



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Destination Marketing & Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jdmm

Research Paper

Community-based collaborative tourism planning in islands: A cluster analysis in the context of Costa Smeralda

Giacomo Del Chiappa^{a,b,*}, Marcello Atzeni^c, Vahid Ghasemi^c^a Department of Economics and Business (DiSEA) & CRENoS, University of Sassari, Italy^b Senior Research Fellow, School of Tourism & Hospitality, University of Johannesburg, South Africa^c Department of Economics and Business, University of Cagliari, Italy

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Community involvement
 Community integration
 Exogenous-driven tourism development
 Heritage proximity
 Island destinations
 Italy

ABSTRACT

This study analyses residents' perceptions and attitudes towards tourism development and community integration in tourism planning in an island tourism destination whose economy is widely influenced by the presence of big external investors. Findings reveal that residents believe that tourism planning should be more sensitive to residents and tradition, and be able to guarantee a higher level of heritage proximity in order to achieve a more indigenous/endogenous-oriented development. Exploratory factor analysis and hierarchical and non-hierarchical cluster analysis were conducted. Four clusters were identified ('enthusiastics', 'moderate supporters', 'critics', and 'indifferents'), with significant differences in terms of employment reliance on tourism, length of residence, contact with tourists in everyday life, and level of education. Conversely, they did not differ based on gender, age, employment status, or geographical proximity to the tourist area, thus providing some contradictory insights when compared with previous studies. From a theoretical point of view, the findings seem to suggest that studies devoted to the investigation of residents' view and attitude toward tourism should concentrate more on the personal values of respondents and less on their socio-demographic characteristics, which often render the findings of cluster analysis very site-specific and hard to generalise. Managerial implications are discussed, and suggestions for further research are provided.

1. Introduction

It is widely recognised that tourism is one of the largest and fastest growing industries in the world (UNWTO, 2015). In 2014, it contributed approximately 9% to the world's total GDP; further, it has been estimated that international tourist arrivals worldwide will increase by 3.3% per year between 2010 and 2030 to reach 1.8 billion (UNWTO, 2015). Tourism is widely considered as the main vehicle for economic development on islands (e.g. Croes, 2006), with other sectors often being unable to offset any downturn in tourism activity if and when this should occur (Brown & Cave, 2010). Therefore, tourism can potentially affect the residents' well-being and quality of life (e.g. Kim, Uysal, & Sirgy, 2013; Woo, Kim, & Uysal, 2015). The main goal in developing tourism is to maximise the positive impacts while minimising the negative impacts to the host community (Ritchie & Inkari, 2006). To ensure that the economic, socio-cultural, and environmental benefits of tourism development outweigh the related costs, and that tourism sustainability can be achieved, collaborative policymaking among local authorities, government agencies, businesses, and host communities is needed (Vernon, Essex, Pinder, & Curry, 2005). This is

particularly relevant in the case of islands, where sustainable tourism development asks for a high level of community integration (Chen, 2006) in order to preserve their local identity and the unique natural and cultural resources that they own (e.g. Croes, Lee, & Olson, 2013). Hence, in considering and taking into account residents' views, a development process is needed to obtain their support for tourism projects (Ap, 1992) and is crucial for the sustainability of tourism (Woo et al., 2015) and its long-term success (e.g. Fotiadis, Yeh, & Huan, 2016; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). A host community that is positively disposed and hospitable will enhance tourists' experiences (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002), increase tourists' willingness to revisit the destination (Fridgen, 1991), and make tourists more inclined to spread by word of mouth (both online and offline) a positive image about their destination (Chen, Dwyer, & Firth, 2014), thus significantly helping to position the destination brand (Simpson & Siguaw, 2008).

Tourism development on islands is a popular topic in the tourism literature (e.g. Hampton & Christensen, 2007), as is tourism sustainability (Oreja-Rodríguez, Parra-López, & Yanes-Estévez, 2008; Yasarata, Altinay, Burns, & Okumus, 2010). Sustainability, especially

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: gdelchiappa@uniss.it (G. Del Chiappa), marcelloatzeni@icloud.com (M. Atzeni), Va.ghasemi1@studenti.unica.it (V. Ghasemi).<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2016.10.005>

Received 13 November 2015; Received in revised form 12 October 2016; Accepted 21 October 2016

Available online xxxx

2212-571X/© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

in island tourism destinations, is very important, given the growth of economic, environmental, and social challenges. In this type of tourism destination, community-based tourism becomes pivotal (Timothy, 1999). Regrettably, some inequalities can occur on islands in the way benefits generated by tourism are distributed within the local community (Thaman, 2002); hence, collaborative policymaking and community integration are needed to avoid these inequalities at undesirable levels. Finally, island tourism is often characterised by a distinct and unique heritage that represents, together with other aspects (remoteness, wilderness environment, etc) one of the main attractions to the destination (Brown & Cave, 2010). According to previous studies, heritage could lose its meaning if residents, among the other local stakeholders, are not involved in the decision-making process (Garrod & Fyall, 2000).

Despite this, only a handful of papers have focused on analysing residents' perceptions and/or attitudes toward tourism development and community integration during the planning process (e.g. Bestard & Nadal, 2007; Ko & Stewart, 2002; Mitchell & Reid, 2001; Nunkoo, Gursoy et al., 2010; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2010; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001), especially when an island's economy is widely influenced by imperialism (e.g. Sinclair-Maragh & Gursoy, 2015). Further, very few studies have applied cluster analysis and/or have been carried out considering the context of Italy.

This paper was therefore carried out with the aim of contributing to the current and limited body of knowledge about residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism activity and their involvement in tourism planning in the context of island tourism destinations. The research site of this study is Arzachena, a municipality on the island of Sardinia (Italy), whose administrative boundaries include the greater part (90%) of Costa Smeralda, one of the most well-established tourism destinations in the world.

