

住民の観光事業への参加に関する考察： 参加への利益・不利益の分析を通して

丸 山 奈 穂

A Study on Residents' Participation in Tourism: through Analysis of Costs and Benefits

Naho MARUYAMA

要 旨

最近の研究によると、地域の観光事業に地域住民が参加することによって、住民の観光に対する態度が前向きなものになるとされている。しかし、「誰が」「なぜ」観光事業に参加するのか（しないのか）に関する研究はまだなされていない。そこで、本研究では、地域住民の観光事業の参加にかかるコストとベネフィットの評価が、実際の参加にどのような影響を与えるかを分析した。調査は富岡市および日光市で行われた。収集された1268枚の調査用紙を元に分析を行ったところ、ベネフィット因子は、両地域において、住民の参加を強く促していることが分かった。一方で、コスト因子に関しては、日光市では住民の参加の妨げになっていたが、富岡では強い関係性は見られなかった。しかし、富岡市における住民の参加率はかなり低いため、今後の研究では、参加を妨げているその他の要素を見つける必要があるといえよう。

Abstract

The recent studies show local residents become positive toward tourism through participation in local tourism planning. However, no study has examined “who” participates in the tourism planning and “why”. In order to address the question, this paper assessed the impacts of residents' evaluation of costs and benefits of the participation in the tourism planning on their actual participation. The questionnaires were distributed in Tomioka City and Nikko City. Analysis of collected 1268 questionnaires showed the benefit factors encouraged local residents' participation in tourism planning in both cities. Meanwhile, the cost factors prevented the residents from the participation in Nikko City, but didn't show strong association with the

residents' participation in Tomioka City. Since the level of residents' participation in tourism planning is relatively low in Tomioka City, future studies need to find other factors preventing local residents from participation in tourism.

Key Word: World Heritage Site, Tomioka Silk Mill, Nikko, Residents' Participation, Costs-Benefits Analysis

I . troduction

Over the last several decades, researchers have devoted themselves to identify ways in which local residents shape their perception towards tourism (i.e., Boley & McGehee, 2014; Lankford & Howard, 1994; Sharpley, 2014). This is based on the premise that residents' perception towards tourism would affect their friendly, or unfriendly, behavior towards tourists, which will then determine the success and sustainability of tourism (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003).

Among several predictors of residents' perception towards tourism, community's participation in the tourism planning process is considered to play an important role to foster positive attitudes toward tourism (e.g., Jamal & Getz, 1995; Lepp, 2007; Scheyvens, 1999). Participation in the planning process can promote joint decision making and is expected to adjust tourism project aligned with the local eco and cultural system and lead to fair distribution of benefits. At the same time, problems and challenges of community participation have also been identified (Blackstock, 2005; Stone & Stone, 2011).

According to Wandersman et al. (1987), individuals decide to participate in a voluntary association when they expect to gain some benefits, while they decide not to participate when they perceive the costs exceed the benefits. In other words, the individual make a rational choice of participate or not to participate by comparing the costs and benefits of participation. This can be explained by the Social Exchange Theory.

In tourism studies, Social Exchange Theory has been predominantly applied to examine residents' attitudes towards tourism (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012; Ward & Berno 2011). Previous studies indeed reveal the fact that those who receive direct economic benefits from tourism (i.e. those who are employed by the tourism sector) show more positive attitudes towards tourism development than others (e.g. Choi & Murray, 2010; Perdue et al., 1990) and support SET's utility. However, SET has not applied to examine who and why people participate in tourism planning process.

The goal of this study is to examine the relationship between local residents' evaluation of costs and benefits of participation and their actual participation in the tourism planning process in their community. For the purpose of this study, two communities, namely city of Tomioka, Gunma prefecture, and city of Nikko, Tochigi prefecture, were chosen.

II. Literature Review

II – 1 . Residents' Attitudes and Tourism

The importance of residents' attitudes towards tourism has been reflected to the large number of studies related to this issue in the last several decades. These studies identified various predictors of the attitudes, including perceived costs and benefit from tourism (Wang & Pfister, 2008), people's occupational and environmental identity (Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012), levels of tourism development (Látková & Vogt 2012), and various socio-demographic factors, such as gender, education, and length of residence (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Teye, Sirakaya, & Sönmez, 2002).

