



Tourism Development in Borneo: Comparative Excursions Twenty Years On

Victor T. King*
Chiang Mai University

Abstract: Tourism is making an increasingly important contribution to economic development in Borneo and is an important element in government development plans and policies. Nevertheless, it is a relatively new developmental enterprise in comparison with the established tourism destinations in neighboring Thailand, Peninsular Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and the Philippines. The paper has two objectives. First, research on tourism in Borneo is reviewed from the early 1990s; the conclusion is that it is uneven in its achievements and its contribution to tourism studies generally, although empirically it is useful it is poorly developed conceptually. Secondly, given that three ASEAN states are represented in Borneo (The Federation of Malaysia, Negara Brunei Darussalam and The Republic of Indonesia), then they provide fertile ground for comparative studies. In this regard it is argued that, although the emphasis and direction of tourism development policies indicate some convergence (in ecotourism, ethnic and longhouse tourism, heritage tourism and even beach resort tourism), there is evidence of considerable divergence as well. The reasons for this divergence are examined and are related to differences in overall political and economic priorities in these three nation-states, as well as to their environmental, socio-cultural, historical and infrastructural characteristics.

Keywords: Comparisons, tourism development, cross-border movements, regional cooperation, Borneo

Introduction

Research on tourism in Borneo dates primarily from the early 1990s when the first conference panels on this subject were organized at the Second Biennial International Conference of the Borneo Research Council held in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah in 1992 (King 1994a, 1994b, 1994c, 1994d). In turn this emerging interest related to earlier multi-disciplinary work on tourism in Southeast Asia (see Hitchcock, King and Parnwell 1993a). Among other matters, research in the early 1990s was concerned to explore the variegated,

complex character of tourism encounters; the process of 'touristification' (Picard 1993, p. 93-94; 1995, 1996, 1997, 2003; Picard and Wood 1997); the relative, contingent, fluid, contested, symbolic, constructed and 'invented' character of culture (Wood 1993, p. 55-66; and see 1984, 1997); and the conceptual and methodological issues which tourism research engendered within the context of modernization and globalization (Hitchcock, King and Parnwell 1993b, p. 4-8). In addition to drawing attention to the neglect of domestic and regional tourism and its conceptual importance other concepts with regard to 'authenticity', 'staging', 'identity', 'representation' and 'sustainability' were also debated.

A major conclusion which emerged from the 1992 conference was that very little research had been undertaken on tourism development in Borneo up to then (King 1994b, p. 4-5; 1993c, p. vi). In consequence there was a need to focus on the effects of cultural and ethnic tourism on the peoples, communities, material culture and cultural performances of Borneo; the tension between the conservation and the commoditization of the environment; the ways in which 'imaging' and 'representation' create particular understandings and expectations among tourists and their effects on local populations (and see King 1992a, 1992b, 1993, 1999, 2013; Millum 1993; Saunders 1993); the roles which the tourism industry plays in economic development; and the policies and actions which governments and their agents deploy in the promotion of tourism. Therefore, after over twenty years of growth in the tourism industry in Borneo since the early 1990s, it seems timely to evaluate what has been achieved in developing our understanding of tourist-generated transformations.

What is also clear is that since the early 1990s a considerable amount of attention has been devoted to the 'imaging' and 'representation' of Borneo for touristic purposes; the primary focus has been 'wild Borneo' (both cultural and natural), tattooed and loin-clothed head-hunters, longhouses, blowpipes, women displaying their woven costumes, beads and silver jewellery, and exotic and mysterious fauna and flora. Winzeler has captured these issues in terms of the processes of 'cultural objectification' and the 'creation of externalized traditions' in Borneo with particular reference to Kruse's work on Iban longhouse tourism and Winzeler's own research on the Bidayuh (2011, p. 220-236; and see 1997a, p. 12-15; 1997b, p. 223-237; and see Cohen 2008, on ethnic tourism in Southeast Asia).

Another important consideration in this chapter is the interconnection between the different Borneo territories, an issue which has already been examined in a broader Southeast Asian context (Teo, Chang and Ho 2001a, 2001b) and one which Geoffrey Wall captures in his pertinent observation, that 'tourism is, at the same time, a homogenising and a differentiating phenomenon as global forces are mediated by local conditions and even small local differences may become causes for celebration and turned into tourist attractions' (2001, p. 319).

Conceptual Considerations

With regard to reflections on the field of tourism studies in Borneo during the past two decades, a preliminary evaluation of the achievements in relation to conceptual advances in the more general field of studies is necessary. To pre-empt my conclusions my overall judgement is that there has been a worthwhile addition to the empirical literature on tourism development and a broader coverage of cases, issues and themes, but not much in the way of conceptual development; large gaps also remain in our understanding of the effects and processes of tourism encounters. In an important recent review of the sociology of tourism and other dimensions of tourism research, Cohen and Cohen (2012a, 2012b) draw attention to three promising innovative approaches: mobilities, performativity and actor-network theory (and see 2012b, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c). Their proposals have occasioned some debate (see, for example, King 2015a, 2015b), but they do constitute a significant advance on earlier concerns with 'authenticity', 'staging', 'imaging', 'hosts and guests', 'impacts' and the 'tourist gaze'. However, there is very little in the tourism literature on Borneo which inspires this level of conceptual contemplation or the realization of the importance of 'post-tourists', domestic and intra-Asian tourism and the move from concerns about authenticity to those preoccupied with fun, entertainment and simulacra (Cohen and Cohen 2012b).

It is glaringly obvious that one of the major preoccupations in the study of Borneo tourism during the past two decades continues to be issues of 'imaging' and 'representation' (see, for example, Gingging 2007; Kruse 1998, 2003; Markwell 2001; Mayer 1999). But unfortunately these subsequent studies from the early 1990s have not, in my view, advanced

beyond or even made recourse to Tom Selwyn's widely cited 'views from the brochures' chapter on Southeast Asia which considered both 'structuralist' and post-structuralist' readings of tourism promotional literature directed primarily to Thailand and Malaysia, including Borneo (1993, p. 117-137; and see Selwyn 1996). In 'structuralist' mode, following Dean MacCannell's pursuit of 'structures of modernity' (1976, p. 4) and the ways in which the 'homeless' and 'isolated' tourist captures, recreates and brings together the 'scattered fragments of [modern] everyday life', Selwyn indicated that tourist brochures (as well as other forms of advertising and representation) promote leisure as 'an arena in which the fragmented modern may recover his sense of structure or, to borrow terms from Louis Dumont, "orientation to the whole"' (Selwyn 1993, p. 118). In this structuralist mode Lévi-Straussian 'mythemes' and 'traditional myth' are replaced by modern advertising and become touristic 'mythemes' of 'sites', beaches and boundaries', 'smiles of local friends' and 'food' in tourism brochures. The language of tourism in this mode dwells on 'the construction of individuals and groups, also with relations between groups' (Selwyn 1993, p. 126), and 'the brochures do seem to be in the business of selling myths' (Selwyn 1993, p. 127). Overall then sites are 'signifiers which, linked together, form coherent structures within which individual tourists find historical and biographic meaning' (Selwyn 1993, p. 129).

Selwyn then developed his argument further by addressing post-structuralist readings of brochures in the context of the increasing interest in cultural commoditization and consumerism and the transformation of the world into a 'tourist supermarket' so that everything advertised is reduced to the same level: 'intellectual distinctions and judgements about the relative value of things becomes blurred' (1993, p. 119, p. 128). In this mode structure, boundaries, and frontiers are fragmented and even erased in the process of marketing commodities and in 'incentive travel' (1993, p. 127, p. 133). Selwyn argued persuasively that when tourism transforms destinations and sites into commodities they are presented as 'centres of physical and emotional sensation from which temporal and spatial continuities have been abolished', and the tourist experience is characterized as one of 'discontinuous intensity' (1993, p. 129).

Selwyn illustrated these two modes of reading brochures with examples, among others, from Borneo and the wider Malaysia: these cases comprised Discovery Tours (Sabah) and their brochure *Borneo, Sabah, Malaysia*, with a 'Penampang Cultural Tour' and 'the rich cultural heritage of the Kadazans', including a visit to a renowned head-hunter and his 'House of Skulls', another includes, not unexpectedly, a visit to Kinabalu National Park; Api Tours (Borneo) and its brochure *Borneo Adventurama* including visits to Sabah's natural attractions, though with some attention to the state capital, Kota Kinabalu, and its prominent cultural sites; Musi Holiday's *Great Mahakam River Tours* where the tourist will have the opportunity to encounter 'ancient tribes' in East Kalimantan; and CPH Travel Agencies (Sarawak) brochure *Borneo Unexplored* with visits to an Iban longhouse (1993, p. 130-133). Therefore, the main sites and experiences are natural (especially rivers, rainforests, and fauna) and cultural (churches, temples, mosques, museums, colonial architecture, state buildings and monuments, and longhouses), and some visits focus on the interaction between culture and nature and between 'ancient tribes' and their surrounding natural environment. Selwyn argued that these brochures can be read in structuralist mode, and are amenable to Lévi-Straussian interpretation: the oppositions and connections through, for example, mediation, transaction and exchange, between nature and culture, hot and cold, modern and traditional, unity and diversity, tribal host and tourist guest, self and other, wild/unexplored/untamed and the domestic/familiar, and individuals (parts) and wholes. Selwyn suggested that the 'alienated modern' of Dean MacCannell 'cannot help but be invited into a universe which seems intellectually and emotionally warm and encompassing' (1993, p. 133). The brochures are preoccupied with structure, linkage, solidarity, sharing, belonging and unity, and interestingly most of the structuralist readings are taken from Borneo and essentially from the promotion of ecotourism and ethnic tourism.

