

THE IMPACT OF SHOPPING TOURISM IN SURABAYA

Siti Rahayu

Fakultas Bisnis dan Ekonomika, Universitas Surabaya

Email: s_rahayu@ubaya.ac.id

Fitri Novika Wijaya

Fakultas Bisnis dan Ekonomika, Universitas Surabaya

Email: novika_andin@yahoo.com

Erna Andajani

Fakultas Bisnis dan Ekonomika, Universitas Surabaya

Email: worldnot2000@yahoo.com

Abstract

Tourism is a key sector for the economic development of a city. The local government develops tourism in accordance with its potential. However, the development of tourism needs to consider the sustainability of the related industry in the area, as the industry is very much relates to social aspects and environment. This study examines the impacts of tourism business industry within several important factors: demography, economy, environment, and social impacts in supporting shopping tourism in Surabaya. The focus is on a tourist shopping area. The results show that the growing of malls in Surabaya makes the city more flourishing and populous. This finding is in line with the argument of the sustainability on tourism.

Keyword : shopping tourism, resident perceptions, market segmentation

1. Introduction

Economists estimate the tourism sector will be one of the important economic activities in the 21st century. The role of the tourism sector in the economy of a country will exceed the oil and gas sector (petroleum and natural gas) and other industries, if developed in a planned and integrated. The tourism sector will serve as a catalyst for development (agent of development) will also accelerate the development process itself and will be the main drivers of the 21st century economy. This will generate new opportunities in the tourism industry (Yoeti, 2008; Karim, 2008; Omerzel, 2006, quoted in Rahayu, 2010).

The study by Zortuk (2009), tourism business development has been the focus of study in recent times. A general consensus has emerged that it not only

increases foreign exchange income, but also creates employment opportunities, stimulates the growth of the tourism industry and by virtue of this, triggers overall economic growth. As such, tourism development has become an important target for most governments. According to the estimates of the World Tourism Organization, the number of international people movements around the world will surge to 1602 million by 2020, while tourism receipts will reach some US\$200 billion. Furthermore, the World Tourism Travel Council expects that the scale of the world tourism industry, which made up roughly 10.4% of the world's GDP in 2004, will increase to 10.9% in 2014. When all components of the tourism industry are taken into account, i.e., tourism consumption, investment, government spending and exports, the industry grew 5.9% in 2004 alone, reaching US\$5.5 trillion. The 10-year growth forecast is for US\$9.5 trillion in 2014. For these very reasons, thoroughly investigating all aspects of tourism development and economic growth is extremely important for governments. (C.C. Leea., C.P. Chang: 2007, p.180)

Tourism has been seen as the driving force for regional development. Successful tourism can increase destination's tourist receipts, income, employment and government revenues. How to attract the tourists to revisit and/or recommend the destination to others is crucial for the success of destination tourism development (Chen and Tsai, 2006:1115, cited in Rahayu, 2010).

However, the development of tourism in a region should not ignore the environment, especially people who are living in the area. Without community support, tourism will grow becoming difficult. This is consistent with the paradigm proposed by Andereck and Vogt (2000: 27) which "this follows the paradigm that without community support, it is difficult to develop a sustainable tourism industry in the community".

Support communities in tourism development is very crucial role. Society is one important part in controlling the presence of tourism in its region. This is because the existence of tourism does not always give positive value to society. The society will be direct beneficiaries of the effect of tourism. The United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) posits that in order to have a sustainable tourism destination, the environmental, economic and social impacts must be monitored and brought to an acceptable level for residents, visitors and business interests (UNWTO: 2004, in Hritz and Hji-Avgoustis: 2008). Therefore, the hospitality of the local community is vital to the sustainability of the tourism industry and the destination should be developed according to host community needs (Andriotis: 2005 in Hritz and Hji-Avgoustis: 2008). The community needs in any form should be an important concern for government and tourist destinations manager. Because this time many emerging new type of tourist destinations.

Tourism is not always related to natural phenomena such as mountains and beaches. However, in big cities, such objects were more difficult to obtain because the tourists have to travel out of town. Properly, when the shopping centers (malls) into

the new destination of tourists in the big city. The existence of shopping malls as a tourist attraction is actually not just to target urban communities. Those who live in mountainous or coastal areas also need a tourist. Residents edges saturated with the surrounding landscape were then chosen a trip to the big city. Malls became the main destination of tourists this. In Surabaya, the employers attempt to scatter all over the entrance to the city of Surabaya with a new shopping center to block the rate of tourists into the heart of the city (Suara Karya, 2008).

Shopping Tourism in Surabaya growing and demand, even according to Executive Director Surabaya Tourism Promotion Board (STPB), enthusiasts Surabaya mall not only local residents. Tourists who come from Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, and Singapore choose to shop or just a taste of food in Surabaya. The entire shopping centers in Surabaya coincide to give discounts to attract many visitors. Shopping centers in Surabaya, can be categorized into :

1. Mall: Plaza Tunjungan, Surabaya Town Square, Mal Galaxy, Surabaya Plaza (Delta Plaza), Pakuwon Trade Center, Supermal Pakuwon Indah, Royal Plaza, Golden City Mall, Plaza Marina, Jembatan Merah Plaza, City of Tomorrow, Empire Palace.
2. Modern: Sinar Supermarket 24 jam, Sinar Jemursari, Carrefour Golden City, Carrefour BG Junction, Carrefour Center Point, Carrefour Rungkut, Carrefour Ahmad Yani, Makro Tandes, Makro Waru, Giant Maspion Square, Giant Mayjend Sungkono, Giant Mulyosari, Giant Wiyung, Hi-Tech Mall (pusat komputer), Tunjungan Electronic Center, World Trade Center (pusat ponsel), Jembatan Merah Plaza (JMP) dan Pusat Grosir Surabaya (PGS).
3. Tradisional: Pasar Atom, Pasar Turi, Darmo Trade Center (DTC), Pasar Tambah Rejo Baru, Pasar Genteng, Pasar Kapanan.

