



How religiosity affects the attitudes of communities towards tourism in a sacred city: The case of Jerusalem

Ze'ev Shtudiner*, Galit Klein, Jeffrey Kantor

Department of Economics and Business Administration, Ariel University, Ariel 40700, Israel



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Resident attitudes
Tourism development
Heritage tourism
Religious affiliation
Communities

ABSTRACT

Sacred cities are not only venerable focal point for tourists; they also mainly attract believers to take up residence in them, creating potential tension between residents and tourists. This study examines the role of religiosity as an influence on the attitudes of communities towards tourism. We examine Jerusalem as a case study, a city sacred to three religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. We focus on the practical inevitability of Jewish resident interaction with a variety of tourists. A survey was used to gauge the impact of tourism on social, economic, and environmental conditions. Participants were asked to identify their level of religious observance. Of the 1776 Jewish residents who participated in the survey, 200 defined themselves as ultra-orthodox, 994 as orthodox or traditional, and the remaining 496 as secular. Socio-demographic variables were measured, including amount of financial benefit gained from tourism. Overall, subjects acknowledged tourism as a contributor to personal benefit and the prosperity of Jerusalem. As such, our findings indicate that religiosity exerts an important influence on community attitudes. Consistent with Social Distance Theory, we found that the more extreme the religious group, measured as self-segregation from external influence, the less affirmative they were towards tourism. The findings also suggest that individuals who profit financially from tourism were more affirmative towards tourism. This connection is explained according to Social Exchange Theory (SET). The latter variable interacts with religious characteristics, suggesting a more complex picture of Jerusalem residents. These results point to a major contribution of religiosity to perceptions of tourism, the implications of which should be considered when planning urban developments, especially those linked with sacred sites or landmarks.

1. Introduction

The study of resident attitudes towards tourism is central to tourism research since the mid-1970s (e.g., Almeida-García, Peláez-Fernández, Balbuena-Vázquez, & Cortés-Macias, 2016; Ap & Crompton, 1993; Butler, 1974; Chao et al., 2013; Dogan, 1989; Jackson, 2008; Nyaupane, Timothy, & Poudel, 2015). The current work aims to evaluate the impact of religiosity, specifically its Jewish manifestation, on resident perspectives of tourists. As such, assessing this phenomenon in the context of Jerusalem, one of the world's great sacred cities, seems very appropriate. Indeed, public perception of tourism can be of vital importance to both tourism planners and policymakers attempting to gain local support for tourism projects.

Harrill (2004) maps the literature on community attitudes towards tourism development, presents theoretical frameworks, discusses the factors that influence these attitudes, and draws implications for tourism development. According to Harrill, tourism planners should address how to protect an area's social, economic, and environmental

quality of life enjoyed by residents and tourists alike. Tourism literature shows that tourism has both a positive and negative impact on local resident populations (Allen, Long, Perdue, & Kieselbach, 1988; Ap, 1990; Jackson, 2008; Liu & Var, 1986; Pizam, Neumann, & Reichel, 1978; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012). These were classified by Jackson (2008) into three domains: socio-cultural, environmental, and economic. Socio-cultural impact includes changes in availability of cultural experiences such as entertainment and education. Conflicts between residents and tourists, as well as increases in crime rates or violations of the law, are also linked to the socio-cultural dimension. Environmental factors include impact on local infrastructure, crowds, noise pollution, traffic jams, and ecological difficulties. Finally, economic factors include taxation, costs of living, housing markets, employment rates, etc.

Scholars also point out socio-demographic factors such as age, gender, education, income, ethnicity, and length of residency as influencing diverse resident views on tourism (Brougham & Butler, 1981; Cavus & Tanrisevdi, 2003; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Zamani-Farahani &

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: zeevs@ariel.ac.il (Z. Shtudiner).

Musa, 2012). While many characteristics have been examined, the religiosity of residents has garnered relatively minor attention as a research variable (Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012).

Religion is a central cultural factor influencing perceptions, attitudes, values, and behaviors (Eid & El-Gohary, 2015; Mokhlis, 2009). Accordingly, religion also affects the types of products and services believers consume, including tourist commodities. Since religion influences numerous aspects of believer daily life, it is unsurprising that a pilgrim-oriented tourism industry has evolved in parallel with more conventional tourism, creating, in the words of Bremer, a “duality of place” (2001, p. 3). Cities have started to brand their sacred sites and market them to pilgrims and general tourist alike (Hughes, Bond, & Ballantyne, 2013; Nyaupane et al., 2015). However, in many cases, these sites are not isolated from living communities and consequently residents can be exposed to high volumes of tourists. Some residents choose to settle in sacred areas precisely because of their religious significance. As such, religious residents may come into contact with secular or tourists from different religions, and so the potential for friction is high. Therefore, resident perceptions in sacred cities are especially important for municipality regulatory affairs and tourism planning.

This paper contributes to the existing literature in several ways. First, only a few articles have investigated the impact of religious affiliation on community attitudes (Eid & El-Gohary, 2015; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012) even as pilgrimage-based tourism is well documented (e.g., Griffiths, 2011; Nyaupane et al., 2015; Olsen & Timothy, 2006). Second, we focus on residents living in sacred places and how they are influenced by religiosity. Jerusalem is our case study since it is well-known as sacred to three Abrahamic faiths: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Therefore, residents end up interacting with visitors from many nations who belong to a variety of religions, making this city a unique example of interreligious contact. Third, the existing research is largely dominated by case studies in North America (specifically on rural tourism or recreation areas) and, to a lesser extent, Australia, New Zealand, and the UK (Sharpley, 2014). A surprising lack of attention has been paid to the Mediterranean region, although it is highly visited. Fourth, most research is concerned with domestic tourism, especially those based in North America. Only a few studies focus on international tourists (Sharpley, 2014). Tourism in Jerusalem is mostly international, and, in this case, resident attitudes can be more varied since the cultural and economic distinction between residents and tourists is more significant.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, the literature review is divided into three sub-sections. First, we review how social and cultural factors impact the attitudes of residents towards tourism. Second, we focus on the role of religion and religiosity as affecting the attitudes towards tourism in a sacred city such as Jerusalem. Third, we review two theories that we suggest as explaining the connection between religion and attitudes towards tourism. Section 3 describes the methodology. In Section 4, the results are presented. Finally, in section 5, we offer concluding remarks and suggest some implications for tourism research and tourism policymakers.

2. Literature review

2.1. Socio-cultural factors that impact attitudes towards tourism

A growing body of research has explored the effect of tourism on local residents and their attitudes towards this industry (Almeida-García et al., 2016; Ap, 1992; Hernández & Mercader, 2015; Karanth & Nepal, 2012; Liu & Var, 1986; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012). Two research methods are generally used: The first involves examining the effects of tourism on the community at the local level. Researchers formulate statements to elicit levels of agreement from residents, thereby determining local attitudes to the tourism industry organized into three areas: economic, social, and environmental. The second

method is evaluating demographic characteristics and personal information in assessing impact on attitudes towards tourism. The current study aimed to combine these two approaches and measured the effect of demographic variables on local attitudes towards tourism.

Since tourism depends on the hospitality of residents, scholars started to look at whether local populations perceive tourism as a contributing or detracting factor in their community. According to Chen (2011), previous studies have listed the affirmative impacts as *benefit and opportunity factors*, among them being: increase in employment rate, business opportunities, tax revenues for local government, extending knowledge of foreign cultures, improvement of local infrastructure, enrichment of entertainment and social life, restoration of historical sites, preservation of local cultures, and conservation of natural resources. By contrast, negative aspects of tourism, known as *costs and concerns*, include increasing crime rates due to vandalism, prostitution, and illicit drugs. Additional negatives consist of increase in housing prices, disruption of traditional culture, deterioration of the natural environment, pollution, crowdedness, traffic congestion, and overall decrease in the quality of life. A study conducted in Hawaii revealed that most residents agreed that tourism is beneficial to their cultural framework (Liu & Var, 1986). Subjects have argued that increase in tourism can contribute to expansion of the entertainment industry, leisure possibilities, and educational opportunities. On the other hand, locals also insist that tourism is responsible for increases in crime levels, prostitution, vandalism, and, to some degree, illicit drug selling and use. As a result, some respondents claimed that tax revenues should first be allocated to eradication of crime and only then to tourism development.

Findings have revealed that residents are not homogenous or monolithic in their opinion of tourism and can be divided into different group perceptions: these can range from “lovers” and “in-betweeners” to “haters” (Davis, Allen, & Cosenza, 1988). These different approaches to tourism can be linked to several factors: engagement in tourism businesses (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf, & Vogt, 2005), employment in tourism industries (Andereck et al., 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; Liu & Var, 1986; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012), place of birth (Haley, Snaith, & Miller, 2005), attitudes towards environmental issues (Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002), distance or proximity of tourist attractions to residential areas (Harrill & Potts, 2003; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004), and ratio of tourists to residents (Sheldon & Var, 1984). Likewise, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) categorized residents into those directly dependent on tourism and those who are not. They found that the former perceived the tourism industry in a more positive light in terms of employment opportunities, standard of living, personal income, and tax revenues.

