

PICTURE



**Pro-active management
of the Impact of Cultural Tourism
Upon Urban Resources and Economies**

Deliverable n° **D12**

Deliverable title **Definition of Key Indicators for
the Analysis of the Impact of
Cultural Tourism Strategies on
Urban Quality of Life**

Summary

Task n° **1.3**

Task Leader: **QUB**

Task partners: QUB, LEMA, ITAS, ITAM-ARRCHIP

Authors: **QUB**

Date: **April 2005**



The PICTURE project is financed by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme of Research

Specific Programme: Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area
Activity: Specific activity covering policy-orientated research under "Policy support and anticipating scientific and technological needs"

Priority 3. Underpinning the economic potential and cohesion of a larger and more integrated European Union

Topic 3.6. The protection of cultural heritage and associated conservation strategies
Task 5: Cultural heritage and tourism. Contract n° SSP1-CT-2003-502491

Report D12 Summary

Deliverable D12 is divided into two parts; Part 1, provides the theoretical and literature framework to the research and identifies the preliminary definition of indicators which was used to inform the case study work. The Case study research, which is currently still being undertaken as part of the project, is contained within Part 2. Part 2 therefore aims to define further this preliminary identification of indicators leading towards the production of guidelines for local authorities for use in impact assessments. The report highlights the importance to the PICTURE project of identifying the potential impacts of cultural tourism strategies on residents' quality of Life (QoL), outlining that any reduction in quality of life arising from developing tourism may result not only in a lack of support for tourism initiatives but in a downgrading in the well being and prosperity of the city's own residents. Previous studies had tended to focus mainly on the economic and environmental impacts of Cultural Tourism but this element of the PICTURE research concentrates on the potentially far-reaching consequences of social and cultural impacts on local communities. In arriving at a preliminary definition of indicators the report considers the need to identify the various impacts on residents quality of life including for example consideration of the stage of maturity of the host city and the importance of residents perceptions and attitudes. In conclusion the report identifies key criteria which influence quality of life and could be directly impacted by cultural tourism strategies – namely “material well being”, “community well being” and emotional well being. Within each of these categories indicators are then identified which can help local authorities or tourism managers to measure the potential impact on quality of life for example – emotional well being - *access to leisure and recreation facilities, ability and opportunity to pursue hobbies, increasing opportunity for learning and education, personal and family safety etc*, community well being – *access to social and cultural facilities, opportunity for cultural exchanges, improved image of city, improvement in quality of local environment* and Material Well being – *opportunities for employment, cost of local goods and services, attitudes towards public allocation of funding*.

D12 Part 1

1. Introduction

Once a city becomes a visitor destination, the lives of residents in that city are inevitably affected to some degree by the impacts of tourism (Jurowski, 1994). The aim of report D12 (Part 1) is to provide the research background to the issues surrounding the potential impacts of cultural tourism development strategies on the quality of lives of residents and local communities in selected cities addressed by the PICTURE project. It is the authors' view that the Quality of Life (QoL) of residents must become an important concern to tourism bodies and planners. Any reduction in quality of life arising from the development of tourism may result not only in lack of local support for tourism initiatives, but in a downgrading in the well-being and prosperity of the city's own residents. The report seeks to establish if indicators can be defined which could help cities measure and monitor the positive and negative impacts on the lives of residents and thus help provide input into future policy formulation.

Previous studies have tended to focus mainly on the economic and environmental impacts of Cultural Tourism strategies and other tourism development programmes, but the PICTURE research also wishes to consider the potentially far-reaching consequences of social and cultural impacts on local communities. Murphy (1985) describes social impacts as “more immediate changes in the social structure of a community and adjustments to the destination's economy and industry.... while cultural impacts are more long-term changes in a society's norms and standards, which will gradually emerge in a community's social relationships and artefacts”. Furthermore, the planning

and marketing of tourism have been primarily oriented towards the needs of the tourist, but this planning should include efforts to manage the welfare of the host population. If unmanaged, these impacts can result in the disruption or destruction of cultures and values and the deterioration of the social fabric of the host community (Kim, 2002). Cultural tourism development will clearly have costs as well as benefits to any host community. Sustainability, which is a central theme of the PICTURE project, should be about managing the changes that impact upon a local society and weighing up those costs and benefits to determine the limits of acceptability.

