

*BOOK Chapter from paper presented at the International Research
Conference on Perspectives on Tourism in Nordic and Other
Peripheral Areas
Umea, Sweden. August 2003*

**The Vulnerability of Peripheral Tourism; the rapid disenchantment
of peripheral attraction.**

Wilson Irvine and Alistair R Anderson
Aberdeen Business School
Robert Gordon University
Garthdee
Aberdeen
AB 24 7QE

Email- w.irvine@rgu.ac.uk
a.r.anderson@rgu.ac.uk

Abstract

This chapter explores the impact of foot and mouth disease on peripheral tourist destinations. It is argued that such destinations are extremely vulnerable to changes in visitor perception and that the effects of national disasters impact disproportionately. The twinned conceptions of the local and the global are employed to show how the time-space compression of globalisation is a double-edged sword. The paper first offers a theoretical explanation based on the symbolic otherness of peripheral places. In the first instance, this otherness attracts, but symbolic constructions are brittle things, and the advent of national disaster turns this otherness into a repelling force. We then offer some data on the uneven effects of foot and mouth disease. This demonstrates how the local of peripherality is vulnerable to the sensationalism of the global. We find that the lenses of perceptions of place magnify the good and the bad. But significantly, peripheral tourist places suffer most.

The Vulnerability of Peripheral Tourism; the rapid disenchantment of peripheral attraction.

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the impacts of foot and mouth disease on peripheral tourist destinations. Our theoretical orientation is that tourists are attracted to the “otherness” of peripheral places; that whilst such places stand as different, this conception of difference can rapidly shift from attraction to repulsion. Hence peripheral tourism is vulnerable. We first outline our conceptual framework, then report on the role of tourism in the periphery of Scotland, Grampian region and in the northern periphery of England, the Cumbria region. To develop our understanding we studied two different areas; Grampian which was only indirectly affected and Cumbria which was directly affected by the presence of the disease. Our empirical data, collected by survey shows a very uneven effect; by region as we had expected, but also by type of tourist establishment. Finally we discuss our findings in the light of our theoretical model.

The attractions of places

Whilst Mathieson and Wall (1982) note that there is little agreement about the importance of any specific factor to motivate people to visit particular places (Tiefenbacher et al, 2000), Galloway, (2002) proposes two types of motivation, push and pull factors (Goossens, 2000; Crompton, 1979). Push factors are broadly associated with demographic attributes and psychological variables such as need and personal values. Pull factors are seen as those external to the individual and are aroused by the destination. Dann, (1981) points out many researchers focus on the pull factors since they represent the specific attractions of place. Goossens (2000) suggests that both sets of factors should be considered, since each is one side of the motivational coin. Emotion is seen to be the connecting link, because tourists are pushed by their emotional needs and pulled by the emotional benefits. Leisure is thus seen as a positive and

subjective experience; in particular that emotion plays a major role in hedonistic consumption.

In terms of destination pull factors, there is broad agreement about the influence of tourism image on the behaviour of individuals (Ashworth and Goodall, 1988; Mansfield, 1982). There is now considerable evidence (Gartner, 2000; Kent, 1996; Crompton and Ankomah, 1993;) of the influence of tourism image on the choice of holiday destination. Places with stronger positive images will have a higher probability of being included and chosen in the process of decision making (Alhemoud and Armstrong, 1996; Bigne et al, 2001). Pike (2002) recently reviewed 142 academic papers about image. One key element of his review was that images were either favourable or not. Tiefenbacher et al (2000) argue that such perceptions are generated by advertisement, movies and word of mouth. Amongst the range of proposed factors they suggest that “keeping up with the Jones’s” is important. Thus group perceptions of a place are an influence. Reid and Reid (1993) make a similar point, that positive images are shared and also lead others to visit the location.

Image will therefore influence a tourist in the process of choosing a place to stay (Bigne et al, 2001) and image, and its influence is likely to be constructed prior to the actual experience of the place. So influence begins at the stage of choosing the holiday destination, and consequently destination choice cannot be explained exclusively in terms of the objective environment (Johnson & Thomas, 1995). As Gallanti-Moutafi, (1999) notes, tourists embark on their journeys with already formed images, largely the product of popular cultural representations. Places are transformed into a tourist site through the system of symbolic and structural processes. Tourists “read” these signs and judge their aesthetic appropriateness. Stewart et al, (1998) stress how interpretation of place provides a better framework for understanding perceptions of place than merely asking visitors to recount “facts”. Moscardo and Pearce (1996) suggest this is because people cannot process all the available information. Conversely, Owen et al (1999), suggests that because of a lack of detailed information, prospective tourists will place greater reliance on long established impressions and possibly stereotypical impressions. Mathieson and Wall (1982) suggest, in terms of push factors, that the motivation to visit a place may hinge upon the perception of the value in visiting that destination. Thus images of place are broad conceptions, loosely formed and probably based on the assimilation of diverse and incomplete information. For example, Dann (1996:79) shows how representations of destinations rely on cultural stereotypes and received images, “which remain to be confirmed or invalidated by

