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Abstract
Although youth tourism is an increasingly relevant subject little research have been done regarding the segment’s own perception of their impacts. A consumer perspective was assumed to examine in what ways youth tourism impact places. This study adopts a deductive approach reviewing existing literature regarding youth tourism, impact and place. A case study concerning how youth travellers perceive and evaluate their own impacts was conducted using mixed-methods. Data sources include a survey and in-depth interviews concerning sociocultural, economic, and environmental items. The study concludes that what impacts youth tourism has on places are subject to the place’s current state and ability to host youth travellers. The number of youth travellers and their behaviour determines the local and global sociocultural, economic and environmental impacts that youth tourism has on places. This paper is considered a pre-study that contributes to the development of theory regarding youth tourism.

Keywords
Youth tourism; youth travellers; impacts; tourism impacts; place; place identity; place attachment; Social Exchange Theory; Triple Bottom Line.

Disclaimer
We consider this research to be a pre-study in the fields of youth tourism as the scope of this study allows us to see indications of how youth tourism impact places from a consumer perspective. In order to generalize the impacts of youth tourism, a more extensive and in-depth study is necessary. A larger database with greater scope would allow causality and results to be determined to a greater extent. There are likely additional nuances, insights and interpretations to be found in our dataset that could inform the direction of future studies.
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1. Background

This chapter presents an overview of youth tourism, impact and place. Attention is drawn to the complexity of the concepts as well as how they relate to one another. Different approaches to how youth tourism can be studied are introduced resulting in a research question and purpose.

An increase in travel among young people have been seen due to several factors. First, an expanding international student population. Education contributes to a rise in income which makes new markets emerge in developing countries (Richards and Wilson, 2003). Second, a growing number of countries experience increased prosperity. Higher standards of living in developing countries have led to more travel opportunities among these often young and affluent populations. Finally, the tourism industry itself is changing from the traditional tourism value chain to a value web. Suppliers and actors are becoming more easily accessible through a more integrated and complex network. Value webs link tourism to other sectors exploiting new opportunities where value is created. Young people have been seen to embrace this kind of changes since they are prepared to try new things which in turn will create new links (UNWTO, 2011). No universal understanding of what constitutes a ‘young’ tourist, or how to define youth tourism, has yet been agreed upon (Richards and Wilson, 2003), but according to the United Nations, youth tourism consists of travellers ranging from ages 15-29 and are referred to as youth travellers. Representing more than 23% of the over one billion tourists travelling internationally each year, they are one of the fastest growing segments of international tourism. The youth tourism segment is therefore considered to be a major force with the ability to influence the tourism sector (UNWTO, 2016).

As the youth tourism market grows, interest and possible research aspects increase. A common identifier in youth tourism research is to study what outcome certain actions give (Richards and Wilson, 2003). Regardless of action, some kind of impact will occur. An impact is a change that occurs at a given condition over time (Hall and Lew, 2009). It is often related to the Triple Bottom Line (TBL), consisting of sociocultural, economic and environmental aspects (Stoddard, Pollard and Evans, 2012). Impacts can be seen in all of these aspects as a result of external stimulus. The term tourism impact is used to describe changes that happen as a result of tourism (Hall and Lew, 2009). Previous tourism studies include social impacts, the experience of unorganized travel, risk assessment and behavioral patterns (Richards and Wilson, 2003). When studying tourism activities, different degrees of impacts can be seen in the various aspects (Hall and Lew, 2009). They can be short- and long-term including environment, communities (UNWTO, 2011) and education (Ballantyne, Packer and Falk, 2011). Tourism both affects and is affected by people and things, as opposed to the common description of it being a one-way effect (Hall and Lew, 2009).

To help understand tourism related impacts it is important to know where they occur. Both physical and social environments are affected by tourism (McKercher, 1993) and to see changes one needs to understand the current state of places. When people, things or other attributes occupy a space it becomes a place where memories are created (Mowla, 2004). As meaning is attached to a space, a place occurs (Cresswell, 2015). Place is a holistic phenomenon (Hallak, Brown and Lindsay, 2012) where interpersonal, social and cultural relationships are formed (Hallak, Brown and Lindsay, 2012). A place has its own symbols and labels that are simultaneously changing with interactions and relationships. How people connect to and perceive a place can be explained through place identity and place attachment. Place identity refers to how a person relates to a place through own experiences and values (Coghlan et al., 2016). Place attachment is the emotional bond a person has to a place (Anton
and Lawrence, 2014) and how well and to what extent they feel they belong to the environment (Coghlan et al., 2016). How people perceive a place can have effects on their behaviour while being there and thus affect their impact. Youth tourism’s ability to influence the tourism sector will inevitably have short- and long-term impacts on places. This makes it a relevant research topic.

1.1 A question of inquiry
Given that youth travellers are between 15-29 years old, they are in 2018 part of two different market segmentations. Generation Y, born late 70’s to mid 90’s (Huang and Petrick, 2009), and Generation Z, born after the mid 90’s (Vetter, 2017). Expedia Media Solutions (referred to by Davies, 2017) state significant consumption and travel differences between the two segments. Generation Y is characterized by frequent, deal-driven travellers with a wide variety of interest (Jennings et al., 2010) whilst Generation Z is known to be open minded, technologically cunning and budget orientated with the goal to complete a bucket list (Davies, 2017). Taking this into consideration it is interesting to further examine if Generation Y and Z are separated in regard to tourism. Or is it that these two target groups are invalid in tourism since they, in this context, might constitute one generation. If they are separated, possible research could be conducted concerning the consequences of having two demographics in the target group youth tourism.

Another interesting topic to study related to youth tourism is that extensive network technology has facilitated so that digital information can instantly be shared across the globe. Modern technology facilitates and has been facilitated by the concept of time-space compression. It is a gradually developed concept that makes physical distance seem shorter and changes the perception of time and space. Places appear closer and more accessible (Harvey, 1999) which opens up the discussion of how a place is perceived. This in turn leads to the debate about what a place is and how it is defined. With the development of Information & Communication Technologies (ICTs), Social Media has emerged and become a matter of course in everyday life. This has caused rapid changes in the way tourists behave as well as how they plan and consume their travels (Bizirgianni and Dionysopoulou, 2013). Consequently, how the use of Social Media impacts the behavioural patterns of young travellers becomes relevant. Tourists are now able to express opinions, needs or desires affecting the supply of tourism products. This amplifies the realization that Social Media has influence on youth tourism (Bizirgianni and Dionysopoulou, 2013). Studying youth tourism in relation to Social Media increases interest in how Social Media can be used as a tool to reach youth travellers.

As mentioned above, there are differences within the target group youth travellers. However, research shows that youth travellers display some heterogeneity regarding their engagement in various activities (Frändberg, 2010). Eusébio and Carneiro (2015) identified four primary categories including culture, fun, sun and beach, and nature. Within these categories differences were found regarding socio-demographics, travel motivations, interaction with locals and other visitors and other features of travel behaviour. A wide variety of travel behaviour results in different short- and long-term impacts. To further examine what these impacts are and to what degree they affect a place would be a possible research topic. If the purpose of youth tourism is one of the four identified categories, potential research can examine what role that will play in the choice of destination and what measures can be taken to attract youth travellers to a specific location.
A case study by Richards and Wilson (2005) shows that youth and student travel have increased as a result from the development of budget/low cost airlines and more flexible employment modes in the mid 90s’. Several aspects of societal change, such as ICTs, changing demographics, development of budget/low cost airlines and flexible employment modes, suggests multiple factors in the emergence of youth tourism. This encourages further studies of the underlying reasons to why youth tourism has grown. An increasing number of countries and regions are becoming more aware of the benefits of youth travellers. Local communities can experience vast socioeconomic opportunities as this segment often travel longer and spend more money than other travellers. This stimulates local businesses as well as fostering closer social interactions (UNWTO, 2016). When studying youth tourism, the positive impacts are often highlighted. Less research has focused on the negative effects. Issues from a producer perspective that may be central for further studies include; how youth tourism affect relationships in and between local families; long term impacts on the environment; and what the impacts is on a place that is dependent on tourism as a source of income when the market saturates and eventually declines. A majority of previous studies have a perspective focusing on local residents’ perception of tourism and youth tourism impacts (e.g. Deccio and Baloglu, 2002, Tosun, 2002, Andereck et al., 2005, Lundberg, 2017). Another way of looking at these issues is from a consumer perspective. Therefore, it becomes interesting to study how youth travellers perceive changes at places. What different types of change do youth travellers react to the most? Is the experienced authenticity affected or is the feeling of security reduced as the number of visitors on a place increase?

As societal change has enabled youth tourism and made it one of the fastest growing and most influential segments of international tourism, it has been chosen as the discourse of this study. This in combination with youth tourism’s ability to affect a place and its society, have led to the research question:

In what ways does youth tourism impact places?

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of the study is to examine theoretical findings in relation to empirics of how youth travellers perceive and evaluate their impacts on places. This will be done by conducting an inventory using a consumer perspective.

1.3 Switching it up

Given that the research question is “in what ways youth tourism impact places”, it makes sense to first define the concepts. We will start by considering the definition of place, as this is where impacts occur. This is followed by what is meant by impact and tourism impacts. Once that is done we can think about these concepts in general terms. In order to bring it together we need to also understand what is meant by youth tourism. Only then, we can consider the impacts youth tourism has on places.
2. Method

A presentation of research strategies with the purpose of explaining how the study was conducted, why it was implemented in this way and to what extent it is possible to rely on the results.

2.1 Creating knowledge

This study is based on different concepts and the Triple Bottom Line model from existing literature in the fields of; youth tourism and its characteristics; impacts, how it is defined and its relation to tourism; and place, its different definitions and various forms. By doing so the study assumed a deductive approach, which is explained by Smith (2017) as theoretical findings being tested against empirics. Due to the complexity of youth tourism, mixed-methods were used. Combining quantitative and qualitative methods were used to complement each other and helped provide a better understanding of our research problem than either trends or stories alone. It is a way to make the methods more effective and to create synergy (Hesse-Bieber, 2015). The interviews sought more in-depth answers (Smith, 2017) than the survey and could therefore provide more nuanced answers which were important as we searched for people’s opinions and perceptions. The survey provided a database which helped us interpret the general perception of how youth travellers comprehend their impacts. To reflect on how different methods influence the study we used the model set forth by Åsberg (2001) as methodology. Choosing mixed-methods and reflecting on what different choices mean for our study has enabled a clearer work process and interpretation of the results.

Looking at previous studies regarding tourism and youth tourism impacts we see a knowledge gap in what perspective is being investigated. A majority of studies focus on residents’ perception of tourism impacts (e.g. Deccio and Baloglu, 2002, Tosun, 2002, Andereck et al., 2005, Lundberg, 2017). Due to the gap, a consumer perspective was chosen. This will contribute to a better understanding of how youth tourism, impact and place cohere. A case study concerning youth tourism’s impacts on places was conducted which enabled us to analyse and compile the results with the objective of contributing to the theory development.

2.2 Gathering empirical data

For the data to be relevant, respondents were sought within our target group. What knowledge is sought determines which method is used (Smith, 2017). Primary data was gathered through a survey and complementing interviews which resulted in a unique database with specific knowledge about youth tourism.

Quantitative data provided width and enabled a start to generalization (Long, 2007) regarding in what ways youth tourism impact places. To cover a large part of our target audience a web-based survey was conducted using three different methods. First, to reach our own network the survey was posted on our Facebook wall. Limitations occur in terms of only reaching our friends and possibly their friends connected to Facebook. However, the majority of our friends are connected and meet the criteria of the target group. We therefore consider them reliable and relevant respondents. Second, to reach a wider network than our own, ten special travel related Facebook groups were used. We understand that reaching out to these specific travel groups exclude members of the total population that are outside of their communities. Finally, people in Kalmar, Sweden, were approached face to face. Contacting people using three different forums increases the variety of respondents, which reduces data bias (Oppermann, 2000). Jordan and Gibson (2004), suggest that for a more profound
understanding of a subject, in-depth interviews can provide qualitative experiential data. Three interviews were conducted extending our understanding of youth tourism impacts.

2.3 Selection and delimitations
The population on which the selection is based consists of young travellers between 15-29 years old. The accepted size of selection errors and the desired detail of the study determines the amount of selection required (Smith, 2017). Given that our population exists worldwide and to complete the study within the given time frame we were forced to do a selection. How the selection was done determined how accurate and reliable the result is (Long, 2007). We are aware that depending on who the respondents are results can vary. Therefore, to acquire relevant data people within the age group, interested in travel, were sought. The data of the study has been collected and compiled by the researchers. It consists of responses collected through a survey. In total, 150 respondents answered the survey but after compiling and reviewing the data we determined 145 useful. Data error in the survey consists of respondents who did not meet the age requirements of our target group. It is not possible to determine how many within our contact network respectively the travel Facebook groups that answered the survey. However, 100 people responded to the survey via Facebook and 50 responded face to face at the Linnaeus University Library. We consider the data errors to be minor and representative which according to Bryman and Bell (2005) increases the validity of the study.

Convenience selections were made when conducting the survey through Facebook and via face to face interactions. We are aware of the disadvantages of convenience selections, such as the inability to generalize research findings and that sampling errors are likely to occur (Smith, 2017). However, this method was chosen since we, due to law restrictions, were denied access to clients of Kilroy (Michael Unkuri, Travel advisor Kilroy Sweden AB). Ten travel related Facebook groups, targeting different parts of the world, were chosen to widen the access and nationalities of our target group. The survey was reposted after ten days as a reminder. In total, it was available for two weeks after which it was closed down due to time limitations. Face to face surveys were conducted at the Linnaeus University library. We chose to ask respondents on a Tuesday afternoon as this time and day is a popular time of the week to visit the library according to statistics by Google.

Purposive sampling was used to determine the participants in the interview. The respondents were selected due to their experience and extended time spent abroad. Criteria set up for participation were to at least have stayed in a place for six consecutive months and revisited that place at least six months after leaving it, or; to at least have stayed in one place for twelve consecutive months. These visits were required to have been when the traveller was within the age span of a youth traveller (15-29). We are aware of that purposive sampling does not represent the entire population. However, this method was used as it allows for contacting people believed to best provide relevant information (Tongco, 2007) and can therefore be considered an advantage in our study.