On the other hand the post-structuralist brochures are taken from well developed tourist sites with luxury hotels (Penang, Bali, Langkawi and Singapore), and in an environment of corporatist and large-scale tourism organizations, with an emphasis on refined elegance, privilege, quality service and hospitality, relaxation, recreation, and shopping, the tourist experiences, sensations, pleasures, dreams and feelings, mystique and magic, and 'the interchangeability of reality and fantasy' (1993, p. 134). According to Selwyn the changing world of tourism development will tend to move

increasingly towards the post-structuralist mode which is 'above all, individualistic, and the representations..... elevate the individual - with his or her pleasures, fantasies, senses of power, and so forth – to a central position in the pantheon of symbols used by the brochure writers' (1993, p. 137). Nevertheless, the structuralist 'mythemes', which strike familiar chords among anthropologists will also continue to have resonance '*because* this type of language links with dispositions which are so "elementary"' (1993, p. 137). These issues of representation, image construction and tourism advertising will be returned to below,

Another area of conceptual interest which also has a planning and policy dimension is that of regionalization and interconnections across boundaries. Geoffrey Wall remarked some 15 years ago that there was clear evidence of an increase in the volume of travellers moving within the Southeast Asian region, and given its cultural and natural diversity and its attractiveness to international tourists, then there are all kinds of opportunities for cooperation and interconnection (2001, p. 316, p. 321, p. 323). Nevertheless, tourism sites have developed unevenly across the region, and in spite of the diversity and the potential for product differentiation and the development of niche markets and market segments, the problems of infrastructure and ease of access, the lack of training in the tourism industry and the quality of service provision have still presented obstacles to tourism growth in certain locations.

The concept of interconnections in *Interconnected Worlds* is also closely interrelated with that of globalization, with tourism conceived as a macro-global force, and with the need to understand the processes underpinning it (Teo, Chang and Ho 2001a, 2001b, p. 1-10). But in the circumstances which I am investigating, especially with regard to the northern Borneo territories, the interconnections seem much more to do with historically constructed relationships which were reconfigured during decolonization and the immediate post-colonial period. Most certainly some movements of people across political borders there are to do with globalization and regionalization, but they also occur more prominently because established historical connections and their associated social, cultural, economic and political relationships were artificially interrupted and transformed during the colonial period arising from boundary agreements and the subsequent decisions about the post-war constitution of newly-independent states.

This was particularly the case in the ultimate configuration of the Brooke Raj in Sarawak and of British North Borneo (later renamed Sabah) under the Chartered Company, both of which became British Crown Colonies in 1946, including the island of Labuan, previously a constituent member of the Straits Settlements; together they gained their independence within the Federation of Malaysia in 1963. However, the island of Labuan off the northern coast of Borneo was separated from Sabah in 1984 to become a Malaysian federal territory. The remaining territory of the Brunei sultanate, divided by the 1890 annexation by the Sarawak Raj of the Limbang Basin, was a British protectorate and secured its full independence from Britain in 1984. Movements across borders between Brunei, Sarawak, Labuan and Sabah, like the land connections between Singapore and Peninsular Malaysia using the causeway, occur on a regular basis, especially at weekends, irrespective of 'foreign direct investments in tourism; government-to-government initiatives; and regional bloc collaborations' (Teo, Chang and Ho 2001b, p. 4), and of the existence of the sub-regional Brunei-Indonesia-Malaysia-Philippines (East Asia Growth Triangle) (BIMP-EAGA) (Wadley and Parasati 2000).

Tourist connections across the land borders between the Malaysian Borneo states and Indonesian Kalimantan are less intense and the significant movements are primarily locally generated, primarily between Sarawak and such centers as Pontianak in West Kalimantan with regular bus services. International tourism, which is not as well developed in Kalimantan as in Sarawak and Sabah, is usually routed through flights from Jakarta and Surabaya to the main urban centers of Pontianak, Banjarmasin, Balikpapan, Palangkaraya, Samarinda and Tarakan. Flights are also available from Kuching to Pontianak, and from Kuala Lumpur and Singapore to Balikpapan. The main foci of tourism interest in the Indonesian territories comprise limited areas of West Kalimantan and, in East Kalimantan, Balikpapan and the Mahakam River.

Aside from the attempt by Teo, Chang and Ho (2001a) to understand interconnections in terms of globalization and regionalization, another interesting approach is that of Erik Cohen in his analysis of 'four principal trends of change' in tourism in Thailand (2001, p. 4). He categorizes these trends as: (1) 'massification: from personalized to impersonal tourism' from the 1970s; (2) 'expansion: from centralized to dispersed tourism'; (3)

'heterogeneization: from homogeneous to diversified tourism'; (4) and 'regionalization: from isolation to regional integration' (2001, p. 4-14). An interesting observation is that there is no general model of regionalization. According to Cohen, Thailand as a mature tourism market is somewhat exceptional. Surrounded by nation-states which were relatively closed to tourism until the 1990s the regionalization of tourism has been a recent phenomenon in that Thailand has become a hub for movement into nearby countries which have opened up to the world market.

In contrast it is my view that cross-border relations in Borneo were well-established before then, but that these relations need to be understood in rather different terms from the expansion of tourism from Thailand to neighboring mainland Southeast Asian countries from the 1990s. In other words, in the Borneo states the contextualization of cross-border connections should not be seen simply in terms of globalization, nor should it be seen as a product of what might be termed the logical development of regionalization in a maturing tourism industry. If we reorient ourselves to domestic tourism and the regular movement of Southeast Asians across neighboring borders for a variety of purposes, and address particular historical circumstances and the ways in which states came into being, then we begin to shift our frames of reference. We can also begin to relate these cross-border movements to issues of convergence and divergence in the tourism industry and the kinds of provision for leisure and enjoyment which neighboring states have developed or constrained.

Contributions to Tourism Research on Borneo

There have been several reviews of tourism development in some of the constituent parts of Borneo but no recent overall assessment. Yet Borneo offers an ideal site for comparative research. It is the only island in the Southeast Asian region which embraces three nation-states: Brunei Darussalam, two major states of the Federation of Malaysia, and five provinces of the Republic of Indonesia. In any comparative study of tourism development Borneo offers an ideal laboratory to examine issues of convergence and divergence, and homogenization and differentiation, as well as movements across borders and boundaries. Unfortunately, the main overviews of tourism have been confined to the Malaysian Borneo states

(Douglas 1999; Douglas and Douglas 1999; King 1994a, 1994b, 1994c, 1994d; Lau, Oh and Hu 2008; Pearce 1997a, 1997b; Pianzin 1992). In my view, what is needed for Borneo as a whole is the kind of conceptual analysis which Pearce briefly sketches for Sarawak and Sabah in terms of a range of concepts to do with nodes, interrelationships and movements: origins, destinations, gateways, hubs, multiple functions and synthesis, and scales and hierarchies (2001, p. 27-43). This approach focuses on tourism plans, strategies and policies, but, in its concerns with spatial arrangements, it causes us to think seriously about the intensity, character and direction of tourist movements.

Nature and Culture: Imaging

Convergence in tourism development in Borneo has focused on nature and culture, but particularly on nature (Mayer 1999; Sanggin 2009). The Tourism Master Plans for Sarawak, for example, emphasize the strategic importance of culture, nature and adventure (Nicholas anak Bujang 2005, p. 30; and see Pearce 1997a, p. 88). Adventure, excitement and 'hard travel' are emphasized (Schiller 2001, p. 415; Adeyinka-Ojo and Khoo-Lattimore 2013). All the constituent administrative/political units of Borneo promote ecotourism, focused on national parks, lakes, uplands, coasts, river routeways, forest reserves and wildlife sanctuaries (see, for example, Zeppel on ecotourism in Sabah [Kinabatangan, Mount Kinabalu], Sarawak [Sri Aman] and Kalimantan [Kayan Mentarang] 2006, p. 258-266). The most successful destinations in this regard have been in Sabah and Sarawak with their two UNESCO World Heritage Sites (Cochrane 2016).

As Graham Saunders convincingly demonstrated in his review of the European travel literature on Borneo, tourists arrive on the island 'with certain expectations' (1993, p. 270, 1994; and see King 1992a, 1999). Images of Borneo have been constructed over a long period of European contact with the island so much so that 'there are certain sights which they [tourists] expect to see, certain experiences they expect to enjoy, certain activities they expect to undertake'. This is because '[t]hey carry with them an idea of Borneo, an image which tourist brochures have conveyed and tourist authorities have cultivated' (Saunders 1993, p. 270). But the people of Borneo were not passive recipients of these images; they 'responded to European contact in ways which helped develop the European image of Borneo' (Saunders 1994,

p. 25). Saunders, unlike Selwyn, did not undertake a structuralist and post-structuralist reading of brochures, but what he did address was some of the influential European writings on Borneo and argues that the primary images of Borneo carried in the public mind were already firmly in place by the 1920s.

These images, as Selwyn also demonstrated, are those which continue to be conveyed in tourist brochures, by tour guides, agents, operators, and government departments responsible for tourism promotion, though there tends to be significant promotional differences between public sector agencies and private tour companies. Nevertheless, Saunders captures some of them: 'orang-utans, Dayak head-hunters, longhouses, Brunei's Kampong Ayer, Mount Kinabalu, Bajau horsemen...' (1993, p. 284). We can add proboscis monkeys, hornbills, crocodiles, Rafflesia, rainforests and rivers. Even when new tourist sites in Borneo have been opened up and tours constructed and advertised they have been set firmly in an already established representational framework. These images persist and they continue to be addressed by recent researchers. Cohen draws our attention to the same promotional strategies in the development of hill tribe tourism in northern Thailand; images have been constructed by a small number of tour operators, which, like Borneo, emphasize 'tribes entertaining a way of life which contrasts sharply with modern Western urban civilization' (2001, p. 68).

Therefore, one of my arguments is that tourism in Borneo has developed on the basis of the images designed to 'sell' the island as 'wild', 'untamed', 'unexplored', 'dangerous', 'mysterious' and 'exotic'. In this respect the tourism industry across the constituent political units of Borneo converges, especially in the promotion of natural attractions, ecotourism and the natural-cultural interface. Returning to Saunders, he captures the dominant perceptions of nature and ecotourism appositely which developed from European travellers who 'carried with them their own intellectual baggage along with their physical luggage: and concepts like the Noble Savage, the Romantic view of nature, Darwinian theory and the scientist's impulse to collect and classify, combined with a human fascination with the unusual and the exotic' (1993, p. 285). What is more the research undertaken during the past two decades in Borneo locks into these preoccupations has become fixed on imaging, representations and signs of nature and culture as well as the need

to manage and administer the tensions and conflicts between tourism, and the conservation and protection of nature necessary to conform to the tourism images of pristine, diverse rainforests, and tribal people living in harmony with their natural environment.

