

Chapter 9

Film Tourism and Its Impact on Residents Quality of Life: A Multi Logit Analysis



Subhash Kizhakanveatil Bhaskaran Pillai, Kaustubh Kamat, Miriam Scaglione, Carmelita D'Mello, and Klaus Weiermair

Abstract Past research has confirmed film tourism emerging as a major growth sector for research in tourism and a driver of tourism development for many destinations. To date, there has been relatively substantial literature on the subject, yet this paper tries to shed some light on the quality of life perception with respect to the International Film Festival of India (IFFI). Earlier research results have shown different impacts of film tourism on the quality of life of the local community, and the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards tourism, but no research has shown neither how nor how much these perceptions and attitudes change according to a change in the demographic profile of the local community. The empirical findings show that: age, income, education and marital status have a significant impact on residents' attitude towards film tourism. Factor analysis resulted in 4 latent factors which drive residents' perception about quality of life, viz., Community Pride, Personal Benefits, Negative Environmental effect and Negative Social effect. The results have shown that a varia-

S. K. B. Pillai (✉)

Department of Commerce, Goa University, Goa, India

e-mail: subhash@unigoa.ac.in

K. Kamat

Department of Business Administration, Goa Multi-Faculty College, Goa, India

e-mail: kamatkau@gmail.com

M. Scaglione

Institute of Tourism, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland,

HES-SO Valais, Sierre, Switzerland

e-mail: miriam.scaglione@hevs.ch

C. D'Mello

Department of Commerce, St. Xavier's College of Arts, Science & Commerce, Goa, India

e-mail: litad@rediffmail.com

K. Weiermair

Schulich School of Business, York University Toronto, York, Canada

Department of Tourism and Service Management, Institute of Strategic Management,

Marketing and Tourism, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

e-mail: Klaus.Weiermair@uibk.ac.at

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2019

A. M. Campón-Cerro et al. (eds.), *Best Practices in Hospitality and Tourism*

Marketing and Management, Applying Quality of Life Research,

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91692-7_9

tion in the demographic profile of the resident community determines a variation in the attitudes towards tourism impacts. In a time of mass movement of people, man power and immigration, changes in the demographic profile of residents are very likely and this research shows that it should be taken into consideration when managing tourism destinations and planning new tourism policies.

Keywords Film tourism · Residents perception · Quality of life · Indian cinema · International film festival of india · Goa · Multinomial logit

9.1 Introduction

Film festivals represent one of the most rapidly expanding areas of cultural events worldwide (Getz and Page 2016; Mueller 2006). International film festivals draw film professionals such as directors, actors/actresses, critics, producers, and buyers as well as multitudes of cultural tourists who travel to attend diverse national and/or international film festivals. These cultural travelers come to the venue of the festival and support the local economy through expenditures on lodging, meals, local products, and other cultural consumption in the region. With anticipated economic benefits generated by visitor spending at film festivals, public and private agencies are embracing film festival tourism as a new source of income for local business and taxation. In addition to the economic benefits, film festivals are also perceived to benefit local residents in the communities by providing more cultural events, improved infrastructural facilities in terms of world class accommodation and food availability, efficient transportation, excellent sanitation and garbage management, and also hassle free parking facilities, which are considered as part of improving the quality of life at the film tourism destination. At the same time, strict and efficient mechanisms for minimising the negative impact of social evils like crime, drugs, and human trafficking. Garnering support for film festivals is an appealing activity among policy makers as a way to develop a reputation for promoting arts and culture. With economic and political benefits derived from investing in film festivals and cultural events, financial support by public authorities continues to expand in many places worldwide which also improve the quality of life at the destination.

Though the history of cinema/films in India dates back to 1896, recognizing the catalytic nature of film tourism and immediately after independence, the then Indian government headed by the first prime minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru initiated the International Film Festival of India (IFFI) in 1952. During the last 6 decades IFFI has been inaugurated in most of the metropolitan cities, viz., Mumbai, Delhi, Kolkata, Chennai, Hyderabad, Bengaluru, and Thiruvananthapuram. In 2004, the then government Bharatiya Janatha Party (BJP) at the centre and also in Goa unanimously decided to make Goa the permanent venue for IFFI and inaugurated the 35th International Film Festival of India (IFFI-2004) in Panaji, Goa on November 29, 2004. This initiative was based on the unique blend of Indo-Portuguese culture, cuisine and lifestyle but most importantly, Goa's unique selling proposition (USP), her friendly, warm hearted and hospitable people (D'Mello et al. 2015). Historically ancient Goa

was self-ruled by Gaonkaris (1000 BC–500 BC), Hindu Dynasties (500 BC–1330 AD), Islamic dynasties (1326–1510), Portuguese (1510–1961), until it became liberated in 1961 (Wiki 2015a, b). This being the case, coupled with the mythological spiritual cleansing power, traditional adithi-devo-bhava culture, and 450 year long Portuguese colonial rule molded the very Goan culture in to one of the best in the world.

Even after 13 years of hosting IFFI in Goa (IFFI 2015), no studies were carried out by the government nor by any private researchers on assessing the factors which drive local residents' perceptions about film tourism and the impact of film tourism on the quality of life of the residents, hence the present study was conducted to identify underlying structures of residents' attitudes toward Film tourism in terms of social, economic, and environmental impacts and to examine causal relationships between the impact variables and benefits and costs which provides some insight on the quality of life of the residents. This study further identifies the effect of demographic variation of the residents' support for Film tourism, contributing to the debate on Film tourism development, and also provides a base for successful tourism policies. Past research has shown the different impacts of tourism on the local community, and the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards tourism, however no research has shown neither how nor how much these perceptions and attitudes change according to a change in the demographic profile of the local community. Therefore, the present study fills this gap by adding valuable knowledge, new perspectives, and presents possibilities for consideration. The paper offers valuable inputs for different stakeholders of the film tourism industry; especially the event organizers, film producers, movie lovers, academicians, academic institutions, government, and NGO's in the region under study.

