

Tourism Impact and Support for Future Development: Local's Perspective at Ambaran Village

Journal of Tourism, Hospitality & Culinary Arts (JTHCA)
2016, Vol. 8(2) pp 10-21
© The Author(s) 2016
Reprints and permission:
UiTM Press
Submit date: 29th March 2016
Accept date: 12th Sept 2016
Publish date: 1st Dec 2016

Suvidha Khanna

Sandeva Khajuria*

School of Hospitality and Tourism Management

University of Jammu, India

sandeva_khajuria@yahoo.co.in

Abstract

Ambaran is a small village in Jammu region of Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) State of India. Located on the bank of Chenab River, the village is inhabited by Dogra community of the region. Earlier, the village used to attract visitors from the surrounding at the times of religious events and congregation. Recently in the last decade, the Archeological Survey of India excavated certain remains of Buddhist dynasty dating back from 1st to 3rd century AD. This discovery has attracted the attention of the cultural and historical societies and provides the scope of domestic tourism in the future. The village thus serves as a potential tourism destination and the future development of tourism is bound to some repercussions on the overall community. This study considers such impacts focuses on the perception of the local residents about impacts of future tourism development and their attitudinal support for future tourism development in the village. This study analyzes the tourism development impact, focusing on the demographic characteristics of the residents, their perception on tourism development and their future behavior respectively. Regression analysis, ANOVA, t-test are the major statistical techniques used in testing the study hypotheses.

Keywords:

Tourism Impact, Future Tourism Development, Residents, Perception, Ambaran

1 Introduction

India being a diverse nation possesses endless varieties of physical features and cultural patterns. The vast population is composed of varied religions, heritage, creeds, and customs. Though the country is emerging with various new and innovative concepts of tourism products to offer, yet the world knows it mostly as a cultural destination. Currently, there are many areas which have the potential as a tourism

destination. One such diverse place worth seeing is the state of J&K. Situated in the north most part of India, J&K is known for its natural beauty & religious sacredness. A trip to Jammu is no less than an expedition to a holy land. There are various other places in Jammu which are worth seeing but are yet not too developed for tourism business. Recently ancient Buddhist monastic establishments were excavated from this site. Although not much popular as a tourist destination, the site has immense potential to attract tourists in the coming future. For this piece of research, a particular village of Jammu, Ambaran is selected.

Tourism development does not only to provide basic facilities like accessibility and infrastructure and to create tourism products but also to bring together all the stakeholders so as to make them work in coordination and harmony. 'Benefit for all' had been marketed during the initial development process. Moreover, the host community is an important stakeholder in tourism, and it is extremely necessary to encourage local community's participation in tourism development process (Uran & Juvan, 2010). Inevitably, the tourism activities will fetch some positive as well as negative impacts to the site. So, in line with the concept of these impacts, this research will investigate the perception of the local residents of Ambaran about the possible impacts of tourism development in their area. It is known that perception shapes the attitude of individuals (George, 2010).

1.1 About Ambaran

Ambaran is a small village in Akhnoor Tehsil, in Jammu district of Jammu & Kashmir. The area is inhabited by a *Dogra* community, who has been practicing their traditions & cultures for centuries. Earlier, the village used to attract the locals from the surroundings at local congregations only, but now it is known for reasons other than its ethnicity. With the discovery of Buddhist evidence in Ambaran, the place is earning a religious and tourism status and has become a source of attraction for the locals as well as the outsiders. During the two excavations, one 1999 - 2001 and the other in 2008 - 2010, remains belonging to 1st to 3rd century A.D. were unearthed. A stupa, votive stupa, and walls of a monastery, all built of burnt brick masonry were exposed. The excavations also included important antiquities like a large number of decorative terracotta statuettes, semi precious stone beads, leaves and ornaments, terracotta skin-rubber, iron nails, copper objects and various other articles of Kanishka the great, Kushan emperor. These findings belong to the Kushan period, the Gupta and the post-Kushan period.

