

博士論文 (要約)

# **Evaluation of Tourism Policy Focused on “Tourism Zone Development” in Japan**

(日本の観光圏整備事業に着目した観光政策評価)

金 炫廷

**Kim, Hyunjung**

**Department of Urban Engineering**

**Graduate School of Engineering**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO**

**August 2015**

# **Evaluation of Tourism Policy Focused on “Tourism Zone Development” in Japan**

(日本の観光圏整備事業に着目した観光政策評価)

by

金 炫廷 (Kim, Hyunjung)

A dissertation presented to Department of Urban Engineering,  
Graduate School of Engineering in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**Supervisor**

**Professor: ASAMI, Yasushi**

**Advisors**

**Professor: SADAHIRO, Yukio**

**Associate Professor: SETA, Fumihiko**

**Associate Professor: HINO, Kimihiro**

**Associate Professor: HATOYAMA, Kiichiro**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO**

**August 2015**

Amid struggles of many countries with the economic recession, tourism industry is expected to become as an emerging strategy for economic stimulation. For decades, Japan has been struggling with significant social matters such as a sharp population decline, aging society and long-term national debts. With this social state, Japanese government advocated a strong belief in “Tourism Nation (観光立国)” can be a key to the rebuild of Japan. In the line with this, various tourism policies for regional revitalization have been promoted as well as Japan Tourism Agency was established, which is responsible enforcement authority for tourism policy.

The emphasis on tourism policy evaluation is growing in its importance. In many countries, policy evaluation is now in progress, and a large volume of tourism information, data, and evaluation reports are gathered on a regular basis. Despite its significant role as a national strategy of tourism policy in Japan, however, lack of data research on tourism policy evaluation still remained. There has been the limited number of academic researches on tourism policy measurement. Not only the researches on the topics related to Tourism Zone Development do not exist, but also a few previous researches related to the tourism policy evaluation have mostly been done at the individual case level with idiographic explanation.

The rationale behind this, this study made an attempt to conduct an analysis on empirical approaches that can be applicable to verify the practical effects of tourism policy implementation in Japan. The target policy is Tourism Zone Development under the law Tourism Zone Development Act. Under revision of this act, there are two periods of tourism zone; tourism zone period 1 was terminated in 2012 and tourism

zone period 2 is ongoing at present (this study includes the tourism zones certificated before April, 2015). This study conducts empirical studies based on quantitative data on a nation-wide spatial range with nomothetic explanation out of the framework of existing research.

Types of policy evaluation vary according to its timing, stage, purpose and etc. Generally, policy evaluation can be divided into summative evaluation and formative evaluation. Summative evaluation is conducted after the policy implementation to see the policy outcome effectiveness, while formative evaluation takes place before or during the policy implementation to assist performance improvement. Therefore, in this study, a formative evaluation is adopted to see the policy effectiveness of tourism zone period 1 where the subsidy program was terminated in 2010, and a summative evaluation is to assist on the currently working programs.

Regarding the tourism zone period 1, summative evaluation is conducted to see the policy impact. The consequential measurements of policy impact are divided into two parts. Part 1 concerns about only whether the policy implementation had an effect or not. In part 2, with using the actual subsidy expenditures, the parameters and each project's subsidy effect are obtained. The theoretical background to see the effectiveness is based on the pretest-posttest control group design of quasi experiment. To find out the actual policy implementation influences, other factors except the policy implementation should not be considered. For example, even though the number of tourist visitors increased in a certain area, it remains unsure if it caused by the policy influence or by other social factors. To solve this kind of problem, in social studies, a quasi-experiment

is known as the most convincing method of evaluation. On the other hand, the subsidy effect is measured by regression modelling by each type of project.

For the tourism zone period 2, formative evaluation is conducted to assist in policy formation. By utilizing binary logit model, the probability choice model is analyzed to estimate the trip features derived by the tourists', transportation and destination features of tourism zone period 2. The dependent variable used in the binary logit model is the ratio of tour traffic generated in the  $i$  region over the selected  $j$  region. The explanatory variables consist of tourists', transportation and destination attributions. While physical distance was mainly used in previous studies, this study chooses the travel time which is more realistic traffic indicator reflecting the actual movement of tourists. In addition, crossing administrative borders (main islands, main regions and prefectures) are included in this model in order to consider the change of recognition distance due to the passage barriers. The binary logit models of probability choice model were conducted accordingly by its characteristics; weekday and holiday, individual and group and male and female.

The main data used in this study is National Urban Traffic Characteristic Survey from the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism. This data has a variety of information including the traveler's characteristics, travel information and trip purpose. Therefore it is possible to identify the national tourism movement by extracting trip purpose of tourism. In addition, this data is collected continually every 4~5years, therefore, both the comparison between before and after changes upon the policy implementation and also the time-series differences are possible to be measured.

Analysis of data of the summative evaluation suggests that the policy had little effect. Only in the tourism zone consisting of narrow regions in the same prefecture had an actual effect from quasi experiment. Besides, the subsidy expenditure in information transmission, measures for the secondary traffic and space formation had an effect on increasing the tourist visitors. Therefore, in terms of expecting maximum policy effect, instead of making wide areas as on tourism zone, making a moderate size of tourism zone is expected to have more effect. If a tourism zone consists of different prefectures, a special system including fluent cooperation and communication is required. The tourism zone consisting of more than 2 different prefectures had a negative effect on the subsidy of improving stay program, marketing, development of human resource/awareness enlightenment. This is interpreted that these projects need a long period of time to see the effect, especially on the development of human resources. In addition, the tourism zones where they increased visitors and also had positive subsidy effects are originally well-known touristic place. On the other hand, the least effective tourism zones are not famous for touristic places such as rural agricultural area, which is interpreted one of the purposes of this policy is on balancing the regional disparities.

From the empirical results derived from the probability choice model of formative evaluation, increasing the number of accompanying person has a negative effect on the probability of choice. The marginal effect was the highest in female visitors, on the other hand, the marginal effect on the increasing number of accompanying person was the lowest in holiday. This implies the increasing number of accompanying person in holiday is less sensitive than other groups. Among administrative borders, crossing main Islands did not affect the probability choice,

where crossing main regions and prefectures had a negative effect on the probability choice. In addition, crossing administrative borders did not affect the probability choice of tourist visitor in holiday while weekday, individual, group, male and female visitors had a negative effect. Most of the groups had a positive effect on the number of stations except holiday. The marginal change of probability is the greatest in individual visitors. Among the destination attributes, waterfall and garden and parks (tourism variable) had a positive effect, and the number of stations and airports (regional variable) had a positive effect on the probability of choice. From the analysis of the probability choice of tourist who visits tourism zone, as holiday visitors, there was no constraint of traveling long distance from their origin. Accordingly, it is considered that the expansion of transport services is required. Individual tourist had more tendencies to travel within the same prefecture with using trains, therefore providing adequate tour programs are required such as one-day travel for individual tourist, a tourist map provided in each stations with the attraction information of each tourism zone, and etc.

This study has significance as a first attempt to empirical evaluation analysis on contemporary tourism policy; Tourism Zone Development in Japan with nomothetic explanation of nation-wide spatial scope. In addition, this study synthetically examined the effect of tourism policy implementation in two aspects; whether the policy implementation had an effect or not, and how much each subsidy project had an effect. Moreover, this study estimated the tourists', transportation and destination factors affecting the probability choice of visitors of tourism zone period 2, which is on-going suggesting guideline for a successful policy formation.