trampers are even more alienated from the subtleties of this culturally-nuanced, etiquette-based possibility of place-making. The product that is being sold to them is not to be engaged with in a lasting manner, but through ‘accelerated’ and transient performances, allowing for more products to be consumed in a short period of time (Bell and Lyall, 2002). Such an engagement, although fully embodied as Bell and Lyall (2002) remind us, seems to be less reliant on senses other than the visual, maintaining both nature and local manifestations of culture distanced from the performance, and participating in the experience only as setting.

Clearly, hut etiquette can be a cause of conflict for trampers also. In fact, most complaints about hunters concerned hut etiquette and were particularly focused on the fact that hunters tended to use too much room and were not particularly accommodating of trampers. However, such an attitude (occupying too much room) is a reflection of the place-making effort of the hunting experience, but in this case, with careless disregard for the ‘appropriate’ hosting performance. Most importantly, it does not represent a lack of ‘local’ knowledge of hut etiquette but an explicit attempt to disturb ‘unwelcomed guests’. Nonetheless, trampers criticised hut users in general terms more often than singling out hunters specifically; common themes revolved around untidiness, noise and disrespect for nature. Here again the production of space seems to be central to the conflict situation. When the hunting space intrudes upon the tourist space, or any other for that matter, without an effort to accommodate both spaces in a harmonious way, as with the production of the host/guest environment, conflict tends to occur.

Previous studies in the New Zealand conservation estate show that crowding is frequently a source of conflict between visitors and is usually related to negative impressions about the experience (for examples see: Higham, Kearsley and Kliskey,
In the present research, crowding was mentioned several times by participants who usually associated crowding with unpleasant situations. In fact, crowding was the single major source of conflict reported by both trampers and hunters in the survey conducted during the initial stages of this project (Reis, 2008). Informal conversations showed also that, even when complaints were directed at one specific group (ie trampers or hunters), the actual source of conflict was crowding and not group-related activity or behaviour. The following comment made by one respondent (tramper) from the survey illustrates the feeling: “hunters crowding huts.” Caroline, a tramper, described a situation that she experienced on the Southern Circuit to exemplify a conflict event that could have arisen with any other group:

you wouldn’t want to bump into another bigger group in there because the huts are just so tiny, they’re sort of... the bunks space and the actual moving around space is very limited by the time you have a bench and the little fires. (Caroline)

Another survey respondent (tramper) rated his experience as ‘satisfying’ rather than ‘very satisfying’ because there were: “too many people (hunters and trampers) [on tracks/in huts], did not feel remote.”

Here it is interesting to note that Stewart Island is considered a remote destination, where one will experience wilderness and isolation. The Lonely Planet (2009: online) states that the atmosphere on the island is “remote, rugged, and friendly” while the Department of Conservation (2011b, online) describes the island in an almost poetic way, emphasising the natural features and remoteness from other landmasses:
From the South Island, Stewart Island can be seen on most days as a mysterious jagged, dark blue lump on the horizon. When the weather drives in from the Southern Ocean the island disappears behind low cloud and grey sheets of cold rain. On clear summer days the island seems very close and shines an inviting blue-green, topped by rocky mountain peaks. To the north is often stormy Foveaux Strait and the South Island, to the east, west and south lies the endless tracts of unforgiving Southern Ocean. Sea-pounded cliffs and sandy beaches make up the western coast while on the eastern side of the island there are three sheltered inlets.

It is in this ‘mood’ that the ‘tramping product’ is sold, and if a specific aspect of the experience does not match the ‘advert’, then the overall experience is compromised. Again, engaging with that environment is satisfying only if ‘one gets what one paid for’, reiterating the commodification of nature and of the experience. The construction of wilderness as devoid of humans means that the ‘true’ experience of wilderness can be attained only if humans are not in sight. Hence, meeting “too many people” jeopardises the experience. Here I would like to draw the reader’s attention to the philosophical underlines of these performances. For trampers on Stewart Island, it is the concept of ‘wilderness’ that drives the tramping product that is being consumed. Nature, in this sense, is therefore ‘Other’ to trampers, being simply a means to ‘escape from civilisation’, for instance. For hunters, nature is a constitutive part of the Stewart Island experience and performance and therefore inseparable from the hunting space created.
Conclusions

On Stewart Island, the production of the hunting space, although historically situated and passed on culturally from generation to generation, is central to the hunting experience and involves a place-making effort that reinforces the cultural history of hunting in this country, as well as wider social norms related to outdoor activities. Understanding space and place as inseparable, but at the same time distinct, both the production of the hunting space and hunters’ place-making effort – that creates ‘hut as home’ and facilitates the performance of hunters as hosts – are extremely powerful aspects of the hunting performance that cannot be overlooked, or simply merged. Following Wainwright and Barnes (2009), I do not contend that either space or place should be favoured, one over the other, but that the constitution of each is central to the constitution of the other. In the case of hunting on Stewart Island, the production of the hunting space helps in the constitution of a significant place for hunters, which in turn reinforces the hunting space. One does not take precedence over the other, nor is it possible for them to be disconnected. Therefore, the hunting practice as a cultural performance cannot properly be understood if it is itself disconnected from these two metaphysical concepts of place and space. Finch highlights the importance of these concepts in the passage below:

*separating practice and place [is inappropriate because] those who study hunting across societies and time recognize the relationships created between the landscape, the hunters, and the hunted as fundamental to the material and cultural significance of those constitutive elements. The encounters between the hunter and the hunted structure the social memories of those involved and are given meaning through references to the ‘places and spaces of encounter’ within which they were enacted or performed. (2007: 363)*