There were several reasons why it was decided to apply the study to this tourism destination. First, according to recent research, the destination can be described as being in the mature and stagnation stages of its lifecycle (Del Chiappa, 2012). Hence, for policymakers and destination marketers 'it becomes pivotal to call for increased revitalization efforts, ideas and input from the community residents' (Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001, p. 345). Further, the increase of tourism on the island is frequently sporadic: this circumstance calls for tourism planning and management that is process-oriented through mutual adjustments between stakeholders instead of outcome-oriented, and it must be cognizant of host communities dynamics (Carter, 2004). Finally, the tourism development of the area was and still is widely influenced by the presence of big external investors, thus rendering the research site particularly interesting to investigate residents' perceptions, attitudes, and integration in tourism planning in the context of islands widely influenced by imperialism.

Specifically, the aim of the study is to profile a convenience sample of 890 residents based on their perceptions and attitudes towards tourism development and based on their self-reported level of community integration in tourism planning. Further, it aims to investigate whether significant differences exist among the clusters based on their socio-economic and demographic characteristics (i.e. gender, age, level of education, employment status, geographical proximity to tourist area, economic reliance on tourism, length of residence, and contact with tourists in everyday life).

2. Literature review

Based on the current literature, residents play a relevant dual role in tourism development. On the one hand, the local community, with its traditions, culture, and authenticity, is one of the main 'attractions' for people travelling driven by the purpose of experiencing and connecting with the local culture and authenticity (Murphy, 1985); this means that the host-guest cohabitation and interaction are pivotal in shaping and co-creating the tourist experience. On the other hand,

the local community represents one of the main stakeholders, as it is the one most closely affected by the economic, environmental, and socio-cultural impacts of tourism. As widely recognised by tourism literature, these impacts can be both positive and negative.

Tourism can positively influence the life standards of residents, increasing their income, creating new job opportunities, improving the local infrastructure, increasing the availability of entertainment facilities, promoting the local identity, and so on. Nonetheless, tourism also has the potential to create negative impacts by increasing the cost of living and micro-crimes, exacerbating overcrowding and traffic congestion, and altering the ecosystem (e.g. Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005; Besculides, Lee, & McCormick, 2002; Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Madrigal, 1995; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1990; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001). Social exchange theory suggests that residents' perceptions toward tourism impacts affect their support for tourism development (e.g. Anderek et al., 2005; Ap, 1992; Perdue et al., 1990).

A deep understanding of residents' perception and attitudes toward tourism development is therefore pivotal to obtaining their support for tourism projects (e.g. Ap, 1992; Brida, Osti, & Barquet, 2010), to foster their sense of belonging to the place, and to plan a future course of action that is sensitive to their needs and desires (Sirakaya-Turk, Ekinci, & Kaya, 2007) and that is able to guarantee their well-being. In an attempt to achieve effective resident empowerment and to foster residents' sense of belonging to the community, it would also be useful to assess the so-called heritage proximity, that is, 'the perceptual distance between residents and heritage promotion in a particular location' (Uriely, Israeli, & Reichel, 2009, p. 859). However, it should be noted that resistance to building a community tourism product may come from political leaders, a dominant industry, the chamber of commerce, local businesses, residents, environmentalists, and public agencies at all levels (Blank, 1989).

Community tourism analysis concurs with the idea that planning is a pluralistic process in which different stakeholders have, or should have, equal access to the economic and political resources (Reed, 1997). Blackstock (2005, p. 39, citing Hall, 1996) argues that 'community[-]based tourism (CBT) centres on the involvement of the host community in planning and maintaining tourism development in order to create a more sustainable industry'; said in other words, community-based tourism planning allows us to harness citizens' opinions about tourism development issues (Reed, 1997). To achieve this aim, community-based tourism planning is needed. Collaboration in relation to community-based tourism planning has been defined as 'a process of joint decision making among autonomous key stakeholders of an inter-organizational community tourism domain to resolve problems of the domain and/or to manage issues related to the domain' (Jamal & Getz, 1995, p. 188).

It should be noted that the analysis of residents' views and attitudes toward tourism ('the listening') is a necessary but insufficient condition for achieving collaborative community-based planning. Having analysed such views and attitudes, policymakers and destination marketers should effectively involve residents in tourism planning, thus making them the subject of development (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000) and allowing them to act as stewards of the natural and cultural resources, caring for and conserving them effectively (Tsaour, Lin, & Lin, 2006). Missing this goal would undermine tourism sustainability. For example, Garrod and Fyall (2000) noticed that heritage could lose its meaning if a wide range of local stakeholders is not properly involved in tourism planning. In addition to guaranteeing involvement of residents in the decision-making process, achieving community integration is needed to favour community-based collaborative policymaking able to move toward more sustainable tourism development. According to Mitchell and Reid (2001), community integration is defined 'in terms of decision-making power structures and processes, local control or ownership, type and distribution of employment, and the number of local people employed in the local tourism sector...and

implies that locals take an active and significant role in decision-making' (p. 114).

In an attempt to achieve community involvement and integration, policymakers and destination marketers should act in order to remove any operational (e.g. lack of coordination among stakeholders), structural (e.g. lack of financial resources, skills, and competences) and cultural (e.g. apathy) barriers (Tosun, 2000). On the other side, with the aim of experiencing tourism development that is as endogenously driven as possible, it would be necessary for the residents to willingly support this growth by financially supporting promotion operations, investing in tourism activities, and encouraging their children to undertake tourism-related training/education and/or to enter into a tourism profession (Del Chiappa, Atzeni et al., 2015).

The foregoing literature has found several factors affecting residents' attitude toward tourism. Specifically, these can be categorised into extrinsic and intrinsic factors. According to Faulkner and Tideswell (1997), the former relate to the characteristics of the destination in itself, whereas the latter refer to the characteristics of the host-community members. Among the extrinsic factors, researchers have considered, for example, the degree or stage of tourism development, the degree of tourism seasonality (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000), the tourist–guest ratio, and the type of tourist visiting the destination (Nyaupane, Morais, & Dowler, 2006).

