Current issue in tourism

The missing voices in the perceptions of tourism: The neglect of expatriates

Christopher S. Dutt[a],[*], William S. Harvey[b], Gareth Shaw[b]

[a] *Emirates Academy of Hospitality Management, Dubai, United Arab Emirates*
[b] *University of Exeter Business School, UK*

A B S T R A C T

The interconnected nature of tourism suggests it can offer alternative solutions and perspectives to a variety of situations which have hitherto been unexplored. This research reviews the extant literature pertinent to community tourism to explore potential gaps present, with a particular focus on the suggested impact upon expatriates. A number of gaps are uncovered, from both a tourism and expatriate perspective, including demographic discrepancies, lack of geographical representation, and the lack of temporal consideration, among others. These gaps offer future areas of analysis that can provide more insight into the possible role of tourism in improving expatriate adjustment, as well as areas of future community tourism analysis. Of specific note, the expatriate community has been by-and-large excluded from much of the analysis on perceptions of tourism, which holds significance given the increasing prominence of expatriates globally.

1. Introduction

An expatriate; an individual who lives and/or works in a foreign country for an extended period of time (Isakovic & Whitman, 2013). A tourist; an individual who stays outside their usual environment for at least one night (Swarbrooke & Horner, 2007). Two very closely related groups with many overlaps, yet existing research has still to fully explore the nature of these overlaps.

Numerous studies exist considering the economic, environmental, and socio-cultural perceptions of tourism held by the resident population (see for example Ap, 1990; Gu & Ryan, 2010; Liu & Var, 1986; Pizam, 1978; Sharpley, 2014). A frequent approach to assess perceptions of tourism has been through the guise of community tourism and Social Exchange Theory (Ap, 1990; Pizam, 1978; Sharpley, 2014). However, throughout the literature pertaining to community tourism and host involvement, the expatriate has been excluded when defining the 'resident', even though they can play host to tourists (see Dutt, Ninov, & Haas, 2015) and may hold alternative opinions of tourism than the 'naturalised' resident. Their growing numbers and potential integration issues would suggest that further consideration needs to be given towards this market in order to facilitate more comprehensive review of perceptions of tourism to acknowledge any potential differences between the types of resident.

Doxey's 'Irridex' Doxey (1975), proposes that as tourism development continues, the local population can move from feelings of euphoria to ones of annoyance and antagonism. While this is normally targeted towards the tourist, it is not clear to what extent the expatriate

is being made a scapegoat or compounding the issue. This is particularly important in nations such as the UAE, where up to 74% of the population are expatriate (Isakovic & Whitman, 2013). The expatriate could side with the host or be victimised accidentally, or intentionally, along with their tourist compatriots. Alternatively, could excessive expatriate numbers force nationals along the 'Irridex' to greater annoyance with the tourist through misplaced annoyance? Furthermore, in environments where expatriates hold positions of influence over government decision making – directly or indirectly – their opinions could be instrumental in the formation of government policy.

The purpose of this review is to critique the current community tourism literature – with special emphasis on the exclusion of the expatriate community. This review will, therefore, analyse current community tourism literature to uncover gaps or disagreements relating to the understanding of community tourism – the study period, the length of residence, the place of birth, the cultural base, and the role of community tourism in the Middle East, among others – as well as expatriate-specific short-comings such as the exclusion of expatriates from community tourism analysis. This will help to lay the ground work to explore how and why expatriate opinions of tourism should be further considered. Community tourism offers the potential to develop community involvement in tourism and enhance the social impacts of tourism. By conducting this review, a more holistic understanding of the nuances of community tourism can be offered with the aim of encouraging further research to consider, for example, the use of community tourism as a social mechanism to include expatriates and facilitate their integration into a community.

---

* Corresponding author.
  E-mail address: chris.dutt@emiratesacademy.edu (C.S. Dutt).

1.1. Tourism

Tourism has repeatedly been reported as a powerful activity that can have significant impacts on a nation, often concerning a country's economy, society and culture, and environment (Fan, Lu, & Wu, 2013; Harrill, 2004; Kaltenborn, Andersen, Nellemann, Bjerke, & Thrane, 2008). In a very general sense, considerable previous literature would seem to argue that economic impacts are often regarded as positive by residents, while socio-cultural and environmental impacts are viewed more negatively (see Dowling, 1993; Liu & Var, 1986; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1990; Pizam, 1978). Pizam (1978) offered one of the first attempts to consider residents' perceptions of tourism. He found that residents dependent on tourism were more supportive, while residents living in tourist-heavy areas were less supportive. It is worth pointing out that related studies found that local residents enjoy the economic benefits of tourism but dislike the tourists themselves (Sharpley, 2014). Again there is scope in this literature to mention the voice of the expatriate.

The term 'resident' has been poorly defined within the tourism literature. Fallon and Kriwoken (2003), along with Gu and Ryan (2010) and Sharpley (2014) have explained that communities and residents are not homogeneous groups, each potentially having their own set of demographic and attitudinal factors which can influence their overall perception of tourism (cf. Šegota, Mihalic, & Kuscer, 2016). With that in mind, further consideration should be given to the resident and their attitudes; they are arguably a heterogeneous group and hence greater analysis of their experiences could help to gain a more nuanced representation of their perceptions of tourism.

The current use of 'resident' would seem to generally consider those who live in the area being researched (see Belise & Hoy, 1980; Pizam, 1978). Some categorisation occurs with regards to participants' demographic characteristics, such as: age, gender, contact with tourists and employment in tourism (Brida, Osti, & Faccioli, 2011). However, these elements mostly seem to be used as characteristics to describe the same pool of resident and differentiate their views of tourism; they are not seen as different types of resident. Expatriates, for example, could be considered a different type of resident in a destination, yet they have not been specifically identified in extant literature. Kaltenborn et al. considered the attitude of residents towards the second-hand, holiday-home market who "…interact with local communities in different ways and pose [other] challenges…" (2008, p. 665). In a similar light, expatriates may interact with tourists differently to nationals and therefore will hold different attitudes towards tourism, due to their varying levels of commitment to the host community. Hence, the lack of a concrete definition of resident is, in itself an important oversight as it limits the extent to which community tourism research can be applied and compromises the completeness of the research and its application. The exclusion of expatriates, specifically, is problematic due to their growing numbers and potential exposure to tourism (see Bailey & Dragoni, 2013; Bischoff & Koenig-Lewis, 2007; Dutt et al., 2015). The burgeoning number of expatriates means they are playing an increasingly significant role in the functioning of societies globally as well as the delivery of tourism products. In the case of the former, this impact on the functioning of society, is a matter of increasing importance as expatriate numbers rise (Enright & Newton, 2005) while the latter will influence tourists' experiences and hence a destination's competitiveness (AlBalushi & Wise, 2017).

If expatriates constitute a different type of resident and exhibit different behaviours, they will, nevertheless, hold a perception of tourism. This perception may then influence their interactions with tourists socially, or in a work capacity. While expatriates may not necessarily be able to enforce any political change when it comes to tourism, their treatment of the tourist can, not only impact the perception tourists will hold of the destination, but also may affect the manner in which nationals treat the tourist. There is also the potential that expatriates may hold alternative perceptions of tourists to nationals because expatriates may be incorrectly categorised and treated by the national as an 'extended tourist', which could lead to resentment on the side of the expatriate, particularly if the (foreign) tourist is treated differently and openly discriminated against.