Nature, Ecotourism, Imaging and Sustainability

With regard to ecotourism in Borneo and its representations the papers by Norman Backhaus (2003) and Kevin Markwell (2001a, 2001b) are exemplars. They both reinforce the touristic search for pristine rainforests. Backhaus says 'In western countries the expression "Borneo" itself is a sign which stands for jungle, nature, adventure as well as for (indigenous) culture. Western tourists who visit Sabah and Sarawak mostly have this diffuse image of green, damp jungles, full of unknown creatures, where hidden tribes live secluded from the modern world' (2003, p. 154). However, on the basis of his local survey in Kuala Lumpur of 500 people, he recognizes that domestic tourists usually want different experiences in nature: hiking, trekking, camping, rafting, fishing, relaxing, and staying with friends and families; 'only a few...want to see plants, animals or local culture' (Backhaus 2003, p. 155; and see 2005, p. 7-8, p. 247-248). Backhaus remarks that, given that the concept of national parks and environmental conservation are Western-derived concepts, 'Malaysians have only recently become aware of sustainable development' (2005, p.7). Western tourists too vary in their demands and interests, but all tourists are 'semioticians' looking for 'signs' to address their expectations, although the diversity of interests suggests that signage to satisfy all tourist demands is highly problematical. Cochrane too draws our attention to the 'different way in which Westerners and South-East Asians perceive wilderness areas' (1993, p. 318; 2009, p. 254-269).

In his detailed analysis and assessment of tourism and environmental conservation in national parks, including Gunung Mulu in Sarawak (2005, p. 203-244) Backhaus develops the themes and concepts which he had presented previously in relation to tourist sites as 'non-places', and touristic experiences contextualized and understood in terms of 'ontological security', 'critical situations', 'safeness and adventure', 'risk and control', and the sociological concepts of 'structuration' and 'habitus' (2003, p. 1-23). Much of this analysis turns on the need for the safety of tourists and their concerns to be protected (though for some the provision of an experience of adventure and risk), and

the need to allow nature to operate in its own way, but to protect and conserve it in a context of human intervention. These are demanding issues to manage and administer.

Markwell too investigates ‘the visual and textual imagery’ presented in tourist brochures, guidebooks, travelogues and postcards, and, in particular, the ways in which external perceptions of nature are constructed, developed and transformed, and how they strongly influence the expectations, actions, behavior and experiences of the tourist (2001a, p. 248). His major conclusion confirms the general thrust of my argument that ‘The enduring qualities of Bornean nature which were constructed during colonial times, such as its exoticism, its association with the primitive and its wildness, continue to resonate in contemporary touristic constructions’ (2001a, p. 249; and see 2001b on Sabah). He demonstrates that tourist promotional material on Borneo renders nature as a commodity, and tames it with modern chalet accommodation, transport, raised forest walkways, guided tours, signage, fenced viewpoints, but continues to present it as ‘authentic, wild, primitive and exotic’ (2001a, p. 252). Certain icons are selected in this exercise of imaging: ‘the hornbill bird, beautiful orchids, the carnivorous pitcher plant, the proboscis monkey, turtles, and, of course, the orang utan’ (2001a, p. 253). And the connection between wildness and animal imagery is most clearly expressed through the orang utan (literally ‘person [man] of the forest’). Markwell says, ‘To a considerable degree, the orang utan may well signify “wild Borneo” to Western tourists, most of whom are already familiar with this “wild man of the jungle”’ (2001a, p. 255; and see Russell and Ankenman 1996). Yet Markwell emphasizes that ‘wildness’ has to be ‘modified and mediated in order to make it palatable’; it is provided as ‘a sanitised and safe product, generously removed of the unequal binds of reality’ (2001a, p. 259).

References in tourist guidebooks to the natural attractions of Borneo for the ecotourist are too numerous to list in detail (see Hutton 1993; Muller 1990; Pelton 1995; Robinson, Karlin and Stiles 2013; Robinson 1996; Turner, Taylor and Finlay 1996). However, the two UNESCO World Heritage Sites (Gunung Mulu National Park in Sarawak and Kinabalu National Park in Sabah) are heavily promoted. Other sites which are featured in guidebooks are in Sarawak the national parks of Bako, Niah, Gunung Gading, Batang Ai, Maludam, Endau-Rumpin, Lambir Hills, Kubah, Simalajau, Tanjung Datu,

Talang Satang, the Wildlife [Orang-utan] Rehabilitation Centre of Semenggok, and the upland site of Bario. In Sabah there are the national parks of the Turtle Islands, Tunku Abdul Rahman, Tun Mustapha, Pulau Tiga, Crocker Range, Tun Sakaran Marine, Sipadan Island, the Sepilok Orang-Utan Rehabilitation Centre, the Danum Valley Conservation Area, and the Kinabatangan Wildlife Sanctuary. In Brunei the major parks are Ulu Temburong and Tasek Merimbun. In Kalimantan the protected areas are numerous, but they include Tanjung Puting, Tangkiling, Betung Kerihun, Danau Sentarum, Bukit Baya, Gunung Palang, Kayan Mentarang, Kutai, Wehea, Mahakam and Kersik Luway Nature Reserve.

Several studies have been devoted to particular national parks and eco-sites and emphasize such issues as the management of precious and diverse natural resources and tourist assets, the impacts of tourism, the combination of natural and cultural attractions, and also visitor perspectives and activities (see, for example, Bako National Park [Chin et al. 2000]; Batang Ai National Park [Bratek, Devlin and Simmons 2007; and see Buckley 2003, p. 51-52]; Tanjung Puting National Park, Central Kalimantan [Atkinson 1996; and see Irawan, Oka and Yunus 2013; Øvstetun and Cochrane 2014]; Danau Sentarum, West Kalimantan [Lubis, Handayani and Muazir 2009]; the Kinabatangan Valley [Hamzah and Mohamad 2011; Goh 2015], and Orang Utan reserves at Sepilok and Kinabatangan [Newsome and Rodger 2012, p. 60-64; see also Lew 2013]; Tun Mustapha Park [Liew-Tsonis et al. 2012]; Kinabalu National Park [Wong and Phillipps 1999]; and Tasek Merimbun [Azman Ahmad 1999]). Janet Cochrane has also recently undertaken a comparison of the UNESCO World Heritage Sites of Gunung Mulu and Mount Kinabalu, with specific attention to the management arrangements struck between the state and the private sector. She questions the balance between the benefits derived by private sector interests managing such tourist facilities as accommodation, restaurants and shops and what returns to the public sector for conservation purposes and local involvement (2016). Her work is closely related to the findings of Goh who undertook a detailed study of Kinabalu National Park and concluded that ‘the privatization program has not been able to shift the focus of Sabah Parks to nature conservation and that the private sector is unable to fulfil all objectives of sustainable tourism’ (2007, p. iii; and see Zeppel 2006). She examined sustainability from three perspectives: environmental conservation and protection; benefits to local

communities; and visitor satisfaction (Goh 2007, p. 124; and see Goh 2009; Goh and Masiney 2010; Goh and Rosilawati 2014). An informative context for this case study in Sabah is provided by Pianzin's examination, though now somewhat dated, of the management of tourism development in Sabah (1992).

Culture, Ethnic Tourism and Staged Performance.

The other major focus of tourism development in Borneo has been cultural or ethnic tourism, in the Malaysian Borneo states expressed in the longhouse tour and pioneered by Sarawak from the 1960s. Brunei and Kalimantan are unable to compete in this arena, though they also promote cultural tourism. Here the promotional images present tattooed warriors, costumed women, headhunting, and longhouses. These images are most widely recognized as representing 'wild' and 'exotic' Sarawak to the international tourist market, but even in Kalimantan the images comprise 'natives in traditional dress clustered around an orang-utan skull [and] headhunting dances', and visitors have 'the opportunity to see.....artificially extended earlobes'. 'Long-eared Dayak [women]' adds to the exotic images (Schiller 2001, p. 416). A substantial literature has been produced on longhouse tourism in Sarawak; it has tended to be straightforward and practical in its aims, preoccupied with the touristic ways in which the Iban in particular, have been represented and how they stage their culture, as well as the impacts, benefits and disadvantages of participating in tourism.

Studies of Iban longhouse tourism go back some 40 years when Peter Kedit at the Sarawak Museum conducted a survey in the Skrang River in 1975 (Kedit, 1980). Follow up research was undertaken in 1989-1990, 1991 and 1992 and came to one conclusion that longhouse tourism 'may be in danger of becoming too commercialized' (Kedit and Sabang 1994, p. 57). A subsequent study by Heather Zeppel was the first major piece of field research to be undertaken on Iban longhouse tourism (see, for example, 1994a, 1994b, 1995, 1997a, 1997b, 1998). She conducted research in longhouses on the Lemanak River. The Skrang and Lemanak along with other rivers such as the Engkari (see Caslake 1994) and the Batang Ai were selected because they are not too far from the state capital Kuching and can be reached within a day by road and river, and importantly include a river journey (Winzeler 2011, p. 230). Moreover, sites have to be selected which retain some sense of what a 'traditional' longhouse is like as it is presented to tourists, or that they can be

transformed into the tourist image of a longhouse with some judicious staging. Even in the early 1990s Iban longhouse packages, mainly organized by Kuching-based, Chinese-owned tour agencies were attracting annually over 16,000 visitors (Winzeler 2011, p. 221-250; Zeppel 1994b, p. 59). Following on the heels of Kedit, Sabang, Zeppel and Caslake there were several studies of Iban longhouse tourism in the late 1990s and early 2000s (see, for example, Benji anak Jihen 2001; Bratek, Devlin and Simmons 2007; Dias 2001; Kruse 1998, 2003; Sanggin et al. 2000; Tisen 2004; Yea 2002a; Yea and Noweg 2000).