Among the intrinsic factors, it might be reasonable to consider the perceived balance between positive and negative impacts (e.g. Dyer, Gursoy, Sharma, & Carter, 2007; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997), community attachment (Besculides et al., 2002), the level of ecocentric values of residents (Gursoy et al., 2002), the involvement in tourism planning, the geographical proximity to the tourist area (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000), the length of residency (e.g. Gu & Ryan, 2008; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001; Weaver & Lawton, 2001), the level of contact with tourists, and the economic reliance on tourism (Ap, 1992). Finally, intrinsic factors also include the socio-demographic characteristics of residents, such as gender (Rasoolimanesh, Jaafar, Kock, & Ramayah, 2015), age, and level of education (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001; Wang & Pfister, 2008).

Several studies in the context of community-based tourism have analysed residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism development using a cluster analysis approach (e.g. Aguiló & Rosselló, 2005; Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; Brida et al., 2010; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Madrigal, 1995; Presenza, Del Chiappa, & Sheehan, 2013; Ryan & Montgomery, 1994; Vareiro, Remoaldo, & Cadima Ribeiro, 2012). However, very few have adopted a cluster analysis approach in the context of island tourism destinations highly characterised by an exogenous tourism development model, especially in the context of Italy. This occurs despite the fact that, in current literature, it is widely recognised that grouping residents based on their perceptions and attitude to tourism and studying each of them separately might provide useful information to policymakers and tourism developers' to better understand the relationship among the perception factors for each segment (Sinclair-Maragh, Gursoy, & Vieregge, 2015).

3. Methodology

3.1. Study setting

The research site for this study is Arzachena, a municipality with 13,561 inhabitants located in the northeast of Sardinia (Italy) that includes the well-established and famous Costa Smeralda, one of the best-known luxury tourism destinations in the world. Traditionally, this area was based primarily, if not exclusively, on agriculture and farming, and has suffered from very poor infrastructure. The tourism development of this location started in the early 1960s, thanks to a huge investment made by the Prince Aga Khan. Since then, its tourism development has been mostly 'exogenously driven' by the presence of big external investors (namely, the Prince Aga Khan; the Colony

Capital, headed by Tom Barrack; and, currently, the Qatar Holdings Investment), with residents often feeling poorly involved in tourism planning, unable to exert an active and effective role in it, and showing weak attachment to the destination image. Arzachena, and Sardinia as a whole, has enormous opportunities in ecotourism, food and wine tourism, and sport tourism. Further, the destination boasts a strong and unique culture, many traditions, and an impressive heritage and archaeology heritage: hence, a great potential exists for cultural tourism. Despite this, and as it happens on other tourism islands, the area still depends heavily on the notion of sun, sea, and sand. In addition, much of the infrastructure relating to the tourism industry is linked to people not belonging to the local community and is highly concentrated around the coastal zone.

3.2. Research design

For the purposes of this study, a structured questionnaire was developed, based on previous literature devoted to community-based tourism (e.g. Aguiló & Rosselló, 2005; Diedrich & García-Buades, 2009; Dyer et al., 2007; Gursoy, Chi, & Dyer, 2010; Presenza et al., 2013). It was composed of two parts. For the purpose of this study, residents were defined as those persons who maintain residency in a given place (i.e. Arzachena, in this study). Hence, a qualifying question about whether respondents have residency in Arzachena was included in the beginning of the first part. Only people who answered positively were then allowed to complete the questionnaire. Respondents were then asked to reply to some general demographic questions (gender, age, education, etc). The second part asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with statements (items) related to: (a) the positive and negative economic, social, and environmental tourism impacts; (b) residents' willingness to support further tourism development in their area; (c) the implementation of tourism policies and the consequences on local welfare; and (d) the sense of community belonging. To this end, a seven-point Likert scale was used (1= strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree).

The data were collected in 2012 (October and November) through face-to-face interviews conducted by three interviewers who were directly trained and supervised by the authors. The interviewers were instructed about the streets and area in which to administer the questionnaire. Only people aged 18 or over were asked to take part in the survey. In total, 3000 respondents were approached, of which 890 completely filled out the survey, thus yielding a response rate of 29.67%.

4. Findings and discussion

Table 1 shows the general socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. Most respondents were reported to be females (56.06%), in the 36–45-year-old age group (38.16%), administrative workers (25.84%) or freelance workers (19.33%), free of economic reliance on cruise activity (62.77%), married/cohabiting (71.23%), and possessing a high-school degree (49.67%). Further, the majority had resided in the municipality from more than 20 years (49.20%), not very near to the tourist areas (65.59% over 6 km). In addition, 39.04% of respondents interact frequently with tourists in everyday life, and most are not members of any type of association (80.76%).

The findings (Table 2) reveal that residents thought that the positive effects of tourism development outweighed, albeit slightly, the negative impacts ($M=4.86$), and were willing to support further tourism development ($M=5.76$), especially if it were to be sensitive to local tradition and able to guarantee heritage proximity (residents were currently concerned about this: $M=3.99$). Further, they were not extensively willing to support this growth by financially supporting promotion operations ($M=3.03$) or investing in tourism activities; rather, they wanted to do this by encouraging their children to undertake tourism-related training/education and to enter into a

Table 1
Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample.

Variables	%		%
Gender		Married/cohabiting	71.23
Male	43.94	Divorced	6.62
Female	56.06	Education	
Age		Primary school	3.94
18–25	9.62	Middle school	30.07
26–35	24.97	High degree	49.67
36–45	38.16	Bachelor degree	
46–60	21.08	Master degree/PhD	1.63
> 60	6.16	Length of residence in Arzachena	
Employment		< 5	2.96
Executive manager	2.61	5–10	4.10
Administrative worker	25.84	11–15	3.19
Freelance	19.33	16–20	15.26
Retired	5.86	≥ 20	49.2
Teacher	3.47	Membership in associations	
Student	5.97	Yes	19.24
Unemployed	6.84	No	80.76
Other	30.08	Geographical proximity to tourist area	
Economic reliance on tourism		< 2	14.66
Yes	47.23	3–5	19.75
No	62.77	6–10	28.20
Marital status		11–20	23.60
Single	22.15	≥ 21	13.79

tourism profession ($M=4.77$). Further, they felt poorly involved in tourism planning ($M=2.86$), and they thought that many of the businesses related to tourism were run by people who live in the city ($M=3.92$) and that institutions should financially support residents more than others so that endogenous tourism development can occur ($M=5.86$) (Table 2). On the whole, findings highlight that the destination was characterised by a low level of community involvement and integration in tourism planning and development. Further, the findings suggest that the resistance to building a community-based tourism product could have been caused, at least from the residents' perspective, by the predominant role exerted by external investors.