By considering the national and expatriate communities' perceptions of tourism, more thorough analysis of tourism perceptions is possible. With an improved understanding, tourism could be leveraged in alternative scenarios – such as expatriate adjustment – further establishing the usefulness and reach of tourism.

1.2. Perceptions of tourism

International tourism has been defined by the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO) as activities related to individuals "travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business, or other purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited" (Commission for the European Communities, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, World Tourism Organisation, and United Nations Statistics Division, 2011, p. 1). Based on this definition, any number of activities can be related to tourism including Visiting Friends and Relatives (VFR), leisure, business, hedonism, cultural exploration, spa and health visits, and historical tourism, among many others.

The umbrella-term 'Community Tourism' has been use to study the opinions of a destination's resident population towards tourism, often analysing residents' perceptions of tourism's economic, environmental, and socio-cultural impacts (see Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005; Brida et al., 2011; Choi & Murray, 2010; Getz, 1994; Harrill, 2004; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997; Murphy, 1985; Pizam, 1978).

1.2.1. Community tourism

Community Tourism has been referred to as tourism which allows the community to "join in the general progress and participate in the blessings of prosperity" brought about from tourism (Krippendorf, 1987 as cited in Ap, 1992, p. 681). Murphy (1985) explained that the Community Tourism product was like any other tourism product but specifically referred to that which "…the community as a whole, wishes to present to the tourism market." (Murphy, 1985, p. 37). Murphy's view of Community Tourism suggested that a community focus would help alleviate economic, environmental, and socio-cultural concerns related to tourism. The literature often discusses Community Tourism in the sense of residents' attitudes towards tourism, frequently using the ideology of Social Exchange Theory (SET). The basic philosophy of SET suggests that individuals will support an activity if they receive more benefits than costs from the activity (Ap, 1992; Pizam, 1978). The literature on Community Tourism has used SET to understand residents' support for tourism. That is, if residents perceive greater personal benefits from tourism than costs, they will support tourism and tourism development in their community (see Perdue et al., 1990; Vargas-Sánchez, Porras-Bueno, & Plaza-Mejía, 2014; Yoon, Gursoy, & Chen, 1999, 2001). While the premise of this theory is relatively clear, it does not consider the perception of the tourist, nor allow for the weighting of impacts. In the case of the former, an individual may support tourism because of the benefits generated, but still view tourists negatively (Sharpley, 2014). In the case of the latter consideration, individuals may weight various impacts more than others. For example, current economic benefits may be perceived more positively than negative environmental impacts. Yoon et al. (1999) discovered that individuals who had lived in a destination for a longer period of time were more resilient to the economic impacts of tourism, suggesting a presence of some form of internal weighting, which current research has yet to specifically address.

A theme of Community Attachment has been discussed in the literature in line with Community Tourism. While Community Tourism considers residents' perceptions of tourism, Community Attachment

Table 1
Community tourism elements.

Community tourism element	Sources	Hypothesised nature and literary consensus
Use of social exchange theory	(Andereck et al., 2005; Ap, 1990; Brida et al., 2011; Choi & Murray, 2010; Getz, 1994; Harrill, 2004; Jurowski et al., 1997; Kayat, 2002; Kibicho, 2004; Madrigal, 1993; McGehee, Andereck, & Vogt, 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ninov, 2005; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Oviedo-Garcia, Castellanos-Verdugo, & Martin-Ruiz, 2008; Perdue et al., 1990; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Stylidis, Biran, Sit, & Szivas, 2014; Teye, Sirakaya, & Sönmez, 2002; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014; Yoon et al., 1999, 2001).	Greater perceived benefits will result in support for tourism.
Length of residency	(Andereck et al., 2005; Brida et al., 2011; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Choi & Murray, 2010; Harrill, 2004; Lankford, 1994; Liu & Var, 1986; Madrigal, 1993; McGehee et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Yoon et al., 1999).	Mixed Discussion: The longer an individual has lived in a community, the more attached they are and hence the more negatively they view tourism.
Place of birth	(Andereck et al., 2005; Choi & Murray, 2010; Harrill, 2004; Lankford, 1994; Madrigal, 1993; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Yoon et al., 1999).	If one were born in a community, the more attached they would be and hence the more negative they would view tourism development.
Distance from tourism zone	(Andereck et al., 2005; Ap, 1990; Belise & Hoy, 1980; Brida et al., 2011; Harrill, 2004; Korça, 1998; Madrigal, 1993; McGehee et al., 2002; Perdue et al., 1990; Sheldon & Var, 1984).	The greater the distance from the tourism zone, the more negatively individuals would view tourism since they experience fewer benefits regularly.
Level of touristic development	(Ap, 1990; Brida et al., 2011; Korça, 1998; Madrigal, 1993; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014; Yoon et al., 1999).	Heavily developed tourism zones would likely attract more negative perceptions of tourism and therefore less support for further development.
Employed in tourism	(Andereck et al., 2005; Ap, 1990; Brida et al., 2011; Harrill, 2004; Lankford, 1994; Liu & Var, 1986; Madrigal, 1993; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Teye et al., 2002; Yoon et al., 1999).	Individuals employed in tourism would view tourism in a more positive light.
Family members employed in tourism	(Milman & Pizam, 1988; Teye et al., 2002).	Mixed discussion; it has been argued that family members employed can promote positive or negative perceptions of tourism.
Income from tourism	(Andereck et al., 2005; Harrill, 2004; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Korça, 1998; Madrigal, 1993; McGehee et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988).	Individuals who receive a large portion of their income from tourists would perceive tourism positively.
Tourism knowledge	(Andereck et al., 2005; Brida et al., 2011; Pérez & Nadal, 2005).	The more knowledgeable the individual regarding tourism, the more positive tourism would be perceived.
Involvement in decision-making	(Andereck et al., 2005; Choi & Murray, 2010; Harrill, 2004; Lankford, 1994; Madrigal, 1993; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Teye et al., 2002; Yoon et al., 1999).	Those who felt involved in communities' tourism decisions would perceive tourism more positively.
Contact with tourists	(Andereck et al., 2005; Belise & Hoy, 1980; Brida et al., 2011; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Yoon et al., 1999).	Individuals who experience increased and more frequent contact with tourists would perceive tourism more positively.
Tourist density	(Brida et al., 2011; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Liu, Sheldon, & Var, 1987; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014).	Communities experiencing a lot of tourism would perceive more negative impacts of tourism
Use of tourism facilities	(Brida et al., 2011; Korça, 1998; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Yoon et al., 1999).	If individuals frequented those facilities utilised or originally built for tourists, more positive perceptions of tourism would be apparent.
Education	(Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Korça, 1998; Liu & Var, 1986; Madrigal, 1993; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Teye et al., 2002).	Overall, unspecified, however a few instances have argued that the more educated the individuals, the more positive tourism would be perceived (Korça, 1998).
Age	(Brougham & Butler, 1981; McGehee et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978).	Mixed discussion – older individuals either view tourism more positively or negatively than younger individuals.
Perceived economic benefits	(Andereck et al., 2005; Harrill, 2004; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Korça, 1998; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Pizam, 1978).	Individuals who perceived economic benefits resulting from tourism would perceive tourism more positively and support further tourism development.
Perceived economic costs	(Korça, 1998)	Individuals who were conscious of economic costs due to tourism, would view tourism negatively and would not enthusiastically support tourism development.
Personal benefit from tourism	(Andereck et al., 2005; Ap, 1990; Harrill, 2004; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; McGehee et al., 2002; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Perdue et al., 1990; Teye et al., 2002; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014; J. Williams & Lawson, 2001).	If one perceives benefits from tourism, one is more likely to support further tourism development
Tourism's perceived positive impact	(Choi & Murray, 2010; Harrill, 2004; Liu & Var, 1986; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011).	If individuals perceived generic positive impacts of tourism, there was more support for tourism development.
Community attachment	(Andereck et al., 2005; Brida et al., 2011; Choi & Murray, 2010; Harrill, 2004; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; McGehee et al., 2002; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014; Yoon et al., 1999).	Individuals who were more attached to the community would be more aware of the negative impacts of tourism and hence, less likely to support further tourism development.