Identifying delimitations allows us to value the level of knowledge in the study. It states the extent of the study and how much it can be specified (DePoy and Gitlin, 1994). Delimitations were done in relation to the population and situation the study examined and helped determine the study’s reliability and external validity. Delimitations in the literature review concerned published research articles, books and reports. The scope of the literature review was delimited with regard to youth tourism, impact and place. This made the study possible without compromising a comprehensive review.
Delimitations within the empirics were done through the case study which allowed us to focus on one context without including all possible variables. Our empirical data access is mainly built on personal networks in which we have developed relationships to gatekeepers during previous travels and employment. Gatekeepers refers to people who are either facilitators or limiters of information (Smith, 2017). In this study facilitators are the interviewees and Kilroy a limiter. Delimitations in the survey were narrowed to people between 15-29 years old. The purpose of the survey was to see the distribution in a randomly assembled population, and therefore we chose to do a descriptive analysis. We did not intend to do other measurements and the material would not have allowed it. We are aware of that the relationship we have to a majority of the respondents may have influenced the answers. People from our contact network may have wanted to provide us with the right responses, resulting in bias. Knowing bias might have occurred, it is still important to turn to gatekeepers who can and will provide access to the information needed (Bryman and Bell, 2015). In order to reduce bias interviews were conducted with each other’s contacts.

2.4 Survey and database
A questionnaire-based survey was used as a method to collect data because it provides a large database with possibilities to generalize results. It is also a time- and cost-efficient way (Smith, 2017) to better understand youth travellers’ characteristics and/or interpretation of their behaviour. Ap and Crompton’s (1998) framework was used as a tool in order to understand how youth travellers perceive and evaluate their impacts on places. Modifications were done to better suit our study resulting in a survey based on travel motivations, the Triple Bottom Line and personal information. It consisted of 30 questions where 25 questions where 1-5 Likert-scales (see attachment 1).

In order for the survey and the research question to relate in a relevant way, the foundation of the survey was created parallel with reading literature. Knowing previous findings provided a better understanding of what to ask in order to fulfil the purpose of the study. As youth tourism includes everyone between the ages of 15-29 this study focuses on that age segment. Therefore, gender is not a necessary variable in our survey. To avoid overlooking errors and to ensure the accuracy and efficiency two pilot surveys were conducted. The participants in the first pilot were chosen through a convenience sample. After obtaining and analysing feedback, problems such as logistical and technical issues were addressed resulting in us sending out a second pilot. This was also done through a convenience sample.

2.5 Interview
The interview questions were based on the survey with the intention of creating more in-depth knowledge. The design of the interviews is within the framework of semi-structured retrieval where follow-up questions enabled important answers. Just like the survey a pilot interview was conducted to ensure reliable answers. The three interviews were conducted using Skype and provided us with in-depth information, valuable to this study. Skype interviews have the same characteristics as in-person interviews but can be subject to technical issues that may compromise the interview. As only part of the participant’s body was visible, interpretation of the body language was limited (Janghorban, Roudsari, and Taghipour, 2014). Skype was used as it, similar to an in-person interview, can ensure that the respondents understand the questions (Jordan and Gibson, 2004). We did not experience any technical issues, though misunderstandings may still have occurred and it is possible that we have unconsciously affected the interviewees’ answers. However, as using semi-structured interviews can minimise potential errors, such as misunderstandings (Bryman and Bell, 2015) we believe results are reliable.
To give the respondent an understanding of the research and its content a short summary was presented prior to the interview. Describing the purpose of the study increased credibility and created a positive atmosphere and relationship to the interviewee. The interviewee was encouraged to ask questions or add information during and after the interview which according to Smith (2017) mitigate potential errors and ensure reliable answers.

2.6 Analytical methods

Four different methods were used when gathering primary data. These include the three ways of conducting the survey and the one way of conducting the interviews. As mixed-methods were used, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered. The quantitative data is based on the survey and analysed using descriptive statistics. This was done to see how the answers are distributed and spread rather than who responded. It allowed us to see some variations but due to data restrictions a deeper analysis of the material was not possible. Qualitative data were gathered through the interviews and analysed similar to a content analysis. What follows is a presentation of the two analytical methods.

2.6.1 Quantitative analysis

Quantitative data was analysed to detect the frequency of which certain answers were given. To analyse the data the statistics program SPSS was used which enabled comparison of different variables. How well a theoretical expectation or prediction is consistent with empirical observation can be tested through a Chi-square ($\chi^2$) test (Edling and Hedström, 2003). Using $\chi^2$-test allowed us to see differences in distribution between two categorical variables and so discover possible relationships. This was important as it can explain why a sub segment have answered in a specific way. The difference was calculated through $\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(O_i-E_i)^2}{E_i}$ were $O_i$ stands for observed values and $E_i$ for expected values (Djurfeldt, Larsson and Stjärnhagen, 2003). The version of $\chi^2$-test used is Pearson Chi-square test where the $p$-value represent the probability of the occurrence of a given event (Edling and Hedström, 2003). A $p=0.05$ or less is in the research considered a significant dependency. To create a better overview and comparison of the results, excel sheets were created enabling us to present a visual representation in the form of three different scatter plots. The mean was calculated in order to understand youth travellers’ perceived and evaluated impacts on places. Standard deviation (SD) show the reliability of the results. The closer its value is to 1, the lower the spread of answers, indicating a reliable result. If standard deviation exceeds 1 it indicates an over confidence of the result (Djurfeldt, Larsson and Stjärnhagen, 2003).

2.6.2 Content analysis

All interviews were recorded and transcripted, which according to Smith (2017) can be done to achieve accuracy. To reduce researcher bias interviews were conducted with each other’s contacts. All interviewees were given a copy of the transcript for additional comments and/or corrections. This gave more accurate and reliable results as misunderstandings were clarified. The answers of the various interviewees were summarized under each question, which meant that we could see differences and to what extent similarities occurred. Looking at overall similarities and differences resembles a content analysis which is described by Fisher (2007) as adding quantitative elements to qualitative material. The answers were in turn analysed based on the Triple Bottom Line categories in relation to the results from the survey and the literature review. We were aware of the potential issues concerning a content analysis regarding researcher bias that can occur when reading, annotate and coding data. We have tried to, as far as we can, obtain an awareness that subjectivity may have occurred in the
study. By being two researchers, we could decode the information separately, which according to Hall and Valentin (2008) mitigates reliability issues.

2.7 Triangulation
Triangulation was used by analysing our research question from existing literature, qualitative and quantitative data. As explained by Decrop (1999) it can strengthen findings as individual sources merge, or at least do not contradict each other. Using triangulation can verify trends found in the data according to Oppermann (2000). Trends that were detected in the data were to some degree confirmed by the literature. A majority of the respondents were Swedish which might have influenced the results. Results from the $\chi^2$-test did not show any major nationality causation. More extensive research and cross-validation with other nationalities could to a higher degree verify or falsify this (Koc and Boz, 2014). By using interviews as part of data triangulation we were able to achieve some cross-validation. Another important reason for using data triangulation is that it has enabled us to limit problems of bias, ensure relevance and increase reliability and validity (Smith, 2017).

2.8 Generalization
The goal of conducting a case study using mixed-methods is to contribute to a greater understanding of the subject. As previously stated, we view this as a pre-study and hope that it can be part of the greater work of understanding youth tourism. It is often difficult to generalize when doing a case study as they usually consist of small samples (Smith, 2017). As this is consistent with our study we can only generalize the results to it. However, by combining the literature review with results from the survey and interviews it is possible to see indications of trends that could be representative for a larger population. We would suggest further and more extensive research to confirm or contradict these indications. Despite restrictions in generalization, we believe that researchers and others involved with youth tourism find the results informative and valuable. As youth tourism is one of the fastest growing segments in the tourism industry (UNWTO, 2016) the market can change drastically. Limitations may therefore occur regarding for how long the generalizations should be considered valid. Time dependency makes is necessary to continuously evaluate the situation and to always take new or changing variables into account (Bryman and Bell, 2015).

2.9 Limitations of data
Impact limitations in the data of the study refers to a strong regional focus. A reason for a majority of the respondents being Swedish is that one third of the survey was conducted at a Swedish Library. Had the survey been conducted elsewhere results might have been different. Results may therefore not translate to youth travellers of other nationalities. The results may still be widely applicable as they indicate how the target group perceive and evaluate their impacts on places. By obtaining more data, results could have been generalized to a larger population. A shorter survey could have resulted in more answers (DeFranzo, 2014) but would not have given as accurate and detailed results. Another way to acquire more responses would have been to do more face to face surveys in different locations. Offering valuable incentives to the respondents could according to Smith (2017) have motivated more people to answer. Feedback from respondents suggests that a survey in the native language would have increased the number of responses, but due to wanting to reach a wider target group and time limitations, this was not possible. The language barrier could have been eased by using different wording to make the questions more comprehensible (DeFranzo, 2014). Lastly there may exist a way to make a future version of the survey easier to comprehend. We detected this when conducting it face to face, and it would have e.g. been possible to change the order of evaluation and belief related to each question.
2.10 Reliability
Reliability refers to how consistent or reliable a result is (Smith, 2017) and was achieved in the study by accuracy and consistency throughout the data collecting process. This was done through conducting pilots which ensured relevant and understandable questions, and by contacting relevant respondents. Provided that the same method is used we believe that the study can be re-implemented with same results which according to Smith (2017), indicates a high level of reliability. If the study is to be carried out again, it is important to take into consideration the ever-changing tourism market. This means that the study is to some extent limited to the conditions under which it was conducted. We are aware that delimitations within the literature may have lowered the reliability, but estimate it to be extensive enough to still be considered reliable. Comparing the empirical data with the literature has strengthened this belief further. Preconceptions may have affected the results but we have tried to remain objective by not favouring a certain interpretation. To ensure that findings, conducted using a qualitative research method, reached a high trustworthiness, respondents were encouraged to comment on the interview transcript. This was done to see if the findings adequately reflect the phenomena being investigated (Noble and Smith, 2015).

2.11 Validity
The internal validity in the study refers to how well the research address the issues it claims to and whether the results can be considered valid or not (Smith, 2017). Because a thorough study and triangulation have been conducted, the results of the study can be judged as valid. To what extent the results are generalizable and transferable to other circumstances is according to Smith (2017) explained as external validity. As mentioned we can see indications of trends but reserve judgement to generalize the results for the entire youth tourism segment. In order to generalize the results validity and reliability are a prerequisite. Without high reliability in the study, high validity would not have been possible to achieve.

2.12 Method reflection
Mixed-methods allowed us to get a more comprehensive understanding of youth tourism. Integrating different ways of knowing by using both qualitative and quantitative methods allowed limitations in one type of data to be balanced by the strength of the other. An advantage of using mixed-methods was the possibility of triangulation as well as that it allowed for the qualitative findings to approach generalization. Only using one method, would have meant more time to do an in-depth and complete analysis of the results of that method. Since youth tourism is an international phenomenon we could not limit the research to Sweden alone. However, if we had chosen to do this, it would have been more time efficient as the target group would have been more easily accessible. Using SPSS to analyse the results from the survey were more challenging and time consuming than predicted. It took focus from other parts of the study, but we considered it necessary in order to achieve a higher level of credibility and relevance of the results in our study. Continuously keeping notes of our work and following a time schedule the process of the research became more structured which facilitated the work process. We could easier see what needed to be prioritised in order to complete the study within the given time frame.
3. Literature review

A review of previous theoretical research regarding place, impacts and youth tourism. As place can be interpreted differently depending on context, its definition in relation to the study is clarified. Place is a physical location that is socially constructed where actions create impacts as a result of external stimulus. Therefore, two concepts – Social Exchange Theory (SET) explaining social behaviour and the Triple Bottom Line concerning sociocultural, economic and environmental impacts – will be used to demonstrate how different impacts can take form. In order to understand the impacts of youth tourism, it is important to know what enables it as a market and its characteristics. Only then is it possible to fully grasp what impacts youth tourism has on places.

3.1 Place

Living in an era where the world seems smaller and things are more familiar, what was once unknown and remote have now, to a greater extent, become a part of everyday life. With capital moving freely across borders and rapid technological advancements bringing people closer together the world is going through a phase of globalisation. An increasing number of people are travelling more frequently and across longer distances. Clothes and food that was once considered exotic and only available abroad is now manufactured and shipped around the world. Email enables communication within seconds. Globalisation has resulted in constantly changing structures in distribution channels which has led to geographical specialization. As capital and production is constantly moving there is a desire to preserve places of special importance to us. A sense of place becomes central and protectionism is created. This influences people’s behaviour and affects places and how they are perceived (Buhalis and Laws, 2001). Place is a term used by people in everyday life without reflecting on its meaning (Cresswell, 2015). Therefore, place is hard to grasp and becomes necessary to define in the context of this study. In order to do so we need to understand the concept of space. Both place and space are considered abstract concepts with different complexities. They inter-relate at such a level that they require each other for definition (Cresswell, 2015).

3.1.1 Place in relation to space

Space is, just as place, a term often used without contemplating its meaning (Massey, 2005). For decades, the terms space and place have been well discussed resulting in several understandings of their meaning and relation. Agreed is, that space is a prerequisite for a place to occur and exist (Mowla, 2004, Massey, 2005, Cresswell, 2015). Tuan (1977) describes space as that which allows movements where place can be seen as pauses – stops along the way. A space only become a place when we add meaning to it. This statement is supported by Cresswell (2015) who argues that a place occurs when humans invest meaning and then become attached to it. Mowla (2004) explain space as the area within or around an object that becomes a place only after adding a person, thing or other attribute. Memory association emerge from physical and mental ideas and is what transform a space to a place. It occurs through the personal experience of a location and the events and interactions with people there. A place then becomes familiar and induce a belongingness to the space. Therefore, the experience creating the place needs to be both personal and relevant. Another way that space can be viewed, is as a surface on which social and cultural phenomena occur (Massey, 2005). Viewing space only as a surface means excluding it from interactions and memories. Believing that people and cultures are merely a phenomenon existing on a surface is saying that conquering a space does not bring social and political impact on the people. Similar to viewing space as a surface on a map is to consider it as coordinates. There are no values or meanings attached to it. To most people, coordinates are just numbers indicating a location. Replacing the coordinates with a name, such as Las Vegas, will to most people bring
a set of images to mind. These images indicate some recognition of that location which then can be referred to as a place (Cresswell, 2015).