I undertook an assessment of the literature on longhouse tourism in the 1990s and I do not think that our understanding has progressed much since then (1994b, p. 1-7; 1994d, p. 29-43). The preoccupations of researchers on Borneo tourism have been with host-guest interactions, visitor perception and experiences, the positive and negative impacts of tourism, images of the 'exotic' and the 'other', local participation and agency, and socio-economic development (King 1994d, p. 35-40). Zeppel, for example, formulated a straightforward distinction in her examination of host-guest interactions, and the process of 'getting to know the Iban' between what she terms 'cultural sightseeing': the structured and more controlled tour package (a longhouse tour, dances, games, handicraft sales, blowpipe and cockfighting demonstration, and a jungle walk, possibly including a jungle feast, fishing and hunting); and depending on the tour company there may also be the inclusion of chanting and singing, or a ritual offering to deities and spirits, and depending on the timing of the visit, a special ritual celebration such as a wedding. The other cultural engagement is a much more spontaneous 'meet the people' experience which provides for a more intimate encounter rather than one based on 'the tourist gaze' (1994b, p. 60-64; 1997a, p. 122-138). This distinction in turn has implications for the relationship between the imaging of the Iban in tourist promotional material and what tourists expect to see and experience, which is primarily 'staged tradition', and what they experience in a more personal and impromptu cross-cultural encounter (1997a, p. 132-138). Caslake too dwells on the ways in which Iban culture is marketed, and what happens when tourists are confronted by evidence of Iban 'modernity' (1994, p. 78-88). Borneo exoticism and headhunting imagery has continued (Mayer 1999; Gingging 2007).

Research on other communities involved in longhouse tourism in Borneo is more limited. This is for obvious reasons: Iban longhouse tourism is long-established, well advertised and organized and high profile in the international tourist industry. Moreover there has been considerable attention devoted to the emergence of Iban identity and the ways in which the Iban and their culture have been presented and imagined (see, for example, Lim 2001; Tan 2009). However, there have been studies of tourist visitor packages to the Bidayuh in Sarawak (Chin et al. 2014; Winzeler 1997b); Ong's detailed field study of Rungus Dusun tourism in Sabah has also made a considerable contribution to the literature on longhouse tourism (2000, 2008). However, in conceptual terms her use of familiar concepts is clear: commodification and commoditization; the tourist gaze; host-guest encounters; authenticity and staging; media representations and imaging; changes in ethnic identity; local participation in tourism development and the social, cultural and economic impacts in terms of the benefits and disadvantages of ethnic tourism (2008, p. 21-35).

There have also been interesting studies of theme parks and cultural villages: the most well known example being the Sarawak Cultural Village at Damai about 25 kilometers from Kuching (Yea 2002b; and see Abi, Mariapan and Aziz 2015). As with other studies of theme parks which demarcate, select, stereotype, construct and represent culture and ethnic identity, an important theme is the relationship between the state's presentation of national and sub-national identities and those of the people who are being imaged and staged (Yea 2002b, p. 241-244; and see Hitchcock 1997; Hitchcock and Stanley 2010). An important focus is the way in which the state's concerns with unity and harmony are handled in relation to sub-national identities, ethnic minorities and autonomy. Even in more modest touristic presentations of 'a culture village' similar themes are emphasized and pursued (Schiller 2001). Similar themes emerge in Gingging's examination of the Monsopiad Cultural Village of the KadazanDusun in Sabah and the ways in which local people exercise agency in constructing and presenting their identity located in a headhunting past (2007). Sadly studies of home stays and local level responses to tourism development at the village level deliver some interesting empirical data and some guidance for government policy-makers, but very little else (see, for example, Wong 2004; Hamit 2003).

In Kalimantan Indonesian government policies under Suharto's 'New Order' were directed against elements of culture, especially among ethnic minorities in the Outer Islands, considered to be backward and primitive. One cultural marker of 'traditional culture' which was a target of coercive government 'modernization' programmes was the Dayak longhouse. Ironically this was the very symbol of exoticism among the Iban of Sarawak which tour agents and the Sarawak government marketed to such great effect in their tourism development policies, and which the Indonesian government was bent on erasing. In her study of the government-sponsored touristic development of the Kenyah 'culture village' of Pampang in East Kalimantan inland from the urban centre of Samarinda, Schiller remarks that when tourists arrived there they discovered that houses 'were simply like those of [poor] city dwellers in Samarinda...Most of all Pampang lacked a "longhouse" (2001, p. 417).

Cross-border Movements: Convergence and Divergence

There has been some attention to cross-border issues and the development of tourism in Borneo, but this has not received the focus that it deserves. Some studies have examined the development of tourism across the land borders between Sarawak and West Kalimantan (Hitchener et al 2009; Muazir and Hsieh 2013, 2014). But what is clear is the regular and continuous movements across borders in Borneo for weekending, shopping, attending weekly markets and visiting family and friends. Some of these comprise daily excursions, but many involve overnight stays for leisure and tourism. Had comparative studies been undertaken in Borneo from the 1980s and 1990s then the importance of domestic and intra-regional tourism would have served to reorient our focus of research and the concepts which we developed primarily on the basis of encounters between non-Asian guests and Southeast Asian hosts. Instead the increasing interest in Asian tourists in Asia and domestic tourism has only emerged in a substantial empirical and conceptual way within the last decade (see, for example, Cochrane 2008, p. 131-267; Cohen and Cohen, 2012a, 2015a, 2015b, 2015c; Singh 2011; Winter 2007, 2008, 2009; Winter, Teo and Chang 2008).

Visitors to Sarawak and Sabah

During my residence in Brunei for a total of 12 months in 2012, 2013 and 2015 I undertook research on the tourism sector in Brunei which included

attention to the movements of Brunei residents, citizens and expatriate workers to neighboring states. Borneo provides a long-established site of domestic and intra-Southeast Asian tourism. In 1992, for example, Sarawak received 1,655,701 visits; we need to note that the statistics count visits not separate visitors; many individuals undertook multiple visits (www.mot.sarawak.gov.my/upload/file_folder/1992-2000.pdf). The majority comprised Malaysians (1,119,000) from other parts of the Federation since Sarawak continues to maintain its own immigration authority and records visits from Peninsular Malaysia and Sabah. The next major source was Brunei (207,644), and then Indonesia (136,945). A further 64,885 came from other parts of Southeast Asia (Singapore, the Philippines, Thailand) and the wider Asia (Hong Kong, China, Japan, Taiwan) (and see King 1994d, p. 32-33; Pearce 1997a, p. 93; Walton 1994, p. 15-18, for data on visits in 1990). Somewhat over 140,000 came from other sources, but even some of these were generated within Asia. This pattern of movement has not changed significantly. The total figures for 2000 were 3,284,215; of these 1,789,809 were Malaysian, whilst visitors from Brunei quadrupled to 844,416; Indonesian travellers doubled to 273,421; and those from Singapore, the Philippines and Thailand remained reasonably stable at 68,954; visitors from other specified Asian destinations reached almost 100,000.

Statistics available for 2012 give a more detailed breakdown of source countries and specify 14 Asian countries including the Indian subcontinent. The figures again confirm an overwhelming movement of Asians into Sarawak (www.mot.sarawak.gov.my/upload/file_folderdec%202012.pdf). Of 4,069,023 visits 1,434,308 derived from Peninsular Malaysia and Sabah. Visits from Brunei almost doubled from the year 2000 to 1,728,923; Indonesian visits totalled 417,072, and from Singapore, the Philippines and Thailand together just over 200,000. Taking these countries and visits from other parts of Malaysia along with other specified Asian countries then the number of visits totals just under 3,900,000. From the East Asian regions visitor numbers are relatively modest at 27,965.

Sabah presents a somewhat similar picture. Preliminary figures for the full year 2013 give a total number of visits as 3,383,243, again overwhelmingly from other parts of Malaysia and neighboring Southeast Asian and Asian countries (www.sabahtourism.com/sites/default/files/visitor-2013.pdf).

However, in contrast to Sarawak, which shares land borders with Brunei, visits from Brunei to Sabah totalled a relatively modest 99,122; Indonesian visits stood at 211,145. The most significant difference between Sabah and Sarawak is that the visitor numbers to Sabah from East Asia stood at 551,621, the majority from China, including Hong Kong and Macau, at 360,361, and from South Korea at just over 106,000. Good airline services to Sabah International Airport from East Asia and the promotion of recreational facilities as well as ecotourism, particularly to Kinabalu National Park, help explain the competitive advantage that Sabah has over Sarawak in the recreational tourism sector.

The overwhelming number of visitors to Sarawak and Sabah (which also comprise business travelers, people visiting family and friends, public sector employees in other parts of Malaysia attending meetings and conventions and so on) cannot be understood primarily in terms of the interests, motivations and character of tourists from countries outside Asia. Certainly there are tourists from Europe, the Americas, Australia and New Zealand who visit Malaysian Borneo (though a not insignificant number of these will be living and working within the Asian region and taking vacations and short-term breaks), but these do not determine the overall direction and character of tourism development there. In the early 1990s I wrote then that with regard to Sarawak 'the bulk of tourists have the same or similar cultural backgrounds to various Malaysian communities, and the supposed cultural clash between Western and Oriental values and practices may not be as significant as is commonly thought' (King 1994d, p. 33).

Tourist Assets in Sarawak and Sabah

In the case of Sarawak and Sabah there is some convergence in tourism development policies. The promotion of ecotourism is an obvious sector that is mutually reinforcing in that there has been the development of tourism packages which take in the two World Heritage Sites of Gunung Mulu and Mount Kinabalu and the Sepilok Orangutan Rehabilitation Centre near Sandakan in eastern Sabah; some ecotourists will also have visited the Niah Caves in Sarawak and possibly some national parks sites closer to Kuching like Bako, and the Semenggok Orangutan Rehabilitation Centre; side trips to the Batang Ai are organized from Kuching, especially with the connection between the Hilton Hotel there and the Batang Ai longhouse resort which is

also part of the Hilton complex. But some of the more adventurous backpackers and travelers might take in a visit to Temburong National Park in Brunei whilst to-ing and fro-ing between Sarawak and Sabah, thereby integrating Brunei into an ecotourism circuit.