Shopping tourism is a mainstay district of Surabaya, where Surabaya is also the second largest city after Jakarta. Surabaya City is known as the city of Metropolis has an interesting variety of potential like various types of attractions. However, various potentials cannot be explored to the fullest. To develop the existing potential, the city of Surabaya to try to make breakthroughs. People who should concerned with tourism such as travel agents, so that both domestic and foreign tourists wishing to visit the city. Head of Culture and Tourism (Disbudpar) Surabaya, Surabaya has revealed that a variety of potential that can be offered. Aside from being a city with shopping, Surabaya has the potential of culture that can be sold. To attract domestic and foreign tourists go to Surabaya, Surabaya Disbudpar also develop the tourism potential of water along the Kalimas. Surabaya is expected next year could realize the ideals to be achieved to have the tourist area of water in the middle of town. Currently Disbudpar is preparing some of the concepts that are appropriate for the development of water tourism in Surabaya.
<http://www.facebook.com/group.php?gid=173288698633>

The development of Surabaya as the city with shopping as a mainstay, although managed to be a multiplier effect for the growth of other tourist, but not always welcomed positive. Traditional market traders complain. Trends in society these days tend to prefer to enter the mall rather than slum markets. Evidence, not just the people of Surabaya, they are from out of town too much that sucked share in the splendor of the modern shopping center (<http://www.suarakarya-online.com/news.html?id=198485>).

Shopping in malls is more attractive to any economy people segments. The location of a vast shopping mall, the arrangement of a variety of tenants such as bookstores, electronics shops, cinema, fashion, shoes, bags, food court, children's playground, fitness room, exhibition space, and parks have reshaped the business into the public space. Even the various facilities that now also has become a means of conquest of telecom operators to offer wireless Internet access (wifi), it has become a new oasis. People, who initially seek refreshment in the park or town square, now began to shift to the mall.

Executive Director of the Surabaya Tourism Promotion Board (STPB) is optimist that shopping discount programs on tourism in Surabaya will be in great demand not only by local tourists but also by also foreign tourists. In fact, citizens of some countries even have a hobby shop in Surabaya. Special tourists from Brunei, for example, in addition to shopping, also had come because they want to enjoy a reflexology massage. (<http://www.suarakarya-online.com/news.html?id=198485>)

The development of malls or shopping centers in Surabaya, decent shopping become a mainstay of the industry promotion of tourism in Surabaya. Chairman of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Mall Shopping Centre Management Association of Indonesia (APPBI) states that the potential of tourism in Surabaya is Surabaya Shopping lately been known abroad. Surabaya with more than 20 malls that offer a variety of shopping tourism potential, repercussions to Malaysia, Singapore was also Brunei Darussalam. The most obvious indicator is the Surabaya Shopping Festival, which always held in May. Implementation of both of them capable of generating a turnover of IDR 1 trillion, more than doubled from the first operation in 2008. Visits on average each mall in Surabaya reached 40 thousand people a day. In the presence of more and more malls, more significant is the number of tourists who come to the mall. Mall manager asked the government to support efforts aimed at promoting the mall as part of tourism industry (Soetantini, 2010).

2. *Tourism Impact*

Tourism is an important factor of the economic growth of a country. The success of the tourism sector is highly depended on the attractiveness of tourist destination. The local government faces a complex challenge in developing and organizing the tourist destination as the tourism sector is strongly related to society, local business, and other industries (Howie, 2003, dalam Presenza).

In the past ten years, it has been a consensus that tourist destination is a combination between goods and services, which offer an integrated experience for customers (Davidson e Maitland, 1997; Hall, 2000). Bieger (2000, p. 86) defines tourist destination as a geographic location, which can be in the forms of place, regency, city, village, or a country, chosen by tourists for holidays or travels, and the related facilities including accommodation, foods, and cultures.

Further, Keller (2000, p. 31) says that “ In a traditional sense destinations are geographical places (a country, region or location) attracting a great number of tourists [...] tourists perceive a destination or supply services in that destination as a whole. It is often impossible to set supply services apart from the destination. So destination and goods are identical” (Dioguardi et al., 2013)

So what we would like to underline is that a destination is an entity that, although it is complex and heterogeneous, is a global construct; it is presented as an aggregate of resources, structures, activities joined with each other. This is the meaning of “global product, which is a specific and spatially-defined set, containing all the attractive factors (goods, services, information, natural and social resources) to which the tourist can address – according to his motivations, his culture, his value system, information and experience, his personality and his socio-economical conditions – his own specific demand (Rispoli and Tamma, 1991, 1995 as quoted in Franch, 2002).

Rural communities seeking to improve the quality of life for their residents often turn to tourism as a means to improve their economic position and create jobs to maintain the existence of their community (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Jurowski, 1998). At the same time, rural residents who value their clean environment and social structure resist efforts that would result in a deterioration of their lifestyle. For development strategies to be sustainable, they must be socially equitable, provide economic security, and maintain the integrity of the environment (Flint, 1999). Faced with such a challenge, many community organizations have become proactive and are attempting to control and shape their own destiny through both collective organization and social action (Heskin, 1991; Logan & Rabrenovic, 1990). Jurowski and Brown (2001).

Research by Mitchell (2006) show that sustainable management of tourism operations seeks a balance of economic, social and environmental considerations. And even with widespread concern about social and environmental impacts, economic business drivers continue to dominate management thinking. Although there has also been considerable research into the cooperation between tourism groups, government and communities, relatively few examine the challenge of balancing business management philosophies and practices with the objective of achieving sustainable tourism.

