

LĪNA STANULE*, ARMANDS MUIŽNIEKS**

An Analysis of Factors Influencing the Development of the Kemerī District (Latvia) as a Tourism Destination

Abstract. The theme of the article is the Kemerī district's development in Latvia as a tourism destination. The aim is to research the reasons for the decline in tourism in Kemerī and to determine factors influencing tourism development in the Kemerī district. Scientific articles and theoretical resources (44 in total), including Latvia's and Jūrmala municipality's long-term planning documents, have been used to create this document. For primary data, a survey was conducted amongst the Kemerī district's local inhabitants, and the foreign and local visitors in Jūrmala and Kemerī, in addition to interviewing Latvian tourism industry experts. Consequently, a mixed method of research was conducted, both of qualitative and quantitative data, obtained through secondary and primary data analysis. The study contains research on the reasons for the decline in the district's tourism, focusing on the Kemerī district in Latvia's and Jūrmala municipality's future strategies and plans, which have had no interest in investing in the district, and whether there actually is a potential for the Kemerī district to develop its tourism from the point of view of visitors and experts.

Keywords: health resort, health tourism, Kemerī district, development factors, tourism destination, Latvia

1. Introduction

The Baltic States have valuable natural healing resources for health resorts, each of them able to offer something different, making their own products unique. Estonia and Lithuania have managed to sustain their existing health resorts from

* Turība University, Department of International Tourism, Riga, Latvia, e-mail: linastanule@hotmail.com, phone: +37 129 933 746.

** Turība University, Department of International Tourism, Riga, Latvia, e-mail: bingonis@gmail.com, phone: +37 129 218 560.

the 19th century. However, this has not been the case in Latvia, despite the fact that it has a wide range of natural resources for developing a health resort. In previous years the focus of the Latvian tourism industry has been on culture, MICE and rural. Between 1918 and 1990 the focus was centered on health tourism.

Kemeri district (KD) development has always been a topic of great discussion in the Latvian tourism industry because the health resort has a deep history and great potential for restoration. In the 18th century [Latvian Tourism Association 2011: 120] the most popular health resort was Kemeri health resort (KHR) which during the time developed both in quality and the range of services. From 1990 the KHR lost much of its prestige and popularity, which soon led to its closure. Little effort was taken to conserve the assets of KHR after its closure. The hotel's park, sanatoriums, town and main buildings were left to deteriorate until very recently [Jūrmala. Daba un kultūras... 2004: 237; Latvian Tourism Association 2011: 120]. The decline of KHR was very sudden and there has been little consideration into its rejuvenation. The reasons for the decline of such a prestigious and popular health resort, as well as factors influencing KD development are being analyzed in this research.

Health resort development is important for tourism development taking in account regional development aspects, combating negative impact of seasonality, decreasing unemployment and other positive impacts. Analysis of influencing factors allows more detailed planning of development of tourism destination. Kemeri, which is part of city of Jūrmala since 1959, is only territory where still is the space and resources for health resort development.

The KD topic can be divided into four main aspects: T1) historical importance of Kemeri as a health resort, T2) no development progress after “perestroika”, T3) priorities of tourism development in Latvia, T4) investor interest in Kemeri infrastructure (accommodation, restaurants, museums, etc) development. The answer to the question of whether KHR is going to be restored in future is unknown, which shows that there must be factors that negatively influence KD's development as a tourism destination (TD). Thus, for the research have been outlined four main questions:

- Q1. What have been reasons for KD decline?
- Q2. What is the focus and future strategy on KD basis?
- Q3. What are the aspects for no interest in investing in KD?
- Q4. Is there a potential for KD from visitors' and experts point of view?

2. Kemeri district's characteristics

KD is a part of Kemeri National Park, established in 1997 by Saeima, a part of Jūrmala municipality, and is located in the West of Jūrmala, 45 km from Riga, giv-

ing the district quick and convenient accessibility by railway and highway. KD is rich with natural resources: seaside (Riga Bay a shoreline of 15 km in KNP area), 30 sulphur springs with different levels of sulphur concentration from 18 to 50 mg/l, lakes, therapeutic mud, swamps [Latvian Tourism Association 2011: 115; Terentjeva & Fridernberga 2008]. Kemeru has three major microclimate zones: national park territory, park of KH, polyclinics and Kemeru town which each differ in humidity of the air, flora and fauna [Terentjeva & Fridernberga 2008]. The major architectural object of the district is KH with its park and objects located there.

3. Tourism destinations in crisis

The profitability and a long-lasting life cycle of tourism business depend on several factors, like the trends, demand, supply, location and others. There are businesses that have faced all or almost all the life stages suggested by Butler [2006] – exploration, involvement, development, stagnation, reorientation and decline. Only few businesses are capable of acting and experiencing rejuvenation; this consequently depend on how fast the management reacts and how effective the strategy plan will be, as well as on political and economic factors the business is located in and the same factors in areas from which it has the dominant demand. As one of the oldest tourism businesses can be mentioned well-known thermal and balneological resorts: Baden Baden in Germany (Die Kur), Rogaska in Slovenia (European Spas Association), Piestany in Slovakia (European Spas Association), Vichy in France (La Medecine Thermale), Saaremaa and Varska in Estonia (Estonian Spa Association) and Druskininkai and Birstonas in Lithuania (Lietuvos Kurortu Asociacija). These health resorts have survived due to innovation and development at the resorts and have continued to attract tourists. This question is another topic for research and can be examined for the comparison of Latvian health resort life and development.

As it was analyzed in the previous research on KD development [Stanule 2015], the reasons why TD faces a crisis are unique to each destination's location, size, structure, and legal terms. The main two types of crisis are: natural caused (storms, floods, disasters, etc.) and man-caused, such as terrorism, economic and political changes [Beirman 2003; Laws & Prideaux 2005; Sausmarez 2007: 1-2; Evans & Elphick 2005: 136]. Consequently, the sources of the crisis can be global or internal and they affect TD suddenly, therefore it requires pro-activeness and a new marketing strategy to be taken into action, otherwise it can cause the loss of reputation, popularity, loss of income and unemployment in the TD [Beirman 2003: 4; Evans & Elphick 2005: 137; Sausmarez 2007: 5].

