



The Collaboration of Tourism in Rural Sustainability (Case Study: Gelan Rural Region, Amol County)

Reihaneh Soltani Moqadas^{*1} - Mostafa Taleshi²

1- Assistant Prof. in Geography and Rural Planning, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

2- Full Prof. in Geography and Rural Planning, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 27 August 2019

Accepted: 26 July 2020

Abstract

Purpose- Rural areas experience various economic and social tensions such as population instability and limited job opportunities, which place villages at risk. Rural tourism can improve the economic activities that increase the population and improve the economy because tourism transforms a fragile economy with dynamic activities that enable the establishment of service enterprises and bring about entrepreneurship opportunities. This study aimed to model the multilateral effects of tourism on rural sustainability.

Design/methodology/approach- This research applied the theoretical-pragmatic approach. Data were collected using library and field studies. Field studies are a prominent element in the analysis of results. In this course, the systematic questionnaire was used for the extraction of the field database. Using the Cochran formula, the sample size was estimated 214 people. Furthermore, the interrelationship Structural Equation Model (SEM) was applied to analyze the networks of variations. Also, path analysis and partial least squares regression model was adopted to model the interrelationship between the variables observing the systematic nature of the sustainability approach.

Findings- Tourism is an accelerating tool in rural permanency. It stimulates the stability of the population, cultural similarities, and promotion of rural culture, which subsequently establish rural sustainability. On the other hand, as land use change is acknowledged as one of the unfavorable consequences of tourism, support for the environmental aspect is mentioned as a necessary factor for sustainability. Tourists should also recognize the eminent function of the environment in rural settlements to ensure that promoting the entire aspect of sustainability results in rural stabilization.

Practical implications- Specifically, tourism develops social solidarity through the formation of micro-businesses and particular rural entrepreneurship that directly and indirectly contribute to the expansion of job creation in rural settlements. Also, these mechanisms are involved in producing local capital that strengthens sustainable rural income and livelihood. On the other hand, tourism highlights the significance of the environment, and its protection is essential to the rural sustainability.

Key words- Rural tourism, Rural sustainability, Economic diversification, Entrepreneurship, Environmental protection, Land use change.

Paper type- Scientific & Research.

Use your device to scan and read the article online



How to cite this article:

Soltani Moqadas, R. & Taleshi, M. (2020). The collaboration of tourism in rural sustainability (Case study: Gelan rural region, Amol County). *Journal of Research & Rural Planning*, 9(3), 1-14.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.22067/jrpp.v9i4.82609>

* Corresponding Author:

Soltani Moqadas, Reihaneh, Ph.D.

Address: Department of Geography, Faculty of Social Sciences, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran.

Tel: +98915 156 4790

E-mail: r.soltani@pnu.ac.ir

1. Introduction

Rural tourism is extensively advocated as an antecedent of rural sustainability (RS) (Björstig & Sandstrom, 2017). Similarly, tourism stimulants can widely motivate economic functions to enrich rural economy and enhance new employments. Tourism also enhances rural life satisfaction and increases social improvements necessary for sustainability (Truong, Hall, & Garry, 2014; Huang et al., 2016). Many studies have stipulated that rural tourism can empower rural residents and act as a catalyst for sustainable development (SD) (Sharpley & Telfer, 2015; Hashemi & Ghaffary, 2017; Shahipour & Mojtazadeh, 2016). Until recently, rural settlements have faced many challenges such as limited job opportunities and lack of income, which caused extensive migration. These issues also have created an imbalance in the regional and consequently national levels. Thus, sustaining villages by tourism-based implementations is widely justified as an enhancing policy to overcome rural problems.

The concept of sustainability has received growing attention in the literature on tourism because of growing evidence proving that RS can be a positive effect of tourism. Therefore, the importance of RS can be considered from several aspects. First, RS stimulates the social and economic development of villages and protects the environment (Toumi, Le Gallo & Ben Rejeb, 2017; Kim, Uysal, & Sirgy, 2013; Torres-Delgado & Palomeque, 2014; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). Second, tourism contributed to a new scheme of development in which fundamental changes in rural regions can contribute to the sustainability process. Third, rural sustainability and urban sustainable development are directly related as the root of major problems in large cities can be traced back to rural migration. Hence, reducing these migrations can establish a balance between urban and rural areas (Chi, Cai, & Li, 2017). In this regards, Environmental conservation, energy saving and consideration to ecosystem are effective factors for sustainability of a landscape (Hoseini, Tavakoli, Pourtaheri & Eftekhari, 2019).

The most important goal of sustainable tourism is to support local economies by supporting direct and supplementary revenues, which have multiple impacts on rural economies. Traditionally, studies have generally examined the economic effects of tourism and sustainable rural development (Andreeski, 2000; Dwyer, Forsyth & Spurr, 2004; Ohlan, 2017; Hashemi

& Ghaffary, 2017). However, previous studies have failed to investigate the role of rural tourism in RS based on the principles of sustainable development theory. Considering this literature gap, the present study explores the role of tourism in solving rural problems, and described a high level of sustainability in rural settlements.

This study also makes three main contributions to the literature on tourism and RS. First, the work advances rural tourism studies by measuring sustainability considering the mediating roles of social, economic, and environmental facets. Based on sustainable development theory, the present research examines the benefits and expenses of social, environmental, and economic dimensions of tourism growth on RS. Second, the effective role of each sustainability dimension is accurately emphasized. Most studies have discussed sustainable development as a single concept, thereby neglecting the role of effective constituents that negate it (Almeida-Garcia, 2016; Rasoolimanesh, Jaafar, Kock & Ahmad, 2017). This study is one of the few that investigates diverse tourism impacts.

Third, this research evaluates the impact of rural tourism from the perspective of rural residents. The benefits of rural tourism to local residents is a function of sustained achievement, and the researcher aims to evaluate these variables from the perspective of residents.