3.1.2 Place identity and place attachment
Place consists of personal interactions making it socially constructed. It is made up of its own symbols and labels that are constantly changing due to the personal interactions and influence of others. The social constructions of culture, identity and meaning are what connects people and places and coincide with what a place represents (Coghlan et al., 2016). Place is a broad term that has laid the foundation for a wide range of different concepts, all of which are used in different ways and have different meanings. Two concepts that are important to understand in relation to tourism are place identity and place attachment. Both of which are part of how a person refers and connects to a place.

As stated by Anton and Lawrence (2014) the term place identity was first introduced by Proshansky who defined it as a substructure of self-identity. It is a cluster of ideas about place and identity that consists of memories, ideas, feelings, values, and personal experiences that occur in places that satisfy a person’s individual needs (Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff, 1983). In recent years, place identity has been referred to as how related an individual is with the physical environment through feelings, values and goals (Coghlan et al., 2016). That is, how meaningful and important a place is for residents and visitors (Othman, Nishimura and Kubota, 2013). A strong place meaning contributes to a person’s perception of self and how well he/she relates to their surroundings (Coghlan et al., 2016). A research by Hixson, McCabe and Brown (2011) shows that place identity is affected by length of stay. This means that a person’s place of residence influences the bond between an individual and a place. As place identity is associated with the creation of memories, attachment and meaning it can also weaken if the identity is lost. If it is weakened or diminished there will be no sense of place and consequently no feelings or attachments evoking a sense to care about a place. It is therefore important to secure the identity of a place which can be done through people’s physical activities and memories (Othman, Nishimura and Kubota, 2013).

Unlike place identity, place attachment is the emotional bond an individual feels with the environment (Anton and Lawrence, 2014). A feeling that he/she connect or belong to it (Coghlan et al., 2016). Other researchers extend the definition to also include the emotional bond between groups and their environment (Brown and Raymond, 2007; Altman and Low, 1992). Place attachment reflects at what level a person feels connected to a place through memories or experiences. High place attachment tends to increase a person’s quality of life (Harris et al., 1995) as it often results in greater social and political involvement as well as increasing overall cooperation (Mesch and Manor, 1998). It also strengthens an individual’s physical and psychological health which in turn can satisfy social relationships (Tartaglia, 2012). According to a research by Davis (2016) place attachment occurs only after a person experience place identity. Place identity and place attachment can and sometimes do occur at the same time but it is also possible for them to exists on their own.

3.1.3 Place – a summary
A sense of place has become more central as structures are changing due to globalisation. For place to occur a person, thing or other attribute needs to be present. Only then can meaning be formed through social interactions, memories and culture, all of which create identity. Adding feelings, values and goals creates place identity were the level of how well an individual relates to the physical environment is affected by length of stay. If place identity weakens, a sense of place will decrease resulting in less care and attachment to the place. The degree of
place attachment determines how strong the emotional bond between people and their environment is. It has the ability to affect a person’s quality of life as it can strengthen physical and psychological health and build social relationships. This can in turn foster involvement and cooperation in the community, regardless of being a local resident or a visitor. Impacts due to their actions will affect the physical and social environment in various ways and to different degrees.

3.2 Impacts
Impact is a recurring term when talking about tourism. It is a change that occur at a given condition over time and the way it is used implies that tourism has an effect on something (Hall and Lew, 2009). Tourism can be seen as mobility, a movement that consists of actions. Regardless of action, some kind of impact will occur as a result of external stimulus (Gössling and Hall, 2005). The sociocultural, economic and environmental impacts are often referred to as the Triple Bottom Line, a concept based on the notion of sustainability and sustainable development (Stoddard, Pollard and Evans, 2012). Rockström et al. (2013) has begun to re-evaluate and develop the sustainability concept where they instead suggest working with sustainable development based on the nine planetary boundaries. However, as sustainability in not the main focus of this study the Triple Bottom Line will be used, but only as a foundation. Tourism impacts exist to varying degrees (Hall and Lew, 2009) and a continually flow of interactions between a host community and visitors can result in both short- and long-term impacts across the globe. These can be positive or negative and can affect everything from individuals, companies, and communities to the local and global environment (Gössling, Hall and Weaver, 2009). Tourism is often misunderstood as a one-way effect but as it consists of interactions it both affects and is affected by people and things. As it affects the physical and social environment, issues of tourism activities often occur simultaneously consisting of at least two dimensions (Hall and Lew, 2009). Tourism impacts have been widely studied (Abeyratne, 1999, Deccio and Baloglu, 2002, Giannoni and Maupertuis, 2007) where a majority of researchers have been focusing on studying host communities, most of which concern stakeholder perspective where residents’ perception of tourism impacts is emphasised (Lundberg, 2017, Derry, Jago and Fredline, 2012, Moyle, Weiler and Croy, 2012). Negative impacts often point to visitors as the source of the problem. As tourism has the ability to either enhance or inhibit the quality of life of a host community it is instead important to view visitors as part of the solution. Therefore, it is important to understand tourism development and to be aware of how to manage different strategies in order to reduce or respond to visitors impacts (Moyle, Weiler and Croy, 2012). Support from residents is crucial for the tourism sector since the attitudes towards visitors have a huge influence on the tourist experience (Lundberg, 2017). These attitudes and the social exchange that occur between residents and visitors involves a series of interactions and can be explained using Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Emerson, 1976).

3.2.1 Social Exchange Theory
Social Exchange Theory is a concept of social behaviour that was initially based on exchange. Prior to 1958, exchange was most commonly associated with material goods. The notion that it also could have a symbolic value was presented by Homans (1958) and laid the foundation for new theories of social exchange. Despite differences between theorists they all agree upon the central parts of SET (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). These are, that social exchanges consist of interactions which over time provide reciprocal and rewarding relationships that is sustained by a two-way exchange of material, social or psychological resources between people (Emerson, 1976, Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). In terms of tourism, previous research show that the degree of community support for tourism exchanges can vary.
Variables such as length of residence, community attachment and various demographic characteristics can potentially influence residents support for tourism. The way they perceive the exchange is important as it has a direct effect whether they will participate in future exchanges or not. This in turn will have consequences for the larger community and the visitor. Although, much attention is paid to the residents, SET also represent visitors as active evaluators of the exchange (Moyle, Weiler and Croy, 2012). Hence, consequences such as the sociocultural, economic and environmental impacts, the Triple Bottom Line, are evaluated by everyone involved (Stoddard, Pollard and Evans, 2012). If the impacts are perceived to be positive the exchange will continue but if the exchange instead is unbalanced i.e. negative, actors are likely to withdraw from future exchanges (Emerson, 1976).

A fundamental principle within SET is that relationships are continually developing over time. The more time spent in the relationship the stronger commitment, loyalty and trust is developed. For social exchanges to be successful, actors must follow certain rules and norms which are considered to be guidelines of exchange processes. The foremost and perhaps best-known exchange rule is reciprocity (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Reciprocity consists of three different types; reciprocity as a transactional pattern of interdependent exchanges; reciprocity as a moral norm and reciprocity as a folk belief (Gouldner, 1960). Reciprocity as a folk belief will not be discussed further in this research as it refers to the cultural expectation that people get what they deserve (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005) and does therefore not relate to the purpose of this study.

Reciprocity as interdependent exchanges means that a two-way exchange is performed. When something is given and something returned an interdependence relationship evolves. Therefore, interdependence is considered to be a defining feature of social exchange (Molm, 1994). This means that reciprocal interdependence is based on contingent interpersonal transactions (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005) where a party’s actions depend on the other’s behaviour. It becomes an exchange process where interdependence have the ability to reduce the risk and encourage cooperation (Molm, 1994). Each consequence of the process can create a self-reinforcing cycle that is likely to be continuous (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005).

Reciprocity as a norm refers to how one should behave. If one chooses to follow the norm, one is obligated to behave reciprocally. The level to which one chooses to support reciprocity differs between individuals. People with a high exchange orientation are more likely to track obligations and are therefore more likely to return a good deed. Individuals who exhibit less concern have shown to care less if exchanges are reciprocated (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005). Having a strong exchange ideology and a positive reciprocity orientation have been found to foster stronger relationships (Eisenberger et al., 1986) where positive treatment generates positive treatment. This suggests that an individual’s reciprocity preference influences behavioural and informational choices (Gallucci and Perugini, 2003). To what extent visitors are aware of the consequences their exchanges have on communities and its residents are an important component of SET. By inspiring them to engage in the development of management strategies, negative impacts can be reduced or possibly prevented. By exploring how visitors perceive tourism impacts across the Triple Bottom Line, sustainable strategies can be optimized. SET can therefore be used as a tool to better understand how youth travellers perceive and evaluate their impacts on places.
3.2.2 Sociocultural impacts

Sociocultural impacts occur when tourists and hosts come into contact with each other (Wall and Mathieson, 2006). The sociocultural impacts of tourism result from the interactions between residents and visitors and affect lifestyles, traditions and culture at a destination (Smith, 2015). Tourism can, as stated by Rätz, (2002) create changes that affect a community’s quality of life. This is corroborated by Mbaiwa (2004), who describes that social and cultural changes occur within value systems, family relationships, the community structure as well as in people’s individual behaviour. The tourist-host relationship and the development of the industry itself are considered to be two of the major factors that influence these changes. One way of describing the sociocultural impacts are, as explained by Glasson et.al (referred to in Mbaiwa, 2004), as it being the ‘people impacts’ of tourism i.e. the daily changes affecting the quality of life. It is the host community’s direct and indirect associations with tourists (Wall and Mathieson, 2006).

As mentioned by Wall and Mathieson (2006) research regarding the sociocultural impacts can be divided into three different categories. These are; the tourist, the host and tourist-host interrelationships. Research about the tourist emphasizes the impact of tourism demand. It includes tourists’ motivations, attitudes and expectations as well as their purchasing decisions and demand for services. Research about the host on the other hand, stresses the concern for the inhabitants of a destination area and their offering of tourist services. Tourist-host interrelationship concern the relationship between hosts and guests, their different characteristics and its consequences. Tourist-host encounters can according to de Kadt (referred to in Wall and Mathieson, 2006) occur in three different contexts. First, through the exchange of goods or services i.e. tourist buying from the host. Second, where both parties find themselves side by side i.e. equally important in the relationship. Finally, where both parties consider exchanging information and ideas as an important part of the relationship. Not surprisingly it is the first two types that are more common. The third type of contact is often referred to when talking about tourism being an important mechanism for increasing international understanding.

Regardless of whether a tourist seeks culture as the primary travel motive or not, they will at some point experience cultural interaction – thereby becoming agents of cultural change. As culture tourism has become a more diverse market more people have started to consume it in a different way (Smith, 2015). Culture is more available than before and is now shared by many rather than the elite few (Palmer and Richard, 2010). However, travelling is still more commonly practiced by the world’s elite and are therefore more likely to, in terms of cultural changes, affect the population of the destination rather than the visiting. As the search and demand for everyday or ordinary culture increases, remote and fragile locations are more likely to be affected. Local people in these areas tend to be more disturbed by tourists than people living in urban locations (Smith, 2015).

Introducing foreign ideologies and exposing societies to tourist ways of life for the first time is called the demonstration effect. It can be considered an advantage as it can inspire people to adapt and work for things they lack or desire (Wall and Mathieson, 2006). Sociocultural impacts can occur on different levels in the society. From a global and supranational perspective, cultural impacts of tourism occur by international organizations such as United Nation World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) sets policies and funds conservations efforts. The national and regional perspective include the revitalization of traditional art in a local culture and are one of the most common benefits of tourism. A desire to witness or experience unique practices such as arts, clothing and handicrafts creates an increasing demand for these.
items. This demand can be met by rejuvenating traditional skills among local suppliers and thereby reviving and strengthening cultural traditions. Community cultural impacts include the development of cultural landscapes within a destination and can be beach recreation districts, pedestrian shopping streets, waterfront districts or ethnic cultural districts (Hall and Lew, 2009).

Social impacts of tourism can, as stated in the previous section, be changes in a residents’ quality of life (Hall and Lew, 2009). Previous research has found that tourism has several positive social impacts on communities (Deery, Jago and Fredline, 2012). As the demand for public services increases due to tourism it also leads to an increase in the services provided (Andereck et al., 2005). An expanding range of new facilities and public transportation services benefits the community. This include a wide range of shopping, entertainment and recreational opportunities which increase the possibility to socialize. Engaging with local residents is often seen to be part of the tourist experience and will promote intercultural interactions if the tourist come from another culture (Deery, Jago and Fredline, 2012). As stated by Andereck et al. (2005), sharing public spaces with tourists provides social interactions opportunities that may add to the atmosphere. The fact that tourists wants to visit a destination and spend money there also provides a sense of pride among the local community.

Among the negative community cultural impacts due to tourism are physical damage to cultural resources. It is not uncommon that e.g. historic sites suffer from vandalism, littering or theft. Another concerning factor is the removal and selling of cultural artefacts. Despite it being illegal in most countries it is a significant problem in developing economies as underpaid guards sometimes see it as a way to supplement their salary (Hall and Lew, 2009).

The individual tourist can have direct impacts on a place simply by being there. Failing to respect local norms and behaviour can cause an annoyance among locals that eventually creates a resentment by locals against tourists. (Hall and Lew, 2009). Developing a wider range of shops, restaurants and nightclubs attracts more people. More facilities and services provided can cause longer queues, waiting times and it requires more maintenance which is an additional cost to the community. It also allows tourists to socialize later in the evening, often while consuming alcohol. This leads to higher noise levels for locals. More people in motion can cause frustration among local residents and finally cause them to withdraw (Deery, Jago and Fredline, 2012). Along with alcohol problems and higher noise levels among tourists comes behavioural problems and with them an increase in overall crime rates. Crimes are often associated with disorderly, drunken behaviour or illegal drug use which is considered disturbing for the local residents (Andereck et al., 2005). Easier accessible entertainment facilities such as gambling opportunities can cause social problems for the local residents as they subsequently visit such facilities. Another negative effect from tourism is the increase in prostitution among locals (Deery, Jago and Fredline, 2012).