To prevent a TD from complete failure and to create a new effective marketing strategy depends on how good the communication between the entities will be and how it will be developed. The steps suggested by Beirman [2003: 23] that should be undertaken in the case of crisis in TD are: identify the event/problem as either a crisis or hazard; establish a crisis management team and define roles; promote the destination during and after the crisis; monitor recovery and analyze the crisis experience. Meanwhile, as discussed in the previous research [Stanule 2015], an effective coordination and cooperation between all the enterprises involved in the TD is the key element for effective marketing strategy development, as well as the communication between local and governmental tourism organizations and the direction towards a united goal [Kanter 1983: 127; Laws & Prideaux 2005; Laws, Prideaux & Chon 2007].

The author of the paper has collected three crisis management and phase models collected from Laws and Prideaux [2005], Laws et al. [2007], Pforr and Hosie [2009]. Laws and Prideaux [2005] suggest that there are five phases in crisis: 1) pre-event phase, 2) prodromal phase, 3) emergency phase, 4) intermediate phase, 5) long term recovery phase, 6) resolution phase.

Laws Prideaux and Chon also suggests [2007] four stages of crisis management: 1) pre-event (to recognize the potential areas of crisis), 2) warning sign stage (identify potential warning signs of potential crisis, the need to be proactive and to take an action), 3) action (short term, medium and long term action), 4) review (to ensure that it's successful, communicate between each other).

Pforr and Hosie [2009] have presented Heath's [1998] risk management model PPRR: prevention, preparation, response, recovery. Meaning that for avoiding a setback or an incident for a business, there should be taken actions that would reduce or eliminate the likelihood of any incident, thus the business will be prepared before an incident by taking steps before an incident, ensuring effective response and recovery. Consequently, response and recovery each have definite actions in regards to minimizing effects of an incident towards the business. For each step can be developed a separate action plan, or it can be developed as one [Pforr & Hosie 2009].

Currently TD in KD is in the process of a revival, a review stage will follow to gauge the effectiveness of this revival.

4. The role of the government in tourism destination planning

According to Pike [2004: 44], the core source for an effective TD management is government, because it is "responsible for the development of infrastructure to

enable tourism, such as utilities, sewerage, cleaning, health and fixed communication and transport facilities” [Pike 2004: 29]. Author also states that the government can interfere in market failure, provision of infrastructure, fiscal revenue, border controls, spatial distribution, protection of resources, regulatory safeguards, exogenous events, social benefits [Pike 2004: 24] for the TD which can be beneficial for economic growth of TD, municipality and in overall- the GDP.

In Stanule [2015] the relation between the government and KD was discussed. It can be seen that nothing much has been done to improve either infrastructure or the tourism industry in general in the area from the side of government, although KD shows a potential as a TD [Stanule 2015] and this matter also relates to Pike’s concern [Pike 2004: 37] that if there is no coordination and cooperation in the tourism industry, the TD is not capable of existing because there is no support and resources allocated from government’s side, as stated in Stanule [2015], moreover, a successful and sustainable coordination must happen between government departments, within industry and between government and industry [Stanule 2015: 37]. Ruhanen [2013: 81] states that the government is as a primary source for the development of a TD and it is capable of providing this coordination because it has an access to taxation revenue and legislation. Also according The Latvian Commercial Law, the local government is responsible for contribution in business development [The Latvian Commercial Law].

5. Methodology

Since the goal of the research had to be obtained through four areas, the information of which would bring the main reasons of Kemeru tourism decline and the main factors influencing district’s development, a mixed method research both of qualitative and quantitative data, obtained through the secondary and primary data analysis (Table 1). Such method was chosen according to the theoretical background, also discussed in the master thesis’ paper of factors influencing KD’s development [Stanule 2015]: mixed method is a combination of both qualitative and quantitative research methods which allows gaining better research results because qualitative method is often objective and quantitative simply outlines numeric data and also cannot be so efficient; therefore, the use of both methods can create the linkage between numeric and contextual results [Hesse-Biber 2010; Creswell & Plano 2011]. Thus, mixed method research allows answering more questions and bringing better results for the research.

The qualitative secondary data revealed a qualitative information on the factors influencing KD’s development, among which were 1) analysis of the historic information on KHR TALC, 2) analysis of reports on selling KH (e.g. LETA),

Table 1. Research methodology design

Type of data		Purpose
Secondary		
Analysis of the historic information on KHR TALC	→	To determine reasons for KD decline
Analysis of reports on selling KH (e.g. LETA)	→	To determine the aspects for no interest in investing in KD
The analysis of strategies and plans of Latvia and Jurmala municipality of tourism development, and the Latvian Tourism Law	→	To determine the focus and future strategies on KD basis
Primary		
Questionnaire Survey Q1) On visiting KD Q2) On visiting health resorts	→	To determine the key visiting factors for KD and determining its potential as a TD
Experts Interviews Q1) Opinion on government and municipality's support Q2) Development in Kemeris Q3) Cooperation Q4) The type of tourism development Q5) Competitiveness	→	To research experts point of view on factors influencing KD development through the five main Question areas (government, development, cooperation, tourism type, competitiveness)

Source: own elaboration.

3) analysis of statistics of tourism trends in Latvia and Europe (UNWTO, the Baltic Course, LTDA), and 4) the analysis of strategies and plans of Latvia and Jurmala municipality of tourism development, and the Latvian Tourism Law (a. State strategies and legal documents – The Law of Tourism (1998), Guidelines for Latvia Tourism Development for 2014-2020, The Latvian Tourism Marketing Strategy 2010 – 2015 (LTDA), The Law of Kemeris National Park (2001), The List of State-Protected Heritage (State Inspection for Heritage Protection), The Law on Heritage Protection (1992), and b. Jurmala municipality's strategies – Jurmala Municipality Tourism Development Strategy 2007-2018, Jurmala City Development Strategy 2010-2030, The Conception of Jurmala City Resort 2009-2018, The Thematic Plan "The Vision of Kemeris Development," Strategy for Kemeris Park's with its architecture reconstruction and renovation in Jurmala municipality 2015-2020 [Jurmala 2012]).