This study is motivated by sustainable development theory and tourism impacts. Thus, this study aims to assess the effect of economic reinvigoration on rural sustainability and to evaluate social improvement in stabilizing rural settlements. Furthermore, this review focuses on how tourism conserves environmental quality in rural settlements relative to the importance of environmental attitude.

The literature review highlights the strength of each aspect of sustainability as an activator of development. Some social, economic, and environmental variations are performed to estimate the logical relationships. Whether or not sustainability of the rural community is still considered a noteworthy issue has yet to be fully discussed. In this regard, the aim of this study is evaluating the positive and negative impacts of tourism on rural sustainability in accordance with the main question of the research: how does tourism collaborate in rural sustainability?

And the minor questions are the following:

- How is the strengthening of the rural economy via tourism effective in shaping rural sustainability?

- How has the reconstruction of social solidarity and rural population stabilization through rural tourism been effective in institutionalizing rural sustainability?
- Has tourism been able to play a role in rural sustainability in terms of environmental protection?

2. Research Theoretical Literature

Sustaining the rural settlements in economic shock situations is propounded a substantial affair in planning process. In this regard, rural tourism is acknowledged as a catalyst in rural restructuring and partnership in sustainable making (Gao & Cheng, 2020; Pilving, Kull, Suskevis & Viira, 2019). As worldwide recession of rural areas influences the national and global economies and causes negative population mobility to cities (Anthopoulou, Kaberis & Petrou, 2017; Liu & Xu, 2016; Gray & Mueller, 2012). Rural tourism can promote the diversification of the rural economy that nurtures rural enterprises that have essential role in sustainability (Gao & Wu, 2017; Steiner & Atterton, 2015). In this case, the concept of sustainability examines the relationship among economic development, environmental quality, and social impartiality. Hence, sustainability is the term used to fill the gap between development and environment, and its goal is to exert all aspects of development simultaneously (Rogers, Jalal, & Boyd, 2008). In addition, Strong (1995) stated that the shift to sustainability denotes extensive and profound changes in social, economic, institutional, and technological environments. So, sustainability leads to the growth of the economy, society, and environment. Also, incorporating rurality into tourism is a relatively efficient global development path. Therefore, sustainability as a multi-faceted concept is considered the most important target of rural planning. In this regard, the planners proved that rural tourism entails economic income and jobs by minimizing the population loss in rural regions (Flisher & Felsenstein, 2000; Palmisano et al., 2016). There are some approaches to sustainability are as follows. Integrative approach: Pierre Bourdieu, Neil Fligstein, Paul Dimaggio and Louis Wazquant have suggested a new analytical frame work for sustainability from integrating knowledge across the interactions of environment and social elements (Olsson & Jerneck, 2018).

Multifunctionality approach: It is a holistic framing to realize the linkages between socio-environmental and economic benefits from framing operations and

the demands of local societies (Marsden & Sonnio, 2008). This approach considers the whole functions of elements with network attitude.

Literature review on rural sustainability clarifies that following dimensions play crucial functions in the efficacy of tourism in rural sustainability:

1. Economic dimension: Rural income is low in poor countries, and thus, economic growth is an essential aspect of rural development. As rural tourism leads to market-led growth, economic benefits trickle down to villages (Shepherd, 1998). In their survey in Hongdong, Kim and Jamal (2015) found that tourism through small-scale enterprises contributed to RS. Carneiro, Lima and Silva (2015) also affirmed that two Portuguese villages produced a local economy based on tourist services that were expanded to adjust with nature. This process helped achieve SD and generated major economic leakages through transnational involvement (Pratt, 2015). Similarly, the most important aspect of sustainability is an economic dimension (ECD), which is vital in sustainable livelihood and job creation (Jaafar, Rasoolimanesh, & Tuan Lonik, 2017).

In this course, the use of local and indigenous capabilities can play a significant role in strengthening the rural economy (Fatemi, Rezaei, Motiee Langrodi, Faraji Sabokbar & Darban Astaneh, 2019). The third generation of tourism can operationalize sustainable rural development by laying the foundation for a local creative economy such as products, processes, creative people, and spatial branding (Einalli, Mohammadi Yeganeh & Ghasemlou, 2019). On the other hand, according to Ghorbanzadeh and Niloufar (2019) tourism can contribute to the development of the rural economy by expanding trans-regional relations between the city and rural centers by transferring added value and capital from urban centers to rural areas.

2. Social dimension: Tourism brings social benefits and supports rural social stability (Altinay, Sigala & Waligo, 2016; Zhou, Chan & Song, 2017). In this case, tourism produces social infrastructures that promote population stability in terms of cultural similarities and social solidarity. However, tourism also has negative social-cultural effects such as social deviations, crimes, and social anomalies. Additionally, cultural mixing threatens local traditional culture (Howell, 2017). Kim et al. (2013) also found that the positive cultural impact of tourism influences rural well-being and social improvement. Social dimension (SOD) is calculated based on life satisfaction, place attachment, and rural

culture promotion. Thus, populatin stability is the most effective aspects of social sustainability because of job opportunities of tourism.

3. Environmental dimension: Although tourism has economic and social benefits for host societies along with a modified quality of life, it also unavoidably varies rural natural prospects (Oliver & Jenkins, 2003). Tourism noticeably destroys local ecosystems, which is one of the most important conflicts in the tourism industry. According to Rebollo and Baidal (2009), the vernacular tourist order in the Torrevieja region in Spain inverts faint sustainability, wherein a kind of economic progress that allows the decline and utilization of natural resources is asserted. However, tourism development negatively affects the environment (Zhang, 2016;

Alipour & Kilic, 2005), which emphasizes the demand for environmental conservation to limit environmental devastation (Mc Kercher, 1993; Coria & Calfucura, 2012). The amount of waste, vegetation demolition, water resource pollution, and agricultural land conversion to residential areas and second homes are variables for environmental dimension (ED) evaluation. Although many studies have been conducted on the effects of tourism, few research has been done on the role of tourism in realizing the dimensions of sustainability in all aspects. This study focuses on the sustainability of rural settlements and examines the role of tourism. Therefore, in the research background, indicators effective on the subject are derived are presented from other studies (Table 1.).

