



Destination Visitor Survey Program  
Strategic Regional Research – Tasmania

**Community perceptions of tourism impacts on Tasmanian  
communities – Stage 1 Summary of results**

**August 2009**

Photo credits: Cradle Mountain  
JP & E Baker  
  
Derby River  
Rick Eaves  
  
Richmond Bridge  
Nick Osborne  
  
The Neck  
Geoff Murray  
  
Flinders Island  
Steve Lovegrove  
  
Currie Harbour  
Dennis Harding

All photos – Copyright Tourism Tasmania

The information in this report is presented in good faith and on the basis that neither Tourism Australia nor Tourism Research Australia, nor their agents or employees, are liable (whether by reason of error, omission, negligence, lack of care or otherwise) to any person for any damage or loss whatsoever which has occurred or may occur in relation to that person taking or not taking (as the case may be) action in respect of any statement, information or advice given in this publication.

Data derived from Tourism Research Australia surveys are subject to sample error. Users of the data are advised to consult the sample error tables contained in Tourism Research Australia publications or otherwise available from Tourism Research Australia before drawing any conclusions or inferences, or taking any action, based on the data.

© Tourism Australia, 2009.

Tourism Australia and Tourism Research Australia permits copies to be made of this publication for the purpose of promoting Australian tourism, provided that Tourism Research Australia is recognised on any copies as the author of the report and the material is reproduced in its current form and a statement similar to the one listed below is included on any copy. However, copies may not be made for a commercial purpose, that is, for sale without the permission of Tourism Research Australia.

This work should be referenced as: *Community perceptions of tourism impacts on Tasmanian communities – Stage 1 Summary of results, August 2009*, Tourism Research Australia, Canberra.

Tourism Research Australia  
Level 3, 11-17 Swanson Plaza, Belconnen Canberra ACT 2617  
GPO Box 1110, Canberra ACT 2616  
Telephone: +61 6228 6100  
Fax: +61 6228 6180  
Email: [tra@tourism.australia.com](mailto:tra@tourism.australia.com)

Web: [www.tourism.australia.com](http://www.tourism.australia.com)

ABN 99 657 548 712

Publication Date: August 2009

# Table of contents

Introduction	2
Stage 1 result summaries:	
Dorset	3
Richmond	7
Bruny Island	11
Flinders Island	15
King Island	18
Conclusion	21

# Introduction

This report provides the details from Stage 1 studies (incorporating five separate communities) which examines perceptions of the host residents towards tourism within Tasmanian communities. The regions that were examined were:

- Dorset
- Richmond
- Bruny Island
- Flinders Island
- King Island

A quantitative method was used, based on a refined questionnaire that had been developed and used previously in a range of destinations. The questionnaire contained questions relating to general impressions of tourism and a number of specific tourism impact statements. The study used a three phased method to collect data. In the first phase, a postcard notifying residents of the survey was sent to all households in each community region and, where applicable, to permanent addresses of non-resident rate payers. The second phase of the study was the distribution of the questionnaire; this was followed up in the third phase with a reminder postcard. An online version of the questionnaire was also made available for completion.

Fieldwork for these studies was conducted during the period October to mid-December 2008.

Three more Tasmanian Community surveys are currently in the planning stage and will be conducted during the second half of 2009.



# Destination Visitor Survey Strategic Regional Research - Tasmania

## Community perceptions of the impacts of tourism – Dorset: Summary of results

This report provides results from a survey of residents from the municipality of Dorset, Tasmania. The municipal boundary extends from Musselroe Bay in the east, to Nabowla, Golconda and Wyena in the west, with Scottsdale being the main service centre for the municipality.

Other communities participating in this research were:

- Richmond
- Bruny Island
- Flinders Island
- King Island

For Dorset, a total of 118 responses were received from local residents out of a sample household population of 600. This represents a 20% response rate. Compared to respondents from the other four regions included in this study, Dorset respondents were much younger (18.1% in the 18–39 year group), many more owned their own home in the region (85.2%) and many more had lived in the region all of their life (85.2%). The highest education levels achieved by respondents from Dorset were lower than for respondents in the other regions, with more in the secondary school category and fewer being tertiary qualified.