According to the Archeological Survey of India, the large complex unearthed structure could possibly be a monastery in the past. The site is believed to be abandoned around the 7th century A.D., due to the flash flood and the decline of Buddhism in the area. The structures found in the excavations are exhibited in a small room along with some photographs and detailed information. The site has already started attracting some tourists and researchers and is potential to attract mass tourists in future. The site can serve as good source of heritage tourism due to the presence of ancient establishments, religious tourism due being a Buddhist site in past

and leisure tourism due to its location on the bank of Chenab river, which is already a place of excursion for the tourists. Thus, it can be predicted that if developed properly in terms of infrastructure and facilities and projected effectively to the outsiders, the site can be a popular Tourism destination in the coming years.

2 Literature Review

There has been a growing body of literature that addresses tourism as a viable economic option for local community development. While the literature suggests a number of roles local communities could take in tourism development, little emphasis has so far been given to how local communities themselves believe or feel about it. In fact, resident's attitude or behavior is one of the most important issues of research in tourism as the concept of a viable and sustainable tourism development can be turned into practice with the help of the locals and is beneficial if it fulfills their needs and demands (Ulleberg & Rundmo, 2003). Therefore, this study looks into the literature on the perception of the local community which is known to build or influence the behavior of the individuals towards the tourism development phenomenon.

2.1 Local's Perception of Tourism Impact

Perception can be split into two processes. Firstly is processing sensory input which transforms this low-level information to higher-level information (e.g. extract shapes for object recognition), while secondly on processing which is connected with person's concept and expectations (knowledge) and selective mechanisms (attention) that influence perception. Tourism is widely perceived as an economic development tool for the local community, providing factors that may improve quality of life such as employment and investment opportunities, tax revenues, restaurants, accommodation services, natural and cultural attractions, festivals, and outdoor recreation opportunities (Andereck et al., 2005; Hanafiah, Hemdi & Ahmad, 2016; Kiriakidou & Gore, 2005; Kandampully, 2000). On the other hand, tourism can also lead to negative effects on resident's quality of life like increased traffic, parking problems, crime, higher cost of living and changes in hosts' lifestyle (Brunt & Courtney, 1999; McCool & Martin, 1994). Also undoubtedly, residents' perceptions and attitudes toward any local tourism development policy should be analyzed and studied (Ritchie and Inkari 2006; Aguiló & Roselló 2005).

In fact, the sense of residents' community attachment not only influences residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism (McCool & Martin, 1994; Um & Crompton, 1987; Liu, Sheldon & Var, 1987), but also the relationship between residents and tourists. If residents' attitude is favorable towards the tourism impact, then they will probably support additional local tourism development, and they will be more hospitable with tourists. In this context, it is important to remember that tourists are more attracted by destinations where the residents are more friendly, honest and hospitable (Fallon & Schofield, 2006). Consequently, the primary aim of any destination

manager is to gain a thorough knowledge of the destination's characteristics that residents want to preserve and protect because understanding the residents' attitudes towards the impacts of tourism implies to know the emotive relations between residents and their place (Brehm et al., 2004). So far, only a few studies were conducted with the aim to analyze the relationship between residents' community attachment and socio-demographic characteristics and perceptions of impacts, benefits, and support for tourism development (Hanafiah, Jamalludin & Zulkifly, 2013; Lee et al., 2010).

2.2 Tourism Impacts

The academic literature has analyzed community reactions to the local development of tourism since the early writings of Young (1973) & Doxey (1975). Several studies have highlighted the fact that tourism impacts on the host destination are economic, environmental and socio-cultural. A comprehensive review of the recent research studies related to tourism impacts on the host destinations is found in the work of Easterling (2004) Deery et al. (2012). The literature review suggests that each tourism impact category includes positive and negative effects. The economic impact, on the positive side is perceived as a mean to generate employment, develop local economy, increase investments and economic diversification (Vargas-Sanchez et al., 2009; Diedrich & Garcia-Buades, 2008; Liu, Sheldon & Var, 1987), and improve local and state tax revenues, etc. (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). Conversely, on the negative side, residents seem to perceive an increase in the cost of living, i.e. in prices of goods and services, and an unequal distribution of the economic benefits (Andriotis 2005; Andereck & Vogt 2000; Haralambopoulos & Pizam 1996; Liu & Var 1986). Studies also suggest that tourism causes traffic and pedestrian congestion, parking problems, disturbance and destruction of flora and fauna, air and water pollution, and littering (Frauman & Banks, 2011; Andereck et al., 2005; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; McCool & Martin, 1994).