Source: Authors.

considers individuals' connection to their community (Choi & Murray, 2010; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011), often measured by considering the duration residents had lived in the community for and whether or not they had been born in the community (Andereck et al., 2005). It has been proposed that individuals who have stronger Community Attachment view tourism more negatively, although results here are inconclusive (Andereck et al., 2005).

Throughout the Community Tourism literature, a number of elements have been discussed to consider their effectiveness at influencing individuals' attachment to their community and perceptions of tourism. The most frequently discussed and cited elements have been discussed here and are listed in Table 1.

1.3. Community tourism elements

1.3.1. Length of residency

A popular element included under Community Tourism and Community Attachment considers how long participants have been a resident in the community being studied. The premise in this scenario is that the longer an individual had lived in an area, the more attached to the community they were likely to be, and therefore the more negative the perception they would hold of tourism's impacts (Andereck et al., 2005; Sheldon & Var, 1984). Conversely, it was suggested by a number of studies that length of residence was positively related to perception of tourism, with long-term individuals feeling more attached to a community and therefore more supportive of tourism in the community (Choi & Murray, 2010; McGehee et al., 2002) as well as being more resilient to the negative environmental impacts, instead seeing greater economic impacts (Yoon et al., 1999). To further add to the debates on this topic, other researchers found no relationship between length of residency and positive or negative perceptions of tourism (Andereck et al., 2005; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Lankford, 1994; Milman & Pizam, 1988).

While these discrepancies are present, little has been offered to indicate why they may have occurred. It is possible that the discrepancies are not down to a temporal relationship, but rather a more qualitative emotional element of attachment. It is here where expatriate exclusion could be most apparent. It is conceivable that in some communities, individuals who have been resident for a number of years feel attached to the community, and therefore may follow Andereck et al.'s (2005) postulation that the longer the residency, the more negative the perception of tourism. However, in other communities, individuals could have been resident for a long period of time yet, for whatever reason, do not feel attached to the community, and therefore are less concerned with the community's well-being. In some scenarios, expatriates may not be able or willing to apply for long-term or permanent residence (see Dutt & Ninov, 2017), which may have impacts on their attachment to the community and therefore their perception of tourism, for better or worse. Hence, the emotional attachment may be more significant than duration of residence.

1.3.2. Place of birth

In a similar vein to length of residency, place of birth explored if an individual had been born in the community being studied. Considered for both Community Tourism and Community Attachment, this element theorised that an individual who was born in a community would hold more negative perceptions of tourism (Andereck et al., 2005), as they were more sensitive to changes brought about by tourism (Sheldon & Var, 1984). On the other hand, Choi and Murray (2010) suggested those born in the location would view tourism development more positively. Other researchers (Andereck et al., 2005; Lankford, 1994) found no significant relationship between place of birth and attitudes towards tourism.

However, if one is born in a destination, it is no guarantee that they are attached to that destination or feel part of the community. Particularly in an expatriate setting, an individual born in a destination may still not feel a member of that community, instead preferring their parents' destination. Alternatively, in a transient society, an individual may have been born in a specific destination, left, and later returned. In this case, they may not yet feel part of the community, or feel torn between multiple communities (Saxenian, 2006) – such as the case with Third Culture Kids (Useem, 1999; Yiu, 2008), and therefore hold a different perception of tourism to those born and brought up in the community.

1.3.3. Distance from tourism zone

In Community Tourism, Belise and Hoy (1980) first proposed the idea that the further an individual resided from the tourism zone, the less contact they would have with tourists, and therefore the less likely

they were to be aware of the positives of tourism, resulting in negative perceptions of tourism (Alipour, Olya, & Forouzan, 2017; Belise & Hoy, 1980; Perdue et al., 1990; Sheldon & Var, 1984). Few literary discrepancies were present with this factor (see Korça, 1998).

From an expatriate perspective, the impact of proximity is important to observe; it is possible that due to expatriates' likelihood to immigrate for work (Isakovic & Whitman, 2013), they will live and work in locations close to tourism zones and yet if they do not feel attached to their community, their perceptions of tourism may differ from their national neighbours. Seasonality, a potential variable requiring consideration, was considered by Brida et al. (2011) from the perspective of the nature of a destination's seasonality. Large differences in tourist numbers between the peaks and troughs of a destination's seasonality could result in positive perspectives of tourism, by giving residents a 'break from tourism' or could result in negative perspectives since the dependence and damage of tourism will be evident. Extending this impact, the timing of the study is a vital, yet underreported topic. Participants who are studied during a tourism peak may have different perceptions than those surveyed during a lull in numbers. Additionally, a study's temporal proximity to major holidays or events must also be considered. A study conducted before, during, or after a major international business, entertainment, sporting or religious event, such as the Olympics or Hajj, could have potentially very different results, due to the type of tourists visiting and residents' awareness of tourists.

1.3.4. Level of touristic development

It has been proposed that the more developed a destination's tourism market, the more negative the perception of tourism (Madrigal, 1993), or the less support for future tourism development (Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014; Vargas-Sánchez, Porras-Bueno, & Plaza-Mejía, 2011) especially from an environmental stand-point (Yoon et al., 1999).

One element relating to tourism development that deserves further analysis is the destination's experience with development. A destination that has been growing for many years may be more tolerant towards tourism development. On the other hand, a destination that has started development relatively recently may be more sensitive to growth. Additionally, in 'newer' or less developed tourist destinations, the resident may feel a need to adapt and change their lifestyle and culture to better match the tourist, their behaviour and expectations. As a result, the resident may feel resentful of the tourist since they feel that the tourist is, in some way, forcing them to adapt and change in a possibly unwanted manner (Monterrubio & Mendoza-Ontiveros, 2014).

The tourist zone should also be linked to the type of tourist in an area. That is, a study conducted in a destination's Central Business District (CBD) may report different community attachment results to a study being conducted in a historical or cultural site. It is possible that in a CBD a tourist, or at least a business tourist, could 'blend in' and hence be less noticeable. Additionally, since the CBD could be a more modern, built location, the site may be able to physically handle tourism better than a more historical site.

The cultural origin of the tourist also has not extensively been considered in the community tourism literature. Tourists from a more similar culture could be looked on more favourably by residents because they are less obvious than more culturally distant tourists (Harvey & Novicevic, 2000; Jun & Gentry, 2005; Kogut & Singh, 1988). This element has been discussed in other disciplines, for example literature relating to expatriate adjustment, termed Cultural Distance, which could be potentially insightful to explore in a community tourism setting. The Cultural Distance hypothesis proposes greater contact when two individuals from similar cultures interact (Hemmasi & Downes, 2013). While Hemmasi and Downes discussed this potential occurrence for expatriates, it is possible that a similar scenario is present between the resident and the tourist. With tourists from a similar culture, it is possible that fewer stereotypes will be formed (Reisinger, 2009), which could normally restrict interactions.