From an historical perspective, early planning focused on the economic benefits with little regard to the socio-cultural or environmental impacts. During the 1960's and 70's the prevalent thinking was that tourism was a clean industry with no fumes or pollution and had an economic multiplier effect to drive high employment. This attitude was soon challenged and the ideal of tourism for producing high foreign exchange earnings were negated by the limited nature of tourism related jobs that were seasonal and low paying in nature. This led to the 1990's where tourism policy makers and development agencies began to evaluate the economic, social, cultural, and political sustainability of tourism. Issues surrounding QoL, requiring the examination of variables impacting on the well-being of host communities and local residents, is a natural extension of this thinking.

Various authors (Bachleitner and Zins, 1999; Linstaedt, 1994) also believe that cultural tourism has the potential to facilitate the building of cultural identity and image within a host city—the possibility of identifying regional awareness with the increased development of a cultural feeling of belonging. It is suggested that this emergence of a proper identity related to history and cultural heritage could represent an improvement in quality of life. However policy makers are also warned that they must consider carefully that cultural identity and authenticity may be affected as a result of increasing tourism impacts.

In summary, therefore, there has been a clear movement from almost complete disregard for social and cultural aspects of quality of life to a more creative approach in which cultural tourism is seen as a potentially beneficial strategy to support stronger local identity and sense of belonging.

2. Identifying the impacts of tourism on quality of life

It is difficult to find a definition for quality of life – but in simple terms it can be referred to as “an individual's overall satisfaction with life” (Anderson and Czajkowski, 1990). The well-being or QoL of a population is clearly an important concern for any society but it can be very difficult to measure. An important consideration is standard of living with access to goods and services. Of course, this type of information can be fairly easily measured. However less tangible feelings and experiences—such as freedom, aesthetics, social relationships—are more difficult to quantify. As a result, this can create an imbalance in programmes and policies which are often designed to fit around much more easily quantifiable economic data.

Various authors refer to the societal impact of tourism and the growing links between not only tourism and cultural pursuits, but also with foreign policy initiatives, economic development and efforts even to enhance global understanding and peace. Much has been written about the impacts of tourism on host communities in terms of economic impacts and employment and occupation structure. For example, tourism is often credited with increasing job opportunities for the host population, however there is concern and criticism that such employment offers mainly opportunities for migrants/immigrants and that a large number of these jobs are unskilled, low pay and low status (MacNaught, 1982). Less literature exists on the social and cultural impacts that tourism may have and the research that exists tends to concentrate on rural areas or island communities. Gilbert and Clark (1997) identify this paucity of material as surprising, considering the importance of urban areas in generating and receiving tourists. Ashworth (1992) asserts that the

reason for the lack of study could be due to the fact that within cities tourists are wholly integrated into other urban behaviour, function and physical patterns making them less easily definable. Some authors and theorists however have attempted classifications. Travis (1984) for example classifies socio-cultural costs and benefits to host communities. The benefits being cultural development (modernisation) and exchange, social change and choice, improved image of host community, improved public health, social and amenity improvements, education and conservation, positive cultural interchange and political modifications. The costs include, host culture destruction and debasement, social instability, consumerism, changes in the law and social order, commercialised host visitor relationships, changes in traditional values and political destabilisation.

Cultural tourism, as perhaps suggested by its title, is also considered to have major impacts on material and non-material cultural expressions. On the one hand, it could be seen as contributing to traditional arts through increased spending on souvenirs, crafts, traditional costumes etc. However, the counter argument to this effect is that traditional art and craft can be displaced by “airport” art and the staging of contrived or unauthentic cultural experiences in order to satisfy tourist demand.

Table 1 highlights positive and negative impacts on quality of life classified by type.

Impact	Positive	Negative
Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased Expenditure • Employment Creation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price increases during special events • Real Estate Speculation
Physical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of new facilities • Improvement of local infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Damage • Overcrowding
Social	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening of community Fabric via volunteering 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of ‘greed factor’ • Acceleration of undesirable social trends such as excessive urbanization
Psychological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased local pride and community spirit • Increased awareness of non local perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tendency toward defensive attitudes concerning host regions • High possibility of misunderstandings leading to varying degrees of visitor hostility
Cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New ideas from exposure to other cultures and their way of life • Strengthening of regional traditions and values 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercialisation of activities that may be of a personal or private nature • Modifications of nature of event/activity to accommodate tourism
Political	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced international recognition of a region and its values • Propagation of political values held by government and/or population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic exploitation of local population to satisfy ambitions of political elite • Distortion of true nature of events to reflect values of political system of the day

Table 1: Examples of probable impacts of tourism development programme on a typical destination (Source: Ritchie 1987 quoted in Crouch 1999)

Seeking a simplified approach to measuring tourist impacts on cities and communities can hide many problems and externalities – particularly those of poor urban management and the

development of a tourism monoculture all of which affect the quality of life of residents. In addition, no account is taken of the behaviour or profile of various visitors.