9.2 Literature Review

To some, the idea of traveling to a distant locale to see movies makes no sense; after all, you can see movies in your own city or town. But for others, combining travel with movie-going offers a happy partnership in which the rigors of sightseeing or the indulgence of sunbathing are leavened by taking time out each day to see films. International film festivals offer the latest and best of what is available in the global marketplace. Film tourism can take a number of different forms and activities as identified and discussed by a number of authors (Beeton 2005; Busby and Klug 2001; Connell 2012; Couldry 2005; Croy 2010, 2011; Croy and Heitmann 2011; Li et al. 2017; Lin et al. 2007; Lin and Huang 2008).

9.2.1 Residents Perception About Film Tourism and Quality of Life

“Special events; like music festivals, film festivals; have economic impacts which are estimated from the expenditures made by attendees, performers, and sponsors, either directly or indirectly associated with the event (Murphy and Carmichael 1991)”.

They supplement the traditional financial balance sheets provided to the government (Crompton et al. 2001), since they address the broader issue of what community residents receive in return of their investment of tax funds.

Studies (Riley and van Doren 1992; Riley et al. 1998) identified that the benefits of film tourism are three-fold: first, raising tourist awareness; second, increasing destination appeal, and: third, contributing to the viability of tourism, which ultimately leads to improvement of quality of life at the destination. Film and literary induced tourism typify the values of post modernity where the symbolic values of a product (in this case, a landscape, place or setting) often have greater appeal to the consumer than the product itself (Rojek 1995). However, film induced tourism, like any other form of tourism, also bring negative impacts to a destination (Mordue 2001, 2009) in the form of traffic congestion, high cost of living, garbage and waste management, drugs and prostitution, insufficient infrastructure, and also law and order problems, which the residents consider as negative impacts on their quality of life. Moreover, some of the sites are not prepared for the sudden increase in tourist volume. The insufficient infrastructure and developing film tourism not only diminish tourists' experiences, but also compromise the local environment. This fact makes film tourism an important issue that requires more study.

In the field of tourism, residents' perceptions and attitudes to tourism development of a destination is a frequently studied topic (Lee et al. 2010). Earlier works show improvement in various areas, i.e., employment opportunities, tax revenues, economic diversity, festivals, restaurants, natural and cultural attractions, and outdoor recreation opportunities have improved quality of life perception of residents. Past studies have indicated that the support of local residents is a vital element in the tourism development of a destination (Andereck and Vogt 2000). Further research in tourism planning and development suggested that regions must involve various stakeholders including the local community (Ap 1992; Ap and Crompton 1993; Brayley et al. 1990). Resident's attitude plays a crucial role in sustainability of any tourism; moreover Destination Management Office (DMO) should identify what the real drivers behind resident's attitudes are. A review of the literature suggests commonly used theoretical frameworks explaining resident perceptions toward impacts of tourism; viz.; social exchange theory (SET). SET has been advocated as the most appropriate framework for explaining residents' perceptions on the impact of gambling tourism (Giacopassi and Stitt 1994; Jurowski 1994; Jurowski et al. 1997; Pizam and Pokela 1985; Stitt et al. 2003); which suggests that residents would evaluate benefits and costs associated with a tourism avenue and then decide whether they should support it or not, i.e., in other words residents becomes supporters if their quality of life is improved, opposers if their quality of life is hampered, or become neutral if no change takes place. The more the benefits, the more residents will become supportive and vice versa, depending on their demographic characteristics (D'Mello et al. 2015, 2016a, b; Kamat et al. 2016). Film induced tourism, like other forms of tourism, introduced both positive and negative impacts on a destination (Heitmann 2010). Many of the impacts are extensions of those witnessed in tourism destinations generally, although some are more emphasized in film locations. This leads to the first and second research questions and related hypothesis.

RQ1: Is it possible to identify the effect of demographic variables on resident's perception about film tourism in Goa, and also to describe the main characteristics of each of the groups; viz.; Supporters, Neutral, or Opposers?

H₁: No significant difference exists between residents attitudes towards Film Tourism (Supporters /Neutral /Opposers) with respect to age, gender, income, marital status, education, length of stay.

RQ2: Is it possible to identify the effect of variations of population characteristics on each of the groups, viz., Supporters, Neutral, or Opposer?

The problems and issues that have emerged from the increased flow of film tourists usually leads to carrying capacity problems with respect to the four A's of tourism; viz.; attraction (overcrowding, misuse of resources, pollution, etc); amenities (improper accommodation facility, poor quality food, bad sanitation facility, shortage of water and electricity, etc); accessibility (inadequate transportation, traffic congestion, parking difficulty, etc); and *ancillary services* (lack of additional / supplementary attractions, inadequate peripheral tourism development, etc). This may lead to a situation where conflict between guest-host takes place (Beeton 2001, 2004a, b, 2005; Connell 2005a, b; Croy and Walker 2003; Hudson and Ritchie 2006a, b; Mordue, 2001, 2009; O'Neill et al. 2005; Riley and van Doren 1992; Riley et al. 1998; Tooke and Baker 1996). A common thread can be drawn which highlights that conflicts occur if locals are not taken into consideration while planning events of this nature. Furthermore, to determine the perspectives of the community and to understand the aspirations and concerns of those who will be impacted by the film's development and tourism potential, individual responses should be considered. Therefore, it is important to understand how residents perceive the impacts of Film based Tourism on their quality of life (Busby and Klug 2001; Busby et al. 2013; Connell 2012; Kim et al. 2013; Kim et al. 2017; Li et al. 2017; Sine 2010; Zhang et al. 2016). This leads to the third and fourth research questions and the related hypothesis.

RQ 3: Is it possible to identify important factors which drive Quality of Life perception of residents due to Film tourism in Goa?

RQ 4: Is there any difference in perception with regards to Quality of life factors across demographic profiles?

H₂: No significant difference exists between perceived factors which drives Quality of life perception with respect to age, gender, income, marital status, education, length of stay.