Table 1. Previous Research on the role of tourism in rural sustainability

Researchers	Findings
Kim and Jamal(2015)	Tourism can shape small and local enterprises that promotes the economic value of rural settlements.
Saberi & Ghedamini (2018)	Tourism is considered effective element in reducing migration, increasing employment, market prosperity and the development of handicrafts and workshops.
Safari Alamoti & Shams (2020)	Tourism has proved effective in increasing income, reducing migration, increasing economic activities, and diversifying the rural economy in the village of Ovan in Qazvin. As a result, the villagers have started to earn money from tourism by creating small shops, handicrafts, and accommodation facilities.
Dehghani & Adeli Sardoei(2018)	Studying the target rural settlements for tourism in Jiroft city revealed that tourism has played an effective role in increasing social solidarity and contribution.
Karami Benmaran, Khosravipour, Ghanian & Baradaran, (2014)	In their study of the villages of Kan county of Tehran city, found that the establishment of small local tourism-related enterprises is effective in strengthening sustainable rural development
Guaita Martinez, Martin Martin & Salinas Fernandez (2019)	Among the advantages of tourism in rural areas of Spain include, the expansion of jobs and job markets in rural areas that attracts the workforce and provides rural job opportunities on a seasonal basis.
Park, lee, K., Choi & Yoon (2012)	The strength of cultural similarities in rural settlements influences the capability of local residents to direct the tourism results and shape extents of growth in villages of south Korea.
Randelli & Martellozo (2019)	Rural tourism in villages of Tuscany converts the agriculutral lands to new built area that affects the land conservation.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Geographical Scope of the Research

The review was conducted in one of the rural regions of Amol in the Gelan rural region, which is famous for its serene landscapes and natural capabilities. Four important tourist rural settlements were chosen, including Gelan, Vilisdeh, and Kokedeh situated in the Paieen Khiaban Litkoh district in the central sector of Amol county, and Noabad located in the Daboy district of the Dabodasht sector (Figure 1). Amol is located in north of Iran, one of the most attractive marine regions in tourism. This area is located in the southern part of the Caspian Sea, where most people travel from

around the country. Geographically, the weather in this region and its special marine climate is distinct from those of other regions in the country and is known as the mild Caspian climate. This climate is comparable to that of the Mediterranean climate because of the Mediterranean clouds pass and constant rain (Alijani, 2013). Tourism has increased in this region because of pleasant weather conditions and unique green places (Asgari, 2016). Various plant species formed diverse forest ecosystems (Iran Forests Organization, 2000). The region has various tourism services that locals has created and used to develop tourism. A wide range of activities is offered, including natural adventures involving rivers, jungles, and mountains. Moreover,

various ethnicities, tribes, and cultures exist in this region, which led to the creation of local rituals, foods, and ceremonies in the rural areas that attract tourists. Therefore, tourist attractions are naturally, culturally, and economically diverse. Having various villages with natural and economic capabilities, this region provides the ground for different agricultural activities (Jafari, 2013) which are unique for the tourist attraction industry. Some of the residents of Tehran have bought

second homes in this region because of its proximity to the city. The advantage of this region over other areas is its proximity to the capital, Tehran, and the ease for its citizens to go there at the end of the week. Air pollution in large cities endangered people's lives, and this rural area is an alternative residence for citizens of big cities. The possibilities of rural tourism in rural stabilization were reviewed in this study.




Figure 1. Geographical position of Gelan rural region.

3.2. Indicators and Dimensions

Although most studies consider tourism as a form of economic incentive, tourism also stimulates various aspects of SD and sustainability. Thus, the US National Academy of Sciences identified three major categories of SD that should be developed to realize sustainability such as environment, economy, and society. Therefore, sustainability is based on the evident discrepancies among economic, social, and environmental conditions in different regions worldwide (Rabie, 2016; Bell & Morse, 2003; Ko, 2005), since one of the major goals of SD is to prioritize people's needs. The Brundtland Commission also described SD as a model with environmental and developmental dimensions. This model is defined as a Triple Bottom Line model because SD consists of and incorporates environmental, economic, and social

dimensions (Klopp, 2017). In addition, SD addresses a pivotal topic in rural regions given the intricate interplays among natural resources, agricultural generations, and native communities (Pa'sakarnis et al., 2013). Policymakers planned and elevated these ideas within the European Union's (EU) rural development policies. Specifically, the EU Rural Development Policy aids EU rural areas (European Commission, 2013). According to a literature review (table 1), the pillars of RS are economic, social, and environmental dimensions.

3.3. Data Collection

The present study was conducted by considering the different dimensions of RS. The reviewed data were gathered according to the research goals through library and field studies. To employ a holistic approach, the integration among dimensions was also

considered. Several questions were raised to measure the research variables on a Likert scale to evaluate them based on local and geographical aspects and sustainability dimensions. The field studies were conducted in four villages with different specialities in terms of the benefits of tourism. The questionnaire elicited the benefits of rural tourism and the effective role of tourism in rural development. The population of the sample villages was 2,047 individuals, which based on the modified Cochran's formula, the sufficient sample size for the survey was estimated at 214 participants. One theoretical sampling strategy was performed. Various groups from different ages (young, old, men, and women) were selected; income level, job, and education level data were collected, and purposive sampling was employed. The composite reliability (CR) of each index was estimated by Cronbach's alpha model to evaluate the internal consistency of the variations. Results showed that all indexes were within the acceptable range (Table 1). The reliability for each construct invades the recommended level of 0.7. In this test, economic dimension, environmental dimension, social dimension, positive impacts, negative impacts, and rural sustainability was estimated at 0.93, 0.74, 0.81, 0.86, 0.76, and 0.82 (Table 2).