Residents could also demonstrate greater understanding and tolerance towards tourists from a similar culture.

1.3.5. Employment in tourism

Often described as economic dependency, employment in tourism businesses is another element which occurs in the Community Tourism and Community Attachment literature. It has been theorised that the more economically dependent an individual is on tourism, through a tourism-based job, the more positive their perceptions of tourism (Madrigal, 1993; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978). Conversely, Teye et al. (2002)found that employment in tourism was related to more negative perceptions of the impacts of tourism, while Lankford (1994) and Liu and Var (1986) found no significant impact.

Again, the type of tourist is important to consider here, along with the type of work. Business tourists' behaviours and demands, for example, may be much easier to predict for hotel staff than leisure tourists. At the same time, retail stores catering mainly to tourists may not interact frequently with business travellers, and so prefer leisure travellers and their greater expenditure (see Davidson & Cope, 2003). The literature considering employment in tourism has not considered either of these elements, which could explain the discrepancies in perceptions of tourism relating to employment in tourism. From an expatriate perspective, their attitude towards the destination may reflect their attitudes towards tourism, notably if they are employed in tourism. That is, if expatriates enjoy their life in their host destination, they may hold significantly more positive perceptions of tourism because tourism provides them with a means to remain in the destination.

1.3.6. Family member employment in tourism

A small number of researchers have extended the employment in tourism element to also consider the employment of family members (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Teye et al., 2002). Within this literature, no consensus has been offered regarding the influence it has on perceptions of tourism. Teye et al. (2002) found that having a family member employed in tourism decreased the perception of tourism, while Milman and Pizam (1988) found a positive relationship.

As with the employment in tourism element, the nature of the job and the tourist may offer potential confounding variables here. Additionally, for the family member element, the nature of the relationship between the participant and family member could explain strong positive or negative attitudes towards tourism. A more distant relative may not meet the participant very regularly and hence summarise a year's worth of work stories into a one or two-hour interaction. Hypothetically, exaggeration of events or attitudes may be more apparent in this scenario over a relative who is seen on a more frequent basis. While this argument is in itself moot; the participant will hold this attitude whether the relative is close or distant, it is important to understand how participants' perceptions are formed in order to help manage potential consequences, and possibly change their perceptions of tourism.

1.3.7. Tourism income

It has been proposed that if individuals received income from tourism, a more positive perception of tourism would be held (Andereck et al., 2005). While not many studies have directly tested this element, a consistent result is evident (Andereck et al., 2005; Korça, 1998).

1.3.8. Tourism knowledge

A small number of studies considered the impact of participants' tourism knowledge. Andereck et al. (2005), for example, found that the more knowledgeable the participant was about tourism, the more they supported tourism. When Šegota et al. (2016) considered hosts' 'informedness' and their support for tourism, they found that for those who were well informed, more positive perceptions of tourism arose.

The source of this tourism knowledge is a valuable area lacking consideration and raises the question of whether residents gain their knowledge from education, experience from serving tourists, experience from being a tourist or through social networks?

1.3.9. Decision involvement

Involving the community in the decision making process has received consideration in the Community Tourism and Community Attachment literature, although mostly in a descriptive sense, with little rigorous analysis (Andereck et al., 2005; Harrill, 2004; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Yoon et al., 1999). It was proposed that if the community were more involved in decision making, they would view tourism more positively since they could exercise some element of control over it (Madrigal, 1993; Šegota et al., 2016). While this was supported by Madrigal (1993), Choi and Murray (2010) and Teye et al. (2002) found the opposite; that those more involved viewed tourism more negatively.

As Choi and Murray (2010) explain, the initiator in this case is unknown; residents could view tourism negatively and so become more involved to help 'fix' the problems. Teye et al. additionally explained that while their participants' perception of tourism was lower if they were involved, they were also more willing to "…bear the inconveniences…" (2002, p. 682). Regardless of the initiator, many researchers have suggested that involving the community is paramount to a successful tourism system (Šegota et al., 2016; Teye et al., 2002). The extent of hosts' involvement in tourism could benefit from further consideration over what is currently available in the literature; does involvement include soliciting opinion, or does it consider a more active role in tourism development such as employment or task forces (see Gu & Ryan, 2010)? The impact of this factor on expatriates may occur differently as expatriates' temporary and possibly non-committal nature could mean that expatriates who are strategically involved in tourism may view it as a form of employment rather than an opportunity to feel involved. Additionally, expatriates may not be concerned about their degree of involvement because they view their tenure in the destination as temporary and hence are comfortable to have destination-decisions made without their consultation.

1.3.10. Tourism contact, density, and facility usage

It has been proposed that residents who have more contact with tourists will perceive their impacts more positively (Andereck et al., 2005; Brougham & Butler, 1981). The situations in which contact is made, however, have rarely been considered in the extant literature. The only broad focus in this area has been when participants were asked about the usage of tourist facilities (Korça, 1998; Yoon et al., 1999). Contact that occurs through the course of one's job may result in very different perceptions to those that occur during leisure time. When the use of tourism facilities was considered, Korça (1998) proposed that the more residents used tourism facilities, the more positive their perception of tourism, possibly due to increased contact with the tourist. It has also been suggested that the greater the density of tourism in a destination, the more negative the perceptions of tourism (Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014), much in line with the pre-existing discussion of carrying capacity (P. W. Williams, 1994, p. 431). In the case of tourism contact (Andereck et al., 2005; Belise & Hoy, 1980; Pizam, 1978) and the use of tourism facilities (Korça, 1998; Yoon et al., 1999), the general consensus agrees with the aforementioned positions; greater contact with tourists and increased usage of tourist facilities does promote more positive perceptions of tourism. Density, however received mixed results. Korça (1998) agreed with the postulation, while Sheldon and Var (1984) found the opposite, possibly in a similar light to tourism contact where greater density results in more positive perceptions of tourism. Vargas-Sánchez et al. (2014) and Brougham and Butler (1981) found mixed results regarding density.

1.3.11. Education

Some previous research has considered individual's education as a factor impacting participants' perception of tourism, as can be seen in Table 1. Most studies explain that the more educated the individuals, the more positively they perceive tourism (Korça, 1998; Teye et al., 2002). As the base of this premise, it has been proposed that individuals with greater education have a greater desire to associate with foreign tourists (Teye et al., 2002). The reason for this desire is, however, not analysed. Other studies that tested education found no significant differences, suggesting that education did not impact an individual's perceptions of tourism (Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988). While no exact reason is apparent for these conflicting findings, the cultural and social base of the destinations being studied may prove to be a confounding variable.

1.3.12. Age

A small number of studies have considered participants' age and their perceptions of tourism, with older participants predicted to hold more positive perceptions (Brougham & Butler, 1981; McGehee et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978). Only Milman and Pizam (1988) found no significant relationship between age and perceptions of tourism.