Primary data consisted of the questionnaire survey and interviews with experts that both were conducted from April until May in 2015. Such period of time was chosen due to a low tourist arrival in winter to Jurmala, therefore the time period from April until May is more convenient to undertake data collection from questionnaire surveys for the research with the main area in Jurmala. For the quantitative data has been chosen questionnaire survey since it allows to

collect the necessary information for determining the potential of KD as a TD: by classifying people and their circumstances, gathering straightforward information in relation to people's behaviour, the basic attitudes of a group of people [Denzin & Lincoln 2000].

Questionnaire survey consisted of in total 24 optional case questions that were divided into two types of questions which brought quantitative data: Q1) on visiting KD, and Q2) on visiting health resorts in general. The target was to research an opinion of Kemeru local inhabitants, Kemeru and Jurmala visitors (both Latvian local inhabitants and foreign guests) with different age groups (15-29 and 30-60 plus), based on the fact that Kemeru is a historic area and respondents of different age groups would have different perceptions and opinion on the district. In total, 435 responses ($n = 435$) were collected, the general set was determined by margin error 5%, population of 2 million (the number of inhabitants in Latvia), confidence of 95% and response distribution of 50%. The questionnaires were distributed in Jurmala TIC, Jurmala, Jaunkemeru Resort Center, Yantarnyi Bereg Resort Center, KNP walking trails, Forest house, Kemeru town, and in online sources. According to the conducted research [Stanule 2015], in order to receive better results, the questionnaire contained various types of questions, such as Likert scales, open-ended questions, and multiple choice questions. The most important information was obtained from the Likert scale or the "scaling technique" [Veal 1997: 298] in which respondents were asked to state their attitude towards KD and on what they value the most in health resorts. All data from questionnaire survey was analysed by using coding technique [Veal 1997: 419], a descriptive analysis with frequency procedure, which presents counts and percentages of responses for single variables. First, the survey questions were coded, divided into groups, second, the frequency formula was used [Veal 1997], and finally the data counts were transferred into percentages.

Experts interviews gave the quantitative data and in total were managed five interviews (the administrator of LLC "Ominasis Latvia" [5.05.2015], interview with the consultant of Jurmala Entrepreneurs Association, consultant [25.04.2015], interview with the deputy of Jurmala City Council [6.05.2015], interview with the director of the Incoming Tourism Operator [27.04.2015], and interview with the manager of tourism department of Jurmala City Council [27.04.2015]) out of the 13 planned. The experts were selected in regard to the audience and if they are related to Jurmala municipality and KD: government, local, entrepreneurs, and tourism agencies or operators. Interview consisted of 9 questions that were related to five problematic question groups of KD on government and municipality's support, Q2) development in Kemeru, Q3) Cooperation, Q4) The type of tourism development, and Q5) Competitiveness. A conceptual framework was created for analysis of interview data through the model presented by Veal [2011]. The framework consists of the main factor groups and

subordinate factors which were identified from interview responses and such mean of the method gave strategized results and a specific differentiation of factors influencing KD's development.

6. Analysis of Kemerī Health Resort TALC

KHR development is a clear example of Butler's theory in regard to TALC since the resort during its history and recent situation has gone through different stages due to political and economic forces. According to Butler [Cooper 2011: 12; Morrison 2013: 5], the tourism life cycle (TALC) contains six stages which are *exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, and decline/rejuvenation*. However, KHR still has not faced the rejuvenation stage. The aspects of

Table 2. Kemerī tourism destination's historical development: TALC

Time	Stage	Trend
early	Exploration	Mud baths. For highest ranks of society
1812		Swimming areas
1833-1835		Petition to offer support for historical health resort's development
1836		700 ha state-owned land. The construction of a treatment facility. The road from Kemerī to the Sloka -Tukums highway
1838		Health resort was founded. Market: the Russian Empire. The first state swimming institution
1838	Development	The Kemerī landscape Park
1877		Steamships. The railroad line between Riga un Tukums
1912		Direct rail line between Kemerī, Riga and Moscow
		One of the most modern treatment facilities in all Europe
1924		A new swimming facility with mud baths
1936	Consolidation	Karlis Ulmanis. The KH built
The Soviet era		Ten sanatoriums. Employed 100 doctors
1971		Kemerī declared to be a historical health resort of pan-Soviet importance
1975-1985		The largest sanatorium in Kemerī was built. "Latvija" – "Līva" 11-story building. Accommodated 1,200 patient at a time. During a year: 140,000 people served
Until 1994	Stagnation	Five sanatoriums. Caika, Daugava, Dzimtene, Kemerī and Līva, along with a polyclinic Kemerī
1990s	Decline	Not profitable. Closed down. Privatisation process
21 century		KH auctions. Lack of investors. KH building deterioration

Source: own elaboration.

such situation are thus being researched. KHR history dates back into the 18th century which is when the exploration stage started.

KHR TALC in Table 2 clearly shows how economic, political and market trends affect the tourism area. Each stage is closely related to these three aspects in the internal and external market sense. Thus, here can be presented Morrisson's statement of TALC which "The TALC is a process describing how a destination starts off slowly with visitor numbers limited by the facilities and access. As the destination attracts more visitors, amenities are improved and visitor numbers grow rapidly towards and sometimes beyond the carrying capacity of the destination" [Morrisson 2013: 158].

The aforementioned factors and actions enhancing health resort development show that KHR has been successful in the periods that it received governmental and economic support. The most noble persons for KHHR have been Tsar Nicholas I who petitioned support for further development of health resort [Latvian Tourism Association 2011: 120], and the president of Latvia Kārlis Ulmanis, who in 1936 opened KH [Latvian Tourism Association 2011: 120]. Unfortunately, no such person can be mentioned since the 21st century.

Consequently, KHR has a chance of the next stage – rejuvenation-, however, since the decline stage is still present, the rejuvenation also can be considered as a new start for KHR tourism area due to that the resort requires a new approach towards the use of its resources, based on market trends and innovations in tourism and health resorts.

7. Analysis of the Case of Kemerī Hotel

In the beginning of the 1900s, KH faced negative changes of which solution would be attracting investors. The case lasted until 2015 and it can be divided into three periods – KH decline and the loss of its owner, KH auctions, Investors and future investment plans for KH and KD.

7.1. KH decline and the loss of its owner

KH faced its decline in the early 19s after a whole KHR was closed down. Afterwards it was owned by the Saudi-Arabian company LLC "Ominasis Latvia" since 1995 and which during 20 years did not invest a lot in the hotel's maintenance, therefore the hotel deteriorated due to a seasonal climate (according to LETA 2015b). The owner passed away in 2013 and the company went bankrupt, there-

fore KH became maintained by the chairman of Latvian Certified Insolvency Administrators Association Ainars Kreics (LETA 2015b).