9.2.2 Historical Perspective of Indian Cinema and the Final Destination of IFFI

Films in India have a long history; divided in to pre-independence era (1896–1946) and post-independence era (1947–2015). The pre-independence movie era began with the screening of moving picture in 1896 in Mumbai. Slowly, interest towards

films started taking place in the form of talkies in cities like Kolkata and Andhra Pradesh. In the year 1913, the first ever movie was released by Dadasaheb Phalke whose contributions to Indian Cinema went on to be recognized as the highest national recognition award in Cinema. During 1943, Information Films of India and the Indian New Parade were set up to cover the World War. With movement for independence gaining pace in India movies which were related to encouraging and making society aware of their right to be independent, British regulated and started banning such movies namely *Wrath* and *Raithu Bidda*. Subsequently, Statutory Bodies were formed (Information Films of India and Indian new Parade) to produce documentaries with the prime objective to censor the information communicated through movies and documentaries.

With India getting independence in 1947, there was a division of national assets and the merging of two prominent film associations namely, Information Films of India and the Indian New Parade into the Film Division of India in 1948 by the then prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru, mainly for the purpose of production and distribution of information films, enlisting documentary cinema (news based or animation film in 15 national languages to be shown in theaters throughout the country) for the larger project of nation building, integration, and development (Deprez 2013). On March 21, 1952, The Cinematograph Act was passed by Indianising the earlier The Cinematograph Act of 1918 making the screening of the documentaries by the Film Division compulsory throughout the country. The Division also aims at fostering the growth of the documentary film movement, which is of immense significance to India in the field of national information, communication and integration (Knowindia 2015). Just before passing The Cinematograph Act on March 21, 1952, 1st edition of International Film Festival of India (IFFI) was organised by Film Division in Mumbai (New Empire cinema) from January 24 to February 1, 1952.

The fundamental philosophical theme on which the IFFI was started is: “*Ayam bandhurayam neti ganana laghuchetasam, Udāracharitanām tu vasudhaiva kutumbakam*”, The English translation of this ancient Vedic period Indian philosophical thought is “One is my brother and the other is not – is the thinking of a narrow-minded person. For those who are broad-minded, liberals, or noble people, the entire world is one big family”. This ancient Indian philosophical thought is considered as the origin of globalization with a heart, in contrast with the present globalization (without a heart) propagated by the western and European economies (Subhash and Chen 2012). *Nothing exemplifies the Indian notion of non-violence and peaceful coexistence as ‘Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam’*, the phrase on which the IFFI and its theme are rooted (IFFI 2015). The 1st edition of IFFI saw entries from 23 countries with around 40 feature and 100 short films, of which the 4 Indian entries were *Awara* (Hindi), *Patala Bhairavi* (Telugu), *Amar Bhoopali* (Marathi), and *Babla* (Bengali) and other notable films were *Bicycle Heives*, *Miracle of Milan & Open City* (Italy), *Yukiwarisoo* (Japan), *Dancing Fleese* (UK), *The River* (USA) and *Fall of Berlin* (USSR). It was the first time that the Indian Film Industry was exposed to a vast range of outstanding post-war era films, and the festival was non-competitive in nature (DFI 2015). The festival was subsequently taken to Chennai, Delhi, and Kolkata, but it was not organized on an annual basis. The 2nd edition of IFFI held in

New Delhi from October 27 to November 2, 1962 was also non-competitive; and the 3rd edition held in New Delhi from January 3 to 21, 1965, competition was introduced and continued for the next 7 years, all held in New Delhi.

From 1965 to 2004 IFFI was held in different states of India and during 2004 Goa was identified as the permanent venue with the inauguration of the 35th International Film Festival of India (IFFI-2004) in Panaji, Goa on November 29, 2004. Now, and for the last decade, film tourism is being promoted during the month of November every year and it has resulted in many changes in the social setup of Goa, which directly and indirectly influences the quality of life of the residents of Goa.

9.3 Methodology

Since there were very few studies carried out on film tourism and its impact on the residents quality of life, and also no similar studies were carried out on IFFI and its impact on the quality of life of the residents in the state of Goa, the present study was carried out with the aim of identifying the perception of residents about the impact of IFFI on their life. IFFI is an annual event, usually taking place during November every year, data were hence collected during the 45th IFFI from November 2014 to April 2015 from residents who has been living in Goa for more than 6 months, because any lesser stay period may not allow the residents to assess the impact on their quality of life from such events. The selection of respondents was based on convenience because, in general, the residents who were approached by the investigator were reluctant to participate in the survey as most of them were not happy with the way the event IFFI was organized by the authorities. Those residents who were willing to participate after convincing the purpose of the present research were given the questionnaire. Based on the existing literature review on event tourism, especially focusing on film tourism and its impact on quality of life of various stakeholders, a structured questionnaire was developed. Around 200 questionnaires were distributed, of which 190 questionnaires were returned by the respondents, of which 4 were incomplete, and thus, only 186 useable questionnaires were received with a response rate of 93%.

The survey questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part included 35 statements on residents' perceptions of the film tourism and how it affects their quality of life. These statements were derived from the previous literature review on resident reactions to tourism and various events including film tourism (Beeton 2001, 2004a, b, 2005; Connell 2005a, b; Croy and Walker 2003; Hudson and Ritchie 2006a, b; Hudson and Tung 2010; Hudson et al. 2010; Getz and Page 2016, Mordue 2001, 2009; Riley and van Doren 1992; Riley et al. 1998; Tooke and Baker 1996). All 35 statements came under the four subsets of quality of life, viz., Community Pride, Personal Benefits, Negative Environmental effect and Negative Social effect. Both positive and negative aspects of quality of life were included. The participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The second part of the questionnaire tried to identify the residents general perception about IFFI; viz., “I support IFFI Tourism”, “I am Neutral”, and “I oppose IFFI Tourism”. Options were given to respondents to identify themselves as a Supporter/Neutral/Opposer of film tourism during the survey. They were informed that after answering the 35 statements which reflects on improvement of quality of life as a result of IFFI, they may identify themselves as a supporter if they feel that their quality of life is improved, as an opposer if they feel that their quality of life is adversely affected and neutral if no change had taken place in their quality of life. Based on their opinion, analysis was carried out by classifying respondents as supporter/neutral/opposer of film tourism. The respondent’s basic demographic information, viz., age, gender, education, marital status, monthly income, and occupation were collected using the third part of the questionnaire.