Moving on to beach tourism, Sarawak has coastal resorts at Damai Beach in reasonably close proximity to Kuching as a major gateway to Sarawak. But much of the coastline of Sarawak does not lend itself to the development of sand, sun and sea tourism. Damai's business also depends in part on local weekend tourism from Kuching. In addition, Sarawak's tourism industry is also very reliant on its proximity to Brunei at the northern end of the state. Here there is a leisure industry, shopping, hotels, nightclubs and bars catering in particular for workers in the oil and gas industry and also for the large overnight and weekend market from Brunei. It therefore has a much more specific tourism direction in contrast to Sabah. Another important destination in Sarawak across the border from Brunei is Kuala Lurah, which provides a gateway to Limbang, and the route for those travelling by land onwards to Sabah. Labuan too, as a Malaysian duty free federal territory with good quality hotels and coastal locations, a short ferry journey from Brunei's main port of Muara, is also a leisure destination, again primarily at weekends for Brunei residents. Between January and September, 2014 Labuan received 757, 588 visitors, many of them travelling from Miri, Brunei and Kota Kinabalu (*Borneo Bulletin*, 11 November 2014; borneobulletin.com.bn). A significant attraction of these Malaysian outliers, which are in effect closely interconnected with the Brunei economy, is the sale of alcohol and cigarettes which are unavailable in Brunei, and which are allowed into Brunei for personal consumption, though restricted for Muslims. This provision is a particular Sarawak touristic response to the Brunei market and the oil and gas industry.

There has therefore been some divergence in tourism development between Sarawak and Sabah in relation to catering for Borneo-generated movements, especially from Brunei to adjacent areas of Sarawak and also to Labuan. Sarawak also pioneered ethnic longhouse tourism and has maintained a lead in this sector in comparison with Sabah (Voon and Lee 2009). It is difficult to obtain statistics on visitor numbers on longhouse tours or 'river safaris' as they are marketed in Sarawak, but Zeppel gives us figures of 16,456 in 1991

(1994b, p. 59) and 18.200 in 2004 (2006, p. 262). Because of the nature of this kind of activity there is a limit on the number of longhouses that can participate in the tourism package. This is not a mass tourist experience; it is likely that numbers have increased during the past decade, but probably not significantly.

Sabah's sand, sun and sea recreation is concentrated in and around the state capital Kota Kinabalu with its coastal location and its proximity to islands, beaches and offshore national parks in such resorts as Tanjung Aru and Sutera Harbour. Sabah presents a rather different picture from Sarawak and has been and continues to be an attractive leisure destination for recreational tourists from East Asia, with the added ecotourist attraction of Mount Kinabalu. Sabah is the major location in Borneo for East Asian visitors and diverges significantly from what is available elsewhere on the island. Just as Sarawak is unlikely to be challenged in longhouse tourism, Sabah will continue to be dominant in coastal recreational tourism directed to Asian international tourists.

Brunei as an Exporter of Visitors

Given the overwhelming importance of the oil and gas industry in Brunei, the fact that Brunei is a territorially and demographically small nation-state, and that, though it has an international airport, it is not a major regional airport hub, then its tourism industry has always been relatively modest in size in its contribution to Brunei's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (The World Travel and Tourism Council [WTTC] 2014, 2015; <http://www.wttc.org>). A further set of factors has to be taken into account. Brunei, as a devout Muslim country with a very clear Muslim-Malay identity has not been attracted to the development of international mass tourism and especially beach tourism; the only major tourist accommodation on the coast is the Empire Hotel and Country Club at Jerudong. Furthermore, with the restriction on drinking alcohol in public places, including within hotels and restaurants, and the lack of night-life and the more overt forms of popular recreational entertainment which are sought by many international tourists from the West, Australia, New Zealand and East Asia then the attraction of Brunei in these respects is limited. It also explains why there is a very large movement of Brunei residents, especially expatriates, on one-day excursions, over night, or for a weekend to pursue activities which are not permitted in Brunei (King 2016).

It also needs to be emphasized that, although the tourism sector in Brunei is relatively small, it is by no means insignificant, and as the Brunei government continues to seek ways of diversifying the economy with the expectation in the medium- to long-term that oil and gas revenues will decrease as reserves diminish and the costs of exploitation increase, tourism has the potential to play an expanding role in Brunei's development plans (Tisdell 2003). For example, in 2014 the direct contribution of tourism and travel revenue to the country's GDP was estimated at B\$ 317 million (1.5% of GDP), but taking into account indirect benefits its total contribution was B\$1.402.5 million (6.8% of GDP). The total contribution projected for 2025 is B\$ 2.117.5 million (7.5% of GDP). In employment terms in 2014 the total number of jobs generated directly and indirectly by the tourism industry was calculated at 15,500 (7.6% of those employed) which is projected to reach 20,000 jobs in 2025 (7.7% of those employed). The revenue from 'visitor exports' (that is, spending within the country by international visitors on business and leisure trips, excluding expenditure on education) amounted to B\$ 518.6 million and by 2025 is projected to total B\$ 736.5 million (WTTC 2015, p. 1) (in November 2015 the exchange rate with pound sterling was B\$ 2.19 to £1).

However, visitor arrivals are very modest in comparison with Sarawak and Sabah. Just over a decade ago in 2004 arrivals in Brunei totalled 119,000 (Indexmundi, 2015, <http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/brunei/international-tourism>). With some ups-and downs they had reached 225,000 by 2013, a decrease from 2011 when visitor numbers were around 242,000 (The World Bank 2015, <http://www.data.worldbank.org/indicator/ST.INT.ARVL>). In 2012, they had decreased to 209,000, but numbers picked up again from 2013. It is estimated that there will be around 263,000 visits to Brunei in 2015, projected to increase to 435,000 by 2025 (WTTC 2015, p. 5).

The Tourism Assets of Brunei

There is evidence that the Brunei government has increasingly taken the potential of the tourist industry more seriously with the very recent creation of a Ministry of Primary Resources and Tourism. Prior to this the government had already established a Brunei Tourism Board (BTB) with its associated Tourism Development Department (TDD) within the then Ministry of Industry and Primary Resources. One of the Board's major recent projects has been the production of a *Brunei Tourism Master Plan 2012-16* completed in

2011 (Oxford Business Group 2013). It sets out a clear strategy to promote slow-growth ‘niche’ tourism rather than mass tourism, very different from strategies in Sarawak and Sabah which are directed to the significant increase in its visitor numbers. Brunei has no such ambition, whilst Kalimantan has the ambition but does not have the resources, facilities, and infrastructure to achieve it.

The focus in Brunei is on the ‘ecotourism and family holiday market’ and in terms of attractions to concentrate on natural attractions and ‘a rich vein of Islamic history’ (and see Azman Ahmad 2014). The strategy is ‘high-end and low-volume tourism’, to ensure “a minimum impact on the Sultanate’s environment and local culture” (Oxford Business Group 2013, p. 160). There has also been discussion in Brunei of the potential for the development of Islamic tourism in order to attract more visitors from the Middle East. This seems to be an unlikely way forward, given the intense competition from Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, and now increasingly Thailand, and the attractions there of designer shopping, luxury accommodation, leisure activities, beach resorts, restaurants, including those serving Middle Eastern food, and a developed tourism infrastructure, including public transport, taxis and hire cars.

Therefore nature and Islamic cultural heritage comprise the twin elements in Brunei’s official tourism promotion. Moreover, given the change in strategy, routes and the restructuring of Royal Brunei Airlines (RBA), there is an increasing focus on the ASEAN market and on bringing short-stay Chinese visitors to Brunei (with regular flights from Hong Kong and Shanghai). In line with the BTB’s emphasis on nature and culture the two catch lines in advertising Brunei tourism are ‘The Green Heart of Borneo’ and ‘A Kingdom of Unexpected Treasures’. Clearly, aside from ecotourism, the combination of culture and heritage tourism plays the major role, and because much of the heritage is concentrated in and around the capital, Bandar Seri Begawan, it is preoccupied with monarchy. Tourism in the capital includes the major royal sites, as well as displaying the history of the sultanate and that of the Brunei Malays.

Indonesian Kalimantan's Tourist Assets

In the Indonesian territories of Borneo the development of tourism is rather more problematical. Clearly the Indonesian government has ambitions to expand the tourism sector there, and tourist sites began to be identified and developed in earnest from the 1980s. Substantial travel guides appeared in the 1990s (see, for example, Muller 1990; Robinson 1996; Pelton 1995, p. 387-550). Information on Kalimantan also appears regularly in Lonely Planet and other guides (see, for example, Berkmoes 2013; Robinson, Karlin and Stiles 2013). It is difficult to secure statistics on visitor arrivals and other tourism-related information for Kalimantan as a whole or even for particular provinces, though national-level figures are regularly available. In 2014 the total number of Indonesian international arrivals was 9,432, 411 (https://en.wikipedia/wiki/Tourism-_in_Indonesia/). What we can say is that out of this total relatively small numbers visited the Kalimantan provinces.

The major Indonesian tourist sites are listed as Bali, East, Central and West Java, Banten, Jakarta, West, North and South Sumatra, Lampung, South Sulawesi and Torajaland. Kalimantan is not mentioned. The main source countries for Indonesian tourism, which includes tourism in Kalimantan, follows a similar pattern to Sarawak and Sabah. The overwhelming majority of visits are generated within the Asian region: from Singapore and Malaysia especially, but also China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines and Thailand. If detailed statistics were available then it is likely that foreign visitors to Kalimantan would also comprise Malaysians travelling across the land border between Kalimantan and Malaysian Borneo (and the air connection between Kuching and Pontianak), as well as Singaporeans and Peninsular Malaysians, given the air routes which connect Singapore and Kuala Lumpur with Balikpapan. But there would also be significant levels of domestic tourist traffic from other Indonesian islands, especially Java.