**Table 1 Characteristics of Dorset respondents**

		%
Gender	Male	44
	Female	56
Age groups	18–39 years	18
	40–59 years	42
	60 years plus	40
Years of residence	Less than 2 years	7.0
	2–5 years	12
	6–10 years	11
	11–20 years	16
	More than 20 years	25
	All my life	29

**Table 1 continued**

Living arrangement	Own home, live there permanently	85
	Rent home in Dorset	0.9
	Own holiday home in Dorset	10
	Other	4.3
Place of birth	Within 50km of Dorset	36
	Elsewhere in Tasmania	31
	Elsewhere in Australia	21
	In another country	12
Education	Less than Year 10	16
	Completed Year 10	19
	Completed Year 12	15
	Trade qualification	7.9
	Technical college/TAFE	20
	Undergraduate degree	7.0
	Postgraduate degree	15
	Other	0.0
Benefit from tourism	Personal benefit	17
	Family benefit	5.2
	No benefit	78

## Discussion of findings

The survey results indicated a low level of support for tourism at the personal level and quite strong support at the community level. The low level of support at the personal level might be due largely to the fact that tourism was not (at the time of the survey) a substantial industry in the region and as a consequence, had little impact on residents.

- While most respondents were happy with continued development, about one third of respondents wanted growth in a different direction. Like respondents from most other regions included in this study, many indicated the need for additional facilities in support of further growth.
- At a personal level, *events*, *pride* and *economic benefit* were seen to be the key positive impacts of tourism, while *economic benefits* and the *showcase effect* were seen to be the key positive impacts at a community level.
- *Damage to the environment* and *disruption* were the key negatives at both personal and community levels.

From the open-ended responses in particular, there was a sense that tourism in the area was underdeveloped and there was substantial support for better roads and infrastructure and further tourism development with an environmental and/or heritage focus. Respondents indicated that the area needed to have a more clearly identified brand in order to reap the benefits of increased tourism to the region. There were no specific negative impacts which attracted substantial concern.

## Contact with tourists, feelings about them and feelings about development

- Around one third (30%) of Dorset respondents were happy to *tolerate* tourists, while 66% said they *love* tourists.
- Over one third (36%) of respondents reported *seeing tourists around but not talking to them*, while 30% reported *meeting and talking to tourists*.
- The majority of respondents were happy to see continued tourism growth (54%), although almost one third (31%) felt that future growth should be focused in a different direction.
- Less than 1% expressed a desire for less tourism.
- With regard to general urban growth in the region, 44% were happy to see continued growth, while another 41% felt that more growth would be good, but only if accompanied by the development of new facilities.
- Of all respondents, 10% stated that there should be no further growth.

## 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 0.88, with 52% rating it as positive.
- Only 4.2% of Dorset respondents reported a negative impact on their *personal quality of life*.
- In considering the overall impact of tourism on the *community as a whole*, the mean value was 1.90, with 92% rating the impact as positive. More than one third of respondents rated the impact as very positive (+3).
- No respondents reported that tourism had a negative impact on the *community as a whole*.
- The highest rating of *personal benefit* was for the *positive impacts associated with events* (0.91).
- From a community perspective, the *economic benefits* and the *showcase effect* (the promotional benefits of tourism through media, exposure and positive word-of-mouth referral) (both 1.47) were rated as most beneficial.
- On the negative side, *damage to the environment* (-0.16) was seen as the most pressing personal issue, while *disruption* was seen as the most serious community issue (-0.06).
- Comments were made in relation to the need for improved infrastructure in the region, particularly the need to improve the condition of the roads.

## Variation in perceptions within the community

- Those who received a *personal benefit* (1.79), and those who received a *family benefit* (1.17) rated the overall personal impact of tourism more positively than those who did not (0.67).
- Although there were also some observable differences in the community impact ratings, they were not statistically significant.
- Residents who made new friendships with tourists were more likely to rate tourism more positively.

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](mailto: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](mailto: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 – Richmond: Summary of results

This report provides results from a survey of residents of Richmond, Tasmania. Other communities involved in this research were:

- Dorset
- Bruny Island
- Flinders Island
- King Island

For Richmond, a total of 80 responses were received from local residents out of a sample household population of 501. This represents a 16% response rate. Of the five regions involved in this survey, Richmond had the largest percentages of respondents over 60 years of age (54%), and those who had resided 6–10 years in the area (33.3%). It also had the second highest number of home owners with no respondent stating that they owned a holiday home in the area.