experience”. Images of place and the consequent choice of destination are therefore an individual subjective interpretation, but formed from social and shared representations selected from our economy of space and sign (Lash and Urry, 1994).

So tourism consists of a demarcation of both space and time. For time, as Baudrillard (1998) points out, it is a leisure time, differentiated from work time and caught up in the consumption of signs and experiences. For space, tourism is about created leisure space, places which are first signed as appropriate (Urry, 1995) and then consumed. “A new, or renewed importance attaches to place...even when these are imagined or invented”, Kumar (1995:123) Tourism thus creates specific social space, (Meethan, 2001). Yet this specificity of place is also caught up in the headlong dash of space-time compression, what Harvey calls the annihilation of space through time. As Harvey (1989:293) puts it so well, “Mass television ownership coupled with satellite communication make it possible to experience a rush of images almost simultaneously, collapsing the world’s spaces into a series of images on a television screen.....mass tourism, films made in spectacular locations, make a wide range of simulated or vicarious experiences of what the world contains available to many people”. What is paradoxically in this fission and fusion of the local and the global; the global spread of tourism depends upon the specificity of place but that the processes of globalisation brings about such a greater range of wider couplings. The demonstrating that globalism pulls two ways. One specific arena of this global local acting out is the periphery, where the otherness of image places a vital role in attracting tourists.

Peripheral places

Peripherality is also a matter of perception, Brown and Hall (1999:9) argue that a place that is remote and difficult to reach may be perceived by tourists to have certain qualities symptomatic of its situation, such as natural beauty, quaintness and *otherness*. Such places are seen as authentic, (Urry, 1990) rich in symbolic representations of the unspoilt, the pristine and the traditional. Urry (1995) also makes a powerful case to show that it is this otherness which creates attraction. Thus as Blomgren and Sorensen (1998) propose, the attractiveness of a periphery relies on the subjective interpretation of such symbols. Anderson (2000) argues that peripheral spaces have moved from outlying production zones to become areas which are consumed in their own right. He argues that it their very “otherness”, non-industrial, distance and an absence of core activities, which creates value in the consumer’s eye. Moreover, it is

those very qualities of otherness which are consumed, (2000:102) “the periphery is the ideal zone for the production of aestheticised cultural goods”. Brown and Hall (1999) describe a peripheral area as one which suffers geographic isolation, being distant from core spheres of activity, poor access to and from markets. Such areas, they claim, are characterised as economically marginalised with much of the business activity confined to micro-business. But as Wanhill (1997) notes the European Union’s Maastricht Treaty acknowledged that tourism could reduce regional disparities. Taken together we see the importance of tourism for the peripheral place, highly dependent on the “difference” of image from the core, but equally we see how it appears to depend on a positive image.

The vulnerability of subjective interpretations

One problem with image and motivation to visit, is the fragility of symbolic otherness. (Pearce, 1982) considers appropriate images as transitory, but insulated ones from danger. Meethan (2001) talks of trust in a destination; trust in it measuring up to its image. He makes the salient point that the elimination of risk and issues of safety appear as prime factors in choice of destination. Cavlek (2002) points out that peace, safety and security are the primary conditions for the tourism development of a destination. He also notes (2002:479) how “nothing can force them to spend a holiday in a place they perceive as insecure” Indeed, Sonmez and Graef (1998:120) argue that if the destination choice is narrowed down to two alternatives which promise similar benefits, the “one that is safe from threat- is likely to be chosen”. Pearce (1988) suggests that concern with personal security is a major factor in the decision-making process through which individuals make their travel choices (Sonmez, 1998). Although Galloway’s (2002) paper explores sensation seeking as an explanatory factor in motivation and Elsrud (1999) discusses “risk-taking” as an attraction in backpacking holidays, these are special instances when risk appears to enhance image. So different groups may have different perceptions or even different social constructs of thrills and danger (Carter, 1998).