Kalimantan has some extremely attractive tourist sites and great potential. However, there are difficulties in expanding the tourism industry and there is a strong desire on the part of the tourism authorities and agencies there to encourage cross-border travel and co-operation from the Malaysian side (Muazar and Hsieh 2013, 2014). This is going to be difficult. A recent study revealed that in the Sambas sub-district in West Kalimantan which borders Sarawak and has an extended coastline which could be developed for tourism purposes, in 2013 only 53 foreign visitors were recorded, though there were

40, 259 domestic tourists (Muazir and Hsieh, 2014, p. 367). The problems of inadequate infrastructure, facilities, accommodation and promotional advertising are referred to as obstacles in developing these marginal areas of Kalimantan (2014, p. 373).

The main sites in Kalimantan are in the province of East Kalimantan (Samarinda, Balikpapan, and the Mahakam river basin), and West Kalimantan, particularly Pontianak and neighboring coastal urban areas. Central Kalimantan does not have high visitor levels, but its main attraction is Tanjung Puting National Park and the orang-utan sanctuary there. In spite of some international air connections with Singapore and Malaysia, most foreign visitors have to transit through such Javanese airports as Jakarta or Surabaya. Moreover, connections between the different provinces of Kalimantan are not particularly good.

Distances are considerable between destinations in Kalimantan and the internal transport infrastructure is not as well developed as in Malaysian Borneo and Brunei. Following policies of decentralization and devolution local government administrative units have tended to operate relatively independently of each other and therefore co-operation in developing tourist packages across different sites and across provincial borders becomes more difficult. Accommodation also usually does not meet international standards and the quality of services is generally not competitive. English as the international tourism language is still not widely spoken and tourist guides and information about tours and sites is usually inadequate. Longhouse tours are not viable, given the lack of longhouses, though there has been some development of the concept and implementation of the 'culture village' (Schiller 2001, p. 414). Some of the remaining longhouses are considerable distances from the main centers of population and difficult of access. Forest fires and more recent issues to do with clearing vegetation by burning and the resulting haze complicate the development of ecotourism in certain parts of Kalimantan.

Importantly the provincial authorities in Kalimantan, like the Malaysian Borneo states and Brunei are focused on the promotion of ecotourism. Collaboration across borders in this regard has been facilitated by the involvement of the Borneo states in 'The Heart of Borneo' conservation program. Here there is real cross-border convergence and collaboration.

Aside from this Kalimantan across its various provinces seems to present a rather disparate set of tourism products: cultural and ethnic tourism, heritage and historical tourism in urban centers, adventure, trekking and river journeys, beach tourism in certain limited coastal areas, and diving from some of the islands off East Kalimantan. Divergence in tourism appears to be more marked in Kalimantan, though some of its elements are also deployed in other Borneo states. It seems that tourism development in Kalimantan lacks coordination, focus and financial support.

Although populations in Kalimantan cross borders to the north for touristic purposes, and there are movements southwards as well, most of the tourism activity in Kalimantan is generated within Indonesia with tourists travelling from other islands for business and leisure. This in turn partly reflects the size of the Indonesian Borneo territories and the size and diversity of Indonesia and its population. Given the scale of domestic tourism in Indonesia and the role it plays in the development of tourism in Kalimantan it is difficult to evaluate what the future holds in terms of convergence and divergence and whether or not border crossings between Kalimantan and the Malaysian Borneo territories will increase in favor of Kalimantan. It is likely that the main movements will continue to be from Kalimantan (and Indonesia) to Sarawak and Sabah.

Concluding Remarks

This pioneer attempt to develop a comparative study of Borneo tourism in terms of processes of convergence and divergence and the interrelationship of these processes with cross-border movements still have to be worked out. More empirical case material and, where possible, more statistical information is needed. The interest in these matters has emerged from my fortuitous return to Borneo studies and to earlier work on tourism in the early 1990s. My review of the literature during the past 20 years has not found much which pushes forward the conceptual understanding and analysis of tourism; the same themes and concepts continue or re-emerge in slightly different guises. But in this re-excursion into tourism studies in Borneo I continue to be wedded to the principle of comparative studies and the need to adopt a more wide-ranging perspective on transformations and processes embracing different political units and different populations and cultures. It happens that Borneo provides an ideal site for comparative analysis. I also

maintain that had we pressed an agenda for tourism research there we would not have been seduced into the Eurocentric concepts which focused on Western (guest)-Eastern (host) encounters in the development of mass tourism in Indonesia (Bali), Malaysia, Thailand and Singapore. Borneo would have revealed a very different pattern of leisure activity and motivation for crossing borders which certainly goes back to the 1960s.

Notes

*Victor T. King is currently Adjunct Professor, Center for Ethnic Studies and Development, Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University, Thailand. He is also Emeritus Professor in the School of Languages, Cultures and Societies, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom. He also holds honorary posts as a Distinguished Visiting Fellow in the Institute of Asian Studies, Universiti Brunei Darussalam and as a Professorial Research Associate in the Centre of South East Asian Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. E-mail: v.t.king@leeds.ac.uk

References

- Abi, J., Mariapan, M. and Aziz, A. (2015). Visitor's Evaluation on Facilities and Services using Importance-Performance Analysis at Sarawak Cultural Village. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*, 9(12), pp. 16-24.
- Adeyinka-Ojo, S. F. and Khoo-Lattimore, C. (2013). The Making of 'Authentic' Tourism Experience: the Case of Barrio, Sarawak. *BIMP-EAGA Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(2), pp. 51-53.
- Atkinson, S. (1996). *Role of Tourism in the Conservation of Tanjung Puting National Park, Kalimantan Tengah, Indonesian Borneo*. MS diss. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Azman, A. (1999). Local Perception of Ecotourism: the Case of Brunei's Merimbun Heritage Park. *Borneo Review*, 10(1). pp. 51-57.
- Azman A. (2014). The Disengagement of the Tourism Business in Ecotourism and Environmental Practices in Brunei Darussalam. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 10(1), pp. 1-6.

- Backhaus, N. (2003). "Non-place Jungle": the Construction of Authenticity in National Parks of Malaysia. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, special issue, *Tourism and Heritage in South-East Asia*, M. Hitchcock and V. T. King, eds. 31(89), pp. 151-160.
- Backhaus. N. (2005). *Tourism and Nature Conservation in Malaysian National Parks*. Münster: LIT Verlag, Culture, Society, Environment; South Asian and South East Asian Studies No. 6.
- Benji ak J. (2001). *Socioeconomic Impacts of Longhouse Tourism on Local Communities: a Case Study of Selected Longhouses in the Ai, Engkari and Skrang Rivers Systems, Sri Aman Division, Sarawak*. MSS diss. Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Berkmoes, R.V., Atkinson, B., Brash, C., Butler, S., Noble, J., Skolnick, A., Stuart, I, and Sties, P. (2013). *Indonesia*. Hawthorn, Victoria: Lonely Planet Guides.
- Bratek, O., Devlin, P. and Simmons, D. (2007). Conservation, Wildlife and Indigenous Tourism: Longhouse Communities in and Adjacent to Batang Ai National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia. In: R. Butler and T. Hinch, eds., *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples: Issues and Implications*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, and Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 141-160.
- Buckley, R. (2003). *Case Studies in Ecotourism*. Wallingford, Oxfordshire and Cambridge, MA: CABI Publishing.
- Caslake, J. (1994). Tourism, Culture and the Iban. In: V. T. King, ed. *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp. 67-90.
- Chin, C-H., Lo, M-C., Songan, P. and Nair, V. (2014). Rural Tourism Destination Competitiveness: a Study on Annah Rais Longhouse Homestay, Sarawak. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, pp. 35-44.
- Chin, C.L.M., Moore, S.A. Wallington, T.J. and Dowling, R. K. (2000). Ecotourism in Bako National Park, Borneo: Visitors' Perspectives on Environmental Impacts and their Management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(1), pp. 20-35.

- Cochrane, J. (1993). Tourism and Conservation in Indonesia and Malaysia. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. J.G. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in South-East Asia*. London: Routledge, pp. 317-326.
- Cochrane, J. ed. (2008). *Asian Tourism: Growth and Change*. Oxford and Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Cochrane, J. (2009). New Directions in Indonesian Ecotourism. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in Southeast Asia: Challenges and New Directions*. Copenhagen: NIAS Press and Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 254-269.
- Cochrane, J. (2016). Selling Nature: Arrangements for Tourism in Malaysia's Natural World Heritage Sites. In: V. T. King, ed., *UNESCO in Southeast Asia: World Heritage Sites in Comparative Perspective*. Copenhagen: NIAS Press, pp. 367-378.
- Cohen, E. (2001). *Thai Tourism: Hill Tribes, Islands and Open-ended Prostitution*. Bangkok: White Lotus Co., Ltd., Studies in Contemporary Thailand No. 4.
- Cohen, E. (2008). Southeast Asian Ethnic Tourism in a Changing World. *Asian Anthropology*, 7(1), pp. 25-56.
- Cohen, E. and Cohen, S. A. (2012a). Authentication: Hot and Cool. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(3), pp. 1295-1314.
- Cohen, E. and Cohen, S.A. (2012b). Current Sociological Theories and Issues in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), pp. 2177-2202.
- Cohen, E. and Cohen, S.A. (2015a). A Mobilities Approach to Tourism from Emerging World Regions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(1), pp. 11-43.
- Cohen, E. and Cohen, S.A. (2015b). Tourism Mobilities from Emerging World Regions: a Response to Commentaries. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(1), pp. 68-69.
- Cohen, E. and Cohen, S.A. (2015c). Beyond Eurocentrism in Tourism: a Paradigm Shift to Mobilities. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 40(2), pp. 157-168.
- Dias, T. (2001). *Tourism and Longhouse Communities*. Kota Samarahan, UNIMAS: IEAS Working Paper.