Despite these negative attitudes, scholars found that locals tend to refrain from expressing them in behavior. Most respondents claimed that they behave kindly to tourists and that their hospitality is repaid. They also affirm that tourists tend to understand and respect their local culture, religion, and lifestyle. The mixed attitudes expressed by residents were also found in Jackson (2008) research. This particular study focused on the attitude of residents towards unique aspects of tourism. The findings indicated that although residents were generally positive towards tourism, they also pointed out some negative consequences of these aspects. Jackson demonstrated that residents are aware of inconveniences of tourism, but weigh the benefit against the cost, which, in this case, exceeds any negative influence. However, when cost exceeds benefit, a majority of residents want it discontinued. This example is incongruent with findings from other studies (e.g., Chao et al., 2013; Haley et al., 2005) suggesting multifaceted feelings on the part of residents concerning tourism and its impact on the local community.

In order to decipher this inconsistency, scholars have identified several variables that impact community perception of tourism (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; Chen, 2011). Andriotis and Vaughan (2003) categorized these variables into three types: (1) *extrinsic*

variables, including the state of tourism development in the host community, type of tourism, and seasonal status; (2) *intrinsic variables*, incorporating distance from the tourism area, resident involvement in degree of tourism, and dependency of residential economy on tourism; and (3) *socio-demographic characteristics* representing gender, education, ethnicity, age, income, employment status, and number of years living in a tourism zone (e.g., Almeida-García et al., 2016; Hernández & Mercader, 2015; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Allen et al., 1988; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Hernandez, Cohen, & Garcia, 1996; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012). For example, Almeida-García et al. (2016) found significant correlation between age and impact of environmental and socio-cultural factors. Attitudes on effects of tourism on the local environment and socio-cultural factors improved progressively with age. The picture was reversed for economic factors. The younger residents (younger than 20) expressed more positive attitudes on the economic impact of tourism compared to their older counterparts. A connection was also found between marital and parental status on environmental and socio-cultural impact. Married residents and residents with children were more positively disposed towards tourism as compared to unmarried residents and residents with no children. Other linkages such as level of education, type of work, and years of residence were also noted. However, connections to gender of residents proved insignificant. It was concluded that socio-demographic characteristics influence opinions of residents on tourism. Therefore, it is necessary to take them into account during the planning and implementation stages of tourism development initiatives.

Of the socio-demographic variables analyzed in connection to attitudes on tourism, religiosity has received scant attention. The current study is intended to compensate for this oversight, adding to our understanding of the impact of socio-demographic factors. This work is an attempt to explore whether level of religiosity influences the perception of residents vis-à-vis tourism.

2.2. Religiosity and the attitude of religious residents of sacred areas

In many societies, religion is not just a belief system, but also a faith realized in every aspect of life, including consumption of products and services such as traveling and the hospitality industry. For thousands of years, religion has been a central incentive for people to travel and visit sacred sites, motivated by desire to fulfill a perceived religious obligation or satisfy a spiritual yearning. Today, religious tourists represent an evolving industry, with numerous sites aimed at pilgrims, hoping to attract not only believers but also general tourists (Griffiths, 2011). According to Rysbekova, Duissenbayeva, and Izmailov (2014), religious tourism is a unique kind of cognitive tourism, since it attempts to satisfy *gnoseological* incentives, giving tourists the opportunity to observe and live through a religious cult-like process of ceremonies and rituals. Alongside the spiritual process, religious tourism conceals marketing aspects, allowing pilgrims to consume religious souvenirs and tokens. According to Nyaupane et al. (2015), the motivation for religious tourists is different from that of their conventional secular counterparts. Religious tourists are motivated by spiritual motivations; therefore, visiting sacred places may well evoke strong feelings of religious inspiration. Non-religious tourists, however, may simply satisfy their curiosity, motivated instead by recreational or cultural incentives.

Similar spiritual motivations inspiring religious tourists stimulate believers to live near sacred sites and in sacred regions. As the location is developed, it can attract more residents and come to provide services to the local community as well as to visiting tourists. This may result in unavoidable interactions between locals and tourists, some of the latter motivated by religion and others by curiosity. Zamani-Farahani and Musa (2012) showed that tourist behaviors can sometimes provoke the values and beliefs of residents. And yet, they also contribute to their economic, social, and environmental conditions, leading to complex feelings about tourism.

Although there is an extensive literature on religious tourism, it is mostly concentrated on pilgrimage motivations (Keeling, 2000; Nolan &

Nolan, 1992; Nyaupane et al., 2015), managerial and marketing aspects of sacred places (Hughes et al., 2013; Raj & Morpeth, 2007; Rysbekova et al., 2014), and the travel needs of religious tourists (Dunbar-Hall, 2001; Rinschede, 1992). There is scant research on how religiosity in these communities impacts attitudes towards visitors in their area. In fact, Zamani-Farahani and Musa (2012) argue that, to their knowledge, no study has ever addressed this specific question. They conducted their study on Islamic populations in two tourist areas: Sare'in and Masooleh, both located in Iran. These towns are not religious sites, but possess environmental attractions (hot springs in Sare'in) and ancient architecture (Masooleh). While most of the subjects in their study defined themselves as atheists, they were segregated based on religious practices. They found a positive relationship between religiosity and perceived sociocultural impacts of tourism. That is, the more the subject self-defines as religious, the more tourism is claimed to bring better infrastructure improvement, cultural activity, and life quality. These subjects also deny that tourism causes social problems. Not only that, they also found that residents with higher levels of Islamic religiosity perceived tourism as a beneficial factor as compared to less observant residents. Zamani-Farahani and Musa (2012) suggested that the positive connection between religion and affirmative attitudes might stem from similar characteristics between them and tourists visiting these sites. Most tourists either were visiting through organized tours or had limited contact with the local community, or they were tourists from neighboring Muslim countries, sharing similar beliefs and codes of conducts. Therefore, according to Social Distance Theory (SDT, Thyne & Lawson, 2015; Thyne, Lawson, & Todd, 2006), individuals with similar appearance, attitude, values, and characteristics tend to be more tolerant and accepting of each other. The subjects in this study did not feel that their local traditions and customs were threatened. On the contrary, not only did residents identify with the tourists, they also benefitted financially from them. This positive connection can also be explained by Social Exchange Theory (SET). In this theoretical framework, residents alter their attitudes to tourism by the benefit they gain or the cost they absorb from this activity (Nunkoo, Smith, & Ramkissoon, 2013). Therefore, subjects with tourism-based jobs had more positive attitudes towards the influence of tourism on their sites.

While SDT and SET explain positive connections when tourists and residents are similar, we can speculate that with greater distance between these two groups, the picture might be reversed. We, therefore, chose to explore how Jewish residents of Jerusalem perceive tourism based on religious affiliation.

2.3. Background on Jerusalem and different perceptions of Judaism

Tourism is one of Israel's major sources of income, generating more than \$4.3 billion USD in income (1.4% of total GDP) and more than 2.8 million arrivals in 2016, according to the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics. In 2016, Travel & Tourism (directly and indirectly) supported 245,000 jobs (7.0% of total employment). Fifty six percent of all tourist arrivals in 2016 were from European countries, 28% from American countries (22% from the USA), and 16% from Asia and Africa. Thirty two percent of tourists who came to Israel in 2016 visited primarily for touring and leisure, while 23% came for pilgrimage. Seventy-seven percent of all tourists visited Jerusalem. Of all tourists, 45% visited the Via Dolorosa and 68% the Western Wall.

Jerusalem is the capital of Israel and its largest city. At the end of 2015, the population of Jerusalem numbered 865,700 residents, including 542,000 Jews and 323,700 Arabs and other populations, according to the Jerusalem Institute for Policy Research (2017). Jerusalem is also one of the oldest cities in the world and is sacred to the three major monotheistic religions. Therefore, it is not surprising that many tourists visit Jerusalem each year (Cohen Ioannides & Ioannides, 2006). Jerusalem attracts visitors from throughout the world due to its unique cultural and religious heritage as well as historical, archeological, and cultural sites. According to the Jerusalem Institute for

Policy Research (2017), twenty percent of all hotel rooms in Israel's tourism industry are located in Jerusalem. The number of guests in Jerusalem hotels totaled 1,243,600, 60% of whom were tourists from abroad, while 40% were Israelis. Jerusalem has a strong power of attraction for foreign tourists. The number of foreign hotel guests in Jerusalem was 744,600 (28% of all foreign hotel guests in Israel), compared with 705,000 in Tel Aviv (26%) and 143,600 in Eilat (5%).

In 2016, the number of overnight stays in Jerusalem hotels was 3,545,900, split between 3,040,300 (86%) in West Jerusalem and 505,600 (14%) in East Jerusalem.¹ In terms of revenues, 89.4% were recorded by West Jerusalem hotels. In terms of employment, 5.6% of Jerusalem workers are in the accommodation and food service industry.