In any case we know that images are incomplete. For example, Cavlek (2002) reports that during the Indonesian crisis, tourism to Bali was not affected. This was because of the general lack of awareness that Bali was part of Indonesia. Similarly the Greek island of Kos was badly affected by the misinformed associating it with Kosovo! Drabek (2000) notes how the effects of crisis ripples out to areas where no such problem exists (Cavlek, 2002). Crises have become integral to business activity, and

tourism, in particular, suffers more than any other. Faulkner and Vikulov (2001) propose that all destinations face the prospect of either a natural or a human-induced disaster. In particular, Cavlek (2002) suggests that government warnings to potential tourists always have strong psychological effects, thus creating a major impediment to selling holidays, even to parts of the country still entirely safe.

Thus far we have explored the importance of image in motivating tourism. We have demonstrated that the “otherness” of peripherality is a key mechanism for attracting tourists. This otherness, we have argued, is an incomplete social construction, driven by globalisation but dependent upon a positive impression of local place. We have also noted how perceptions of risk, real or imagined, like the images themselves, can act to reverse the attraction and turn it into a repelling force. We now continue to explore the vulnerability of a peripheral tourist place

Tourism in Scotland

Tourism is Scotland’s most important industry, injecting £2.5 billion into the economy annually (www.scotexchange.net 2003). It is the 4th biggest employer, employing 193,000, some 8% of the workforce. In 1995 the UK ranked 4th in the top 10 tourist destinations in Europe, with 23.7 million arrivals (De Vaal, 1997). However, inbound tourist statistics show that only 1.9 million of these United Kingdom visitors came to Scotland (www.staruk.com 2003), with that figure dropping to 1.5 million in 2001 (Tourism Attitudes Survey, 2002). This decrease is blamed on the effects of the September 11th terrorist attack and Foot and Mouth disease. 2002 did however, experience increased visits to Scotland by UK residents, with visits being up by 10% on 2001 (McKay, 2003).

Tourism in Grampian

Grampian is the north east shoulder of Scotland with a tourist product primarily focused on scenery and castles. Heritage and history play a major part in tourist attraction; seeing historic house and castles is important for 8 out of 10 visitors. Grampian’s attractions currently range from outdoor activities, natural and built heritage to adventure and theme

parks. However Aberdeen and Grampian visitor numbers fell by 13.1% from 140,743 in 2001 to 122,255 during the same period in 2002 (www.scotexchange.net,2003). This drop was confirmed by the local tourist board, at -12.8%, it was the 2nd largest decline in numbers in Scotland.

Tourism in Peripheral Grampian

Researchers have spent much time debating Grampian's problems of seasonality and peripherality and analysing what disadvantage, if any, is placed on the area because of these factors. Peripherality has been viewed as the biggest problem, being held responsible for the increasing amount of difficulties being experienced within the industry (Baum, 1996) and is most often viewed as the most consistent policy issue within cold-climate areas. A peripheral area is seen as an area of remote geographical isolation that is far away from central areas of activity, with poor infrastructure meaning access is difficult (Brown et al 1999). This problem is especially evident in Grampian where the majority of the region is isolated from major cities. It is an area with a mainly peripheral structure with poor roads and a large rural community not dissimilar to Cumbria. It also contains some unique tourist attractions and wonderful scenic beauty comparable to the North East of England.

Tourism in Cumbria

Cumbria was an area directly affected by Foot and Mouth and is devoted to tourism. Cumbria includes the Lake District National Park and the Hadrian's Wall World Heritage Site and has recently been awarded, after a rigorous assessment Green Globe Destination Status. (<http://www.golakes.co.uk> 2003). It is a relatively remote area composed of sparsely populated sectors with some minor concentrations of populations.

Foot and Mouth Disease

Foot and mouth disease is one of the most contagious animal diseases. Although most affected adult animals will recover within two weeks, the drop in yields could have enormous economic impact. It has few effects on humans. Nonetheless, the UK government policy of slaughtering

affected or at risk herds had an enormous impact on Britain's countryside. The first cases of Foot and Mouth disease (since 1967) were confirmed on the 10th of February 2001. Within 2 weeks the disease had spread to a large number of cases. After peaking in April/May numbers tailed off to October 2001. As Anderson (2003:5) noted, a total of 2026 cases of the disease were identified and a total of over 4 million animals were culled during the crisis. Media attention during the crisis focussed dramatically on the agricultural community, showing the destruction of livestock and the closure of farms across the county. The vast majority of which was brought about without confirmation of the disease in that area. Ireland and Vetier (2002:5) detail the steps taken when farms were not directly affected, but were unfortunate to be in the cull area, or have links with Foot and Mouth cases. "A quarantine ban was established on farms with trace former connections to the confirmed case and animals killed under the classification of 'slaughter on suspicion'." However there were also direct affects felt in some way or other by most other industries. In particular tourism that is dependent on access to accommodation and associated tourist facilities in core and peripheral areas.