3.4. Data Analysis

Data gathered from the questionnaire were analyzed based on the structural equation model with Partial Least Squares Regression Model (PLS-SEM) to diagnose the interrelationships of variables. This model enables researchers to simultaneously examine a series of interrelated dependence relationships between a set of constructs represented by several variables (e.g., scales), while accounting for measurement error. SEM's ability to simultaneously test relationships incorporated into an integrated model contributed to its widespread application. Furthermore, PLS-SEM is advantageous when used on small sample sizes. Compared with regression, SEM model can calculate all existing relationships. Thus, data were coded and organized according to dimensions of social, economic, and environmental effects on RS compatible with the literature review. The literature has clarified that tourism opportunities could lead to efficient development, such as entrepreneurship.

4. Research Findings

4.1. Sample Profile

The number of participants was determined by the percentage of males and females. According to the descriptive analysis, 60% of respondents are male and 52% are female. Respondents were classified into five age categories: 20–30 (16%), 30–40 (33%), 40–50 (29%), 50–60 (17%), and 60 years (5%). Nearly half of the participants earn average income. Half of the participants have diploma and most of the respondents are farmers (57%).

4.2. Measurement Model

The consistency and reliability, as well as convergent and discriminant validity of construct items were evaluated. In Table 2, all cross loading items are above the standard level of 0.7 to their relative constructs. The lowest loading value is 0.786 for a segment measuring SOD (the data confirmed the consistency and reliability of all measurement items). The average variance extracted (AVE) values for each construct are above the recommended level of 0.5 (Hair et al., 2011). The lowest AVE value is 0.680 for positive impact. Therefore, the convergent validity of the measures was considered. To evaluate discriminant validity, the extent to which the construct and measure was observationally discrete from those of other constructs was examined. So, cross loadings and square roots of the AVE is presented in Table 2. All item loadings on their respective construct were greater than their loadings on other constructs, and the square roots of the AVEs exceeded the correlations between every pair of latent variables. Thus, discriminant validity is confirmed. On the other hand, the composite reliability of convergent validity, which should be higher than the AVE for each factor ($CR > AVE$). The comparison presented in Table 2 affirms that the CR for all latent variables is higher than the AVE, and the convergent validity is in place.

Table 2. Assessment results of the measurement model
(Source: Research finding, 2020)

Index	Variations	Economic Dimension	Environmental Dimension	Social Dimension	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Rural Sustainability
	CR	.93	.74	.81	.86	.76	.82
	AVE	.770	.737	.706	.681	.718	.804
Economic Dimension (ECD)	Job opportunity	.874	-.734	.753	.735	-.719	.520
	Construction jobs	.878	-.652	.653	.693	-.711	.762
	Service jobs	.877	-.738	.700	.714	-.768	.785
	Entrepreneurship	.891	-.744	.755	.675	-.755	.529
Environmental Dimension (ED)	Vegetation protection	-.714	.846	-.713	-.648	.663	-.735
	Soil protection	-.738	.819	-.677	-.687	.670	.730
	Water resources protection	-.728	.890	-.738	-.734	.722	-.715
	Protection of agricultural lands	-.717	.866	-.709	-.647	.721	-.746
Social Dimension (SOD)	Youth migration	-.722	.869	-.720	-.687	.746	-.678
	Social solidarity	.606	-.688	.786	.559	-.574	.695
	Cultural similarities	.686	-.735	.892	.726	-.690	.763
	Promotion of rural culture	.692	-.689	.877	.680	-.653	.751
Positive Impacts (PI)	Income increase	.693	-.674	.801	.688	-.705	.612
	Entrepreneurship	.694	-.641	.719	.826	-.666	.651
	Land price increase	.538	-.604	.586	.821	-.622	.578
Negative Impacts (NI)	Nature destruction	.656	-.709	.647	.829	-.656	.661
	Agricultural production reduction	-.737	.668	-.631	-.754	.873	-.703
	Social anomalies increase	-.750	.735	-.722	-.709	.893	-.781
Rural Sustainability (RS)	Population stability	-.769	.793	-.741	-.766	.914	-.814
	Economic improvement	.779	-.766	.608	.773	-.721	.893
	Rural environmental conservation	.635	-.790	.404	.407	-.788	.898
	Physical improvement	.641	-.756	.728	.717	-.402	.899

Also, according to the statistical analysis in Table 3, the impact of ECD on RS at 0.792 is positive. In Vilisdeh village, numerous shops and restaurants that create jobs for rural residents can improve the income levels of residents. These shops offer local fruits, vegetables, and simple food for tourists, which help locals diversify their activities and increase value added through tourist demands. Furthermore, the increase of land price enables

residents to gain money from selling land to urban residents. Gelan and Kokedeh have the most second homes in the region and offer high land prices. Residents of Tehran go to these villages on holidays to enjoy natural landscapes and escape their hometown's air pollution and congestion. Thus, the economic situation in tourist villages became more favorable than that of other villages that do not encompass many tourist attractions.

Another effective aspect of sustainability is ED, which encompasses the prevailing feature of sustainability and SD. Environmentally, tourism has a negative effect on the regional sustainability. The effect of ED on RS is -0.751, which shows that tourism harms the rural environment. Some

tourists do not observe environmental protection rules and pollute the rural environment. Tourists do not throw their garbage properly, which causes natural demolition. In addition, various natural landscapes and rice cultivation lands were also transformed into second homes.

Table 3. Discriminant validity
(Source: Research finding, 2020)

constructs	Economic Dimension	Environmental Dimension	Social Dimension	Positive Impacts	Negative Impacts	Rural Sustainability
Economic Dimension	.826					
Environmental Dimension	-.771	.869				
Social Dimension	.695	-.723	.848			
Positive Impacts	.601	-.626	.622	.824		
Negative Impacts	-.698	.634	-.621	-.677	.891	
Rural Sustainability	.792	-.751	.749	.671	-.690	.892

Based on a theoretical review, SOD includes another debate on sustainability. In the Gelan region, tourism boosts social variables such as population stabilization and social solidarity. The population of the Gelan region remained unchanged for 10 years, whereas other villages experienced intense depopulation. The effect of SOD on sustainability is 0.749. The data show that tourism can increase the sense of place attachment in Gelan villages, because the economic advantages of tourism facilitate the effectiveness of SOD. The effect of ECD on SOD is 0.690, which shows that economic elements can positively influence social affairs. The analysis also suggests that the square root of a structure should be higher than its correlation with other structures. This finding indicates that the related structure is better than other structures, thereby confirming the results of this review.

