Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: A Literature Review with Implications for Tourism Planning

Rich Harrill

Planners are increasingly turning to tourism as a viable economic development strategy, as many communities experience industrial restructuring. Consequently, many residents are exposed to tourism for the first time, whereas established destinations experience increasing volumes of tourists. Planners are now challenged with understanding how the public perceives tourism in order to gain local support for tourism projects and initiatives. By exploring the literature on resident attitudes toward tourism development, this article examines (1) resident attitudes toward tourism in relation to socioeconomic factors; (2) spatial factors; (3) economic dependency; (4) resident and community typologies; (5) measuring residents' attitudes tourism development; and (6) theoretical perspectives such as community attachment, social exchange theory, and growth machine theory. This literature review provides planners with a basis for initiating citizen participation processes related to tourism issues and identifying groups of people concerned about, or opposed to, tourism planning and development in their communities.

Keywords:

tourism planning; economic development; research methods; resident attitudes; citizen participation

Tourism is becoming an important component of economic development programs around the world. Planners who have traditionally viewed economic development as "bricks and mortar" industrial development now consider tourism a viable strategy as traditional industries relocate for cheaper labor and resources. At the same time, residents in many areas are encountering tourism's impacts and benefits for the first time. To gain support for tourism projects and initiatives, many planners now strive to understand how the public perceives the tourism industry. For planners with little exposure to the tourism industry other than being tourists themselves, the learning curve about this industry and resident attitudes toward tourism can prove daunting. Despite growing interest, only a handful of articles on tourism planning have found their way into planning journals (Harrill and Potts 2003; Inskeep 1988; Ioannides 1995; Jamal et al. 2002; Marcouiller 1997, 1995), and books on tourism planning are scarce

RICH HARRILL is a senior business associate with the Georgia Institute of Technology's Economic Development Institute, Tourism and Regional Assistance Centers (TRACS), which is available to provide tourism research to clients whose concerns range from local to international tourism. He has a master's degree in city and regional planning and a doctorate in parks, recreation, and tourism management from Clemson University.

Journal of Planning Literature, Vol. 18, No. 1 (February 2004).
DOI: 0885412203260306

(Bosselman et al. 1999; Gunn 1994; Hall 2000; Inskeep 1991; Judd and Fainstein 1999; World Tourism Organization 1994).

Other books contain insightful case studies linking resident perceptions of tourism directly to a development scenario. Some of these use a narrative style describing what it is like to live with tourism on a daily basis.

For example, in Hal Rothman's *Devil's Bargain: Tourism in the Twentieth-Century American West* (1998), the author describes the clash of values and economic expectations in several ski resort communities:

> Local ownership and leadership gave way to outside money, bringing neonatives tied to the new regimes with values that were different from those of the people they supplanted. Locals faced the classic devil's bargain of tourism. When they acquiesced, they found themselves displaced; they could neither afford to live in the new circumstances nor did they necessarily enjoy them. (P. 286)

First-person accounts are also enlightening and popular with students. In Jamaica Kincaid's *A Small Place* (1988), the author provides an emotional account of growing up in Antigua. In one passage, Kincaid describes the envy felt by natives toward tourists:

> They [natives] are too poor to escape the reality of their lives; and they are too poor to live properly in the place where they live, which is the very place you, the tourist, want to go—so when the natives see you, the tourist, they envy you, they envy your ability to leave your own banality and boredom, they envy your ability to turn their own banality and boredom into a source of pleasure for yourself. (P. 19)

Without proper planning and management—in this case the equitable distribution of tourism's economic benefits—this envy can quickly turn to open hostility toward tourists, eventually contributing to the destination's decline.

These accounts provide a context for understanding the importance of resident attitudes in tourism development processes but also indicate the need for site-appropriate tourism planning in many developed and developing communities.

Tourism, defined for the purpose of this review as *all travel except commuting*, permeates communities unlike other industries. Its composition of transportation, lodging, and entertainment exercises considerable influence on a community's employment, land use, environment, and social structure. Because of this pervasive influence, obtaining the input of residents should be integral to any tourism planning process. As more planners become involved with the tourism industry, they should become familiar with the research on resident attitudes toward tourism development that has developed in fields related to, but outside, mainstream planning, such as leisure studies and parks, recreation, and tourism management.

This article maps the literature on resident attitudes toward tourism development, discusses the types and characteristics of this literature, and draws implications for this research on tourism planning. The literature presented in this review was identified through multiple sources, including (1) the use of a tourism database known as TourCD[153], a database with abstracts in leisure, recreation, and tourism; (2) tracking citations to and from well-known literature; (3) and creating and maintaining a file of relevant articles over time. To date, most of this research has been conducted in North America and Europe, and it is hoped that interest in this research area will stimulate efforts to explore resident attitudes in other locales. This article presents literature in the following categories: socioeconomic factors; spatial factors; economic dependency; resident and community typologies; measuring residents' attitudes toward tourism development; and theoretical perspectives, including community attachment, social exchange, and growth machine theory.

FACTORS INFLUENCING ATTITUDES TOWARD TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Socioeconomic Factors

The use of socioeconomic factors to explain resident attitudes has been common among tourism researchers. These variables, such as income, ethnicity, and length of residence, have been used in many cases as part of formal hypotheses regarding resident attitudes; however, more often than not, these variables are included simply as a standard part of survey instruments. Identified as variables important to community development by Park and Burgess of the Chicago School, this *systemic model* supposes that attachment weakens in the absence of formal and informal ties (Ritzer 1996). Consequently, tourism researchers have assumed that the longer residents live in a community, the more negative their perception of tourism development. However, despite the numerous researchers exploring the relationship between socioeconomic variables and resident attitudes, the literature suggests that socioeconomic factors play a relatively minor, and sometimes contradictory, role in explaining the variation in resident attitudes toward tourism development (Perdue et al. 1990).