For the purposes of the study, a factor-cluster analysis was adopted (Madrigal, 1995). Hence, an explorative factor analysis, principal component analysis, and varimax rotation were used to reveal the underlying factors in the data. Five factors were identified (52.42% of total variance). The KMO index (Kaiser–Myer–Olkin =.926) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity (chi-square =10603.820; p -value < .0001) confirmed that the results are appropriate to explain the data. Cronbach's alpha was then calculated to test the reliability of the extracted factors; all values were .7 or higher, suggesting that the factors are reliable (Table 3).

The first component was named 'Sense of belonging' (28.58% of total variance), and was strongly related to the sense of belonging and attachment to the community. The second component, labelled 'Ability of involvement of local authorities' (8.5% of the total variance), was correlated with the items that investigate the ability of authorities and policymakers to involve residents in their decisions and to promote territorial and identity elements of local communities. The third component summarised 6.33% of the total variance, and the items relating to residents' perception toward impacts generated by tourism development explained it. For this reason, we named this factor 'Attitude towards tourism development'. The fourth component, 'Support to local entrepreneurship', represented 4.74% of the total variance. This component related to the development of tourism by the local entrepreneurship in the territorial context. The last component was labelled 'Propensity to invest in tourism' (4.26% of total variance), and was related to items that measured the propensity of residents to invest in tourism.

The scores of the five principal components were entered into a cluster analysis. According to the advice given by Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010), a hierarchical cluster (Ward method – Manhattan distances) was performed. Four groups emerged. Then, a non-hierarchical method (k -means) was applied to factor scores defining four different groups of residents. 'Enthusiastics' was reported to be the biggest cluster ($N=289$), followed by 'moderate supporters' ($N=273$), 'critics' ($N=165$), and 'indifferents' ($N=163$).

'Enthusiastics' was the largest group ($N=289$) and included mostly females (60.2%) belonging to the 36–45-year-old age bracket with a high-school degree (47.6%) or middle-school education (36.1%) and without employment reliance on tourism (58.6%). Further, they tended to have been residing in Arzachena for more than 20 years (68.5%), close to tourism areas (66.9% under 10 km), and have had a high level of interaction with tourists (59.8%: the score on the seven-point Likert scale is ≥ 5). They expressed a very positive attitude toward the tourism development of the area ($M=5.66$) and thought positively about the future economic health of the area ($M=4.47$). Nevertheless, they were not willing to support the tourism development, neither with a financial contribution to support tourism promotion ($M=3.29$) nor by personally investing in tourism activities ($M=3.39$). They were very satisfied with living in the area ($M=5.44$), felt highly attached to this community ($M=5.82$), and trusted the ability of local authorities in running promotion operations that are able to exploit the destination identity and authenticity ($M=5.13$). However, they felt poorly involved in tourism planning ($M=3.62$).

'Moderate supporters' ($N=273$) were mostly females (51.6%), middle-aged (37.7% were in the 36–45-year-old age group), and had a high-school degree (52.2%) and employment reliance on tourism (52.1%). Further, they were reported as interacting frequently with tourists in their daily life (the score on the seven-point Likert scale is ≥ 5 : 58.1%). People of this cluster thought that the positive tourism impacts outweigh the negative ones ($M=4.91$), and they were willing to support further tourism development ('I hope that my destination can be developed further for tourism': $M=6.19$). In spite of this, they were critics of the managerial capabilities of local authorities (i.e., 'I feel involved and listened to in the process of tourism programming for the destination': $M=2.32$; 'Local authorities are able to strike a fair balance between protecting the needs and interests of the residents and the need to increase tourist visitation': $M=2.51$). Further, they thought that residents, rather than other people, should be supported financially so that they can invest in tourist activities ($M=6.15$). This cluster expressed a high sense of belonging; for example, it scored high on statements such as 'Belonging to this community is important to me' ($M=6.28$) and 'I feel very attached to my community' ($M=5.68$).

'Critics' ($N=165$) were mostly females (59.1%), belonging to the age bracket 36–45 (44.2%), possessing a high-school degree (49.4%), resided in Arzachena for less than five years (19.4% between 5 and 10 years and only 53.9% for more than 21 years), lived close to a tourism area (57.4%), and interacted frequently with tourists (60.5% of the score on the seven-point Likert scale is ≥ 5). Finally, most of them had a tourism-related job (54%): this aspect would merit further attention. One could argue, even based on previous literature, that people with economic reliance on tourism should favour tourism development, which is not confirmed in our findings. This could be explained by arguing that people belonging to this segment are unsatisfied with how the tourism development is driven more than with the tourism phenomenon in itself. Indeed, the findings reported here suggest that respondents think that the positive effects of tourism development outweigh, even slightly, the negative impacts; in particular, this happened for all aspects: economic ($M=4.24$), sociocultural ($M=4.23$), and environmental effects ($M=4.81$). Further, respondents expected that would experience further tourism development ($M=6.5$), and for this they would also be willing to encourage their children to undertake training and a profession in the tourism sector ($M=5.16$). Respondents belonging to this segment were very critical of the way in

Table 2

Rotated factor matrix (Varimax rotation).