Finally, the theoretical basis suggests the need for sustainable villages to become an important target.

However, absolute and complete sustainability is actually a relative concept. Thus, some sustainability aspects are realized, whereas others are unsustainable.

4.3. Structural Model

The result of the structural model is demonstrated in Table 4, which shows that all path coefficients are significant. The R2 values for positive impacts, negative impacts, and sustainability were 72%, 76%, and 90%, respectively. Findings show that the economic advantages of tourism positively affected RS ($\beta=0.377$, $p<0.001$). The ED negatively affect on RS ($\beta=-1.38$, $p< 0.01$). In addition, the SOD positively influenced RS ($\beta=-0.210$, $p<0.01$). Thus, the positive influence of rural tourism on RS was confirmed ($\beta= 0.169$, $p<0.01$). Therefore, tourism can efficiently create rural sustainability.

Table 4. Results of tourism impacts testing

(Source: Research finding, 2020)

Index	Positive impacts (R2=.723)		negative impacts (R2=.758)		sustainability (R2=.900)	
	β	t	β	t	β	t
Economic Dimension	.371	3.011	-.467	4.471	.389	5.688
Environmental Dimension	-.285	2.647	.346	3.274	-.138	2.364
Social Dimension	.284	2.546	-.125	1.417	.210	2.674
Positive impacts	-	-	-	-	.169	2.916
Negative impacts	-	-	-	-	-.092	1.707

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This study evaluated the effects of tourism on RS. Based on the literature review, the dimensions of RS are linked to survey indices. Sustainable development theory was adopted for analyzing RS which included social, economic, and environmental aspects and were utilized to synthesize the indicators in the PLS. The findings empirically examined the factors influencing three different sustainability dimensions in villages that practice tourism. The results indicated that the ECD of RS positively affect RS. This finding was in line with several previous studies that reported a remarkable effect of rural tourism (Dogru & Bulut, 2018). So, villages with increased activities and tourist satisfaction aspired increased involvement in sustainability, indicating a focus on the importance of residents' participation in the rural economy. Liu, Nijkamp, and Lin (2017) also examined tourism as an alternative channel of sales and marketing which facilitates the development of agricultural commodities in the destination area, diversifies agricultural products, and helps develop a much more diversified product pattern with a high value added in rural areas. Thus, the impact of the ECD on sustainability proved that a tourism-driven rural economy system is more efficient and may link tourism development and economic growth. This finding is in line with that of Prat (2015) for Jamaica. Hence, in many tourism villages, constructing second homes increases land value for residents to gain profit and economic diversification to invigorate the economic structure. The result also emphasizes the need for more reliable tourism development strategies to be executed by the government to maximize the potential of tourism for promoting economic growth (Ohlan, 2017).

Moreover, the SOD findings revealed that tourism has an efficient role in the social improvement of villages, leading to RS. Accordingly, the encouraging function of tourism on population stability is a social benefit for rural regions. This finding is in line with the results of Deery, Jago, and Fredline (2017), indicating that tourism results in effective social influences such as life satisfaction (Wang, 2017), place attachment development, and rural culture (Strzelecka, Boley, & Woosnam, 2017). Although the environment was considered as an important basis for this debate, the results showed conflicting effects for this RS dimension. Environmental consequences of tourism negatively affected RS. Natural land use as residential areas posed a challenge. This finding is in line with former studies (e.g., Farstad & Rye, 2013; Jeong et al., 2014). The devastation of natural tourism attractions also threatened the environment and tourism sectors. Tourists are unaware of the importance of the natural landscape and significantly harm the environment. Therefore, the results highlight that tourism destinations require economic value creation, constitution of specific local market, and improvement of tourist attractions. Authorities should also inform rural residents of tourist demands by conducting extension classes and raising local values to improve RS. Accordingly, the accomplishment of RS is consistent with the reciprocal participation of rural residents and tourists through resident-tourist value co-creation (Lin et al., 2017), especially to focus rural environmental conservation on SD process. Hence, the government should highly advertise environmental protection for tourists and residents to achieve a pure rural environment. Therefore, the research questions were evaluated and analyzed using a structural model, which showed that tourism

in the social and economic fields has established a suitable foundation for sustainability in rural settlements. Regarding the environment, there are positive and negative effects on the rural system based on related field research, which appropriate measures should be taken with regard to environmental protection. Then, some suggestions are recommended:

- It is vital to attract urban investment in the economic-productive sectors such as: agricultural, industrial and service activities in order to strengthen the rural economy;
- To expand rural social solidarity, mechanisms must be put in place for villagers to benefit from

tourism output, such as: constitution of cooperatives and the prosperity of micro-businesses;

- In order to protect the environment, legal restrictions must be imposed to prevent the conversion of natural and agricultural lands into second houses;
- To attract rural youth for engaging in rural tourism activities, the necessary incentives should be provided, including: loans, appreciation and rural branding.

Acknowledgments: This article has not received any specific grant from any organizations and is the result of scientific research by the authors.

