

Table 1 continued

Living arrangement	Own home, live there permanently	24
	Rent home in Bruny Island	0.7
	Own holiday home in Bruny Island	62
	Other	13
Place of birth	Within 50km of Bruny Island	28
	Elsewhere in Tasmania	26
	Elsewhere in Australia	25
	In another country	21
Education	Less than Year 10	6.6
	Completed Year 10	12
	Completed Year 12	7.3
	Trade qualification	9.2
	Technical college/TAFE	13
	Undergraduate degree	23
	Postgraduate degree	27
	Other	1.8
Benefit from tourism	Personal benefit	12
	Family benefit	5.0
	No benefit	83

Discussion of findings

While the results from the survey indicated positive support for tourism, the level of support at both the personal and community levels was much lower than for other regions participating in this research.

- One quarter of respondents from Bruny Island felt obliged to *adjust their lifestyles* because of tourism, which probably explains the reason why they are less positively disposed towards growth in general, and growth of tourism in particular.
- While the respondents acknowledged the value of *having interesting things to do* (personal level) and the *economic benefits of tourism* (community level), they were concerned about *overcrowding, disruption and environmental damage* caused by tourism.

Contact with tourists, feelings about them and feelings about development

- Around half (49%) of Bruny Island respondents were happy to *tolerate* tourists, while 20% said they *love* tourists.
- One quarter (25%) indicated that they have to *adjust their lifestyles* to cope with the impacts of tourism.
- Half (51%) of respondents reported *seeing tourists around but not talking to them*, while 18% reported *meeting and talking to tourists*.
- Over a third (36%) of respondents were happy to see continued tourism growth, but a similar number (35%) did not want any more growth.
- Of all respondents, 12% expressed a desire for less tourism, which was far in excess of the responses from the other regions included in this study.

- With regard to general urban growth in the region, 28% did not want to see any further growth, while another 46% felt that more growth would be fine, but only if accompanied by the development of new facilities.
- About 10% of respondents stated that the population on Bruny Island should be reduced.
- The responses to the open questions in this section highlighted the need for more facilities focused on transport infrastructure – both the ferry service and roads.

Impacts of tourism

Residents were asked to rate the overall impacts of tourism using a seven point scale ranging from very negative (-3) to very positive (+3). Respondents were asked to rate the impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life*, and on the *community as a whole*. Therefore, mean scores greater than zero indicate favourable perceptions of tourism, and mean scores less than zero indicate unfavourable perceptions.

- When considering the overall impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life*, the mean value was 0.10; one of the lowest mean ratings of all communities in this research.
- An equal proportion of respondents rated the impact as negative or as positive (39% and 38% respectively).
- In considering the overall impact of tourism on the *community as a whole*, the mean value was 1.06, with 75% rating the impact as positive. One fifth of respondents rated the impact as very positive (+3).
- Nearly one quarter (22%) of respondents reported a negative impact on the *community as a whole*.
- The highest rating of *personal benefit* was for the positive impacts associated with having *more interesting things to do* (0.53).
- From a community perspective, the *economic benefits of tourism* (1.2) were rated as most beneficial.
- On the negative side, *overcrowding* was seen as the most concerning issue at both personal and community levels, although other issues such as *damage to the environment*, *disruption*, *delinquent behaviour* and the *negative effects of events* also contributed to the overall low mean for the impact of tourism on the personal and community quality of life.

Variation in perceptions within the community

- Table 2 shows that the non-resident rate payers were more favourably disposed towards tourism than the permanent residents.

Table 2 Perceived personal or community impact of tourism by residents

	Residency status	Number of respondents	Mean
Impact on personal quality of life	Permanent resident	70	-0.24
	Non-resident rate payers	195	0.22
Impact on community as a whole	Permanent resident	71	0.70
	Non-resident rate payers	190	1.16

- Those who received a *personal benefit* (1.35) rated the overall impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life* more positively than those who did not (-0.04).
- Those who received a *personal benefit* (1.62) and *family benefit* (1.43) rated the overall impact of tourism on the *community as a whole* more positively than those who did not (0.95).