The growing importance placed on studying impacts from a destination perspective also increases the likelihood for support for tourism development and

enabled policymakers to enhance the quality of life and create a sustainable community (Chen, 2001). Other research suggests that, social exchange theory is used predominately in the literature on assessing tourism related impacts to a destination (Andriotis, 2005; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Ap, 1992; Chen, 2000; Chen 2001; Gursoy, et al., 2002; Perdue, Long & Allen, 1990, Vogt & Jun, 2004). Hritz and Hji Avgoustis (2008)

According to Ap (1992), social exchange theory allows for the investigations of both positive and negative impacts tourism has on a destination. The theory postulates that hosts and visitors exchange resources that are valued by both parties. More than likely, residents will be aware of the positive and negative implications of tourism and either will support or not support tourism development based on their perceptions of the benefit and costs (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003) Hritz and Hji Avgoustis (2008)

The benefits of this exchange may be employment opportunities, tax, revenues and improved quality of life (Perdue et al., 1990). Costs may include increased traffic congestion, noise, and deterioration of natural resources (Chen, 2001). Those community groups who view the benefits of tourism to outweigh the costs will have a favorable attitude to tourism, and more likely to give support to tourism development (Allen, Hafer, Long, & Perdue, 1994; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997). Conversely, those who view the costs higher than the benefits will not support tourism development (Harrill, 2004). Chen (2000), finds that those who feel more "loyal" to their community were also more likely to support tourism growth versus those did not feel as loyal. How long a resident has lived in the community was also found to be important when discussing the perceived impacts of tourism and support for growth.

Liu and Var (1986) state that tourism development decisions are often based on economics first. These results indicate that identifying different resident groups is important when addressing how residents might feel about tourism growth. Tourism business owners are an important player in the delivery of the tourism product. The hospitality of this group of residents is paramount, then in the success of tourism at a destination. Therefore the input of this group should weigh heavily on future decisions of growth and development (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2009). Tourism business owners not only are residents of a tourism community, but are unique in their in their perspectives of its impacts. This group, with a stronger attachment to their community for their business interests are more sensitive to tourism development (Bachleitner & Zins, 1999). Hritz and Hji Avgoustis (2008)

Another way to define development and the benefits and costs of tourism is through economic, social and environmental categories. Economic impacts are usually discussed in terms of the multiplier effect and leakage (Starr, 2002; UNWTO, 2004)). Social/cultural impacts include greater cultural awareness and the loss of the unique cultural identity (Akis, Peristianis, & Warner, 1996; Williams,

1998). Environmental impacts can take the form of both the quality of the physical environment and access to these resources (Mason, 2003). Hritz and Hji Avgoustis (2008)

Mbaiwa(2002) conduct research on the socio-economic and environmental impacts of tourism development in the Okavango Delta located within Ngamiland District in northwestern Botswana. The growth of tourism in the Okavango Delta has also resulted in the establishment of tourist facilities in the area. The nature of tourism development in destination areas such as the Okavango Delta (a natural wetland) make it have socio-economic and environmental impacts, an aspect that this study aims at addressing. These issues are assessed based on the concept of sustainability, which is anchored on the three main principles of social equity, economic efficiency, and ecological sustainability.

Most governments encourage the growth of tourism in their respective countries in order to support economic development. For poor countries, regions, towns and cities, tourism is seen as the fast track to development. Hall (1995) states that the main reason why governments, particularly in developing countries encourage tourism investment is because of the expectations that it will contribute to economic development. It is also argued that tourism should be seen as a means of development in a broader sense (see, for example, Krapf, 1961; Kaiser & Helber, 1978; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Murphy, 1985; McIntosh *et al.*,1995; Wahab & Pigram, 1997; Cooper *et al.*, 1998). These analysts describe the broader sense of tourism to mean the potential of the industry to have direct socio-economic impacts on destination regions. This issue is made more clear by Binns (1995), who states that development should not only refer to economic matters but should encompass social, economic, environmental and ethical considerations such that its measurement may incorporate indicators of poverty, unemployment, inequality and self-reliance. Carter (1991) notes that there is a cumulative relationship between tourism development, the environment and socioeconomic development. This means that if tourism is to contribute to sustainable development, then it must be economically viable, ecologically sensitive and culturally appropriate (Wall, 1997). This suggests that an economic initiative such as tourism should be based on the idea that economic development should conform to the concept of sustainable development. The basic principle of this concept is that of intergenerational equity, which says that our development is sustainable only to the extent that we can meet our needs today without prejudice to those of the future generations. Therefore, the present generation should leave for the next generation, a stock of a quality of life assets no less than those we have inherited (Pearce *et al.*, 1989).

An assessment of tourism's contribution to economic development in host regions requires an analysis of the backward and forward linkages between tourism and other sectors, an understanding of the spatial location of tourism activities and identification of the beneficiaries of its economic and other impacts. This means if

tourism is to have a major influence on the economy of a country or a particular region, it should have strong linkages with the rest of the domestic economy. Tourism can, therefore, be a catalyst for national and regional development, bringing employment, exchange earnings, balance of payments advantages and important infrastructure developments benefiting locals and visitors alike (Glasson *et al.*, 1995). In the study Mbaiwa, discover important things to be considered in the development of tourism is: contribution to gross domestic product (GDP) and government revenue, Impacts on employment and Impacts on infrastructure development (the road network, International Airport, and Hotels and safari camps)

Once a community becomes a destination, the lives of residents in the community are affected by tourism, and the support of the entire population in the tourism community is essential for the development, planning, successful operation and sustainability of tourism (Jurowski, 1994). Therefore, the quality of life (QOL) of the residents in a community should be a major concern for community leaders. If the development of tourism results in a lesser quality of life, residents may be reluctant to support tourism in their community. Therefore, government planners and community developers should consider residents' standpoints when they develop and market recreation, travel, and tourism programs, and help residents realize their higher order needs related to social esteem, actualization, knowledge, and aesthetics.

