

---

# Barriers of Community Capacity Building in Types of Tourism Activities

<sup>1</sup>Fariborz Aref & <sup>2</sup>Sarjit S Gill

<sup>1</sup>School of Management and Economics, Science and Research Branch

Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of Social and Development Sciences, Faculty of Human Ecology

Putra University, Malaysia

[fariborzaref@yahoo.com](mailto:fariborzaref@yahoo.com) & [sarjit@putra.upm.edu.my](mailto:sarjit@putra.upm.edu.my)

**Abstract:** This paper investigates barriers of community capacity building in tourism development base on types of tourism activities. This study was run in local communities of Shiraz, Iran. Questionnaire was used to collect data from community leaders. The focus group discussion also performed to collection data from community residents who were engaged in tourism activities. One way Anova was used to examine the difference barriers of community capacity base on types of tourism activities. According to the survey, results showed barriers of community capacity building in tourism development in handicraft activities higher than other types of tourism activity. [Journal of American Science 2010;6(2);136-142] (ISSN: 1545-1003).

**Keywords:** community capacity building, tourism activities, local communities, handicraft

## 1. Introduction

Tourism is a multi sector, and as a means of economic and social cultural exchange, it has many aspects and types (Mowforth & Munt, 2003). Because of its various forms, tourism researchers have been incapable of reaching either a conceptual or operational unity over a consensus definition (Mill & Morrison, 2002; Mills, 2005; Wall & Mathieson, 2006). Mill & Morrison (2002) and Wall & Mathieson (2006) noted how the discipline of studying tourism struggled with establishing a

global definition of tourism. This aim of this study was to determine the barriers of community capacity building for tourism development base on types of tourism activities. In this study, community capacity building is tested as a dependent variable having a direct effect on tourism development. Hence understanding barriers of community capacity in terms of types of tourism activities can help to local communities for future planning to achieve sustainable tourism development.

## 2. Literature Review

Harrill & Potts (2003, p. 233) believed that "tourism is an invisible industry, encompassing transportation, lodging, and entertainment. Unfortunately, tourism is also invisible to many planners, so tourism development is often left to private developers and leisure service providers". Tourism research has also recently come to be a favourite research subject in community development researches (Galston & Baehler, 1995). Ivanovic (2009) states that various types of tourism activities are an important element capable of considerably increasing tourism expenditure and the length of tourists' stay in communities (Ivanovic, 2009). Despite the potential for community capacity building in tourism development, barriers do exist and need to be addressed in tourism development planning. community capacity building in tourism development often faced barriers (Moscardo,

2008). Barriers to community capacity building in tourism development have hardly been debated by scholars of tourism (Moscardo, 2008).

Understanding barriers of community capacity building base on types of tourism activities is important when a community is getting organized for involvement in tourism activities. 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 also face barriers that can hinder its progress in responding and recognizing the priorities of local communities in Shiraz. Overcoming the barriers to tourism development presents a challenge to both communities and government, and will serve to facilitate the policy making process. There are several literatures that directly deal with the

barriers of tourism development through local communities particularly in third world countries.

- i. **Power: Socio-political traditions:** The biggest barriers in local communities in the face of tourism development are the strong views of power-wielding governments that still exist in many third world countries. This form of government customarily nearly always precludes grassroots participation in tourism development (Sharma, 2004).
- ii. **Information accessibility:** One of the primary barriers for local business in less developed countries is marketing difficulties. Limited access to advertising outlets, reservation system and adequate transportation services also contribute to lack of ability in some local business (Sharma, 2004).
- iii. **Lack of awareness:** Lack of understanding by residents about tourism impacts prevents many people from becoming involved in tourism decision making and in the benefits of tourism (Sharma, 2004).
- iv. **Economic problems:** Insufficient public funding is another limitation to local communities for achieving tourism development. Financial barriers at lower levels of administration increase dependence on national government. As a result the involvement of local people in tourism decision making can hardly be achieved (Sharma, 2004).
- v. **Lack of cooperation:** It is argued that a great deal of collaborative effort is necessary for success in tourism development. Despite this apparent need, few places have achieved high level of cooperation in this regard (Sharma, 2004).

This study also outlines some of the more common barriers and challenges as perceived by Steven & Jennifer (2002) in local communities. The important barriers to community capacity building are referred to below.