While no specific explanation is available for the one discrepancy in this relationship, it is possible that this result arose out of the study's location; Florida's position and reputation as a tourism destination (Milman & Pizam, 1988) could mean that regardless of participant's age, residents understand the nature and importance of tourism to the local economy, hence a similar view of tourism has arisen. This could suggest a more wide-spread theoretical gap in our understanding related to the various cultural bases of studies; different studies conducted in different cultural backgrounds may result in conflicting results. The reason for younger participants' negative perceptions was not specifically identified, nor how this perception would change over time. Younger participants may hold more negative perceptions of second homes (Brougham & Butler, 1981) because, for example, they experience greater housing prices and therefore find it difficult to get started on the property ladder. This perception could change as they age, receive greater salaries and are already established in the housing market. To be able to accurately discover youth's perception of second homes, and tourism for that matter, and how this may change over time, more longitudinal studies are needed (Sharpley, 2014).

1.4. Limitations of extant community tourism literature

Several gaps and discrepancies in the literature have been explained, and require consideration to allow a thorough and accurate understanding of Community Tourism to develop. Without further understanding, we are left with a number of potentially significant problems related to the utility of and insight into Community Tourism. These have been summarised in Table 2.

Additionally, the extant literature has provided a variety of statistical practices, with descriptive statistics seeming to be the most preferred, followed by confirmatory factor analysis. This suggests a particular methodological and analytical emphasis, as can be seen in Table 3 with quantitative methods being heavily preferred, raising the question of whether there are theoretical and methodological benefits from adopting other approaches.

1.5. The expatriate

In the literature reviewing the methods and process of expatriate adjustment, several variables have been cited to facilitate greater expatriate adjustment; cultural distance (Andreason, 2003; Black, 1988; Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991; Jun & Gentry, 2005), duration of the assignment (Isakovic & Whitman, 2013; Jun & Gentry, 2005), previous expatriate experience (Andreason, 2003; Black, 1988;

Isakovic & Whitman, 2013), family adjustment (Andreason, 2003; Black, 1988), degree of interaction with the host (Andreason, 2003; Black, 1988; Black et al., 1991), and the individual's personality (Caligiuri, 2000; Huang, Chi, & Lawler, 2005).

There are generally two types of expatriate frequently referred to: the self-initiated expatriate, and the organisational expatriate. The self-initiated expatriate is one who undertakes international migration of their own accord to find work, while the organisational expatriate is one sent by their employer to an overseas posting (see Isakovic & Whitman, 2013). Few differences have been uncovered relating to adjustment process and effectiveness between the two. That is, currently, there appears to be little difference between the two types in terms of how effectively they adjust and which tools prove most effective at facilitating adjustment. Potential differences between the two types can benefit from further empirical consideration to confirm the presence, or lack, of any differences (see Isakovic & Whitman, 2013; Myers & Pringle, 2005). A potential third sub-group, Third Culture Kids (TCK), also exist, however research is scant on TCKs as expatriates and their adjustment processes, with only a small number of studies specifically focussed on them (see Lam & Selmer, 2004). Third Culture Kids are individuals who spent "…significant portions of their growing years in cultures other than their passport culture. TCKs internalize portions of both their home culture and the host culture, building a new cultural identity that reflects all their experiences without developing a sense of belonging to any single culture." (Useem, 1999, n.p.).

Although the nature of these factors are disputed, it is generally suggested that an expatriate will adjustment if they are from a more similar culture to that of the host, are on assignment for longer, have been an expatriate before, whose family has adjusted, and interacts with the host. Tourism has the potential to act as a catalyst of expatriate adjustment through several of these factors by providing common ground for interactions between the expatriate and host, and providing entertainment and information helping the family to adjust.

Furthermore, literature exists concerning the impact of culture on tourist perceptions (Ng, Lee, & Soutar, 2007), and on tourisms' impact on expatriation or migration – termed mobilities (Williams & Hall, 2000), from which further literary and conceptual solutions to expatriate adjustment could be sourced. While the connection between expatriation and tourism is not new, the role of tourism as an adjustment agent, specifically, is lacking and open to further research.

2. Discussion and conclusions

Many of the discrepancies highlighted previously could be down to geographical and temporal differences between the studies, which have yet to be fully accounted for. Teye et al.'s (2002) findings, for example, was only of only two studies conducted in Africa and seemed to contradict the work of other research in different countries on many occasions, such as participants' involvement in decision making, and the employment of a family member in tourism. On a similar note, the studies by Belise and Hoy (1980) and Brougham and Butler (1981) were conducted over 30 years ago and therefore their findings could be challenged today as tourism has become a more popular, better understood and accepted occurrence (see UNWTO, 2014). The discrepancies regarding participant demographics has made the grouping of perceptions according to demographics a difficult exercise. Similarly, Jackson and Inbakaran (2006) claimed that personality is a potential element that could also be used to categorise residents' attitudes towards tourism.

The impact of studies themselves may also cause bias, for example individuals may view tourism in a positive light. However, when they are surveyed and presented with the possible negative impacts of tourism, their perception may adjust. The act of measurement may, therefore, distort the results (see Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle; Furuta, 2012). Extant literature has not considered the abovementioned factors as confounding variables of each other; that is, in general, the

Table 2
Tourism literature agreement, disagreement, and gaps.

(Dis)agreement/gap	Topic	Explanation
Agreement	Distance from tourism zone	Those living close to the tourism zone would be more sensitive to the negatives of tourism (Belise & Hoy, 1980). Missing: Tourism seasonality, cultural origin of tourists, Type of tourist, type of destination, period when survey conducted.
Agreement	Tourism income	Income from tourism encourages positive perceptions of tourism (Andereck et al., 2005; Korça, 1998).
Agreement	Tourism knowledge	More knowledge will provide a more positive perception of tourism (Andereck et al., 2005).
Disagreement	Length of residency	Long-term residents viewed tourism more negatively (Sheldon & Var, 1984) vs. more positively and with greater resilience to negative impacts (Yoon et al., 1999).
Disagreement	Place of birth	Individuals born in the destination would view tourism more negatively (Sheldon & Var, 1984; Yoon et al., 1999) vs. more positively Choi and Murray (2010).
Disagreement	Level of touristic development	The more developed the destination, the more negatively tourism will be viewed (Madrigal, 1993). Missing: History of tourism development, history of expatriate experience.
Disagreement	Employment in tourism	Employment in tourism will generate more positive perceptions of tourism (Pizam, 1978) vs. more negative perceptions (Teye et al., 2002) or inconclusive results (Lankford, 1994; Liu & Var, 1986). Missing: Type of tourist.
Disagreement	Family member employment in tourism	A family member employed in tourism will generate negative perceptions of tourism (Teye et al., 2002) vs. positive (Milman & Pizam, 1988). Missing: the nature of employment, and the type of family relation
Disagreement	Decision involvement	Individuals involved in decision making would view tourism more positively (Madrigal, 1993) vs. negatively (Choi & Murray, 2010; Teye et al., 2002). Missing: perception formed before or after involvement.
Disagreement	Contact, density, facility	Greater contract with tourists, more use of tourist facilities, and less dense tourist zones will encourage positive perceptions of tourism (Andereck et al., 2005; Korça, 1998). Density – High density vs. low density will encourage positive perceptions of tourism (cf. Sheldon & Var, 1984).
Disagreement	Education	Greater education correlations with more positive perceptions of tourism (Korça, 1998; Teye et al., 2002) vs. negative perceptions (Liu & Var, 1986).
Disagreement	Age	Older individuals view tourism more positively (Brougham & Butler, 1981; McGehee et al., 2002; Pizam, 1978) vs. insignificant effect (Milman & Pizam, 1988). Missing: Reason for this perception.
Gap	Geographic base	The varying locations of previous studies may explain many discrepancies in the literature (Sharpley, 2014).
Gap	Culture	The cultural base of the residents and tourists may encourage different perceptions towards tourism and different levels of support.
Gap	Study process	The act of asking the participants about their views and offering different positive and negative perceptions of tourism may promote specific results
Gap	Confounding variables	The various elements of community tourism may act as confounding variables and combine to influence participants' perceptions
Gap	Study period	The period when the study was conducted, proximity to major events etc.