Kim menyatakan, impact studies emerged in the 1960s with much emphasis on economic growth as a form of national development, measured in terms of "Gross National Product (GNP)," rate of employment, and the multiplier effect (Krannich, Berry & Greider, 1989). The 1970s saw the impacts of tourism ventures on social-cultural issues (Bryden, 1973). Environmental impacts of tourism became the sole concern of tourism researchers in the 1980s (Butler, 1980). 1990s tourism impact studies are an integration of the effects of the previous determined impacts, leading to a shift from "Mass Tourism" to "Sustainable Tourism" in the form of Eco-tourism, heritage tourism, and Community tourism (Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997). Tourism is an industry with enormous economic impacts. It is also an industry that has many environmental and social consequences. A thorough understanding of each component of the tourism phenomenon is essential so that those involved with planning, management, and policy determination have a basis for decision-making.

The early research in this area focused on identifying the various perceived impacts of tourism development (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Liu, Sheldon, & Var, 1987; Liu & Var, 1986; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1987; Ross, 1992; Sheldon & Var, 1984). The major impacts and variables have been identified, methodological approaches developed, and problems and research needs delineated. Generally, residents recognized the positive economic impact of tourism development, but were concerned with potentially negative social and environmental impacts such as traffic

congestion, crime, public safety issues, and pollution. This early research also typically examined differences in perceived impacts among different types of local residents identified on the basis of socio-demographic characteristics (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978); place of residence or distance from the tourism area of the community (Belisle & Holy, 1980; Sheldon & Var, 1984); and economic dependency on tourism, measured both as type of employment (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978) and by comparing local entrepreneurs, public official and other residents (Thomason, Crompton & Kamp, 1979; Lankford, 1994; Murphy, 1983).

According to the Inter-organization committee (1994), in general, there is consensus on the types of impacts that need to be considered (social, cultural, demographic, economic, social psychological).

2.1 Economic impacts

Tourism can create jobs, provide foreign exchange, produce return on investment for emerging economics, bring technology, and improve living standards. The most prominent benefits used to promote tourism development are the economic benefits that communities can expect to derive from an increase in tourism activity. The studies demonstrate that residents feel tourism helps the economy (Ritchie, 1988), that tourism increases the standard of living of host residents (e.g., Var & Kim, 1990), and that tourism helps the host community and country earn foreign exchange (e.g., Ahmed & Krohn, 1992; Var & Kim, 1990). Also, tourism helps generate employment (e.g., Ahmed & Krohn, 1992; Backman & Backman, 1997; Milman & Pizam, 1987; Var & Kim, 1990), and increase revenue to local business (Backman & Backman, 1997; Sethna & Richmond, 1978) and shopping facilities (Backman & Backman, 1997). Services of all kinds are established and offered to tourists, which in turn also serve local residents, and tourism generates the impetus to improve and further develop community infrastructure and community service (Var & Kim, 1990). Tourism is related to foreign domination of tourist services and facilities, increases in the cost of land and housing, increases in prices of goods and services, increases in food and land prices, and shortage of certain commodities (Var & Kim, 1990). Some researchers conclude that residents agreed that tourism's economic gains were greater than social costs (Liu & Var, 1986; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Weaver & Lawton, 2001). The vast majority of studies have focused on employment opportunities, standard of living, the revenue that a community derives from tourism activities, and cost of living.

However, they also found that rapid construction led to heavy unemployment after completion, and that the frequently seasonal nature of the industry disrupts the employment structure. Revenues from tourists for local business and standard of living. Like many other industries, the measure of receipts, and especially the net income generated by those receipts, that a community can expect from tourism

expenditure is dependent upon government policies and a variety of local economic characteristics. One study revealed that net income from tourism ranges from 25% to 90% of the total receipts, depending upon the share of national and local interest in the tourist business (Peppelenbosch & Templeman, 1989). Researchers have also asked residents if they felt that tourism improved the economy (Allen et al., 1988; Bradley et al., 1989; Ritchie, 1988), provided an improved standard of living (Belisle & Holy, 1980; Tosun, 2002; Um & Crompton, 1990), increased investment (Liu et al., 1987) and more business activity (Prentice, 1993). The findings of these studies suggest that residents perceive an improvement in income, standard of living, investments and business activities ensuing from tourism activities. For example, Liu and Var (1986) reported that 90 % of the residents in Hawaii agreed that tourism brought the community more investment and local business.

Based on Daniel J. Stynes, Businesses and public organizations are increasingly interested in the economic impacts of tourism at national, state, and local levels. One regularly hears claims that tourism supports X jobs in an area or that a festival or special event generated Y million dollars in sales or income in a community. "Multiplier effects" are often cited to capture secondary effects of tourism spending and show the wide range of sectors in a community that may benefit from tourism.

Negative economic impacts caused by an increase in the price of goods and services have been perceived by residents in several surveys (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Keogh, 1989; Pizam, 1978; Tosun, 2002; Weaver & Lawton, 2001). Sheldon and Var (1986) found only moderate agreement with a statement which suggested that increases in tourism were the cause of increased prices of goods and services. Very few respondents perceived tourism as the cause of the high cost of living in Zambia (Husbands, 1989). Only 26% of a sample of New Brunswick, Canada residents felt that the addition of a new park would cause price inflation in stores (Keogh, 1989). Tourism can cause the price of land to rise rapidly, as noted by Lundburg (1990), who found that the cost of land for new hotel construction rose from 1 percent to nearly 20 percent as the site was being developed. An early study by Pizam (1978) found that residents viewed the cost of land and housing as a negative effect of tourism. More than 70% of the respondents in a Turkish study agreed that tourism increases property value and housing prices (Tosun, 2002; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Var, Kendall, & Tarakcoglu, 1985). However, other studies found more neutral attitudes. For example, Belisle and Hoy (1980) determined that approximately 90% of respondents described the effect of tourism on the cost of land and housing as neutral. About half of the respondents agreed with the statement that tourism unfairly increases real estate costs, while, in a study of Colorado residents, the other half disagreed (Perdue et al., 1987). These mixed findings suggest that, even though dramatic real estate change has commonly been associated with tourism

development, the perception of the effect of these changes on residents is mixed and irregular.

