

Barriers of Tourism industry Through Community Capacity Building

Fariborz Aref¹, Ma'rof Redzuan², Zahid Emby³, Sarjit S .Gill⁴

This study outlines some of the more common barriers of tourism industry as perceived by local communities. A lack of community capacity has been identified as main barrier of tourism in third world countries; thus, the study provides a focus group discussion of this issue within tourism development in local communities in Shiraz, Iran. Findings through focus group discussion show that generally local residents agreed about community capacity barriers in tourism industry in both district of Shiraz. It is expected that the findings of this study could be utilized by the community developers for reassessments of tourism industry programs in local communities.

Field of Research: Tourism Development

1. Introduction

Shiraz has many cultural and tourism attractions. However, despite having so many tourism attractions and advantageous factors, Shiraz has not been able to attract her deserved number of tourists. It is alleged that local communities in Shiraz do not play a significant role in tourism industry (Mashae, 2008). However, they are not only suffering from community structural weaknesses in tourism but also not been able to attract her deserved number of tourists. Moreover, there other problems such as weak tourism organizations, lack of strong tourism leadership and poor foundations for tourism industry. It is believed that, in the lack of community capacity building, tourism industry in Shiraz will not develop. The question is that how local community could offer a viable solution for tourism development and removes its barriers in local communities? Answer to this question is by increasing the community capacity in tourism Smith, et al (2001:1) describe community capacity building as the "essence of development". Consequently, the study suggests that although community capacity building is an important aspect of tourism development. However, there seems to be formidable barriers to development of tourism industry. It is the main aim of this paper to show these barriers of community capacity building in development of tourism industry in Shiraz.

¹ PhD Candidate Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti Putra Malaysia Email:fariborzaref@yahoo.com

² Senior Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti putra Malaysia Email: marof@putra.upm.edu.my

³ Senior Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti putra Malaysia Email: zahid@putra.upm.edu.my

⁴ Senior Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Human Ecology, Universiti putra Malaysia Email: sarjit@putra.upm.edu.my

2. Literature review

The concept of community capacity building has been given only limited attention in the tourism literature. This concept has, however, been extensively used in other areas of development, especially health, education and agriculture (Laverack, 2006; Moscardo, 2008:9). Chaskin, et al, (2001), suggest a concept of community capacity building at the community level that could be considered as the basis for discussion of the conceptual framework in development of tourism industry. Community capacity building in development of tourism industry often faces barriers (Moscardo, 2008; Steven & Jennifer, 2002). Hence understanding barriers of community capacity building is important when a community is getting organized for or involved in tourism activity. This understanding can help individuals, community, and organizations more effectively impact the tourism policy-making process. Further, it is important for government to understand that communities that also faced barriers that can hinder its progress in responding to and recognizing the priorities of local communities in Shiraz. Overcoming the barriers to tourism development faced by both communities and government will serve to facilitate the policy-making process (Steven & Jennifer, 2002).

Barriers to community capacity building in tourism development have hardly been debated by scholars of tourism (Moscardo, 2008). There are several literatures that directly attend to the barriers to community capacity building. Hunt, (2005) reviews an uptake of the notion 'community capacity building' in local communities. Her paper strongly expresses that any community capacity building activity in local communities must acknowledge and address the many barriers to that community capacity building. Hunt, (2005) outlines in broad terms such as constraints to include the following:

- A lack of community participation in development policy
- A lack of knowledge and awareness
- Power imbalances between governments and local communities
- Segmented and complex institutional arrangements
- Lack of financial resource.

The results of a survey of Not for Profit Services, undertaken in 2004 by the Social Policy Unit of the Western Australian Government have shown the barriers to community capacity building. The barriers include knowledge, skills, funding limits, abilities of individuals and groups to participate and lack of skilled tourism development practitioners (Unit, 2004). According to McGinty, (2003) , Taylor, (2003), Cronin, (2003) and Hunt, (2005), there are following barriers in community capacity building in local communities:

- Lack of power as a component of community development
- Inadequate focus on human resource development at the community level
- Lack of information to facilitate informed decisions
- Lack of authority for communities to control important matters
- Lack of effective and strong governance institutions
- Dependency on government and bureaucracy to meet needs
- Lack of capacity to solve problems (Cronin, 2003:3; Makuwira & Yumbah).