For a copy of the full report, *Host Community Perceptions of the Social Impacts of Tourism on Tasmanian Communities*, please email tra@tourism.australia.com

Tourism Research Australia
Level 3, 11-17 Swanson Plaza, Belconnen ACT 2617
PO Box 1110, Belconnen ACT 2617
Telephone: + 61 2 6228 6100
Facsimile: + 61 2 6228 6180
Email: tra@tourism.australia.com
ABN 99 657 548 712

Image courtesy of Tourism Tasmania



Destination Visitor Survey Strategic Regional Research - Tasmania

Community perceptions of the impacts of tourism – Flinders Island: Summary of results

This report provides results from a survey of residents of Flinders Island, Tasmania. Other communities participating in this research were:

- Dorset
- Richmond
- Bruny Island
- King Island

For Flinders Island, a total of 211 responses were received from local residents and non-resident ratepayers. This represents a 20% response rate. Non-resident ratepayers made up 33% of the respondents to the survey.

Table 1 Characteristics of Flinders Island respondents

		%
Gender	Male	54
	Female	46
Age groups	18–39 years	11
	40–59 years	52
	60 years plus	37
Years of residence	Less than 2 years	13
	2–5 years	12
	6–10 years	13
	11–20 years	14
	More than 20 years	31
	All my life	17
Living arrangement	Own home, live there permanently	56
	Rent home in Flinders Island	7.2
	Own holiday home in Flinders Island	19
	Other	18

Table 1 continued

Place of birth	Within 50km of Flinders Island	14
	Elsewhere in Tasmania	23
	Elsewhere in Australia	46
	In another country	17
Education	Less than Year 10	4.9
	Completed Year 10	15
	Completed Year 12	13
	Trade qualification	7.8
	Technical college/TAFE	16
	Undergraduate degree	19
	Postgraduate degree	19
Benefit from tourism	Other	6.3
	Personal benefit	26
	Family benefit	6.8
	No benefit	67

Discussion of findings

The survey results indicated a high level of support for tourism and substantial interest in seeing the industry grow. The *positive impact of events* and *economic benefits of tourism* were seen to be the key positives for respondents, and *delinquent behaviour* and *dislocation caused by rising house prices* were seen to be the key negatives. It was clear that respondents were keen for Flinders Island to receive more tourism and indicated strongly that access to the island was the biggest stumbling block for an enhanced tourism industry. A larger percentage of respondents from Flinders Island benefit directly from tourism than respondents from the other regions in the study, which would help to explain their interest in further tourism development.

Contact with tourists, feelings about them and feelings about development

- Of all respondents from Flinders Island, 58% said they *love* tourists, while 30% were happy to *tolerate* tourists.
- One quarter (25%) indicated that they have to *adjust their lifestyles* to cope with the impacts of tourism.
- About 34% of respondents reported they had *made friends with tourists*, while 21% reported *meeting and talking to tourists*.
- One quarter (25%) reported *seeing tourists around but not talking to them*.
- The majority (54%) of respondents were happy to see continued tourism growth, but 20% felt that growth should be focused in a different direction.
- With regard to general urban growth in the region, 47% were happy to see continued growth, while 39% felt that more growth would be fine, but only if accompanied by the development of new facilities.
- In replying to the open ended questions, a number of respondents commented on the lack of growth in both tourism, and the permanent population on Flinders Island and expressed a strong desire that they both increase.

Impacts of tourism

Residents were asked to rate the overall impacts of tourism using a seven point scale ranging from very negative (-3) to very positive (+3). Respondents were asked to rate the impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life*, and on the *community as a whole*. Therefore, mean scores greater than zero indicate favourable perceptions of tourism, and mean scores less than zero indicate unfavourable perceptions.