2.2 Social impacts

Tourism increases traffic congestion and crowdedness in the public area, and brings social problems. Tourism also contributes to social ills such as begging, gambling, drug trafficking, and prostitution, as well as the uprooting of traditional society, and causes deterioration of the traditional culture and customs of host countries (Ahmed & Krohn, 1992, Var & Kim, 1990). Tourism contributes to an undesirable increase in the consumption of alcohol, increased traffic congestion, and overcrowding because of visitors (Backman & Backman, 1997). However, tourism brings more opportunities to upgrade facilities such as outdoor recreation facilities, parks, and roads, but brings crowdedness in theaters, movies, concerts, and athletic events (Lankford & Howard, 1994; Liu & Var, 1986).

Another common theme in tourism resident attitude is that of crowding and congestion, especially focused on traffic inconveniences. Rothman (1978) concluded from his study on seasonal visitors that residents curtailed their activities during the peak tourism season because of congestion. Liu and Var (1986) reported that residents in Hawaii experienced crowdedness during the peak tourism seasons. Tyrrell and Spaulding (1980) determined that the residents of the state of Rhode Island saw congested roads as well as parking and shopping areas as a problem caused by tourism. Several other studies also found that residents perceived that traffic was a major problem created by tourism activities (Long et al, 1990; Keogh, 1990; Prentice, 1993). However, residents' perceptions of the congestion caused by a major world event were less than predicted (Soutar & McLeod, 1993). The majority of respondents in a Florida study did not agree with a statement which suggested that traffic problems would disappear with the absence of tourists (Davis et al., 1988).

Along with tax revenue and employment opportunities, residents have differing views on the effects of tourism on local services. An early study by Sethna and Richmond (1978) found that residents in the Virgin Islands agreed that the money acquired from tourism contributed to the improvement of public services. Likewise, residents in Cape Cod perceived a positive effect of tourism on local services (Pizam, 1978). The Rhode Island study found that only government officials perceived an increase in the cost of police services (Tyrrell & Spaulding, 1980). An important finding in the aspect of services was made by Murphy (1983), who examined the differing views of residents, administrators, and business owners. He found that three groups differed in their perception of the impact of tourism on local services.

Increasing social problem Crime is conceptualized here as any anti-social behavior including increased sale or consumption of drugs and alcohol, as well as

behavior considered immoral by the society as a whole. Smith's study (1992) of Pattaya, Thailand supported the view that tourism development brought prostitution, drug abuse linked to many tourist deaths, sex-related disease and injuries, and police corruption. A Florida study revealed that residents perceived tourism as a causal factor in increasing crime and alcoholism (King, Pizam, & Milman, 1993). On the other hand, Liu and Var (1986) reported that when they asked residents in Hawaii if they perceived that tourism increased crime generally, only 37% of respondents felt that tourism contributed to crime. Other researchers who have examined resident attitudes towards crime and tourism development also found little perceived relationship between crime and tourism overall (Allen et al., 1993).

2.3 Cultural impacts

Even though tourism contributes to the renaissance of traditional arts and craft (Var & Kim, 1990), tourism has frequently been criticized for the disruption of traditional social and culture structures and behavioral patterns. Destination areas that have embraced tourism for its economic benefits have witnessed heightened levels of crime and prostitution, and displacement due to rising land costs and loss of the cultural heritage of local people, particularly youth. Tourism has been charged not only with the debasement of socio-cultural factors but also with degradation of the environment.

Acculturation takes place when two or more cultures come into contact for a sustained period and ideas are exchanged (Liu & Var, 1986). In the case of relatively undeveloped countries, however, local cultures and customs tend to be overwhelmed by more developed cultures, especially Western ones (Liu & Var, 1986; Weaver & Lawton, 2001).

Preservation of local culture, there is some debate over whether tourism preserves or destroys cultures, but the primary position is that the impact is deleterious (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). Tourism has been denounced as being responsible for the depletion of the diversity of non-western cultures (Turner & Ash, 1975).

Kim, the author concluded that tourism does not demand modern capitalist structures and values, but that it is thoroughly compatible with traditional pre-capitalist structures and values. Provided that development is relatively slow and of an equitable nature, tourism can integrate itself into traditional structures. Instead of causing their destruction, it can make their survival possible. Kim's research results, indicate a positive impact and negative aspects of tourism from economic, social, cultural and environmental. This list of tourism impacts was drawn from the literature on the impacts of tourism (Andereck, 1995; Ap & Crompton, 1998; Crandall, 1994; Farrell & Runyan, 1991; Gunn, 1988; Mathieson & Wall, 1984; Murphy, 1985; Tosun, 2002; Weaver & Lawton, 2001; Witt, 1990). Research on the impact of tourism is also done Haley, Snaith, and Miller. They examine the

social impact of tourism in Bath, UK. Where as Elita Bielza – Valdez (2009) also conduct the research on socio-economic impact of tourism and entrepreneurship di Vigan city Philipine.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to expand on the literature and examine relationships between tourism business industry representative's perceived economic, environmental, and social impacts of cultural and convention tourism and support of these market segments.

3. Research Method

This type of research is conclusive experimental research. which aims to determine the impact of tourist spending and look at the factors that influence public support towards the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya.

Source of data used in this study obtained from the primary data, where data were obtained from the survey by distributing questionnaires to the respondents in accordance with the target and the characteristics of the population. The characteristic of the population has been determined that the people of Surabaya who have business in the shopping center or in the vicinity, minimum education junior high school because the education level of respondents deemed to have the ability to understand the questionnaire are given, and is domiciled in Surabaya in order to facilitate the research. The minimum number of respondents who were taken for this study was 294, calculated based on Bernoulli, sample calculation method. Assuming a level of trust that is used by 95% ($\alpha = 5\%$) and error rate (e).

The sampling technique used was non-probabilistic sampling because of the opportunity of members of the population was not identified and election of members to be the sample population was randomly selected and the sample is able to understand the questionnaire provided. From non-probabilistic sampling chosen the convenience sampling, which means sampling in which samples are taken and completely dependent on the researcher selected. So researchers are free to determine the elements that will be included in the sample with a record of representing the characteristics of the population.