Among these various potential predictors, residents' participation in the planning process is considered as a critical aspect for creating positive perception towards tourism among residents (Byrd, 2007; Jamal & Getz, 1995). According to Wandersman et al. (1987, p. 534), citizens' participation is "the essence of democracy" and "a force for creating a sense of community and a sense of control over our lives and institutions." A sense of control over ones' lives, which is often referred to "empowerment," is considered critical for tourism to be sustainable (Scheyvens, 1999). Thus, participation has been expected to play an important role to foster positive perception towards tourism and make the tourism project sustainable. Indeed, Jamal and Getz (1995) argue that community participation and joint decision making enable "tourism planning and development to be adjusted as the economic, social and environmental perceptions change within the community" (p.194). Similarly, Zhang, Cole, and Chancellor (2013) state that community participation may reduce unfair power distribution between residents and powerful tourism authorities. Indeed, there are ample of studies that advocate the importance of community participation in tourism planning (Choi & Murray, 2010; Okazaki, 2008; Tosun 2004).

At the same time, however, challenges and constraints that may hinder community participation has been identified (Blackstock 2005; Stone & Stone 2011; Timothy and Tosun, 2003). While the importance of community participation has been widely acknowledged, studies also revealed the challenge of participation particularly by *ALL* members of a community. As Blackstock (2005) argues, a "local community" is not a homogeneous but rather a heterogeneous

entity in which each social group has different culture, needs, interests, and power. And, such differences has potential to determine who participate and who do not. In addition, community participation requires human resource, information, and knowledge, and not all members of a community have the equal access to the resources. This might be particularly true in developing countries (Cole, 2006; Stone & Stone, 2011; Tosun, 2000). For example, Tosun (2000) argues that centralization of public administration, lack of information, expertise, and trained human resources, and elite domination prohibit local communities to participate in planning in developing countries. Cole (2006) similarly argues that community participation is often constrained because of a community's lack of access to information and knowledge about tourism planning in Indonesia. However, different from these developing countries where distribution patterns of power and wealth are often ruled by a small group of powerful elite (Tosun, 2000), in developed countries, the constraints to the participation may be influenced by psychological variables (Wandersman et al, 1987).

II – 2 . Community Participation and Social Exchange Theory

According to Wandersman et al.(1987), citizens' participation in a voluntary association (i.e., a neighborhood organization or citizen advisory committee) is not caused by physical needs or direct pay; rather, it is related to individuals' goals and motivations. In this way, individuals' choice of participation is influenced by demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, marital status, education, and occupation), social psychological characteristics (i.e., individuals' personality), and evaluation of costs and benefits.

Particularly, the third approach is associated with Social Exchange Theory (Redmond, 2015). The theory proposes that social behavior is a result of social exchange that involves a series of interaction between two or more individuals or groups, each of which works as a single unit (Ap, 1992; Blau, 1967). Individuals or groups exchange something the other value, and if they perceive the exchange rewarding, they continue to engage in the exchange, while the exchange is perceived as more costly, they may withdraw from it. In other words, individuals examine the costs and rewards, and seek to maximize the former while minimizing the later (Redmond, 2015).

Based on SET, Wandersman et al.(1987) argue that when people consider whether to participate or not to participate in a voluntary association, they calculate the costs and benefits of participation, and make a rational choice. Wandersman et al. (1987) further argue that benefits of participation includes both personal incentives, such as monetary rewards and social interactions, and purposive incentives, such as bettering community and fulfilling a sense of responsibility. The costs of participation, on the other hands, include time, money, and effort that

might be consumed by participating in neighborhood activities. Indeed, several studies (Butterfoss & Kegler, 2002; Cornwall, 2008; Fowler, 2007; Klandermans, 2004; Lasker et al., 2001) demonstrate that individuals' perception of costs and benefits of participation influence their decision to participate in political activities and social movement.