	M.	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Alpha
F1. Sense of belonging		8.86	28.58	.886
O15 - I feel at home in this community	5.07	.766		
O16 - If I had to live in another community I would be displeased	5.07	.622		
O17 - It is important to maintain the traditions of this community	6.09	.531		
O18 - Belonging to this community is important to me	5.36	.793		
O19 - I always know what is going on in my community	3.96	.559		
O20 - I am generally satisfied with life in my community	4.38	.679		
O21 - My community is the perfect place to build a family	4.93	.75		
O22 - The relationships between residents are friendly and cordial	4.82	.672		
O23 - I feel very attached to my community	4.92	.759		
F2. Ability of involvement of local authorities		2.63	8.5	.851
O5 - Local authorities should encourage community participation	3.36	.643		
O6 - I feel involved and listened to in the process of tourism planning	2.86	.483		
O12 - The economic future of this area seems to me healthy and bright	3.60	.453		
O14 -Local authorities are able to strike a fair balance between protecting the needs and interests of the residents with the need to increase tourist visitation	3.26	.621		
O24 - My community through cultural identity and traditions that it expresses is one of the main tourism resources of my destination	4.63	.45		
O25 - The local authorities promote authentic forms of tourism that enhance the local identity	3.99	.733		
O26 - The local authorities are able to effectively communicate the identity and cultural elements of my community to the tourist market	3.83	.757		
O27 - The most part of the tourists are respectful of the environment, traditions and culture that characterises the local community	3.67	.51		
O28 - I identify and recognise myself in Arzachena approach to tourism and the image that it evokes	4.02	.442		
O29 - Many of the businesses related to tourism are run by people who live in the city	3.92	.63		
O30 - The investments carried out on the territory by people who do not live in the area are positive for the socio-economic development of our community	4.3	.53		
F3. Attitude toward tourism development		1.96	6.33	.83
O1 - The economic benefits generated by tourism development are greater than the negative ones	4.76	.775		
O2 - The positive socio-cultural impacts generated by the tourism development are greater than the negative ones	4.56	.765		
O3 - The positive environmental effects generated by tourism development are greater than the negative ones	4.30	.715		
O4 - I think that positive economic, socio-cultural and environmental effects generated by tourism development are greater than the negative ones	4.86	.726		
F4. Support to local entrepreneurship		1.47	4.74	.69
O7 - I hope that my destination can be developed further for tourism	5.76	.648		
O10 - I would encourage my children to undertake training and a profession in the tourism sector	4.77	.462		
O11 - The decision to support the future development of tourism in the region is highly dependent on what kind of tourism the DMO invests	5.33	.49		
O31 - The residents, rather than other people, should be supported financially so that they can invest in tourist activities	5.86	.547		
F5. Propensity to invest in tourism		1.32	4.26	.7
O8 - I am willing to support the development of tourism in the region with a financial contribution to tourism promotion	3.03	.693		
O9 - I am willing to support further development of Arzachena personally by investing in tourism activity	3.74	.781		

which local authorities managed the tourism development in the area and guarantee fair heritage proximity. For example, this cluster scores low on statements such as 'Local authorities are able to strike a fair balance between protecting the needs and interests of the residents with the need to increase tourist visitation' (M=2.62) and 'The local authorities are able to effectively communicate the identity and cultural elements of my community to the tourist market' (M=3.32). Moreover, 'critics' felt a poor level of involvement in tourism planning (M=1.96) and a relatively low sense of belonging; for example, they scored low on statements such as 'Belonging to this community is important to me' (M=4.0) and 'I feel very attached to my community' (M=3.6).

'Indifferents' (N=163) were mostly females (55.2%), belonging to the 36–45-year-old age bracket (33.7%), without employment reliance on tourism (59.3%), and with a high-school degree (52.5%). They had been living for more than 20 years in Arzachena (57.1%), resided relatively close to the tourism area (65% of them live 6–10 km from the tourist area), and did not interact frequently (the score on the seven-point Likert scale is ≤ 4) with tourists in everyday life (50.8%). They expressed a relatively neutral position regarding tourism impacts. Further, they thought that it is important to maintain the traditions of the community (M=4.66) and ask for institutions to financially support the residents, rather than others, so that they can invest in tourism businesses (M=4.18). Further, they seemed to feel a relatively low sense of belonging; for example, they scored low on statements such as 'Belonging to this community is important to me' (M=3.89).

Tests associated with the chi-square statistic (Table 4) showed that significant differences exist between the segments based on employment reliance on tourism ($\chi^2=11.981$, $p=.007$), length of residence ($\chi^2=48.093$, $p=.000$), contact with tourists in everyday life ($\chi^2=32.773$, $p=.018$), and level of education ($\chi^2=21.711$, $p=.041$).

Conversely, no differences were found based on gender ($\chi^2=4.087$, $p=.18$), age ($\chi^2=14.971$, $p=0.243$), employment status ($\chi^2=31.795$, $p=.061$), and geographical proximity to the tourist area ($\chi^2=12.573$, $p=.401$).

These findings seem to confirm some previous studies and disconfirm others, thus adding to the body of knowledge by highlighting that an inconsistent relationship between residents' view and support of tourism and intrinsic factors seems to exist. For example, the findings confirm several previous studies reporting that gender does not moderate residents' perception (e.g. McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Wang & Pfister, 2008), but also disconfirms others that report the opposite (e.g. Rasoolimanesh et al., 2015). Further, the present study seems to disconfirm previous studies showing the moderating effect of age (e.g. Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Látková & Vogt, 2012). As far as education is concerned, the findings confirm Sheldon and Abenoja's (2001) study but disconfirm findings provided by McGehee and Andereck (2004). Quite surprisingly, and contradicting previous studies (e.g. Fredline & Faulkner, 2000), the present study did not find any significant differences among the clusters based on geographical proximity to the tourist area. A similar situation occurs when the length

Table 3
Comparative analysis of the level of agreement of different groups of residents (mean value).