Early research employing these variables pursued many different socioeconomic elements to determine

which ones might have an influencing effect. For example, using segmentation analysis in a study of Scotland, Brougham and Butler (1981) identified significant differences in resident attitudes related to local and personal characteristics, contact with tourists, length of residence, age, and language. In a study of northern Wales, Sheldon and Var (1984) discovered evidence suggesting that residents' attitudes toward tourism development are culturally bound, finding that natives and Welsh speakers were more sensitive to tourism's social and cultural impacts than were nonnatives and non-Welsh speakers. Similarly, in a study of New Braunfels, Texas, Um and Crompton (1987) found German ethnicity was a factor in attitudes toward tourism development, discovering that the more attached a resident was to the community regarding birthplace, heritage, and length of residence, the less positively he or she perceived impacts, with the exception of perceived adverse impacts on environmental quality. However, although finding significant variations in attitudes toward tourism development by demographic subgroup, Liu and Var's (1986) study of Hawaiian residents did not find significant differences in attitudes based on ethnicity and length of residence.

Supporting Liu and Var's (1986) findings, Allen et al.'s (1993) study of ten rural Colorado communities found no significant influence of length of residence on attitudes toward tourism development. However, Girard and Gartner (1993) found that for long- and short-term second homeowners in Wisconsin, both groups appreciated the availability of goods and services from increased tourism, although long-term residents did not want to see increased tourism development. Similarly, McCool and Martin (1994) and Williams et al. (1995) in studies of Montana and Virginia, respectively, found that long-term residents had a less favorable perception of tourism than did short-term residents. Snaith and Haley's (1999) study of residents of the historic city of York, England, observed that the shorter the length of residence, the more positive residents' opinions about tourism were, although short- and long-term residents both recognized the benefits and impacts of tourism.

Age has also been explored as a factor in resident attitudes toward tourism development and should receive more attention as the baby boomers retire and seek tourist destinations in which to work and play. Tomljenovic and Faulkner's (1999) study of Australia's Gold Coast found that older residents were generally as favorably inclined toward tourism development as young residents. In addition, older residents were more tolerant of international tourists and less concerned about tourism's adverse environmental impacts. Cavus and Tanrisevdi (2002), in a study of Kusadasi, Turkey, also found a significant relationship between age and length of residence and attitude toward tourism development, but contrary to Tomljenovic and Faulkner, they discovered that older residents had more negative perceptions.

Regarding gender, Mason and Cheyne (2000), in a study of rural New Zealand, found that women were more opposed to tourism development than men due to perceived negative impacts, such as increases in traffic, noise, and crime, although acknowledging positive benefits, including community tourism facilities and regional economic benefits. In a study of Charleston, South Carolina, Harrill and Potts (2003) also found gender to be a significant predictor of tourism's perceived economic benefits, with more women than men negatively disposed toward tourism development. The authors suggested that this difference might be attributed to traditional wage and occupational differences. However, they also asserted that this finding might be related to feminist perspectives regarding women and urban space (Ritzdorf 1995), with some women associating increasing tourist volumes with decreasing neighborhood safety and marginal economic benefits. Using chi-square analysis, the researchers found no significant association between gender and the survey item, "Tourism has increased crime in Charleston," although they argued that crime and security are perceived differently by urban residents.

Beyond socioeconomic factors, the literature presents perceptions influenced by the concentration or spatial arrangement of tourism facilities and activities, the economic impact of tourism (including social and environmental trade-offs), and types of attitudes within resident groups or communities (Table 1).

Spatial Factors

A few researchers have investigated the relationship between urban space and attitudes toward tourism development, attempting to make connections between attitudes in specific residential or tourism zones and the physical distance between residents and tourists. Based on the variables of size, distance, and location, Toennies, Durkheim, Simmel, and Wirth's *linear model* of community development supposes that attachment weakens as population and density increase. Consequently, tourism researchers have assumed that the closer a resident lives to concentrations of tourism activity, the more negative his or her perception will be of tourism development. So important is this relationship that Hester (1993) in a study of the coastal town of Manteo, North Carolina, enlisted residents in defining their community's "sacred structure," or those places such as the waterfront and particular shops deemed important to the community's quality of life. An under-

TABLE 1. Selected Literature on Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development

Characteristic	Source
Socioeconomic factors	Allen et al. (1993); Brougham and Butler (1981); Cavus and Tanrisevdi (2002); Girard and Gartner (1993); Harrill and Potts (2003); Liu and Var (1986); Mason and Cheyne (2000); McCool and Martin (1994); Sheldon and Var (1984); Snaith and Haley (1999); Tomljenovic and Faulkner (1999); Um and Crompton (1987); Williams and Lawson (2001)
Spatial factors	Belisle and Hoy (1980); Gursoy and Jurowski (2002); Harrill and Potts (2003); Korça (1998); Pearce (1980); Pizam (1978); Tyrell and Spaulding (1984)
Economic dependency	Akis et al. (1996); Andressen and Murphy (1986); Caneday and Zeiger (1991); Cooke (1982); Evans-Pritchard (1989); Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996); Haukeland (1984); Husbands (1989); Jordan (1980); Lankford (1994); Lawson et al. (1998); Liu et al. (1987); Long (1996); Martin et al. (1998); Pizam (1978); Pizam and Pokela (1985); Prentice (1993); Ross (1992); Soutar and McLeod (1993); Thomason et al. (1979); Tyrell and Spaulding (1984); Var et al. (1985)
Resident and community typologies	Ap and Crompton (1993); Davis et al. (1988); Dŏgan (1989); Rothman (1978); Ryan and Montgomery (1994); Smith and Krannich (1998); Williams and Lawson (2001)
Measuring perceptions of residents' attitudes toward tourism development	Ap and Pang (2002); Ap and Crompton (1998); Kang et al. (1996); Lankford (1994); Lankford et al. (1995); Lankford and Howard (1993)

developed aspect of the literature, this information can be important to planners seeking appropriate sites for tourism facilities as well as determining areas unsuitable for tourism development.