In tourism studies, SET has been one of the most used theories (e.g. Choi & Murray, 2010; Perdue et al., 1990; Waitt, 2003). However, application of SET has been limited to examination of residents' attitudes. For example, Perdue, Long and Allen (1990) and Ap (1992) argue that, when tourism development is initiated in a community, residents seek to improve the community's well-being. And, if residents perceive the benefits from tourism development (i.e., increase of household income and the community's infrastructure and public service), they develop positive attitudes towards it, while if they perceive more costs than benefits, they are more likely to oppose the tourism development or exhibit antagonistic behavior towards tourists. Indeed, various studies (e.g. Choi & Murray, 2010; Perdue et al., 1990; Waitt, 2003) demonstrate that those who perceive direct benefits from tourism, particularly those who are employed in the tourism industry or have better access to tourism resource, present more positive perception toward tourism development than others. Few studies, however, applied SET to examine residents' decision to participate in the planning. Therefore, the goal of this study was to examine the influence of cost-benefit evaluation of participating in tourism planning on the residents' actual participating behavior.

III. Research Methods

III – 1 . Research Context

Tomioka city is located in the southwest part of Gunma prefecture, northwest of Tokyo. The city is known as the site of Tomioka Silk Mill, the first Japanese modern silk reeling factory. Tomioka Silk Mill was established in 1872 as a government owned factory. Approximately 400 trained female workers were gathered from around the country to produce raw silk under the guidance of Paul Brunat, a French silk engineer, and other foreign directors (Tomioka Silk Mill, n.d). Owing to the high quality of raw silk produced in the mill, the textile industry had become a key industry in the growth of Japan's economy. In 1893, the ownership of the factory was sold to Mitsui Congromat, and the factory was privatized because of the financial deficit. Later, the ownership was again transferred to Hara Unlimited Partnersip, and then to Katakura Industry Co.Ltd. While the ownership changed several times, the Tomioka Sillk Mill continued to be a silk reeling factory until 1987.

After the operation of the mill was stopped, the buildings were well-reserved by the Katakura Industry. In 2014, UNESCO recognized the mill's historical role as "the center of innovation for the production of raw silk and marked Japan's entry into the modern, industrialized era, making it the world's leading exporter of raw silk, notably to Europe and the United States" (UNESCO, 2014) and enlisted it as the WHS with other three related sites. With designation as a WHS, the number of visitors rose from 314,516 (in 2013) to 1,337,720 (in 2014). In 2018, the number stayed as 519,070. Tomioka city has also several other tourism attractions, including Gunma Safari park, Gunma Museum of Natural History, and Mt. Myogi.

City of Nikko is located in the north area of Tochigi prefecture. The city is an entrance for the several tourism attraction, including Nikko National Park, Nikko Toshogu shrine, Futarasan and Shrine Rinnō-ji (Nikko City Travel Association, n.d).

Nikko was also known as a town of copper mine (Ashio copper mine) from 17th century to the Meiji period.

Beginning in the Nara period that lasted from A.D. 710-794, Nikko had been a center of mountain worship. In the Edo period, which lasted from 1603 to 1868, Nikko became prospered as a town of Toshogu shrine. Toshogu shrine was initially built in 1617 by Ietada Tokugawa to enshrine his father, Ieyasu Tokugawa, the founder of the Edo period. Iemitsu Tokugawa, Ieyasu's grandson, then enlarged it. Toshogu shrine and other two sites were registered as a World Heritage site in December 1999. Recently, the city has been recognized as one of the most popular tourism destination particularly among foreign visitors (Kanko Keizai Shinbun, September, 28, 2018). Approximately 12, 310,000 visitors visited Nikko in 2018, which was the highest number since its designation as a WHS (Asahi Shinbun, April 11, 2019)

III – 2 . Questionnaire design

This study used three scales. 10 items for costs were chosen from Wonderman et al. (1987) and some related materials. The original scale also presented two factors, including *opportunity costs* and *participation costs*. The former indicates what people may need to sacrifice in order to participate (i.e., personal time or time with family). The later identifies "organizational frustration" (Wondersman et al., p. 546), including a lack of progress or interpersonal conflicts. Finally, to examine residents' participation in the tourism planning, six items were used from Hung et al. (2010). Similarly, to examine the perception of benefits to participate in the planning among the residents, 10 items were chosen mainly from Wonderman et al.'s (1987) study and some related materials. Wonderman et al.'s scale presented two factors (personal gain and helping others).