- i. **Lack of understanding of policy process:** Understanding the policy making process can help individuals and community organizations to decide whether they will become involved in trying to develop or change a policy and if, so, how to best go about it (Steven & Jennifer, 2002).
- ii. **Lack of community resources:** In order for local communities to play an active role in the policy making, it is important for community residents to have access to resources. These resources include adequate funding, government training programs, education and volunteers to support community development. Many local communities tend to lack most of

these resources. Having inadequate resources negatively impacts on the community's ability to effectively influence and develop tourism policy. Atkisson et al. (2003) believed tourism development at the community level has a number of limitations such as lack of resources, inadequate communication and planning.

- iii. **Reliance on volunteers:** Access to financial resources, which is necessary to address problems of a local community. As a consequence, a lack of resources and tourism experts from local communities results in a depletion of potential future community leaders (Steven & Jennifer, 2002).
- iv. **Policy timeline restrictions:** Often the policy timeline can create difficulties for communities looking forward to impacting policies pertaining to a particular issue.
- v. **Lack of access to information:** Community citizen have indicated that they feel there is a lack of access to tourism information. Local communities have also reported that the information that is available on government programs is difficult to obtain and interpret. Ebbesen et al. (2004) identified the most common barriers to building community capacity including:
  - i. Lack of clearly defined goals and outcome to be achieved for the community development.
  - ii. Lack of leadership to unite, motivate and take action in community.
  - iii. Limited public support or community voice to contribute to the change effort.
  - iv. Lack of funding and commitment, perceived to be related to competing priorities for policy attention and resource investment in community.
  - v. Lack of political will to develop capacity in communities.
  - vi. Inability of resource mobilization to quickly capitalize on opportunities.

Hunt (2005) also reviews an uptake of the notion of community capacity building in local communities. She strongly believed that any community capacity building activity in local communities must acknowledge and address the many barriers to that community capacity building. She outlines in broad terms, the following constraints:

- i. A lack of community participation in policy development
- ii. Lack of knowledge and awareness
- iii. Power imbalance between local communities and government
- iv. Lack of financial resources

The results of a survey by the Social Policy Unit of the Western Australian Government have shown the barriers of community capacity building. These

barriers include lack of knowledge, skills, funding limits, lack of abilities of individuals and groups to participate and lack of community development practitioners (Social Policy Unit, 2004). According to Cronin (2003), Hunt (2005) and McGinty (2003) there exist the following barriers in community capacity building in local communities:

- i. Lack of recognition of local authority and power as a component of community development.
- ii. Inadequate focus on human resource development at the community level
- iii. Lack of information to facilitate informed decisions
- iv. Lack of effective and strong government institutions
- v. Dependency on government and bureaucracy to meet needs
- vi. Lack of capacity to solve problems and manage individual and community matters
- vii. Lack of authority for local communities to control important matters (Cronin, 2003).

In terms of barriers of community capacity building in local communities, Kleiner et al. (2004) also refers to limited resources (e.g., funding, expertise, time) and competition between communities and residents to regionalism, community organizations conflict, attracting participant interest and time constraints as the commonly cited problem in implementation of community capacity building in local communities.

### 3. Research methodology

The data for this study were collected from community leaders and local residents which engaged in tourism activities. Community leaders was identified as a key factor in developing tourism in local communities (Aref & Ma'rof, 2009a; Moscardo, 2008). According to Eyler et al. (1999), Thompson et al. (2000), and Von et al. (1992) the leaders are able to speak for the community because of their knowledge and their roles in the community. The primary and major data collection is based on questionnaires. Focus group discussion (FGD) also was used to collection data from local residents that were engaged in tourism activities. According to Riley (1996) the majority of tourism research has relied on structure surveys and quantification" (Riley, 1996, p. 22). The items in the questionnaire for this survey were measured using Likert scale (Aref et al., 2009). The Likert scale is most commonly used in tourism marketing research (Grover & Vriens, 2006). Dong-Wan & William (2002) and Maddox (1985) recommended the use of a Likert scale in tourism research due to its high validity. Descriptive Analysis, and one way Anova were used to interpret the data in this study. Descriptive statistics usually include means, standard deviations, and frequencies (Anderson, MacLellan-Wright, & Barber, 2007). One-way

<http://www.americanscience.org>

Bushell & Eagles (2007, p. 154) states tourism as a phenomenon of affluent contemporary societies is a particularly difficult concept in local communities in developing countries to grasp. In this sense tourism development may be more difficult than other activities. Shortcomings are similar to those local communities, but a few factors tend to be more pronounced among local communities:

- i. Lack of formal education or illiteracy
- ii. Lack of foreign language skills
- iii. Different ways of dealing with hygiene, litter, maintenance of infrastructure and buildings
- iv. Limited knowledge of food preparation for foreigners, including catering to dietary, nutritional and culinary tastes
- v. Lack of decision making and planning skills concerning the possible consequences of tourism, coupled with limited ability to control tourism development, unpredictable political climates, and long-term funding uncertainty (Bushell & Eagles, 2007, p. 154).