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

Atkisson, et al, (2003) believed development of Tourism industry at the community level has a number of limitations such as lack of resources, inadequate communication among local stakeholders, and inadequate planning. Steven & Jennifer, (2002) also outlined the following barriers in community capacity in term of tourism:

- Lack of community resources
- Lack of understanding of the policy process
- Lack of access to information
- Absence of community representation in the tourism decision-making process
- Relationship between government and local communities: The relationship between local communities and government is strained by the community perception that governments do not understand community issues and impose policies and programs that negatively affect local communities (Doern & Phidd, 1988).

Community capacity building is used in three major contexts and can be categorized as individual, organizational and community levels (Raik, 2002). These three levels are analyzed in this study to explain barriers of community capacity building in tourism development. It should be noted that such these barriers are not mutually exclusive. Although there is no special reason beyond this classification, it is supposed that it will facilitate understanding of barriers to community capacity building in the tourism development, at least at a theoretical level. The three levels of barriers are as follows:

- a. Individual capacity barriers: Those barriers which include the lack of skill and knowledge and lack of leaders capable in tourism industry.
- b. Organizational capacity barriers: Those barriers which are usually associated with community organization, power structures, lack of external support, lack of expertise, elite domination, lack of an appropriate legal system, and lack of trained human resources.
- c. Community capacity barriers: Those barriers which are related to cultural factors which include limited cultural capacity of local people and lack of participation and their power in decision making in tourism development.

3. Research methodology

This study is based on qualitative methodology to investigate the barriers of community capacity building in tourism development. For the purposes of the study, Shiraz is divided to two major areas including the Old Shiraz (Historical area) and the New Shiraz (Modern area). Eighty six communities are located in Old Shiraz, whereas 92 communities are located in New Shiraz. The most interesting buildings in Shiraz are located in the old district of the town. In the Old Shiraz, one can find many historical artifacts such as monuments, gates, and old buildings, whereas new and modern edifices including shopping complexes and hotels are located in New Shiraz (Aref & Ma'rof, 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Aref, et al 2009a, 2009b).

The research study use focus groups discussion (FGD). Qualitative research methods nowadays are widely used in tourism research and are gaining wide acceptance in the

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

social sciences e.g. (Smith, et al, (2002) and Walle, (1997); in tourism research, anthropologists and sociologists have used qualitative research. Decrop, (1999); Riley & Love, (2000) and Joffres et al., (2004) employed a qualitative design to study community capacity building among community groups engaged in health education. When it comes to economy, geography, psychology or marketing, researchers tend to use quantitative approaches (Decrop, 1999). Walle, (1997:528); explained that the use of qualitative research methods in tourism is useful and appropriate. Bush, et al, (2002) and Fawcett et al., (2001) suggested qualitative methods in the measurement of community capacity building (Smith, et al 2003). According to Rafipoor, (2005:23) because of Iranian society culture FGD, is special important technique in social sciences .

For achieve the objectives ten FGD were held at convenient place (local mosque, and school). FGD participants were selected from local community in the old and new areas of Shiraz that they were involved in local business. Community residents were directly involved in assessing barriers of community capacity building through FGD.

Five FGD were scheduled in the new district as well as five FGD held in the old district. FGD are a type of qualitative research method that Initially were used in marketing research (Cullen, 2000), but they have also been widely used in social science research due to the useful and innovative data that are obtained. Bedford & Burgess, (2001) defined a FGD as a one meeting between four and eight individuals who are brought together to discuss a particular topic chosen by the researcher. The FGD is a special qualitative research technique in which people are informally "interview in a group discussion setting. According to Howden & Vanclay, (2000) strongly argued that it is a useful method local community research. Gibbon, at al, (2002), state the importance of FGD in order to assessing community capacity domains. This technique has a special value in social research topics where the emphasis may not be on the objectivity of individual respondent, but on validity and good quality data. However, FGD was obtained involving two different groups. Participants were classified according to their community place. Tape recorder was used for FGD. All respondents were male. They ranged in age from 27 to 79. The five remaining FGD took place in the new district of Shiraz. These individuals ranged in age from 25 to 67, all were males. These FGD subjects were purposively selected. We explained to them the purpose of my research, what questions would be asked, the confidentiality of their responses, and how their responses would be used. The FGD session in the old district took place in the mosque. One assistant accompanied me for this FGD session. In New Shiraz, FGD took place on the mosque and school and private home. Each session was initially intended to last between seventy and eighty minutes.

4. Finding of the study

Information for this study was gathered from local residents through FGD July 2008. The FGD was used to obtain the data from local residents in Shiraz. As noted earlier, the unit of analyses is divided by two regions; Old and New districts. Table (1) details descriptive statistics for the people in local community that were used in FGD analysis.