III-3. Data Collection and Sample Characteristics

The target populations for this study were residents living in Tomioka city and Nikko city. Heads of households or their spouses in both areas were sampled on weekends from November, 2016 to July, 2018. Utilizing a multi-stage cluster sampling scheme (Babbie, 2011), both areas were reduced to 20 to 30 areas according to the residential maps. Within each area, homes were further randomly selected and visited. Two student assistants from Takasaki City University of Economics and the other local university in Tochigi comprised the data collection research teams. In each selected area, research teams visited every second household using city maps. Research assistants described the nature of the study and asked to fill the survey. If the head of the household or his or her spouse agreed, a questionnaire was left with the person and collected later that day (Woosnam, 2012). If no one answered the door, the next house was visited. In total, 608 survey was collected in Tomioka and 660 surveys were collected in Nikko.

IV. Findings

In an effort to examine the factor structure of the costs, benefits, and participation scales, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with a promax rotation was undertaken (table 1-3). Factors were retained based on two criteria: scree plot examination and eigenvalues exceeding a value of 1.0. Only those items with loadings 0.5 or higher were retained (Costello & Osborne, 2005).

For the costs scale, all items were retained, and procedure yielded a two-factor solution for both samples, accounting 62.9 % (Tomioka) and 59.9% (Nikko) of the variance in the scale and yielding Cronbach's alphas 0.85 to 0.88. Two factors were named "opportunity costs" and

Table1.Principle Component Factor Analysis of Costs

Factor	Tomioka			Nikko		
	Factor Loading	Mean ^a	Variance Explained (%)	Factor Loading	Mean ^a	Variance Explained (%)
Factor1. Participation costs			48.86			44.09
Concern about how to behave and dress at the meetings	.881	2.51		.837	2.46	
Fear of feeling unwelcome at the meetings	.875	2.67		.817	2.62	
Concern about what my peers think about my attending the meetings	.801	2.58		.816	2.39	
Uncertainty regarding the extent to which my ideas would be considered	.786	2.76		.768	2.72	
The need to look for someone to go with	.780	2.84		.697	2.71	
Factor2. Organizational costs			14.08			15.81
The need to give up personal and family matters	.819	3.12		.784	3.07	
The amount of time it takes	.791	3.34		.835	3.44	
Feeling of frustration from lack of making progress	.762	3.32		.725	3.45	
Interpersonal conflict with others	.758	2.94		.403	3.00	
A lack of interested in tourism planning	.539	3.13		.538	2.83	
Total variance explained			62.94			59.90

^a items were rated on a 5-point likert scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.

Table2.Principle Component Factor Analysis of Benefits

Factor	Tomioka			Nikko		
	Factor Loading	Mean ^a	Variance Explained (%)	Factor Loading	Mean ^a	Variance Explained (%)
Factor1. Helping Others			54.38			53.20
Increased sense of handling the matters of the neighborhood	.853	3.49		.837	3.48	
Increased knowledge of the community and how to improve it	.849	3.74		.865	3.74	
Friendship with other members or staff	.844	3.65		.843	3.66	
Enhanced personal professional goals	.834	3.51		.844	3.51	
Sense of contributing to my community	.822	3.60		.830	3.60	
Increased sense of responsibility	.762	3.31		.768	3.31	
Solutions to specific problems of direct concern to me	.676	3.23		.685	3.23	
Factor2. Personal Gain			13.77			15.19
Increased status or prestige in my community	.451	2.50		.875	2.50	
Increased political influence on community affairs	.547	2.72		.853	2.71	
Material benefits	.301	2.28		.802	2.27	
Total variance explained			68.15			

a items were rated on a 5-point likert scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.

Table3.Principle Component Factor Analysis of Participation

Factor	Tomioka			Nikko		
	Factor Loading	Mean ^a	Variance Explained (%)	Factor Loading	Mean ^a	Variance Explained (%)
Factor1.Participation			70.071			76.071
I meet with officials to discuss tourism issues	.882	1.28		.915	1.46	
I do what is asked by tourism office/ officials	.856	1.35		.850	1.67	
I share my opinions with officials regarding tourism	.850	1.33		.874	1.61	
I initiate contacts with tourism officials whenever necessary	.834	1.36		.898	1.64	
I provide assistance and resources for tourism development	.818	1.55		.860	1.88	
I contribute to tourism decision making in my community	.778	1.60		.833	1.64	

a items were rated on a 5-point likert scale, where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree.