- When considering the overall impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life*, the mean value was 1.12.
- The majority (61%) of respondents rated the impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life* as positive and only 9.1% as negative.
- In considering the overall impact of tourism on the *community as a whole*, the mean value was 1.88, with 90% rating the impact as positive.
- Only 5.8% of respondents reported a negative impact on the *community as a whole*.
- The highest rating of *personal benefit* was for the *positive impacts associated with events* (0.99).
- From a community perspective, the *economic benefits* were rated as most beneficial (1.62).
- On the negative side, *dislocation due to rising house prices* (-0.20) and *delinquent behaviour* (-0.14) were seen as the most serious community issues.

Variation in perceptions within the community

- Table 2 shows that the non-resident rate payers were more favourably disposed towards tourism than the permanent residents, although the differences were not statistically significant.

Table 2 Perceived personal or community impact of tourism by residents

	Residency status	Number of respondents	Mean
Impact on personal quality of life	Permanent resident	134	1.04
	Non-resident rate payers	70	1.29
Impact on community as a whole	Permanent resident	133	1.77
	Non-resident rate payers	69	2.10

- Those who received a *personal benefit* (2.15) or *family benefit* (1.14) rated the overall impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life* more positively than those who did not (0.72).
- Similar patterns were observed in the community level ratings.

For a copy of the full report, *Host Community Perceptions of the Social Impacts of Tourism on Tasmanian Communities*, please email tra@tourism.australia.com

Tourism Research Australia
 Level 3, 11-17 Swanson Plaza, Belconnen ACT 2617
 PO Box 1110, Belconnen ACT 2617
 Telephone: + 61 2 6228 6100
 Facsimile: + 61 2 6228 6180
 Email: tra@tourism.australia.com
 ABN 99 657 548 712

Image courtesy of Tourism Tasmania



Destination Visitor Survey Strategic Regional Research - Tasmania

Community perceptions of the impacts of tourism – King Island: Summary of results

This report provides results from a survey of residents of King Island, Tasmania. Other communities participating in the research were:

- Dorset
- Richmond
- Bruny Island
- Flinders Island

For King Island, a total of 139 responses were received from local residents and non-resident ratepayers. This represents an 18% response rate. Non-resident rate payers made up 17% of the respondents to the survey. Of the five communities involved in this study, King Island had the largest percentage of respondents who had lived in the region for over 20 years (34%).

Table 1 Characteristics of King Island respondents

		%
Gender	Male	46
	Female	54
Age groups	18–39 years	11
	40–59 years	50
	60 years plus	39
Years of residence	Less than 2 years	8.5
	2–5 years	10
	6–10 years	8.5
	11–20 years	22
	More than 20 years	34
	All my life	18
Living arrangement	Own home, live there permanently	65
	Rent home in King Island	11
	Own holiday home in King Island	12
	Other	11

Table 1 continued

Place of birth	Within 50km of King Island	13
	Elsewhere in Tasmania	21
	Elsewhere in Australia	48
	In another country	19
Education	Less than Year 10	10
	Completed Year 10	15
	Completed Year 12	8.7
	Trade qualification	8.7
	Technical college/TAFE	21
	Undergraduate degree	17
	Postgraduate degree	13
Benefit from tourism	Other	7.1
	Personal benefit	24
	Family benefit	3.7
	No benefit	73

Discussion of findings

The results from the survey on King Island indicated a high level of support for tourism at both the personal and community levels and substantial interest in seeing the industry grow. The *economic benefits* and *events* were seen to be the key positive impacts, and *dislocation caused by rising house prices* the key negative impact. Given the relatively large percentage of respondents who benefited personally from tourism and the recognition of the important economic benefit that tourism can have at both the personal and community levels, it was not surprising that there was general interest in building further tourism on the island. Additionally, growth in the tourism industry was also recognised as having potential for keeping general prices down, although this must be offset against increased house prices.