Level of measurement used in this study was the interval level. The level of measurement intervals have the same distance and a clear difference in scale. Questionnaire distributed to respondents are closed (close ended question) that the respondent's answer has been restricted by providing alternative answers. Alternative answers provided for the interval level are prepared on the basis of numerical scale with a scale of 1 to 5. Where states do not agree number 1 and number 7 states agree to a statement in the questionnaire.

Data processing method used in this study is to analyze the frequency, factor analysis, and multiple linear regression.

3. Result

Data was collected by distributing questionnaires to the respondents in accordance with the characteristics of the population. The data can be collected are as many as 330, this amount already exceeds the minimum adequacy of the data. 30 questionnaires distributed first and then testing the validity and reliability of data, this is done to see if the instrument of measurement in this study is a questionnaire has been proven as an appropriate measuring instrument. From the results of testing the validity of that seen from the correlation value of each statement of perception total score was found that each statement significantly correlated, it means that each statement is considered valid for measuring the concept in the study. While the reliability of test results obtained Cronbach's alpha value greater than 0.6 so that it can be interpreted that the questionnaire is quite consistent measurement results. Because the questionnaire was considered appropriate then it can be used to collect research data, and may collect a total of 300 respondents so that data can be processed is 330 data. The first treatment carried out to see the percentage of respondents profile given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondent

Demographic variables	N	P
Gender		
Female	213	64.5
Male	117	35.5
Total	330	100.0
Age		
18-25	57	17.3
26-35	138	41.8
36-45	98	29.7
46-55	24	7.3
56-65	10	3.0
66 +	3	0.9
Total	330	100.0
Length of residence		
1-10 years	60	18.2
11-20 years	66	20.0
21-30 years	109	33.0
31-40 years	51	15.5
41-50 years	35	10.6
51 + years	9	2.7
Total	330	100.0

Highest level of education		
SMP	45	13.6
SMA	141	42.7
Diploma	37	11.2
Bachelor's degree	96	29.1
Master's degree	8	2.4
Doctoral	3	0.9
Total	330	100.0
Length of time employed in tourism industry		
0-5 years	100	30.3
6-10 years	133	40.3
11-15 years	52	15.8
16-20 years	20	6.1
21-25 years	12	3.6
26 + years	13	3.9
Total	330	100.0

Table 1 above illustrates the profile of respondents. It shows that more female respondents than male respondents. Age of respondents at most be in the range of 26-35 years, ie 138 respondents, or by 41.8%. Respondents who had lived in Surabaya during the 21-30 years at most compared to other groups, as many as 109 respondents or 33%. Last education respondents most is the high school level. While the duration of respondents own a business in the shopping center or the surrounding environment is 6-10 years as many as 133 respondents or a total of 40.3% and the second is 0-5 years as many as 100 respondents, or by 30.3%.

Table 2. Mean and Standard Deviation of variable impact tourism

No	Impact area and variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Economic impact			
1	The shopping tourism has created more jobs for masyarakat Surabaya	3.92	1
2	The shopping tourism has given economic benefits to local people and small business	3.84	0.949
3	My standard of living has increased considerably because of shopping tourism	3.65	0.960
4	The price of goods and services have increased because of shopping tourism	3.51	1.023
5	The cost of developing tourism the shopping tourism facilities is too much	3.18	1.115

Social Impact			
6	The shopping tourism has increased the crime rate in Surabaya	3.29	1.077
7	Local residents have suffered from living in a shopping tourism as destination area	2.98	1.013
8	The shopping tourism has encouraged a variety of cultural activities by the local residents	3.45	1.014
9	Meeting tourists from other regions is a valuable experience to understand their culture and society	3.80	0.953
10	The shopping tourism has resulted in positive impacts on the cultural identity of Surabaya	3.53	1.039
Environment Impacts			
11	The shopping tourism provides more parks and other recreational areas	3.82	0.947
12	Our roads and public facilities are kept at a high standard due to the shopping tourism	3.70	0.864
13	The shopping tourism has provided an incentive for the restoration of historical buildings and the conservation of natural resources	3.22	0.946
14	Local residents have suffered from living in a shopping tourism as destination area	3.23	1.265
15	Construction of the shopping tourism facilities for tourist has destroyed the natural environment	2.95	1.151
Total		3.47	1.021
Support for development			
16	I support the shopping tourism in Surabaya	3.83	0.941

Table 2 shows average and standard deviation of respondents' answers to each question on the questionnaire. Total average of respondents' perceptions of shopping tourism in Surabaya is 3.47 this shows relative respondents agree to any statement that is given, with a total standard deviation of 1.021. The statement, which has the highest average, is the "shopping center to create more employment opportunities for people of Surabaya", amounting to 3.92 this means that the respondents agreed that tourism expenditure is able to create more employment opportunities for people of Surabaya. While the lowest average is "Development of shopping facilities for tourists could damage the natural environment" of 2.95 which means that the respondents assess the development of shopping facilities for tourists not to damage the surrounding natural environment.