Table4. Relationships between Costs, Benefits, and Participation

Participation with Costs and Benefits Factors ^a	F	R ²	Tomioka			Nikko				
			Beta	t	Sig.	F	R ²	Beta	t	Sig.
Participation	9.945	.071				27.446	.168			
Participation Costs			-.106	-2.033	.043			-.196	-4.379	.000
Organizational Costs			-.083	-1.623	.105			-.115	-2.702	.007
Helping Others			.132	2.416	.016			.285	6.316	.000
Personal Gain			.156	2.806	.005			.122	2.593	.010

“organizational costs” aligned with Wonderman et al. (1987). Similarly, for the benefits scale, all items were retained, and procedure yielded a two-factor solution for both samples, accounting 70.487 % (Tomioka) and 68.392 % (Nikko) of the variance in the scale and yielding Cronbach’s alphas 0.90 to 0.92. Two factors were named “helping others” and “personal gain” aligned with Wonderman et al. (1987).

Finally, the participation scale, all items are retained, and the procedure yielded a one-factor solution for both samples, accounting 76.07 % (Tomioka) and 68.70 % (Nikko) of the variance. The factor was named “participation.”

Based on the results of principle component factor analysis, composite factor means were calculated within each sample, and used within a series of multiple linear regression analyses (table 4) to determine if factors of costs and benefits had impacts on the levels of residents’ participation in the tourism planning. Overall, both costs and benefits were significant predictors of residents’ participation and non-participation with seven out of eight models yielding significant findings ($p < 0.00-0.05$). Only non-significant relation is the second factor of the costs (“*organizational costs*”) and the participation in the Tomioka sample. In addition, the first factor of the costs (“*participation costs*”) was significant but weak in Tomioka ($p = 0.048$).

V. Discussion and Limitation of the Study

Community participation has been identified for playing an influential role in forming residents’ attitudes towards tourism. Although some predictors of community participation has been explored, the influence of individuals’ perception of costs and benefits regarding participation has not been explored as such predictor. This is the first kind of study that explores such relationship.

The analysis indicated that in the both destinations, benefits strongly increase the residents’ participation in the tourism planning. This is parallel to Wandersman et al. (1987) and other studies that support the utility of SET to analyze individuals’ participation in voluntary associations (Butterfoss, & Kegler, 2002; Cornwall, 2008; Fowler, 2007; Klandermans, 2004; Lasker et al., 2001). Arguably, local residents who perceive that participating in the tourism process can be medium through which they can help others or increase ones’ gain (both material and non-material) are more likely to participate in tourism planning and joint decision making process.

In terms of the costs, in Nikko, both factors strongly and negatively influence the residents’ participation in the planning. This may indicate that both opportunity and organizational costs

are considered as constraints of participation among residents of Nikko. In Tomioka, on the contrary, the first factor (*organizational costs*) was significant but weak, and the second factor (*participation costs*) did not present significant influence on the participation. However, the data also indicated that the participation rates are rather low in both communities, and it is particularly true in Tomioka. Arguably, residents in Tomioka may feel some other costs than these two factors, and those costs draw them back from participating in the tourism planning.

Overall, the analysis of this study indicated the utility of SET in examining why people participate, or not participate, in tourism planning process. To increase residents' participation, two practical suggestions can be drawn from these results. Firstly, the analysis indicated that when residents feel they can help others and make their community better, they would participate. In addition, they also more likely to participate when they perceive participating increase their reputation, political influence, and economic gain, they are more likely to participate. Therefore, tourism practitioners and authorities need to facilitate the meetings in ways to fulfill these needs. On the contrary, the perceived costs of participation may vary among destinations. Therefore, tourism authorities and practitioners need to carefully examine drawbacks of participation that residents may feel, and reduce these burden. These effort would help increase residents' participation in the tourism planning.