As Jerusalem is such a popular tourist destination, we chose to conduct our survey among its residents. The Jewish population in Jerusalem consists of secular, orthodox, and ultra-orthodox (Haredim) residents. The Jerusalem Institute for Policy Research (2017) estimated that 34.0% of the Jewish population self-defined as ultra-orthodox, 26.0% as secular, and the rest as orthodox or traditional. Religious Jews, both ultra-orthodox and orthodox, are characterized by punctilious adherence to Jewish precepts rooted in the Hebrew Bible and codified in *Halacha* (Jewish Law). Many secular Jews observe only a few rituals related to life cycle events and holidays. Ultra-orthodox Jews tend to be the most extreme in their religious interpretations and self-segregate from normative Israeli society. Indeed, level of social isolation is a useful measure to distinguish these three groups in addition to level of faith. Both secular and orthodox Jews believe in assimilation and engagement with the state of Israel. The two groups live together, side by side, work in the same occupations, serve in the army, and believe that Israel should be a democratic country. As noted, the ultra-orthodox community, however, self-isolates from the rest of Israeli society in most dimensions: socially, culturally, demographically, economically, and even geographically. Friedman (1991) argued that the ultra-orthodox community presents an alternative to Israeli secular-Zionist culture, a counterculture that emphasizes values of devotion to religious studies and only recognizes the right of the Jewish nation to exist if based on Jewish law. This community tries, not always with success, to segregate itself from the rest of Israeli society. Most ultra-orthodox males devote their lives to becoming master-scholars in religious studies, with secular studies only offered to male children until fourth grade. From then on males usually concentrate on religious studies, culminating in an adult career in which they are expected to study in a religious institution (Yeshiva) while their wives support them economically (Friedman, 1991). Therefore, most of the male population in this community either does not work, or works inside their community with minimal contact with the outside secular world. Nevertheless, Friedman also states that full segregation is impossible to accomplish. Ultra-orthodox Jews live in neighborhoods that are surrounded with residents who are traditional and secular, and consume services from institutions located in other areas. Most importantly, they often visit the Old City of Jerusalem, which is sacred to other faiths in addition to Judaism. Therefore, while this group has unique features they still meet and interact with visitors from other cultures and religions. In sum, ultra-orthodox Jews see Jerusalem mainly as a spiritual and religious center, while secular and orthodox Jews additionally see the city as an important cultural and historical center that attracts tourists.

2.4. Social Distance Theory, Social Exchange Theory and hypotheses

Several theories model how attitudes towards visitors are generated.

¹ Jerusalem was divided into East and West along the 1949 Armistice Line (the "Green Line") after the War of Independence. Israel controlled the West and Jordan the East. After the Six Day War in 1967, Israel captured East Jerusalem from Jordan and reunited the city.

One is Social Distance Theory, with social distance defined by Magee and Smith as "a subjective perception or experience of distance from another person or other persons" (2013, p. 159). The theory claims that people have expectations of closeness in their interaction with others. Hence, individuals are motivated to minimize the social distance between them. The reduction of distance not only depends on type of interaction, but also on other parameters, among them closeness and resemblances between individuals. People are more tolerant and acceptable of others who are similar to themselves, compared to those who are socially or culturally dissimilar. For example, Triandis and Triandis (1960) found that both Roman Catholics and Protestants considered Jews as more distant from themselves, while Jews considered Roman Catholics more distant compared to Protestants.

During the interaction of residents and tourists, both groups evaluate each other and decide how to behave according to the magnitude of distance between them (e.g., Nyaupane et al., 2015; Sinkovics & Penz, 2009; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012). While some studies used race and nationality as determinants of social distance (Triandis & Triandis, 1960), Nyaupane et al. (2015) argue that religion should also be taken into account. They followed the evolution of distance between tourists from dissimilar religions such as Christianity and Hinduism visiting sites sacred to Buddhism. They found that social distance was smallest between members of the same faith; however, the distance between Buddhists and other groups of believers was not so far as well. On the other hand, pilgrims and local worshippers were often annoyed by the behavior of secular visitors, who violated the meditation and worship of the believers. Their conclusion was that although religion can be a segregating force, religious individuals from different faith traditions tend to be closer between themselves as compared to secular tourists. In a similar vein to Nyaupane et al. (2015), the current study concentrates on Jerusalem, a city sacred to several religions, which, therefore, attracts a diverse range of pilgrims. Besides pilgrims, many secular tourists arrive in Jerusalem as well, behaving in manners that may contradict religious norms. According to SDT, the greater the resemblance residents feel towards tourists, the more positive the attitudes² expressed. Since Jerusalem's tourists are diverse and composed of multiple religions, we can speculate that orthodox Jews will feel more discontent with the tourists, since they share the least resemblances with them. From social and cultural perspectives, ultra-orthodox residents have less in common in comparison to the other two groups, orthodox and secular. Likewise, the role of religiosity, as an economic/social/inter-cultural contact factor between the host and guest relationships, is crucial. From an economic perspective, many ultra-orthodox simply do not work or work in their segregated community. Therefore, we can also speculate that this group will have the least contact with occupations related to tourism, which would expand their negative attitude towards tourism. Since our subjects represent a diverse degree of religious observance, our first hypothesis is:

H1a. Ultra-orthodox residents will express the least positive attitudes towards tourism in comparison to orthodox and secular residents of Jerusalem.

H1b. Secular residents will express the most positive attitudes towards tourism, followed by orthodox residents of Jerusalem.

In addition to SDT, Social Exchange Theory (SET) can also explain diversification of resident attitudes. Social exchange theory was developed in the social-psychology field, and can be attributed to the early work of Blau (1964) and Homans (1958). It evolved from the idea that human interactions and economic exchanges intermix simultaneously in economic and social transactions between two or more entities (Kong, Dirks, & Ferrin, 2014). During the transaction, the two

² Attitudes towards tourism were measured by subject scores to statements assessing the contribution of tourism to level of education, cultural events, conflict between residents and tourists, crime level, and other related factors, as described in section 3.2.1.

actors weigh costs (psychological, economic, physical, and social) against benefits that can be earned from the interaction. Based on the computational result, people decide on which partners with whom they wish to engage. Similarly, scholars argue that SET can also explain the diversified attitude towards tourism (Ap, 1992; Boley, McGehee, Perdue, & Long, 2014; Long, Perdue, & Allen, 1990; Nunkoo et al., 2013). The interaction between tourists and the local community can involve environmental, economic, and social benefit or deterioration. If residents perceive that benefits exceed costs, they will favor tourism and engage in its promotion. However, if the costs surpass the benefits, then the attitude will be negative. Likewise, residents who work and earn their living from tourism were more affirmative towards tourists, although their positive attitude is reduced in relation to less beneficial events (Boley et al., 2014; Jackson, 2008; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012). This parameter is even more prominent in the current study, since we inspect how the residents perceived the contribution of tourism towards economic aspects. Therefore, as SET argues, people who see tourism as not only exploiting resources and requiring financial investment, but as a source of financial prosperity, evaluate the impact of tourism more positively. On the other hand, residents who do not gain financially from tourism may rank its costs as burdensome as residents pay taxes and suffer from over-crowdedness, but fail to gain material advantage in exchange. Therefore, from SET the second hypothesis can be derived as:

H2a. Residents of Jerusalem, who materially benefit from tourism, will attribute the influence of the tourist as more positive.

Although SET claims that financial benefit may decrease resistance to tourism, SDT argues that this attitude is influenced by resemblances between tourists and residents. However, these two theoretical frameworks can create friction with each other. For instance, will residents who are segregated from tourists, but benefit from them financially show more tolerance in comparison to residents who do not benefit? Based on SET, we argue that even in the most segregated community, as exemplified by the ultra-orthodox, residents who benefit financially from tourism will be more affirmative towards many of its aspects. Therefore, our last hypothesis can be framed as:

H2b. Ultra-orthodox residents who benefit financially from tourism will have more positive attitudes towards tourism in comparison to ultra-orthodox residents who do not benefit from tourism.

3. Material and method

3.1. Subjects

A paper-based survey was distributed during the spring of 2015. Participants were located through convenience sampling, among residents living in Jerusalem. They needed to be over 18 years old and speak Hebrew. We went to ultra-orthodox, orthodox, and secular neighborhoods, introducing ourselves and asking residents who matched our pre-term to participate in the survey. Overall, 1776 subjects participated in the survey. Two hundred subjects defined themselves as ultra-orthodox (11.3%), 994 as orthodox or traditional (56%), and the rest (496 subjects) as secular (27.9%).³ Forty eight percent of respondents were male and 52% female. Fifty three percent of respondents were single, 45% married, and the rest either divorced or widowed. The mean age was 32 (sd = 12.95), with mean score of 23 for years living in the city (sd = 14.62), while the socio-economic status

³ A primary obstacle in data elicitation was lack of cooperation from ultra-orthodox respondents. This community is known for its segregation, and tends to avoid participating in non-religious surveys, including governmental and academic studies. While we tried to convince ultra-orthodox subjects to participate in the study, the result led to underrepresentation for the ultra-orthodox community and overrepresentation for the orthodox community.

mean score was 2.91 (sd = 0.90, on 1 to 5 scale). In regard to the question, “How much do you profit from tourism?” the mean score was 2.46 (on a scale from 1 to 9-very much), which indicated that most respondents did not directly profit from tourism.