- Douglas, N. (1999). Towards a History of Tourism in Sarawak. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(2), pp. 14-23.
- Douglas, N. and Douglas, N. (1999). Towards a History of Tourism in Sarawak. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(1), pp. 77-86.
- Gingging, F. A. M. (2007). "I Lost My Head in Borneo": Tourism and the Refashioning of the Headhunting Native in Sabah, Malaysia, with Responses by B. A. Conklin and C. Bacchilega. *Cultural Analysis*, 6, pp. 1-29.
- Goh H. C. (2007). *Sustainable Tourism and the Influence of Privatization in Protected Areas Management: a Case Study of Kinabalu Park, Malaysia*. PhD diss. Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, Bonn.
- Goh H. C. (2009). Mountain Guiding in Kinabalu Park: an Evaluation of Visitor Satisfaction. *Borneo Research Journal*, 3, pp. 85-95.
- Goh H. C. (2015). Nature and Community-based Tourism (CBT) for Poverty Alleviation: a Case Study of Lower Kinabatangan, East Malaysia. *Geografica: Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 1(3), pp. 42-52.
- Goh H. C. and Masiney, M. Y. (2010). Sustaining Tourism Development in Protected Areas: a Case of Kinabalu Park. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 1(2), pp. 179-183.
- Goh H. C. and Rosilawati Z. (2014). Conservation Education in Kinabalu Park of Malaysia: an Evaluation of Visitors' Satisfaction. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science*, 26(2), pp. 207-218.
- Hamit N. H. (2003). *Tourism Planning at the Local Level: a Case Study of Lundu-Sematan, Sarawak, Malaysia*. Masters diss. Lincoln University, New Zealand.
- Hamzah, A. and Mohamad, N. H. (2011). *The Sustainability of Community-based Ecotourism Surrounding Protected Areas in the Lower Kinabatangan Wildlife Sanctuary; Critical Success Factors*. Skudai, Johor: Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Monograph No. 12.
- Hitchcock, M., King, V. T. and Parnwell, M. J. G. eds. (1993a). *Tourism in South-East Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Hitchcock, M., King, V. T. and Parnwell, M. J. G. (1993b). Tourism in South-East Asia: Introduction. In: M. Hitchcock, V.T. King and M. J. G. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in South-East Asia*, London, Routledge, pp. 1-31.

- Harris, R. W. (2009). Tourism in Bario, Sarawak, Malaysia: a Case Study of Pro-poor Tourism Integrated into Community Development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(2), pp. 125-135.
- Hitchcock, M. (1997). Indonesia in Minature. In: M. Hitchcock and V. T. King, eds., *Images of Malay-Indonesian Identity*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, pp. 227-235.
- Hitchcock, M. and Stanley, N. (2010). Outdoor Ethnographic Museums, Tourism and Nation Building in Southeast Asia. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. Parnwell, eds., *Heritage Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Copenhagen: NIAS Press and Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 73-82.
- Hitchener, S., Apu, F. L., Tarawe, L., Supang G.@S. N. Aran and Yesaya, E. (2009). Community-based Transboundary Ecotourism in the Heart of Borneo: a Case Study of the Kelabit Highlands of Malaysia and the Kerayan Highlands of Indonesia. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 8(2), pp. 193-213.
- Hutton, W. ed. (1993). *East Malaysia and Brunei*. Singapore: Periplus Editions.
- Indexmundi (2015) [online]. Available at:
<http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/brunei/international-tourism> "Brunei – international tourism." [Accessed 25 October 2015].
- Irawan I M. B., Oka, N. P., and Yunus. R. (2013). Determinants of Length of Stay Tourists in Tanjung Puting National Park, Central Kalimantan Province. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*, 4(6), pp. 112-117.
- Kedit, P. M. (1980). *A Survey on the Effects of Tourism on Iban Longhouse Communities in the Skrang District, Sarawak*. Kuching: Sarawak Museum Field Report No, 2.
- Kedit, P. M. and Sabang, C. L. (1994). Tourism Report: a Re-Study of Skrang Longhouse Tourism. In: V. T. King, ed., *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp. 45-58.

- King, V. T. ed. and comp. (1992a). *The Best of Borneo Travel* (with an editorial introduction, pp. xiii-xviii). Singapore: Oxford University Press (second edition, 1994, third edition 1995, fourth edition, 2001).
- King, V. T. (1992b). Tourism and Culture in Malaysia. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 20(1), pp. 1-17.
- King, V. T. (1993). Tourism and Culture in Malaysia. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. J.G. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in South-East Asia*. London, Routledge, pp. 99-116.
- King, V. T. ed. (1994a). *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992).
- King, V. T. (1994b). Tourism in Borneo: General Issues. In: V. T. King, ed., *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp. 1-7.
- King, V. T. (1994c). Preface and Acknowledgements. In: V. T. King (ed.), *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives* Williamsburg, Virginia, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Borneo Research Council, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp. v-vi.
- King, V. T. (1994d). Tourism and Culture in Malaysia, with reference to Borneo. In: V. T. King, ed., *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp. 29-43.
- King, V. T. ed. and comp. (1999). *Moving Pictures. More Borneo Travel*, (with an editorial introduction, pp.ix-xvi). Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press.
- King, V. T. (2013). *Kalimantan Tempo Doeloe*. Depok: Kelompok Komunitas Bambu, Indonesian trans. of *The Best of Borneo Travel*, trans. R. Widyaningrum, with a new 'Preface', Pengantar Penulis Edisi Bahasa Indonesia, pp.v-ix.
- King, V. T. (2015a). Mobilities and Encounters: Conceptual Issues in Tourism Studies in Southeast Asia. *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, 30(2), pp. 497-527.

- King, V. T. (2015b). Substantive and Conceptual Issues in Tourism Research: a Personal Engagement with Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, special issue, 11 (3), pp.15-51.
- King, V. T. (2016). Brunei Darussalam: "A Kingdom of Unexpected Treasures". In: P. Porananond and V. T. King, eds., *Tourism and Monarchy in Southeast Asia*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kruse, W. H. (1998). Tourism, Cultural Change and the Architecture of Iban Longhouses in Sarawak. In: R. L. Winzeler, ed. *Indigenous Architecture in Borneo: Traditional Patterns and New Developments*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 5 (including papers from the Fourth Biennial International Conference, Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam, June 1996), pp.138-169.
- Kruse, W. H. (2003). *Selling Wild Borneo: Iban Longhouse Tourism in Sarawak* PhD diss. Australian National University.
- Lau, E., Oh, S-L., and Hu, S. S. (2008). *Tourist Arrivals and Economic Growth in Sarawak*. Munich: Munich Personal RePEc [online]. Available at: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muechen.de/9888/> [Accessed 1 January 2015].
- Lew, A. A. (2013). Defining Community Resilience in Community Based Tourism: Miso Walai and Pulau Mabul in Sabah, Malaysia. *BIMP-EAGA. Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(2), pp. 40-43.
- Liew-Tsonis, J., Cheuk, S., Mohd Rizwan A. M., and Jumin, R. (2012). Economic Implications of Ecotourism in Marine Protected Areas: Tun Mustapha Park, Sabah. *BIMP-EAGA. Journal for Sustainable Development*, 1(1), pp. 21-32.
- Lim K. T. (2001). *"Iban": the Emergence of an Identity in Sarawak*. PhD diss. Griffith University.
- Lubis, M. S., Handayani, N., and Muazir, S.. (2009). Eco and Cultural Tourism Development in Danau Sentarum Natrional Park. Wuhan, China: 13th World Lakes Conference, 1-6 November, 2009.
- MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Shocken.
- Markwell, K. (2001a). "Borneo', Nature's Paradise": Constructions and Representations of Nature within Nature-based Tourism. In: P. Teo, T.C.

- Chang and K.C. Ho, eds., *Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, Pergamon, pp.248-262.
- Markwell, K. (2001b). "An Intimate Rendezvous with Nature"? Mediating the Tourist-Nature Experience at Three Tourist Sites in Borneo. *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), pp. 39-57.
- Mayer, J. (1999). Everyone Wants to Get a Head. Environmental and Cultural Tourism in the Borneo Interior. In: J. Forshee, with C. Fink and S. Cate, eds., *Converging Interests: Traders, Travelers and Tourists in Southeast Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, Center for Southeast Asian Studies Monograph No. 36, pp. 51-83.
- Millum, T. (1993). *Tramps and their Excuses: a Study of the Writing of Travellers in Borneo in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, MPhil diss. Open University.
- Muazir, S. and Hsieh, H-C. (2013). Borderlands and Tourism Development in Kalimantan Island: Kalimantan Barat, Indonesia – Sarawak, Malaysia, "Head to Head". *Journal of Design and the Built Environment*, 13(1), pp. 1-12.
- Muazir, S. and Hsieh, H-C. (2014). Lagging yet Strategic: Tourism and Regional Development Planning in a Lagging-Outermost-Forefront Area (Borderland) in Indonesia. *Tourism Review*, 62(4), pp. 361-376.
- Muller, K. (1990). *Indonesian Borneo – Kalimantan*. Berkeley and Singapore: Periplus Editions, edited by Davd Pickell.
- Newsome, D. and Rodger, K. (2012). Vanishing Fauna of Tourism Interest. In: R. H. Lemelin, J. Dawson, and E. J. Stewart, eds., *Last Chance Tourism: Adapting Tourism Opportunities in a Changing World*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 55-70.
- Nicholas ak. B. (2005). *The Impact of the Existence of Ulu Skrang Roads upon Tourism and Rural Livelihoods*, MEM diss. Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Ong P. L. (2000). *Packaging Myths for Tourism: the Case of the Rungus of Kudat, Sabah, Malaysia*. PhD diss. University of Edinburgh.
- Ong P. L. (2008). *Packaging Myths for Tourism: the Rungus of Kudat*. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