In an early study of Cape Cod, Massachusetts' residents, Pizam (1978) confirmed that heavy concentrations of tourism facilities and services in a destination led to negative attitudes toward tourism development. Subsequent research found more complex aspects to this relationship. For instance, Tyrell and Spaulding (1984) found that Rhode Island households favored tourism growth on the whole but felt less favorable toward the location of tourism facilities close to home because of trash and litter. In addition, Pearce (1980) reported that Harrison County, West Virginia residents living in urban areas assessed their community's reaction to non-American travelers positively, whereas location from urban centers was associated with negative perceptions of foreign travelers.

In a study of five rural counties surrounding a national recreation area, Gursoy and Jurowski (2002) found that local, heavy users of the area had negative perceptions of tourism's benefits and were not likely to support tourism development. The authors asserted that negative perceptions might be the result of residents' fear that if visitors increase, ability to use the recreation area might be impaired. Gursoy and Jurowski concluded that tourism planning should include protecting residents' use of the recreation area or enhance their ability to use it.

Harrill and Potts (2003), in a study of Charleston, South Carolina's historic district, found that the neighborhood (South of Broad) with the most negative attitudes toward tourism in that city was located in the tourism core and received the most negative impacts, whereas other neighborhoods with more positive attitudes toward tourism were farther from the core and received fewer impacts. This spatial difference between neighborhoods contradicts Belisle and Hoy's (1980) findings that as distance from the tourism zone increases, positive impacts are perceived less favorably. However, it should be noted that their research took place in Bogota, Columbia, where a large portion of the urban population depends on tourism. Conversely, Korça (1998) found that residents of Antalya, Turkey, supporting tourism did not live in proximity to the primary tourism area. On the basis of these studies and their own, Harrill and Potts asserted that attitudes toward tourism development are partially a function of spatial location *and* economic dependency: the residents of neighborhoods who suffer the most impacts and who do not depend economically on tourism will have more negative attitudes toward tourism development than will other residents.

Economic Dependency

Economic dependency has long been of interest to social science researchers attempting to predict attitudes based on economic benefit or economic standing within a community. In this context, social exchange

theory has often been used to explain the influence of material and psychological exchanges on resident attitudes. Consequently, tourism researchers have viewed the relationship between resident attitudes and economic dependency acroos a range of perspectives, from a single individual to an entire community, with the most prevalent and obvious hypothesis being that the more a person or community depends on tourism dollars, the more positive his or her attitude is toward tourism development. This hypothesis has been confirmed in the literature from Pizam (1978) to Vesey and Dimanche (2000), although researchers have found interesting dimensions to the relationship between resident attitudes and economic dependency.

For example, many residents and communities have developed interesting coping mechanisms to continue enjoying tourism's economic benefits. In an ethnographic survey of a Vermont village, Jordan (1980) reported that native residents attempted to salvage their economic future through development of a phony folk culture—a stereotypical culture constructed for tourists—preserving selected aspects of their traditional culture. Residents held social gatherings and celebrations during the winter off-season for themselves. Similarly, Evans-Pritchard (1989) found that as a method of coping with ambivalent feelings toward tourists, Native American silversmiths in New Mexico often created stereotypical images of tourists and Native Americans in their work, helping them deal with the psychological problems of face-to-face encounters with tourists.

However, not all residents can develop such coping mechanisms. For example, Cooke (1982), in a study of two British Columbia communities, found that potential jobs and income were not viewed as significant by residents, who also perceived tourism as increasing the cost of living. Haukeland (1984), in a study of the sociocultural impacts of tourism in three Scandinavian communities, reported that negative attitudes toward tourism were strongest among those engaged in traditional industries, such as manufacturing, and were directly related to the levels of tourism development. Akis et al. (1996), in a study of Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus, reported negative perceptions resulting from the replacement of high-wage with low-wage jobs and tax liabilities and change in local social structure resulting from change in economic status.

Obviously, most individuals and communities who do not receive economic benefits from tourism growth will not support further tourism development, as noted by Martin et al. (1998) in their study of retirees' support for tourism in Hilton Head, South Carolina. Support for tourism in a given community is often mixed, defined by those individuals who hold the best social and economic position to receive benefits, such as business owners and town officials, as determined by Tyrell and Spaulding (1984) in their study of Rhode Island. Similarly, Husbands (1989) found in the Victoria Falls area of Zambia that white-collar workers were more favorably disposed to tourism than was the lower-tier managerial class. These studies illustrate the urban growth machine interests that can form around tourism development issues. However, it is not always the movers and shakers who support tourism development. For example, Soutar and McLeod (1993) found in their study of Fremantle, Australia, that a broad spectrum of residents there perceived the America's Cup sailboat racing event to have improved quality of life and provided a foundation for long-term economic benefits.