3.2.3 Economic impacts
The diverse nature of tourism and its ability to provide economic diversification makes it a vital element of the world economy (Torres and Momsen, 2004). By complementing other economic activities, tourism has the potential to stimulate global economic growth. Areas known to be improved are employment opportunities, tax revenues, development incentives and the contribution to gross domestic product (GDP) (Cárdenas-García, Sánchez-Rivero, and Pulido-Fernández, 2015). According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2017), travel and tourism directly contributed US$2.3 trillion to the global economy in 2016.
Adding the indirect and induced impacts that number increases to US$7.6 trillion. This is equal to 10.2% of the world’s GDP in 2016. Having a strong tourism economy increases the demand for supporting businesses which enables the development of other industries. This suggests that tourism includes those parts of the economy that would otherwise not exist or be significantly less without it (Hall and Lew, 2009). A growing economy due to tourism growth can influence the cultural progress of a society or community and in turn improve the welfare of the resident population (Cárdenas-García, Sánchez-Rivero and Pulido-Fernández, 2015).

International tourism is considered an export industry as it brings the consumers to the product (Mathieson and Wall, 1982). It consists of demand and supply and both are equally important for tourism to exist. A common approach in tourism economic research is to examine them separately. The available resources found at the destination refer to the supply side. It can be natural or a build tourist attraction such as facilities, attractions and supporting infrastructure. A place that is supply-driven relies on its attractiveness i.e. in what consumers find value. Therefore, it is dependent on creating its own market demand. In order for these attractions to be important for the tourism economy, improvements in terms of transportation system and accommodation are required. The demand side consists of the people or segments that visit the place and the attractions is created to meet their demand such as Disneyland or SeaWorld. Supply and demand are equally important and for economic success to be achieved both must be present and met (Hall and Lew, 2009).

As mentioned in previous section, tourism affects many parts of the economy. It is a labour-intensive industry meaning it is employment generating for local people (Torres and Momsen, 2004). According to WTTC (2017), travel and tourism were responsible for 109 million jobs worldwide in 2016. When adding indirect and induced impacts the sector provided 292 million jobs globally. This means that one in ten jobs was created due to the tourism industry. It often requires low skilled work and therefore creates more income opportunities than other sectors (Hall and Lew, 2009). As tourism contributes to economic diversification, it can provide stability in the economy (Torres and Momsen, 2004). Tourism can be used as an alternative when other sectors experience economic decline such as the decommissioning of extractive industries. Having a strong tourism sector is beneficial as areas where these industries often are located tend to be scenic and thus have tourism potential (Hall and Lew, 2009). According to Cooper et al. (2008), these scenic remote places often have limited employment and income sources. Tourism can be used to redistribute income to these areas. Tourism also helps fund governments by increasing the tax base through indirect and direct taxes. As tourism facilities and employees pay property, sales and income taxes governments receive funding (Hall and Lew, 2009). Governments can also receive funding from the World Bank and other international development organisations to improve infrastructure in favour of tourism (Mihalić, 2014). Other sectors related to tourism development that benefit from funding and taxes are environment, safety and communication. Government revenues can also subsequently improve a community’s health and education which in turn can increase the development of social and human capital. Developing a better healthcare system can also be a result from an increased demand among tourists from wealthier countries. The larger tourism sector, the more advanced economy which increases the demand for experienced workers. Hence increased investment in local education (Torres and Momsen, 2004). Hall and Lew (2009) suggests that as tourism evolves, a need for producers and services to support the industry is required. This means an increase in businesses that indirectly benefit from the development include e.g. maintenance companies, retailers and human resource services. This is corroborated by Mathieson and Wall (1982) who in addition to this suggest that tourists demanding specific items stimulate local entrepreneurial activity which increase employment.
According to Gottlieb (1994), there are also businesses and services that seek tourism amenity locations. They are attracted to scenic or environmental locations where they intend to open up their business as well as live (Goe and Green, 2005). Places with high amenity is attractive to companies that are not bound to the location of their raw material e.g. high-technology companies (Gottlieb, 1994). Developing and/or improving a place’s amenity can therefore be a strategic way to attract new companies. Businesses like these tend to be strong supporters of maintaining the quality of a place, the economy, culture, social structure, and environment and thus increase tourism (Hall and Lew, 2009).

Although tourism brings positive effects to individuals, businesses and communities, negative impacts can arise from tourism development. Expanding or developing infrastructure and facilities cost money, especially when materials and services are not available within the community. This may include sustaining the right amount of water supplies which results in an increase in taxes. A rapid growth in tourism means a higher demand of public services and facilities. If tourism increase at a faster rate than tax revenues problems will occur such as maintaining infrastructure, water supply, electricity as well as health and education facilities (Hall and Lew, 2009). In addition to increased tax revenues, tourism development increases the demand of local resources such as land. A higher demand for land results in rising land prices. Selling is encouraged resulting in short-term income for farmers and other landowners who are left with low-wage work opportunities (Archer, Cooper and Ruhanen, 2005). Low-wage hospitality jobs are often casual, part time or underpaid which can result in a large working poor population. By keeping low wages employers are, in addition to tourism in many cases being a seasonality, part of this. Problems become more evident when government pay more attention to the rich than to the poor. People then tend to seek assistance from the government and non-governmental organisations which can be seen as an additional burden on government and taxpayers (Hall and Lew, 2009).

Tourism development tends to attract outsiders looking for a second or permanent home. These people can influence development of facilities and services. Their attitudes can also have an impact on the community’s sociocultural aspects. A rise in second and permanent homes results in business potential for entrepreneurs and workers which are seen as a positive impact of tourism for the construction industry (Girard and Gartner, 1993). Hall and Lew (2009) on the other hand, states that locals working in low-wage hospitality jobs tend to be negatively affected since housing and basic commodities then rise beyond their salaries.

3.2.4 Environmental impacts
Travelling has local and global effects on the environment. The environment is holistic and complex making it difficult to define (Hall and Lew, 2009). According to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2000), there is no agreement on the international definition of the term, resulting in differing terms being used between countries. This creates difficulties in addressing environmental issues. Effects are global but no international definition of the term makes it hard to confirm changes and in turn agree upon solutions. Difficulties also arise because ultimately, changes occur due to connections between physical and social processes alike. Definitions become essential when approaching legal work. When speaking of the environment in an impact context it is however normally referred to as the physical environment of humans. In terms of travelling impacts on the environment, the predominant focus was previously on changes at the destination. At the end of the twentieth
century increased attention was drawn to global effects. As a result, focus has shifted to the relationship between travelling and global environmental issues (Hall and Lew, 2009).

Not only does tourism affect the environment, it is also affected by it (Jafari, 1997). Tourism impacts are associated with effects on the natural, cultural or historical resources. Depending on how these are managed, positive or negative effects can occur relating to the tourism service facility development, preservation, recreation opportunities and development of infrastructure (Gartner, 1996). Conservation and restoration of historical and cultural heritage as well as traditional buildings done with adaptation to modern life often results in positive impacts. Tourists seeking these attributes are attracted and their spending can fund further preservations and projects (Mathieson and Wall, 1982). Other positive impacts as a result of tourism can be conservation of biodiversity. Biodiversity, the variety of life on earth (UNEP, 2017), is vital to human development as it provides goods and services. Biological products and processes constitute around 40% of the economy, and the rest would be impossible without it. In order for positive impacts to occur, tourism need to be managed with standards and guidelines aiming to protect and promote biodiversity (UNEP, 2003). Taking part of nature activities can raise awareness of its value amongst tourists. It also provides an income and encouragement for local people to preserve it. One such case is the preservation of mountain gorillas in the area of the Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Uganda. Collaborations and respecting the natural habitat of the gorillas generated direct and indirect income for locals and an increase in numbers of the gorillas (UNEP, 2017). Laws and regulations can also help preserve both historical as well as natural sites (Sunlu, 2003).

In 1980, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) reported that tourism is largely dependent on the environment. It can suffer from decline if the environment is degrading. This is corroborated by Musila (1996), saying that if natural resources are not planned and managed properly, they can be harmed resulting in tourism decline. Musila continues to argue that, for natural and cultural sites, the foundation of tourism attraction should always rely on the carrying capacity of the environment. When a place’s carrying capacity is reached but the number of tourists continue to increase negative impacts occur. If a place cannot cope with the pressure it can lead to soil erosion, pollution, emissions into the sea, loss and decrease of natural habitat and endangered species and people struggling for access to critical resources (Sunlu, 2003). According to the OECD (1980) other effects are degradation of historic sites and monuments, overcrowding and rise in conflict and competition.

One of the areas affected by tourism is the climate. A result from burning coal, oil and natural gas is increasing greenhouse gases in the atmosphere (Sunlu, 2003). This has resulted in a warmer earth and atmosphere which have led to changes in rain cycles, stronger storms, more unpredictable and extreme weather, diminishing glaciers and rising sea levels. The broad nature of tourism and its various components affect climate change to different extents. Tourism is estimated to be responsible of about 5% of global CO2 emissions (UNWTO, n.d.). Air pollution is one of the greatest causes and affects large areas as emissions are spread when travelling across continents and oceans (Ramanathan and Feng, 2009). Tourism is a significant contributor to this as it is responsible for around 50% of traffic movements. Air travel is responsible for 40% of the total carbon emissions within tourism transportation, making it the main tourism contributor to global warming (UNWTO, n.d.). Results from changing climate are increasing floods, wildfires and droughts as well decrease in snowfalls. It does not only affect the local population but the tourists as well. People seek different destinations due to e.g. lack of snow at ski resorts (Sunlu, 2003) or places becoming too hot.
during certain seasons (Rutty and Scott, 2010). Therefore, it is arguable that local residents are affected by climate change in two ways; more extreme seasons and living conditions as well as possible decrease in income from tourism.

Climate change can also have great impacts on plants and animal life. As mentioned biodiversity is essential for human development. Though initiatives for preservation are being made, biodiversity is decreasing due to human involvement. Uncontrolled land conversion, pollution, unsustainable harvesting and introduction of invasive species are, along with climate change, reasons for this (UNEP, 2003). Tourism can also play a part in the biodiversity loss (Vehbi and Doratli, 2010). If not managed properly, there are great risks of negative impacts. Places with a rich variety of plants and animals that also are popular tourist destinations need to be extra cautious of this (UNEP, 2003). In many cases the nature is the attraction, and if exploited, tourism is also at the risk of decline (Vehbi and Doratli, 2010). Unawareness of this relationship is often the root to the problem (UNEP, 2003).

One of the critical resources formerly mentioned is water, freshwater in particular (Sunlu, 2003). It is unevenly distributed within and between countries. Tourism largely depends on freshwater and is one of the main industries consuming it (Gössling et al., 2012). The tourism industry is, according to Sunlu (2003), overusing the water supply. It is used in pools, for laundry and dishes, keeping gardens and golf courses green as well as for personal use by tourists. People tend to use more water when on holiday (Gössling et al., 2012), especially in hot and dry areas. These regions are facing larger threats of water shortage and degradation of water supplies (UNEP, 2003). Contradictory to the study by Sunlu, Gössling et al. (2012) argues that though water is an essential part of tourism, the industry’s direct use is less than 1% of the global consumption. According to their research, the industry can grow up to 4% per year without significantly having an effect on water consumption.

3.2.5 Impacts – a summary

It is important to understand that interactions between people, their actions and behaviour determine the type of impact that will occur. As visitors are often seen to be responsible for negative impacts it is crucial to strengthen the social exchange. If the relationship is reciprocal and rewarding positive impacts are more likely to occur. Both actors are active evaluators of the exchange and need to perceive the exchange as positive for it to continue. Length of residence, community attachment and various demographic characteristics are variables among local residents that can shape the attitude towards the exchange. Having a strong exchange ideology and a positive reciprocity orientation creates stronger relationships as positive treatment is returned. Other positive impacts can be achieved through longer relationships as it creates loyalty and trust.

As interactions and relationships between local residents and visitors both have social and cultural impacts it is known as the ‘people impacts’. Sociocultural impacts are a result of various exchanges such as trade in goods and services, equal relationship between actors and exchanging information and knowledge. All of which affect lifestyles, traditions and culture at a destination. An increasing number of visitors will have positive outcomes in local communities such as the development and upgrade of public services and entertainment which improves resident’s quality of life. It facilitates the possibility to socialize which enhances the tourist experience as well as promote intercultural interactions. If the relationship is negatively affected due to lack of respect of local norms and behaviour it can result in tension and annoyance from local residents. Behavioural problems are often related to alcohol consumption, which in turn leads to higher noise levels, disturbance and crime.
A well-developed tourism sector has positive effects on the economy. As tourism is a labour-intensive industry it generates direct income for tourism related businesses as well as it facilitates supporting industries. It provides more job opportunities since it consists of low skilled work. However, these jobs are often low wages, seasonal and part-time, which is not sufficient to support the need for basic commodities. Infrastructure, safety and education can be improved due to funding and incentives from various organisations. This in turn increases the social and human capital. A rapidly expanding tourism sector can cause problems if the demand for public services and facilities exceeds the level of incoming tax revenues. Maintaining infrastructure, water supply, electricity and health and education facilities will then become problematic.

Tourism and the environment can both affect and be affected by each other. Standards and guidelines need to be implemented in order to minimize environmental changes. Protecting and promoting biodiversity, natural resources and cultural sites raise awareness among visitors as well as local residents. Engaging in nature activities increase the understanding of the environment’s value. If visitors show an interest in the environment the likelihood for local engagement and the desire to preserve it becomes stronger as it serves as an income source. As nature often is a primary attraction tourism can decline if the environment is not managed properly. Activities should therefore be subject to a place’s carrying capacity. Too much pressure on a place’s carrying capacity can result in exceeding amounts of pollution, emissions into the sea, loss and decrease of natural habitat and endangered species and people struggling for access to critical resources.

As established, tourism impacts can be seen through different perspectives. What impacts occur are a result of people’s behaviour, attitudes and actions. In order to fully understand youth tourism related impacts a deeper review of youth tourism is required.