3.2. Instruments

3.2.1. Dependent variables: attitudes towards social, economic, and environmental aspects

A questionnaire was designed to capture the opinions of residents on the impact of tourism in three domains: social, economic, and environmental. We based our survey on Jackson (2008) questionnaire, but made a few adaptations according to local residents. While some scholars suggested other measurements (e.g. Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Gursoy et al., 2002; King, Pizam, & Milman, 1993; Ko & Stewart, 2002), we found Jackson's questionnaire sufficient and extensive enough to capture the attitude of residents towards these three domains. Moreover, most studies in the existing literature are concerned with resident perceptions of advantages and disadvantages of tourism development. Attitudes towards tourists are rarely addressed (Sharpley, 2014). Jackson's questionnaire includes statements that relate to both types of attitudes. In addition to Jackson's questionnaire, we added four questions relevant to unique aspects of the Jewish religion. We asked participants to indicate the extent of agreement with each one of the statements. We measured their opinion on a 5-point Likert scale, resembling Jackson's methodology. The Likert-type scale (Likert, 1932) is a very common psychometric scale for measuring respondent agreement on a continuum. Therefore, it enabled us to carry out statistical analyses such as ANOVA, mean score differences, and regression analysis.

Since only some of the items measure positive attitudes, we decided to reverse the scale of items that capture negative attitudes towards tourism. Items that were reversed are designated with the letter (R). After these changes, all items represented positive attitude. Therefore, the higher the score, the more respondents were affirmative towards the impact of tourism on Jerusalem.

We first applied factor analysis over the items of Jackson's questionnaire. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.799, above the commonly recommended value (0.6). Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($X^2 = 12,624.96$, $p < 0.00$). We used Direct Oblimin Method since we speculated that the factors may be correlated among themselves, allowing factors to not be orthogonal. Overall, the factor analysis found eight factors that explained 53% of the total variance.⁴ The initial Eigen value indicated that the first three factors explained 15%, 10%, and 7% of the variance, respectively. We chose three-factors solution since the other factors included items that were loaded on the first three factors and this solution captured the original categorization in our theoretical reference. With that, the three factors solution was also examined using varimax and oblimin rotation of the factor-loading matrix. There were little differences between the three-factors varimax and oblimin solution, thus both solutions were examined in subsequent analyses before deciding to use an oblimin rotation for the final solution. Finally, items that did not reach the lower cut-off point of .4 were eliminated to capture more coherent factors. The factor-loading matrix for this final solution is presented in Table 1.

The first factor was named “economic-social aspect” and was measured by 10 questions on respondent perception of the contribution of tourism to financial status, workplace, and economic condition of the city. It also assessed tourist contributions to cultural activities and educational experiences. The second factor mainly measured negative effect on the social aspects of the city, including social conflict between

⁴ While some researchers suggest that factors analysis should exceed 60% (Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins, & Kuppelwieser, 2014), other indicate that a cumulative variance should be above 50% (Merenda, 1997, p. 158; Sarstedt & Mooi, 2014, p. 247, p. 247).

Table 1
Factor loadings and communalities for the first three factors based on a principal components analysis with oblimin rotation for 33 items.

Question number in the questionnaire		Mean (SD)	Economic- social aspects	Social aspects	Environment aspects
18	Tourism development has generated much employment in Jerusalem	3.54 (1.17)	.670		
20	Tourism development benefits Jerusalem in that it has created jobs for Jerusalem residents	3.59 (1.15)	.658		
17	Tourism attracts more investment and spending in the city's economy than any other industry	3.37 (1.10)	.631		
19	The economic contributions of tourism far outweigh the negative social impacts of tourism	3.34 (1.21)	.580		
16	The economic gains from tourism for the city are more important than the temporary inconvenience that special events cause	3.35 (1.19)	.571		
12	Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population (e.g., arts, music, etc.)	3.44 (1.21)	.564		
11	Interacting with visitors from all over the world is a valuable educational experience	3.49 (1.24)	.529		
14	³ Without tourism revenue, the city would not be able to meet its financial obligations	3.07 (1.26)	.517		
34	³ Because of tourism, there are more recreational activities available for local residents	3.16 (1.22)	.507		
5	Tourism is one major reason for the variety of entertainments available to residents in the city	3.13 (1.28)	.495		
25	Because of tourism, our local infrastructure such as our roads and other public facilities are kept at a high standard	3.20 (1.26)	.448		
23*	During special events, commercial activities such as vendors selling on the main streets in the city should be allowed	3.62 (1.20)	.387		
15*	I am satisfied with the way my taxes are spent by the city on tourist information, etc.	2.75 (1.11)	.354		
22*	Local businesses are the ones which benefit most from tourism	3.67 (1.12)	.345		
7	Tourism increase may lead to social conflicts between tourists and residents (R)	3.51 (1.30)		.642	
8	Because of tourism, the crime rate in Jerusalem has increased (R)	3.33 (1.26)		.622	
35	I think tourism has led to vandalism in the city of Jerusalem (R)	3.91 (1.25)		.614	
30	Improving public tourist facilities is a waste of our taxes (R)	3.34 (1.29)		.604	
1	Jerusalem will be a better place if vacationers would not come here (R)	4.06 (1.33)		.585	
4	Jerusalem residents are the ones who suffer from tourist areas (R)	3.26 (1.27)		.541	
6	A higher government tax should be levied on tourism expenditures (R)	3.23 (1.33)		.515	
21	Economic benefits accrue to a minority of the Jerusalem population (R)	2.76 (1.33)		.452	
3	I would be in favor of increased tourism development in Jerusalem	3.89 (1.27)		.414	
2*	I have concerns about future tourism development in Jerusalem	2.57 (1.20)		.312	
9*	Resident taxes should go towards reducing crime rates rather than promoting tourism (R)	4.74 (.85)		.310	
28	Tourists disrupt the peace and tranquility of our community (R)	1.27 (.88)			.888
33	Because of tourism, I do not go shopping in the downtown area	3.05 (1.51)			.741
27	Tourists are a burden on government services (R)	3.04 (.44)			.730
31	Tourism has resulted in unpleasantly overcrowded outdoor spaces for the local population (R)	4.79 (.73)			.605
26	Tourists greatly add to the traffic problem in Jerusalem (R)	3.13 (1.27)			.623
10	Tourists are inconsiderate when using our facilities and of our lifestyle (R)	3.02 (.45)			.602
32*	Government expenditures should go towards preserving and protecting the environment rather than promoting tourism (R)	2.98 (.40)			.352
29*	Planning by the government can control the impact on the ecological environment	2.91 (1.17)			.315
% of variance			11	9	5
Reliability (α Cronbach)			.786	.757	.725

Note. Factor loading < 0.2 are suppressed *We excluded this item since it was lower than cut-off point of 0.4 or since this item reduces the reliability of this aspect variable.

residents and tourists, crime rate, and vandalism. This was measured by 7 statements and named “social aspect”. The last factor was “environmental aspect,” measured by 5 questions concerning aspects such as portion of tourists engaged in noise pollution, crimes, overcrowdings, traffic jams, and destruction of ecological systems. In the questionnaire for ultra-orthodox respondents, we added another four questions. They measured ultra-orthodox perception of fundamental and relevant religious aspects. Table 1 displays the question numbers, the mean scores, and standard deviations (SD) for each of the questions.

Next, we calculated for each factor a new variable based on total mean score for items loaded on it. The mean score results in the three new factors are: *socio-economic* (M = 3.36, sd = 0.72), *social* (M = 3.63, sd = 0.75), and *environmental* (M = 2.59, sd = 0.44).

3.2.2. Control variables: demographic and other characteristics

Following the attribution questionnaire, we asked residents about their socio-demographic attributes, including age (“age”), gender (“gender”: 0-male, 1- female), occupation, number of years living in Jerusalem (“years living in the city”), status as apartment owners or renters (“own”: 0-no, 1-own an apartment), level of profit from tourism (“financial”: on a scale from 1 to 9-very much), and socio-economic status (“socio-economic”: on a scale from 1- to 5 very good). We also measured political attitude (“political”) by asking respondents to describe their party affiliation from 1 representing right wing to 9 signifying left wing.

Religious affiliation (“religiosity”) was measured through a self-perceptual identification. Responders had to categorize themselves into one of three groups: ultra-orthodox (0), orthodox (1), or secular (2). In order to conduct correlation and regression analyses, we transformed the religiosity variable into three dummy variables, representing different religious categories. The first variable measured if the respondent self-identifies as ultra-orthodox and was labeled, “ultra-orthodox” (1-yes, 0-otherwise). The second variable measured respondent status as orthodox (“orthodox” 1-yes, 0- otherwise), while the third measured secular (“secular” 1-yes, 0-otherwise).

4. Results

4.1. Descriptive statistics

Table 2 presents the means, standard deviations, and correlations among all variables under scrutiny.

Table 2 shows that age is positively correlated with several demographic variables, indicating that older respondents have a higher tendency to vote for left wing parties. They also tend to be female, have resided longer in the city, own an apartment, and be characterized by higher socioeconomic status. Higher social economic status was connected with older residents who have lived in the city for more years,

Table 2
Means, standard deviations, and correlations.