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

A summary of demographic information on the participants is presented in Table 1. There were 60 participants (100% male) with an average age of 55 years. The respondents were choice because of their involvement in tourism activities. The mean number of participants in each FGD was six. Data from all FGD were analyzed separately and then their information obtained in two parts: FGD in old and new Shiraz. The FGD pilot numbers 1,3,4,5, and 7 were in the old district and number 2, 6, 8, 9, 10 were in the new Shiraz. Information obtained from FGD supported finding in objective 1, 2, and 5.

Table 1: Frequency of FGD respondents' demographic profiles

FGD Session	All FGD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Number of Participants	60	6	5	6	7	6	6	7	5	5	7
Mean Age	55	68	56	59	63	57	48	53	52	45	49
Education	Under Diploma	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Diploma	12	2	1	2	2	1	3	0	1	0
	Vocational.Edu	10	2	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	0
	BA/BS	25	0	2	2	1	1	5	4	3	2
	MA/MS	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
	PhD	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

According to FGD a number local people saw some barriers to community capacity building in tourism industry. The list below summarizes the consistent finding identified in the FGD. These themes emerged in 10 FGD sessions in response to this objective.

-Focus group participants from both districts named inadequate funding as one of the biggest obstacles to development of tourism industry in Shiraz. External funding for tourism is crucial in local communities. Local government and private sources such as banks also often have limited resources to invest in tourism. The need for community infrastructure, seed money for tourist attractions, and tourism promotion makes public funding for tourism very important. Several of the communities in Old district of shiraz had obtained state funding for tourism development. Focus group respondents reported that funds for tourism have been shrinking, and obtaining tourism grants has become more competitive between local communities in Shiraz. However, government giving more funding only to communities that have special tourism attractions.

- Focus group participants from one of the new communities bemoaned the lack of "empower leadership" that would support, a fund, and promote tourism.

-Focus group respondents in all the communities emphasized on lack of tourism planning as important barriers of tourism industry.

- Respondents in all the focus groups discussed the importance of technical assistance for development of tourism industry. Respondents noted that technical assistance for

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

tourism development can also give local people the confidence and incentive to develop and promote tourism themselves. Although they noted the difficulties of obtaining this help.

- A lack of funds and resources for tourism industry. This barrier was common between old and new Shiraz. Most of the participation through FGD referred to this barrier as a main barrier of community capacity building for development tourism industry.

- Lack of coordination between community residents and government in terms of tourism development. All of participation in both districts of Shiraz referred to this barrier. However, two groups of participant in the new district of Shiraz, between residents and leaders there isn't any collaboration in terms of tourism.

- Perception of the local people in some community was as a barrier for create sense of community between them. These barriers achieved through FGD in the new district of Shiraz. Most of the participation in new area of Shiraz believed the local people are not friendly and together. A hence low level of sense of community was another limitation for development of tourism in Shiraz.

- Community Power structures that exist are unable to create a decision making toward tourism development. Overall they believed there are no suitable constructions in the community for achieve tourism development. Another common barrier in all of the communities was the lack of really residential involvement in the tourism decision-making. As mentioned earlier in this study, government was not much of an issue in Shiraz. This finding supported the findings of (Butler, 1980) and (Pearce, 1989) that they implied it is very difficult to develop tourism industry in a local community without government involvement. They also referred to some barriers include government politics and communities religious structure. They were not motivated to seek additional funds to increase their programs as well as increase tourism development based community capacity to their programs. One of the respondents through FGD illustrated that there are several reasons that lead the government not to support tourism: First, the oil base of Iran country led the County to believe that they did not need tourism; and second, the Shiraz lacked the resources to support tourism.

- In local communities, financial resources played an important role in the support of tourism. Shiraz city does not have the financial resources to commit to tourism development. Therefore, tourism cannot be empowering because of the lack of economic resources in the communities.

- Respondents believed the lack of incapacity of the local municipality to deal with the tourism was behind the failure investment in the community. This is evidenced in the poor conditions of roads, deterioration of local city parks and sidewalks, and overall conditions of the district. Because of this, Shiraz residents believed while tourism helped activate the economy, it did this at very high social and environmental costs. They commented on the lack of tourism planning and preparation from the government.