Contact with tourists, feelings about them and feelings about development

- Nearly three quarters (73%) of King Island respondents said they *love* tourists, which was higher than for any other region included in the study.
- One quarter (25%) were happy to *tolerate* tourists.
- One quarter (25%) of respondents reported they had *made friends with tourists*, while 30% reported *meeting and talking to tourists* and 28% reported *seeing tourists around but not speaking to them*.
- The majority (54%) of respondents were happy to see continued tourism growth, but 30% felt that growth should be focused in a different direction.
- With regard to general urban growth in the region, 46% were happy to see continued growth, while 44% felt that more growth would be fine, but only if accompanied by the development of new facilities.
- In replying to the open ended questions, a number of respondents commented on the lack of growth in the permanent population on King Island due to the expense of living there.

Impacts of tourism

Residents were asked to rate the overall impacts of tourism using a seven point scale ranging from very negative (-3) to very positive (+3). Respondents were asked to rate the impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life*, and on the *community as a whole*. Therefore, mean scores greater than zero indicate favourable perceptions of tourism, and mean scores less than zero indicate unfavourable perceptions.

- When considering the overall impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life*, the mean value was 1.22; the highest value of all communities in the study.
- About 61% rated the impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life* as positive and only 4.4% as negative.
- In considering the overall impact of tourism on the *community as a whole*, the mean value was 2.06 (the highest value of all communities in the study), with 91% rating the impact as positive. More than half of respondents rated the impact at the highest positive level (+3).
- Only 6.1% of respondents reported a negative impact on the *community as a whole*.
- *Economic benefits* and *positive effects of events* attracted the highest rating at both the personal (1.14 and 1.09 respectively) and community levels (1.66 and 1.58 respectively).
- On the negative side, *dislocation caused by rising house prices* was seen as the most serious personal (-0.12) and community issue (-0.22).

Variation in perceptions within the community

- Table 2 shows that the permanent residents were more favourably disposed towards tourism than the non-resident rate payers, although the differences were not statistically significant.

Table 2 Perceived personal or community impact of tourism by residents

	Residency status	Number of respondents	Mean
Impact on personal quality of life	Permanent resident	103	1.30
	Non-resident rate payers	24	1.13
Impact on community as a whole	Permanent resident	102	2.19
	Non-resident rate payers	24	1.83

- Those who received a *personal benefit* (2.16) and those who received a *family benefit* (2.0) rated the overall impact of tourism on their *personal quality of life* more positively than those who did not (0.91).
- Although there were also some observable differences in the community impact rating, they were not significant.

For a copy of the full report, *Host Community Perceptions of the Social Impacts of Tourism on Tasmanian Communities*, please email tra@tourism.australia.com

Tourism Research Australia
 Level 3, 11-17 Swanson Plaza, Belconnen ACT 2617
 PO Box 1110, Belconnen ACT 2617
 Telephone: + 61 2 6228 6100
 Facsimile: + 61 2 6228 6180
 Email: tra@tourism.australia.com
 ABN 99 657 548 712

Image courtesy of Tourism Tasmania

Conclusion

- Those communities such as Flinders Island and King Island that benefit financially from tourism are more positively disposed towards tourism in their communities.
- Most respondents perceived that tourism was good for the economy of the community.
- Most of the impacts of tourism were seen to be positive in most regions, with impacts such as the *maintenance of facilities, more interesting things to do* and the *exposure to different cultures* being among the positive impacts.
- From the results reported in this study, Bruny Island is the only community for which there are serious concerns about the impacts of tourism. It should also be noted that amongst the respondents, the permanent residents were more negative regarding the impacts of tourism than non-resident rate payers, which is the opposite result to what is normally found. Generally, permanent residents are more likely to derive economic benefits from tourism than non-residents and therefore tend to be more favourably disposed towards tourism.

Tourism Research Australia

Level 3 11-17 Swanson Plaza Belconnen ACT 2617

PO Box 1110 Belconnen ACT 2616

Telephone: + 61 2 6228 6100

acsimile: + 61 2 6228 6180

Email: tra@tourism.australia.com

www.tra.australia.com



Australian Government



Tourism Australia