



---

# Effects of Tourism on Transformation of Rural Settlements on Montenegro Coast

Mirjana Devedžić  
*University of Belgrade, Yugoslavia*

---



## Introduction

The paper analyzes the effects of tourism on the transformation of size, status, and image of rural settlements, deagrarianization, and sources of income on Montenegro Coast. The analysis is based on demographic indicators and individual examples from some villages. Specific features and different effects of tourism are identified, depending on the location of rural settlements relative to the coastline.

Recent social and economic development of Yugoslavia is featured by industrialization and urbanization, resulting in deagrarianization and deruralization. As a consequence, a number of changes are evident in rural settlements all over the country. However, various regional and local factors shape up these changes, hence the transformation of villages in, say, mountainous regions differs from those in Panonian and coastal regions. One of such factors that have extensively affected the overall development of the country, that has had effects comparable to an extent to those brought by industrialization, and that in the last 40 years has featured especially the development of Montenegro Coast, is tourism. M. Friganović notes that, taking into account the entire area of ex-Yugoslavia, the most rapid transformation of villages happens on the coast, where traditional features of agrarian and Mediterranean mentality, interwoven with the culture of hillside ranchers, gradually fade away (Friganović, 1980.).

Mediterranean village goes through changes that only partially overlap those in the rest of Yugoslavia, and that are most specific and most different from the general ones. Specific features of urbanization and transformation in a tourist region are drawn from specific characteristics of tourism, from the process of acculturation that is speeded-up by the effects of tourism, and from the litoralization and specific qualities brought by tourism-oriented infrastructure. Entirely new relations get established in the life of a village that no more relies neither on agriculture, nor on ranching, nor on fishing.

Different communication and tourism features, different potentials for tourism development, different level of tourism economy, different historical and cultural contexts in the subregions of Montenegro Coast, as well as different ethnic and religious features, make the region quite heterogeneous and result in different extent of the effects of tourism as a factor of village transformation in different microregions. However, it is necessary to stress that tourism is not the only factor to consider, neither it is isolated from the other factors of changes on Montenegro Coast – on the contrary, all factors are interdependent. Hence the effects of tourism should be preferably considered in a wider context of global changes on Montenegro Coast, as well as by microregions that are functionally more homogeneous and in which such effects are more direct.

## Complexity of Tourism as the Factor of Changes

Effects of tourism in the transformation of villages is best reflected in spatial, behavioral, and structural changes that can be analyzed by demographic indicators.

## DEVEDŽIĆ

If we start from the Castells' note (1975) that each production mode creates a specific space, then tourism also searches for a specific space and creates it. In search for it, Montenegro Coast has witnessed a linear extension of urban matrix along the beaches, multiplication of the number of resorts, and the establishment of an urban continuity (that includes rural settlements on the coast as well). Along with larger resorts, smaller settlements get assimilated by the urban texture and create specific functional and visual entity. The development of tourism is paralleled by a multiplication of urban settlements. There were only five big towns on Montenegro Coast in 1961. Ten years after, two small towns have grown into big ones, and the number of small ones has increased from 30 to 40. Criteria for counting big towns have changed by the 1991 census, resulting in the number of big towns increasing by 13. Today, urban settlements on the coast are the ones with most visible tourism function, and for most of them the tourism function has been an essential factor of urbanization, both in terms of the increase of population and in terms of agglomeration with neighboring big towns. As an example, on the little island (fishermen village) of St. Stefan there were only 14 families in 1953, 60 people altogether, and in Djenasi (the coastal village just across the sea from the island to which some people from the island were moved due to the modification of the island into a resort) only 21 people lived. In 1991, this part of the coast, that has developed and acquired urban features only due to tourism development, had 421 people. Village Becici stagnated and has had only 40 inhabitants by 1961, but has undergone a large increase in population in the following years and has finally become a functional part of the Budva town, which is a resort and an urban center of the sub region. The population of Sutomore village has increased between 1953 and 1961 by only 29 inhabitants. By the next census, due to the development of its tourism function, the population of that village has increased 2.5 times, by 1991 more than five times, and the village has turned into a town (Devedžić, 1999).