Other scholars suggested that tourism impacts also exert socio-cultural effects, such as increased intercultural communication, the modification of traditional cultures, the increase in crime, in costs of accommodation and the waiting time to deliver services (Diedrich & Garcia-Buades, 2009; Andereck et al., 2005; Ross, 1992; Dogan, 1989). In an attempt to understand and examine the host perceptions toward tourism, several theories including attribution theory (Pearce 1989), the dependency theory (Preister, 1989), the social representation theory (Andriotis & Vaughn 2003, McGhee & Andereck, 2004; Sirakaya et al., 2002; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996) have been developed. The most accepted one, Social Exchange Theory (Ap, 1992) highlights that this relationship exists thanks to the existing tradeoff between costs and benefits. In the same argument, we can observe that residents' perception of tourism impacts is influenced by the possibility of having an economic gain (McGhee & Andereck, 2004; Sirakaya et al., 2002; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Gilbert & Clark, 1997; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). On the other hand, Andereck et al. (2007) suggest that the more residents have knowledge about tourism

and have intensive contact with tourists, the more they have a positive perception of the benefits gained through tourism.

2.3 Future support for tourism

The cooperation of the residents is important to ensure the socio-cultural, political physiological, commercial and economic development with tourism. Also, their role in contributing to the tourism development activities along with the government is imperative (Jamaludin, Othman & Awang, 2009). Furthermore, it was noticed that their perception makes one of the key factors in evaluating the current situation of the destination due to the closeness with the place Cottrell and Vaske (2006). As the support of the local community is necessary for the successful and sustainable development of any tourism project, the local's opinion and support are of immense significance to the government, policy makers and businesses (Dyer et al. 2007; Lee et al., 2010; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012). Earlier studies were descriptive and offered no clarification about the reasons behind the resident's perception and response to tourism activities (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). Thus, the later studies came up with theoretical frameworks like Ajzen (1975), Social Representations Theory (e.g., Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003), Theory of Reasoned Action (e.g., Dyer et al., 2007). The most appreciated framework explaining the local resident's response to tourism development is the Social Exchange Theory (Ap, 1992).

The underpinning theory is based upon opinions backed by psychological and experiential outcomes (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Prayag et al., 2013) and suggests that individuals in the society by exchanging resources and usually get involved in the exchange process if they find some benefit out of it. Thus in the case of resident's support for tourism, if the perceived benefits prevail over the potential costs, the residents are likely to support tourism development (Dyer et al., 2007; Gursoy et al., 2010; Ko & Stewart, 2002; Lee, 2013). Therefore, the local's perception about the impact of tourism and their future support is essential for development and operation of tourism (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). To conclude, this study focuses on the perception of the locals about the various tourism impacts and their support towards future tourism developments.

3 Methodology

3.1 Sample

The residents of Ambaran were chosen as the target population. The population obtained from the panchayat in the year 2014 was approximately 3000. And thus according to Krejci and Morgan (1970), the sample size at 95 % confidence level and 5% margin of error comes out to be 345. Thus, 350 questionnaires were distributed randomly among the residents of Ambaran, out of which 270 were found usable, leading to a response rate of approximate is 77%.

3.2 Instrument

As the undertaken study is empirical in nature, the primary data source for this study includes survey and interviews of the respondents with the help of a self-structured questionnaire titled as “Tourism Impact and Support for Future Development- Local’s Perspective at Ambaran Village.” The questionnaire consisted of three sections followed by an open-ended section of suggestions. The first section marks the demographic profile of the respondents of the study. The second section of “Perceived impact of Tourism Development” consists of fifteen positive and eight negative statements, adopted from and is measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= Highly Disagree to 5= Highly Agree.

The next section focuses on the Support for Future Tourism Development. The questions were adapted from Hanafiah, Jamalludin, and Zulkifly (2013), in which consists of eleven statements again measured upon the fore mentioned five-point Likert scale.