Most of this literature demonstrates that residents can recognize the positive and negative aspects of economic dependency on tourism. For instance, Thomason et al. (1979), in a study of Corpus Christi, Texas, discovered that residents had a positive perception of winter tourists, although they did feel more tourists strained local resources. Entrepreneurs in Corpus Christi were the most positive about tourism development, although predictably dissatisfied with the level of visitor spending. In a study of residents in the Turkish resort town of Marmaris, Var et al. (1985) found that residents perceived tourism as increasing property values and housing prices, although they agreed that tourism creates business and reduces umemployment. Liu et al.'s (1987) study of Hawaii; North Wales; and Istanbul, Turkey, found that residents were concerned with tourism's environmental impacts, including litter and ecological degradation, despite economic benefits. Ross (1992), in a study of the Australian tourist city of Cairns, found that positive attitudes were associated with enhanced leisure and economic activities, whereas negative attitudes were associated with increased costs of accommodation. Prentice (1993), in a survey of England's North Pennines area, found that residents perceived tourism as beneficial to some economic sectors, although few households individually claimed to benefit from tourism. Similarly, Lankford (1994) observed that residents of the Columbia Gorge region of Washington and Oregon agreed that tourism plays an important economic role in the community by providing employment, although they disagreed about the desirability of tourism jobs and tourism's role in raising personal standards of living.

Residents often have a fairly sophisticated grasp of the role of tourism economics in their community. For example, Lawson et al. (1998) found that residents of 10 New Zealand communities were concerned that tourism dollars remain in the country, demonstrating an

understanding of tourism revenue "leakage" from local economies. Other research suggests that residents can point out negative impacts, including poor economic benefits such as low wages, yet still favor further tourism development, usually in hopes of future economic benefits. For instance, Andressen and Murphy's (1986) study of two Canadian communities located along major transportation corridors found that the perceived benefits of tourism significantly outweighed its adverse impacts. The authors discovered that the communities' location and function as travel corridors did not create social or environmental problems as far as residents were concerned and that residents preferred an increased share of tourism's benefits. On the Greek island of Samos, Haralambopoulous and Pizam (1996) reported that despite pointing out adverse impacts such as high prices, drug use, vandalism, violence, and sexual harassment, residents not only supported the current level of tourism but favored expansion.

Casino gambling is rapidly becoming an important form of revenue for many communities, despite the controversies surrounding its potentially serious social and economic impacts. As a result, an increasing number of tourism researchers are documenting this industry's impacts and effect on community life. Numerous planners first encounter tourism issues through gambling, as the establishment of gaming facilities can have an immediate and lasting impact on local economic development, land use, and transportation. Moreover, planners often find themselves placed in the middle of ethical and moral debates concerning gambling, clashes that intersect tourism and planning theory.

Pizam and Pokela's (1985) survey of residents of two Massachusetts communities found that some residents thought that a local casino project could improve their standard of living and provide additional employment, as well as increase entertainment and recreation opportunities. However, other residents feared that casino gambling would reduce neighborhood quality, negatively alter the town's image, and result in crime and congestion.

Long's (1996) study of gambling communities in South Dakota and Colorado determined that residents did not have a strong antigambling sentiment, but they disagreed about gambling's economic, social, and personal benefits. In addition, the author found that many residents of gambling communities could separate the expected benefits of gambling from personal attitudes toward it.

Evidence does suggest a relationship between attitudes toward gambling as a form of tourism development and certain socioeconomic variables. In a study of the gambling community of Deadwood, South Dakota, Caneday and Zeiger (1991) discovered that the more money residents made in tourism-dependent jobs, the less likely they were to identify negative impacts. In addition, the more education tourism-employed residents had, the more likely they were to find negative impacts. Conversely, the more education gained by entrepreneurs not employed in tourism, the less recognition they had of tourism impacts. The authors related this finding to the fact that this group did not directly attribute negative social, economic, and environmental impacts to the gambling industry.

As many gambling initiatives are instigated by powerful political interests within and outside communities, tourism researchers might use urban regime and growth machine theories in developing a better conceptual understanding of the influence of this industry on resident attitudes toward tourism development.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Resident and Community Typologies

As research accumulates regarding resident attitudes toward tourism development, some researchers have attempted to segment residents exhibiting similar attitudes into categories in the same way tourism marketers segment types of travelers. Tourism planners have assumed that such categorizations facilitate the acceptance or predict the rejection of development plans across an entire community. Although these categories have proven valuable in understanding the range of perceptions exhibited within a community, recent tourism research suggests that more subtle differences exist among attitudes than demonstrated in many resident typologies.

One of the best-known models of resident attitudes is the *Irridex Model* or *Doxey's Irridex*, first developed by Doxey (1975) and described by Fridgen (1991). This model is used to define attitudes of residents resulting from social impacts in a destination community. It suggests that in the early stages of tourism development, residents welcome the new visitation and the new dollars beginning to trickle into the community. Little tourism planning occurs in this initial stage, called *euphoria*. Visitors find their way to the destination without much marketing, and the community itself offers little in the way of tourism amenities. New visitors often learn of emerging destinations through word of mouth, and such travelers are often characterized as adventurous, requiring few amenities.

However, over time, residents notice steadily increasing visitation, and some begin to take commer-

cial advantage of the nascent tourism development, whereas others criticize the perceived and actual changes in their community. In this stage, called *apathy*, tourist presence in the community is no longer considered a novelty, and the enthusiasm of the euphoria stage begins to wane. At this point, some tourism-related marketing and development begins to arise, a period often characterized by the appearance of T-shirt stands and souvenir shops. The tourism planning that does occur at this stage is mainly geared toward supplying electricity, water, and transportation to these new businesses.

As tourism growth continues, residents can become irritated by the number of tourists in their community and concerned about the presence of tourism in general. This stage is called *annoyance*, in which the community is nearly saturated by tourists. During this phase, private entrepreneurs and public economic developers may begin to develop still more amenities to meet tourist demands and expand infrastructure to accommodate increasing tourist flows. It is also at this point that commercial and real estate interests from outside the destination begin to move in and purchase smaller tourism-related businesses. Franchise hotels and restaurants may proliferate at this time. As Fridgen (1991) noted, a final development here also includes the planning and implementation of special districts or corridors for the isolation or restriction of visitors.