Table 3. Result of Factors Analysis for Shopping Tourism Impact

No	Item Questions	Factor 1: Socio- environment	Factor 2: economic	Factor 3: Negative impact	Factor 4: Socio- economic
1	Meeting tourists from other regions is a valuable experience to understand their culture and society	.676	.195	.035	.318
2	The shopping tourism provides more parks and other recreational areas	.612	.541	.102	.064
3	Our roads and public facilities are kept at a high standard due to the shopping tourism	.803	.192	-.017	.095
4	The shopping tourism has provided an incentive for the restoration of historical buildings and the conservation of natural resources	.705	-.097	.089	.006
5	The shopping tourism has created more jobs for masyarakat Surabaya	.159	.785	-.053	.110
6	The shopping tourism has given economic benefits to local people and small business	.058	.859	.071	.055
7	My standard of living has increased considerably because of shopping tourism	.083	.687	.020	.155
8	The shopping tourism has increased the crime rate in Surabaya	.145	.054	.828	-.130
9	Local residents have suffered from living in a shopping tourism as destination area	.027	-.046	.748	.078

10	Tourism has resulted in traffic congestion, noise and pollution	.010	.180	.675	.274
11	Construction of the shopping tourism facilities for tourist has destroyed the natural environment	-.100	-.124	.623	.453
12	The price of goods and services have increased because of shopping tourism	.105	.251	.082	.617
13	The cost of developing tourism the shopping tourism facilities is too much	.006	-.041	.337	.642
14	The shopping tourism has encouraged a variety of cultural activities by the local residents	.390	.158	.046	.651
15	The shopping tourism has resulted in positive impacts on the cultural identity of Surabaya	.478	.242	-.136	.505
Eigenvalue		4.151	2.350	1.429	1.095
% of variance		27.673	15.669	9.526	7.297
Cumulative %		27.673	43.342	52.868	60.165
Cronbach's alpha		0.743	0.727	0.726	0.641

The result from factors analysis produces the characteristic roots (eigen value) and information on the total variation for each component as well as cumulatively. From the original variables are transformed into a component correlated with each other, with each component consisting of the original variables that form an interrelated factors free. The selection factor is done by seeing the eigen value or the size of the total variation information can be given by the eigen valuenya factor greater than or equal to one or have more data variability than 10%.

Table 3 shows that that statement no 1 to 4 are located in a single factor: the first factor. This factor shows the social and environmental aspects, which explains that the Surabaya city government is considered to have facilitated the development of public utilities, repairs and maintenance around the roads or access to the shopping center. Not only shopping but the government also tried to develop

tourism with due regard to historic buildings such as the Ampel, Submarine monument, the Tugu Pahlawan or protection of natural resources such as natural attractions of the river or beach Kalimas Ria Kenjeran. This is consistent with the statement of Head of Culture and Tourism (Disbudpar) Surabaya, which revealed that Surabaya has a variety of potential that can be offered. Aside from being a city with shopping, Surabaya has cultural and tourism potentials of water. Shopping center shopping center also provides more play areas and recreational areas that can provide opportunities for businesses in the shopping center to meet with many tourists from different regions, it is a valuable experience to understand the cultural and tourist life.

Statement No. 5 to No. 7 is located on one factor: the economic factor. Tourism spending in Surabaya can have an impact on the economic aspect, it means business community in the area surrounding the shopping center and felt there was an increase of employment opportunities, economic benefits and improved standards of public life. Various types of new businesses to provide benefits such as the houses around the shopping center can be made day care a motorcycle or a place to sell food and drinks. Each shopping center will provide hundreds of tenants who need staff to help determine the sales, as well as for energy security, park interpreters, and technicians who assist business processes running smoothly.

Statement No. 8 to 11 located on one factor: the negative impact factors. The number of visitors or tourists around the shopping center would allow the occurrence of crime, crowds can also disturb the environment, the number of vehicles used in tourists to the location of the shopping center also can cause congestion, pollution, noise and environmental damage have each other because of the relatively high correlation indicates a negative impact with a shopping tour in Surabaya

Statement No. 12 through 15 located on one factor because it has a high correlation of socioeconomic factors because the Government considered to have a lot to pay for the development of support facilities in the shopping center. So the shopping mall into the resorts comfortable with complete facilities. Various tourist needs can be met by goods and services and facilities available. This can cause the price of goods and services may be higher if sold in the shopping center, although in some places with the purchase amount will be obtained wholesale quantity discounts. Various events held in shopping centers can also increase the variety of cultural activities by the communities, and a positive impact on cultural identity in Surabaya.

Each factor has a value of eigen value greater than 1, with a cumulative percentage of 60,165%. The first principal component explained a total of 27.673% variation, the second major component of 15,669%, the third major component of 9.526%, while the fourth major component of 7.297%. The fourth factor also indicates the level of reliability greater than 0.6 as indicated by the value of

Cronbach's alpha, this means that there is consistency in response to any given statement.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis of Impact Factors

Variable	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Socio-environment	0.142	0.024	0.436	5.929	0.000
Economic	0.084	0.021	0.209	4.012	0.000
Negative impact	-0.068	0.014	-0.244	-5.045	0.000
Socio-economic	-0.008	0.023	-0.024	-.327	0.744
R = 0.571		R2 = 0.329			
F = 39.228					

Regression model testing done to see factors that affect support for the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya, shown Table 4. The independent variables in the regression model are the socio-environment factors, economic factors, negative impact, and socio-economic factors. Being the dependent variable is support for the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya. Regression model showed that the socio-economic factors were not statistically significantly affect support for the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya, while other factors, namely: socio-environment, economic and the negative impact significantly affect support for the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya.

Regression coefficient on the socio-environment variables for 0.436 shows the influence of socio-environment factor is greater than the economic factor of 0.209. Both these variables influence the direction of the dependent variable, this means greater social benefits, environmental and economic community felt Surabaya will provide more positive support to the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya. While the negative impacts variable has a negative regression coefficient of 0.244, this could mean that the people of Surabaya feel the negative effects of tourism spending is not felt, so that support for tourism development spending is still there. The people do not feel disturbed by the number of tourists who come, as well as traffic congestion, air pollution, and noise is not only caused by tourist spending. This fits well with the results of research Nancy Hritz, Sotiris Hji-Avgoustic (2008).

The test overall regression model showed significantly with an F statistic of 39.228 with a determination coefficient of 32.9% which means that the independent variables together can explain 32.9% variation on the dependent variable data.

4. Conclusion

The results of this study described the impact of shopping tourism in Surabaya. The rapid growth of shopping centers in accordance with the policy of the Surabaya city government who consistently grow the tourism potential shopping was also perceived positively by the people of Surabaya that has a business in the shopping center and surrounding areas. Especially in the economic aspect, because the shopping center is perceived to create more employment opportunities for people of Surabaya. Support to develop a shopping tour also provided by the city of Surabaya, which has businesses in the shopping center and surrounding areas.