### 3.3 Youth tourism

Travellers ranging from ages 15-29 are by the United Nations referred to as youth travellers (UNWTO, 2016). All tourism activities performed by youth travellers are then considered as what creates youth tourism. From being only a small group consisting of young aristocrats of the last century (Horak and Weber, 2000), youth travellers now represent more than 23% of the over one billion tourists travelling internationally each year. This makes it one of the fastest growing segments of international tourism (UNWTO, 2016). An increase in youth travel is a result from e.g. globalization (Horak and Weber, 2000) and budget/low cost airlines. Another factor contributing to the evolvement of youth tourism is parental incomes (Richard and Wilson, 2005). Many young travellers make use of their parents’ money to fund their travels (UNWTO, 2016). An increase in travel have also been seen due to an expanding international student population (Richards and Wilson, 2005). Projects, such as exchange programs, have been implemented to promote student travel (Horak and Wilson, 2000). As education contributes to a rise in income, new markets emerge in developing countries (Richards and Wilson, 2003). Pendergast (2010) argues that Generation Y has a higher level of education than any other generation. This in combination with them being one of the most frequently travelling segments, supports the theory of youth tourism growing as a result of an increased student population. According to Beus-Richmenbergh (referred to in Horak and Weber, 2000), people have the greatest possibility to travel when they are between 15-24 years old and can therefore be considered a factor to the youth tourism growth. As previously mentioned, the tourism industry has been changing to a more technology and internet based market in terms of planning and booking. It has opened up for new opportunities to produce
and consume tourism products. Young people have embraced this (UNWTO, 2011) as they have grown up in an era of technology and therefore are technologically confident. Accommodation, flights and sights etc. are sought on the internet (Cooper et al., 2008). Many are inclined to use personal information to create customised travel experiences through e.g. mobile apps (ITB Berlin, 2016). As shown, the development of youth tourism is a result of several factors contributing to the growth in various degrees and ways.

### 3.3.1 Segments of youth tourism

The UNWTO (2016) definition of youth tourism is the one this research will be based on. It does however result in a very wide segment with many possibilities of variations within. Beyond the age span, no precise categorisation of what constitutes a youth traveller have been agreed upon. Therefore, sub-segments, found in the literature, that are fully or part of what makes up youth tourism have been used to create a clearer understanding of the segment. Sub-segments of youth tourism can be identified through different categorisations such as age (Pendergast, 2010), occupation (Bicikova, 2014), way of travel (Sørensen, 2003) or what kind of activity is preferred when travelling (Nicolau and Más, 2006, Eusébio and Carneiro, 2015). When speaking of age segmentations within youth tourism it is often concerning the two demographics Generation Y and Generation Z (Benckendorff, Moscardo, and Pendergast, 2010). Part of both are, at the time of conducting the study, what constitutes youth tourism. Research on each are therefore considered when describing the characteristics of youth travellers. Youth and student tourism are often spoken of as one, as they are closely interrelated (Richards and Wilson, 2009, UNWTO, 2011, Bickikova, 2014, UNWTO, 2016). Both are also closely related to backpacking and many uses it as a way of travel (Sørensen, 2003). Features of student and backpacker travel have therefore been used to describe youth tourism. With research often focusing on the segments mentioned above, Nicolau and Más (2006) and Eusébio and Carneiro (2015) sheds light on segmentation related to what kind of activity is undertaken during their travels. The concepts and activity based segmentations that have been used are themselves to some degree debatable in terms of precise definition, but as their central features are clear they have been applied to describe the characteristics of youth travellers.

### 3.3.2 Characteristics of youth tourism

What strongly characterises youth travellers is their want to experience and understand the world (UNWTO, 2016). Main features are the desire to meet different people, explore a diverse set of cultures and increase their knowledge (Richards and Wilson, 2003). This intellectual motive to discover new places and learn about them can be referred to as the Ulysses Factor (Nicolau and Más, 2006). Focus here lies upon the psychological desire to discover the unknown, as well as the personal development and experience of the traveller. Eusébio and Carneiro’s research (2015) concerning travel motivations of youth travellers supports this as “novelty” and “knowledge” were the two most important dimensions of motivations in their survey. This indicates a desire to experience new things and learn about new places and corroborates with previous research on youth travel motivations (Richards and Wilson, 2003). That Vogt (1976) finds personal growth to be a primary motivation for youth travellers also supports the argument that the segment is driven by the Ulysses Factor (Pearce, 1988). One reason that the Ulysses Factor is an important feature in the motivation of travel among young people is explained by Mayo and Jarvis (referred to in Nicolau and Más, 2006) as travelling being a mean to satisfy the intellectual need to know.

Many youth travellers have a desire to interact with locals during their trips (UNWTO, 2011). Developing some kind of relationship to people from the host community is a way to ensure
cultural enrichment (Eusébio and Carneiro, 2012) and developing accepting attitudes towards other people (Eusébio and Carneiro, 2015). The frequency and depth of these interactions are strongly related to the individual level of desire to learn about other cultures (Reisinger, 2009). It also relates to how positive the effects of the interactions are perceived – effects of higher interaction levels are perceived as more positive than low (Eusébio and Carneiro, 2015). Encouraging interactions between host communities and travellers have resulted in exchanges with benefits for both parties. These include e.g. increased knowledge and a deeper bond to the destination for the traveller, which makes a return visit more likely, creating greater revenue for the local community (UNWTO, 2011).

In line with other research (e.g. Nicolau and Más, 2006, Eusébio and Carneiro, 2012), Eusébio and Carneiro (2015) found that the strongest motivators for youth travellers are to be in a different environment, learn new things, engage in different activities, view the scenery and get to know other cultures. From these categories four segments were formed: culture lovers, fun lovers, sun and beach lovers, and nature lovers. Within these segments, knowledge, challenge, escape and novelty were found to be four dimensions of motivations for travel. Correlations between what motivates youth travellers and what activities they undertake were detected. Novelty and the desire to increase knowledge drove the culture and fun lovers more than the other segments. Nature and fun lovers were motivated by a want to escape. No dimension of motivation was especially distinctive for sun and beach lovers in relation to the other segments. However, within the segment, novelty was the most distinctive dimension of motivation. Differences in motivations were also found depending on type of trip, to what destination people were going and between genders. A research done by Nicolau and Más (2006) suggests that the qualities of a destination need to match the motivations of the traveller in order for a visit to occur. They suggest that people with a strong Ulysses Factor are motivated to travel longer distances due to their desire to explore and learn about the unknown. People travelling to visit friends and family were also inclined to make longer journeys as it, in a way, meant to return home.

Correlations have also been seen between motivations and way of travel (Bickikova, 2014). Based on how youth tourists travel, Schönhammer (1992) found three groups: people traveling with family, people going on organised (package) trips and people travelling unorganised (independently). Some homogeneity has been seen within these groups such as people going on organized trips to a greater extent engage in nightlife, entertainment and adventure activities, whereas independent travellers value beautiful nature, culture and famous tourism sites higher (Bickikova, 2014). Differences in way of travel and what activities one take part in can also occur due to nationality, culture, background and gender (Field, 1999). This can be considered an effect of that people who grow up under similar circumstances develop similar behaviours and values (Moscardo and Benckendorff, 2010). Though the read literature does not show specific differences to a certain nationality or culture, some variations have been seen in preferred activities between genders. While male travellers more often participate in sports or other active activities, female travellers seek to discover new places and cultures (Bickikova, 2014).

Youth travellers seeking knowledge and information search for authentic experiences (ITB Berlin, 2016). Authenticity in a tourism context, as argued by Sharpley (referred in Wang, 1999), concerns the traditional culture and origin. Genuineness is important and is achieved when artefacts or rituals are made or performed by local people in a traditional way. This is argued to be a form of objective authenticity. What is seen needs to feel genuine (Cohen, 2003). For youth travellers to feel authenticity it is important that encounters with local
people and cultural experiences feels genuine (ITB Berlin, 2016). Research show that length of stay and level of interaction with locals affects to what degree a visitor sees an encounter as positive, meaning authentic or genuine (Eusébo and Carneiro, 2015). Cultural experiences can also be achieved through food tours, music and art (ITB Berlin).

In their search for richer experiences, youth travellers are willing to sacrifice some security (Pendergast, 2010). Hunter-Jones, Jeffs and Smith (2008), suggest that as backpacking grows, so does media’s attention to it, often focusing on risks. Corroborating with Pendergast (2010), they argue that the perception of risk may not be sufficient to discourage travel. However, though there has not been a decrease in travel among young people (UNWTO, 2006), changing safety conditions have led to people choosing alternative travel destinations. A decrease in travel has generally been seen to Turkey, Egypt and Tunisia, whereas Spain and domestic travel have had a rise (ITB Berlin, 2016). Youth travellers are confident (Pendergast, 2010) and independent (Moscardo and Benckendorff, 2010), seeking information to minimise risks including terrorism, natural disasters and epidemics (Pendergast, 2010). People travelling on a tighter budget without a pre-planned timetable or itinerary are according to O’Reilly (2006), taking more risks. Morgan and Dimmock (2006) suggest that risk can make the traveller feel excited, challenged and that it is fun, leading to a desire to travel. To what degree the risk motivator actually has influence is not certain, e.g. it might not be transferable to crisis.

3.3.3 Impacts of youth tourism

Both Generation Y and Z are budget conscious and price play a big part when deciding on a destination (Davies, 2017). Similar results have been found when researching student travellers and depending on the personal motivation for the trip, price sensitivity varies (Bicikova, 2014). As youth travellers are often associated with having low budgets, staying at low price accommodation and travelling locally, their high value and economic significance have been neglected. However, as their numbers grow, so does the recognition of them as a strong force in the tourism industry (Richards and Wilson, 2005). Because young travellers are often low on money, they tend to stay longer in one place than other tourists resulting in more money being spent in the local community (UNWTO, 2016). This in combination with more frequent travel (Pendergast, 2010) increases money flow in general and the amounts of money spent in the visited places (UNWTO, 2016). As youth travellers often turn to local businesses during their trips, economic leakage is reduced (Richards and Wilson, 2003). This can in turn contribute to employment opportunities, conservation and sociocultural benefits (Rodrigues and Prideaux, 2011).

Research by Richards and Wilson (2003) corroborate the characteristics of youth travellers and suggests reasons as to why the segment travel this way. They suggest that though it is more common for young people to travel more frequently, longer trips are still considered an opportunity occurring only once in a lifetime. Consequently, many are motivated to spend a lot of time and money to ensure an unforgettable trip. Research done by the WYSE Travel Confederation suggests that youth travellers spend around 60% of their budget within the places visited. On average, they spend US$2160 on their main trip and in 2014 the total value of the youth tourism market reached US$286 billion, confirming them to be a market of high value. Due to the longer trips of youth travellers, they spend about two thirds more on average than most other tourists. The UNWTO predict that by 2020 almost 370 million youth travellers will make up the market, spending a total value of over US$400 billion (UNWTO, 2016).
Youth tourism being a contributor to the economy is also related to many young travellers being students or workers. Students are living in a place and therefore spend directly in the local community (UNWTO, 2016). Findings of international students having a lot of free time suggest that they have a higher prosperity to travel (Hsu and Sung, 1997). In addition to this, many are visited by family and/or friends resulting in added revenue from inbound travel (UNWTO, 2016). Due to the effects of longer trips being a once in a lifetime opportunity, many young people work during their travels (Richards and Wilson, 2003). That many wishes to experience everyday life of the local people could be another reason for working during the holiday. Working means they do not only contribute to companies directly related to tourism. Instead, this way of travel results in a more holistic economic contribution as a greater variety of sectors are involved. Destinations taking advantage of the mobility of young people have good opportunities attracting young professionals. By relocating, these workers contribute to the development of work-related skills, benefitting the local economy. Some concern to if holiday or relocated workers will take jobs from locals have been raised. However, in a globalised economy, to attract talent is becoming a requisite for economic competitiveness (UNWTO, 2016).

Finally, youth tourism being of high value for the economy is related to the fact that the travellers are young and therefore have many years of travel opportunities ahead of them. Many are likely to revisit places contributing to additional income (Richards and Wilson, 2005). Furthermore, the individual desire to travel increases the more one travels. New destinations and/or experiences are being sought indicating a need for development of new products to satisfy the market demand (Richards and Wilson, 2003).

3.3.4 Youth tourism – a summary

All tourism activities performed by people in the ages of 15-29 are what creates youth tourism. Due to the complexity of the youth tourism segment this research include age, occupation, way of travel and activity as the main segments when describing their characteristics. Globalization, low budget airlines and a rise in income among young people have enabled the rapid expansion of the market. The Ulysses Factor creates the desire to discover the unknown including meeting new people and exploring their cultures. This satisfy their need for knowledge and personal development. For the cultural experience to be perceived as positive the relationships developed with local residents needs to feel genuine and authentic. Higher interaction level and longer stays results in more benefits for both actors. Four categories within youth tourism have been identified; culture lovers, fun lovers, sun and beach lovers, and nature lovers. These segments are motivated, to various degrees, by knowledge, challenge, escape and novelty. Depending on an individual’s nationality, it is possible to distinguish differences in the way of travel and chosen activities as behaviour is influenced by culture and background. Characteristics such as confidence, independence and the feel of excitement and challenge make young travellers willing to overlook some safety for the benefit of richer experiences.

Because of the budget consciousness of youth travellers their economic significance has been neglected. However, due to frequent travel, longer stays, and spending locally they are to a greater extent recognized as high value that contribute to local economic growth. This in turn creates employment opportunities and sociocultural benefits as economic leakage is reduced. Student and working travellers tend to stay longer in one place contributing to a more holistic economic development. In addition, they are often visited by friends and family, increasing income from inbound travel. Concerns have been raised due to working travellers regarding
them taking job opportunities from local residents. However, it is possible to argue that in a
globalized economy attracting talent is a competitive advantage.
4. Results
For the purpose to better understand results from the survey, findings are presented and clarified through tables and scatter plots. In addition, suggestions are made regarding the meaning of the results. Findings are discussed in relation to the literature review and interviews. By comparing the literature review, survey and interviews, similarities and differences were found. Thus, we were able to better answer the research question. Due to lack of previous research on youth tourism’s environmental impacts will section 4.6 – Environmental impacts of youth tourism – only be comparing overall tourism impacts with youth travellers’ perception and evaluation of the segments impacts.