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Age	32	12.95	1												
2. Gender (0-male, 1-female)			.11**	1											
3. political attitude	3.45	2.34	.12**	.08**	1										
4. years living in the city	23	14.62	.65**	10**	.01	1									
5. benefit from tourism (on a scale from 1 to 9-very much)	2.46	2.32	.03	.042	.10**	.01	1								
6. owner (0-no, 1-own an apartment in the city)			.26**	.01	-.04	.33**	.03	1							
7. socio-economic state (scale 1 to 5)	2.91	0.9	.17**	.07**	.12**	.12**	.17**	.23**	1						
8. economic- social aspect	3.36	.72	.01	-.03	.04'	-.07**	.08**	.03	.08**	1					
9. social aspect	3.63	.75	.04	-.07**	.02	.00	.02	.01	.06**	.27**	1				
10. environmental aspect	2.59	.44	.01	-.04	.10*	-.00	.06*	-.01	-.21**	-.03	.12**	1			
11. ultra-orthodox (1-yes 0-no)			-.02	-.00	-.19*	-.01	-.10**	-.04	-.36**	-.12**	-.10**	-.69**	1		
12. orthodox (1- yes, 0- no)			.06**	.04	.25**	.08**	.07**	.06*	.18**	.04	-.03	.31**	-.43**	1	
13. secular (1-yes 0- no)			-.06*	-.04	-.15**	-.07*	-.00	-.03	.05*	.052*	.093**	.17**	-.24**	-.77*	1

N = 1776 *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, 'p < 0.10.

are female, benefit financially from tourism, and are owners of apartment. The correlation results for the three attitudes, encompassing social, economic, and environmental aspects, show that these three variables are positively correlated among themselves. That is, respondents who perceive tourism as contributing in one aspect tend to see it as enhancing other aspects and vice versa.

The results also show negative correlation between secular residents and age (r = -0.06, p < 0.05), political attitude (r = -0.15 p < 0.01), as well as positive correlation with socioeconomic status (r = 0.05 p < 0.05). That is, secular residents were younger, tend to vote more for right wing parties, and had higher socioeconomic status. Orthodox residents were older (r = 0.06, p < 0.05), vote for left wing parties (r = 0.25, p < 0.01), live in the city longer (r = 0.07, p < 0.05), earn from tourism (r = 0.07, p < 0.01), own an apartment in the city (r = 0.05, p < 0.01), and their socio-economic status was higher compared to other groups (r = 0.17, p < 0.00). The ultra-orthodox residents describe themselves as voting for right wing parties (r = -0.16, p < 0.01), did not earn from tourism (r = -0.10, p < 0.01), and their socio-economic status was lower (r = -0.36, p < 0.01).

Ultra-orthodox Jews indicated negative attitudes towards all three aspects: economic-social (r = -0.12, p < 0.01), social (r = -0.10, p < 0.00), and environmental (r = -0.69, pp < 0.01). Orthodox residents felt positively concerning environmental aspects (r = 0.31, p < 0.01). Secular residents had positive attitude about economic-social (r = 0.052, p < 0.05), social (r = 0.09, p < 0.00), and environmental (r = 0.17, p < 0.01).

While a correlation was detected, it was not high enough to suggest a multicollinearity problem. To be certain, we also carried out a variance inflation factors (VIF's) test (Dormann et al., 2013; Mansfield & Helms, 1982). The results of the VIF's tests were less than 2, indicating lower multicollinearity possibility between demographic variables, including those of religiosity.

4.2. Hypothesis testing: attitudes towards tourism as aspects of religious affiliation

Our first two hypotheses argue that social distance between religious affiliations of residents and tourists will determine resident attitudes towards the latter. We thus argue that the ultra-orthodox will be less positive in their attitude in comparison to secular and orthodox residents. Although these last two groups do not share the same beliefs, they are linked by similar socio-demographic characteristics. They live in the same neighborhoods, are employed in the same workplaces, and participate in similar cultural events. As noted, the ultra-orthodox community tends to pursue a lifestyle of radical segregation in all aspects of life: neighborhoods, workplaces, and cultural events. They are, therefore, quite dissimilar from the typical tourist visting Jerusalem,

both in religiosity and lifestyle. Thus, our first hypothesis (H1a) is that ultra-orthodox residents will display the least favorable attitude towards tourists in Jerusalem. We also argue that the most affirmative group will be the secular residents (H2a), based on the assumption of social distance between Jewish orthodox residents that live in Jerusalem and non-Jewish tourists and pilgrims visiting the city.

To assess both hypotheses, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)⁵ test was conducted between religious affiliation (ultra-orthodox, orthodox, and secular) and the attitude they possess concerning the different aspects. Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard deviations (in parentheses) of each group (secular, orthodox, and ultra-orthodox) and their rankings of statements. As noted, we reversed the direction of the negative sentences. To simplify the reading, we changed the direction of the statements. Therefore, the higher the mean score given in the sentence, the more the respondents felt positive towards the attitude that appears in the statements.⁶

To determine which group stands out as significantly different, we applied a post-hoc test in the next step. Table 3 presents the mean differences test according to Duncan multi-range test. Post-hoc analysis revealed significant differences in the attitude of ultra-orthodox respondents as compared to the other two groups on the majority of the statements. Both orthodox and secular residents expressed more positive attitudes towards tourism across all three aspects, and there were insignificant differences between these two groups for most of the statements.

For *economic-social aspects*, the ultra-orthodox felt significantly less positive concerning the ability of tourism to create jobs for residents and generate employment in Jerusalem, in comparison to orthodox and secular residents. The ultra-orthodox were more negative concerning tourism's ability to attract more investments than other industries and its contributions to more recreational activities available for local residents.

For *social aspects*, the ultra-orthodox felt that tourism increases social conflict between tourists and residents, leads to vandalism, and is a waste of taxes. The ultra-orthodox were more negative on effects of tourism on crime rates and felt that Jerusalem would be better off without tourism. These responses are in stark contrast to attitudes of both orthodox and secular residents.

As for *environmental aspects*, both secular and orthodox residents were more affirmative of the effects of tourism on environmental issues as compared to the ultra-orthodox. The ultra-orthodox respondents felt that tourists prevent them from shopping in the downtown area as compared to both secular and orthodox residents. They also felt that tourism creates public crowdedness, adds to traffic problems in Jerusalem, and that government expenditures should go towards protecting the environment rather than promoting tourism.

The results indicate that for most of items, the ultra-orthodox residents, who are the most extreme religion group, expressed the highest negativity towards the impact of tourism, particularly in its economic and social aspects. This result strengthens the negative correlations (see Table 2) found between all three aspects and the dummy variable for the ultra-orthodox group. It also strengthens the positive correlations between the three aspects and dummy variables for secular and orthodox residents. That is, the ultra-orthodox reported negativity towards the impact tourism on economic, social, and environmental

⁵ We conducted a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test since this procedure is commonly applied to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between the means of three or more groups. Since ANOVA is an omnibus test, it cannot determine which of the groups explain the differences. Therefore, we also carried out a post-hoc test to determine the source of the variance differences (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014).

⁶ For example, in the question: "Because of tourism, the crime rate in Jerusalem has increased", we reversed the sentence. Therefore, highest mean score indicates that the respondents *did not* agree with this sentence and feel that crime rates in Jerusalem have not increased because of tourism. For easier reading, the statements in the table appear after the inversion.

aspects. This attitude was significantly more extreme as compared to the other two groups. They expressed positivity concerning the impact of tourism. Thus, it can be concluded that our first hypothesis (H1a) was confirmed. On the other hand, concerning the second hypothesis (H1b), we found that in most of the statements there were insignificant differences between orthodox and secular residents. Therefore, the results did not confirm this hypothesis.

The mean score of the *total attitude aspects: social, economic, and environmental*⁷ in the three religious groups indicate similar results. Significant mean differences were found between the evolution of the *economic-social* contribution of tourists to the city: $F(2,1687) = 10.629$, $p < 0.01$. Mean differences were found between ultra-orthodox residents and the other groups (ultra-orthodox, $M = 3.10$; orthodox, $M = 3.32$; and secular, $M = 3.33$, $p < 0.00$), with no significant differences found between orthodox and secular residents. Significant differences were found in the attitude of the residents towards the *social impact* of tourism on the city: $F(2,1687) = 14.583$, $p < 0.00$. Significant mean differences were found between the ultra-orthodox and other subjects (ultra-orthodox, $M = 3.25$; orthodox, $M = 3.77$; and secular, $M = 3.62$, $p < 0.00$). Significant differences were also found between orthodox and secular residents ($p < 0.00$). The total mean differences indicated that orthodox residents were the most affirmative towards the contribution of tourism to social impact, followed by secular and ultra-orthodox residents. Lastly, the results of *environmental* contribution were similar to those found towards economic aspects. Significant mean differences were found between the three groups: $F(2,1687) = 68.71$, $p < 0.01$. The mean differences reveal significant differences between the ultra-orthodox residents and the other groups (ultra-orthodox, $M = 2.61$; orthodox, $M = 3.49$; and $M = 3.39$ for secular, $p < 0.00$). This suggests that ultra-orthodox residents felt that tourists have a negative impact on environmental aspects compared to both secular and orthodox residents. In fact, there were no significant differences between attitudes of orthodox and secular residents on the impact of tourism on environmental issues.