Along with tourism development, agricultural soil was turned into construction one, rural settlements on the coastline have got an urban image, and traditional architectural style was abandoned. As a specific phenomenon, a number of "holiday residences" were built in resorts, hence there are much more residential buildings than actual households in such places. This has changed the image of villages and towns entirely, and has made tourism-oriented buildings visually dominant.

Along with spatial effects, the effects of tourism development are most visible in the structure of economy. The process of tertiarization is intensified, traditional activities such as agriculture and crafts fade out, and the number of work centers increases. A specific coastal economy is generated, with its characteristic modes of organization and coverage. Seasonal oscillations in the flow of tourism have also created a "seasonal economy".

These changes have initiated social changes as well. Social changes are most visibly manifested in new living standards, strengthening of economic and social security of the inhabitants, and adapting to the service-oriented character of the dominant activity. The changes typically include participation of all members of the family and the household to tourism service as the common activity (thus creating a kind of a "family manufacture"), as well as the change of mentality and the mindset of autochthonous inhabitants through the process of behavioral urbanization. In rural settlements, this is a radical change since it establishes quite new living relations and living philosophy of the patriarchal population. Altogether, these qualitative changes are best characterized by the phrase "living standard" or "lifestyle".

Global effects of tourism on the coast are reflected in the change of traditional demographic model and are best represented by demographic indicators. Rapid population increase and depopulation decrease have become the characteristic of the entire region. The number of inhabitants of Montenegro Coast after WW II is in constant increase, especially after 1960s, when more intensive tourism development has started (69 809 inhabitants in 1948, 83 407 in 1961, and 134 687 in 1991). Starting from that time, more people move for good to coastal municipalities. Population distribution and population density change entirely, due to the concentration of population in urban centers – the leaders of development of coastal economy (development of tourism in the first place) – and in tourist places along the coast. Other typical effects of tourism at the coast include the transition of agricultural population to non-agricultural activities, increase of employment rate, intensification of daily and seasonal migrations of labor, changes in economic and educational structures of population, the changes of the sources of

## **Effects of Tourism on Transformation of Rural Settlements on Montenegro Coast**

households' income, and many more.

### **Dual Character of the Effects of Tourism**

In rural settlements, some of the transformations discussed above have special dimensions. However, if Montenegro Coast is considered administratively, as the region encompassing the coastal municipalities, which include not only the territory right next to the coast, the effects of tourism are not the same in all the rural settlements. This is due to different locations and different suitability for tourism development. Roughly speaking, the effects of tourism are dual and its implications can be positive and negative. Dual effects of tourism development can be illustrated by considering two categories of rural settlements a). rural settlements on the coastline with potentials for tourism development, and b). inland settlements, as well as coastal settlements without attributes attractive for tourism development (at least in the context of tourism model that has been developed on Montenegro Coast).

The first category is featured by all the global effects discussed above, which can be noted in the entire coastal region and in all the rural settlements. Depending on the available tourism resources, it is possible to identify a hierarchy of settlements in which all aspects of transformation are more or less present. On top of such a hierarchy would be those settlements that have better-rated natural potentials for tourism development and those that have micro-location advantages (better and more easily accessible beaches, more sunshine, clear water, location along the Adria highway and close to an urban resort).

The second category of rural settlements contrasts the statement that decrease of depopulation has resulted from tourism development. On the contrary, it is possible to state an antithesis – it is exactly because of tourism and certain natural attractions that depopulation has started in settlements that didn't have it before. People from such settlements have migrated to resorts. Although the goal of modernization of regional and local roads was to decrease migration from hillside inland villages towards towns, it was poorly accomplished due to the fact that the regional roads have only better supported the migration towards towns and resorts (Bakić, 1991.). Since the unplanned development of the region and the stimuli only to tourism activities have absurdly put aside some desirable complementary activities (e.g., agriculture), the second category of rural settlements has been a good ground for opposite processes, more akin to the processes in continental inland – rural exodus, ageing of rural population, and the like. In the Budva municipality, four hillside settlements along the road to Podgorica (the capital of Montenegro) have died out – in 1961 they have had 275 inhabitants, and in 1991 only 8. Functional transformation of coastal settlements and orientation towards tourism have also caused notable depopulation in seven settlements close to the coastline that even don't have transit locations (from 381 to 51 inhabitants).

