

The Impact of Tourism Development on the Urban Dimensions

Mitra Honarjoo

Member of Board, Department of Architecture, Islamic Azad University, Maragheh, Iran

Received: November 30 2013

Accepted: January 10 2014

ABSTRACT

In recent years, interest in tourism has spread rapidly throughout many small and medium Asian cities, which previously have not necessarily considered themselves as tourist destinations. Tourism is increasingly seen as a potential lever towards high economic growth, measured both in terms of income and employment. In the present Working Paper we report the analysis on the economic impact undertaken in the framework of the picture Project, showing the results of a novel econometric exercise to statistically assess the impacts of tourism upon Asian municipalities. More precisely the analysis aims at estimating the effects of tourism specializations on local income and prices.

KEYWORDS: Tourism, Economic Growth, urban dimensions.

INTRODUCTION

Since 2009, Iran's major cities were home to more than two-thirds (69%) of the population. In contrast, just 2 per cent of the total population lived in remote or very remote areas of Iran and 29 per cent lived in regional areas. In addition to housing the bulk of Iran's population, Iran's capital cities are also key gateways for international tourism and significant destinations for domestic tourism. For 2008, Tehran, Mashhad and Shiraz respectively rated as the top three regions for expenditure by domestic and international visitors. Tourists constitute a 'transient population' using cities either as gateways to other destinations or as a home for ephemeral periods of time contributing to the rise and fall of urban populations as each new wave of visitors replaces the last. During their stay, tourists interact with the host destination and impacts may arise from this interaction. Edwards, Griffin and Hayllar (2008) have argued that a dialectic engagement takes place in cities between host and visitors they question whether cities, originally designed to accommodate permanent residents and concentrations of economic and physical activity, face their own set of consequences that differ to regional contexts. The process of maintaining the live ability of cities for the communities who reside there and the attractiveness for people who visit needs to be informed by an understanding of fundamental relationships between the structural elements of urban tourism (transport, accommodation, attractions, entertainment) and the interests of the various stakeholders with an interest or stake in tourism. For tourism destination management to be effective, a comprehensive understanding of these interrelationships is required. The focus of this project is to assess the urban residents' perceptions of tourism, the challenges that tourism presents for urban local governments, and, in particular, how tourism affects social qualities of cities.

The key objectives of this study were:

- To understand the perceptions and attitudes of urban host communities towards tourists and tourism in their local area.
- To identify the impact issues that is of most concern to host communities.
- To understand the impact of tourism on local government and the implications of this for the sustainable development of tourism within and across local government areas.
- using the outcomes of this project and previous work on urban tourism undertaken by the project team, to develop a destination auditing 'tool' that can be used by managers in urban destinations.

The study was undertaken in Iran's three major urban destinations: Tehran, Mashhad and as they contain significant tourist attractors, such as beaches, and concentrations of accommodation especially catering to Tehran's backpacker market.

METHODOLOGY

The study aimed to gain an understanding of how residents in urban communities comprising the cities of Shiraz, Tehran and Mashhad, and an amalocalareasm of (Tehran's) perceived tourism, and the impacts of tourism in their local area.

The data collection methods used in this study included a literature review, focus groups and resident surveys. The aims of the focus groups were: to elicit council opinions regarding the impacts of tourism on local government and their constituent communities; the perceived net costs or benefits of these impacts; and how

* **Corresponding Author:** Mitra Honarjoo, Member of Board, Department of Architecture, Islamic Azad University, Maragheh, Iran.

these impacts are currently addressed. The outcomes from the focus group and understandings gained from the literature review were then incorporated into the questionnaire for the resident survey.

The questionnaire involved residents assessing whether 27 specific tourism impacts occurred in their area, and the level they perceived each of these had on their area. Respondents were recruited by a random mailout to 9,000 residential addresses located throughout the four study regions, using a resident impact survey. Residents were invited to complete the 15-minute survey either online, or by contacting the research team for a paper survey form. To boost response rates, respondents went into a draw to win retail gift vouchers with a total prize pool of \$3,000.

RESULTS

The study set out to better understand the perceptions and attitudes of urban host communities toward tourists and tourism, and to understand the impacts that were of most concern to these communities in major cities. Outlined below is a summary of key findings from the local government focus groups and community survey.

Focus groups

For Shiraz, it was about identifying its character such that it differed from Mashhad and Tehran. Transport and signage were seen in Tehran as major drawbacks to the Local areas accessibility. Mashhad was concerned about the pressures tourism placed on authenticity, increased rents squeezing out interesting, but low-income, commercial operations (such as artist studios), and managing the diverse expectations of visitors, business, residents and government.