4.1 Respondents’ perception of tourism impacts
Table 1 present respondents’ perception of the overall tourism impact on places as well as how they perceive their own overall impact. The mean score originates from a 5-point scale and forms a foundation which can be used to interpret and better understand the more specific youth tourism impacts. Table 1 show that the overall impact of tourism is perceived as slightly better than neither bad or good as it shows a mean of 3,5. The perception of the respondents’ own overall impact was rated 3,9 indicating it to be somewhat good. This implies that youth travellers view their own personal impact as more positive and favourable to places than the overall impacts of tourism. Standard deviation shows a greater spread in perception of personal impacts (0,76) than for overall impacts of tourism (0,83), meaning that the mean score of 3,5 can be relied upon to a greater extent.

Table 1. Tourism impacts as perceived by youth travellers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of overall impact of tourism</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>0,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of respondents’ own overall impact</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>0,76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=145)

The results can be interpreted as that youth travellers may have an inaccurate self-perception and therefore fail to notice the negative impacts of their own behaviour. Greater reflection on their own behaviour and influence on places may have resulted in a different outcome. However, it is also possible that youth travellers view themselves as agents with prospects of making positive changes rather than affecting places negatively.

4.2 Perceived and evaluated youth tourism impacts
Table 2 show more specific perceptions and evaluations of youth tourism impacts. The perceived items of impacts are based on the Triple Bottom Line and have been grouped by sociocultural, economic, and environmental impacts. Belief represents the extent to which respondents perceive the specific items to increase or decrease in places as a result of youth tourism. It was measured on a 5-point scale where 1 represents decrease and 5 increase. Evaluation represents how respondents evaluate the impact of the item in question, where 1 represents bad and 5 good on the same scale as for belief. The overall perception of the items in Table 2 shows that impacts due to youth tourism increases. In order to see if the increase is evaluated as good or bad we need to compare it with the evaluation of the item. To clarify this, scatter plots of the items concerning sociocultural, economic and environmental impacts will be presented separately. Belief is shown on the vertical axis and the evaluation on the horizontal. Both axes’ numbers represent the respective 5-point scales. The letters A-L serves as a reference that illustrates the belief and evaluation of their respective items. Standard deviation shows to what extent the different means can be trusted. The overall concentration is close to 1 (0,71-1,1), meaning that there is a low spread of answers within each item.
resulting in reliable means. If the standard deviation exceeds 1 it indicates an over confidence of the mean.

Table 2. Youth travellers’ perceptions of their impacts on places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived impacts</th>
<th>Belief (n=144)</th>
<th>Evaluation (n=145)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived sociocultural impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Awareness of culture and heritage</td>
<td>3.7, 0.87</td>
<td>3.8, 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Opportunities to meet people</td>
<td>4.2, 0.92</td>
<td>4.4, 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Variety of entertainment</td>
<td>3.9, 0.94</td>
<td>4.0, 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Life and vitality of community</td>
<td>3.7, 0.86</td>
<td>3.7, 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Opportunities to learn about people’s culture</td>
<td>3.9, 0.96</td>
<td>4.2, 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Standard of living for locals</td>
<td>3.2, 0.84</td>
<td>3.2, 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Change in local social patterns/values/customs</td>
<td>3.4, 0.82</td>
<td>3.2, 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Change in a destination’s authenticity</td>
<td>3.2, 1.10</td>
<td>2.8, 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Tension within local community</td>
<td>3.3, 0.71</td>
<td>2.9, 0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Drug and alcohol consumption</td>
<td>3.4, 1.02</td>
<td>2.7, 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Crime</td>
<td>3.2, 1.09</td>
<td>2.5, 0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Quality of nightlife</td>
<td>3.7, 0.83</td>
<td>3.6, 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived economic impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Income to local businesses</td>
<td>3.9, 0.81</td>
<td>4.0, 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Number of jobs in local community</td>
<td>3.7, 0.83</td>
<td>3.8, 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Revenue generated in economy</td>
<td>3.7, 0.85</td>
<td>3.8, 0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Personal income of local residents</td>
<td>3.4, 0.82</td>
<td>3.4, 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Funding for infrastructure/facilities</td>
<td>3.4, 0.81</td>
<td>3.5, 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Economic development</td>
<td>3.8, 0.83</td>
<td>3.8, 0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived environmental impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Awareness of environmental issues</td>
<td>3.3, 1.05</td>
<td>3.3, 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Changes in natural environment</td>
<td>3.4, 1.05</td>
<td>2.7, 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Pollution</td>
<td>3.5, 1.05</td>
<td>2.5, 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Litter</td>
<td>3.4, 1.07</td>
<td>2.5, 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Quality of natural environment</td>
<td>3.2, 0.98</td>
<td>2.9, 1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean of the evaluation of all items of impacts have an average of 3.4. Comparing it with youth travellers’ overall perception of impacts of tourism (3.5), as shown in Table 1, suggests that both segments are considered by youth travellers to have a similar positive impact on places. This can be interpreted as that youth travellers view youth tourism as part of the overall tourism sector. They do not distinguish their own segment as one with more positive or negative impacts. On the other hand, it can also mean that youth travellers do not reflect or attach importance to themselves as a specific segment. When comparing their perception of their personal overall impact (3.9) to the general perceived youth tourism impacts (3.4), a greater difference can be seen. This difference can either be interpreted as explained in the previous section – as a consequence of youth travellers’ possible inaccurate self-perception – or lack of reflection of segmentation.
4.2.1 Sociocultural items

Figure 1 indicates that respondents mostly perceived youth tourism’s sociocultural impacts on places to be increasing and good (upper right quadrant). To what degree the impacts of the different items are increasing and good vary. Opportunities to meet people (B) was perceived to increase the most as well as being the most positive impact. The standard of living for locals (F) was perceived to be only slightly increasing and good. However, somewhat consistent is that the degree of increase is similar to the evaluated positive effects of the respective items. This indicates that the more an item of the upper right quadrant is increasing, the more positive effects are seen. A minority of the items were perceived to be increasing and bad (upper left quadrant). These were; changes in a place’s authenticity (H), tension within local communities (I), drug and alcohol consumption (J) and crime (K). The overall mean of the evaluated sociocultural impacts is 3,4 and therefore consistent with the mean of the overall evaluated impacts of youth tourism (3,4). Sociocultural impacts have just as the overall sociocultural impacts of youth tourism a lower average than that of the evaluated own impacts, indicating a stronger belief in the personal possibilities to create positive change than the collective.

4.2.2 Economic items

Figure 2 show that all youth tourism economic impacts are perceived by youth travellers to be increasing and good (upper right quadrant). This indicates a belief that youth tourism contributes to economic development and that the change is positive. Similar to the perceived sociocultural impacts, the level of increase seems to correlate to the evaluated degree of positivity. On average, the evaluation of economic impact is 3,7. This is a higher mean than that of the overall evaluated impacts of youth tourism (3,4), indicating economic impacts to have more positive effects for a place than other categories. However, sociocultural impacts include more items of impacts than the economic and environmental categories. Including more aspects of economic and environmental impacts may have resulted in a different outcome. Compared to youth travellers’ own overall impact on places (3,9), youth tourism economic impacts are considered to be somewhat less good.
4.2.3 Environmental items

Figure 3 indicates that youth travellers perceive youth tourism environmental impacts on places to be mostly increasing and bad (upper left quadrant). Awareness of environmental issues (A) is the only item to be evaluated as being a positive increase. It is also the only non-physical item. Similar to both the perceived sociocultural and economic impacts, how much something increases in the upper right quadrant is related to how good it is evaluated. The same causality is not seen when the increase is evaluated as bad. In these cases, the items have lower score on the evaluation scale in relation to the same item’s believed increase. To clarify, attention can be drawn to e.g. pollution (C) that has a belief score of 3,5, but an evaluation score of 2,5. What is interesting is that awareness of environmental issues (A) has a perceived positive increase but physical changes in the environment (B-E) are increasing with a negative effect. This result points to an increased awareness but an ignorance of the problem. On average, the environmental impacts are seen as bad with an evaluation score of 2,8. It is lower than the average of overall evaluated youth tourism impacts (3,4). The score (2,8) is also lower than the evaluated own overall impacts on a place (3,9). Both the overall and youth travellers’ own environmental impacts suggests that, as mentioned before, youth travellers do not have a correct self-perception and therefore do not consider themselves as having negative impacts on places. It can also indicate that when evaluating the own overall impact, youth travellers perceive and evaluate their positive impacts to largely outweigh their negative ones.

4.3 Relations between different variables and perceived impacts

To see if perceived impacts are affected by variables such as age, nationality and length of stay they were individually compared to the different items. Results between \( p = 0.01-0.05 \) are considered to have a causality (Djurfeldt, Larsson and Stjärnhagen, 2003). No overall causation between the different variables within youth tourism and the perceived youth tourism impacts were found. However, some exceptions showed causation.

Age and the evaluation of income to local businesses have a causation of \( p = 0.044 \). The result shows that a larger majority of the respondents in the age span of 23-29 perceive impacts as positive (83%) than the respondents in the age span of 15-22 (64%). The most distinctive difference is seen when viewing the answers separately. Within the answer ‘good’ 20% of the younger respondents chose this option, compared to 37% of the older respondents. This implies that the impact of income to local businesses are perceived as more positive the older a person becomes. It can also be related to younger people not reflecting over their impacts to the same extent.

Concerning nationality, causalities were only found within environmental impacts. Awareness of environmental issues were to a greater extent believed to have a ‘moderate increase’ or ‘increase’ among non-Swedish respondents (53%) compared to Swedish respondents (37%).
Differences between the two segments were also found within ‘no change’ where 45% of the Swedish respondents saw neither increase or decrease. The option was to a smaller extent chosen by non-Swedish respondents (23%). Viewing the results concerning litter a causality of \( p=0.024 \) was found. The overall perceived evaluation was similar between the segments. However, a difference was seen within the option ‘somewhat bad’ where 41% of the Swedish respondents selected this option, compared to 22% of the non-Swedish. In order to comment on what the causal relationship is, one needs to look at the answers and questions in relation to how a particular individual has responded. We therefore reserve judgement as to why we see this shift in attitudes. Similarly, this applies to the causation that was found in five questions regarding how much time on average a person spend at a destination when travelling. The evaluation concerned; income to local businesses \( (p=0.021) \), standard of living for locals \( (p=0.015) \), change in a destination’s authenticity \( (p=0.039) \) and within belief; revenue generated in economy \( (p=0.019) \) and change in a destination’s authenticity \( (p=0.034) \).

When comparing motivations and dimensions of motivations no causalities were found. What youth travellers seek and are motivated by was also found not to correlate to how impacts are perceived and evaluated. As shown in Table 3, an even distribution was found between what the respondents considered their main motivation and dimension of motivation. This propose that youth tourism consist of a heterogeneous group of travellers with different needs and interests. This in turn is supported by a consistent high standard deviation.

### Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun and beach</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of motivations</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Presentation of interview participants

Selection of participants for the interviews was made by the criteria presented in section 2.3 – Selection and delimitations. Three interviews were conducted. Swedish Malin Andersson, Telemarketer, currently living on Phi Phi Island, Thailand, has visited the island four times since 2007. Swedish Johanna Franzon, PADI Scuba Diver Instructor, has lived on the same island and revisited five times since 2007. New Zealander Brad Prosser, Consultant for elite level athletes, has lived in and revisited multiple places over the course of ten years.

4.5 Sociocultural impacts of youth tourism

Youth travellers’ desire to travel can be explained by the Ulysses factor (Nicolau and Más, 2006). In their attempts to learn about other people and places (Richards and Wilson, 2003), various interactions occur which have both social and cultural effects. To what extent a place is affected varies (UNWTO, 2011). This is observed by Brad Prosser who means that certain areas experience different impacts. Places such as Indonesia or Thailand have experienced a greater change, than e.g. Europe, due to youth tourism. This can, as explained by Smith (2017), be a result from remote and fragile locations being affected to a greater extent than urban places. The fact that only a small percentage of the world’s population have the possibilities to travel can also be a possible factor. The travelling population is largely concentrated to the West and is therefore likely to have less effects on places similar to their home environment. Malin Andersson has also witnessed varying degrees of impacts on places. She argues that certain islands in Thailand are largely impacted by youth tourism. Because local residents are dependent on tourism they develop entertainment and activities attractive to youth travellers. Brad Prosser has seen that more remote areas have developed
more of a party image than urban places. Partying can be a big part of the urban destinations. Places such as Europe have more of a balance between people travelling to party and e.g. visiting historical attractions, evening the impacts out. It is possible to argue that depending on the place’s ‘starting’ situation and who is visiting, different impacts will occur in various degrees. Westerners visiting a remote place in Asia are more likely to influence local residents with their values and behaviour as opposed to visiting a country in the West. The greater the social and cultural differences are the more impacts are likely to occur. Results in the survey indicate that youth travellers perceive their impacts on social patterns, values and customs to be slightly increasing and positive. A possible explanation for this could be that the change results in a more familiar social environment. What is familiar is often perceived as good and therefore it can sometimes be difficult to reflect on the negative impacts one might have.

Johanna Franzon has recognized, that to keep local tradition and religion becomes difficult as tourism increases. In her experience, local customs have faded more in tourism intense regions. Differences between e.g. Asia and Europe are no longer as evident as before. Malin Andersson, Johanna Franzon and Brad Prosser all argue that though they have seen an increase in opportunities to experience or witness local tradition, the level of authenticity in the activities has decreased. This could potentially become an issue when attracting youth travellers as they value authentic experiences. If the experience does not meet the expectations, revisits are unlikely and bad word of mouth can occur. Considering youth travellers’ technology usage (Davies, 2017) and the fast and large reach of Social Media (Bizirgianni and Dionysopoulou, 2013), a bad reputation can quickly become uncontrollable with extensive consequences. Brad Prosser means that though the locals’ religious beliefs might not change, it will still be affected by the target group of the place in question. The place will cater for the particular group and by doing so, local culture will inevitably be affected. That decreasing authenticity might create difficulties in attracting young travellers is supported by results in the survey indicating a negative response to changes in a destination’s authenticity. With the premise that youth travellers prefer experiences of high authenticity, it is possible to argue that the changes concern decreasing authenticity as they are evaluated as negative. This is further supported by Johanna Franzon, stating that in her own opinion differences and authenticity in the typically local is what creates value.