Source: Authors.

literature has reviewed the impact of, for example, length of residency, employment in tourism, and involvement in decision making as three independent factors that influence an individual's perception of tourism. If, however, these factors also influence each other, it may explain the resulting discrepancies in the literature. For example, individuals who have lived in a region all their life may wish to feel involved in decision making and may, therefore, seek employment within tourism so as to be more involved. The main influencer on individuals' perceptions of tourism is not, therefore, involvement or employment in tourism, but rather their length of residency. A better understanding of the different factors which' impact upon perceptions of tourism is needed as well as further analysis into how these factors impact one another.

In terms of the geographic context, a contemporary Middle-Eastern focussed study would provide an important empirical contribution to previous literature by exploring the nature of the aforementioned elements in a region experiencing increasing tourism numbers (see UNWTO, 2014). Each location could potentially offer a different form of interaction and result in a different perception towards tourism. Hence, the choice of the setting is important and needs to be explained in that

Table 3
Extant literature statistical testing.

Statistical test	Source
Descriptives	(Andereck et al., 2005; Barnett, 2014; Brida et al., 2011; Choi & Murray, 2010; Fallon & Kriwoken, 2003; Fan et al., 2013; Getz, 1994; Gu & Ryan, 2010; Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006; Jurowski et al., 1997; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Kibicho, 2004; Korça, 1998; Liu & Var, 1986; Madrigal, 1993; McGehee et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ninov, 2005; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Pearce, 1980; Perdue et al., 1990; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Stylidis et al., 2014; Teye et al., 2002; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014; J. Williams & Lawson, 2001; Yoon et al., 1999).
ANOVA	(Belise & Hoy, 1980; Gu & Ryan, 2010; Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; J. Williams & Lawson, 2001).
t-test	(Andereck et al., 2005; Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Teye et al., 2002).
Chi-square	(Belise & Hoy, 1980; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; J. Williams & Lawson, 2001).
Multiple regression	(Korça, 1998; McGehee et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ninov, 2005; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon & Var, 1984).
Cluster analysis	(Brida et al., 2011; Gu & Ryan, 2010; Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006; Madrigal, 1993; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; J. Williams & Lawson, 2001).
Principal component analysis	(Korça, 1998; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Teye et al., 2002).
Correlation	(Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ninov, 2005; Yoon et al., 2001).
Confirmatory factor analysis	(Andereck et al., 2005; Belise & Hoy, 1980; Choi & Murray, 2010; Getz, 1994; Korça, 1998; Liu et al., 1987; Madrigal, 1995; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Stylidis et al., 2014; Teye et al., 2002; Yoon et al., 1999).
Exploratory factor analysis	(Choi & Murray, 2010; Ninov, 2005; Perdue et al., 1990; Stylidis et al., 2014; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014).
Qualitative interview	(Kayat, 2002; Wheeler & Laing, 2008)
Secondary data	(Ap, 1992; Crouch & Ritchie, 1999; Harrill, 2004; Jamal & Getz, 1995; Sharpley, 2014)

Source: Authors.

Table 4
Community tourism extant literature locations.

Continent	Location	Source
North America	US: Arizona (3), Colorado, Florida, Hawaii (2), Massachusetts, Texas (2), Virginia (4)	(Andereck et al., 2005; Choi & Murray, 2010; Jurowski et al., 1997; Liu et al., 1987; Liu & Var, 1986; Madrigal, 1995; McGehee et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ninov, 2005; Pearce, 1980; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Yoon et al., 1999, 2001).
South America	Columbia	(Belise & Hoy, 1980).
Europe	Greece	(Stylidis et al., 2014).
	Italy	(Brida et al., 2011).
	Norway	(Kaltenborn et al., 2008).
	Spain	(Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Pérez & Nadal, 2005; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2014).
	Turkey	(Korça, 1998; Liu et al., 1987).
	UK: Devon, North Wales, Scotland (2)	(Barnett, 2014; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Getz, 1994; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon & Var, 1984).
Africa	Ghana	(Teye et al., 2002).
	Kenya	(Kibicho, 2004).
Asia	China	(Fan et al., 2013; Gu & Ryan, 2010).
	Malaysia	(Kayat, 2002).
	Mauritius	(Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011).
Oceania	Australia	(Fallon & Kriwoken, 2003; Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006; Wheeler & Laing, 2008).
	New Zealand	(Williams & Lawson, 2001).

Source: Authors.

geographical context. Extant research has focussed on a small number of locations, notably Western-orientated nations, with few exceptions, as identified by Sharpley (2014) and depicted in Table 4.

While a number of community attachment antecedents have been explored in the literature (Andereck et al., 2005; Brida et al., 2011; Choi & Murray, 2010; Harrill, 2004; Kaltenborn et al., 2008; McGehee et al., 2002; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Oviedo-Garcia et al., 2008; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2011; Yoon et al., 1999), some additional confounding variables should be considered. For example, perceptions of tourism may differ given the various types of tourists who visit the destination being researched, the political and economic environment the study was conducted in, or the proximity of the study to major events or holidays. There has also been limited consideration towards the nature in which perceptions could be formed; interactions might take place at work, through conversation, at entertainment sites, or in other settings.

Of further importance is the expatriates' perception of tourism. Throughout the literature relating to Community Tourism, the expatriate market has generally been ignored. Kaltenborn et al. (2008) and Barnett (2014) considered residents' perceptions of second home tourists, individuals who travel to an area in which they own a second home (Williams & Hall, 2000). This has been the closest attempt to include more expatriate-styled individuals in Community Tourism research. Fallon and Kriwoken (2003) and Gu and Ryan (2010) have both argued that the 'resident market' considered in Community Tourism literature is not homogenous, and yet is treated as such. However, both papers have considered the potential heterogeneity of residents as a discussion topic, with no empirical consideration. The main focus has therefore been to propose that "…the fact that a group of people live in the same geographical area does not mean they belong to the same 'community'." (Williams & Lawson, 2001, p. 271). Madrigal (1995) considered potential inter-community differences when analysing the resident's perception of tourism and the role of government. In fact, Madrigal was able to cluster the communities researched into 'Realists', 'Haters', and 'Lovers', each with their own perception of tourism. He did apply some level of demographic clustering to form these groups, which were mostly based on their support for tourism. The only demographic characteristic explained in these clusters considered the residents' place of birth; native born or otherwise (Madrigal, 1995). While some recognition of the potential differences between resident groups exist, further understanding and analysis is required, particularly with regards to the increasing expatriate market (Shim & Paprock, 2002). In particular, do expatriates form their own sub-group of residents, and do they differ from national residents with regards to their attitudes towards tourism?

A study by Dutt et al. (2015) considered the impact of VFR tourists on their expatriate hosts and discovered that expatriates in Dubai felt they had learnt more about Dubai and the UAE through their guest. It was explained that the hosts' desire to educate and answer their guests' questions would encourage the expatriate-host to learn more about the destination. Additionally, expatriate-hosts often accompanied their guest on tours around the destination, which also improve their learning. Could such action be extended to a greater variety of tourism activities, improving expatriate adjustment and offering an additional benefit of tourism?