	Indifferents (N=163)	Critics (N=165)	Moderate supporters (n=273)	Enthusiastics (N=289)
F1: Sense of belonging	.7270876	-1.1406348	.6420956	.4547679
F2: Ability of involvement of local authorities	-.0514079	-.0873067	-.8605055	.8917063
F3: Attitude toward tourism development	-.3535799	-.1969787	.0634885	.2519122
F4: Support to local entrepreneurship	-1.3475643	.9651661	.1583747	.059392
F5: Propensity to invest in tourism	.0006729	.1489587	.2024343	-.2766519
O1	3.72	4.24	5.01	5.37
O2	3.73	4.23	4.63	5.16
O3	3.55	3.81	4.16	5.12
O4	3.79	4.44	4.91	5.66
O5	3.28	2.36	2.61	4.7
O6	3.33	1.96	2.32	3.62
O7	3.9	6.5	6.19	6.03
O8	2.86	2.68	3.08	3.29
O9	3.15	4.27	4.11	3.39
O10	3.39	5.16	4.85	5.33
O11	4.11	5.65	5.43	5.79
O12	3.36	2.89	3.29	4.47
O14	3.1	2.62	2.51	4.39
O15	3.72	3.42	5.95	5.96
O16	3.66	3.83	5.75	5.9
O17	4.66	5.72	6.62	6.62
O18	3.89	4.0	6.28	6.09
O19	3.33	2.68	4.37	4.68
O20	3.56	2.73	4.71	5.44
O21	3.8	3.37	5.62	5.8
O22	3.9	3.43	5.24	5.75
O23	3.34	3.6	5.68	5.82
O24	3.66	3.88	4.54	5.73
O25	3.59	3.48	3.14	5.3
O26	3.34	3.32	3.04	5.13
O27	3.42	3.55	3.13	4.39
O28	3.19	3.56	3.82	4.89
O29	3.1	3.99	3.23	5.01
O30	3.28	4.85	3.66	5.2
O31	4.18	6.29	6.15	6.3

Table 4
Demographic profile of respondents and χ^2 test.

Variables	Chi-square test	df	sig
Gender	4.087	3	.187
Age	14.971	12	.243
Employment	31.795	21	.061
Economic reliance on tourism	11.981	3	.007
Education	21.711	12	.041
Length of residence	48.093	12	.00
Geographical proximity to tourist area	12.573	12	.401
Contact with tourists	32.773	16	.018

*significant at .05 level, ** significant at .01 level.

of residence is considered: specifically, the findings confirm some studies (e.g. Gu & Ryan, 2008; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001; Weaver & Lawton, 2001) but contradict others (e.g. McCool & Martin, 1994). That said, it could be argued that this apparent inconsistent relationship between residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism and intrinsic factors could be explained, at least partially, by referring to the fact that different studies were carried out in different tourism destinations, each with its peculiarities in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic factors that can affect residents' view and support for tourism. Hence, the results of different studies are quite site-specific, and their findings are hardly generalisable.

5. Theoretical and managerial implications

This study was carried out with the aim of deepening the scientific debate about community integration in an island tourism destination by presenting and discussing the findings of a cluster analysis on a

sample of residents living in Arzachena (Sardinia, Italy), a geographical area whose tourism development has been widely influenced by the presence of big external investors. Overall, the findings reported that residents believed that the positive effects of tourism development outweigh, if only slightly, the negative impacts. This, coupled with the fact that they also tended to express concerns that the economic future of their area is healthy, could explain why they thought that further tourism development was desirable. Furthermore, respondents felt themselves poorly involved in tourism planning and did not think that institutions were currently doing enough to provide them, rather than others, with financial support to invest in tourism businesses. This might contribute to explaining why they thought that tourism planning should be more sensitive to residents and their traditions and able to guarantee a higher level of heritage proximity; moreover, they thought that it should be aimed at achieving a more indigenous/endogenous-oriented development. In order to achieve this latter aim, respondents said that they would be willing to invest personally by financially supporting promotion operations, investing in tourism activities, and encouraging their children to undertake tourism-related training/education and to enter into a tourism profession.

The cluster analysis applied to the scores of the five factors identified through the exploratory factor analysis ('sense of belonging', 'ability of involvement of local authorities', 'attitude toward tourism development', 'support for local entrepreneurship', and 'willingness to invest in tourism') showed that residents' perceptions and attitudes are not homogenous.

Specifically, four clusters were identified: 'enthusiastics', 'moderate supporters', 'critics', and 'indifferents'. The 'enthusiastics' were the biggest segment. The results showed that residents with a higher sense of belonging ('moderate supporters' and 'enthusiastics') were those that evaluate economic, social, and environmental impacts more positively.

This seems to contradict previous studies (Jurowski, 1994) that show that residents who are more attached to their community evaluate environmental impacts negatively.

In addition, this study highlights that residents feeling a higher sense of belonging to their community are more prone to support further tourism development. This disconfirms Harrill's (2004) study reporting residents with higher attachment to their community are more negative about tourism development, probably because they think that the tourism industry has the potential to undermine the quality of life in their community. In this study, significant differences existed between clusters based on the level of education, employment reliance on tourism, length of residence, and contact with tourists in everyday life. No differences were found based on gender, age, employment status, and geographical proximity to the tourist area. This seems to confirm some previous studies and disconfirm others, thus adding to the body of knowledge by highlighting an inconsistent relationship between residents' views and support of tourism and intrinsic factors.

On the whole, the results of this study seem to provide further evidence to Williams and Lawson's (2001) call to investigate residents' perceptions of tourism by concentrating more on the personal values of respondents and less on their socio-demographic characteristics, which often render the findings of cluster analysis very site-specific, barely generalisable and linked more to the town in which respondents live rather than to cluster membership. That said, even the 'enthusiastics' did not feel themselves involved and committed in tourism planning, and they did not believe local authorities are listening to their views when making decisions about the future tourism development of their destination; this renders the need of achieving strong community integration a priority in the agenda of policymakers and destination marketers.