This study used the principle component factor analysis to find the factor structure of the scales. This is exploratory factor analysis, and confirmatory factor analysis was not performed in this study. To increase the reliability of the scales and analysis, the future study need to perform CFA. In addition, this study simply explored the influences of costs and benefits on the participation level. The future studies need to explore the influences of socio-demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, length of residence, etc), and how these variables interplay with the perceptions of costs and benefits. In addition, the analysis indicated the participation rate is significantly low in both communities. This study did not explore the reasons for the overall participation. Finally, future studies need to explore how residents' participation influences their perception towards tourism. This kind of study has not yet been conducted in Japan. To make the Japanese tourism sector more sustainable, exploring residents' perception and why they feel in the way they feel would be important.

(まるやま なほ・高崎経済大学地域政策学部准教授)

Reference:

- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of travel research*, 42(2), 172-185.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665-690.

- Babbie, E. R. (2014). *The basics of social research* (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Blackstock, K. (2005). A critical look at community based tourism. *Community Development Journal*, 40(1), 39-49.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. London, UK: Transaction Publishers.
- Boley, B. B., & McGehee, N. G. (2014). Measuring empowerment: Developing and validating the Resident Empowerment through Tourism Scale (RETS). *Tourism Management*, 45(0), 85-94.
- Butterfoss, F. D., & Kegler, M. C. (2002). Toward a comprehensive understanding of community coalitions. *Emerging theories in health promotion practice and research*, 157-193.
- Byrd, E. T. (2007). Stakeholders in sustainable tourism development and their roles: applying stakeholder theory to sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Review*, 62(2), 6-13.
- Choi, H. C., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 575-594.
- Cole, S. (2006). Cultural tourism, community participation and empowerment. *Cultural tourism in a changing world: Politics, participation and (re) presentation*, 89-103.
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices. *Community development journal*, 43(3), 269-283.
- Fowler, J. H., & Kam, C. D. (2007). Beyond the self: Social identity, altruism, and political participation. *The Journal of politics*, 69(3), 813-827.
- Huh, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2008). Changes in Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism over Time: A Cohort Analytical Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 446-455.
- Hung, K., Sirakaya-Turk, E., & Ingram, L. J. (2011). Testing the efficacy of an integrative model for community participation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 276-288.
- Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 186-204.
- Klandermans, B. (2004). The demand and supply of participation: Social-psychological correlates of participation in social movements. *The Blackwell companion to social movements*, 360-379.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121-139. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)90008-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)90008-6)
- Lasker, R. D., Weiss, E. S., & Miller, R. (2001). Partnership synergy: a practical framework for studying and strengthening the collaborative advantage. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 79(2), 179-205.
- Lepp, A. (2007). Residents' attitudes towards tourism in Bigodi village, Uganda. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 876-885.
- Látková, P., & Vogt, C. A. (2012). Residents' attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 50-67.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An Identity Perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2012). Power, trust, social exchange and community support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 997-1023.
- Okazaki, E. (2008). A community-based tourism model: Its conception and use. *Journal of sustainable tourism*, 16(5), 511-529.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599.
- Redmond, M. V. (2015). Social exchange theory.
- Scheyvens, R. (1999). Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 245-249.
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37-49.
- Stone, L. S., & Stone, T. M. (2011). Community-based tourism enterprises: challenges and prospects for community participation; Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, Botswana. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(1), 97-114.
- Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & F Sönmez, S. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668-688.
- Timothy, D. J., & Tosun, C. (2003). Arguments for community participation in the tourism development process. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 14(2), 2.
- Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, 21(6), 613-633.
- Waite, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 194-215.
- Wandersman, A., Florin, P., Friedmann, R., & Meier, R. (1987). *Who participates, who does not, and why? An analysis of voluntary neighborhood organizations in the United States and Israel*. Paper presented at the Sociological Forum.
- Wang, Y. A., & Pfister, R. E. (2008). Residents' attitudes toward tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(1), 84-93.
- Ward, C., & Berno, T. (2011). Beyond social exchange theory: Attitudes toward tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4),

1556-1569.

Woosnam, K. M. (2012). Using emotional solidarity to explain residents' attitudes about tourism and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research, 51*(3), 315-327.

Zhang, Y., Cole, S. T., & Chancellor, C. H. (2013). Residents' preferences for involvement in tourism development and influences from individual profiles. *Tourism Planning & Development, 10*(3), 267-284.