During the time KH lost its real estate value: drop from 6.6 million euro to 5.05 million euro, 15% less (LETA 2015b).

7.2. Kemerī Hotel's auctions

There have been five auctions which all were unsuccessful due to the lack of registrants or that no one was interested to pay the security money of 503 thousand euro [Libeka 2014; Liepiņš 2014]. However, there was an interest from a Russian investor Aleksander Gusakov in 2013, an owner of the hotel chain Heliopark with several hotels in Europe, Egypt and Russia [Libeka 2014; Will former Kemerī spa hotel... 2014]. Gusakov was the only participant in the auction of 2013 October 3, meaning to make him the winner of the auction in which KH was sold for 3 million euro; however, he did not manage to pay the amount in three months, therefore, the result of this auction was cancelled. Nevertheless, Gusakov registered the hotel as "Park Hotel Kemerī," and it was planned to be opened in 2017 (Will former Kemerī spa hotel... 2014).

7.3. Investors and future investment plans for KH and KD

In the spring of 2015, discussions were held between three companies as possible investors in KH development: "Arhiidea" Ltd, "Park Hotel Kemerī" Ltd and "Vichy." The architectural company "Arhiidea" Ltd bought KH for 2.86 million euro, however, later the company gave the rights for KH to "Park Hotel Kemerī" (BNS 2015). It was planned that "Arhiidea" Ltd would be responsible for hotel building's reconstruction, while "Park Hotel Kemerī" and "Vichy" would be investors [LETA 2015a; 2015b; Kemeru sanatorijas... 2015]. Plans for renovation of the building have been made until 2017.

Jurmala municipality has contributed to KD's development and has divided the budget for its infrastructure's renovation. For the renovation of Kemerī park, 20 thousand euro has been allocated for 2015, 3 million euro for 2016 and 5.23 million euro for 2017, as well as 14.2 thousand euro for Kemerī infrastructure in 2015 [Anteina 2015]. The total amount of investment from Jurmala municipality into KD is 8.26 million euro, 16% of the total 51.4 million euro Jurmala investment amount for 2015-2017.

In February 24, 2016 the intention protocol was signed between "Park Hotel Kemerī" member of the board Andrey Danengiršs and Jurmala municipality's

council chairman Gatis Truksnis [LETA 2016; Paraksta nodomu protokolu... 2016]. The forecasted amount of investment is 35 million EUR of which 20 million euro will be for the renovation of Kemerī hotel building and 12-15 million euro for the renovation of the old health resort's polyclinic. According to the protocol, the municipality has agreed to an intention that until the year 2021 European Union Structural Funds will be invested to the amount of 11.23 million euro for Kemerī development, including the renovation of more than 42 ha of Kemerī park, access road and streets (Tukuma, Katedrāles and Tūristu street), to build an interactive nature tourism object, improvement of the territory and the building of parking lot in Emīla Dārziņa street, which will support Jūrmala city's socio-economic development and a growth in visitors numbers. The owners of Park Hotel Kemerī have mentioned that another party has since become involved – G Capital Management. According to the protocol, it is planned to renovate Kemerī sanatorium complex, to start hotel operations and offering rehabilitation services until the 1st of October 2019, ensuring 195 new labor placements [LETA 2016].

Such cooperation of the parties involved in KD will not only foster KD development, but will also promote the development of related companies and Jūrmala municipality. With the rebirth of KD, Jūrmala will have developed an area of the municipality which has been in a state of neglect for more than 20 years, it will have an emphatic focus on KD that will bring not only visitors to KHR, but also will improve the number of visitors to Jūrmala, both the city and other seaside areas. It is hoped that as a result of this development, Jūrmala municipality will gain popularity as a tourism destination in Latvia. Such development will also benefit the owners and investors of Park Hotel Kemerī.

8. Analysis of strategies and regulatory documents

Tourism development priorities of Latvia and Jūrmala municipality have been outlined through analysis of a total of seven strategic and regulatory tourism documents: three at the state level and four on Jūrmala municipality (see the summary of results in Table 3).

In the previous research of Stanule [2015] it was stated that according to the tourism development strategies of Latvia and Jūrmala, a conclusion can be reached that the government of Latvia and the municipality of Jūrmala do not focus enough on KD development as a TD, however, objectives have been set to be fulfilled until the year 2020 in relation to KD infrastructure [Stanule 2015]. In the state regulatory documents there is no specific section about KD because The Law of Tourism speaks about resorts and their development only in general

Table 3. Summary of results on the analysis of strategies and regulatory documents

Document	Focus on KD
Governmental level	
The Law of Tourism	The law speaks about resorts and their development only in general; there is no specific section about KD.
Guidelines for Latvia Tourism Development (2014-2020)	As Kemeris is a part of Jūrmala municipality, the development of KD as a TD is included in the development of Jūrmala as a resort.
The Latvian Tourism Marketing Strategy (2010-2015)	To develop spa services, high quality products by the use of natural resources as medical mud, sulphur springs, mineral water springs, and to develop rehabilitation centers and spa hotels in Jūrmala, consequently, also in KD.
Municipality level	
Jūrmala Municipality Tourism Development Strategy (2007-2018)	To establish Resort Competence Centre in Kemeris; Development of Kemeris as a health resort; KHR park renovation and infrastructure development; New service development across ecotourism products: catering, accommodation, WC; Infrastructure renovation and maintenance: renovation of Kemeris pavilion rotunda; KNP – trails, mineral water springs, fountains, climate stations, pavilions for leisure in rainy days, illuminated walking road along the seaside, etc.; to focus and develop ecotourism, nature, leisure, active tourism, water tourism.
Jūrmala City Development Strategy (2010-2030)	To establish Resort Competence Center establishment; Kemeris town development in-between KNP; KH development; The use of natural resources; The old Kemeris rehabilitation traditions adapted to global and modern requirements and trends; Improvement of living and business environment in Kemeris; To maintain and renovate Kemeris park and other public territories; To find solutions for the use of destroyed and unused objects with cooperation of government and investors; To diversify tourism products: the establishment of the Olympic centre, underwater exploration and archaeological museum, astronomic tourism, KNP tourism products. To focus on health, nature tourism, astronomic tourism.
The Conception of Jūrmala City Resort (2009-2018)	Jaunkemeris and Kemeris resort cluster's development where are efficiently operating resort business and establishments; to focus on health, nature, active tourism.
The Thematic Plan "The Vision of Kemeris Development"	Kemeris and Jaunkemeris in future as a balanced functional territorial development; Focus on modern, sustainable, economically active territory; Respecting the historical KHR development of infrastructure and functional us; Balneology Center's establishment; focus on health, nature, active tourism.