There are population zones in the entire coastal region. The longer the distance from the coast and the higher the altitude, the smaller the number of settlements and inhabitants. Tourism is a factor of demographic and economic polarization both on the microlevel and on the level of the whole Montenegro.

In summary, the changes at Montenegro Coast and the effects of tourism on the transformation of rural settlements are after all positive, since the social and economic development initiated by tourism, the increase of gross national income, and positive demographic changes are still dominant and most obvious effects.

### **Demographic Aspects of the Effects of Tourism**

Administratively, six municipalities compose Montenegro Coast: Herceg Novi, Kotor, Tivat (all of them are clustered around the Boka Kotorska Bay), Budva, Bar, and Ulcinj. Each one of them has its own geographic, economic, and demographic characteristics, hence rural settlements in them are not stereotypical and the changes are not identical. The first-degree zone of the effects of tourism on the transformation of villages covers the monofunctional Budva municipality. The territory of the Bar municipality stretches deep inland, and differs from

## DEVEDŽIĆ

the rest of Montenegro Coast in terms of relief structure, climate, vegetation, and economy. Ulcinj municipality has most notable potentials for agricultural development in its villages, as well as tourism potentials that are not exploited in their full capacity, but is also featured by a specific ethnic and demographic structure (ethnic Albanians are the dominant group) and traditional basis that modifies the power of tourism as a factor of change and its effects. The municipalities of the Boka Kotorska Bay have always had higher percentage of urban and non-agricultural inhabitants than the other coastal municipalities. This fact itself has produced some transformation in villages, and tourism is not the most significant factor of change in them. This is especially true for the Kotor municipality, where the narrow coast backed by high mountains and shortage of beaches have prevented more intensive development of swimming-oriented tourism. This kind of analysis is further impeded by the fact that the continuity of tourism development on Montenegro Coast was interrupted by the 1977. earthquake, resulting in a period of stagnation for tourism economy.

Starting from specific constraints of Yugoslav statistics, the following analysis covers the period from 1961, when tourism has become statistically "independent" and when its effects on the overall development of Montenegro Coast have become more apparent, to the last census in 1991.

During that period, the population at the Coast was constantly increasing, in all municipalities. The index of population growth on coastal municipalities for the 1961-1991 period ranges from 134 in Kotor to 242 in Budva. Its values come from the increase of urban population in the first place; the population in rural settlements has also increased, though with smaller intensity. Only between the last two censuses a small decrease of population growth can be noted in rural settlements at the Coast. The percentage of the Coast population in the total population of Montenegro constantly increases, which is followed by the increase of population density. In 1991, population density ranged from 62 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup> in Bar to 248 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup> in Tivat. It can be noted that population density increases especially on the coastline of towns and other important resorts, in some of them even explosively. The coastlines of rural settlements from the close inland have had more moderate increase of population density, while those belonging to mountain slopes have had demographic erosion and decrease of population density (Bakić, Popović, 1991). Specific effects of tourism development can be analyzed by considering individual settlements. For example, small rural settlements on the Lustica peninsula which have neither undergone tourismologic evaluation nor they belong to major communication routes, have suffered from continuous population decrease, from 649 in 1961. to 341 in 1991. The only exception is Radovici, the settlement that has advanced to a resort, due to the facts that hotels were built there and that it has got linked to the main regional road. Its population still grows, although not as fast as in more advanced resorts located closer to main communication network. The rural settlement Krasici also had a slight population increase. It is better known as a settlement of holiday residences, which outnumber permanent residences 16 times (636:39).