Attempts to measure barriers of community capacity building in types of tourism activities raise concerns about the relationship between dimensions of community capacity building and tourism development processes.

Anova also is an appropriate statistics tool for comparing two or more independent groups on the central tendency (Morgan et al., 2001). In this study, it was used to compare the sample means for each independent group. When Anova test results indicated that the independent groups were significantly different, Post Hoc tests (Tukey HSD test) were performed. According to Morgan et al. (2001) Tukey HSD is a common Post Hoc test to use when the variances are equal (Aref & Ma'rof, 2009b). Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS 17) was used to process and analyze the quantitative data. The pre-testing of instrument was carried out prior to the actual data collection to examine the appropriateness and reliability of the instrument. Hence 32 convenient samples were chosen to conduct the pre-testing. The results indicated the sufficiently and factor ability of statements. It also showed satisfactory internal consistency of the manifest items measuring level of community capacity building. In order to determine the reliability of the instrument, the Cronbach Alpha was tested on each dimension of community capacity building. According to Garson (2009), the dimensions should have a Cronbach alpha of at least .70 to establish reliability of the constructs. Base on the reliability alpha values in this study the instruments has reliability with

[editor@americanscience.org](mailto:editor@americanscience.org)

Cronbach's alpha values (between .0.74 and .93)(Aref et al., 2009).

**4. Results and Discussions**

Respondents in survey of the study were community leaders. Out of 175 questionnaires distributed among the community leaders in whole Shiraz. The respondents illustrated handicraft activities with 34.90%, nature 10.3%, cultural activities 41.7%, business activities 10.9% and medical services 2.3% (Table 1). As earlier it

illustrated Shiraz has many cultural tourism attraction and so it known as a cultural tourism destination and recently it be medical tourism destination. According to Table 1 most of local communities in Shiraz have activates around the cultural activities and this because of many cultural attraction in Shiraz.

**Table 1: Frequency of Types of Tourism Activities (N=175)**

Tourism status	Category	Frequency	Percent
<b>Types of tourism activities</b>	Handicrafts	61	34.9%
	Nature	18	10.3%
	Culture	73	41.7%
	Business	19	10.9%
	Medical service	4	2.3 %
	Total	175	100%

Table 2 shows barriers of community capacity building according to types of tourism activities in the community. The result show that the barriers of community capacity building in communities that tourism activity is base on handicraft (Mean=

136.93) is higher than other types of tourism activity. According to this table medical service has fewer barriers compare to other communities activities.

**Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations of Barriers of Community Capacity Building to Types of Tourism Activities**

	N	M	SD	SE
<b>Handicrafts</b>	61	136.93	17.527	2.224
<b>Nature</b>	18	130.94	16.882	3.979
<b>Cultural</b>	73	122.86	19.286	2.257
<b>Business</b>	19	131.89	20.864	4.787
<b>Medical services</b>	4	118.25	14.863	7.432
<b>Total</b>	174	129.47	19.445	1.470

A one-way Anova was used to test for preference differences barriers of community capacity building in among different types of tourism activities. Preferences for barriers of community capacity building differed significantly across the types of tourism,  $F(4, 170) = 5.255, p = .001$ . According to table 3 the F ratio with a F-probability value less than .05 It is significant,

suggesting that the type of tourism activity significantly influences barriers of community capacity building in tourism development  $F(4,170)=5.255, p<.05$ . According to Table 3 there were significant differences between barriers of community capacity building and types of tourism activities at the  $p < .05$  level ( $F = 5.255, p = .001$ ).

**Table 3: One Way Anova of Barriers of Community Capacity Building According to Types of Tourism Activities**

	SS	df	MS	F	P
<b>Between Groups</b>	7239.783	4	180946	5.255	.001
<b>Within Groups</b>	58549.852	170	344.411		
<b>Total</b>	65789.634	174			

Post Hoc tests were performed to examine where the difference existed in the types of tourism activities. Due to the unequal group sizes among the types of tourism activities, the Games Howell modification of Tukey's HSD Post Hoc test was used. The analysis revealed handicraft activates was more likely to bring some barriers for community capacity building in tourism development. Post Hoc tests (Tukey) result indicates that there is a significant difference between the different types of tourism activities.