The two study areas affected by the disease were Cumbria and Grampian Region, both peripheral in the sense that they are not associated with any major population areas and the associated activity and tourism attractions that are principally in the countryside; The Lakes, Landscapes and associated activities in Cumbria and the Castle and Whisky Trail and Golf in Grampian. Cumbria was affected directly with a large number of affected cases but Grampian only indirectly, as it did not have one case during the out break and was more than 150 miles from the nearest case in the South West of Scotland.

Foot and Mouth in Cumbria

Cumbria's main industries are agriculture and tourism and tourism was affected just as badly as agriculture. As Ireland and Vetier (2002:6) put it; "it is...evident that demand failure among tourists has a severe impact on the British tourism industry." The BBC News website (April 2001) dramatically described the devastation and fear of the unknown future for the farmers of Cumbria saying; "Cumbria is holding its breath. Not just in dread of future outbreaks, but also because of the smell of the burial sites." Television dramatised the extreme actions taken by the government and the effect on peoples' lives. Tourism in Cumbria suffered particularly when the Government closed the countryside down. The Anderson report (2003:3) noted the closure of many foot paths, "the instrument to close footpaths and bridleways were necessary not only in

infected areas but also outside them.” But many of the tourism businesses within Cumbria rely on the footpaths and surrounding areas to be open for them to survive. One consequence was the difficulty in gaining access to many of the small villages within Cumbria when these roadways are closed.

Television coverage of the Foot and Mouth epidemic detailed every case and scare within Cumbria. The television coverage scared many potential tourists away from the countryside; many areas that had no contact with the outbreak suffered because of the media messages given. Ireland and Vetier(2002:1) identified that; “Exaggerated media reporting of a crisis can be as damaging as inept Government policy.” Many of the tourism businesses within Cumbria closed because of the dramatic reduction of visitors within the area. After the epidemic was over tourism organisations within Cumbria began to try and rebuild the businesses by extra advertising and property upgrading. Although considerable efforts were made, tourism numbers were still poor related to previous years.

The following Table 1b shows the drop in numbers experienced by tourism businesses due to the Foot and Mouth epidemic. The trips refer to the summer months of June to September 2000- 2002.

Tourism trips in England

Summer trips:	All tourism trips 2000	All tourism trips 2001	All tourism trips 2002
	Million	Million	Million
England	64.9	55.5	63.0
Cumbria	2.3	1.8	1.8
Yorkshire	6.0	5.4	5.8
London	9.1	7.7	8.0

Table 1b, adapted from Staruk 2003 <http://www.staruk.com>

Table 1b demonstrates that, of the four representative locations, Cumbria was the worst effected with the largest drop in visitor numbers and no obvious signs of recovery. Anderson (2003:3) argues that numbers were kept low with the unnecessary prolonged closure of footpaths and woodland areas.

The effects within Cumbria were devastating with both tourism and agricultural businesses affected. Many of the businesses exist in remote towns and villages spread out within the district and many directly rely on tourists drawn to their areas by the impressive wildlife. Thus the closure of footpaths and roads connecting the remote areas of Cumbria to the tourists meant that most of this wildlife could not be reached. This reliance on footpaths and road connections for the remote tourism businesses caused many of the problems when the Foot and Mouth epidemic struck. It caused a decrease in tourists so great, that all tourism businesses within the area were affected. A large number of the Cumbria attractions were shut down for at least three months. Many of these never reopened. As well as the closure of businesses, the loss in tourism numbers reduced turnover within the area; many people lost their jobs because businesses couldn't afford to support themselves, let alone pay wages, nearly all business investment stopped.

Foot and Mouth directly affected Cumbria and had indirect effects upon Grampian. Are there lessons to be learned by comparing these effects and trying to analyse the reason for any differences or similarities encountered in these two mainly peripheral Tourism focused areas?