In its final phase of development, the destination community has grown into a mass tourist destination, leading to the stage of *antagonism* between residents and tourists. At this point, residents no longer welcome tourists and may exhibit behaviors ranging from indifference to hostility. Fridgen (1991) observed that during this stage, residents begin to generate negative stereotypes about tourists and tourism and that the types of tourists arriving at the destination are changing as well. Now, the community as a destination no longer appeals to its first "niche" tourists, or tourists seeking exclusive environments, but has become a tourism economy based on volume appealing to the less-discriminating touring masses. From this point, the destination continues to decline, or rejuvenates itself through redevelopment and remarketing, as first described by Butler's (1980) destination development curve, with subsequent revisions and refinements to this model made by other tourism researchers (see Haywood 1986; Martin and Uysal 1990; Meyer-Arendt 1985).

In support of the Irridex Model, Robert Rothman (1978) defined three groups living in two Delaware coastal communities by their attitudes toward tourism development: (1) the community would be better off without tourism, (2) those favoring tourism, and (3) a majority group who exhibited ambivalence toward the industry.

Subsequent research has elaborated on Rothman's basic model (Ap and Crompton 1993; Davis et al. 1988; Dŏgan 1989; Ryan and Montgomery 1994; Smith and Krannich 1998; Williams and Lawson 2001). In an empirical study of resident groupings in Florida, Davis et al. (1988) segmented residents into the following five categories: *tourism haters*, who possess negative opinions toward tourists and tourism; *lovers*, holding extremely favorable positions; *cautious romantics*, a group recognizing the benefits of tourism, but also holding antigrowth opinions; *in-betweeners*, having moderate opinions about the benefits of tourism and continued growth of the industry; and those that *love 'em for a reason*, approving of the tourism industry because of the jobs it creates and the recreational advantages it provides to residents. The researchers noted a strong relationship between knowledge of tourism's positive impact on the economy and appreciation of the tourism industry.

However, other researchers have attempted to describe response categories to tourism's impacts instead of only attitudes (Ap and Crompton 1993; Dŏgan 1989). For example, Ap and Crompton (1993) defined four strategies used by residents of four Texas communities in responding to tourism's impacts: embracement, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal. On a continuum of responses, *embracement* was described as the favorable promotion of tourism, one most likely occurring when individuals receive direct benefits from tourism, such as employment. The authors described *tolerance* as a slight acceptance, meaning that residents absorb inconveniences or costs associated with tourism's impacts. Those residents who reach *adjustment* to tourism accept the reality of living with tourism on a daily basis but do not express any positive or negative feeling toward the industry. Finally, Ap and Crompton characterized *withdrawal* as silent acceptance: residents resent tourism, but instead of engaging the industry, they withdraw. For future research, the authors suggested that residents' perceptions of tourism impacts should be linked to adopted behavioral strategies, and an instrument should be developed for measuring the strategies described.

Similar classifications can also apply to entire communities as well as individuals. For example, Smith and Krannich (1998) suggested a typology of four rural communities in the western United States experiencing tourism growth that includes tourism-saturated, tourism-realized, and tourism-hungry communities. A

tourism-saturated destination has reached a high threshold of development, and residents desire little or no more tourism. According to the authors, the residents of a tourism-saturated community have significantly higher desires for less future tourism and population growth; greater perceived negative impacts of the industry and economic development; and lower amounts of overall community, economic, and social satisfaction. A *tourism-realized* community has a moderate but increasing level of tourism and a growing ambivalence among residents regarding the desirability of more future tourism. Finally, the *tourism-hungry* community strongly desires more tourism contributing to the local economy and may perceive tourism as being more important than it actually is at the present time. Smith and Krannich concluded that researchers should begin to attempt to distinguish between community and individual tourism dependence and related attitudes, likely finding significant differences between the two groups.

Measuring Attitudes toward Tourism Development

Having identified positive and negative impacts, some resident attitudes toward these impacts, and rudimentary attitude categories, some researchers have turned their attention to developing more effective methods of measuring resident attitudes toward tourism development. The researchers' purpose is to construct a rigorous global measurement instrument or to measure perceptions of specific aspects of the tourism industry, such as gambling.

Lankford and Howard (1993) (also see Lankford 1994; Lankford et al. 1995) developed a multiple-item attitudinal scale for measuring resident attitudes, attempting to assess the effects of selected independent variables identified from the literature. They used this scale to assess the influence of selected variables on resident attitudes toward tourism development in the Columbia River Gorge region of Washington and Oregon. The scale developed and tested is known as the Tourism Impact Assessment Scale (TIAS), which consists of 28 items.

The authors summarized the influence of variables in two factors. Factor 1 (Concern for Local Tourism) included the impacts on the quality of outdoor recreation in the Gorge, length of residence, current employment in a tourism-related job, knowledge of the local economy, and level of contact with tourism. Factor 2 (Personal and Community Benefits) included the ability to influence planning and tourism decision making in the Gorge, current employment in a tourism-related job in the area, the level of contact with tourists, and knowledge of the local economy.

However, Ap and Crompton (1998) claimed that Lankford and Howard's "two domains did not appear to be consistent with any of the taxonomic frameworks that appeared in the literature" (p. 123). This conclusion led Ap and Crompton to develop a perceived impact scale based on data from three Texas communities that "better reflected prevailing conceptual classifications of perceived impacts," or social, economic, and environmental categories. The Ap and Crompton scale consists of (1) a belief component asking respondents to rate the level of change associated with 35 items and (2) an evaluative component asking residents to rate their level of like or dislike for each item. The authors verified social, economic, and environmental domains, as well as four others that emerged during the compilation of the scale: crowding and congestion, services, taxes, and community attitude. They pointed out, however, that the community attitude domains might also be expressed as a dimension of social and cultural impacts, whereas the taxes domain may be perceived as part of generic economic impacts. In response, Lankford (2001, 315) countered that

> what is important to note is that the literature varies widely on the impacts of scale development. A taxonomic framework would be extremely difficult to identify due to the variation in communities, levels of development, ethnic makeup, sociodemographics of resident and tourist populations, land use, and competing industries in any given instance or place. This challenge [developing a standardized scale] does not speak at all to methodology, which is what most academics decide to take issue over in terms of scale development and testing.