Results show a significant difference between handicraft and culture at .000. However there is no significant difference between handicraft with nature, business and medical services. Results indicated nature doesn't significant difference with other its groups. It also illustrated culture has significant difference with handicraft at .000. Post Hoc Test also indicates that there are no significant differences between business activities and medical services with their groups.

**Table 4: Post Hoc Testes (Tukey) of Barriers of Community Capacity Building According to Types of Tourism Activities**

		Mean Difference	SE	Sig.
<b>Handicraft</b>	Nature	5.990	4.978	.749
	Culture	14.071*	3.219	.000
	Business	5.040	4.876	.839
	Medical Services	18.684	9.579	.295
<b>Nature</b>	Handicraft	-5.990	4.978	.749
	Culture	8.081	4.884	.465
	Business	-.950	6.104	1.000
	Medical Services	12.694	10.258	.729
<b>Culture</b>	Handicraft	-14.071*	3.219	.000
	Nature	-8.081	4.884	.465
	Business	-9.032	4.780	.327
	Medical Services	4.613	9.530	.989
<b>Business</b>	Handicraft	-5.040	4.876	.839
	Nature	.950	6.104	1.000
	Culture	9.032	4.780	.327
	Medical Services	13.645	10.209	.669
<b>Medical Services</b>	Handicraft	-18.684	9.579	.295
	Nature	-12.694	10.258	.729
	Culture	-4.613	9.530	.989
	Business	-13.645	10.209	.669

Handicraft activities, as a traditional industry still found in most local communities in Shiraz; But the findings show handicraft activities has most weakness and lack of community capacity building in tourism development.

Through FGD it was also realized that the people engaged in handicraft productions like to change their activities. They said the government didn't support them about marketing their production, they referred to some problems. They said before the Islamic revolution their activities was important but toady they cannot develop their activities. However local communities of Shiraz has many potential for develop this types activities of tourism but the local people were apathy for continue this activity. The local people are unable to protect their traditional production and government also is neglecting to protect these activities and keep them for local people activates (Ivanovic, 2009).

Through FGD majority of participants in communities with handicraft activities stated that government is neglecting to support handicraft traditional and provide marketing in this traditional industry. Local communities engaged in this activity also have little awareness of tourism and little control or access on tourism (Butler & Hinch, 2007). The result also showed cultural activities has fewer barriers in terms of tourism development. This findings is consist with Butler & Hinch (2007) that they believed, However there are diversity of tourism activities in Iran, but cultural tourism activates is very important to Iranian tourism activities (Butler & Hinch, 2007). They also believed however there is a lack of data on characteristic and volume tourism: but most domestic tourism is generated in cultural and pilgrimage site such as Shiraz (Butler & Hinch, 2007).



## 5. Conclusion

This paper investigated barriers of community capacity building for tourism development according to types of tourism activities. To test the difference, One-way Anova was performed. To test differences between barriers of community capacity building based on types of tourism activities, One-way Anova was performed. The result shows that the barriers of community capacity building in communities that tourism activity is based on handicraft (M= 136.93) is higher than other types of tourism activity. According to the results, medical services have fewer barriers in comparison to other tourism

activities. One-way Anova showed barriers of community capacity building is significantly different according to the type of tourism activity  $F(4,170) = 5.255, p < .05$ . In support of these findings FGD was performed. The findings of this study have both theoretical and applied implications in the tourism industry. It is expected that the findings of this study could be utilized by the community leaders and tourism developers for future follow-up studies and reassessment of community capacity building for tourism development in their communities.