Methodology

Our sample frames were drawn from tourist businesses in Grampian and Cumbria. The Grampian sample of 180 businesses was drawn from a sample frame provided by Dunn and Bradstreet. The Cumbrian sample, 170 businesses, was selected by choosing one in five from a list taken from the official Cumbria Tourist Board Guide (2002). The Grampian sample, the main locus of our study, was surveyed twice. The first Survey A, was carried out in April 2001 at the height of the outbreak and had 85 responses (47 %). The second Survey B was carried out in March 2003 and had 60 responses,(33%), 18 others were returned uncompleted. Either the business no longer operating from the address or were under new ownership. These surveys were intended to provide data to allow us to gauge and compare the anticipated with the real effects.

The Cumbrian survey, C was carried out in February 2003 and contained a number of identical or similar questions. This survey had a response of 70 giving a 39 % response rate. Questions were asked about both the expected and the actual effects of the disease. In all of the surveys many

of the questions were open ended to allow respondents to enlarge on the data.

Data Analysis

The data were analysed using descriptive statistics to analyse single variables and simple non-parametric tests were used to compare variables and significance of normally distributed results. The tests included frequency analysis and cross tabs analysis. The cross tabs analysis (Pearson chi-square test) was used to check significance within the normally distributed results. A number of variables were re-coded where results were considered important and significant. Significance was tested at a 90% confidence level. (The majority of tests proved significant and are all represented). All of the tests were carried out after the variables were coded onto SPSS, (Statistical Package for Social Sciences), and entered and run in order to test the confidence of the data. A large number of the variables had open-ended responses, which were grouped using a Pragmatic Content Analysis in order to collate the similar responses and include them as part of the descriptive analysis. A number of tables were constructed at appropriate stages to describe the results.

To provide a comparative framework, tourism providers were re-coded into two types of business organisations. First; Hotel, Guest House and Bed and Breakfast providers and secondly; “other” providers that covered a diversity of organisations from Caravan sites and Golf Courses to speciality equipment or other service providers in both areas. The characteristics of the different surveys are shown in Table 3.

Survey	Business Type	N	% of total	Professional Body Membership %	Customer Type: Tourist %
A, Grampian, Apr 01	1.Hotel/GH/B and B	58	69	65	36
(total n = 180)	2. Other	27	31	34 (.066)	50 (.065)
B, Grampian Apr 03	1.Hotel/.GH/B and B	42	70	64	34
(Total n = 180)	2. Other	18	30	67 (.3)	17 (.042)
C, Cumbria Feb,03	1.Hotel/2.GH/B and B	46	66	66	93
(total n =170)	2. Other	24	34	58 (.031)	75 (.1)

Table 3 general characteristics of all the samples

The Grampian surveys, data and discussion

Survey A took place in Grampian at the height of the disease and could be expected to reflect the worst expectations of the impact. We also expected these prognoses to reflect the general gloom created by the vivid and dramatic media portrayal. The results shown in table 4 below confirms our expectations and show the extent of business reduction anticipated.

Type	Cancellations Anticipated	Volume Decrease	Profit	Staff Cuts	Closure	Overall (length) > weeks/(year)
1.	56	70	67	28	14	86 (36)
2.	55 (.3)	56 (.1)	59 (.3)	22 (.1)	26 (.1)	48 (18) (.003)

Table 4, The impact of the disease (all %) SURVEY A

The overall view is very pessimistic, more than half our respondents anticipated cancellations and large decreases in the business volume and profits. Some 25% expected to have to lose staff and a significant number anticipated closure of their business. Most appeared to expect the impact to last for some considerable time. Taken by type of business, type 1, that is those most likely to be dependent on visitors, we see a very large impact on volume and the duration of the effects.

Survey B (Table 5), was able to measure the real impact and shows that, whilst the impact was large, it was not as bad as had been anticipated. It is worth noting that 10% of our original sample had gone away. This could be partially attributed to the impact or simply business churn. Table 5 demonstrates that cancellations were worse than anticipated for type 1 businesses and at 64% of bookings reflect a major loss of business. Nonetheless, we note that actual volume decrease was “only” 53%, suggesting that some replacement visitors were found. Again the worst impact was on accommodation types of business with 47% lasting for more than weeks and 26% being affected for more than a year.

Type	Cancellations	Volume Decrease	Profit	Staff Cuts	Closure	Overall length > weeks/(year)
1.	64	53	47	14	05	47(26)
2.	28 (.015)	23 (.076)	22 (.1)	06 (.3)	05 (.8)	23(12) (.074)

Table 5, The impact of the disease (all %) SURVEY B

The Cumbria survey

The Cumbrian survey (Table 6) is a snapshot of data collected two years after the epidemic. Since Cumbria was physically affected as an area where the disease was present, the data provides us with some comparison about perceptions and impacts. Table 6 shows a dramatic reduction in visitor numbers with a 98% and 91% in each type indicating some sort of decrease in visitor numbers and 96% and 90% respectively indicating a “loss of business”. When asked about specific percentages of “loss of business” about 20% in both types of business affected identified an actual loss of business of “more than 50%”, with approximately 80% of those affected in each category identifying a loss of between 1 and 50%. Staff cuts were highest in the “other” types of business this differs from both Grampian surveys. A very large percentage in both types experienced the effects for more than a year with a large number still experiencing the effects at the present time.