References

1. Alijani, B. (1392/2013). *Iran Climate*. Tehran: Payame Noor University Press. [In Persian].
2. Alipour, H., & Kilic, H. (1384/2005). An institutional appraisal of tourism development and planning: the case of the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC). *Tourism Management*, 26 (1), 79-94. . [In Persian].
3. Almeida-García, F., Ángeles Peláez-Fernández, M., Balbuena-Vázquez, A., & Cortés-Macias, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54(3), 259-274.
4. Altinay, L., Sigala, M., & Waligo, V. (2016). Social value creation through tourism enterprise. *Tourism Management*, 54(3), 404-417.
5. Andreeski, J. (2000). Development of tourism: A ring of incentives in cross-boundary co-operation for economic development. *IFAC Proceedings*, 33(8), 151-155.
6. Anthopoulou, T., Kaberis, N., & Petrou, M. (2017). Aspects and experiences of crisis in rural Greece. Narratives of rural resilience. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 52(4), 1-11.
7. Asgari, R. (2016). *Iran's tourist information*. Tehran: Road Book.
8. Bell, S., & Morse, S. (2003). *Measuring sustainability: Learning from doing*. London: Earthscan.
9. Bjärstig, T., & Sandström, C. (2017). Public-private partnerships in a Swedish rural context – A policy tool for the authorities to achieve sustainable rural development?. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 49(1), 58-68.
10. Carneiro, M. J., Lima, J., & Lavrador Silva, A. (2015). Landscape and the rural tourism experience: identifying key elements, addressing potential, and implications for the future. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23 (8-9), 1217-1235.
11. Chi, C. G., Cai, R., & Li, Y. (2017). Factors influencing residents' subjective well-being at World Heritage Sites. *Tourism Management*, 63(1), 209-222.
12. Coria, J., & Calfucura, E. (2012). Ecotourism and the development of indigenous communities: the good, the bad, and the ugly. *Ecological Economist*, 73(1), 47-55.
13. Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 64-73.
14. Dehghani, A., Adeli Sardoei, M. (1397/2018). The impact of tourism development on cultural elements of rural residents - The case study: Jiroft county. *Rural & Development Quarterly*, 21(1), 71-90. [In Persian].
15. Dogru, T., & Bulut, U. (2018). Is tourism an engine for economic recovery? Theory and empirical evidence. *Tourism Management*, 67, 425-434.
16. Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., Spurr, R. (2004). Evaluating tourism's economic effects: new and old approaches. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 307-317.
17. Einalli, J., Mohammadi Yeganeh, B. & Ghasemlou, H. (2019). The role of creative tourism in sustainable development of rural areas (Case study: historic-cultural villages in north-west of Iran). *Journal of Research and Rural Planning*, 8(2), 19-39.
18. Farstad, M., & Rye, J. F. (2013). Second home owners, locals and their perspectives on rural development. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 30(1), 41-51.

19. Fatemi, M., Rezaei, H., Motiee Langrodi, S. H., Faraji Sabokbar, H. A., & Darban Astaneh, A. (2019). Analysis of the model of sustainable development planning in rural economy of Iran. *Journal of Research & Rural Planning*, 8(3), 99-118.
20. Flisher, A., & Felsenstein, D. (2000). Support for rural tourism: Does it make a difference? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4), 180-194.
21. Gao, C., & Cheng, L. (2019). Tourism driven rural spatial restructuring in the metropolitan fringe: An empirical observation. *Land Use Policy*, 95(6), In Press.
22. Gao, J., & Wu, B. (2017). Revitalizing traditional villages through rural tourism: A case study of Yuanjia Village, Shaanxi Province, China. *Tourism Management*, 63(1), 223-233.
23. Ghorbanzadeh, M., & Niloufar, P. (2019). Categorization of north khorasan villages in terms of indicators of entrepreneurial ecotourism developments (Case Study: Bojnord- Glestan Road). *Journal of Research and Rural Planning*, 8(3), 119-132.
24. Gray, C., & Mueller, V. (2012). Drought and population mobility in rural Ethiopia. *World Development*, 40(1), 134-145.
25. Guaita Martinez, J. M., Martin Martin, J. M., & Salinas Fernandez, J. A. (2019). An analysis of the stability of rural tourism as a desired condition for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Business Research*, 100(7), 165-174.
26. Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An Improved Structural Model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
27. Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-152.
28. Hashemi, N., & Ghaffary, G. (2017). A Proposed Sustainable Rural Development Index (SRDI): Lessons from Hajij village, Iran. *Tourism Management*, 59(1), 130-138.
29. Hoseini, A., Tavakoli, M., Pourtaheri, M., & Eftekhari, A. R. (2019). Explaining the landscape identity components in the tourist villages with valuable texture in Iran. *Journal of Research and Rural Planning*, 8(27), 107-125.
30. Howell, A. (2017). Impacts of Migration and Remittances on Ethnic Income Inequality in Rural China. *World Development*, 94(1), 200-211.
31. Huang, W., Beeco, J. A., Hallo, J. C., & Norman, W. C. (2016). Bundling attractions for rural tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(1), 1387-1402.
32. Jaafar, M., Rasoolimanesh, S. M., & Tuan Lonik, K. A. (2015). Tourism growth and entrepreneurship: Empirical analysis of development of rural highlands. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 14(1), 17-24.
33. Jafari, M. (2013). *Mazandaran at a glance*. Tehran: Road Book.
34. Jeong, J. S., García-Moruno, L., Hernández-Blanco, J., & Jaraíz-Cabanillas, F. J. (2014). An operational method for supporting siting decisions for sustainable rural second home, planning in ecotourism sites. *Land Use Policy*, 41(1), 550-560.
35. Karami Benmaran, Z., Khosravipour, B., Ghanian, M., & Baradaran, M. (2014). The recognition of effective elements on small and medium economic corporation with focus on rural tourism. *Rural Researches*, 5(4), 737-758. [In Persian].
36. Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management*, 36(1), 527-540.
37. Kim, S., & Jamal, T. (2015). The co-evolution of rural tourism and rural tourism and sustainable rural development in Hongdong Korea: complexity, conflict and local response. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 23(8-9), 1363-1385.
38. Klopp, J. M., & Petretta, D. L. (2017). The urban sustainable development goal: Indicators, complexity and the politics of measuring cities. *Cities*, 63(1), 92-97.
39. Ko, T. G. (2005). Development of a tourism sustainability assessment procedure: A conceptual approach. *Tourism Management*, 26(3), 431-445.
40. Lin, Z., Chen, Y., & Filieri, R. (2017). Resident-tourist value co-creation: The role of residents' perceived tourism impacts and life satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 61(1), 436-442.
41. Liu, Y., & Xu, Y. (2016). A geographic identification of multidimensional poverty in rural China under the framework of sustainable livelihoods analysis. *Applied Geography*, 73(1), 62-76.