3.3 Methods applied

To test the first hypothesis, i.e., “Perception of the locals about the impact of tourism varies with their demographic background” ANOVA (for education and occupation), and t-test (for gender) have been applied. To test the second hypothesis, i.e., “Locals’ Perception of the impact of tourism development has a significant effect impact upon their attitude towards future,” regression analysis between the two variables has been conducted. Techniques including percentage, mean and standard deviation have been used to express demographic profile of the respondents and factors of the variables respectively.

4 Findings

4.1 Demographic Profiles

Table 1 below shows the demographic profile of the respondents. It is found that approximately 90.74% of respondents are males and the rest 9.25% are females. None of the respondents were below the age of 20 years, while 8.14 % were from the age group 20-40 years and 77.40% and 14.44% from age group 40-60 years and above 60 years respectively. Meanwhile, 3% of the respondents had primary education, 54% had education, and 45% were educated over as education. Very fewer respondents (33) belonged to the age group 10 to 20,125 belong to 20 to 30, and the rest 112 respondents were above the age 30 years. Most of the respondents (50%) were employed in the government sector, 34% had their business and the rest 14% were unemployed.

Table 1: Demographic Profiles

Demographics		Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	245	90.74
	Female	25	9.25
Age	Below 20	0	0
	20-40	22	8.14
	40-60	209	77.40
	Above 60	39	14.44
Educational Status	Not Enrolled	1	0.37
	Primary	8	2.96
	Higher	146	54.07
	Above	115	42.59
Length of stay	below10 years	0	0
	10 – 20 years	33	12.22
	20 – 30 years	125	46.29
	Above 30 years	112	41.48
Occupations	Business	97	33.70
	Government Employee	134	49.62
	Unemployed	39	14.44

4.2 Perceived Impact

The perceived impact mean score as been displayed in Table 2 shows that the highest perceived impact among the above mentioned is that tourism will generate more income (M=4.881) and the least observed is that the tourism development will increase the quality of life in Ambaran (M=4.662).

Table 2: Perceived Impact

No	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	Tourism Development will improve the economy of Ambaran	4.851	0.495
2	Tourism Development will help generate more income in Ambaran	4.881	0.335
3	Tourism Development will create new jobs for the locals	4.818	0.559
4	Tourism Development will attract investment to the community	4.766	0.646
5	Tourism Development will raise the standards of living	4.781	0.572
6	Tourism Development will introduce more shopping options in the village	4.785	0.563
7	Tourism Development will introduce more eating and drinking options in the village	4.807	0.495
8	Tourism Development will introduce more entertainment in the village	4.762	0.599
9	Tourism Development will increase recreational opportunities for the locals	4.681	0.728
10	Tourism Development will raise the quality of life	4.662	0.690
11	Tourism Development will improve infrastructure (water, electricity, etc.)	4.674	0.709
12	Tourism Development will improve public development (roads, transport, etc.)	4.673	0.690
13	Tourism Development will induce cultural exchange	4.737	0.657

14	Tourism Development	will promote local culture	4.681	0.686
15	Tourism Development	will bring incentives for environment conservation	4.729	0.671
16	Tourism Development	will raise the cost of living	4.769	0.612
17	Tourism Development	will increase traffic problem	4.762	0.558
18	Tourism Development	will increase litter problem	4.814	0.541
19	Tourism Development	will lead to overcrowding	4.848	0.498
20	Tourism Development	will increase crime rate	4.814	0.541
21	Tourism Development	will lead to friction between tourists and the locals	4.784	0.527
22	Tourism Development	will lead to pollution	4.774	0.563
23	Tourism Development	will be beneficial for few people only	4.800	0.507

4.3 Future Support

Table 3 shows the mean score for Future Support for tourism development. The majority claimed that tourism industry should be actively encouraged in my community, they support tourism and would like to see it become an important part of my community and their area should become a tourist destination (M=4.818).