Type	Visitor Numbers (decrease %)	Loss of Business (Actual Percentage) %	Staff Cuts	Overall length > year %	Overall still experiencing %
1.	98	96	22	48	30
2.	91 (.092)	90 (.096)	33 (.1)	50 (.03)	25 (.4)

Table 6, The impact of the disease (all %) SURVEY C

The effects of the Foot and Mouth disease on Core and Peripheral areas within Grampian. Survey B Longitudinal Survey.

Table 7a clearly articulates that type 1 organisations in this survey were larger and depended less on seasonal business than type 2 organisations. This means that the mainly accommodation providers were less seasonal and larger and surprisingly more were situated in peripheral areas; villages and remote areas. The accommodation providers, more located in peripheral areas had a much greater decrease in volume of 53%

Type	Seasonal %	Size >10 staff %	Peripheral %	Impact, type of volume decrease %
1.	17	46	55	53
2.	33 (.1)	08 (.2)	23(.010)	23 (.076)

Table 7a

Survey **B** :Other characteristics of businesses in Grampian

Table 7b compares core and peripheral businesses (smaller and more seasonal), throughout the region and it seems clear that peripheral businesses, situated in Grampian experienced a greater decrease or large decrease than the core businesses situated in the city and towns. 63% of the respondents were situated in the core and 37% in peripheral locations. There was a much greater effect on profitability in the peripheral locations with 59% experiencing some type of decrease in profitability including a “large decrease” in profitability (25%). There was much the same picture for impact on volume where the peripheral businesses clearly suffered most

Situation	% of total sample	Size>2FT and PT staff %	Non Seasonal %	Impact , type of profitability decrease %	Impact, type of volume decrease %
Core	63	63	79	28	35
Peripheral	37	35(.8)	73(.5)	59(25)(.1)	64(.1)

Table 7b

Survey **B** : Peripherality and Effects

From these data, we conclude that the effects of foot and mouth disease on tourism business was considerable. The Grampian longitudinal studies indicate that although bad, these effects were not quite as bad as anticipated. In both areas the impact was both immediate, manifest in dramatic drops in volume of business, profitability and reductions of staff numbers. It was also long term, a large number of businesses taking almost a year to recover. In some case, though we cannot be certain how many, the business actually closed. There were some unexpected results. We found that caravan sites in Grampian had an increase in business volume. Since the opposite is true of Cumbria, we deduce that visitors had deserted caravan parks in the affected areas and remained loyal to these new areas over the period. We also found some remarkable instances where substitute products were used. These included the use of geese instead of sheep at a sheep visitor attraction. There was some evidence of specific spikes of business activity probably related to a “Dunkirk” spirit and a campaign to support domestic businesses and special marketing initiatives made at the time. Peripheral businesses were more seasonal and smaller and clearly suffered the most in the disease situation with more negative effects on profitability and volume than businesses situated in core areas. The overall effects confirm the perception of lack of security and safety in these areas, (Cavlek, 2002) and these effects have rippled out into the non-affected area (Grampian) as identified by (Drabek, 2000).

The data and analysis appear to support our original argument, that the attractions of otherness are fickle. Peripheral tourist areas which depend on their portrayal as appropriate places for visitors are vulnerable to any change in perception. As the data demonstrates, the impact of any circumstance which detracts from that attraction has serious economic consequences. Lending strength to our case about perception rather than reality is the comparison between Grampian and Cumbria. Both are peripheral places and are highly dependent upon tourism; both are rural scenic places, so that the portrayal of otherness is symbolically dependent upon an Arcadian image. This rural otherness is a contrast to the urban, but is also bucolic, replete with the benign of rural life. Unsurprisingly, the confrontation to this imagery with media pictures of smoking cattle funeral pyres resulted in repelling visitors.

However the contrast between the presence of the disease is significant. Cumbria was very badly affected, but Grampian had no cases of foot and mouth. Cumbria was effectively closed to visitors, but Grampian was only marginally physically affected. Yet, broadly speaking, the impact on

tourism was similar. Effects were admittedly worse in Cumbria. This seems to confirm that perceptions, rather than facts or real circumstances, create the disastrous effects of catastrophe. Within Grampian the businesses situated in peripheral areas also suffered most.