3. Residents' attitudes and perceptions

When tourists feel that they are welcome by the host community, they may be more likely to return and recommend it to others. However, at some point the negative impact of too many tourists may cause permanent residents to resent tourists - where a growing awareness of tourism leads to a growing opposition of impacts. Research by Bachleitner and Zins (1999) for example found that when monitoring the community reactions to a large cultural event over two years – in year one support was high due to the perceived economic benefits and improvements to local infrastructure as a result of tourism development. In Year two however this had changed significantly with the perceived negative effects – in environmental and psychosocial terms were double that of the perceived economic impacts.

Traditional approaches to providing measures for QoL have used a combination of economic, psychological, and sociological measures. There are currently many different indicators used by many different cities to help them look at measuring quality of Life. The problem however is how to measure or infer the impacts (both negative and positive) that are directly attributable to tourism.

Measuring QoL can be done through both subjective indicators and objective indicators (Samli 1995, Foo 2000). Objective indicators are derived from such areas as population, occupation, income, welfare, education etc. The strength of these indicators is that they can usually be well defined and quantified without relying too heavily on individual perceptions. Such objective indicators are regarded as being particularly useful at the neighbourhood, city and country level. Subjective indicators are mostly based on psychological responses, such as life satisfaction and personal happiness and as such are employed more at the individual level. They essentially capture experiences that are important to the individual. Despite the impression that they provide a less scientific measure, subjective indicators can be compared across particular criteria.

In attempting therefore, to distil a set of indicators from the existing literature and theory that could be applied to urban cultural tourism strategies, this study suggests utilising three of these main criteria – emotional, community and material well-being. Within these three fields are a range of indicators, which can help to provide a picture of overall well-being. The aim through Deliverable D12 Part 2 is then to refine and develop these indicators further through empirical research in order to design a set of guidelines to help local authorities measure the potential impacts of their strategies and programmes.

Quality of Life Indicators		Measure Positive/Negative
Emotional Well-being	Access to leisure and recreation facilities	
	Access to religious opportunity	
	Ability and opportunity to pursue hobbies	
	Personal and family safety	
	Improvements in social relationships	
	Increasing opportunity for learning and education (including life-long)	
	Overall life satisfaction	
Community Well-being	Access to social and cultural facilities	
	Opportunity for cultural exchanges	
	Opportunity for variety of social and cultural activity	
	Improved image of city	
	Improvement in quality of local environment (built and natural)	
	Increasing opportunity for community involvement	
	Well maintained local services (roads etc)	
	Increased Congestion / traffic	
	Safety of local area / city	
	Nuisance or inconvenience caused by visitors	
	Overall satisfaction with community	
	Material Well-being	Opportunity for employment
Cost of consumer goods		
Access to consumer goods		
Cost of local services		
Access to local services		
Attitudes towards allocation of public funding towards initiatives		
Overall material satisfaction		

Table 2: Preliminary Definition of Indicators for Measuring Impact on Quality of Life

Tourism within cities inevitably affects the lives of its residents to lesser or greater degrees. By encouraging, planning and developing cultural tourism, this inevitably will have consequences for their quality of lives. In small or medium sized cities those impacts are often magnified as their impacts are not so widely dispersed and more intensely experienced. The potential end result of unmanaged socio- economic impacts is “tourism overkill” attributed to three basic main factors. Firstly, too many tourists, which can be aggravated by seasonality. Secondly too many adverse impacts from the visitors themselves and thirdly too much tourism industry – for example in over proliferation of hotels. They argue that urban tourism should benefit and satisfy the host community equally as much as the visitor themselves

The report highlights the importance of resident perception and attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. Different individuals or communities within cities may respond to the same tourism impacts in different ways. Also attitudes may change over time and according to the stage of tourism development of the city. As such, an assessment must be made not only of potential impacts but also of the resident perception and attitudes towards these impacts, before any indicators can be identified or measured. Defining an absolute set of indicators will never be possible or desirable as each city will have its own different urban planning and cultural context, which must influence the measurements to be applied. However, from the literature a core set of transferable criteria can be identified which can then be adapted to the local unique problems and issues being faced by each city.