A chi-square test is applied to find the answer to RQ1 and a multi-logit analysis is applied to study the effects of variations in demographic characteristics of residents with respect to their attitude towards film tourism to find the answer to RQ2. Change in demographic variables seems to be relevant in defining the community opinion toward tourism aspects. Demographic resident tendency related with host’s attitude could be useful tool for tourism developers. To achieve this, a multi-logit model was run. If any demographic characteristic showed a significant difference between the clusters, logit analysis permits the deviation of predictive parameters on the significant variables. In this multi-logit analysis, the variable of three groups (CL_3i; Supporters/Neutral/Opposers) was treated as the dependent variable and demographic characteristics as independent variables and multi-logit regression is applied to determine the factor that explains the pertinence of a concrete type of cluster. In multinomial logit notation, the model was written as:

$$\text{Multinomial Logit} \quad \text{CL_3i} = \alpha + \beta_j x_k,$$

Where CL_3i is the odds of occurrence on cluster i over the other clusters 2; α = the intercept parameter; β_j = the vector of slope parameter and x_k = the explanatory demographic variables (Age, Education, Gender, Income, Length of Stay, Marital Status). Finally Factor Analysis is applied to find the answer for RQ3 and a Mean test is used to answer RQ 4.

9.4 Analysis and Discussion

9.4.1 Demographic Profiling of Residents

Change in demographic variables seems to be relevant in defining the community opinion towards tourism development, in this case, the impact of film tourism. With the exception of gender and length of stay, all other demographic characteristics of residents have statistical significance when it comes to impact of IFFI on the quality of life. Exhibit 9.1 shows general demographic profiling of residents gives age

Exhibit 9.1 Demographi profiling of residents and attitude towards film tourism

Demographic characteristic (N = 186)		Residents Attitude			Total (%)	χ^2
		Supporter	Neutral	Opposer		
Age	20–29	25	48	7	43.0	57.33*
	30–39	9	20	5	18.3	
	40–49	3	26	8	19.9	
	50 and above	2	9	24	18.8	
Education	Up to 12 years study	11	22	23	30.1	15.16*
	Graduation	11	29	5	24.2	
	Post graduation	17	52	16	45.7	
Gender	Male	19	53	26	52.7	1.033
	Female	20	50	18	47.3	
Income	Less than 2000 USD	28	50	25	55.4	11.75*
	2000–20,000 USD	6	47	15	26.6	
	Above 20,000 USD	5	6	4**	8.1	
Length of stay	Less than a year	5	7	1**	7.0	5.451
	1–10 years	22	65	24	59.7	
	10 years ad above	12	31	19	33.3	
Marital status	Unmarried	18	46	21	45.7	15.16*
	Married	21	57	23	54.3	

*p < 0.05

**The authors acknowledge that the number of observations in those cases are low (the expected value under the hypothesis of independences is less than 5) but they leave this analysis for the sake of explanation

distribution as follows Age 20–29 (43%), 30–39 (18.3%), 40–49 (19.9%), 50 and above (18.8%), it clearly shows that there was a significant age difference between supporters, neutral and opposers of film tourism with regards to age ($\chi^2 = 57.33$, $p < 0.05$), with older people opposing IFFI, while younger people were more supportive to film based tourism. Significant difference was found between education groups ($\chi^2 = 15.16$, $p < 0.05$), as more educated people were neutral towards IFFI and less educated group opposed IFFI. Educational levels were distributed as follows, up to 12 years of schooling (30.1%), graduation (24.2%) and post-graduation (45.7%). It was found to have significant difference ($\chi^2 = 15.16$, $p > 0.05$). Income levels were distributed as follows, less than 2000 USD (55.4%), 2000 USD – 20000 USD (26.6%), and above 20000 USD (8.1%). Significant difference was found with more middle income group being neutral towards Film based tourism ($\chi^2 = 11.75$, $p < 0.05$). Significant difference existed with respect to marital status among opposers, neutral and supporters. With respect to marital status, married people were more neutral in attitude towards film tourism ($\chi^2 = 15.16$, $p < 0.05$).

With respect to gender and length of stay, no statistical significance was observed among the three categories of respondents. There was a roughly even distribution of male and female with 52.2% for male and 47.3% for female in responses with significant difference found with gender ($\chi^2 = 1.033$, $p > 0.05$). Respondents’ length of residence ranged from less than 1 years (7%), 1–10 years (59.7%), and 10 years and

above (33.3%), with no statistical significance($\chi^2 = 5.451, p > 0.05$). Hence, based on the above, the formulated hypothesis (H_1) of RQ1 that “no significant difference between Film Tourism (Supporters/Neutral/Opposers) with respect to age, gender, marital status, income, education, and length of stay” is rejected with an exception of gender, and length of stay.

9.4.2 Marginal Coefficient

Multi Logit Regression and Marginal effects were to answer RQ2: Is it possible to identify the effect of variations of population characteristics on each of the groups viz.; Supporters, Neutral, or Opposer?; which investigates the effects of the demographic variables over the dependent variable for each group significantly different between the clusters. As shown by the result in Exhibit 9.2, the marginal effect for variable age and income is significant at 95% level of confidence for group of Supporters, meaning that if a resident belonging to the age group (50 and above), the probability of being a supporter will be decreased by 25.2% as compared to the age group 20–29, also a resident belonging to the age group (40–49 years), the probability of being a supporter will be decreased by 21.9% as compared to age group (20–29 years). Similarly, a resident belonging to Income group (2000–20,000 USD), the probability of being a supporter will be decreased by 14.3% as compared to a resident belonging to the income group of less than 2000USD.