There are some serious implications for the economics of peripheral places in these findings. We know that for such places a designation of difference, the otherness of such places, is a tourism attractor. We know that peripheral places will continue to suffer from the centripetal forces drawing income into urban cores. Consequently we realise that peripheral places are likely to become more, rather than less dependent, on remaining attractive. Globalisation seems to suggest that the importance of local place is likely to be, on one hand reduced in international convergence. On the other hand the distinctiveness of some peripheral places may become greater, simply in contrast to the convergence of others. Moreover, the massification of communication in globalisation will exaggerate the qualities of peripherality. It may enhance, but, as in the case of catastrophe, it may repel. Thus peripheral places are becoming increasingly vulnerable to the fickleness of attraction. Mere facts, information alone, is unlikely to ameliorate the impact of catastrophe. Tourism decisions seem to be made in the heart, not on the head.

References:

- Anderson, A.R., 2000, Paradox in the periphery; and entrepreneurial reconstruction?, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 12: 91-109
- Ashworth, G. and Goodall, B., 1988. Tourist images: marketing considerations. in Goodall, B. and Ashworth, G., Editors, 1988. *Marketing in the tourism industry The promotion of destination regions*, Routledge, London, pp. 213–238
- Baudrillard, J. (1998) *The Consumer Society*, Sage, London
- Baum, T. 1996, *Images of Tourism Past and Present*, International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol 8, No.4, p.25-30
- Baum, T. and Lundthorp. S. 2001, *Seasonality in Tourism*, Elsevier Science Ltd, Oxford.
- Bigne, J.E., Sanchez, M.I., San, J, 2001, Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: inter-relationship, *Tourism Management* , 22(6), 607-616
- Blomgren, K.B., Sorensen, A., 1998, Peripherality- factor or feature? Reflections on peripherality in tourist regions, *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4, p 319-336
- Brown, F., Hall, D, 1999, The Paradox of Periphery, introduction to Paradox of Periphery, eds., Report 15, Research Centre of Bornholm, Nexø, Denmark
- Brunt, P., Mawby, R. and Hambly, Z., 2000. Tourist victimisation and the fear of crime on holiday. *Tourism Management* **21** 4, pp. 417–424.
- Cavlek, N., 2002, Tour operators and destination safety, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2) 478-496
- Crompton, J.L. and Ankomah, P.K., 1993. Choice set propositions in destination decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research* **20**, pp. 461–476
- Crompton, J.L., 1979, Motivations for pleasure vacations, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6: 408-424.
- Dann, G., 1996, The people of the tourist brochures, in Selwyn, T. (ed.) *The Tourist Image: Myth and myth making in tourism*, Wiley, Chichester.
- Dann, G.M.S., 1981, Tourist motivation: an appraisal, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8: 187-424
- Davidson, R. 1998, *Travel and Tourism in Europe*, 2nd Edn, Addison Wesley Longman Ltd, Edinburgh.

- De Vaal, D. 1997, *A Survey of Continental European Visitor Attractions*, Delotte And Touche Consulting Group, UK, p.12-40
- Demos, E., 1992. Concern for safety: A potential problem in the tourist industry. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* **1** 1, pp. 81–88.
- Drabek, T., 2000, *Emergency Management, principles and Applications for Tourism, Hospitality and Travel Management*, Federal Emergency Management Agency, www.fema.gov/emi/edu/higher.htm
- Elsrud, T., 1999, Risk Creation in Travelling; Risk taking as narrative and practice in backpacker culture, Conference paper presented at the 1st International Conference on Consumption and Representation, University of Plymouth, September.
- Faulkner, B., Vikulov, S., 2001, Katherine, washed out one day, back on track the next: a post-mortem of a tourist disaster, *Tourism Management*, 22, 331-344
- Gagliano, K. B. and Hathcote, J. 1994, *Customer Expectations and Perceptions of Service Quality in Retail Apparel Speciality Stores*, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol 8. No1, p.60-69
- Gallanti-Moutafi, V., 1999, The Self and the Other, *Annals of Tourist Research*, 27(1) 203-224
- Galloway, G., 2002, Psychographic segmentation of park visitor markets; evidence for sensation seeking, *Tourism Management* 23, 581-596.
- Garrod, B., Fyall, A., Leask, A., 2002, Scottish visitor attractions: managing visitor impacts, *Tourism Management*, 23, 265-279.
- Gartner, W.C., 2000. Tourism image: attribute measurement of state tourism products using multidimensional scaling techniques. *Journal of Travel Research* **28** 2, pp. 16–20
- George, R., 2003, Tourist's perceptions of safety and security while visiting Cape Town, *Tourism Management*, In Press,
- Goossens, C. 2000, Tourism information and pleasure motivation, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2) 301-321
- Johnson, P. and Thomas, B., 1995. The analysis of choice and demand in tourism. In: Johnson, P. and Thomas, B., Editors, 1995. *Choice and demand in tourism*, Mansell, London, pp. 1–12.
- Kent, P., 1996. People, places and priorities: opportunity sets and consumers holiday choice. In: Ashworth, G. and Goodall, B., Editors, 1996. *Marketing tourism places*, Routledge, London, pp. 42–62
- Kumar, K., 1995, *From post-industrial to post-modern society*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Lash, S., Urry, J., 1994, *Economies of Signs and Space*, Sage, London
- Mansfield, Y., 1982. From motivation to actual travel. *Annals of Tourism Research* **19**, pp. 399–419.