Source: own elaboration.

(The Law of Tourism). According to the documents in the municipality level, Jūrmala has recently put an emphasis on Kemeris resort's development. In its city and tourism development strategies Jūrmala City Council has included in the plan to

improve infrastructure in KD and to develop the area from a tourism perspective and to make efficient use of natural resources [Stanule 2015]. The renovation strategy of historic Kemerī Park for 2015-2020 has been established in 2012, however, none of the actions planned for completion by 2015 have been started [Stanule 2015].

One of the main goals of Jurmala municipality's city and tourism development strategies, has been to establish Resort Competence Centre, Balneology Centre, and the Olympic center, and to develop KHR [Stanule 2015]. The main focus areas for KD development as a TD have been outlined as infrastructure, natural resources, the use of historical objects, new tourism products, education of society and professionals [Stanule 2015].

9. Result analysis on Questionnaire Survey data

The sample size was 435 (Table 4). The major age groups have been 15-19, 20-24 and 30-39. The average age of sample is the age group of 30-39. From respondents the major part was female 63,2%. According to the country the respondents come from, there were questioned 55,8% Latvians and 44,2% foreigners coming from Russia 10,3%, Germany 5%, UK 3,4%, Italy 3% and other countries with 23,2% (including Japan, Netherlands, China, Brazil, France, Estonia). From the entire sample only 6,4% are local Kemerī inhabitants.

It was important to know how many respondents have visited KD (47.1% have visited, 52.8% have not) and whether they have been in a health resort before (26.4% have visited, 73.6% have not) in order to be able to analyse factors and frequency of their willingness to return to Kemerī.

Table 4. Characteristics of the research sample for Questionnaire Survey

Total	435 (100)					
Age	15-19 (14.1)	20-24 (28.7)	25-29 (19.5)	30-39 (8.0)	40-49 (5)	50-59 (<5)
Gender	Female (63.2)			Male (36.8)		
Country	Latvian (55.8)	Russia (10.3)	Germany (5)	UK (3.4)	Ukraine (0.7)	Belarus (0.7)
Kemerī local	Yes (6.4)			No (93.7)		
Visited KD	Yes (47.1)			No (52.8)		
Visited HR	Yes (26.4)			No (73.6)		

Source: own elaboration.

Q1) On visiting Kemerī district result analysis

Almost a half (47.1) have visited KD and their purpose has been mostly visiting KD because of the national park (37.1), natural resources (25.5), events (22.2), architecture (13.7) and active tourism (11.8). Only 6.9 have visited KD for health treatments and 2.7 for educational purposes.

Respondents mostly visit KD once in 6 months (46.5) or once in 4 months (21.5). The average expenditure during the visit of KD is 0-20 EUR per day. Mostly those who have visited Kemerī before tend to spend 11-20 EUR, 40.4% or 21-30 EUR, 27.5%. The research shows that they are ready to spend average 31-40 EUR per day. As to the tourism type, respondents see KD as a health tourism destination (42.3), active (31.3) and both (26.4).

Another half who has not visited KD (52.8) claims it has occurred due to the lack of information (55), they have been interested in other TDs (19.1), and due to the lack of interest (15.2). Some claim that they have low expectations in regard to KD (5.5). The lack of information being one of the main factors of why visitors have not been in KD before can be attributed to the poor infrastructure of KD and lack of services, thus, there are no qualitative elements to be promoted.

In terms of what could attract visitors to KD (see Appendix 1) it was found out that respondents highly value leisure (41.4) and price (38.6). They consider as a "relevant"-attractions (49.9), leisure (47.1), events and entertainment (42.5, and 42.6).

Q2) Result analysis of responses for visiting health resorts

As indicated above, only 26.4% of respondents have been in a health resort. From this part 46.9% visit HR whenever they feel it necessary, others- 22.1% visit once in a year. They do not tend to spend a long period of time in HR: 46.9% spend 1-5 days, 17.7% spend 7 or 10 days, and only 7.1% spend more than 14 days. Respondents indicate that they have received treatment mostly by foreign (17.3) health care products, local being only (7.2) and by both – 4.3%.

The main factor for respondents not visiting HR before (have not – 73.6%) is that they either do not have time (30.8%), or such treatments are too expensive (30.1%). As other factors have been outlined that respondents prefer spa (18.8%) or not need it (15.8%).

According to the health care products with which they would prefer to receive treatment, it has been strongly indicated that local products are preferred (78.8%), with foreign products only attracting 12.2%, while both 9.2%. The average amount of money they would be ready to spend in a HR is 31-40 euro per day. And they would prefer to receive such treatment in a guest house with spa services (26.4%), spa hotel (23.1%), good quality campsite (16.1%), apartments (19%) and rehabilitation centre (15.4%).

In determining respondents' attitude towards KD as a health resort in future, they would be interested in visiting KHR (83.4%).

It is important to determine how respondents value each given factor for visiting a HR (the results of frequency of each factor can be seen in Appendix 2). "Very relevant" factors have been stated as doctor's professionalism and reliability (49.4%), relaxation (48.3%), natural resources and environment (each 41.4%). "Relevant" factors are variety of medical treatments (48.3%), accommodation variety (43.2%), health improvement for own interests (43.2%), location (40.9%), various spa services (39.8%), doctor's prescription (39.1%).

On the question to which HR respondents have been before, it was found out that in Latvia Jaunkemeri, Jurmala, Tervete, Līgatne, Līva, and even Kemerī have been mostly visited. And in regard to foreign Hrs, Hungary, Estonia, Lithuania (Palanga, Druskininkai), Bulgaria, Greece, Krim, and others have been stated. It was commented that these health resorts have been visited because of location, natural resources, doctor's prescription, good reviews and for relaxation.