Exhibit 9.2 Residents classification based on their different attitudes towards film tourism (supporters, neutral and opposers)

Demographic characteristic		Residents attitude		
		Supporter	Neutral	Opposer
Age	20–29	BC	BC	BC
	30–39	-0.0743	-0.0009	0.0752
	40–49	-0.219*	0.0922	0.1268
	50 and above	-0.252*	-0.2831*	0.5355*
Education	Up to 12 years study	BC	BC	BC
	Graduation	-0.0143	0.213*	-0.1999*
	Post graduation	-0.0005	0.204*	-0.2043*
Gender	Male	-0.0492	0.0217	0.0274
	Female	BC	BC	BC
Income	Less than 2000USD	BC	BC	BC
	2000–20,000 USD	-0.143*	0.188*	-0.0447
	Above 20,000 USD	0.1621	-0.104	-0.0579
Length of stay	Less than a year	BC	BC	BC
	1–10 years	-0.1537	0.115	0.0379
	10 years and above	-0.1486	-0.004	0.1531
Marital status	Unmarried	-0.0782	0.0338	0.0443
	Married	BC	BC	BC

*p < 0.05; **BC** base category

Residents showing Neutral attitude towards Film Tourism had a marginal effect for variable age, education and income significant at 95% level of confidence, meaning that for a resident in the age group (50 and above), the probability of having a neutral opinion will decrease by 28.3% as compared to age group 20–29. Similarly a resident with the education qualification of Post-Graduation, the probability of them having a neutral opinion will increase by 20.4% as compared to a resident with education qualification of up to 12 years of schooling, also a resident with the education qualification of Graduation, probability of them having neutral opinion will increase by 21.3% as compared to a resident with education qualification of up to 12 years of schooling. Also residents belonging to Income group (2000–20,000 USD), the probability of them having a neutral opinion will increase by 18.8% as compared to a resident with income of less than 2000 USD.

The variable age and education is significant at 95% confidence interval for *Opposer*, meaning a resident belonging to the age group (50 and above), the probability of them being an Opposer will be increase by 53.5% as compared to residents in the age group 20–29. Similarly a resident with education qualification of post-graduation, the probability of them opposing film tourism will decrease by 19.9% as compared to a resident with an education qualification of up to 12 years of school education, also a resident with education qualification of Graduation, the probability of Opposing Film Tourism will decrease by 20.43% as compared to a resident with education qualification of up to 12 years of school education.

9.4.3 Factor Analysis of Residents Perception

Exploratory factor analysis is used in order to answer RQ3: Is it possible to identify important factors which drive Quality of Life perception of residents due to Film tourism in Goa?; i.e.; to identify factors driving resident's perception; this analysis was conducted to assess the dimensionality of the 38 items (refer Exhibit 9.3). Kaiser's (1974) overall measure of sampling adequacy is 0.85, indicating that the data are appropriate for the principal components model. Values of 0.6 and above are required for a good factor analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell 1989). An examination of the screen plots derived from principal component analysis with varimax rotation indicated that a four-factor solution was appropriate for these data.

These four factors explained 57.43% of the variance in attitudes toward tourism. Although this percentage is a little less than the 58% found by Lankford and Howard (1994). Of all 38 perception related items based upon the post-survey data were initially factor analyzed; 4 items was removed due to factor loading lower than 0.4. Thirty-four items were factor analyzed again, resulting in the following four underlying dimensions. All factors had reliability coefficients from a low of 0.90 to the high of 0.94. These factors were labelled as: (F1) Community Pride, (F2) Personal gains, (F3) Negative Environmental impact, and (F4) Negative social impact. F1 and F2 deal with the positive aspects of quality of life where as F3 and F4 represents negative aspects. This clearly shows that film tourism in Goa does have positive and negative

Exhibit 9.3 Factors driving residents quality of life

	Quality of life perception statements	Factor loading			
		F1	F2	F3	F4
	COMMUNITY PRIDE (F1)				
1	They have improved the city's tourism image	0.522			
2	I've gained a sense of pride through these events	0.677			
3	They have made the city more international	0.780			
4	They have contributed to the city's tourism	0.739			
5	They have created more network opportunities for residents	0.838			
6	They have promoted economic development	0.844			
8	I've had lots of enjoyment through IFFI	0.646			
9	They have raised the employment rate	0.743			
10	They have created profits for the government	0.652			
11	They have improved shopping opportunities	0.625			
12	They have created profits for private enterprise	0.543			
13	They have led to the creation of new facilities	0.679			
14	They have improved overall living standards of the residents	0.763			
15	They have created many leisure & entertainment opportunities	0.811			
16	They have created new family-based leisure opportunities	0.739			
17	They have provided opportunities to learn about their own community	0.637			
18	These events expose local artists to expertise	0.784			
19	These events provide local artists with an opportunity to showcase their talents	0.835			
	PERSONAL GAINS (F2)				
20	They have enriched my life		0.734		
21	They have brought excitement to my life		0.704		
22	They have brought emotional experience to my life		0.759		
	NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT (F3)				
23	They have created air pollution			0.798	
24	They have destroyed the natural environment			0.832	
25	They have damaged heritage sites			0.702	
26	They have disrupted normal life			0.766	
27	They have created traffic jams			0.710	
28	They have put pressure on urban services			0.784	
29	Parking space has reduced			0.727	
30	Sewage problems has increased			0.813	
31	They have made the place more dirty (littering)			0.805	
32	These have led to increase in alcohol and drug abuse			0.627	
	NEGATIVE SOCIAL EFFECT (F4)				
33	These have led to increase in prostitution				0.88
34	These have led to increase in crime rate				0.88
	ITEMS	19	3	10	2
	EIGEN VALUE	11.5	6.01	2.05	1.67
	VARIANCE EXPLAINED	31.1	16.2	5.56	4.51
	TOTAL VARIANCE EXPLAINED	57.43%			
	KMO MEASURE OF SAMPLING ADEQUACY	0.861			
	CRONBACH'S ALPHA	0.94	0.94	0.94	0.94

impacts on the quality of life of residents. Respondents are very well aware that the DMOs are not managing the event IFFI in the best possible manner, but rather as a stop gap arrangement. Furthermore, the majority of residents were of the opinion (based on the informal conversations) that other stakeholders of film tourism (DMOs, producers, tourists, entrepreneurs) are not bothered about making IFFI a sustainable event for the betterment of Goa as an international film tourism destination.