According to the literature review, learning about local cultures is an important part of the youth traveller’s vacation experience (Richards and Wilson, 2003). Brad Prosser’s observation that an increasing amount of youth travellers seek cultural experiences supports the literature review. In addition to this, results from the survey indicate that youth travellers believe awareness of culture and heritage is increasing as a result of youth tourism. This suggests that as the demand for cultural experiences increases, so do the possibilities to learn, resulting in a higher level of awareness. Malin Andersson has seen a growth in opportunities to learn about other peoples’ culture in terms of food, language and massage classes. She argues that it is a result of demand from curious travellers, which further supports the hypothesis of youth travellers being influenced by the Ulysses factor and wanting to learn about local culture. As results from the survey indicate a positive attitude towards higher awareness of culture and heritage, it is possible to conclude that youth travellers appreciate the possibilities and want to acquire deeper understandings for local culture.

Another way to gain genuine cultural experiences, apart from witnessing or partaking in local traditions, is to interact with local residents. As described in the literature review, interactions that feel sincere are considered positive by youth travellers (Eusébo and Carneiro, 2015). In
line with Social Exchange Theory, longer stays and higher interaction levels are more likely to result in benefits for both hosts and visitors (Eusébo and Carneiro, 2015). Increasing numbers of visitors is argued to generate possibilities for social encounters that enhances the tourism experience (Deery, Jago and Fredline, 2012). Malin Andersson and Brad Prosser argue that there are great opportunities to meet people among youth travellers. Results from the survey also indicate that youth travellers experience a positive increase in opportunities to meet people. Corresponding with the literature review, Brad Prosser judge travellers, especially young people, to be open minded and social, facilitating chances to interact. Giving Asia as an example, he continues to say that impacts of these encounters often affect locals more than visitors. Here many people do not have the opportunity to travel and therefore visitors are creating new possibilities for experiences and information exchange. Johanna Franzon suggests that as local people in more remote places do not have the same technological advantage as youth travellers they benefit more from the exchange in terms of gaining new information. Tourists can often read about everything on the internet. The knowledge youth travellers bring can evoke a curiosity and want to learn among local residents. This in combination with youth travellers’ strive for authentic experiences (ITB Berlin, 2016) causes interactions between hosts and visitors. As explained by SET it is important that the interactions remain reciprocal for them to continue (Moyle, Weiler and Cory, 2012). In contrast to the literature review, Johanna Franzon has experienced than an increasing number of visitors can have negative effects on the social interactions causing the social exchange to end. She argues that the reasons for impaired interest are often based on lack of respect from visitors. Negative spirals occur when a large amount of youth travellers visit a place and behave badly, often as a result of alcohol. When disrespectful behaviour is repeated by people from the same countries, negative stereotypes are created causing tension and annoyance from local residents. Further she explains that bad impressions mostly affect people arriving later and that while travelling young people do not reflect over this. Should a majority of natives develop a resistance towards tourists it is possible that the visitors’ experiences of that place turn out negative. As explained in the literature review this can cause decline in tourism. Given certain areas’ dependency on youth travellers, these places can experience negative consequences in a long-term perspective. Therefore, it is important not only for the visitors to respect the locals, but also for the locals to realize the value of the visitors. It becomes evident, as explained in the literature review, that the social exchange needs to remain reciprocal.

Increasing tourism is argued in the literature review to have positive effects concerning the standard of living for local residents. Improvement of public services and entertainment as well as a rise in income are considered tourism outcomes that will benefit locals (Cárdenas-Garcia, Sánchez-Rivero and Pulido-Fernández, 2015). Because youth travellers are staying longer in places and often work they are considered to contribute to a holistic positive development of places, including the standard of living (UNWTO, 2016). Malin Andersson, Johanna Franzon and Brad Prosser have all seen improvements in the standard of living for locals as a result of youth tourism. Mostly this is related to youth travellers spending money in smaller local businesses, increasing the spending power and in turn improving living standards. Income to local businesses and standard of living for locals are both according to the survey estimated to increase due to the presence of youth travellers. Both of these items were evaluated to have a positive increase. Only looking at the survey does not allow determination of a causality between these results. Combining them with the literature review and the interviews do however advocate a causality. Malin Andersson acknowledge that it is difficult to compare living standards of e.g. Thailand and Sweden. One can argue that often when people are able to afford things they could previously not, it is used as a way to describe
that higher living standards are being reached. Malin Andersson states that this might not be a correct measurement for living standards in Thailand. She explains that Thai people focus more on relationships and helping others than on material possessions. She claims that the opportunity to buy more material goods does not necessarily result in greater happiness.

Youth travellers’ own perception of how they impact the living standards at a place will always be influenced by their own cultural values and customs. What is perceived as correct or positive in Western societies does not always correspond with other cultures. This can create a misinterpretation of what happiness or improvement is. Therefore, what youth travellers believe as positive social changes may not be evaluated in the same way by locals. This can be seen as a reason for tension being created between hosts and visitors. According to the interviewees, alcohol is often a source of this tension. They have witnessed that youth travellers to a great extent consume alcohol causing disrespectful behaviour toward the environment and its local inhabitants. Brad Prosser argues that as some people see the income benefits of having youth travellers while others find them annoying, tension between locals can arise. The survey indicates a rise in crime as a result of youth travellers. Johanna Franzon and Brad Prosser agree but relate it more specifically to youth travellers’ alcohol consumption habits. Though this cannot be confirmed in the survey the result does not contradict it. Alcohol consumption is by the interviewees recognized to be a central part of youth travellers’ vacations. Impacts such as increased alcohol consumption as well as noisy, violent and disturbance behaviour, affects local residents’ quality of life. This causes locals to avoid tourists and develop a negative attitude towards them which reduces the reciprocal social exchange. In turn, this can cause youth travellers to not feel welcome resulting in a rapid decrease in youth tourism and thereby negatively influence the local economy.

### 4.6 Economic impacts of youth tourism

As explained in the literature review, youth travellers’ economic significance has long been neglected due to the general perception of them being budget oriented and low spenders. As the sector grows, they are to a greater extent recognized as high value (Richards and Wilson, 2005). Longer stays, frequent travel and spending locally have contributed to the improvement of local economies (UNWTO, 2016). Malin Andersson, Johanna Franzon and Brad Prosser all agree that revenue generated in the economy increases due to youth tourism. According to Brad Prosser, the level of economic influence varies where certain areas are subject to a larger impact than others. Youth travellers can visit a place without having as much of an effect on it as they would on places with a higher youth target, such as Ibiza or Bali. Here, youth tourism becomes a central part of the local economy as they are considered one of the primary income sources. Further, he explains that New Zealand is a place less affected by youth tourism as it is more expensive. Especially as many seek high end adventure. In his experience, it is the slightly older side of the segment that could affect it as they have more money to spend. The results of the survey imply an increasing positive level of the overall economic development in places. Compared to what Brad Prosser suggests, these results show a more positive increase regardless of place. This can be interpreted as a majority of youth travellers evaluate their economic impacts as positive without regard to place. It is also possible that the respondents of the survey have travelled to places more susceptible to economic impacts resulting in a higher mean. Some variations were seen between older and younger travellers in that the older a person gets the more they evaluate their economic impact to be positive. Brad Prosser argues that older people often have more money to spend. Their greater spending power could therefore be an explanation as to why they, to a greater extent than younger people, evaluate their economic impacts as positive.
Tourism is a labour-intensive industry that generates direct income to tourism-related businesses (Torres and Momsen, 2004). Youth tourism can, as stated in the literature review, contribute to a more holistic economic development (UNWTO, 2016). Observation by Brad Prosser indicates that youth travellers seek cheaper accommodation, restaurants and pubs rather than higher-end accommodation and activities. He argues that the hospitality industry, first and foremost, the small local businesses, are affected the most as they to a greater extent offer what youth travellers seek. The businesses he describes do not often require higher education and his observation therefore correspond with the literature review stating that more low-skilled jobs are created due to tourism development. This is additionally supported by the survey that points to youth travellers evaluating and believing that the number of jobs in local communities have a positive increase as a result of their presence. Though these kinds of jobs are often seasonal, part-time, low-wage and not sufficient to support the need for basic commodities, Malin Andersson and Johanna Franzon have both experienced a positive change within income to local businesses. Johanna Franzon has, since her first visit in 2007, witnessed a major change within the local economy on Phi Phi Island, Thailand. She explains that an increase in youth tourism have brought a larger differentiated market facilitating the establishment of new businesses. This is corroborated by the literature review, which argues that youth tourism increases job opportunities (Rodrigues and Prideaux, 2011). Johanna Franzon argues that this has resulted in local residents being able to afford things that were previously too expensive. It can be assumed that due to a larger local purchasing power, the domestic economy will continue to develop positively, less dependent on inbound tourism. However, Johanna Franzon believes that an increase in low-wage job opportunities can create a gap in education. This statement suggests that locals then would be more dependent on tourism as a source of income. Should tourism rapidly decrease potential risks emerge such as a large unemployed population. Deprioritizing education results in a large uneducated population unequipped for skilled work.

Students and working travellers often choose to live and work in one place for longer periods. The wish to experience everyday life of the local people (UNWTO, 2016) and knowing that it might be a once in a lifetime opportunity (Richards and Wilson, 2003) are factors that contribute to why many young people chose to do this. As witnessed by Brad Prosser, traditionally young travellers have the desire to stay in one place just to experience that particular place’s culture, mentality or environment. He argues that in order to do so they are willing to, and have the opportunity, more than others, to take a job. These are often low-wage jobs. He believes that youth travellers taking on work while travelling do not have a major impact on local people as they already have their jobs secured. If that is not the case, it is a matter of locals being lazy. He does, however, acknowledge that it can have some effect on less wealthy countries. Even though, some concerns have been raised in the literature review regarding working travellers taking job opportunities from local residents, UNWTO (2016) argues that attracting talent is a competitive advantage in a globalized economy. This corresponds with Brad Prosser’s statement of local jobs not being threatened by working youth travellers. Results in the survey also indicates that youth travellers do not consider themselves as a threat to local job opportunities. Instead, they consider themselves to create new jobs in local communities. Johanna Franzon has, to a greater extent than Brad Prosser, experienced that the simplicity of securing a job as a young traveller can cause problems for locals. To repeatedly recruit young travellers for the same position for a few months at a time results in these jobs becoming completely unavailable to locals. Considering the statements of Johanna Franzon, Brad Prosser and what is said in the literature review, it is possible to argue that depending on the nature of the job and where it is located, youth travellers taking
employment will result in different impacts. Similar to impacts on sociocultural, this is likely to affect remote and fragile locations, where jobs are scarce, more than urban places.

Funding and incentives from various organisations can, as stated in the literature review, improve infrastructure, safety and education which in turn increases the social and human capital. This is supported by the survey, suggesting that youth tourism contribute to positive increase in funding for infrastructure and facilities. Brad Prosser gives New Zealand as an example. The country has a large tourism industry meaning that tourists in general will affect it massively, youth or not. He argues that tourism is a large part of the economy as it brings in money for local businesses as well as disposable income for the country. Johanna Franzon has observed a difference in public services and facilities depending on the amount of tourism. An increase in tourism bring better developed infrastructure. Having said that, she has difficulty determining whether it is due to youth tourism or tourism at large. Both these statements propose that youth tourism is not a major contributor to the development of infrastructure and facilities. It is rather the tourism sector as a whole that support these developments. Judging by the survey, youth travellers believe that their presence increase funding for these causes. Malin Andersson agrees, her experience on Phi Phi Island in Thailand is that along with young travellers arriving, the local community wants to adapt and adjust after their preferences and demands. However, this does not exclude other tourism segments to contribute to infrastructural improvement. As stated by Hall and Lew (2009), problems such as maintaining infrastructure, water supply, electricity and health and education facilities can occur if the demand for public services and facilities exceeds the level of incoming tax revenues. Considering this, it is important to have well-planned tourism development strategies that can handle a rapid increase in tourism. Brad Prosser has observed that the more development there is due to youth travellers the more it will affect the locals and their economy. Thailand is one of many examples. Expensive developments specifically targeting young travellers such as nightlife areas and hostels are being built, renovated and expanded. If these developments are not strategically planned, they can result in low or no return on investment. Malin Andersson and Johanna Franzon have seen this in e.g. Thailand, where successful concepts are frequently being copied, often resulting in fast but short-term revenue. In order for these local initiatives to be sustainable and for the community to benefit from them, holistic long-term approaches must be implemented.

4.7 Environmental impacts of youth tourism

The interviewees have all witnessed youth travellers’ impacts on the environment, but the extent to which youth tourism influences the awareness of environmental issues in places varies between them. Malin Andersson argues that an increasing number of youth travellers are more aware of environmental issues and therefore adapt their behaviour accordingly. However, she still sees youth travellers who show little respect for the environment. She believes that people stop caring due to them entering holiday mode. Brad Prosser has a different view of how youth travellers affect the awareness of environmental issues in places. He claims that the care factor is reduced as their aim is to travel and experience the world without responsibilities. This results in, places popular to youth travellers, being flooded with large amounts of litter. He argues that the world in general is getting worse on that front and that the youth follows in the same footprint. He still believes that there is a low proportion will try to help in a positive way. However, the results of the survey show that youth travellers evaluate and believe their impact on awareness of environmental issues in places as a positive increase. It is the only item of the environmental impacts that is perceived to be positive and increasing.
As stated in the literature review, clear guidelines can help minimize environmental changes. By protecting and promoting biodiversity, natural resources and cultural sites, awareness among both visitors and locals can be increased (UNEP, 2003). Malin Andersson and Johanna Franzon have both observed an increase in organized clean-ups, often with initiatives from youth travellers. According to Johanna Franzon it is increasing, but unfortunately only tourists try to create awareness. Seeing locals engaging and organizing activities to improve environmental issues is unusual. That youth travellers choose to stay longer in a place either to study or to work, is according to Johanna Franzon crucial as they contribute with environmental thinking. This in turn increases the awareness among the local population. Brad Prosser agrees saying that the more people who encounter environmental issues, the more awareness is raised. This is reinforced by the literature review which argue that engaging in nature activities increases the understanding of the environment’s value (UNEP, 2017). It is possible to argue that if visitors show an interest in the environment, local people are more likely to engage as well. The desire to preserve the environment becomes stronger as they realize it is a way to ensure a source of income. As the literature review, Johanna Franzon argues that environmental consciousness decreases among local residents as the desire for money increases. A short-term environmental thinking is created where the environment is less prioritized. Her observation is that they have a basic understanding of the negative effect littering e.g. has on nature, but not in the long run. Malin Andersson agrees, her view is that locals show involvement sporadically. It is easy for them to fall back into old behaviours not caring about the environment. Nevertheless, she states that more extensive activities to help nature are organized by larger local organizations. Brad Prosser acknowledges that local residents and communities organize clean-ups etc. but he believes that the underlying cause of action is rather about covering it up than stopping the problem. In addition, he argues that catering young people and the money they bring, exceeds locals dealing with the problem of environmental issues. Supported by the literature review he continues to explain that there are no regulations in place to reduce or stopping it from happening. In many places, it becomes a future problem and that is why some local communities let it slide in order to clean it up later.