The debate between Lankford and Ap and Crompton illustrates the inherent difficulty in developing such a measurement tool, one broad enough to supply information on resident attitudes applicable to many destinations, and at the same time provide destination-specific information required for effective and long-term tourism planning.

Using data from five communities, gambling and nongambling, in Colorado and South Dakota, Kang et al. (1996) developed a measure focused specifically on attitudes toward limited-stakes gambling. The items for the scale were developed around three categories: evaluation, benefits, and adverse impacts. An example of a survey item in evaluation with which respondents agreed or disagreed was the statement, "It would be hard for me to accept gambling here." An example from impacts was the statement, "Most of the money from gambling in this town goes to outsiders." An example of a benefits scale item was, "I personally receive social benefits from gambling (improved quality of life, meet-

TABLE 2. Selected Literature on Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development Theoretical Perspectives

Characteristic	Source
Community attachment	Harrill and Potts (2003); Jurowski (1998); Jurowski et al. (1997); McCool and Martin (1994); Um and Crompton (1987); Vesey and Dimanche (2000); Williams et al. (1995)
Social exchange theory	Ap (1992); Getz (1994); Jurowski et al. (1997); Madrigal (1993); McGehee et al. (2002); Perdue et al. (1990)
Growth machine theory	Canan and Hennessy (1989); Madrigal (1994); Martin et al. (1998)

ing interesting people, and personal satisfaction)." Another general item was, "I don't care if we have gambling in this town." The scale was recommended by the authors to measure attitudes in both gambling and nongambling communities. In addition, Kang et al. reported a two-factor scale—attitudes and benefits—similar to the factors reported by Lankford and Howard (1993).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

The preceding discussion presented research in which few coherent themes and patterns emerge in the literature on resident attitudes toward tourism development. In some respects, the entire research program on residents' attitudes toward tourism development does not seem to have yielded much information to researchers and practitioners for use in further scholarship and applied projects.

Ap (1990) has suggested that the lack of patterns and themes in this research is due to the lack of guiding theoretical frameworks:

> Although researchers were able to clearly identify the problem and state the objectives of the study, the central concepts of the study were not linked to some explicit theory. The atheoretical orientation of the studies poses problems in developing a conceptual framework. This is probably why operational definition of central concepts were [*sic*] not clearly defined *a priori*, and why two of the studies [examined by Ap] did not identify any hypotheses to guide the study. (P. 613)

Because leisure, recreation, and tourism research tends to be an applied field, conceptual frameworks in resident attitudes research are often underdeveloped. It has been argued that this underdevelopment is due to the relative immaturity of the field compared with planning. Although theories of tourism may be mistaken for the emerging approaches and orientations used by researchers, the theories are drawn from mature social sciences such as sociology and psychology. For example, community attachment, social exchange, and growth machine theories, based in sociology and other disciplines, provide a basis for explaining how resident attitudes toward the impacts of tourism development are formed (see Table 2).

Community Attachment

McCool and Martin (1994) defined community attachment as the "extent and pattern of social participation and integration into community life, and sentiment or affect toward the community" (p. 30). Similarly, Buttel et al. (1979, 477) defined the construct as "ideational or attitudinal expressions of solidarity or rates of participation in community social networks" (p. 477). These variables have been used without much critical examination since their identification as variables important to Park and Burgess's *systemic model*, previously discussed under socioeconomic factors: attachment increases with length of residence, family ties, and social advancement. Conversely, an alternative dates back to Toennies, Durkheim, Simmel, and Wirth's *linear model*: attachment weakens as population and density increase (Ritzer 1996). Although these models have played an important role in planning history and theory, recent research suggests that communities exhibit both linear and systemic attachment characteristics, and variables from both of these models have been used regularly in the literature. Generally, tourism researchers have approached the relationships between community attachment and resident attitudes toward tourism from a negative perspective. Tourism is an industry with the potential to undermine community quality of life, therefore the more attached residents are to their community, the more negative they are about tourism development.

Um and Crompton (1987) suggested measuring resident attachment levels in a host community as length of residence, birthplace, and ethnic heritage. McCool and Martin (1994) examined relationships between tourism attitudes, length of residence, level of tourism development, and feelings of community attachment. Williams et al. (1995) measured community attachment as length of residence, age, and income. Jurowski (1998) asked

respondents to rate the quality of life and satisfaction with the community as a place to live. Harrill and Potts (2003) and Vesey and Dimanche (2000) used length of residence and community involvement as measures of attachment, in addition to other sociological variables.

Um and Crompton (1987) found that resident perceptions of tourism impacts on environmental quality did not relate significantly to attachment levels. However, the authors did find that, except for the environmental dimension, the more attached residents were to a community in terms of length of residence, birthplace, and heritage, the less positively they perceived tourism development in their community. Conversely, McCool and Martin (1994) reported that strongly attached residents rated the positive dimension of tourism higher than unattached residents, although they were more concerned that the costs were not shared equitably throughout the community. Similarly, Williams et al. (1995) found that residents with higher levels of attachment, measured as regional identity, tended to be more supportive of tourism development than were less attached residents. Jurowski et al. (1997) found that attached residents evaluated social and economic impacts positively, but environmental impacts negatively. Jurowski (1998) reported that residents with stronger feelings for their community were more supportive of tourism development and more optimistic about the impacts of tourism on the quality of life in their community.