9.4.4 Mean Test of Factors Across Demographic Profile

In order to answer RQ 4: Is there any difference in perception with regards to Quality of life factors across demographic profiles; a mean test was done to analyze difference in perceived Quality of Life factors identified in the preceding section across demographic profiles. Results as per Exhibit 9.4 showed that Factor 1 (Community pride) was not found to be different across various demographic profiles. Factor 2 (Personal Gain) was perceived differently across variable length of stay, implying people who are residents of Goa for more than 10 years found more

Exhibit 9.4 Factors driving residents quality of life and demographic profiling)

Demographic characteristic		Factors driving resident perception			
		F1	F2	F3	F4
Age	20–29	4.28	3.12	4.49	3.56
	30–39	4.84	3.57	4.83	3.86
	40–49	4.25	3.11	4.88	4.29
	50 and above	4.57	3.21	5.73	4.75
	F-value	0.67	0.50	7.31*	3.44*
Education	Up to 12 years study	4.49	2.96	5.00	3.58
	Graduation	4.38	3.72	4.38	3.97
	Post graduation	4.27	3.11	5.03	4.25
	F-value	0.558	2.26	3.33*	1.93
Gender	Male	4.44	3.09	5.07	4.20
	Female	4.28	3.36	4.65	3.75
	t-value	-0.886	0.947	-2.112*	-1.563
Income	Less than 2000USD	4.48	3.36	4.75	3.58
	2000–20,000 USD	4.26	3.07	5.04	4.63
	Above 20,000 USD	4.00	2.84	4.80	3.83
	F-value	1.38	0.76	0.92	6.02*
Length of stay	Less than a year	4.67	2.94	4.09	2.15
	1–10 years	4.28	2.75	4.71	3.76
	10 years and above	4.45	4.09	5.31	4.78
	F-value	0.85	10.79*	6.37*	12.63*
Marital status	Unmarried	4.48	3.24	4.80	4.05
	Married	4.26	3.19	4.91	3.93
	t-value	1.201	0.198	-0.531	0.437

*p < 0.05

personal benefits with Film based Tourism activity ($F = 10.79$, $p < 0.05$). Factor 3 (Negative environmental effect) was perceived significantly different across Age ($F = 7.31$, $p < 0.05$), Education ($F = 3.33$, $p < 0.05$), Gender ($t = -2.121$, $p < 0.05$), Length of stay ($F = 6.37$, $p < 0.05$).

Residents in the age group 50, Post graduates, males and residing in Goa for more than 10 years perceived that Film tourism has brought negative environmental effects such as increased air pollution, heritage sites getting damaged, an increase in drug abuse, parking space, sewage problems as well as putting enormous pressure on facilities meant for locals. Factor 4 (Negative social effect) was perceived across Age ($F = 3.44$, $p < 0.05$), Income ($F = 6.02$, $p < 0.05$) and Length of stay ($F = 12.63$, $p < 0.05$). Residents in the age group 50, belonging to the income group (2000–20,000 USD) and residing in Goa for more than 10 years highly agreed that Film Tourism has brought with it negative social effects such as an increase in crime rate, drug mafia and prostitution.

Hence, based on the above, the formulated hypothesis (H_2) of RQ 3, that “no significant difference exists between perceived Quality of life factors which drives resident’s perception with respect to age, gender, income, marital status, education, length of stay” is rejected with an exception of F1 (Community pride) which was not perceived differently, and which clearly corroborates with similar studies previously carried out, that age, education and income influences residents perception towards Film tourism.

9.5 Conclusion

It has been observed that resident’s perception is driven by the benefits they perceive about tourism. If cost outweighs benefits, opposition happens for a tourism venture and vice versa. Findings of this paper are in line with SET (Social Exchange Theory), as the majority of the respondents feels that the benefits are not completely passed on to the residents, hence they feel that being in a position to manage and control the event like EFFI, DMOs are not really taking interest in improving the quality of life at the destination. The majority of studies carried out in Film tourism measured resident attitude but failed to analyze the possibility of predicting the change in perception with variations of demographic factors. With this background, the present study tried to find out whether any relation exists between demographic variables and residents attitude towards Film tourism as well as the effect a change in demographic variables will have on resident’s attitude and to what extent. Also this study sheds light on factors which drive resident’s perception about Film tourism. The present study is unique in the sense that no similar study combining film tourism and its impact on residents quality of life has been carried out so far, this adds to the existing literature, and is hence relevant in the present tourism literature.

The importance of assessing the demographic characteristics of residents will help the DMOs to plan and manage film tourism as an important event. The result of the study showed that age, income and education of residents has a significant

impact on resident's attitude towards film tourism, implying highly educated and younger people support Film based tourism. Senior residents were the prime opposers. Furthermore, this research shows that any increase in age leads to an increase in the probability of being opposer primarily due to negative environmental and social effect it has on society. Moreover, the increase in Education level showed a sharp increase in attitudes towards supporting these activities mainly because of new job opportunities which these kinds of tourism activities bring to the society at large.

Assessing factors driving resident's quality of life revealed four distinct groups of variables, viz.; Community pride, Personal Benefits, Negative Environmental effect and Negative Social Effect. These four factors are essentially the very basic factors studied when it comes to assessing the quality of life of residents in a particular region, both positive and negative aspects. Residents staying in a destination for more than 10 years showed a high rating for Personal benefits implying that they feel it has helped them with employment and monetary terms, which again corroborates with the SET, i.e., residents will be more supportive when the benefits are more, oppose when the cost is more than benefits, and be neutral when no change is perceived. Senior Residents, Post-graduates, Males and residing in Goa for more than 10 years perceived that Film tourism has brought negative environmental effects such as increased air pollution, heritage sites are getting damaged, an increase in drug abuse, parking and sewage problems, as well as putting enormous pressure on facilities meant for locals. These are the negative aspects on quality of life which needs to be taken care of before the destination ceases to attract tourists in the future. Event organizers can address this problem which might reduce the resistance of locals for these kinds of events. In essence, one can see that residents are very much concerned about negative environmental and social effects which directly impact the quality of life due to film tourism.