The purpose of this paper has been to draw attention to the lack of research surrounding expatriates' perceptions of and role in tourism. Additionally, there have been a number of areas that seem to have been missed in the community tourism literature that could prove important when analysis progresses to consider using tourism to promote further social benefits. Areas such as the potential role of the tourists' culture compared to the hosts' culture, or the lack of consideration of the study period, for instance the proximity to major holidays or events, offer areas of consideration that can impact the perception of tourism.

The paper has also considered the leveraging of tourism as a mechanism to promote further social benefits. Specific consideration of the opinion of expatriates could allow tourism to be leveraged as a bridge between themselves and the national community. Community tourism, through its analysis of the community's perception of tourism, could provide a point from which further analysis can commence to better understand how tourism and expatriates intersect.

References

AlBalushi, A. A., & Wise, N. (2017). Planning for tourism in Oman based on lessons from Dubai: Overviewing economic, environmental and sociocultural impacts. In H. Almuhrzi, H. Alriyami, & N. Scott (Eds.), *Tourism in the Arab World: An Industry Perspective* (pp. 87–103). Bristol: Channel View Publications. Retrieved from 10. 21832/ALMUHR6140.

Alipour, H., Olya, H. G. T., & Forouzan, I. (2017). Environmental impacts of mass religious tourism: from residents' perspectives. *Tourism Analysis, 22*(2), 167–183. http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/108354217X14888192562285.

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. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.03.001.

Andreason, A. W. (2003). Expatriate adjustment to foreign assignments. *International Journal of Commerce and Management, 13*(1), 42–60.

Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 610–616. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(90) 90032-M.

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

Bailey, C., & Dragoni, L. (2013). Repatriation after global assignments: current HR practices and suggestions for ensuring successful repatriation. *People & Strategy,*

36(1), 48–87.

Barnett, J. (2014). Host community perceptions of the contributions of second homes. *Annals of Leisure Research, 17*(1), 10–26. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2014.886156.

Belise, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents: A case study in Santa Marta, Colombia. *Annals of Tourism Research, 7*(1), 83–101.

Bischoff, E. E., & Koenig-Lewis, N. (2007). VFR tourism: The importance of university students as hosts. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 9*(6), 465–484. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jtr.618.

Black, J. S. (1988). Work role transitions: A study of American expatraite managers in Japan. *Journal of International Business Studies, 19*(2), 277–294.

Black, J. S., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1991). Toward a comprehensive model of international adjustment: An integration of multiple theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Review, 16*(2), 291–317.

Brida, G. J., Osti, L., & Faccioli, M. (2011). Residents' perception and attitudes towards tourism impacts: A case study of the small rural community of Folgaria (Trentino – Italy). *Benchmarking: An International Journal, 18*(3), 359–385. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14635771111137769.

Brougham, J. E., & Butler, R. W. (1981). A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 8*(4), 290–569.

Caligiuri, P. M. (2000). Selecting expatriates for personality characteristics: A moderating effect of personality on the relationship between host national contacct and cross-cultural adjustment. *MIR, 40*(1), 61–80.

Choi, H. C., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18*(4), 575–594. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09669580903524852.

Commission for the European Communities, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, World Tourism Organization, & United Nations Statistics Division (2011). *Tourism Satellite Account: Recommended Methodological Framework.* (Luxemburg: United Nations).

Crouch, G. I., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1999). Tourism, competitiveness, and soceital prosperity. *Journal of Business Research, 44*, 137–152.

Davidson, R., & Cope, B. (2003). *Business travel: Conferences, incentive travel, exhibitions, corporate hospitality and corporate travel.* Edinburgh: Pearson Education.

Dowling, R. K. (1993). Tourist and resident perceptions of the environment-tourism relationship in the Gascoyne Region, Western Australia. *GeoJournal, 29*(3), 243–251.

Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants, methodology, and research inferences. *Presented at the 6th Annual Travel and Tourism Research Association Conference* (pp. 195–198). San Diego, CA: Travel and Tourism Research Associate.

Dutt, C. S., & Ninov, I. (2017). Expatriates' learning: The role of VFR tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 31*, 253–264. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2017.03.003.

Dutt, C. S., Ninov, I., & Haas, D. (2015). The effect of visiting friends and relatives on Expatriates' destination knowledge: Abstract. In V. Katsoni (Ed.). *Cultural Tourism in a Digital Era: First International Conference IACuDiT, Athens, 2014* (pp. 325–327). Cham: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15859-4_27.

Enright, M. J., & Newton, J. (2005). Determinants of tourism destination competitiveness in Asia Pacific: Comprehensiveness and universality. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*(4), 339–350. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0047287505274647.

Fallon, L. D., & Kriwoken, L. K. (2003). Community involvement in tourism infrastructure—The case of the Strahan Visitor Centre, Tasmania. *Tourism Management, 24*(3), 289–308. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(02)00072-9.

Fan, X., Lu, Z., & Wu, H. (2013). Current situation of rural residents' tourism: A case study in Zhejiang Province in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 19*(10), 1191–1206. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2013.840657.

Furuta, A. (2012). One thing is certain: Heisenberg's uncertainty principle is not dead. Retrieved 12 April 2015, from http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/heisenbergs-uncertainty-principle-is-not-dead/.

Getz, D. (1994). Residents' attitudes towards tourism. *Tourism Management, 15*(4), 247–258. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(94)90041-8.

Gu, H., & Ryan, C. (2010). Hongcun, China—Residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism on a rural community: A mixed methods approach: 应用混合方法探讨旅游对乡村社会的影响—中国宏村居民的案例研究. *Journal of China Tourism Research, 6*(3), 216–243. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2010.503862.

Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature, 18*(3), 251–266. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0885412203260306.

Harvey, M., & Novicevic, M. M. (2000). Staffing global marketing positions: What we don't know can make a difference. *Journal of World Business, 35*(1), 80–94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9516(99)00036-X.

Hemmasi, M., & Downes, M. (2013). Cultural distance and expatriate adjustment revisited. *Journal of Global Mobility, 1*(1), 72–91. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JGM-09-2012-0010.

Huang, T.-J., Chi, S.-C., & Lawler, J. J. (2005). The relationship between expatriates' personality traits and their adjustment to international assignments. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*(9), 1656–1670. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190500239325.

Isakovic, A., & Whitman, M. F. (2013). Self-initiated expatriate adjustment in the United Arab Emirates: A study of academics. *Journal of Global Mobility, 1*(2), 161–186. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JGM-09-2012-0011.

Jackson, M. S., & Inbakaran, R. J. (2006). Evaluating residents' attitudes and intentions to act towards tourism development in regional Victoria, Australia. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 8*(5), 355–366. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jtr.584.

Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning.

Annals of Tourism Research, 22(1), 186–204. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)00067-3.

Jun, S., & Gentry, J. W. (2005). An exploratory investigation of the relative importance of cultural similarity and personal fit in the selection and performance of expatriates. *Journal of World Business, 40*(1), 1–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2004.10.001.

Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 36*, 3), 3–11. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/004728759703600202.

Kaltenborn, B. P., Andersen, O., Nellemann, C., Bjerke, T., & Thrane, C. (2008). Resident attitudes towards mountain second-home tourism development in Norway: The effects of environmental attitudes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 16*(6), 664. http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/jost792.0.