Overall, the results of the mean differences analysis supported our first hypothesis (H1a), arguing that the ultra-orthodox express more negative attitudes towards tourism as compared to orthodox and secular residents of Jerusalem. However, the second hypothesis (H1b) was not validated since secular and orthodox residents did not present opposing attitudes. Orthodox residents were more affirmative than secular residents towards the contribution of tourism to economic aspects.

Since religiosity represents a type of demographic variable, we wondered if religion makes a unique contribution to overall variance of the attitude towards tourism above other demographic attributions. We thus carried out a hierarchical multiple regressions analysis. The average means of economic, social, and environmental aspects are included in the regression models as the dependent variables.

In the first step, we included demographic variables, excluding religiosity. In the second step, we entered two dummy variables, one for ultra-orthodox respondents (1-represents ultra-orthodox resident and 0-otherwise) and the second for secular (1-represents secular resident and 0-otherwise). Table 4 shows the results from the regression analysis.

The first three models indicate that respondent socio-economic status was positively connected to resident attitude towards economic-social, social, and environmental tourism aspects. The higher the socio-economic status, the more support for tourist contributions to the city. Left-wing partisans were more affirmative towards the effect of tourism on the environment compared to right-wing voters. Economic perception was negatively connected with number of years living in Jerusalem. That is, the longer the period of residence, the less they felt that Jerusalem benefited financially from tourism. Consistent with our second hypothesis, residents who benefit from tourism were more

⁷ The reliability test for environmental aspects was low ($\alpha = 0.041$).

Table 3
Differences in mean score and standard deviation between respondents based on religious affiliation.

	Ultra-orthodox a	Orthodox & Traditional b	Secular c
Economic-Social impact^a			
*Tourism development has generated much employment in Jerusalem (a < bc) ^b	3.31 (1.26)	3.57 (1.14)	3.55 (1.18)
**Tourism development benefits Jerusalem by creating jobs for residents (a < bc)	3.24 (1.26)	3.63 (1.10)	3.64 (1.18)
**Tourism attracts more investment and spending in the city's economy than any other industry (a < bc)	3.25 (1.20)	3.36 (1.07)	3.45 (1.11)
**The economic gains from tourism for the city are more important than the temporary inconvenience that special events cause (a < bc)	3.16 (1.20)	3.37 (1.19)	3.38 (1.17)
** The economic contributions of tourism far outweigh the negative social impacts of tourism (a < bc)	2.99 (1.29)	3.37 (1.17)	3.38 (1.24)
**Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities by the local population (e.g., arts, music, etc.) (a < bc)	3.03 (1.35)	3.49 (1.18)	3.48 (1.20)
**Interacting with visitors from all over the world is a valuable educational experience (a < bc)	3.01 (1.38)	3.61 (1.18)	3.43 (1.25)
**Without tourism revenue, the city would not be able to meet its financial obligations (a < bc)	2.66 (1.24)	3.12 (1.22)	3.12 (1.30)
*Because of tourism, our local infrastructure such as roads and other public facilities are kept at a high standard (c < ab)	3.30 (1.25)	3.23 (1.26)	3.04 (1.26)
*Tourism is one major reason for the variety of entertainments available to residents in the city (a < bc)	2.94 (1.30)	3.14 (1.24)	3.19 (1.26)
I am satisfied with the way my taxes are spent by the city on tourism initiatives, etc.	2.62 (1.22)	2.77 (1.08)	2.77 (1.14)
**Local businesses are the ones which benefit most from tourism (a < b; c < ab)	3.63 (1.36)	3.74 (1.08)	3.55 (1.09)
**Total score for economic-social aspect (a < bc)	3.13 (.63)	3.45 (.63)	3.38 (.67)
Social impact			
**Tourism increase (will not) lead to social conflicts between tourists and residents (ab < c)	3.28 (1.43)	3.48 (1.25)	3.61 (1.32)
*Because of tourism, the crime rate in Jerusalem has (not) increased (a < bc)	3.64 (1.35)	3.94 (1.22)	3.84 (1.29)
**I think tourism has (not) led to vandalism in the city of Jerusalem (a < bc)	3.62 (1.43)	3.99 (1.18)	3.86 (1.29)
**Improving public tourist facilities is (not) a waste of our taxes (ab < c)	3.20 (1.28)	3.37 (1.19)	3.64 (1.31)
*Jerusalem residents are (not) the ones who suffer from living in a tourist area (a < bc; c < b)	3.11 (1.27)	3.32 (1.25)	3.19 (1.30)
**Jerusalem will (not) be a better place if vacationers will not come here (a < bc)	3.73 (1.31)	4.14 (1.31)	4.02 (1.32)
A higher government tax should (not) be levied on tourism expenditures	3.26 (1.43)	3.27 (1.25)	3.15 (1.32)
**Economic benefits (do not) accrue to a minority of Jerusalem's population (a < bc)	2.68 (1.18)	2.79 (1.10)	2.72 (1.15)
**I would be in favor of increased tourism development in Jerusalem (a < bc)	3.31 (1.30)	4.05 (1.15)	3.79 (1.30)
**I have concerned about future tourism development in Jerusalem (ab < c)	2.55 (1.36)	2.49 (1.26)	2.72 (1.29)
**Resident taxes should go towards reducing the crime rate rather than promoting tourism (a < bc)	2.66 (1.29)	4.99 (1.15)	4.85 (.00)
**Total score for social aspect (a < bc)	3.40 (.75)	3.64 (.64)	3.76 (.69)
Environmental impact			
**Tourists (do not) disrupt the peace and tranquility of our community (a < bc)	2.59 (1.32)	4.99 (.07)	4.75 (.13)
*Because of tourism, I do not go shopping in the downtown area (a < bc)	2.50 (1.45)	3.00 (.08)	2.95 (.05)
**Tourists are (not) a burden on government services (a < bc)	2.60 (1.27)	2.95 (.07)	3.10 (.00)
**Tourism has result in unpleasant overcrowded outdoor areas for the local population (a < bc)	3.08 (1.31)	3.89 (.09)	3.75 (.52)
**Tourists greatly (do not) add to the traffic problem in Jerusalem (ab < c)	2.97 (1.35)	3.25 (1.22)	2.94 (1.29)
Tourists are (not) inconsiderate when using our facilities and resources	3.11 (1.32)	3.01 (.04)	2.98 (.00)
**Government expenditures should (not) go towards preserving and protecting the environment rather than promoting tourism (a < bc)	1.76 (1.20)	1.95 (.00)	2.05 (.00)
Planning by the government can control the impact on the local ecosystem	3.05 (1.23)	3.04 (1.15)	3.21 (1.18)
**Total score for environmental aspect (a < bc)	2.61 (1.02)	3.49 (.40)	3.51 (.35)

(continued on next page)

Table 3 (continued)

	Ultra-orthodox a	Orthodox & Traditional b	Secular c
Ultra-orthodox questionnaire			
The government should not invest in transfer payments for ultra-orthodox students who learn religion studies	2.85 (1.38)		
Tourism do not causes desecration of the Sabbath (the holy day for Jews)	2.72 (4.00)		
Due to tourism more entertainment venues, such as restaurants and cinemas, close on Saturday in Jerusalem	2.41 (1.50)		
Tourism (does not) devastate the sacredness of Jerusalem	3.14 (.50)		

Note: *p < 0.05 **p < 0.01. Standard deviation appears in the parentheses.

˘ - The negative words that appear in the parentheses indicate that we reversed the question. The mean score represents the results after the change and indicates positive perception towards tourism in that aspect.

^a The scale was from 1 to 5, where 1 represents complete disagreement with the statement.

^b Significant differences according to Duncan's multi-range test between the groups appear in the parentheses, when (a) represents the mean score for the ultra-orthodox group, (b)- mean score for orthodox group and (c)-the mean score for the secular group.

Table 4

Hierarchical multiple regression between social, economic, and environmental aspects, demographic variables, and religious affiliation.

	Social aspects		Economic-social aspects		Environmental aspects	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Socio-economic status	.062*	.008	.066*	.027	.020**	-.017
Age	.0235	.032	-.016	-.010	-.023	-.012
Gender (0-male, 1-female)	-.043*	-.039	-.036	-.032	-.000	-.027
Years living in the city	-.027	-.029	-.107**	-.108**	-.009	-.003
Owner (0-own an apartment, 1-renting)	.000	.006	.020	.023	-.024	-.007
Benefit financially from tourism	.011*	.030*	.061*	.058*	.000	-.017.
Political attitude (1-right to 9-left)	.002	-.015	.041	.027	.077**	.00
Ultra-orthodox (1-ultra orthodox, 0-else)		-.188***		-.099**		-.319***
Secular (1-secular; 0-else)		-.101***		.008		-.004
Adj R ²	.010	.032	.024	.033	.052	.374
Chg. R ²		.022***		0.008**		.322***
Model F	2.240*	4.817***	4.940***	5.245***	3.417**	14.841***
Number of obs	1390	1390	1387	1387	1390	1390

Note: 'p < 0.10, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

affirmative towards the effect of tourism on both economic and social aspects. It was found that the more respondents financially benefit from tourism, the higher their level of affirmation of the contribution of tourism to both economic and social life.