Migrations directly depend on tourismologic evaluation and tourism development. Also, the more facilities for tourism development, the more intensive the migrations get. An interview with 235 inhabitants who moved into Montenegro Coast has revealed both direct and indirect importance of tourism as a moving-in factor. Many interviewees stated "tourism as a perspective" as the deciding factor for moving in. For 26.9 % of the interviewees who moved in between 1961 and 1991. tourism was not an important factor, 29.6 % have called it "important as a perspective", and 43.6 % have declared that tourism was an important factor (Devedžić, 1999). In Yugoslavia, the Coast is the most compact immigration zone. From 1971. to 1981. 73 settlements on the Coast a positive migration score, although only 7 of them were towns. Almost 30 % of all settlements have had their immigration higher than emigration, and even 18 of them have had less than 200 inhabitants (Vukotić, 1990). In the tourism zone of Budva there were no towns at all in 1961, but still 335 urban immigrants were registered. Town-to-village migrations have become more intensive with the development of tourism. Rural immigration settlements are mostly those located close to resorts and integrated with the corresponding resorts into functional entities. Belgrade municipalities are the top source of immigrants to the Coast, which can be explained partially by building summer residences and real or formal moving to them.

## Effects of Tourism on Transformation of Rural Settlements on Montenegro Coast

Economic structures of the population follow the changes discussed above, as well as the changes in the overall economic structure of the Coast. Agricultural population decreases in all of the coastal municipalities. Compared to the situation from 1961, the last census has detected a significant decrease of farmers and ranchers: in the municipality of Bar from 48,7 % to 4,7 %, in Ulcinj from 53,9 % to 7,7 %, and in Budva from 26.1 % to 0.9 %. In 1991, in 3 out of 6 coastal municipalities (Budva, Kotor, and Tivat) there were less than 1 % of farmers and ranchers in the total population, and in all of them the percentage was less than the Montenegro average (7,4 %). According to the last census, the same groups' participation to the total population in villages ranged from 1,6 % in Budva to 13,2 % in Ulcinj, while 30 years ago the corresponding range was 10 % (Tivat) to 88 % (Ulcinj). In other words, the highest decrease of farmers and ranchers has been detected in Ulcinj (from 88 % to 13,2 %), Bar (from 59 % to 7,6 %), and Budva (from 36,4 % to 1,6 %). Deagrarization has started at the Coast before the arrival of mass-tourism, but tourism has intensified it, since local people have evaluated tourism as safer and more prosperous. Deagrarization was also stimulated by more intensive immigration and higher employment rate in non-agricultural activities. Hence there are two viewpoints when analyzing deagrarization: the outflow of inhabitants from administrative coastal inlands, i.e. the necessary deagrarization initiated by outflow of rural population and giving up agriculture, and deagrarization of coastline, which was not caused by migrations, but by more advanced division of labor. The decrease of agricultural population was especially intensified after the facilities were built for tourism and new jobs were open, and it paralleled the decrease of agricultural soil. Along with tourism development and rapid urbanization, agricultural soil has turned into construction sites. The transfer from agricultural to non-agricultural activities on Montenegro Coast happened more quickly than deruralization (there were 97,1 % of non-agricultural inhabitants in 1991, and 59,7 % of urban population). Deagrarization is almost over on the Coast, although agriculture still exists as a side activity of coastal population.

Households are an entire research domain in itself. They reflect different aspects of tourism development. Changes in households come from adjustments to new social and economic circumstances and show the global social, economic and demographic metamorphosis of the society. Up to 1961, the number of households on the Coast was increasing at the same pace as the number of inhabitants. In the follow-up period the households multiplied faster, due to the split-up of traditional multigenerational families, the population increase and increased immigration. Structural changes in population have followed the changes of the kinds and sources of household income accordingly. Agricultural households are still numerous only in the municipality of Ulcinj (40,8 %), in which agricultural fields compose the majority of its territory, the number of rural settlements in the inland is the largest, and patriarchal lifestyle is the most evident. The facts about agricultural households, combined with the facts about agricultural population, indicate a low level of activity. For example, in 156 agricultural households of the rural settlements in the municipality of Budva, only 11 active farmers lived in 1991. In the traditionally agricultural district of the Herceg Novi municipality (Sutorina) there is just a couple of agricultural households, and the households with the most of land are the least active in agriculture. Hence agriculture doesn't even remain the activity that provides additional income (Derić, 1998). Right after 1961, non-agricultural activities were the major source of income (about 60 %) only in the municipalities facing the Boka Kotorska Bay. This is due to their spatial characteristics, their higher urbanization, and their traditional orientation towards other kinds of activities. In Bar and Ulcinj agriculture was dominant, and in Budva there were multiple sources of income. As for rural settlements, the figure was different. In Tivat, Kotor, and Herceg Novi rural households with multiple sources of income dominated (59 %, 50 % and 47 %). A lower percentage in this regard, but still a dominance, featured the rural settlements of the Budva municipality (44 %). Orientation to agriculture, from which one half of rural households acquire their income, is typical for the two southernmost municipalities – Bar and Ulcinj. It is worth noting that according to the results of the 1961. census, agriculture has been the major source of income in some town households as well, although their number was rather low. It was higher only in Ulcinj and Budva, where 12 % and 6,5 % of town households (respectively) used to make their living on agriculture. 30 years later these percentages have become statistically irrelevant. The situation has changed