As stated in the literature, local support is essential for the creation of an enjoyable tourism product and therefore, this research provides a base for successful tourism policies. Past research has shown the different impacts of tourism on the local community, and the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards tourism, however no research has shown nor how much these perceptions and attitudes change according to a change in the demographic profile of the local community. This research limits to the prediction of purely film based tourism activity in Goa which is comparatively in a nascent stage as compared to other developed countries where film tourism has been developed in the most sustainable manner. The DMOs [Entertainment Society of Goa (ESG) as well as Goa Tourism Development Corporation (GTDC)] must consider the residents' perceptions and opinions into consideration and improve the essential four A's of tourism. Currently, Goa as an attraction is getting negatively affected due to overcrowding, increased pollution especially due to inefficient garbage disposal policy, and misuse of resources. Similarly the amenities are also not in good condition, viz., accommodation issues, poor sanitation facilities, inferior food quality, as well as shortage of water and electricity. The most difficult issue is accessibility, viz., inefficient transportation facilities especially the private taxi operations, regular traffic congestion during season time, and inadequate parking facilities. Finally, absence of ancillary services

(for example lack of additional or supplementary attractions and also inadequate peripheral tourism development) resulted in Goa as being the least sought after film tourism destination. Hence DMOs must take reactive (since not taken any proactive action, resulted in the existing pathetic condition) strategic initiatives for improving all the above mentioned conditions and issues so as to ensure that Goa becomes one of the top ten film tourism destinations in the world by 2020. Furthermore, finding a core reason for opinion and then applying logit model to predict the change could have a wider application in policy formulation and the development of film based tourism in Goa. If the DMOs take the necessary measures for improving the overall infrastructure and allow and enable the benefits to be passed on to the residents, residents attitude towards film tourism will improve considerably in a positive manner. Being one of the smallest states in India, DMOs of the state of Goa have the advantage of formulating and implementing efficient and sustainable strategic initiatives for developing and improving the film tourism segment as one of the most sought after annual events in India in the coming years.

Further research may reveal more information on the impact of IFFI. Assessing film tourists' perceptions and motivations may reveal the much required information about the potential future demand for IFFI that can be used by the DMOs to segment the film tourists and market the IFFI in a better way to both domestic and international markets. Another aspect which needs attention concerns the hospitality industry, which will provide the information about carrying capacity and subsequently allow the stakeholders to improve the quality and standard of their operations to be on par with any other international destination. Along with this, a serious effort is to be done to study the role and importance of transportation facilities available for providing better, efficient and cheaper transport for the tourists that are on par with any other tourist destinations around the world.

Note:

Earlier version the paper titles "Residents Perception Towards Film Tourism in Goa: A Multi-Logit Analysis", was presented at the 3rd World Research Summit for Tourism and Hospitality & 1st USA-China Tourism Research Summit; Florida, USA, 15–19 December 2015 (jointly organized by UCF Rosen College of Hospitality Management, Orlando, FL, USA and Elsevier).

Acknowledgement Authors acknowledge the constructive criticism received from two anonymous referees, which helped in bringing the paper in its present form. Authors also acknowledge the English proofreading and editing support by Simone Dimitriou, Assistant of Research, Institute of Tourism, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland, Valais.

References

- 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.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665–690.

- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' strategies in responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 17(4), 610–616.
- Beeton, S. (2001). Smiling for the camera: The influence of film audiences on a budget tourism destination. *Tourism, Culture and Communication*, 3, 15–25.
- Beeton, S. (2004a). The more things change. A legacy of film-induced tourism. In W. Frost, W. G. Croy, & S. Beeton (Eds.), *Proceedings of the international tourism and media conference* (pp. 4–14). Melbourne: Australia, Tourism Research Unit, Monash University.
- Beeton, S. (2004b). Rural tourism in Australia: Has the gaze altered? Tracking rural images through film and tourism promotion. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6(3), 125–135.
- Beeton, S. (2005). *Film-induced tourism*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Brayley, R., Var, T., & Sheldon, P. (1990). Perceived influence of tourism on social issues. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(2), 284–289.
- Busby, G., & Klug, J. (2001). Movie-induced tourism: The challenge of measurement and other issues. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 7(4), 316–332.
- Busby, G., Ergul, M., & Eng, J. (2013). Film tourism and the lead actor: An exploratory study of the influence on destination image and branding. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 24, 395–404.
- Connell, J. (2005a). Toddlers, tourism and Tobermory: Destination marketing issues and TV-induced tourism. *Tourism Management*, 26, 763–776.
- Connell, J. (2005b). What's the story in Balamory? The impacts of a children's TV programme on small tourism enterprises on the Isle of Mull, Scotland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13, 228–255.
- Connell, J. (2012). Film tourism: Evolution, progress and prospects. *Tourism Management*, 33(5), 1007–1029.
- Couldry, N. (2005). On the actual street. In D. Crouch, R. Jackson, & F. Thompson (Eds.), *The media and the tourist imagination. Converging cultures* (pp. 60–75). London: Routledge.
- Crompton, J. L., Lee, S., & Shuster, T. J. (2001). A guide for undertaking economic impact studies: The Springfest example. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(1), 79–87.
- Croy, W. G. (2010). Planning for film tourism: Active destination image management. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 7(1), 21–30.
- Croy, W. G. (2011). Film tourism: Sustained economic contributions to destinations. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 3(2), 159–164.
- Croy, W. G., & Heitmann, S. (2011). Tourism and film. In P. Robinson, S. Heitmann, & P. Dieke (Eds.), *Research themes in tourism* (pp. 188–204). Wallingford: CABI.
- Croy, G., & Walker, R. D. (2003). Rural tourism and film e issues for strategic rural development. In D. Hall, L. Roberts, & M. Mitchell (Eds.), *New directions in rural tourism* (pp. 115–133). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Depez, C. (2013). The film division of India, 1948–1964: The early days and the influence of the British documentary film tradition. *Film History*, 25(3), 149–173.
- DFF. (2015). International Film Festival of India. Directorate of Film Festivals. <http://www.dff.nic.in/iffi.asp>. Accessed 9 June 2015.
- D'Mello, C., Chang, L., Kamat, K., Scaglione, M., Weiermair, K., & Subhash, K. B. (2015). An examination of factors influencing tourists attitude towards tourism in Goa. *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Systems*, 8(2), 1–11.
- D'Mello, C., Fernandes, S., Zimmermann, F. M., Subhash, K. B., & Ganef, J. P. (2016a). Multi-stakeholder perceptions about sustainable tourism in Goa: A structural equation modeling. *International Journal of Tourism and Travel*, 9(1–2), 21–39.
- D'Mello, C., Chang, L., Subhash, K. B., Kamat, K., Zimmermann, F. M., & Weiermair, K. (2016b). Comparison of multi-stakeholder perception of tourism sustainability in Goa. *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Systems*, 11(2), 1–13.
- Getz, D., & Page, S. J. (2016). Progress and prospects for event tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 52, 593–631.
- Giacopassi, D., & Stitt, B. G. (1994). Assessing the impact of casino gambling on crime in Mississippi. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 18(1), 117–131.