Principal component analysis results obtained 4 factors from the impact of shopping tourism in Surabaya, these factors include socio-environment factors, economic factors, negative impact, and socio-economic factors. But from the results of multiple regression analysis showed that socio-environment factors and economic factors provide a positive influence on support for the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya, Surabaya city means people who have businesses in the shopping center and surrounding support for the development of shopping experience a positive impact on business environment and the city of Surabaya in general, nor feel the impact of the economic benefits by increasing employment opportunities so more increased living standards. Crowds of tourists in the shopping center does not make society as a nuisance, as well as traffic congestion, noise and pollution does not become a barrier to support the development of shopping tourism. Socio-economic factors are not proven to affect support for the development of shopping tourism in Surabaya, this means rising prices of goods and services not only caused by a shopping tour, but may also be due to other external factors, as well as various cultural events held in shopping mall not be a major supporting factor for tourism spending.

5. References

- Andereck, K., and C.A. Vogt, 2000, The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research* 39, 27-36
- Andriotis, K., and R.D. Vaughan, 2003, Urban residents' attitude toward tourism development: The case of crete. *Journal of Travel Research* 42, 172-185,
- Bielza-Valdez, E., 2009, The Socio-Economic Impact of Tourism and Entrepreneurship in Vigan City, *E-International Scientific Research Journal* 1(1),

- Çetinkaya, A. Ş., 2009, Destination Competitiveness Through the use of Information and Communication Technologies, *European and Mediterranean Conference on Information Systems 2009 (EMCIS2009)*, July 13-14 2009, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Izmir, , Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Post Secondary Vocational School of Silifke – Tasucu, Selcuk University, Turkey, alisukru@selcuk.edu.tr / alisukru68@hotmail.com.
- Chen, C-F and D. C. Tsai, 2007, How Destination Image and Evaluative Factors affect Behavioral Intentions?, *Tourism Management* 28: 1115-1122.
- Dioguardi, V., A. Giannitrapani, and A. M. Parroco, 2013, Destination image and tourism intermediation. A possible interdisciplinary approach, *International Marketing Trends Conference*, Paris, 17-19 January 2013.
- Egan, D. J., and K. Nield, 2003, The economic impact of tourism—a critical review, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, August
- Haley, A.J., T. Snaith, and G. Miller, 2004, The Social Impact of Tourism, A Case Study of Bath, UK, *Working Paper* University of Surrey, <http://epubs.surrey.ac.uk/1117/1/fulltext.pdf>.
- Hritz, N., and S. Hji-Avgoustis, 2008, An Investigation of Perceived Tourism Impacts between Market Segments, *Tourism Today* 8, 33-53.
- Jurowski, C., 2001, International Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research* 25(4), 355-370.
- Karim, A., 2008, *Kapitalisasi Pariwisata dan Marginalisasi masyarakat Lokal Kota Lombok*, Yogyakarta: Genta Press.
- Kim, K., 2002, The Effects of Tourism Impacts Upon Quality of Life of Residents in the Community, Unpublished Dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Kurguni, H., 2010, The Effect of Country Based Image in Accurance of Brand in Cultural Destinations, *Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural* 8(3), 79-90.
- Lukasz D., J. Strilchuk, J. Sorochuk, and C. Provost, 2006, Negative Impact of Tourism on Hawaii Natives and Environment, *Lethbridge Undergraduate Research Journal* 1(2), <http://www.lurj.org/article.php/vol1n2/hawaii.xml>.
- Mbaiwa, J. E., 2003, The socio-economic and environmental impacts of tourism development on the Okavango Delta, north-western Botswana, *Journal of Arid Environments* 54(2), 447-467.
- Mitchell, R., 2006, A Reconceptualisation of Destination Tourism Management: Focussing on Sustainability and Corporate Social Responsibility, *Otago Business PhD Colloquium*, October 18 – 19, 2006, <http://otago.ourarchive.ac.nz/handle/10523/760>.

- Omerzel, D. G., 2006, Competitiveness of Slovenia as a Tourist Destination, *Managing Global Transitions* 4 (2): 167-189.
- Pemda Surabaya, Strategi Kota Surabaya Tarik Wisatawan Andalkan Wisata Belanja Hingga Gandeng Agen Travel, www.surabaya.go.id Wisata Belanja Di Kota Surabaya, Selasa, 30 November 2010
- Prezenza, A., 2005, The Performance of a Tourism Destination, Who Manages the Destination? Who Plays the Audit Role?, Working Paper, www.esade.es/credit2005/papers/pers.
- Rahayu, S., 2010, Tour Destination Mapping of Indonesian Tourist, *The 1st Java Institute International Colloquium (JIIC): Reframing Java: Past, Present and Future*, Soegijapranata Catholic University, 3 August 2010.
- Soetantini, N., 2010, Surabaya Layak Jadi Kota Belanja, *Ekonomi Bisnis*, 20 Februari 2010, <http://ekonomibisnis.suarasurabaya.net/?id=53be8b85cec1aad17d556b4217252002201073992> www.suarasurabaya.net
- Stynes, D.J., 1997, *Economic Impacts of Tourism*, <https://www.msu.edu/course/prr/840/econimpact/pdf/ecimpvol1.pdf>
- Suara Karya, 2008, Wisata Belanja Warga Surabaya Kini Punya Banyak Mal Pilihan, Selasa, 29 April 2008, (<http://www.suarakarya-online.com/news.html?id=198485>).
- Yoeti, O. A., 2008, *Ekonomi Pariwisata: Introduksi, Informasi dan Implementasi*, Kompas, Jakarta, <http://www.surabaya.go.id/infokota/index.php?id=6>.
- Zortul, M., 2009, Economic Impact of Tourism on Turkey's Economy: Evidence from Cointegration Tests, *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics* 25, 231-239.