Comparatively, the findings of Harrill and Potts (2003) and Vesey and Dimanche (2000) are notable because the authors used virtually the same survey instrument (Lankford and Howard's 1993 TIAS scale) in similar settings (the historic districts of Charleston and New Orleans, respectively). In a study of New Orleans's French Quarter, Vesey and Dimanche (2000) found that community attachment was related to positive perceptions toward tourism. The authors suggested that residents who have lived in their neighborhood for a long time and are involved with the neighborhood were *positive* about tourism because of its economic benefits and contributions to historic preservation. In contrast, Harrill and Potts (2003) found that in a study of Charleston's historic district, residents had *negative* attitudes toward tourism development, indicating that some residents perceived themselves as losing their collective investments, primarily housing, through property taxes and other taxes used to fund tourism development.

With the exception of Um and Crompton (1987), the research on community attachment and resident attitudes toward tourism development suggests that highly attached residents tend to view tourism development more favorably than do less-attached residents, although with some reservations, as noted by McCool and Martin (1994).

Social Exchange Theory

Complementary to community attachment, although emphasizing reciprocity rather than solidarity, social exchange theory involves the trading and sharing of resources between individuals and groups. These interactions can occur between individuals, role occupants, or groups acting as single units. Resources can be any item, concrete or symbolic, and may be material, social, or psychological in nature. Social exchange theory has interested tourism researchers based on the assumption that tourism development comes with economic benefits in exchange for social and environmental impacts. According to Ap (1992), social exchange theory assumes that social relations involve an exchange of resources among parties seeking mutual benefit from the exchange relationship. Presumably, the primary motive for exchange is the improvement of the community's social and economic well-being by private entrepreneurs and public economic developers. Ap suggested that when exchange of resources is high or balanced, or high for the host party in an unbalanced relationship, tourism impacts are viewed positively by residents. When resource exchange is low in either balanced or unbalanced exchange relations, impacts are viewed negatively by those involved.

Using exchange logic, Perdue et al. (1987) examined relationships between perceived impacts and resident support for additional tourism development in 16 rural Colorado communities. The authors found that, when controlling for personal benefits of tourism, perceptions of its impacts were unrelated to sociodemographic characteristics. In addition, support for additional tourism development was positively or negatively related to perceived positive or negative impacts of tourism. Support for additional tourism development was also negatively related to the perceived future of the community.

Following exchange logic, Madrigal (1993) found that residents from two Arizona communities with positive perceptions of tourism believed that they personally could influence tourism decisions and that tourism-related businesses did not have too much political influence on decision making in their city. In contrast, negative perceptions were negatively related to personal influence and positively related to the belief that tourism businesses had too much influence. Getz (1994), in a study of Scotland's Spey Valley, found that the increased negative attitudes toward tourism development suggested that residents believed benefits had declined or not matched expectations. Conversely, Hernandez et al.'s (1996) study of Isabela, Puerto Rico,

which at the time of the study was the planned site of a large resort, took a neutral approach, speculating that resident ambivalence toward future development resulted from uncertainty regarding the terms of the exchange. Supporting these studies, Jurowski et al. (1997) found in a study of Virginia that the potential for economic gain as an exchange item had a direct and positive effect on resident support. The strongest effect of the economic gain variable was on social impacts, although it had very little effect on environmental impact variables.

However, in a study of 12 Arizona communities, McGehee et al. (2002) found mixed support for social exchange theory. Although the authors found a relationship between personal benefit from tourism and support for tourism development, they did not find a relationship between personal benefit and support for tourism planning. The authors argued that the latter finding did not align with social exchange theory, reasoning that if a resident had a vested interest in tourism development, then he or she would want to see that it is developed properly or with few restrictions. McGehee et al. (2002) offered two explanations for this finding requiring additional research, that (1) citizens have limited trust in the ability of the community to plan for tourism, and (2) everyone, regardless of personal benefit, believes tourism planning is important. Obviously, an important area of future research is to measure resident attitudes toward tourism planning as well as development benefits and impacts.

Growth Machine Theory

Growth machine theory has been of long interest to planners attempting to identify variables that promote or hinder economic development. Although other theories have examined flows of capital or geographically bound attributes such as proximity and access to resources, growth machine theory focuses on the factions and coalitions that emerge in support of urban growth.

Molotch (1976) argued that

> the means of achieving this growth, of setting off this chain of phenomena, constitute the central issue for those serious people who care about their locality and who have the resources to make their caring felt as a political force. The city is, for those who count, a *growth machine* [emphasis added]. (P. 310)

Growth machine theory is particularly useful in understanding the differences in development attitudes among residents and elites. For example, in a study examining attitudes toward land use controls and economic development among seasonal and recreational homeowners in rural Wisconsin, Green et al. (1996) found permanent residents were much more supportive of local economic development activities and less likely to favor land use planning than were seasonal residents.

As tourism grows as an economic development force, the industry will increasingly become a focus of growth machine advocates. Evidence of this trend can be found in locales around the United States, as many cities now debate the efficacy of building aquariums, casinos, and sports stadiums, or having a professional sports team, as a primary means of economic stimuli (see Judd and Fainstein 1999). This conceptual framework has been of interest to tourism researchers based on the assumption that tourism development is controlled by powerful urban interests rather than by individual residents.

Canan and Hennessy (1989) found that decisionmakers in Molokai, Hawaii, identified with socioeconomic values, such as education and employment; supporters of tourism identified with traditional cultural values, such as family and self-sufficiency; and opponents of tourism growth fell between these two extremes. However, no group identified with growth machine values, such as tourism, development, and higher prices for goods and services.