## References

- [1] Anderson, D., MacLellan-Wright, M., & Barber, S. (2007). *Analysing Data Collected from the Community Capacity Building Tool: A Manual for Users*: Public Health Agency of Canada.
- [2] Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. (2009a). Community Leaders' Characteristics and their Effort in Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development in Local Communities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(10).
- [3] Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. (2009b). Level of Community Capacity Building for Tourism Development According to Types of Tourism Activities. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, 5.
- [4] Aref, F., Ma'rof, R., & Sarjit, S. G. (2009). Community Perceptions toward Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tourism on Local Communities. *Asian Social Science*, 5(7), 130-137.
- [5] 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
- [6] Bushell, R., & Eagles, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Tourism and Protected Areas: Benefits Beyond Boundaries*. London CAB International, UK.
- [7] Butler, R., & Hinch, T. (Eds.). (2007). *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples: Issues and Implications*: Elsevier /Butterworth-Heinemann.
- [8] 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](http://www.nt.gov.au/cdsca/indigenous_conference/web/html/Darryl_Cronin_powerpoint.ppt)
- [9] Dong-Wan, K., & William, P. S. (2002). A structural equation model of resident's attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 521-530.
- [10] Ebbesen, L. S., Heath, S., Naylor, P., & Anderson, D. (2004). Issues in Measuring Health Promotion Capacity in Canada: a multi-province perspective. *Health Promotion International*, 19(1), 85-94.
- [11] Eyler, A., Mayer, J., Rafi, R., Housemann, R., Brownson, C., & King, C. (1999). Key informant surveys as a tool to implement and evaluate physical activity interventions in the community. *Health Education Research*, 14(2), 289.
- [12] Galston, W. A., & Baehler, K. J. (1995). *Rural development in the United States: Connecting theory, practice, and possibilities*. Washington, D.C: Island Press
- [13] Garson, D. (2009). Structural Equation Modeling. Retrieved 12, May, 2009, from <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/structur.htm#output>
- [14] Grover, R., & Vriens, M. (2006). *The handbook of marketing research: uses, misuses, and future advances*: Sage Publications.
- [15] Harrill, R., & Potts, T. (2003). Tourism planning in historic districts: Attitudes toward tourism development in Charleston. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), 233.
- [16] 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](http://www.anu.edu.au/caepr/Publications/DP/2005_DP278.pdf)
- [17] Ivanovic, M. (2009). *Cultural Tourism*. USA: Juta and Company Limited.
- [18] Kleiner, B., Raue, K., Silverstein, G., Bell, R., & Wells, J. (2004). Evaluation of The Appalachian Regional Commission's Community Capacity-Building Projects. [editor@americanscience.org](mailto:editor@americanscience.org)

- Washington, DC: Appalachian Regional Commission.
- [19] Maddox, R. N. (1985). Measuring satisfaction with tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(3), 2-5.
- [20] McGinty, S. (2003). The literature and theories behind community capacity building. In S. McGinty (Ed.), *Sharing success: An Indigenous perspective*: Altona: Common Ground.
- [21] Mill, R., & Morrison, A. (2002). *The tourism system: An introductory text* (4 ed.). Dubuque Kendall/Hunt.
- [22] Mills, R. C. (2005). Sustainable community change: A new paradigm for leadership in community revitalization efforts. *National Civic Review*, 94, 9-16.
- [23] Morgan, G. A., Griego, O. V., & Gloeckner, G. W. (2001). *SPSS for Windows: an introduction to use and interpretation in research* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [24] Moscardo, G. (Ed.). (2008). *Building community capacity for tourism development*. Australia.
- [25] Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2003). *Tourism and Sustainability. Development and New Tourism in the Third World*. London, UK: Routledge Publishing.
- [26] Riley, R. W. (1996). Revealing socially constructed knowledge through quasi-structured interviews and grounded theory analysis. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 5(1/2), 21-39.
- [27] Sharma, K. k. (2004). *Tourism And Socio-cultural Development*. New Delhi: Sarup and Sons
- [28] Social Policy Unit. (2004). *Indicative inventory of Capacity building services for the Not-For-Profit Sector*: Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Government of Western Australia.
- [29] Steven , D., & Jennifer, T. (2002). Challenges and Barriers to Community Participation in Policy Development. Retrieved 17, April, 2008, from <http://www.ruralnovascotia.ca/documents/policy/challenges%20and%20barriers.pdf>
- [30] Thompson, B., Lichtenstein, E., Corbett, K., Nettekoven, L., & Feng, Z. (2000). Durability of tobacco control efforts in the 22 community Intervention trial for smoking cessation (COMMIT) communities 2 years after the end of intervention. *Health Education Research*, 15(3), 353-366.
- [31] Von Kroff, M., Wickizer, T., Maeser, J., O'Leary, P., Pearson, D., & Beery, W. (1992). Community activation and health promotion: identification of key organizations. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 7, 110-117.
- [32] Wall, G., & Mathieson, A. (2006). *Tourism, Change, Impacts, and Opportunities*. Essex,England: Pearson.

15/September/ 2009