Table 3: Future Support

No.	Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	I believe that tourism industry should be actively encouraged in my community	4.818	0.887
2	I support tourism and would like to see it become important part of my community	4.818	2.589
3	I will support new tourism facilities that will attract more tourism to my community	4.714	0.648
4	The government support the promotion of tourism in Ambaran	4.644	0.587
5	My community should become more of a tourist destination	4.818	0.471
6	Long term planning on the environmental aspect would exaggerate tourism business	4.714	0.474
7	The effect from tourism industry increased the quality of the outdoor recreation opportunities in my community	4.762	0.531
8	It is important to manage the growth of tourism in Ambaran	4.796	0.612
9	I believe the tourism sector will continue to play a major role in the economy of the community	4.803	0.561
10	Generally, the positive benefit of tourism outweighs the negative impact	4.755	0.573
11	The future of Ambaran as a tourist attraction is sustainable	4.733	0.392

4.4 Variance of analysis

Table 4 shows the variance of analysis reflects the calculated the value of F=1.583 for $v_1=1$ and $v=151$ at 5% level of significance, which is less than the table value

(254.32). Thus the hypothesis that the perception of the locals about the impact of tourism varies with their occupation is accepted.

Table 4: ANOVA represents significant difference in Occupation

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	Degree of Freedom	Mean sequence	F- Value
Between groups	0.142	1	0.142	1.583
Within groups	13.578	151	0.089	
Total	13.720	152		

4.5 Variance of analysis

Table 5 depict the variance of analysis reflects the calculated the value of $F=9.122$ for $v_1=2$ and $v=264$ at 5% level of significance, which is less than the table value (19.496). Thus, the hypothesis that the perception of the locals about the impact of tourism varies with their occupation is accepted.

Table 5: ANOVA represents significant difference in Education

Source of Variation	Sum of Square	Degree of Freedom	Mean sequence	F- Value
Between groups	1.181	2	0.590	9.122
Within groups	17.087	264		
Total	18.269	266		

4.6 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was used to test the study hypothesis. Based on Table 6 below, the hypothesis that Perceived impact influences the future support of the locals is proved to be true ($p < 0.005$). The Coefficient of Correlation ($R = 0.385$) shows considerable positive effects. Further, Coefficient of Determination, R^2 shows that 14% of the change is explained by regression while the rest is because of some unknown factors.

Table 6: Regression Analysis

Regression Statistics	Statistics
Multiple R	.385
R Square	.148
Adjusted R Square	.145
Observations (N)	270

5 Discussion

The undertaken study aimed to explore the perceptions of the locals about the impacts of tourism development and to assess their willingness for the development of tourism in the coming future. This study concludes that the locals have considerable/positive perceptions about the impact of tourism development towards them. They perceived tourism to be beneficial for the economy of the place, generating income, creating new jobs, introducing more eating and drinking options in the village as positive impacts of tourism development, while the increase in traffic, generating more litter, overcrowding, and increase in crime in the area were perceived as negative impacts. They also highly believe that tourism development will be beneficial for selected people only.

In the case of their attitude towards future support for tourism, they highly support tourism and believe that tourism industry will play a key role in the economy of the community, thus showing a highly positive attitude towards future tourism support. Further, the results of the study reveal that the perception of locals varies with their occupation as the residence associated with tourism or alighted services consider tourism to be more important for the place. The perception of the locals emerged to vary with their education as well. The reason behind this may be that more educated people understand and appreciate the importance tourism development more than the less educated ones. Since perception is an indicator of behavior, in the study, also perception emerged to influence the behavior of the respondents in terms of their attitudes towards future tourism development, in a positive way.

6 Limitation and Future Research

This research work has some limitations that can be overcome in future and provide scope for further research. These limitations include semantic barriers of local language, the respondents being ignorant about the importance of research activities and show little interest in being a part of it, time constraints and lastly, the research being limited to a particular destination and targeting the residents only. Similar research at other potential destinations and incorporating the opinion of the other stakeholders, especially the tourists, may alter the finding and provide direction for improvisation in the field of tourism development at potential tourist destinations.

References

- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 172-185.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Vogt, C. A., & Knopf, R. C. (2007). A cross-cultural analysis of tourism and quality of life perceptions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 483-502.

- Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27-36.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behaviour relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84(5), 888.
- Brehm, J. M., Eisenhauer, B.W., & Krannich, R. S. (2004). Dimensions of Community Attachment and Their Relationship to Being in the Amenity Rich Rural West. *Rural Sociology*, 69(3), 405-429.
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515.
- Cottrell, S. P., & Vaske, J. J. (2006). A framework for monitoring and modeling sustainable tourism. *E-Review of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 74-84.
- Diedrich, A., & García-Buades, E. (2009). Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management*, 30(4), 512-521.
- Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 64-73.
- Dogan, H. Z. (1989). Forms of adjustment: Sociocultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 216-236.
- Doxey, G. (1975). A Causation Theory of Visitor-Resident Irritants: Methodology and Study Inferences. In *Proceedings of the 6th Annual Conference of the Travel and Tourism Study Association* (Vol. 1).
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 409-422.
- Easterling, D. (2005). Residents and tourism: What is really at stake? *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 18(4), 49-64
- Fallon, P., & Schofield, P. (2006). The dynamics of destination attribute importance. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(6), 709-713
- Frauman, E., & Banks, S. (2011). Gateway community resident perceptions of tourism development: Incorporating Importance-Performance Analysis into a Limits of Acceptable Change Tourism framework. *Management*, 32(1), 128-140.
- George, R. (2010). Visitor perceptions of crime-safety and attitudes towards risk: The case of Table Mountain National Park, Cape Town. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 806-815.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Hanafiah, M. H., Jamaluddin, M. R., & Zulkifly, M. I. (2013). Local community attitude and support towards tourism development in Tioman Island, Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 105, 792-800.
- Hanafiah, M. H., Hemdi, M. A., & Ahmad, I. (2016). Tourism destination competitiveness: Towards a performance-based approach. *Tourism Economics*, 22(3), 629-636.
- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 503-526.
- Jurowski, C., & Gursoy, D. (2004). Distance Effects on Residents' Attitudes Toward Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 296-312
- Jamaludin, M., Othman, N., & Awang, A. R. (2012). Community based homestay programme: A personal experience. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 42, 451-459.
- Kandampully, J. (2000). The impact of demand fluctuation on the quality of service: A tourism industry example. *Managing Service Quality: An International Journal*, 10(1), 10-19.

- Kayat, K. (2002). Power, social exchanges and tourism in Langkawi: Rethinking residents' perceptions. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(3), 171- 191.
- Ko, D. W., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 521-530.
- Kyriakidou, O., & Gore, J. (2005). Learning by example: Benchmarking organizational culture in hospitality, tourism and leisure SMEs. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 12(3), 192-206.
- Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development, *Tourism Management*, 34, 37-46.
- Lee, C. K., Kang, S. K., Long, P., & Reisinger, Y. (2010). Residents' perceptions of casino impacts: a comparative study. *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 189- 201.
- Liu, J. C., Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1987). Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(1), 17-37.
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 193-214.
- McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29-34.
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 131-140.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268.
- Ogorelc, A. (2009). Residents' perceptions of tourism impact and sustainable tourism development. *International Journal of Sustainable Economy*, 1(4), 373-387.
- Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Nunkoo, R., & Alders, T. (2013). London residents' support for the 2012 Olympic Games: The mediating effect of overall attitude. *Tourism Management*, 36, 629-640.
- Ritchie, B. W., & Inkari, M. (2006). Host community attitudes toward tourism and cultural tourism development: the case of the Lewes District, Southern England. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 8(1), 27-44.
- Ross, G. F. (1992). Resident perceptions of the impact of tourism on an Australian city. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(3), 13-17.
- Roselló, J., Aguiló, E., & Riera, A. (2005). A dynamic model for tourism demand in the Balearic Islands. An evaluation of the price effect of Tourist Tax. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 39, 5-20.
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring resident's attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(1), 27-29.
- Ulleberg, P., & Rundmo, T. (2003). Personality, attitudes and risk perception as predictors of risky driving behaviour among young drivers. *Safety science*, 41(5), 427-443.
- Uran, M., & Juvan, E. (2010). The stakeholder's role within tourism strategy development: The local residents viewpoint. *Organizacija*, 43(5).
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Plaza-Mejía, M. D. L. Á., & Porras-Bueno, N. (2009). Understanding residents' attitudes toward the development of industrial tourism in a former mining community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(3), 373-387.
- Young, S. G. B. (1973). *Tourism--blessing Or Blight?* Penguin Books.