10. Result analysis on the interview data

As discussed in the Methodology chapter, five experts were interviewed on factors influencing KD development. The interviews focused on the following five areas: Q1) opinion on government and municipality's support, Q2) development in Kemerī, Q3) cooperation, Q4) the type of tourism development in KD, Q5) KD competitiveness.

It was determined that six negative factors (government, municipality, cooperation-communication, geo-political situation, investment, and infrastructure) and three positive factors (resources, global trends, and TD potential) are the largest factors influencing KD development (Table 5). These factors are further grouped into subordinate factor areas. For data analysis, Veal's [2011] conceptual framework was utilised. Thus, experts interview response results are differentiated and systematized, outlining the main KD strengths and weaknesses.

The negative factor groups are mostly independent from the positive factor groups, meaning that positive factors can promote KD development, however, in order utilize the positive factors, there is a need to reduce the amount of negative factors. Another issue is that all the negatives are interrelated, for example, government or municipality, or investors do not effectively communicate, the infrastructure still would deteriorate. Consequently, if the communication (government-municipality-investors) is effective and the KD strategy is being developed,

Table 5. Concept: factors which influence the development of Kemerī district as a tourism destination

Level 1		Level 2		Level 3
Negative				
Government	→	Economic. No programs. No board.	→	Attracting investors, EU funding. No support for long term projects.
Municipality	→	Strategies on paper, not realised. The lack of specialists and funding	→	Not realised long term projects. Not involved specialists.
Communication, cooperation	→	Owner, municipality, government	→	Cooperate and communicate towards the goal
Geo-political situation	→	Devaluation of the Russian Rubble (2015); Political situation between EU and Russia; The decrease of tourist arrivals from Russia, Belarus, Ukraine	→	More difficult to attract tourists from Russian market
Investment	→	No big investors. KH. Territory. Regulations. Legal aspects. Communication.	→	Deteriorated territory. Price. Requires large nr of clients. Large investments, the land of KH is owned by the municipality.
Infrastructure	→	Social. Business. Roads. Eng. communications. Public. Tourism	→	Abandoned town. No communication and cooperation for development. Deteriorated public and tourism infrastructure.
Positive				
Resources	→	Natural. Location. History, traditions.	→	The use of natural resources in tourism, medicine. Kemerī offers something different than Jūrmala
Global trends	→	Health and wellness tourism growth. Innovations.	→	Health and medical Spa services combined.
TD Potential	→	Competitive. Potential.	→	Health, wellness, medical Spa tourism. Nature or active tourism. Competitive health resort in the Baltic States.

Source: Stanule 2015.

improvements would be seen in KD. In order to develop KD, there is a strong need for the support from every side involved.

According to the experts, KD has all the necessary resources and potential for developing the area as a successful TD. They see advantages of KD location, natural resources and rich history and traditions. It is well known that KD would be able to offer something new in Jūrmala city and its surroundings. Also the global trend of the growth of health and wellness tourism would enchant the demand for KD tourism services, especially its natural resources that can be

perfectly combined with the modern spa trends. Since KD area is very diverse – from a Hotel park, to the forest, lakes, walking trails and the sea accessible by the means of transportation – experts see that in KD can be developed various tourism types, but they strongly have emphasized KD as a competitive health and wellness resort in the Baltic States.

During the conducted interviews the results of each expert was similar, however different attitudes and points in terms of KD current obstacles were shown. The following thesis has been developed from experts responses: Government and municipality's support for KD has been evaluated negatively, mainly because only small projects have been developed, e.g. trails in Tirelis swamp and Sloka lake; None of the long-term Jurmala municipality's plans have been realised.; Government is ready to support KD development as a health resort only verbally; Latvian government has been mentioned as the primary source of KHR decline, particularly, Mr. Ivars Godmanis – Latvian Prime Minister 1990-1993, 2007-2009.

11. Conclusions

The reasons for KD decline have been due to a several elements: government and municipality, the ignorance of the law, the progress of Jurmala municipality's support in Kemerī development, unsuccessful strategies and plans, business privatization of the 90s, the ignorance of Kemerī historic health resort crisis.

The main core reason for KD decline has been a man-made crisis both with external and internal factors. There were political and economic changes in Latvia in the 90s, which affected KD in terms of that many businesses were privatized. These businesses were not seen as profitable anymore, and therefore, many enterprises (including, the biggest sanatoriums as Līva, for example), were closed down, and afterwards no maintenance was taken into action of buildings. The closure of many enterprises in KD has caused social downturn, followed by the deterioration of infrastructure. Such results have also been caused from the lack of management and ignorance from government's and municipality's side.

The analysis of strategies and planning documents revealed that in the Latvian Tourism Law it is stated that the government supports the protection of Latvian resort resources and they should be utilised rationally, however, such point does not apply to the case of KD, because the natural resources have not been utilised to their full extent, therefore there is a neglect towards KD and its resources from the Latvian government's side. According to the strategic planning documents of Jurmala municipality, the focus has mainly been on the development of Jurmala city centre, but not its surroundings, except Jaunkemerī infrastructural develop-

ment (renovation of roads). In 2014 Jurmala municipality has put an emphasis on KD by attracting possible investors for KD and has also divided an investment for KD infrastructural development for 2015 in the range of 8.26 million euro (16% of the total amount) for the renovation of Kemerī park and the development of business plan and of digital visualization so that in 2016 there can be started the project of Kemerī development and in 2017 the construction of Resort Competence Centre.

The low interest in investing in KD is the result of unsuccessful communication between government-municipality, and municipality-investors. In order to ensure a successful cooperation, the main core is in communication between all the parties related to KD (government, municipality, investors). Moreover, KH building and its park requires a wide range of renovation actions and consequently a large amount of investment (20 million) due to building's and area's deterioration. Another aspect is that KH has 100 rooms, and often how visitors will be attracted to Kemerī has been one of the main concerns.

KD clearly shows a potential as a TD and a health resort, according to the survey data analysis and experts point of view. Kemerī, being an area rich of natural resources, vast history and traditions, is fully capable of being developed as an attractive complex TD as there is potential for the future development of new tourism attractions and a wide range of service areas can be offered (from active to leisure, from health to wellness). For a clear KD development thus should be developed a specific KD image and a definite tourism type. The global tourism trends also indicate a positive and suitable time for when KD can be developed, since there is a constant growth of health and wellness tourism both in Latvian and external market.