D12 Part 2

1. Empirical Research

Part 2 of Deliverable D12 is currently ongoing and consists of research within Liège and Belfast aimed at testing methodological approaches to provide data to help further define indicators and measures. Within the city of Liège, extensive empirical fieldwork has been completed in a particular quarter or neighbourhood, with its own strong local identity and culture, but which is facing increasing pressure from cultural tourism. The methods employed are as follows:

1. Participative observation, meaning a frequent presence in the area and a high participation in the local activities and interactions with locals.
2. Semi-directive interviews with different categories of person living in the area (long term residents of different ages, shop owners, people holding hotels or bed & breakfast, local associations, etc.).
3. Interviews with local politicians, administrative officers, urban planners.
4. Rapid appraisal of the perception of the tourists in the area, meaning observation and occasional fast and dirty interviews with tourists visiting the district.

5. Focus groups with local residents after the participant observation and the individual interviews. This will serve also to find out, if the collective attitude will fit the opinions expressed during the individual interviews.
6. Visual ethnography, meaning documentation and analysis by pictures and small video clips of what is going on in the area.

The research findings highlight that even within one neighbourhood of a city variations in residents perceptions and attitudes toward the impact of cultural tourism on their quality of life exists – for example in one street residents considered that tourists did not have much of an impact whilst in another close by, they were seen as a cause of nuisance. The research highlights the need to distinguish between the impacts caused by tourists and those caused by co citizens. The case study also highlights residents perceptions of the main problems associated with cultural tourism - often centred around what could be defined as urban planning issues and lack of responsiveness by city officials to their concerns. In defining quality of life, residents stated the importance of calmness in their surroundings, access to urban facilities, the importance of having a close social network and the value and security upon their lives which living in a close neighbourhood provides. Cultural Tourism was not seen as having an impact on social cohesion but that this was felt to come from within the neighbourhood itself and could not be imposed through events and festivals. Conclusions as to what would improve quality of life include:

1. Increased Security	5. No “folklorisation” of the quarter
2. Improved public participation and better communication with City	6. Protection of intangible heritage – “ideology of area”
3. Protected parking	7. Improved tourist information
4. Better cleaning services	8. Education – more respectful visitors
5. Civic Spirit – fostered through better education of citizens	

In Belfast the aim is to consider the impact of Cultural Tourism on the residents across the city – contrasting with the individual neighbourhood case study of Liège. Three thousand households have been surveyed in Belfast. The aim of this survey work is to provide measures in a quantitative way for the identified indicators in Part 1 of D12. An example of the questionnaire has been attached. Testing such a quantitative approach will allow the researchers to see the practicality of Local Authorities surveying a significant percentage of the population of a city. The researchers in Liege have also adapted this questionnaire approach to sample school children thus allowing the opinions of a traditionally very difficult age group to be reflected in the research. This quantitative data is still currently been analysed. In order to complement the quantitative data and to provide a comparison with the methodological approach adopted in Liège, researchers have also looked at a neighbourhood within Belfast experiencing considerable pressure from the increase in cultural tourism – West Belfast. The community within this part of Belfast have very actively encouraged and promoted cultural tourism – setting up its own community tourism body which works with local businesses to promote the culture of west Belfast to visitors. As a result, residents in this community have experienced a large increase in numbers of people coming into the local area. Work is currently ongoing to consider how residents feel about such cultural tourists – who often wish to look at and

photograph the physical symbols and emblems of “the Troubles” and the associated violence and disturbances which have characterised this community’s past. The aim is to try to establish using the indicators whether such cultural tourism positively or negatively impacts on the residents of this community. Whether the economic benefits and “feel Good” factor can potentially overcome deep divisions and a painful recent heritage of conflict.

The final element of the Case study work will then be to test the newly defined indicators within a third city – at this point in time Bergen in Norway is considered to provide the best opportunity for this research work. Following this final testing period, the research work will be brought together to provide guidelines for Local Authorities to assist in measuring the impact of Cultural Tourism on the quality of life of residents in their cities.