42. Liu, J., Nijkamp, P. , & Lin, D. (2017). Urban-rural imbalance and Tourism-Led Growth in China. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 64(1), 24-36.
43. Marsden, T., & Sonnino, R. (2008). Rural development and the regional state: denying multifunctional agriculture in the UK. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24(4), 422–431.
44. Ohlan, R. (2017). The relationship between tourism, financial development and economic growth in India. *Future Business Journal*, 3(1), 9-22.
45. Oliver, T., & Jenkins, T. (2003). Sustaining rural landscape: the role of integrated tourism . *Landscape Research*, 28(1), 293-307.
46. Olsson, L., Jerneck, A. (2018). Social fields and natural systems: integrating knowledge about society and nature. *Ecology & Society*, 23(3), 1–18.
47. Pařsakarnis, G., Morley, D., & Malien'e, V. (2013). Rural development and challenges establishing sustainable land Eastern European countries use in Eastern European Countries. *Land Use Policy*, 30(1), 703–710.
48. Palmisano, G. O., Govindan, K., Boggia, A., Loisi, R. V., De Boni, A., & Roma, R. (2016). Local Action Groups and Rural Sustainable Development: A spatial multiple criteria approach for efficient territorial planning. *Land Use Policy*, 59(1), 12–26.
49. Park, D., lee, K., Choi, H., & Yoon, Y. (2012). Factors influencing social capital in rural tourism communities in South Korea. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1511-1520.
50. Pilving, T., Kull, T., Suskevis, M., Viira, A. H. (2019). The tourism partnership life cycle in Estonia: Striving towards sustainable multisectoral rural tourism collaboration. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 31(3), 219-230.
51. Pratt, S. (2015). The economic impact of tourism in SIDS. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52(1), 148–160.
52. Rabie, M. (2016). *A theory of sustainable sociocultural and economic development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
53. Randelli, F., Matellozo, F. (2019). Is rural tourism- induced built-up growth a threat for the sustainability of rural areas? The case study of Tuscany. *Land Use Policy*, 86(7), 387-398.
54. Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Jaafar, M., Kock, N., & Ahmad, A. G. (2017). The effects of community factors on residents' perceptions toward World Heritage Site inscription and sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(2), 198-216.
55. Rogers, P. P., Jalal, K. F., & Boyd, J. A. (2008). *An introduction to sustainable development*. New York: Earthscan.
56. Saberi, H., & Ghaed Amini, M. (2019). Strategic planning of rural tourism development, the case study: Sheikhshabanvillage. *Locational- Spatial Researches*, 4(12) , 111- 136.
57. Safari Alamoti, P., & Shams, A. (1398/2019). The analysis of rural tourism consequences in Rodbar-Alamot area of Ghazvin province, The case study: Ovan village. *Rural & Development Quarterly*, 22(4), 25-49. [In Persian].
58. Shahipour, S., & Mojtabazadeh, H. (1395/2016). Analysis of the Impacts of Rural Tourism on Development (A Case Study of Kandovan). *Journal of Environmental Studies*, 79(1), 637-648. . [In Persian].
59. Sharpley, R., & Telfer, D. J. (2015). *Tourism and development*. Manitoba: Channel View.
60. Steiner, A. , & Atterton, J. (2015). Exploring the contribution of rural enterprises to local resilience. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 40(1), 30-45.
61. Strong, M. F. (1995). From Rio to Copenhagen. *Futures*, 27(2), 238-240.
62. Strzelecka, M., Boley, B. B., & Woosnam, K. M. (2017). Place attachment and empowerment: Do residents need to be attached to be empowered?. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 66, 61-73.
63. Toumi, O., Le Gallo, J., Ben Rejeb, J. (2017). Assessment of Latin American sustainability. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 78(1), 878-885.
64. Truong, V. D., Hall, C. M., & Garry, T. (2014). Tourism and poverty alleviation: Perceptions and experiences of poor people in Sapa, Vietnam. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(7), 1071-1089.
65. Wang, S. (2017). Leisure travel outcomes and life satisfaction: An integrative look. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 63(1), 169-182.
66. Zhang, J. (2016). Weighing and realizing the environmental, economic and social goals of tourism development using an analytic network process-goal programming approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 127(1), 262-273.
67. Zhou, L., Chan, E., & Song, H. (2017). Social capital and entrepreneurial mobility in early-stage tourism development: A case from rural China. *Tourism Management*, 63(1), 338-350.



نقش آفرینی گردشگری در پایداری روستایی (مطالعه موردی: منطقه روستایی گلان، شهرستان آمل)

ریحانه سلطانی مقدس*^۱ - مصطفی طالشی^۲

۱- استادیار جغرافیا و برنامه ریزی روستایی، دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران، ایران

۲- استاد جغرافیا و برنامه ریزی روستایی، دانشگاه پیام نور، تهران، ایران

تاریخ پذیرش: ۵ تیر ۱۳۹۹

تاریخ دریافت: ۶ شهریور ۱۳۹۸

چکیده مبسوط

۱. مقدمه

سکونتگاههای روستایی در کشاکش با تنگناهای اجتماعی - اقتصادی نیازمند فرصت های جدیدی جهت نقش آفرینی در توسعه پایدار هستند. زیرا عدم تعادل در سکونتگاههای روستایی موازنه ناحیه ای را برهم می زند و تناقضات جدیدی را فرآوری سکونتگاههای شهری قرار می دهد. در این ارتباط سازوکارهایی نیاز است که بتواند توسعه پایدار روستایی را گسترش دهد. گردشگری یکی از مهمترین سازوکارهای محلی است که با گسترش ساختارها و کارکردهای نوین، توان دستیابی به پایداری را تقویت می کند. به صورتی که رشد بنیان های اقتصادی در چارچوب کسب و کارهای خرد و کارآفرینی در تشریک مساعی با محیط زیست پایدار در رویکرد پایداری اهمیت دارد. از سوی دیگر اثرات گردشگری در همبستگی اجتماعی و رشد مشارکت روستایی دخالت دارد. پژوهش حاضر در چارچوب نظریه پایداری؛ ابعاد مختلف اثرات گردشگری مانند: اجتماعی، اقتصادی و زیست محیطی را با محوریت پیامدهای مثبت و منفی آن مدلسازی می کند. به صورتی که هدف اصلی پژوهش بررسی میزان مشارکت گردشگری در هر یک از ابعاد پایداری است.