## DEVEDŽIĆ

radically in rural settlements of Budva, Bar, and Ulcinj, where non-agricultural sources of income have advanced their participation to over 80 %, and even over 95 % in Budva. Once agricultural, these territories have completely lost their economic attributes, and agriculture has become a side activity. In the other coastal municipalities, rural settlements are also predominantly oriented towards non-agricultural activities, and the ratio between the other sources of income and agriculture is even higher than 30 years ago. The trend of changes is the same all along the Coast; it is only the intensity of changes that varies.

A field research has been conducted with the goal to find out to what extent tourism participates both formally and informally in non-agricultural sources of households' income. It has indicated that tourism is a global environment of the Coast population. Almost all the interviewees have stated that they were making their living on tourism, regardless of what was their primary activity. Room rental and catering of tourists was described as extremely stimulative, economically speaking. Room rental has expanded after the earthquake, since the households were reconstructed having that activity in mind and hence were expanded. New houses and buildings have changed the ambient in the settlements, and there is hardly any settlement on the coastline that could be called a village.

### Conclusions

There is no doubt that tourism has initiated a major transformation on Montenegro Coast, typical only for tourist regions, and has simultaneously changed the concept of a village and its development. Searching for solutions of the problem of revitalizing the villages that have been bypassed by tourism should start somewhere between traditional values and new orientation. Relatively short Yugoslav coastline (about 250 km) that is the gravity center for a big inland, as well as a number of new inhabitants who have immigrated to it after the split of ex SFRY, indicate the need to touristically activate rural settlements that have not been on offer so far. In that sense, the tourism offer is getting innovated and rural settlements from the inland have a new chance to get involved in tourism business. This is especially supported by the fact that new, alternative tourism demands value country tourism highly. Hence it should be expected that in the years to come tourism will result in new, modified effects on the transformation of rural settlements from the functional inland of Montenegro Coast.

### References

- Bakić, R., Popović, S.** (1991), *Trends and changes in population distribution in Montenegro from 1948 to 1981*, book chapter in "Geography of Montenegro", Vol.1, Nikšić, Yugoslavia, pp. 11-107. (in Serbian).
- Devedžić, M.** (1999), *Tourism as a factor of changes in the development, distribution, and structures of population on Montenegro Coast*, PhD thesis, Department of Geography, University of Belgrade, Yugoslavia. (in Serbian).
- Castells, M.** (1975), *La question urbaine*, Maspero, Paris.
- Friganović, M.** (1979-81), *Changes in lifestyles of village population in Yugoslavia*, Population, No. 1-4, 1979, 1980, 1981, CDIIDN, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, pp. 111-117. (in Serbian).
- Vukotić, V.** *Characteristics of migrations in Montenegro*, in "Reviews of population migrations in Yugoslavia", CDIIDN, Belgrade, pp. 151-166. (in Serbian).
- Derić, B.** (1998), *Sutorina*, Department of Geography, University of Belgrade, Yugoslavia. (in Serbian).
- <sup>xxx</sup> *Census statistics and statistical almanachs of Montenegro.*