**Table 1 Characteristics of Richmond respondents**

		%
Gender	Male	40
	Female	60
Age groups	18–39 years	7.9
	40–59 years	38
	60 years plus	54
Years of residence	Less than 2 years	12
	2–5 years	12
	6–10 years	33
	11–20 years	17
	More than 20 years	19
	All my life	6.7

**Table 1 continued**

Living arrangement	Own home, live there permanently	79
	Rent home in Richmond	6.5
	Own holiday home in Richmond	0
	Other	14
Place of birth	Within 50km of Richmond	28
	Elsewhere in Tasmania	15
	Elsewhere in Australia	26
	In another country	31
Education	Less than Year 10	6.5
	Completed Year 10	14
	Completed Year 12	6.5
	Trade qualification	5.2
	Technical college/TAFE	18
	Undergraduate degree	22
	Postgraduate degree	26
	Other	1.3
Benefit from tourism	Personal benefit	21
	Family benefit	6.4
	No benefit	73

## Discussion of findings

The results from the survey in Richmond indicated a reasonable level of support for tourism at the personal level, and quite strong support for tourism at the community level which appears to be recognition of the economic importance that tourism has for the region. However, a larger percentage of respondents in Richmond than in other regions included in this study indicated that they:

- wish to halt growth at the urban level but were happy with continued tourism growth
- *tolerate* rather than *love* tourists which was in line with higher ratings given to concerns expressed regarding *overcrowding* (community level) and *environmental damage* (personal level).

The fact that respondents listed the *negative impact of events* highly indicated that the management of events in the region needs to be reviewed. As the rating of the impact of tourism on the *personal quality of life* of Richmond residents was less than 1, and nearly 18% indicated that tourism had a negative impact on them, it will be important to monitor community attitudes to ensure that this rating does not reduce further.

## Contact with tourists, feelings about them and feelings about development

- Over half (53%) of Richmond respondents were happy to *tolerate* tourists, while 39% said they *love* tourists.
- Of all respondents, 52% reported *seeing tourists around but not talking to them*, while 22% reported *meeting and talking to tourists*.
- The majority of respondents were happy to see continued tourism growth (55%), although 26% felt that future growth should be focused in a different direction.
- Less than 3% expressed a desire for less tourism.
- With regard to general urban growth in the region, 24% were happy to see continued growth, while another 40% felt that more growth would be good, but only if accompanied by the development of new facilities.
- Around one third (32%) of respondents stated that there should be no further growth.

## 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 0.94, with over 54% rating it as positive.
- Of all Richmond respondents, 18% reported a negative impact on their *personal quality of life*.
- In considering the overall impact of tourism on the *community as a whole*, the mean value was 2.04, with 89% rating the impact as positive. More than half of respondents rated the impact as very positive (+3).
- Only 7.6% of respondents reported a negative impact on the *community as a whole*.
- The highest specific rating of *personal benefit* was for the *development of new facilities* (1.14).
- From a community perspective, the *economic benefits* (1.68) and the *showcase effect* (the promotional benefits of tourism through media, exposure and positive word-of-mouth referral) (1.43) were rated as most beneficial.
- On the negative side, *damage to the environment* (-0.19) and *disruption* (-0.19) were seen as the most pressing personal issues, while *overcrowding* (-0.25) and the *negative impacts of events* (-0.25) were seen as the most serious community issues.
- One specific impact that attracted further comment in the open responses was that there had been inadequate maintenance of facilities and infrastructure such as roads. A number of respondents stated that the poor standard of roads and the high speed limits created a very dangerous environment for both the community and tourists.

## Variation in perceptions within the community

- Those who received a *personal benefit* (2.44) rated the overall impact of tourism on *personal quality of life* far more positively than those who received *no benefit* (0.51).
- The mean score for those who received a *family benefit* (0.6) was only slightly higher than those who received *no benefit*.
- Although there were also some observable differences in the community impact ratings, 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](mailto: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](mailto: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 – Bruny Island: Summary of results

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

- Dorset
- Richmond
- Flinders Island
- King Island

For Bruny Island, a total of 287 responses were received from local residents and non-resident ratepayers. This represents a 22% response rate. Non-resident ratepayers made up the majority of the respondents to the survey (68%). Of the five communities in the study, respondents from Bruny Island were more likely to have a postgraduate degree and were also the least likely to benefit financially from tourism.

**Table 1 Characteristics of Bruny Island respondents**

		%
Gender	Male	52
	Female	48
Age groups	18–39 years	7.6
	40–59 years	46
	60 years plus	47
Years of residence	Less than 2 years	11
	2–5 years	17
	6–10 years	21
	11–20 years	19
	More than 20 years	26
	All my life	5.3

**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](mailto: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](mailto: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
	Other	6.3
Benefit from tourism	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](mailto: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](mailto: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
	Other	7.1
Benefit from tourism	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](mailto: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](mailto: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

Facsimile: + 61 2 6228 6180

Email: [tra@tourism.australia.com](mailto:tra@tourism.australia.com)

[www.tra.australia.com](http://www.tra.australia.com)



Australian Government



Tourism Australia