Trampers have less control over the production of the tourism space in which they perform and that is clearly provided to them by controlling agencies that influence tourism practices in this country. Tramping, as an important part of New Zealanders’ recreation activities, is ‘pre-packaged’ for the tourists without contextualising the practice within New Zealand culture. As many readers familiar with the local tramping culture in New Zealand might agree from reading my account of tramping on Stewart Island; the New Zealand local tramping culture differs in significant ways from the practice that is sold to international visitors and consumed on Stewart Island. Much like hunting, for the domestic tramper the sublime is constantly engaged with in sensuous relations, and fully experiencing the harsh weather and natural formations is as much part of tramping as is getting to the final destination. Such an experience does not characterise Stewart Island’s ‘touristic’ tramping performance. Therefore, without fully contextualising the practice, the tourism industry does not facilitate an engagement that goes beyond the product and that produces a critical response from visitors. In this way, tourists accept the space that is being provided for them, and without full agency in the production of the space in which they perform, place-making is compromised. As a consequence, hunters, who are constantly performing place through their host behaviour, have their hunting space dominating over trampers’, which may in turn cause discomfort for those who wish not to accept as legitimate hunters’ place-making efforts. Clearly, it is impossible to dissociate place-making and space production.
Another important aspect of this complex relationship between culturally inherited spaces, spaces provided by the outside, place-making efforts and performances; is that philosophical positions are constantly being played out in these environments. Philosophies of nature are, therefore, central aspects of these performances as they often dictate, or at least greatly contribute to, the acceptance of the norms that are intrinsically tied to the space produced. On Stewart Island, Romantic ideals of nature, and the dichotomy between human and nature, predominate in both spaces. It is not surprising, though, that this is the case. Both spaces are produced through a New Zealand (Western dominant) construction of nature, although in the case of trampers one that is purposively fabricated for the international tourist. It is possibly because of this that conflict did not seem to predominate in the social relations between trampers and hunters (although tensions were apparent). My position is that the source of these tensions is the commodification of nature in such a way that strongly disconnects the natural environment from the senses and, consequently, from oneself. Although hunters are trapped still in Romantic dualism, they regard nature as an essential part of their embodied experience, where senses are evoked and discovered through the engagement with landscape and prey. Trampers, on the other hand, ‘use’ nature as a disconnected setting, and although their experience could not take place elsewhere, the experience is not about an engagement with nature, but, at the most, is about a personal journey of overcoming challenges, that is later retold to friends and peers through the use of photographic images.

The typical consumer of national parks and wildlife destinations is a tourist whose visit is typically fleeting, shallow and a one-off affair. They may be attracted to such areas in greater numbers than in the past but their relationship with each one is extremely loose and ephemeral and ‘until further notice’. There is nothing but their own pleasure and interest binding them to the place and once that begins to wane, as it typically does after a relatively short period, the tourists take their leave (Franklin, 2008).
My own experience of these activities has provided me with significant tools to understand the experiences of hunters and trampers on Stewart Island. As an acculturated immigrant to New Zealand, as far as tramping is concerned, my tramping practice on Stewart Island was very detached from the tourism space that is provided to the regular tourist. Helplessly aware of the commodified status of nature in the tourism industry, while at the same time opposing such a position, my own tramping experience was a constant struggle to engage from within while hoping not to be trapped in the messages for consumption. Simultaneously, I was becoming more and more familiar with, and appreciative of, the cultural heritage that linked the hunting experience to the New Zealand tramping experience. Constantly trying to perform as a local, I had to negotiate the tramping and hunting spaces with both hunters and trampers, and found myself frequently fluctuating between the two spaces provided, in my case, from without. Significantly, I was eventually trapped in the tourist space, and the recollection of this experience was essential for my understanding of the complexity of the production of spaces in remote outdoor locations, such as cold water islands. It was through my unwitting engagement with both the hunting and the tourist space that I was able to conceptualise these experiences as experiences of space and place, and through this realisation build an argument for the importance of such concepts in the conversation around outdoor recreation in remote island destinations.

End Notes:

1. New Zealand is officially also called Aotearoa, the country's Māori name. I have opted to use the English name only in order to simplify reading. The choice of English is due solely to the fact that I am writing this dissertation in English and therefore it seems more appropriate to maintain the use of one language only.

2. Tramping can be roughly defined as leisure walking undertaken in ‘natural’ areas, or ‘in the bush’, usually involving overnight camping or in New Zealand backcountry huts. Rambling, in the United Kingdom, Hiking, in the United States, and Bushwalking, in Australia, stand as close, but not accurate, synonyms to Tramping in New Zealand. And precisely because of the cultural context embedded in the use of the term I have opted to keep the term tramping throughout this article instead of using another term that may be more familiar to an international audience but that in essence does not convey the meaning precisely.

3. The Tin Range in the southern part of the island, for instance, offers excellent tramping opportunities that are not promoted by the Department of Conservation. This area is currently under evaluation to become a wilderness area and therefore cannot have any marked, maintained track.

4. Backcountry and front-country are terms usually used in New Zealand to designate natural settings with different levels of remoteness, the former being relatively inaccessible and remote, with people having to travel some distance to reach these large settings, and the latter being available at road ends, being “typically small areas, scattered within or on the periphery of large relatively natural areas” (Department of Conservation, 2011c: 74).

5. Heywood (2002), in an empirical survey study of three different outdoor recreation activities, argued that socially accepted behavioural norms are perceived as obligations to behave in particular ways and were highly crystallised amongst his research participants, a finding that supports my argument here.

6. Such norms may be associated to hut etiquette, to the sensual engagement with the sublime, to the constant search for this interaction, among others.
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