Consequently, the negative factor groups influencing KD development are government, municipality, cooperation-communication, geo-political situation, investment, and infrastructure. Positively influencing factor groups in KD development are: resources, global trends, and TD potential.

According to the latest communication results between Park Hotel Kemerī owners and Jurmala municipality and the signing of the intention protocol, it can be said that KD has reached the point where actions for its development have been set and ensured. Plans have been made to develop KD as an interactive TD and start operations from the 1st of October, 2019. However, this time of the year is not the most appropriate time to start health resort's operations due to the fact that winter is the quietest season for tourism. A more convenient time for the opening of Park Hotel Kemerī would be in the spring when the resort would be able to make best use of the new capacity as Jurmala receives a higher amount of foreign and local visitors during this time.

References

- Anteina L., 2015, *Investīciju plāns – kūrorta attīstībai, dzīves kvalitātei un infrastruktūrai*, Jūrmala.lv, 8.01.2015, www.jurmala.lv/page/12&news_id=3489&comments=news [access: 14.04.2015].
- Beirman D., 2003, *Restoring Tourism Destination in Crisis: A Strategic Marketing Approach*, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- BNS, 2015, "Park Hotel Kemeru": Gusakova aizturēšanai Kemeru sanatorijā tīstības plānus, www.latviannewsservice.lv/topic/1533/news/50187514/ [access: 1.03.2016].
- Butler R.W., 2006, *The Tourism Area Life Cycle*, Vol. 1: *Applications and Modifications*, Clevedon: Channelview Publications.
- Cooper, C., 2011, *Tourism Area Life Cycle*, in: *Contemporary Tourism Reviews*, Goodfellow Publishers, Oxford 2011.
- Creswell J.W., Plano C.L.V., 2011, *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, New York: Sage.
- Denzin N.K., Lincoln Y.S., 2000, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Die Kur, www.die-neue-kur.de/en/spas-and-health-resorts-in-germany/map-with-spas-and-health-resorts-in-germany.html [access: 22.02.2016].
- Estonian Spa Association, www.estonianspas.eu/location/varska/ [access: 22.02.2016].
- European Spas Association, www.europeanspas.eu/ [access: 22.02.2016].
- Evans N., Elphick S., 2005, Models of Crisis Management: an Evaluation of their Value for Strategic Planning in the International Travel Industry, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 7(15), doi:10.1002/jtr.527.
- Grants P., Bukovska N., Stepiņa D., Straube A., 2014, Tematiskais plānojums „Kemeru attīstības vizija”. Jūrmala, www.jp.gov.lv/docs/j14/x/j140084_kemeru_vizija.pdf [access: 10.04.2015].
- Hesse-Biber N.S., 2010, *Mixed Methods Research: Merging Theory with Practice*, New York: The Guilford Press.
- Jūrmala, 2004, Daba un kultūras mantojums, Kemeru. Latvijas Republika slaika arhitektūra, Kemeru viesnīca, Rīga: Neputns.
- Jūrmala, 2007, Jūrmalas pilsētas tūrisma attīstības stratēģija 2007-2018 gadam, www.tourism.jurmala.lv/upload/turisms/petijumi/turisma_strategija_gala060208.pdf [access: 10.04.2015].
- Jūrmala, 2009, Jūrmalas pilsētas kūrortkonceptija 2009-2018 gadam, www.tourism.jurmala.lv/upload/turisms/petijumi/kurorta_koncepcija_07122009_pecministrijam.pdf [access: 10.04.2015].
- Jūrmala, 2010, Jūrmalas pilsētas attīstības stratēģija 2010-2030 gadam, www.jp.gov.lv/docs/i10/x/i100825_Strategija_2010-2030.pdf [access: 10.04.2015].
- Jūrmala, 2012, 24.lv, Parakstanodomu protokolu par Kemeru attīstības plāniem, 24. Feb, <http://jurmala.pilseta24.lv/zina?slug=paraksta-nodomu-protokolu-par-kemeru-attistibas-planiem-094dfa8739/1548399> [access: 2.03.2016].
- Kanter R.M., 1983, *The Change Masters. Places where Innovation Flourishes and why*, London: Unwin.

- Ķemeru sanatorijas rekonstrukciju "Arhiidea" cerpabeigt līdz 2017 gadam, Focus.lv, 5.02. 2015, <http://m.focus.lv/bizness/biznesa-vide/kemeru-sanatorijas-rekonstrukciju-arhiidea-cerpabeigt-lidz-2017gadam> [access: 14.04.2015].
- La Medecine Thermale, www.medecinethermale.fr/ [access: 22.02.2016].
- Latvian Tourism Association, 2011, *The Baltic National Parks. Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania*, Latvia: Lauku Celotājs.
- Laws E., Prideaux B., 2005, *Tourism Crises. Management Responses and Theoretical Insight*, New York: The Haworth Press.
- Laws E., Prideaux B., Chon K., 2007, *Crisis Management in Tourism*, New York: CAB International.
- LETA, 2015a, "Arhiidea" Ķemerusanatorijunodod "Park Hotel Ķemeri," Nra.lv, 6.02. 2015. <http://nra.lv/ekonomika/latvija/134034-arhiidea-kemeru-sanatoriju-nodod-park-hotel-kemeri.htm> [access: 14.04.2015].
- LETA, 2015b, Ķemeru sanatorijas īpašumus pārdos kreditoram "Arhiidea," La.lv, 3.02. 2015, www.la.lv/kemeru-sanatorijas-ipasumus-pardos-kreditoram-arhiidea/ [access: 14.04.2015].
- LETA, 2016, "Park Hotel Ķemeri" Ķemerusanatorijuapņemasatjaunot līdz 2019 gada oktobrim, 24.02.2016.
- Libeka M., 2014, "Baltajamkuģim" cūkaslaime – pusmiljonseiro, LatvijasAvīze, 11.11. 2014, <http://am.turiba.lv/nozare/nozares/tourism/arhitem/E9C60FA8-D274-4EF1-B358-5130F213860C/?phase=sanatorija> [access: 14.04.2015].
- Liepiņš I., 2014, Ķemerusanatorijajautagad, visticamāk, atrodas valsts īpašumā. Neatkarīgā Rīta Avīze Latvijai, 26.03.2014.
- Lietuvos Kurortu Asociacija, www.kurortuasociacija.lt/ [access: 22.02.2016].
- Morrison A.M., 2013, *Marketing and Managing Tourism Destinations*, New York: Routledge.
- Pamatnostādņu projekts "Latvijastūrismaattīstības pamatnostādnes 2014-2020 gadam" Latvijas Vēstnesis, 2014, <http://tap.mk.gov.lv/mk/tap/?pid=40300395> [access: 22.02.2016].
- Pforr C., Hosie P., 2009, *Crisis Management in the Tourism Industry*, New York: Ashgate.
- Pike S., 2004, *Destination Marketing Organizations*, London: Elsevier.
- Ruhanen L., 2013, Local government: facilitator or inhibitor of sustainable tourism development? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21, 1-2.
- Sausmarez N., 2007, Crisis Management, Tourism and Sustainability: The Role of Indicators, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(6), doi:10.2167/jost653.0.
- Stanule L., 2015, *An analysis of factors which influence the development of Kemeru district as a tourism destination*.
- Terentjeva L., Frīdenberga L., 2008, *Latvijas Kūrortu Dabiskie Dziedniecības Līdzekļi*, Rīga: Multicentrs.
- The Latvian Commercial Law, adopted on 13.04.2000, published: Latvijas Vēstnesis, 4.05.2000, No. 158/160, last amended 16.01.2014.
- The Latvian Tourism Marketing Strategy 2010-2015 (2010), LTDA, Rīga, www.tava.gov.lv/sites/tava.gov.lv/files/dokumenti/strategiskie-dokumenti/Latvian-tourism-marketing-strategy-2010-2015.pdf [access: 10.04.2015].