- The majority of respondents believed the role of the local government in tourism development was deficient. They noted much of the work the municipality of Shiraz has

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

done focused on the new district of Shiraz and not old district. According to them, was one of the districts providing the most funds to the municipality and also, respondents often noted how slow and bureaucratic procedures in the municipality. FGD groups, especially in the new district of Shiraz often complained about the lack of capacity of community organizations to provide adequate facilities and protection from historical building in their communities. The FGD respondent in old districts also referred to destroy old structure of community with government as main barriers in tourism industry.

- Overall, both FGD groups in both districts of agreed with lack of planning, lack of tourism knowledge, and cultural traits were among the major reasons tourism barriers. Overall the respondents indicated the lack of appropriate conditions in Shiraz to reach tourism development.

With mention to above discussion about barriers of tourism development we summarized these barriers in below table

Table 2: Summarize of Barriers of tourism industry through FGD

Common barriers in both district	Barriers in new district	Barriers in Old district
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •inadequate funding •limited resources •lack of planning •inadequate technical assistance •Lack of coordination between residents and government •Community power structures •no suitable constructions •lack of really residential involvement •government politics •financial resources •lack of incapacity of the local municipality •deficient role of the local government •lack of tourism knowledge •lack of appropriate conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •lack of empower leader •low level of sense of community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •poor conditions of roads, deterioration of local parks and sidewalks •lack of capacity of community organizations to provide protection from historical building

5. Conclusion

The paper has identified and discussed the barriers of development of tourism industry through community capacity. Lack of tourism knowledge and community resource was an important element contributing to limited community capacity building in development of tourism industry. The findings emphasis that residents of these communities are lack

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

skills and knowledge, and they do not have capacity or the knowledge that will enable them to participate in implementation and management of tourism development.

One of the major barriers identified by the study is that the members of communities have restricted access to the decision making alongside with other obstacles. This has implied that they are lacking a sense of ownership to tourism. Several studies reveal that without creating opportunities for local people to take part in the decision-making process it would be very difficult for local communities to get adequate benefits from tourism development (Clancy, 1999; Timothy, 1999; Tosun, 1998). As a result, local communities in Shiraz do not able to become active participants in tourism development. Clearly, the described barriers may not be only specific to participatory tourism development strategy; some of them may also be considered as common general problems of development in many local communities in Iran. Hence, it should be accepted that these barriers may be an extension of the prevailing social, political and economic structure in Iran, which have prevented communities from achieving a higher level of development.

References

- Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. 2008a. "Barriers to Community Leadership in Tourism Development in, Shiraz, Iran". *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 172-178.
- Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. 2008b. "Barriers to Community Participation toward Tourism Development in Shiraz, Iran". *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 5, No.9, pp.936-940.
- Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. 2009. "Assessing the Level of Community Participation as a Component of Community Capacity Building for Tourism Development". *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp.68-75.
- Aref, F., Ma'rof, R., & Zahid, E. 2009a. "Assessing Sense of Community Dimension of Community Capacity Building in Tourism Development in Shiraz, Iran". *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 7, No.3, pp.126-132.
- Aref, F., Ma'rof, R., & Zahid, E. 2009b. "Barriers of Community power for Tourism Development in Shiraz, Iran". *European Journal of Scientific Research*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 443- 450.
- Atkisson, A., Anielski, M, & Quevedo, E. 2003. Connecting local government, business & academia: A model for Regional Agenda 21 planning. Paper presented at the 2nd Biennial International Sustainability Indicators Network Meeting
- Bedford, T., & Burgess, J. 2001. The focus-group experience. In: *Qualitative Methodologies/or Geographers*: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Bush, R., Dower, J., & Mutch, A. 2002. Community capacity index manual: Version 2. Brisbane, Australia The University of Queensland.
- Butler, R. W. 1980. The Concept of a Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources. *Canadian Geographer*, Vol. 24, No.1, pp.5-12.