- Øvstetun, A. J. and Cochrane, J. (2014). The Role of Conservation Agencies in Ecotourism: a Case Study from Central Kalimantan in Indonesia. *Progress in Responsible Tourism*, 3(1), pp. 57-82.
- Pearce, D. G. (1997a). Tourism Markets and Marketing in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 6(3-4), pp. 85-102.
- Pearce, D. G. (1997b). Competitive Destination Analysis in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(4), pp. 16-24.
- Pearce, D. G. (2001). Towards a Regional Analysis of Tourism in Southeast Asia. In: P. Teo, T.C. Chang and K.C. Ho, eds., *Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, Pergamon, pp.27-43.
- Pelton, R. Y. (1995). *Fielding's Borneo: the Adventurous Guide to the Island of Borneo*. Redondo Beach, California: Fielding Worldwide, Inc.
- Pianzin, T. M. (1992). *Managing the Development of Tourism: a Case Study of Sabah*. PhD diss. University of Strathclyde.
- Picard, M. (1993). "Cultural Tourism" in Bali. National Integration and Regional Differentiation. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. J.G. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in South-East Asia*. London: Routledge, pp. 71-98.
- Picard, M. (1995). Cultural Heritage and Tourist Capital: Cultural Tourism in Bali. In: M-F. Lanfant, J. B. Allcock and E. M. Bruner, eds., *International Tourism: Identity and Change*. London: Sage Publications, Sage Studies in International Sociology, 47, pp. 44-66.
- Picard, M. (1996). *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture*. Singapore: Archipelago Press.
- Picard, M. (1997). Cultural Tourism, Nation-building, and Regional Culture: the Making of a Balinese Identity. In: M. Picard and R. E. Wood, eds., *Tourism, Ethnicity, and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 181-214.
- Picard, M. (2003). Touristification and Balinization in a Time of *Reformasi*. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, special issue, *Tourism and Heritage in South-East Asia*, M. Hitchcock and V. T. King, eds., 31(89), pp. 108-118.
- Picard, M. and Wood, R.E. eds. (1997). *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Robinson, D., Karlin, A. and Stiles, P. (2013). *Borneo*. Footscray, Victoria: Lonely Planet Publications.
- Robinson, W. (1996). *Borneo/Kalimantan: Indonesian Borneo*. Hong Kong: Periplus Travel Guides.
- Russell, C. L. and Ankenman, M. J. (1996). Orangutan as Photographic Collectible: Ecotourism and the Commodification of Nature. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 21(1), pp. 71-78.
- Sanggan, S. E. (2009). Community Involvement in Culture and Nature Tourism in Sarawak. *Akademika*, 77 (December), pp. 149-165.
- Sanggan, S. E, Abdul R. A., Noweg, G. T. and Mersat, N. I. (2000). Impact of Tourism on Longhouse Communities in Sarawak. In: M. Leigh, ed., *borneo 2000*. Universiti Malaysia Sarawak: Institute of East Asian Studies, Proceedings of the Sixth Biennial Borneo Research Conference, vol. 4, pp. 423-439.
- Saunders, G. (1993). Early Travellers in Borneo. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. J.G. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in South-East Asia*. London: Routledge, pp. 271-285.
- Saunders, G (1994). Early Travellers in Borneo. In: V. T. King, ed. *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp. 21-28.
- Schiller, A. (2001). Pampang Culture Village and International Tourism in East Kalimantan, Indonesian Borneo. *Human Organization*, 60(4), pp. 414-422.
- Selwyn, T. (1993). Peter Pan in South-East Asia: Views from the Brochures. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. J.G. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in South-East Asia*. London: Routledge, pp. 117-137.
- Selwyn, T. (1996). Introduction. In T. Selwyn, ed., *The Tourist Image: Myths and Myth Making in Tourism*. Chichester: John Wiley and Son, pp. 1-33.
- Singh, S. ed. (2011). *Domestic Tourism in Asia: Diversity and Divergence*. London and Sterling, VA: Earthscan and Singapore: ISEAS, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

- Tan G. G. D. (2009). *In the Image.....Looking at Visual Representation of the Iban People of Sarawak, Malaysia*. PhD diss. National University of Singapore.
- Teo, P., Chang, T.C. and Ho, K.C. eds. (2001a). *Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, Pergamon.
- Teo, P., Chang, T.C. and Ho, K.C. (2001b). Introduction: Globalisation and Interconnections in Southeast Asian Tourism. In: P. Teo, T.C. Chang and K.C. Ho, eds., *Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, Pergamon, pp. 1-10.
- The World Bank (2015) [online]. Available at: <http://www.data.worldbank.org/indicator/ST.INT.ARVL>. [Accessed 26 October 2015].
- The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2014). *Travel and Tourism. Economic Impact 2014: Brunei*. London: WTTC [online]. Available at: <http://www.wttc.org> [Accessed 26 October 2015].
- The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2015). *Travel and Tourism. Economic Impact 2015: Brunei*. London: WTTC [online]. Available at: <http://www.wttc.org> [Accessed 26 October 2015].
- Tisdell, C. (2003). Fostering Tourism to Diversify and Develop Small Economies: Brunei's Policies in a General Context. *Pacific Tourism Review*, 6(2), pp. 83-94.
- Tisen, O.B. (2004). *Conservation and Tourism: a Case Study of Longhouse Communities in and Adjacent to Batang Ai National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia*. Mssters diss. University of Lincoln, New Zealand.
- Turner, P., Taylor, C. and Finlay, H. (1996). *Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei*. Hawthorn, Victoria: Lonely Planet Publications.
- Voon B-H. and Lee, N. (2009). Identifying Dimensions of Tourist Satisfaction for a Cultural Destination: the Case of Longhouses in Sarawak (Borneo). *International Journal of Business and Society*, 10(1), pp. 65-82.
- Wadley, D. and Parasati, H. (2000). Inside South East Asia's Growth Triangles. *Geography*, 85(4), pp. 323-334.
- Wall, G. (2001). Conclusion: Southeast Asian Tourism Connections – Status, Challenges and Opportunities. In: P. Teo, T.C. Chang and K.C. Ho, eds.,

- Interconnected Worlds: Tourism in Southeast Asia*. Oxford: Elsevier Science, Pergamon, pp. 312-324.
- Walton, J. (1994). Economics of Tourism in Malaysia, with Special Reference to East Malaysia. In: V. T. King, ed., *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp. 9-19.
- Winter, T. (2007). Rethinking Tourism in Asia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), pp. 27-44.
- Winter, T. (2008). Conclusion. Recasting Tourism Theory towards an Asian Future. In: T. Winter, P. Teo and T.C. Chang, eds., *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 315-325.
- Winter, T. (2009). Asian Tourism and the Retreat of Anglo-Western Centrim in Tourism Theory. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(1), pp. 21-31.
- Winter, T., Teo, P. and Chang, T. C. eds. (2008). *Asia on Tour: Exploring the Rise of Asian Tourism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Winzeler, R. L. (1997a). Introduction. In: R. L. Winzeler, ed. *Indigenous Peoples and the State: Politics, Land, and Ethnicity in the Malaysian Peninsula and Borneo*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, Monograph 46, pp. 1-29.
- Winzeler, R. L. (1997b). Modern Bidayuh Ethnicity and the Politics of Culture in Sarawak. In: R. L. Winzeler, ed., *Indigenous Peoples and the State: Politics, Land, and Ethnicity in the Malaysian Peninsula and Borneo*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Southeast Asia Studies, Monograph 46, pp. 201-227.
- Winzeler, R. L. (2011). *The Peoples of Southeast Asia Today: Ethnography, Ethnology and Change in a Complex Region*. Lanham, New York, Toronto and Plymouth, UK: AltaMira Press/Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Wong, K.M. and Phillipps, A.(1999). *Kinabalu: Summit of Borneo*. Kota Kinabalu: The Sabah Society in association with Sabah Parks, second revised edition.

- Wong, O. Y. (2004). *Towards Sustainable Community Development: a Case Study of Homestay in Sabah*. Masters diss. Lincoln University, New Zealand.
- Wood, R. E. (1984). Ethnic Tourism, the State, and Cultural Change in South-East Asia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(3), pp. 353-374.
- Wood, R. E. (1993). Tourism, Culture and the Sociology of Development'. In: M. Hitchcock, V. T. King and M. J.G. Parnwell, eds., *Tourism in South-East Asia*. London: Routledge, pp. 48-70.
- Wood, R. E. (1997). Tourism and the State: Ethnic Options and Constructions of Otherness. In: M. Picard and R. E. Wood, eds., *Tourism, Ethnicity and the State in Asian and Pacific Societies*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 1-34.
- Yea, S. (2002a). "On" and "Off" the Ethnic Map in Southeast Asia: the Case of Iban Longhouse Tourism in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Tourism Geographies*, 4(2), pp. 173-194.
- Yea, S. (2002b). Sarawak on Stage: Dayak Development, National Identity and the Sarawak Cultural Village, Malaysia. In: B. David and M. Wilson, eds. *Inscribed Landscapes: Marking and Making Place*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, pp. 240-252.
- Yea, S. and Noweg, G. T. (2000). The Reality of Community: Women's Role in Iban Longhouse Tourism in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Borneo Review*, 11(2), pp. 19-39.
- Zeppel, H. (1994a). *Authenticity and the Iban: Cultural Tourism at Iban Longhouses in Sarawak, East Malaysia*. PhD diss. James Cook University of North Queensland.
- Zeppel, H. (1994b). Getting to Know the Iban: the Tourist Experience of Visiting an Iban Longhouse in Sarawak. In: V.T. King, ed. *Tourism in Borneo: Issues and Perspectives*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Borneo Research Council, Proceedings of the Borneo Research Council, No 4 (papers from the Second Biennial International Conference, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, July, 1992), pp.59-66.
- Zeppel, H. (1995). Authenticity and Iban Longhouse Tourism in Sarawak. *Borneo Review*, 6(2), pp. 109-125.
- Zeppel, H. (1997a). Meeting "Wild People": Iban Culture and Longhouse Tourism in Sarawak. In: S. Yamashita, K. H. Din, J.S. Eades, eds.,

Tourism and Cultural Development in Asia and Oceania. Bangi: Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, pp. 119-140.

Zeppel, H. (1997b). Headhunters and Longhouse Adventure: Marketing of Iban Culture in Sarawak. In: M. Oppermann, ed., *Pacific Rim Tourism*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing, pp. 82-93.

Zeppel, H. (1998). Entertainers or Entrepreneurs: Iban Involvement in Longhouse Tourism (Sarawak, Borneo). *Tourism Recreation Research*, 23(1), pp. 39-45.

Zeppel, H. (2006). *Indigenous Ecotourism: Sustainable Development and Management*, Wallingford, Oxfordshire and Cambridge, MA: CABI Publishing, Ecotourism Series No.3.