These findings are relevant for both researchers and practitioners. On the one hand, they add to the literature on community-based collaborative policymaking and community integration in the context of island economies whose tourism development model is predominantly affected by imperialism. Further, in doing this, it provides insights into a specific geographical context (Italy) where very few studies have been devoted to this research area. On the other hand, the findings provide destination marketers and policymakers with the basis for a focused approach to the planning and management of tourism development in their area. Given that a low level of community integration was discovered, the most important priority for policymakers and destination marketers is to improve residents' involvement in tourism planning through various traditional participation mechanisms, such as seminars, meetings, focus groups, and surveys (Mowforth & Munt, 2003), and by encouraging locals to invest in the tourism industry (Tosun, 2006). Being able to achieve a higher level of community control over tourism planning would improve not only the residents' sense of belonging but could also favour the local entrepreneurship, thus empowering residents toward sustainable tourism development. Given that residents think that the positive effects of tourism development just slightly outweigh the negative ones, the findings suggest that policymakers and destination marketers run internal marketing and communication with the aim of increasing even more the favourableness of residents' attitudes toward tourism. Hence, it is suggested that messages should be tailored to the different segments of residents being considered, seeing that our findings found differences among different clusters based on certain variables (employment reliance on tourism, length of residence, frequency of interaction with tourists, and level of education).

6. Limitations and future research

In spite of the theoretical and managerial contributions, this study does have limitations. First, it is highly site-specific and based on a convenience sample, and thus the findings cannot be generalised; it would be useful to repeat the study in other island destinations in order

to cross-validate the findings. Further, this study ignores other constructs that could be interesting to analyse when profiling residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism, such as ecocentric attitude and community concern (Gursoy et al., 2002; Sinclair-Maragh & Gursoy, 2015).

Additionally, residents were not asked how much tourism development they perceived to be acceptable (Gursoy et al., 2010); rather, they were just asked whether they would support further tourism development in their destination. These aspects would merit attention in future research. Finally, the fact that 'residents constantly re-evaluate the perceived consequences of the exchange transaction within a dynamic social setting' (Waite, 2003, p. 196) highlights the opportunity and need to repeat the data collection over time with the aim of carrying out longitudinal studies. This would allow changes to be monitored and would provide reasons for these changes before, during, and after policymakers and destination marketers adopt certain strategies and policies with the aim of reaching the highest level of heritage proximity, community integration and involvement, and a more indigenous/endogenous-oriented tourism development.

Recent research around the topic of e-democracy (e.g. Sigala & Marinidis, 2012) and smart tourism destinations (Del Chiappa & Baggio, 2015) suggests leveraging the usage of ITCs (information and communication technologies) and social media as tools to enhance community involvement and integration in tourism planning. Based on official statistics of the municipality, a significant portion of residents in Arzachena belongs to the 16–40 age range (40.1%). Official statistics related to the extent to which residents in Arzachena use the Internet and social media are not currently available. However, a recent report released by the Italian Institute of Economic Research (Censis-Ucsi, 2015) reported that 52.9% of residents on Italian islands are Internet users. Further, Italians belonging to the 14–29 and 30–44 age brackets are fairly active on social network sites such as Facebook (14–29 age bracket: 71.1%; 30–44 age bracket: 60.3%), YouTube (14–29 age bracket: 53.6%; 30–44 age bracket: 33.9%), and blogs/forums (14–29 age bracket: 35.8%; 30–44 age bracket: 30%) (CENSIS-Ucsi, 2015). That said, it could be assumed that a significant portion of residents in Arzachena is technology friendly, given that 40.1% of them belong to the 16–40 age bracket. Hence, future research could investigate how, and the extent to which, ICTs and social media could be used to enhance community-based collaborative policymaking in the area and to achieve higher levels of community involvement and integration.

References

- Aguiló, E., & Rosselló, J. (2005). Host community perceptions: A cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 925–941.
- 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.
- 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.
- Belisle, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents: A case study in Santa Maria, Columbia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(1), 83–101.
- Besculides, A., Lee, M. E., & McCormick, P. J. (2002). Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 303–319.
- Bestard, A. B., & Nadal, J. R. (2007). Modeling environmental attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 688–695.
- Blackstock, K. (2005). A critical look at community based tourism. *Community Development Journal*, 40(1), 39–49.
- Blank, U. (1989). *The community tourism imperative: The necessity, the opportunities, its potential*. State College, TX: Venture Publishing.
- Brida, J. G., Osti, L., & Barquet, A. (2010). Segmenting resident perceptions towards tourism: A cluster analysis with a multinomial logit model of a mountain community. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(5), 591–602.
- Brown, K. G., & Cave, J. (2010). Island tourism: Marketing culture and heritage – editorial introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(2), 87–95.
- Carter, R. W. (2004). Implications of sporadic tourism growth: Extrapolation from the case of Boracay Island, the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 9(4), 383–404.