Our main goal was to analyze whether religiosity has a unique impact on the residents' attitudes. In the second step (Model 2), we included *religious affiliation* variables in order to capture the contribution of religiosity to attitudes towards tourism. The regression analysis results suggest that religious affiliation makes a significant contribution to total variance, over and above demographic variables, since the change in the R² was significant in all three aspects. The effect was more prominent when we entered the dummy variable that measured whether the respondent was ultra-orthodox or not. Ultra-orthodox residents were less positive towards the contribution of tourism in all three aspects, and this negativity was higher compared to the effect of the other demographic variables. Secular respondents had similar reactions to the orthodox residents except for their attitude towards the effect of tourism on social aspects. However, being secular contributed the least to overall variance of attitude towards the effect of tourism on social attribution compared to the ultra-orthodox dummy variable. Nevertheless, this contribution was higher compared to other demographic variables.

Our findings suggest that in a sacred city such as Jerusalem, a key characteristic for evaluation of tourism should be based on religiosity. The greater the gap in religious affiliation between respondent and tourist, the more the former felt detached from and discomfited by the effects of tourism on Jerusalem.

4.3. Attitudes towards tourism as an aspect of both religious affiliation and financial contribution - Social Exchange Theory

Through a regression analysis, we found that attitudes towards economic and social aspects were connected to the amount of financial benefit gained from tourism. However, our second hypothesis (H2b) posits that the ultra-orthodox who derive economic benefit from tourism will have more positive attitudes as opposed to ultra-orthodox non-beneficiaries.⁸ The mean scores of high earners in comparison to non-beneficiaries were higher both in economic (M = 3.13, SD = 0.63; M = 3.03, SD = 0.57, respectively) and social statements (M = 3.22, SD = 0.63; M = 3.12, SD = 0.63, respectively). An independent-sample *t*-test showed that these differences exhibit a 10% level of significance (t = -1.83 and t = -1.70, respectively). The result, however, was not significant for environmental attitude. These findings suggest that economic benefit from tourism has a slight effect on the attitude towards tourism even in the most segregated and distant group.

5. Discussion and conclusions

This research has sought to add another layer of understanding to how residents decipher and perceive the impact of tourism on their local communities. Our primary finding indicates that religiosity exerts

⁸ We divided the variable of financial benefit into two groups of earning: low (0, n = 142) and high (1, n = 56) based on median results.

an important influence, especially on residents who are living in a sacred region. The more extreme the religious community, the less affirmative they were towards tourism. This result is in line with other studies that showed that socio-cultural characteristics of residents (such as gender, political attitude, number of years living in the city, age, socio-economic status, and residential property-owning status) affect their perceptions (e.g., Almeida-García et al., 2016; Ap, 1992; Hernández & Mercader, 2015; Karanth & Nepal, 2012; Liu & Var, 1986; Zamani-Farahani & Musa, 2012). The negative correlation between resident religiosity and their attitudes is contrary to the findings of Zamani-Farahani and Musa (2012). In their study, conducted among Islamic residents of two sites in Iran, they found that the more the subjects self-define as religious, the more they were affirmative towards tourism, claiming that it improves quality of life. This difference in findings can be explained by Social Distance Theory (Magee & Smith, 2013; Thyne et al., 2006). Social Distance Theory claims that subjects who resemble each other in their characteristics, appearance, attitudes, values, and faith will be more tolerant and accepting of each other. In Zamani-Farahani & Musa's study, most tourists shared a similar cultural background, since most of the tourists were domestic and even the international tourists were mainly from neighboring Muslim countries. As such, residents and tourists were similar in terms of religion and behavioral code. In our research, most tourists are international and adhere to a variety of religions. In addition, many of the domestic tourists are secular. Moreover, the sites in their study possess environmental-cultural attractions and are not sacred. In contrast, the sanctity of Jerusalem is undisputed, known to stimulate sensitivity, especially among believers.

We also assessed the effect of economic benefit on resident attitudes towards tourism. Our results indicate that earners from tourism were more affirmative towards the presence of tourists. This finding supports Social Exchange Theory (Ap, 1992) and confirms results of previous studies (Boley et al., 2014; Jackson, 2008; Long et al., 1990; Nunkoo et al., 2013). This theory argues that residents evaluate the cost of tourism against the benefit they can derive from it. A positive attitude is resultant when pros exceed cons. Therefore, attitude is a state informed by cognitive deliberations, and not merely emotions.

The ultra-orthodox, the most pious group, expressed the most negative attitudes on tourism impact in every aspect. Ultra-orthodox residents try more than any group to segregate themselves not only from tourists, but also from non-members of their community. Therefore, they live in separate neighborhoods, learn in different schools with different curricula, and mostly work in their own communities. According to SDT, it is not surprising that this group is the least tolerant towards outside visitors. Their discontent was expressed in response to individual survey statements and in aggregate with all categories. They highlighted the negative disruption to their community and increasing crime level. This lack of peace and tranquility also prevented them from shopping in the city center. They also acknowledged that tourists offend both the sacred status of the city and its status-quo due to the opening of entertainment venues on the Sabbath. Their arguments are congruent with Nyaupane et al.'s (2015) findings, who also found that religious pilgrims felt that secular visitors disturbed their ability to meditate and pray in silence.

The negative attitude of ultra-orthodox residents raises an important question: Do attitudes lead to subsequent actions? The existing literature on resident perceptions has almost no answer. Carmichael (2000) study suggests neither positive nor negative attitudes lead to subsequent actions. However, the ultra-orthodox in Israel are known for impressive manifestations of social power. These include thousands of determined demonstrators and confrontations with police forces. These protests occur when their religious status-quo is violated. Therefore, tourism policymakers and municipality planners should consider this

potential hazard when discussing the effect of tourism on the city.

The challenge of policymakers is to balance benefits of tourism and negative attitudes towards tourism development. This tension will be more extreme in the future since the ultra-orthodox population in Jerusalem is steadily growing, from 17.2% of the Jewish population in 1980 to 34.0% in 2015. By 2030, this percentage is projected to increase to 50% (Maishar & Zimring, 2012). As noted, the ultra-orthodox who derive financial benefit from tourism are more affirmative towards the presence of tourists. Thus, tourism policymakers should leverage this tendency in outreach to this group, who otherwise express negative attitudes. This finding is consistent with Reisinger, Kozak, and Visser (2013) study. They found that local hoteliers held predominantly negative attitudes towards Russian tourists, but due to economic incentive and financial benefit were willing to contain the cultural disapproval of their international guests. Similarly, Jerusalem policymakers should encourage initiatives that foster tourism awareness in the ultra-orthodox community. As this group struggles to stay isolated, special programs should focus on ultra-orthodox tourists. Investing in building appropriate hotels, rooms with enough space for typically large ultra-orthodox families, adequate dietary stringencies (kashrut), and respectful tours to holy places. Restaurants and cultural programs should target the ultra-orthodox, promoting the local community and its economic benefit from tourism. As a secondary aim, it may also soften ultra-orthodox resident attitudes, improving tolerance of general tourists.

The case of Jerusalem is unique, as it is a sacred city to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Therefore, this study can offer a distinct perspective on the role of religion as a factor in receptiveness to tourism. Nevertheless, its shortcomings should be recognized. Jerusalem's uniqueness may somewhat limit the generalizability of our findings. The impact of religion in our case may stem from the special status of Jerusalem, and may not apply as uniformly to secular regions and sites populated by practitioners of a single faith or multiple religious traditions. Additionally, our research only extended to Jewish residents of Jerusalem. Other studies should target the cultural domains of Jerusalem's Muslim and Christian populations. For instance, future research should assess community responses in Muslim majority East Jerusalem. Future studies should also expand the factors that may intervene and affect the residents' attitude toward tourism, especially in a sacred city. Since it is one of the few studies that examine the effect of residents' religiosity on the attitudes toward tourism in a sacred city we inspected only three aspects, based on Jackson (2008) categorization. However, the low score in the total factor variance indicated that other aspects may impact residents' attitudes and should be taken into consideration in future studies. Another limitation of the current study stems from applying convenience sampling that may impair generalization of results. This was especially evident in representation of both orthodox and ultra-orthodox residents. As noted, the latter group self-segregates and refuses to cooperate with formal institutions. They were thus underrepresented, while the orthodox community was over-represented. Ultra-orthodox reluctance to participate in research results from the same social imperative to isolate in all aspects of community life. Ultimately, their negative attitude towards tourism was made very apparent. Therefore, future studies should apply more representative sampling methods to capture ultra-orthodox attitudes. In summary, Jerusalem is a city with a vast history of religious development and conflict. Religion can certainly be socially divisive, but our research shows that in the case of tourism it may function as a source of unity. Tourism can impact many aspects of residential life in a community. As such, dialogue between planners and residents on tourism development is critical. This research can promote citizen involvement in these discussions, leading to more informed decisions on the scope and density of tourism initiatives. Moreover, it can identify communities concerned

or opposed to tourism development. This can enhance a planner's sensitivity such that they propose projects reflecting local concerns. The costs and benefits of tourism development should be outlined by planners, with the input of pro-tourism and anti-tourism residents elicited.