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

- Chaskin, R. J., Brown, P., Venkatesh, S., & Vidal, A. 2001. Building Community Capacity. In. New York: Aline De Gruyter.
- Clancy, M. J. 1999. Tourism and development: Evidence from Mexico. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(1), 1-20.
- Cronin, D. 2003. Rethinking Community Development, Resources and Partnerships for Indigenous Governance. Retrieved April, 2, 2009, from http://www.nt.gov.au/cdsca/indigenous_conference/web/html/Darryl_Cronin_powerpoint.ppt
- Cullen, K. 2000. "Market research for nutrition professionals: focus group discussions". *J Am Diet Assoc*, Vol.100, No. 12.
- Decrop, A. 1999. Triangulation in qualitative tourism research. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp.157-161.
- Doern, G. B., & Phidd, R. N. 1988. *Canadian Public Policy: Ideas, Structure, Process*. Nelson: Toronto.
- Easterby-Smith, M., Thorpe, R., & Lowe, A. 2002. *Management Research: An Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fawcett, S. B., Paine-Andrews, A., Francisco, V. T., Schultz, J., Rishter, K. P., Patton, J. B., et al. 2001. Our Evaluation Model: Evaluating Comprehensive Community Initiative. Retrieved April 7, 2009, from http://ctb.ku.edu/tools/en/sub_section_main_1007.htm
- Gibbon, M., Labonte, R., & Laverack, G. 2002. "Evaluating community capacity". *Health & Social Care in the Community*, Vol.10, No.6, pp485-491.
- Howden, P., & Vanclay, F. 2000. "Mythologisation of farming styles in Australian broadacre cropping". *Rural Sociology*, No.65, pp. 295 - 310.
- Hunt, J. 2005. Capacity Building in the International Development Context: Implications for Indigenous Australia, from http://www.anu.edu.au/caepr/Publications/DP/2005_DP278.pdf
- Joffres, C., Heath, S., Farquharson, J., Barkhouse, K., Hood, R., Latter, C., et al. 2004. "Defining and operationalizing capacity for heart health promotion in Nova Scotia, Canada". *Health Promot. Int.*, Vol.19, No. 1, pp. 39-49.
- Laverack, G. 2006. "Improving health outcomes through community empowerment: a review of the literature". *J Health Popul Nutr*, Vol. 24, No.1, pp. 113-120.
- Makuwira, J., & Yumbah, N. *The Politics of Community Capacity Building: Contestations, Contradictions, Tensions and Ambivalences in the Discourse in Indigenous Communities in Australia*. Queensland: Indigenous Learning, Spirituality & Research Centre Central Queensland University
- Mashaee, R. (2008). tourism and its barrier. khabar e jonoob, from Retrieved 1.April, 2008, from <http://khabaronline.ir/jonoob>
- McGinty, S. 2003. The literature and theories behind community capacity building. In In S. McGinty (Ed), *Sharing success: An Indigenous perspective*: Altona: Common Ground.
- Moscato, G. (Ed.). 2008. *Building community capacity for tourism development*. Australia.
- Pearce, D. 1989. *Tourist development*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rafipoor, F. 2005. *Speical Research technipues in social Sciences*. Tehran: Enteshar publication co.

Aref, Redzuan, Emby & Gill

- Raik, D. B. 2002. Capacity Building for Co-management of Wildlife in North America. Retrieved 23, September, 2008, from <http://www.dnr.cornell.edu/hdru/PUBS/HDRUReport02-2.pdf>
- Riley, R. W & Love, L. 2000. "The state of qualitative tourism research". Annals of Tourism Research, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 164-187.
- Smith, N., Baugh-Littlejohns, L & Thompson, D. 2001. "Shaking out the cobwebs: Insights into community capacity and its relation to health outcomes". Community Development Journal. Vol. 36, No. 1, pp.30-41.
- Smith, N., Littlejohns, L. B., & Roy, D. (2003). Measuring Community Capacity: State of the Field Review and Recommendations for Future Research. Retrieved. from <http://www.dthr.ab.ca/resources/documents/reports/MeasuringCommunityCapacity-StateoftheFieldReviewandRecommendationsforFutureResearch.pdf>.
- Steven , D & Jennifer, T. 2002. Challenges and Barriers to Community Participation in Policy Development. from <http://www.ruralnovascotia.ca/documents/policy/challenges%20and%20barriers.pdf>
- Taylor, R. 2003. Indigenous Community Capacity Building and the relationship to sound governance and leadership. Paper presented at the National Native Title Conference. Retrieved April,3 2009, from <http://ntru.aiatsis.gov.au/conf2003/papers/russell.pdf>
- Timothy, D. 1999. Participatory planning: "A view of tourism in Indonesia". Annals of Tourism Research, Vol.26, No.2, pp.371-391.
- Tosun, C. 1998. "Roots of unsustainable tourism development at the local level: the case of Urgup in Turkey". Tourism Management, Vol.19, No. 6, pp.595-610.
- Unit, S. P. 2004. Indicative inventory of Capacity building services for the Not-For-Profit Sector: Department of the Premier and Cabinet.
- Walle, A. H. 1997. "Quantitative versus qualitative tourism research". Annals of Tourism Research, Vol.24, No. 3, 524-536.