As stated by the literature review, a poorly managed environment can cause a decline in tourism (Musila, 1996). If a place exceeds its carrying capacity it can result in excessive amounts of pollution, emissions into the sea, loss and decrease of natural habitat and endangered species and people struggling for access to critical resources (Sunlu, 2003). Brad Prosser argues that a growing number of youth travellers will increase the quantity of busses, boats, flights, transport pollution and litter which in turn affect the environment negatively. He claims there are ways to reduce the negative impact on the environment, but youth travellers chose not to reflect on these issues. The statement by Brad Prosser corresponds to the results of the survey that changes in the natural environment, pollution and litter are believed and evaluated as a negative increase. The literature review suggests that tourism and the environment affect and is affected by each other (Jafari, 1997). It is therefore important to observe and pay attention to changes that occur in the environment in order to mitigate negative effects due to youth tourism. Malin Andersson and Johanna Franzon have experienced a deterioration in water quality, marine life and flora and fauna. Johanna Franzon has similar to Brad Prosser experienced negative effects on the environment due to increased transportation modes. She gives Thailand as an example where speed boats are a major contributing factor to oil and gasoline emissions. Assuming that people travel with a primary goal of experiencing natural environment these kinds of emissions can result in visitors choosing a different destination. If this were to happen in places dependent on youth tourism it may be fatal to the local communities, as their source of income is lost. This corresponds to
the survey that indicates that youth travellers experience increasing changes in the natural environment such as pollution and litter and that this causes the quality of it to decrease.

Taking the previous section into consideration it is interesting to discuss the differences between the evaluated positive overall individual impacts and the general perception that youth tourism is having a negative impact on the environment. In the survey, youth travellers evaluate their own impacts as positive. This in combination with their belief that they contribute to increased awareness of environmental issues suggests that negative environmental impacts will decrease. The results from the survey and the observations of the interviewees, does however indicate negative environmental impacts to increase as a result of youth tourism. These findings point to an ignorance of the problem as awareness is increasing but no actions of improvement are being taken. As previously mentioned bad self-perception can be another factor of the contradictory results. The interviewees all agree that there are some youth travellers who actively try to reduce their ecological footprint by e.g. previously mentioned clean ups. By returning to a place and experiencing changes, a greater insight of the individual impacts is created. The returning factor is not a variable in the survey and therefore it is possible that a majority of the respondents have experienced this. Should this be the case, it can explain the contradictory results as youth travellers adapt a more environmentally friendly behaviour.
5. Conclusion
The sociocultural impact on places from youth tourism were found to be effects on local residents’ social patterns, values and customs by bringing and transferring their own values and behaviour through social interactions. The greater difference between cultures, the more impact resulting in social and cultural differences between countries becoming less evident. The impact of youth tourism on traditions and culture is that the opportunities to learn about them, such as through food and language, increases. This results in higher levels of awareness that can create a greater understanding and respect for different cultures and customs. Another impact from increased youth tourism is that a place’s authenticity decreases as youth tourism increases. A possible long-term effect from decreasing authenticity is that the number of youth travellers visiting will decrease as well. The sociocultural impacts from youth tourism can be explained by the Ulysses factor. That youth travellers are open, social and want to learn facilitates interactions with local residents. This leads to a desire to learn among residents which results in the exchange of information and experience. Youth travellers’ tendency to stay longer, work and their general spending habits reduces economic leakage as they consume locally. This was found to contribute to a higher standard of living for the local population as it strengthens their spending power.

A result from some youth travellers believing that their own values and behaviour are correct is that negative impacts on places have occurred. This have been seen to create a misinterpretation of what happiness or improvement is, sometimes resulting in disrespectful behaviour towards local communities. This causes annoyance and tension towards youth travellers which make residents withdraw from social exchanges necessary for youth tourism to continue. This in turn can make visitors feel unwelcome. In a long-term perspective, the local economy will be negatively affected. Tensions can also rise between locals, as some see the economic benefits of youth travellers, while others focus only on their negative impacts. Detected in the interviews was that youth travellers’ alcohol consumption habits are often the source of negative impacts. It affects the quality of life among residents as noise levels as well as violent and disturbing behaviour increases.

Places focusing on youth travellers become subject to greater economic impact as youth tourism then become one of the primary income sources. The study found that employment opportunities increase due to youth tourism, as youth travellers generally seek accommodation and activities that do not require high-skilled workers. This makes it easier for smaller local businesses to open because they can be managed without higher education. A negative effect from this was found to be a decrease in educational motivation among local residents.

The heterogeneity of youth tourism has led to a larger differentiated market that allows more businesses to open, resulting in more locals having money to spend. A positive effect of this is that the domestic economy becomes more self-sufficient. Youth tourism has holistic impacts on the local economy as youth travellers often live and work in one place for longer periods. The research established that youth tourism does not pose a threat to local job opportunities in more developed countries. However, remote and fragile locations will, to a greater extent, experience a reduction of employment opportunities due to youth tourism. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that depending on the nature of the job and its location, different impacts will occur.

It is possible to conclude that funding of infrastructure and facilities to some extent increase as a result of youth tourism. However, findings in the study suggest tourism as a whole to
have the greatest impacts. Places especially targeting youth tourism that have long-term development strategies adapted for the heterogeneous market are more likely to gain economic benefits over a longer period of time. Lacking a well-planned market strategy often results in short-term business. Therefore, we can conclude that a place’s mode of operation when targeting youth tourism influences youth travellers’ impacts on that place.

The lack of previous research and the scope of this study make it difficult to determine youth tourism’s environmental impacts on places. However, an impact that could be distinguished was that demand from youth tourism must be within a place’s carrying capacity in order for locals to start preserving the environment. Currently the overall perception of youth tourism impacts is that pollution, litter and other negative changes in the natural environment increase as a result of their presence. On a long-term perspective, this could cause a decrease in youth tourism as they value unexploited nature. An increase in negative physical environmental impacts indicate an ignorance of the problem as awareness of environmental issues is increasing but no actions of improvement are taken. It can also be a result of youth travellers’ possible bad self-perception, making them non-receptive for their own negative impacts. Returning to a place make changes more evident, resulting in youth travellers more actively trying to reduce their own ecological footprint.

In conclusion, the impacts youth tourism has on places depends on the place’s current state and ability to host youth travellers. The number of visitors as well as their behaviour influence what impacts will occur. A challenge concerning youth tourism is to balance the local lifestyle, culture and environment with the high economic benefits youth tourism provide. The more youth tourism grows, the greater the impact the segment will have on a local and global sociocultural, economic and environmental scale.
References


Massey, D. (2005), For space, Los Angeles, U.S: SAGE.


Richards, G. and Wilson, J. (2003), Today’s Youth Travellers: Tomorrow’s Global Nomads. New Horizons in Independent Youth and Student Travel, A Report for the International Student Travel Confederation (ISTC) and the Association of Tourist and Leisure Education (ATLAS), Amsterdam: International Student Travel Confederation (ISTC).


6.1 Verbal sources
Unkuri, Michael; Travel Advisor at Kilroy Sweden AB, (2017), E-mail correspondence, November 15th.
Andersson, Malin; Telemarketer, (2017), Skype interview, December 14th.
Franzon, Johanna; PADI Scuba Diver Instructor, (2017), Skype interview, December 12th.
Prosser, Brad; Consultant for elite level athletes, (2017), Skype interview, December 13th.
7. Attachments

This section presents the design of the survey as well as questions forming the foundation on which the interviews are based.

7.1 Attachment 1

Youth Tourism

We are two students attending the Tourism Program at the School of Business and Economics at Linnaeus University, Sweden. We are currently conducting research about youth tourism for our bachelor thesis.

Youth tourism consists of young travellers and represent more than 23% of the over one billion tourists travelling internationally each year. They are one of the fastest growing segments of international tourism. Our aim is to understand in what ways youth travellers perceive and evaluate their impacts on places.

This survey takes approximately five minutes. If you have any questions, concerns or feedback, please feel free to contact Elin Blomgren at eb222ww@student.lnu.se or Sofie Ljungström at sl222zq@student.lnu.se to discuss them.

With appreciation,
Elin and Sofie

*Compulsory

Your Travels

1. How much time, on average, do you spend at a destination when travelling? *

Less than a week
1-2 weeks
3-4 weeks
5-8 weeks
More than two months

2. What do you seek when travelling?

Please rank the choices in relation to each other, where 1 is the most important and 4 the least important.
Culture
Fun
Sun and beach
Nature

3. What motivates your travels?

Please rank the choices in relation to each other, where 1 is the most important and 4 the least important.
Challenge
Escape
Novelty
Knowledge

Perceived economic impacts

We seek your opinion about CHANGES that are associated with tourism development.
Please rate how you believe your presence at destination affects the items listed below. How you evaluate the effect of your presence is rated: 1=bad, 2=somewhat bad, 3=neither bad or good, 4=somewhat good, and 5=good. Your believed influence on the item is rated: 1=decrease, 2=moderate decrease, 3=no change, 4=moderate increase, and 5=increase.

4. Income to local business *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

5. Number of jobs in local community *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

6. Revenue generated in economy *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

7. Personal income of local residents *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

8. Funding for infrastructure/facilities *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

9. Economic development *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

Perceived sociocultural impacts
We seek your opinion about CHANGES that are associated with tourism development.

Please rate how you believe your presence at destination affects the items listed below. How you evaluate the effect of your presence is rated: 1=bad, 2=somewhat bad, 3=neither bad or good, 4=somewhat good, and 5=good. Your believed influence on the item is rated: 1=decrease, 2=moderate decrease, 3=no change, 4=moderate increase, and 5=increase.

10. Awareness of culture and heritage *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

11. Opportunities to meet people *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Decreasing  1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

12. Variety of entertainment *
Bad  1 2 3 4 5  Good
Perceived environmental impacts
We seek your opinion about CHANGES that are associated with tourism development.

Please rate how you believe your presence at destination affects the items listed below.
How you evaluate the effect of your presence is rated: 1=bad, 2=somewhat bad, 3=neither bad or good, 4=somewhat good, and 5=good.
Your believed influence on the item is rated: 1=decrease, 2=moderate decrease, 3=no change, 4=moderate increase, and 5=increase.

22. Awareness of environmental issues *
Bad 1 2 3 4 5 Good
Decreasing 1 2 3 4 5 Increasing
23. Changes in natural environment *
   Bad 1 2 3 4 5  Good
   Decreasing 1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

24. Pollution *
   Bad 1 2 3 4 5  Good
   Decreasing 1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

25. Litter *
   Bad 1 2 3 4 5  Good
   Decreasing 1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

26. Quality on natural environment *
   Bad 1 2 3 4 5  Good
   Decreasing 1 2 3 4 5  Increasing

**Overall impact**
How you evaluate the following questions is rated: 1=bad, 2=somewhat bad, 3=neither bad or good, 4=somewhat good, and 5=good.

27. How do you perceive the overall impact of TOURISM in a destination? *
   Bad 1 2 3 4 5  Good

28. How do you evaluate the overall impact of your PERSONAL visit to a destination? *
   Bad 1 2 3 4 5  Good

**Personal information**
29. How old are you? *
   Under 15 years old
   15-22 years old
   23-29 years old
   Over 29 years old

30. What is your nationality? *
7.2 Attachment 2
Interview questions
We are two students attending the Tourism Program at the School of Business and Economics at Linnaeus University, Sweden. We are currently conducting research about youth tourism for our bachelor thesis.

Youth tourism consists of young travellers and represent more than 23% of the over one billion tourists travelling internationally each year. They are one of the fastest growing segments of international tourism. Our aim is to understand in what ways youth travellers perceive and evaluate their impacts on places.

If there is something you do not understand or if you have any questions during the interview feel free to ask them. If you wish to remain anonymous please let us know.

Before we start, do you have any questions?

1. What is your full name and occupation?
2. How old are you?
3. What is your nationality?

4. When visiting a place, how many months where your longest stay?

5. In your opinion, what does youth travellers seek when visiting that place? Culture, Fun, Sun and beach or Nature?

6. Do you think youth tourism has had an impact on that place?

7. Tell us about how you believe young travellers affect the local people and the community.

8. Did you see any economic, sociocultural or environmental changes due to youth tourism?

9. In your opinion, which are the biggest challenges regarding economic/environmental/sociocultural impacts from youth tourism in?

10. How do you evaluate the effect of youth traveller’s presence regarding perceived economic impacts?
    • Income to local business
    • Number of jobs in local community
    • Revenue generated in economy
    • Personal income of local residents
    • Funding for infrastructure/facilities
    • Economic development

11. How do you evaluate the effect of youth traveller’s presence regarding perceived sociocultural impacts?
    • Awareness of culture and heritage
    • Opportunities to meet people
    • Variety of entertainment
• Life and vitality of community
• Opportunities to learn about people's culture
• Standard of living for locals
• Change in social patterns/values/customs of locals
• Change in a destination’s authenticity
• Tension within local community
• Drug and alcohol consumption
• Crime
• Quality of nightlife

12. How do you evaluate the effect of youth traveller’s presence regarding perceived environmental impacts?
   • Awareness of environmental issues
   • Changes in natural environment
   • Pollution
   • Litter
   • Quality on natural environment

13. Do you feel that you have an influence on these impacts when travelling?

14. Do you have any final questions or anything you would like to add?