Participants in Shiraz would like the city to develop a distinctive identity, one that could be differentiated from Tehran and Mashhad. Transport and signage were seen in Tehran as major drawbacks to the accessibility of the LOCAL AREAS. A significant issue raised by a number of participants was that of managing impacts from what they termed as 'creep'. These are impacts that are subtle at first—and then one day 'one' notices that the 'mojo' has gone. The argument was that impacts could be slow, occurring over long periods of time. As an example, Mashhad and Tehran were both concerned about the pressures caused by tourism over time that result in increasing rents which squeeze out interesting, but low-income, commercial operations such as artist studios or small, family-owned businesses. However, focus group participants felt that the benefits of tourism outweighed the costs. They were mindful of managing the diversity of needs within their communities, but felt constrained by a lack of funds, research and information in this area. One participant made the comment that 'tourism is interrelated to so many other areas—where do you start?' It was pleasing to note that, apart from a friendly rivalry, each of Tehran, Mashhad and Shiraz agreed that differentiation and the development of attractive destinations were critical to the overall attractiveness of Iran as a tourist destination.

Urban community perceptions of impacts

The majority of survey respondents believed tourism provides economic benefits to their local area by generating spending, attracting investment, and creating business and employment opportunities. Residents would like to see tourism contributing to improvements in their area, especially the provision of services and cultural activities. The largest socio-demographic differences were due to gender, where women had stronger opinions than men regarding the impact of the anti-social consequences of tourism. For example, women were more concerned about tourism encouraging excessive drinking/drug use, crowding public spaces, and increases in anti-social behavior.

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the occurrence of a range of impacts and to rate the positive or negative effect each might have on their community.

Impacts perceived to have occurred

The most positive impacts that respondents agreed to have occurred from tourism are:

- Tourism increases recreational and leisure activities for residents
- Tourism increases the quality of shops
- Tourism improves the quality of public spaces
- Tourism provides incentives for conserving the natural environment
- Tourism provides incentives for cultural preservation
- Tourism increases the range of shops and services.

The most negative impacts that respondents agreed to have occurred from tourism are:

- Tourism encourages excessive drinking/drug use
- Tourism makes the area less safe for residents
- Tourism increases litter
- Tourism leads to increase in anti-social behavior
- Tourism diverts money from community projects

- Tourism leads to conflict over land-use zoning
- Tourism increases the cost of goods and services
- Tourism encourages sexual behavior.

Impacts perceived not to have occurred

•Some respondents agreed that tourism could result in positive impacts, but didn't feel that these had occurred. Non-occurring impacts that were perceived as most negative were:

- Tourism provides incentives for conserving the natural environment
- Tourism improves the quality of public spaces
- Tourism encourages higher standards of local planning
- Tourism provides incentives for cultural preservation
- Tourism increases the range of shops and services.

Finally, there were impacts that could be perceived as negative, but respondents did not agree that they occurred and were pleased that they had not. Non-occurring impacts perceived as most positive were:

- Tourism increases noise
- Tourism increases litter
- Tourism increase in anti-social behavior
- Tourism crowding of public spaces
- Tourism makes the area less safe for residents.

Future Research

Important recommendations from this research for local government include:

- Local governments should understand that the same impact could be perceived in different ways by residents. Residents may differ in their perceptions based on location, stage of development, or their socio-demographics. It is important for local governments to heighten their understanding of the concerns residents have of tourism. Data such as this can provide a basis for future comparison following planning and management interventions.

- Recognizing that 'great places to live are great places to visit', means that managing the needs of local communities will lead to positive experiences for tourists. This includes maintaining the local character and feel of a destination, minimizing noise, managing litter, minimizing excessive drinking/drug use and anti-social behavior, ensuring places are safe for residents, and maintaining funds for community projects.

- A clear action plan that articulates a vision, goals and objectives representing an overall agreement between stakeholders, who have an interest in tourism at the LOCAL AREAS level regarding its tourism development, is seen as important to meeting the sustainable development of tourism in urban destinations. It is desirable that such a plan is complementary to and integrated with tourism plans at the state and federal levels.

Recommendations for further analysis and future research include:

- Future analysis that segments (through cluster analysis) groups of residents based on their perceptions and outlines their membership details including socio-demographics and location. This will help identify and target key groups through strategies and communication materials to address the negative impacts and highlight the positive.
- Factor analysis that can identify the underlying dimensions to this range of impacts.
- An examination of the 'predictors' of overall support for tourism development in cities.
- An identification and examination of the 'interventions' which can assist in avoiding the 'creep' of tourism impacts, while taking advantage of the positive effects that can be realized from tourism.