- Mathieson, A., Wall, G., 1982, *Tourism: Economic, physical and economic impacts*, Longman, New York.
- Meethan, K. (2001), *Tourism in Global Society: Place, Culture and Consumption*, Palgrave, Hampshire.
- Moscardo, G. and Pearce, P.L 1996, Mindful visitors; heritage and tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2) 376-397
- Owen, R.E., Botterill, D., Emanuel, L., Foster, N., Gale, T., Nelson, C., Selby, M., 1999, Perceptions from the periphery- the experience of Wales, in Brown, F., Hall, D, eds., *The Paradox of Periphery*, Report 15, Research Centre of Bornholm, Nexø, Denmark
- Pearce, D.G., 1999, Tourism in Paris, studies at the micro scale, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(1) 77-97.
- Pearce, P.L. 1982, *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behaviour*, Pergamon, Oxford.
- Pike, S., 2002, Destination Image analysis- a review of 142 papers from 1973 to 2000, *Tourism Management*, 23, 541-548
- Reid, L. and Reid, S. 1993, Communicating tourism supplier services; building repeat visitor relationships, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 2, 3-19
- Sonmez, S.F. and Graefe, A.R., 1998. Influence of terrorism, risk on foreign tourism decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25 1, pp. 112–144
- Sonmez, S.F., 1998. Tourism, terrorism, and political instability. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25 2, pp. 416–456.
- Stewart, E.J., Hayward, B.M, Devlin. P. J, 1998, The “place” of interpretation; a new approach to the evaluation of interpretation, *Tourism Management*, 19(3) 257-266
- Tiefenbacher, J.P., Day, F.A., Walton, J.A., 2000, Attributes of repeat visitors to small tourist-orientated communities, *Social Science Journal*, 37(2) 299-308
- Urry, J., 1995 *Consuming Places*, Routledge, London
- Urry, J., 1990, *The Tourist Gaze*, Sage, London
- Wanhill, S., 1997, Peripheral area tourism- a European perspective, *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3, 47-70

News Papers.

Mc Kay, D. 2003, *Future of Tourism to be Debated at Abertay*, The Press and Journal, 13 January, Aberdeen.

References Available Online.

Facts About Cumbria 2003, Cumbrian Tourist Board, [online]
www.golakes.co.uk
 (Accessed 23rd July 2003)

International Passenger Survey, 2003, *Inbound Tourism Trends 1995-2002* [online] Available World Wide Web: www.staruk.com
 (Accessed 10th January 2003)

Key Facts of Tourism for Cumbria 2000-2002, Available World Wide Web:
 (www.staruk.com, 2003 (Accessed 20th July 2003))

Know your Market. 1999, *Tourism Attitudes Survey 1999* [online]
 Available World Wide Web: www.scotexchange.net
 (Accessed 12th January 2003)

Media Office, 2003, *Scotland's Most Important Industry* [online]
 Available World Wide Web: www.scotexchange.net
 (Accessed 14th January 2003)

Other Publications.

Ireland, M., Vetier, L., 2002, *The reality and mythology of the Foot and Mouth Disease crisis in Britain: Factors influencing tourist destination choice*, Working Paper.

The House of Commons. 2003, *Foot and Mouth Disease 2001: Lessons to be Learned Inquiry Report*, HC888 (Anderson), The Stationery Office, London