۲. مبانی نظری تحقیق

رکود جهانی در سکونتگاههای روستایی بر روندهای اقتصادی ملی و بین المللی تأثیر می گذارد و باعث رشد بی رویه جمعیت شهرها می

شود. در این ارتباط گردشگری روستایی با تنوع بخشی اقتصاد روستایی و گسترش بنگاههای کوچک اقتصادی محلی باعث افزایش درآمدهای محلی و شکل گیری انباشت سرمایه محلی می شود که در ماندگاری جمعیت روستایی نقش انکارناپذیری دارد. مفهوم پایداری، توسعه اقتصادی، کیفیت محیط زیست و همبستگی اجتماعی را شامل می شود. همچنین پایداری مفهومی است که شکاف بین توسعه و محیط زیست را از بین برده و هدف آن اعمال ابعاد توسعه در رویکردی نظاموار است.

۳. روش تحقیق

مطالعه موردی در ناحیه روستایی گلان در شهرستان آمل انجام شده است. روش تحقیق مبتنی بر روش توصیفی- تحلیلی است و برای جمع آوری اطلاعات از دو روش کتابخانه ای و میدانی استفاده شده است. چهار روستای گردشگری در این ناحیه به صورت موردی انتخاب شده است که از مجموع ۲۰۴۷ نفر جمعیت روستاهای نمونه، ۲۱۴ نفر از ساکنان به عنوان نمونه انتخاب شدند. نمونه گیری به صورت هدفمند براساس طبقات مختلف جمعیتی و اقتصادی انتخاب شده است. داده ها براساس پرسشنامه میدانی مبنی بر مدل معادلات ساختاری تحلیل شدند. همچنین روابط متقابل گویه ها بر مبنای رویکرد پایداری در ابعاد اجتماعی، اقتصادی و زیست محیطی مدلسازی شد.

*. نویسنده مسئول:

ریحانه سلطانی مقدس

۴. یافته های تحقیق

براساس یافته های میدانی ، تأثیر بعد اقتصادی بر پایداری روستایی بر مبنای نتایج مدل ساختاری برابر با ۰/۷ است . به طوری که تنوع بخشی کسب و کارهای خرد نقش مثبتی در افزایش درآمد داشته است. زیرا تأمین نیازهای گردشگران توانسته است در گسترش مازاد سرمایه نقش داشته باشد. علاوه بر این افزایش قیمت زمین در گسترش توان مالی روستاییان تأثیرگذار بوده است. به صورتی که این روند باعث افزایش خانه های دوم شهری و گسترش تعداد گردشگران در این ناحیه شده است و نیازهای اقتصادی جدیدی را ایجاد کرده که نتیجه آن تقویت کارآفرینی روستایی در این ناحیه بوده است. بیشترین میزان گردشگران از کلانشهر تهران به این ناحیه می آیند و بیشترین تعداد خانه های دوم مربوط به روستای گلان و کوکده است. همچنین در بعد اجتماعی ، گردشگری در ناحیه روستایی گلان سبب تقویت تثبیت جمعیت و همبستگی اجتماعی شده است. در بعد زیست محیطی ، گردشگری آثار مخربی بر محیط زیست دارد . به طوری که باعث قطعه قطعه شدن اراضی روستایی و افزایش فرسایش خاک و کاهش منابع آب می شود و تغییر کاربری اراضی کشت برنج بر کشاورزی و رونق تولید نیز اثر گذار است. بنابراین باید برنامه ریزی منسجمی در راستای کاهش آسیب پذیری گردشگری بر محیط زیست صورت گیرد.

۵. بحث و نتیجه گیری

نظریه توسعه پایدار با رویکرد پایداری در این پژوهش به منظور تحلیل مؤلفه های پایداری از قبیل : اجتماعی، اقتصادی و زیست محیطی توسعه یافته است. در این راستا مدل های اندازه گیری و ساختاری برای ترکیب شاخص ها در مدل پی.ال.اس به عنوان مزیت دیگر این مدل به کار گرفته شده است. یافته ها نتایج متفاوتی از اثرگذاری گردشگری بر ابعاد پایداری نشان می دهد. به صورتی که همگام با پیشینه تحقیق، اثرات اقتصادی گردشگری از سایر ابعاد برجسته تر است و توانسته اقتصاد روستایی را متحول نماید. در بعد اجتماعی نیز با عنایت به تأثیرات اقتصادی، ماندگاری جمعیت روستایی مشهود است که در پایداری جایگاه ویژه ای دارد. برخلاف سایر ابعاد در بعد زیست محیطی اثرات گردشگری متناقص بوده است که لازم است به منظور نهادینه کردن پایداری زیست محیطی، سازوکارهای لازم برای جلوگیری از تخریب محیط زیست روستایی و حفاظت از آن عملیاتی شود.

کلید واژه ها: گردشگری روستایی، پایداری روستایی ، تنوع بخشی اقتصادی، کارآفرینی ، حفاظت زیست محیطی، تغییر کاربری زمین.

تشکر و قدردانی

پژوهش حاضر حامی مالی نداشته و حاصل فعالیت علمی نویسندگان است.



How to cite this article:

Soltani Moqadas, R. & Taleshi, M. (2020). The collaboration of tourism in rural sustainability (Case study: Gelan rural region, Amol County). *Journal of Research & Rural Planning*, 9(3), 1-14.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.22067/jrrp.v9i4.82609>