- Censis-Ucsi (2015). *L'economia della disintermediazione digitale* Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Chen, N., Dwyer, L., & Firth, T. (2014). Effect of dimensions of place attachment on residents' word-of-mouth behavior. *Tourism Geographies, 16*(5), 1–18.
- Chen, R. J. (2006). Islands in Europe: Development of an island tourism multi-dimensional model (ITMDM). *Sustainable Development, 14*(2), 104–114.
- Del Chiappa, G. (2012). Community integration: a case study of Costa Smeralda, Italy. , in: Fayos-Sola, E., Silva, J., & Jafari, J. (Eds.). (2012). Knowledge management in tourism: Policy and governance applications bridging tourism theory and practice (PhD dissertation in tourism). Emerald: Bingley, 243–263.
- Del Chiappa, G., & Atzeni, M. (2015). Collaborative policy making: A community-based perspective in the context of Sardinia's Maddalena Archipelago, Italy. , in: Gursoy, E., Saayman, D., & Sotiriadis, M. (Eds.). (2015). Collaboration in tourism businesses and destinations: A handbook (PhD dissertation in tourism). Emerald: Bingley, 57–74.
- Del Chiappa, G., & Baggio, R. (2015). Knowledge transfer in smart tourism destinations: Analyzing the effects of a network structure. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2015.02.001>.
- Choi, H. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2006). Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tourism Management, 27*(6), 1274–1289.
- Croes, R. (2006). A paradigm shift to a new strategy for small island economies: Embracing demand-side economics for value enhancement and long-term economic stability. *Tourism Management, 27*(3), 453–465.
- Croes, R., Lee, S. H., & Olson, E. D. (2013). Authenticity in tourism in small island destinations: A local perspective. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change, 11*(1–2), 1–20.
- Diedrich, A., & García-Buades, E. (2009). Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management, 30*(4), 512–521.
- 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.
- Faulkner, B., & Tideswell, C. (1997). A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 5*(1), 1–26.
- Fotiadis, A., Yeh, S. S., & Huan, T. C. T. (2016). Applying configural analysis to explaining rural-tourism success recipes. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(4), 1479–1483.
- Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Host community reactions: A cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(3), 763–784.
- Fridgen, J. D. (1991). *Dimensions of tourism* East Lansing: Educational Institute of the American Hotel and Motel Association.
- Garrod, B., & Fyall, A. (2000). Managing heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(3), 682–708.
- Gu, H., & Ryan, C. (2008). Place attachment, identity and community impacts of tourism: The case of Beijing Hutong. *Tourism Management, 29*(4), 637–647.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2010). Locals' attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research, 49*(3), 382–394.
- Gursoy, D., Jurovski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(1), 79–105.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: A new improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(3), 495–516.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.) New Jersey, NJ: Pearson.
- Hampton, M. P., & Christensen, J. (2007). Competing industries in islands: A new tourism approach. *Annals of Tourism Research, 34*(4), 998–1020.
- Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes towards tourism development: a literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature, 18*, 251–266.
- Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 186–204.
- Jurovski, C. (1994). *The interplay of elements affecting host community resident attitudes toward tourism: A path analytic approach* (PhD dissertation in tourism) United States: Virginia Tech University.
- 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.
- Ko, D., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A structural equation model of resident attitude toward tourism development. *Tourism Management, 23*(5), 521–530.
- 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.
- Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modeling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(2), 402–424.
- Madrigal, R. (1995). Residents' perceptions and the role of government. *Annals of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 86–102.
- 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.
- Mitchell, R., & Reid, D. G. (2001). Community integration: Island tourism in Peru. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(1), 113–139.
- Mowforth, M., & Munt, I. (2003). *Tourism and sustainability: Development and new tourism in the Third World* (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach* New York, NY: Methuen.
- Nunkoo, R., Gursoy, D., & Juwaheer, T. D. (2010). Island residents' identities and their support for tourism: An integration of two theories. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*(5), 675–693.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2010). Small island urban tourism: Residents' perspective. *Current Issue in Tourism, 13*(1), 37–60.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Residents' satisfaction with community attributes and support for tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 35*(2), 171–190.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Morais, D. B., & Dowler, L. (2006). The role of community involvement and number/type of visitors on tourism impacts: A controlled comparison of Annapurna, Nepal and Northwest Yunnan, China. *Tourism Management, 27*(6), 1373–1385.
- Oreja-Rodríguez, J. R., Parra-López, E., & Yanes-Estévez, V. (2008). The sustainability of island destinations: Tourism area life cycle and teleological perspectives: The case of Tenerife. *Tourism Management, 29*(1), 53–65.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 586–599.
- Prezenta, A., Del Chiappa, G., & Sheehan, L. (2013). Residents' engagement and local tourism governance in maturing beach destinations: Evidence from an Italian case study. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management, 2*(1), 22–30.
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Jaafar, M., Kock, N., & Ramayah, T. (2015). A revised framework of social exchange theory to investigate the factors influencing residents' perceptions. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 16*, 335–345.
- Reed, M. G. (1997). Power relations and community-based tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research, 24*(3), 566–591.
- 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.
- Ryan, C., & Montgomery, D. (1994). The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism and issue in community responsive tourism. *Tourism Management, 15*(5), 358–369.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Abenoja, T. (2001). Resident attitudes in mature destination: The case of Waikiki. *Tourism Management, 22*(5), 435–443.
- Sigala, M., & Marinidis, D. (2012). E-Democracy and Web 2.0: A framework enabling DMOS to engage stakeholders in collaborative destination management. *Tourism Analysis, 17*(2), 105–120.
- Simpson, P., & Sigauw, J. (2008). Destination word of mouth: The role of traveler type, residents, and identity salience. *Journal of Travel Research, 47*(2), 167–182.
- Sinclair-Maragh, G., & Gursoy, D. (2015). Imperialism and tourism: The case of developing island countries. *Annals of Tourism Research, 50*, 143–158.
- Sinclair-Maragh, G., Gursoy, D., & Vieregge, M. (2015). Residents' perceptions toward tourism development: A factor-cluster approach. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 4*(1), 36–45.
- Sirakaya-Turk, E., Ekinci, Y., & Kaya, A. G. (2007). An examination of the validity of SUS-TAS in cross-cultures. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*(4), 414–421.
- Thaman, K. H. (2002). Shifting sights: The cultural challenge of sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 3*(3), 233–242.
- Timothy, D. J. (1999). Participatory planning: A view of tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(2), 371–391.
- Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management, 21*(6), 613–633.
- Tosun, C. (2006). Expected nature of community participation in tourism development. *Tourism Management, 27*(3), 493–504.
- Tsaur, S., Lin, Y., & Lin, J. (2006). Evaluating ecotourism sustainability from the integrated perspective of resource, community and tourism. *Tourism Management, 27*(4), 640–653.
- UNWTO (2015). *Tourism highlights* (2015 ed.) Madrid, Spain: World Travel Organization.
- Urieli, N., Israeli, A. A., & Reichel, A. (2009). Heritage proximity and resident attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(3), 859–862.
- Vareiro, L. M. C., Remoaldo, P. C., & Cadima Ribeiro, J. A. (2012). Residents' perception of tourism impacts in Guimarães (Portugal): A cluster analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism, 16*(6), 535–551.
- Vernon, J., Essex, S., Pinder, D., & Curry, K. (2005). Collaborative policymaking: Local sustainable projects. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(2), 325–345.
- Waitt, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(1), 194–215.
- 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.
- Weaver, D., & Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(2), 439–458.
- Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and residents opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(2), 269–290.
- Woo, E., Kim, H., & Uysal, M. (2015). Life satisfaction and support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 50*, 84–97.
- Yasarata, M., Altinay, L., Burns, P., & Okumus, F. (2010). Politics and sustainable tourism development: Can they co-exist? *Tourism Management, 31*(3), 345–356.