REFERENCES

- Archer B. H. (1988), Tourism and island economies: impact analyses, in: Cooper C.P. and Lockwood A. (eds), *Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 1, Wiley, Chichester, pp. 125-134.
- Adams P. D. and Parmenter B. R. (1995), An Applied General Equilibrium Analysis of the Economic Effects of Tourism in a Quite Small, Quite Open Economy, *«Applied Economics»*, 27, pp. 985-994.
- Ashworth G. J. (2001), Conservation of the built environment in the Netherlands, in: Phelps A., Ashworth G. J. & Johansson B. (eds), *The construction of Built heritage: a north European perspective on policies, practices and outcomes*, Ashgate, London.
- Ashworth G. J. (2004), The blue - grey transition: heritage in the reinvention of the tourism resort, – paper presented at the conference “The Best of Heritage”, University of Dubrovnik, 21 September 2004, http://www.thebestinheritage.com/library/the_bluegrey_transition.rtf.
- Brau R. (1995), *Analisi econometricadelladomandaturistica in Europa: Implicazioni per lo sviluppoeconomicodelleareeturistiche* (An Econometric Analysis of Tourist Demand in Europe:

- Implications for the Economic Development of Tourist Areas), *Contributi di ricerca C.R.E.No.S.*, 1995/2, Università degli Studi di Cagliari.
- Brau R., Lanza A. and Pigliaru F. (2003), How Fast are the Tourism Countries growing? The Cross-Country Evidence, FEEM working paper series, No. 85.2003.
- Candela G. and Figini P. (2005), *Economia dei sistemi turistici*, McGraw Hill.
- Caserta S. and Russo A. P. (2001), Spatial Displacement and Sustainable Heritage Tourism, Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper, TI 2001-035/2.
- Ciccone A. and Hall R. (1996), Productivity and the Density of Economic Activity, «*American Economic Review*», 86 (1), pp. 54-70.
- Ciccone A. and Peri G. (2002), Identifying Human Capital Externalities: Theory with an Application to U.S. Cities, IZA Discussion Paper, No. 488.
- Copeland B. R. (1991), Tourism, Welfare and De-industrialization in a Small Open Economy, «*Economica*», 58, pp. 515-529.
- Corden W. and Neary J. (1982), Booming sector and de-industrialization in a small open economy, «*Economic Journal*», 92, December 1982.
- Creaco S. and Querini G. (2003), The role of tourism in sustainable economic development, paper presented at the "43rd Congress of the European Regional Science Association", 27-30 August 2003.
- Devereux M. B. and Engel C. M. (1999), The Optimal Choice of Exchange-Rate Regime: Price Setting Rules and Internationalized Production, NBER Working Paper 6992.
- Diamond J. (1974), International Tourism and the Developing Countries: a Case study in Failure, «*Economia Internazionale*», Vol. 27, pp. 601-615.
- Eugenio-Martín J. L., Martín Morales N. and Scarpa R. (2004), Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach, FEEM working paper series, No. 26.2004.
- Europa Inform (2004), The Economic Impact of Historical Cultural Tourism, Community Initiative INTERREG III B - ROMIT – Roman Itineraries.
- Europa Nostra (2006), The encouragement and control of cultural tourism in Europe, position paper, http://www.europanostra.org/downloads/documents/EN_position_paper_cultural_tourism.pdf.
- European Commission (2003), Basic orientations for the sustainability of European tourism, Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM(2003) 716 final.
- Gooroochurn N. and Sinclair T. (2003), The Welfare Effects of Tourism Taxation, Discussion Paper 2003/2, Tourism and Travel Research Institute, University of Nottingham.
- Jones R. W., Neary J. P. and Ruane F. P. (1987), International capital mobility and the Dutch disease, in: Kierzkowski H. (ed.), *Protection and Competition in International Trade: Essay in Honor of W. M. Corden*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Keillor G. (1995), White House Conference on Travel & Tourism, http://www.suite101.com/article.cfm/travel_with_disabilities/114769.
- Klein R. (2001), European Commission - Head of Unit Enterprise, Directorate-General, Tourism, Public Policies and Cultural Tourism - EU activities, paper presented at the 1st Conference on Cultural Tourism Economy and values in the XXI century, Barcelona, 29-31 March 2001, <http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/services/tourism/tourismpublications/documents/barcelona30-03-2001.pdf>.
- Lanza A. (1997), Is Tourism Harmful to Economic Growth?, «*Statistica*», n. 3.
- Lanza A. and Pigliaru F. (1994), The Tourism Sector in a Small Open Economy, «*Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali*», 41.
- Lanza A. and Pigliaru F. (2000), Tourism and Economic Growth: Does Size Matter?, «*Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali*», 47, pp. 77-85.
- Lucas R. (1988), On the Mechanics of Economic Development, «*Journal of Monetary Economics*», 22, pp. 3-42.
- Mankiw N. G., Romer D. and Weil D. N. (1992), A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth, «*Quarterly Journal of Economics*», 107, pp. 408-437.
- Martín R. H. (2004), Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports, FEEM working paper series, No. 27.2004.