- Heitmann, S. (2010). Film tourism planning and development - questioning the role of stakeholders and sustainability. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 7(1), 31–46.
- Hudson, S., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2006a). Promoting destinations via film tourism: An empirical identification of supporting marketing initiatives. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44, 387–396.
- Hudson, S., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2006b). Film tourism and destination marketing: The case of Captain Corelli's Mandolin. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(3), 256–268.
- Hudson, S., & Tung, V. W. T. (2010). "Lights, camera, action...!" Marketing film locations to Hollywood. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 28(2), 188–205.
- Hudson, S., Wang, Y., & Gil, S. M. (2010). The influence of a film on destination image and the desire to travel: A cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13, 177–190.
- IFFI. (2015). International Film Festival of India. <http://www.iffi.nic.in/aboutus.asp>. Accessed 9 June 2015.
- Jurowski, C. (1994). *The interplay of elements affecting host community resident attitudes toward tourism: A path analytic approach*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(2), 3–11.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31–36.
- Kamat, K., Chen, R. F., D'Mello, C., Scaglione, M., Weiermair, K., & Subhash, K. B. (2016). The social, economic, and environmental impacts of Casino tourism on the residents of Goa. *Latin American Tourismology Review* [Revista Latino-Americana De Tourismologia], 2(1), 44–54.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management*, 36, 527–540.
- Kim, S. (sean), Kim, S. (San), & Oh, M. (2017). Film tourism town and its local community. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2016.1276005>. Accessed 9 June 2017.
- Knowindia. (2015). *Cinema in India: Film Division*. <http://knowindia.gov.in/knowindia/cinema.php>. Accessed 9 June 2015.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. (1994). Revising TIAS. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4), 829–831.
- 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.
- Li, S., Li, H., Song, H., Lundberg, C., & Shen, S. (2017). The economic impact of on-screen tourism: The case of The Lord of the Rings and the Hobbit. *Tourism Management*, 60, 177–187.
- Lin, Y. S., & Huang, J. Y. (2008). Analyzing the use of TV mini-series for Korea tourism marketing. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 24(2–3), 223–227.
- Lin, Y. S., Lin, P. L., & Huang, H. L. (2007). Study on correlation among tourists' travel behavior, service quality, satisfaction and loyalty – Using Jian Hu Shan Theme Park as an example. *Journal of Sport, Leisure and Hospitality Research*, 2(2), 67–83.
- Mordue, T. (2001). Performing and directing resident/tourist cultures in heartbeat country. *Tourist Studies*, 1, 233–252.
- Mordue, T. (2009). Television, tourism and rural life. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(3), 332–345.
- Mueller, C. (2006). *Film festival tourism*. <http://www.filmfestivals.com/cgi-bin/shownews.pl>. Accessed 15 Sept 2008.
- Murphy, P. E., & Carmichael, B. A. (1991). Assessing the tourism benefits of an open access sports tournament: The 1989 B.C. winter games. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29, 32–36.
- O'Neill, K., Butts, S., & Busby, G. (2005). The corellification of Cephallonian tourism. *Anatolia*, 16(2), 207–226.
- Pizam, A., & Pokela, J. (1985). The perceived impacts of casino gambling on the community. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(2), 147–165.
- Riley, R., & van Doren, C. (1992). Movies as tourism promotion: A push factor in a pull location. *Tourism Management*, 13, 267–274.

- Riley, R., Baker, D., & van Doren, C. (1998). Movie-induced tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25, 919–935.
- Rojek, C. (1995). *Decentring leisure. Rethinking leisure theory*. London: Sage.
- Sine, H. (2010). Film tourism planning and developments – Questioning the role of stakeholders and sustainability. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 7(1), 31–46.
- Stitt, B. G., Nicholas, M., & Giacomassi, D. (2003). Does the presence of casinos increase crime? An examination of casino and control communities. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49, 253–283.
- Subhash, K. B., & Chen, R. (2012). Geography of transnational terrorism: An Indian perspective. In S. Sharma, D. Das, R. Jain, & P. S. Sangwan (Eds.), *India emerging: Opportunities and challenges* (pp. 106–124). New Delhi: Pragun Publication.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Harper & Row.
- Tooke, N., & Baker, M. (1996). Seeing is believing: The effect of film on visitor numbers to screened locations. *Tourism Management*, 17, 87–94.
- Wiki. (2015a). *History of Goa*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Goa. Accessed 18 June 2015.
- Wiki. (2015b). *Timeline of Goan History*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_Goan_history. Accessed 18 June 2015.
- Zhang, X., Ryan, C., & Cave, J. (2016). Residents, their use of a tourist facility and contribution to tourist ambience: Narratives from a film tourism site in Beijing. *Tourism Management*, 52, 416–429.