Tūrīsmalīkums, adopted on 7.10.1998, published: LatvijasVēstnesis, 7.10.1998, No. 287, last amended 14.06.2012.

Veal A.J., 1997, *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism. A Practical Guide* (2nd ed.), London: Pitman.

Veal A.J., 2011, *Research Methods for Leisure & Tourism. A Practical Guide* (4th ed.), London: Pearson.

Will former Kemerī Sanatorium ever open its doors to tourists again?, *Baltic Tourism Marketing Services*, 14.10.2014, <https://btms.wordpress.com/tag/kemerī-hotel/> [access: 14.04.2015].

Appendix 1

The relevancy of motivational factors for/while visiting Kemerī obtained from Q12: “Please rate with X the relevancy of motivating factors while/for visiting Kemerī” (Likert scale 16 statements, in %).

Name	Irrelevant	Semi-important	Relevant	Very relevant
Health improvement	17.9	27.1	34.0	21.3
Leisure	3.4	8.0	47.1	41.4
Sports activities	16.8	36.3	34.5	12.6
Exploring history	14.9	29.9	35.6	19.5
Cultural events	13.3	24.8	42.5	19.5
Entertainment	14.9	21.8	42.6	21.3
Seeing architecture and cultural heritage	8.7	27.2	36.7	27.6
Location	10.3	25.3	39.1	25.3
Modes of transportation	14.9	31.0	36.8	17.2
Price	11.5	9.2	34.0	38.6
Reviews	17.8	32.2	34.0	17.2
Accommodation variety	11.0	29.9	37.9	21.4
Information accessibility	6.4	27.1	40.9	26.0
Tourism objects, attractions	7.6	25.3	49.9	18.4
SPA and medical treatment services	11.0	23.0	39.8	26.4
Excursions	16.8	43.4	26.0	13.8

Appendix 2

Motivational factors and their relevancy of choosing a health resort obtained from Q22: “Please rate the relevancy of motivating factors while/for visiting a health resort” (Likert scale 16 statements, in %).

Name	Irrelevant	Semi-important	Relevant	Very relevant
Doctor's prescription	15.6	19.1	39.1	26.4
Health improvement for own interests	8.7	13.8	43.2	34.5
Annual detox procedures	20.2	36.3	30.6	13.3
Relaxation	5.7	10.3	35.6	48.3
Location	9.2	23.7	40.9	26.4
Natural resources (water, mud, etc)	8.7	15.6	34.5	41.4
Climate	5.7	19.5	39.1	35.6
Infrastructure	8.7	25.3	37.9	28.3
Events	16.1	40.2	35.2	8.7
Environment	7.6	12.6	38.6	41.4
Accommodation variety	8	29.4	43.2	19.5
Various inside attractions	14.5	42.1	32.9	11
Various open air attractions	13.3	27.6	34.5	24.8
Variety of medical treatments	11.5	13.8	48.3	26.4
Various SPA services	6.9	14.9	39.8	38.6
Doctor's professionalism and reliability	10.3	13.3	27.1	49.4

Determinanty rozwoju dzielnicy Kemeris (Łotwa) jako destynacji turystycznej

Streszczenie. Problematyka artykułu dotyczy rozwoju dzielnicy Kemeris – łotewskiej gminy Jurmala – jako destynacji turystycznej. Celem pracy jest określenie przyczyn spadku rozwoju turystyki w Kemeris i wskazanie czynników wpływających na tę sytuację. Do powstania tego opracowania wykorzystano artykuły naukowe i monografie (w sumie 44) oraz długoterminowe dokumenty planistyczne Łotwy i gminy Jurmala. W odniesieniu do danych pierwotnych badanie zostało przeprowadzone wśród mieszkańców dzielnicy Kemeris, zagranicznych i lokalnych gości w Jurmala i Kemeris oraz łotewskich ekspertów branży turystycznej. W konsekwencji badanie przeprowadzono metodą mieszaną, polegającą na analizie jakościowych i ilościowych danych pozyskanych z wtórnych oraz pierwotnych źródeł. Odnosząc się do przykładu dzielnicy Kemeris oraz strategii i planów gminy Jurmala, zidentyfikowano przyczyny zahamowania rozwoju turystyki badanego obszaru i spadku zainteresowania działaniami inwestycyjnymi w tym rejonie. Określono, jakie są obecnie możliwości rozwoju dzielnicy Kemeris z punktu widzenia gości i ekspertów.

Słowa kluczowe: uzdrowisko, turystyka zdrowotna, Kemeris, determinanty, destynacja turystyczna, Łotwa