Kayat, K. (2002). Power, social exchanges and tourism in Langkawi: Rethinking resident perceptions. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 4*(3), 171–191. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jtr.375.

Kibicho, W. (2004). Community tourism: A lesson from Kenya's coastal region. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 10*(1), 33–42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/135676670301000104.

Kogut, B., & Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Palgrave Macmillan Journals, 19*(2), 411–432.

Korça, P. (1998). Resident perceptions of tourism in a resort town. *Leisure Sciences, 20*(3), 193–212. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01490409809512280.

Krippendorf, J. (1987). *The holiday makers: Understanding the impact of leisure and travel.* Oxford: Heinemann.

Lam, H., & Selmer, J. (2004). Are former 'third-culture kids' the ideal business expatriates? *Career Development International, 9*(2), 109–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13620430410526166.

Lankford, S. V. (1994). Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development. *Journal of Travel Research, 32*(3), 35–43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/004728759403200306.

Liu, J. C., Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1987). Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 14*(1), 17–37. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(87)90045-4.

Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research, 13*(2), 193–214. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(86)90037-X.

Madrigal, R. (1993). A tale of tourism in two cities. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*(2), 336–353. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(93)90059-C.

Madrigal, R. (1995). Residents' perceptions and the role of government. *Annals of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 86–102. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)00070-9.

McGehee, N. G., Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2002). An examination of factors influencing resident attitudes toward tourism in twelve Arizona communities. *Presented at the 33rd Annual Travel and Tourism Research Association Conference* Travel and Tourism Research Association (Fort Myers, Florida).

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(2), 191–204. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(88)90082-5.

Monterrubio, J. C., & Mendoza-Ontiveros, M. M. (2014). Tourism and the demonstration effect: Empirical evidence. *Tourism & Management Studies, 10*(1), 97–103.

Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach.* Oxford, UK: Routledge.

Myers, B., & Pringle, J. K. (2005). Self-initiated foreign experience as accelerated development: Influences of gender. *Journal of World Business, 40*(4), 421–431. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.08.009.

Ng, S. I., Lee, J. A., & Soutar, G. N. (2007). Tourists' intention to visit a country: The impact of cultural distance. *Tourism Management, 28*(6), 1497–1506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.11.005.

Ninov, I. (2005). *Attitudes and perceptions of local residents and decision makers toward rural tourism development in the city of Post, Texas.* Texas: Texas Tech University (PhD Dissertation).

Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Residents' satisfaction with community attributes and support for tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research, 35*(2), 171–190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1096348010384600.

Oviedo-Garcia, M. A., Castellanos-Verdugo, M., & Martin-Ruiz, D. (2008). Gaining residents' support for tourism and planning. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 10*(2), 95–109. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jtr.644.

Pearce, J. A. (1980). Host community acceptance of foreign tourists: Strategic considerations. *Annals of Tourism Research, 7*(2), 224–233.

Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 586–599. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(90)90029-Q.

Pérez, E. A., & Nadal, J. R. (2005). Host community perceptions a cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research, 32*(4), 925–941. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2004.11.004.

Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research, 16*(4), 8–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/004728757801600402.

Reisinger, Y. (2009). *International Tourism: Cultures and Behaviour.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Saxenian, A. L. (2006). *The new argonauts: Regional advantage in a global economy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Šegota, T., Mihalic, T., & Kuscer, K. (2016). The impact of residents' informedness and involvement on their perceptions of tourism impacts: The case of Bled. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 6*(3), 196–206.

Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management, 42*, 37–49. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007.

Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism*

Management, 5(1), 40–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(84)90006-2.

Shim, I.-S., & Paprock, K. E. (2002). A study focusing on American expatriates' learning in host countries. *International Journal of Training and Development, 6*(1), 13–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2419.00146.

Stylidis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J., & Szivas, E. M. (2014). Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tourism Management, 45*, 260–274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.05.006.

Swarbrooke, J., & Horner, S. (2007). *Consumer behaviour in tourism.* Routledge.

Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Sönmez, F. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(3), 668–688. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00074-3.

UNWTO (2014). *UNWTO tourism highlights* (2014 ed.). Spain: UNWTO.

Useem, R. H. (1999). Third culture kids: Focus of major study: TCK 'mother' pens history of field. Retrieved 30 April 2016, from http://www.tckworld.com/useem/art1.html.

Vargas-Sánchez, A., Porras-Bueno, N., & Plaza-Mejía, d.l. A. M. (2011). Explaining residents' attitudes to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(2), 460–480. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.10.004.

Vargas-Sánchez, A., Porras-Bueno, N., & Plaza-Mejía, d.l. A. M. (2014). Residents' attitude to tourism and seasonality. *Journal of Travel Research, 53*(5), 581–596. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0047287513506295.

Wheeler, F., & Laing, J. (2008). Tourism as a vehicle for liveable communities: Case studies from regional Victoria, Australia. *Annals of Leisure Research, 11*(1–2), 242–263. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2008.9686795.

Williams, A. M., & Hall, C. M. (2000). Tourism and migration: New relationships between production and consumption. *Tourism Geographies, 2*(1), 5–27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/146166800363420.

Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(2), 269–290. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00030-X.

Williams, P. W., Brent Ritchie, J. R., & Goeldner, C. R. (1994). Frameworks for assessing tourism's environmental impacts. *Travel, tourism, and hospitality research: A handbook for managers and researchers* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Yiu, S. (2008). Third culture kids [Blog]. Retrieved 25 August 2017, from http://denizenmag.com/third-culture-kid/.

Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (1999). An investigation of the relationship between tourism impacts and host communities' characteristics. *Anatolia, 10*(1), 29–44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13032917.1999.9686970.

Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (2001). Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation modeling. *Tourism Management, 22*(4), 363–372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00062-5.

William S. Harvey is Professor of Management at the University of Exeter Business School. Will conducts research, teaches and consults in the areas of reputation, leadership, talent management and migration. He has worked with pharmaceutical, healthcare, energy, mining, management consulting, executive search, local and national government, supranational, aviation and food organisations.

Gareth Shaw is Professor of Retail and Tourism Management at the University of Exeter Business School. In the past 5 years has completed an ESRC project on innovation in the hotel industry and an ESRC follow-on project on Sustainable Travel and Social Marketing. He was formerly Professor of Human Geography at Exeter and has a BA and PhD in Human Geography. Professor Shaw has worked on numerous research projects related to retail and tourism development all of which have been funded by major grant awarding bodies. In addition, he has written widely within tourism and produced key texts on tourism studies. Professor Shaw has acted as a consultant for many local, national and international organisations; these include UNESCO, American Express, Coca Cola and Amoco Oil, Visit England and South West Tourism. He is an elected member of the Tourism Research Centre at Modul University, Vienna and the International Academy of Tourism. In addition, he was also an Innovation Fellow at the Advanced Institute of Management and a currently a member of the Innovation Caucus which is an initiative funded jointly by Innovate UK and the ESRC. He was the Chair of the EU COST Action on Tourism, Wellbeing and Ecosystem services (2012–2017) and also Leader of Theme 5 on the EU Smartline project which involves the development of SMEs and e-Health in the Cornish economy (2017–2020).

Christopher S. Dutt is a Senior Lecturer at The Emirates Academy of Hospitality Management in Dubai. Chris lectures in the areas of Business, Marketing, Culture, Statistics, and Strategic Management. Chris holds a Master's degree from The Emirates Academy of Hospitality Management. He is currently completing a PhD at the University of Exeter.