References

- Allen, L. R., Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(1), 16–21.
- Almeida-García, F., Peláez-Fernández, M.Á., Balbuena-Vázquez, A., & Cortés-Macias, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54, 259–274.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056–1076.
- Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27–36.
- 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. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 610–616.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665–690.
- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(1), 47–50.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New Brunswick (USA): Transaction Publishers.
- Boley, B. B., McGehee, N. G., Perdue, R. R., & Long, P. (2014). Empowerment and resident attitudes toward tourism: Strengthening the theoretical foundation through a Weberian lens. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 33–50.
- Bremer, T. S. (2001). *Religion on Display: Tourists, sacred place, and identity at the san antonio missions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 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), 569–590.
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493–515.
- Butler, R. W. (1974). The social implications of tourist developments. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 2(2), 100–111.
- Carmichael, B. A. (2000). A matrix model for resident attitudes and behaviours in a rapidly changing tourist area. *Tourism Management*, 21(6), 601–611.
- Cavus, S., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2003). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A case study in Kusadasi, Turkey. *Tourism Analysis*, 7(3–4), 259–269.
- Chao, C. W., Shyr, O. F., Lee, C. S., Chao, C. H., Tsai, L., & Kang, C. S. (2013). The debate of environmental impact and tourism Development: Perspective from local resident and businessman. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(10), 410.
- Chen, S. C. (2011). Residents' perceptions of the impact of major annual tourism events in Macao: Cluster analysis. *In Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 12(2), 106–128.
- Cohen Ioannides, M. W. C., & Ioannides, D. (2006). Global jewish tourism. In D. J. Timothy, & D. H. Olsen (Eds.). *Tourism, religion and spiritual journeys* (pp. 156–171). New York: Routledge.
- Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests, and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(2), 2–8.
- Dogan, H. (1989). Forms of adjustment: Socio-cultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 216–236.
- Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., ... Münkemüller, T. (2013). Collinearity: A review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their performance. *Ecography*, 36(1), 27–46.
- Dunbar-Hall, P. (2001). Culture, tourism and cultural tourism: Boundaries and frontiers in performances of Balinese music and dance. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 22(2), 173–187.
- Eid, R., & El-Gohary, H. (2015). The role of Islamic religiosity on the relationship between perceived value and tourist satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 46, 477–488.
- Friedman, M. (1991). The Haredi (Ultra-Orthodox) society—sources, trends and processes. *The Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies*, 41, 1–13.
- Griffiths, M. (2011). Those who come to pray and those who come to look: Interactions between visitors and congregations. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 6(1), 63–72.
- Gursoy, D., Jurovski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79–105.
- Hair, F. J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) an emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106–121.
- Haley, A. J., Snaith, T., & Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism a case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 647–668.
- Haralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 503–526.
- Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 18(1).
- Harrill, R., & Potts, T. D. (2003). Tourism planning in historic districts: Attitudes toward tourism development in Charleston. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), 233–244.
- Hernandez, S. A., Cohen, J., & Garcia, H. L. (1996). Residents' attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), 755–779.
- Hernández, F. A. L., & Mercader, S. D. L. S. T. (2015). Perceived impact of tourism by the resident population in torrevieja: National versus non-national residents. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 10, 120.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606.
- Hughes, K., Bond, N., & Ballantyne, R. (2013). Designing and managing interpretive experiences at religious sites: Visitors' perceptions of Canterbury Cathedral. *Tourism Management*, 36, 210–220.
- Jackson, L. A. (2008). Residents' perceptions of the impacts of special event tourism. *Journal of Place Management and Development*, 1(3), 240–255.
- Jurovski, C., & Gursoy, D. (2004). Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 296–312.
- Karanth, K. K., & Nepal, S. K. (2012). Local residents perception of benefits and losses from protected areas in India and Nepal. *Environmental Management*, 49(2), 372–386.
- Keeling, A. (2000). Church Tourism: Providing a ministry of welcome to visitors. In A. Ryland (Ed.). *Insights* London: English Tourism Council (pp. A-13).
- King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 650–665.
- Kong, D. T., Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2014). Interpersonal trust within negotiations: Meta-analytic evidence, critical contingencies, and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1235–1255.
- Ko, D. W., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 521–530.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of psychology*, 140, 1–55.
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 193–214.
- Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 3–9.
- Magee, J. C., & Smith, P. K. (2013). The social distance theory of power. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 17(2), 158–186.
- Maishar, J., & Zimring, A. (2012). Demographic trends and the economic retreat of Jerusalem. In G. Ofer (Ed.). *Vision for Jerusalem* (pp. 51–82). Jerusalem: The Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies (in Hebrew).
- Mansfield, E. R., & Helms, B. P. (1982). Detecting multicollinearity. *The American Statistician*, 36(3a), 158–160.
- Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391–411.
- Merenda, P. F. (1997). Methods, plainly speaking: A guide to the proper use of factor analysis in the conduct and reporting of research: Pitfalls to avoid. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 30(3), 156–164.
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 191–204.
- Mokhlis, S. (2009). Relevancy and measurement of religiosity in consumer behavior research. *International Business Research*, 2(3), 75–84.
- Nolan, M. L., & Nolan, S. (1992). Religious sites as tourism attractions in Europe. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(1), 68–78.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243–268.
- Nunkoo, R., Smith, S. L., & Ramkissoon, H. (2013). Residents' attitudes to tourism: A longitudinal study of 140 articles from 1984 to 2010. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(1), 5–25.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Timothy, D. J., & Poudel, S. (2015). Understanding tourists in religious destinations: A social distance perspective. *Tourism Management*, 48, 343–353.
- Olsen, D. H., & Timothy, D. J. (2006). Tourism and religious journeys. In D. J. Timothy, & D. H. Olsen (Eds.). *Tourism, religion and spiritual journeys* (pp. 1–22). N.Y.: Routledge.
- Pizam, A., Neumann, Y., & Reichel, A. (1978). Dimensions of tourist satisfaction with a destination area. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5(3), 314–322.
- Raj, R., & Morpeth, N. D. (2007). *Religious tourism and pilgrimage festivals Management: An international perspective*. Wallingford, Oxon, UK: CABI Publishing.
- Reisinger, Y., Kozak, M., & Visser, E. (2013). Turkish host gaze at Russian tourists: A cultural perspective. *The Host Gaze in Global Tourism*, 47–66.
- Rinschede, G. (1992). Forms of religious tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(1), 51–67.
- Rysbekova, S., Duissenbayeva, A., & Izmailov, I. (2014). Religious tourism as a socio-cultural phenomenon of the present. "The unique sense today is a universal value tomorrow. This is the way religions are created and values are made" *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 143, 958–963.
- Sarstedt, M., & Mooi, E. (2014). Cluster analysis. *In a concise guide to market research* (pp. 273–324). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37–49.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40–47.
- Sinkovics, R. R., & Penz, E. (2009). Social distance between residents and international tourists—implications for international business. *International Business Review*, 18(5), 457–469.

- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). New York: Harper & Row, publishers.
- The Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies (2017). *Statistical yearbook 2016*. Retrieved from <http://jerusalemstitute.org.il/?cmd=statistic.564>.
- Thyne, M. A., & Lawson, R. (2015). Developing two types of social distance scales to be used in the host-guest relationship context. *Proceedings of the 1998 multicultural marketing conference* (pp. 527–529). Springer International Publishing.
- Thyne, M., Lawson, R., & Todd, S. (2006). The use of conjoint analysis to assess the impact of the cross-cultural exchange between hosts and guests. *Tourism Management*, 27(2), 201–213.
- Triandis, H. C., & Triandis, L. M. (1960). Race, social class, religion, and nationality as determinants of social distance. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61(1), 110.
- Zamani-Farahani, H., & Musa, G. (2012). The relationship between Islamic religiosity and residents' perceptions of socio-cultural impacts of tourism in Iran: Case studies of Sare'in and Masooleh. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 802–814.



Dr. Ze'ev Shtudiner is a senior lecturer in the department of Economics and Business Administration at Ariel University where he has been a faculty member since 2011. He completed his Ph.D. in Economics at Ben Gurion University. His research interests lie in the area of Tourism Economics and Experimental Economics. His work has most recently appeared in *Management Science* and *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*.



Dr. Galit Klein is a lecturer in the department of Economics and Business Administration at Ariel University. She received her Ph.D in Organizational Sociology from The Hebrew University. Her research interests lie in the area of investments, decision making and social psychology process during establishment of new ventures, including tourist enterprises.



Professor Jeffrey Kantor is the head department of Accounting at Ariel University. He is a Certified Public Accountant with research experience and interest in Accounting and Tourism.