Madrigal (1994) found that resident clusters with similar perceptions of the positive and negative aspects of tourism did coexist within and across two cities in Arizona and the United Kingdom. He also found that cluster membership accounted for a greater percentage of the total variance in resident attitudes toward tourism development than did city of residence, concluding "that viewing a citizenry [in] terms of various constituencies with different perspectives is essential for effective tourism planning" (p. 99).

Finally, Martin et al. (1998) found that retirees in the resort community of Hilton Head Island, South Carolina, did not support continued growth and strongly agreed that tourism had negative impacts. Their findings support the growth machine supposition that individuals who receive no real economic benefits from growth will not support further development.

IMPLICATIONS OF THEORETICAL RESEARCH

Social exchange, community attachment, and growth machine theories have added conceptual focus to the resident attitudes literature, composing the building blocks of future theoretically guided research. Regarding social exchange theory, research has shown that attitudes toward the impacts of tourism development are partially based on the social, economic, and

environmental trade-offs—realized or expected—of this development. Furthermore, the research suggests that there is a point of diminishing returns for residents regarding negative impacts accrued through exchange. The implication derived from this theory is that those undertaking tourism planning and development in a community should as communicative practitioners mediate these emotionally charged exchanges.

The community attachment literature suggests that although highly attached individuals may view the benefits of tourism more positively, long-term but unattached residents view tourism development more negatively than do short-term residents. The implication of this theory suggests that planners have a role in educating or at least informing highly attached individuals about tourism's negative impacts, whereas some long-term residents should be educated about tourism's positive impacts.

The work in growth machine theory requires more attention when compared with the two other theoretical frameworks. As tourism becomes a primary economic vehicle in many cities, urban coalitions will continue to coalesce around the industry's considerable potential revenues. Initial results from this research confirm that such growth regimes can be galvanized into action by tourism issues but that their influence varies depending on the development context. It is in this context that planners accustomed to urban politics will recognize tourism as an economic development issue with particular characteristics and participate in appropriate political forums with valid and reliable information about the industry.

However, the literature raises other issues related to the ever-changing notion of community. As reflected in resident attitudes, the literature reveals that tourism benefits some residents and not others in a community. For planners, the challenge of equitably distributing tourism's impacts and benefits is made more difficult because it is an "invisible" industry made up of many economic sectors. This balancing act requires an in-depth understanding of the social, economic, and environmental dynamics within a community. The research, however, demonstrates a relatively less dynamic understanding of community. Sometimes used to the exclusion of each other, systemic and linear models of community development originating at the turn of the twentieth century continue to exert a tremendous influence, although most social scientists now agree that a community comprises variables of both models. Real versus virtual versions of community might also have ramifications for research into resident attitudes. Future research should not only consider the conceptual frameworks presented here but also revisit the notion of community as the fundamental arena where decisions about tourism are made and attitudes formed.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH RESULTS

The literature shows that residents living in a community the longest have more negative perceptions of tourism development (McCool and Martin 1994; Williams et al. 1995). For age, the results are mixed, and in one study, older residents had positive attitudes (Tomljenovic and Faulkner 1999), whereas in another, they had negative attitudes (Cavus and Tanrisevdi 2002). Cultural minorities and women in some cases have more negative views of tourism development than majority populations and men, respectively (Harrill and Potts 2003; Sheldon and Var 1984; Um and Crompton 1987; Mason and Cheyne 2000). Overall, however, further research into these factors might reveal a high degree of context sensitivity.

The results are also mixed for proximity to spatial factors, also suggesting context sensitivity. In some cases, proximity to tourism development results in positive attitudes (Korça 1998); in other cases, negative attitudes (Belisle and Hoy 1980; Gursoy and Jurowski 2002). Harrill and Potts (2003) argued that attitudes toward tourism development are a partial function of spatial location and economic dependency: the residents of neighborhoods who suffer the most adverse impacts and who do not depend economically on tourism will have more negative attitudes toward tourism development than will other residents. However, future research will likely show that there are other variables important to this rudimentary equation.

The evidence regarding economic dependency is a little less ambiguous: the more an individual or community depends on tourist dollars, the more positive their attitudes (Pizam 1978; Vesey and Dimanche 2000). However, predicting who will support tourism development and where also appears to be highly context sensitive (Husbands 1989; Martin et al. 1998; Soutar and McLeod 1993; Tyrell and Spaulding 1984). Encouraging to tourism planners, many residents demonstrated awareness of the benefits and impacts of tourism development and some understanding of tourism economics in their community (Andressen and Murphy 1986; Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996; Lankford 1994; Lawson et al. 1998; Liu et al. 1987; Prentice 1993; Ross 1992; Thomason et al. 1979; Var et al. 1985).

The research also shows that residents are concerned that tourism will make them strangers in their own community and that they will be left out of tourism's direct economic benefits and pay disproportionately for tourism. They fear that tourism growth will severely affect environmental quality and in many cases are not

satisfied with local planning and environmental management efforts (Cavus and Tanrisevdi 2002; Liu et al. 1987). They also believe that tourism development will adversely affect community aesthetics (Murphy 1981) and are concerned that they will not be able to enjoy local recreational amenities if crowded out by tourists (Allen et al. 1993; Keogh 1990; Perdue et al. 1987). In many cases, residents can point out specific impacts and benefits (Milman and Pizam 1988; Pizam and Milman 1986). For planners, these reactions mean that ongoing resident participation and education must be key components of the tourism development process, with planners reinforcing perceptions of positive economic benefits and effectively addressing what is being done or can be done to mitigate adverse social and environmental impacts.

Similarly, residents often support additional tourism development but are concerned about unmanaged growth and the deterioration of the destination itself. The literature shows that low-to-moderate tourism development is perceived as beneficial to the community, but as development increases, residents' perceptions can quickly turn negative (Allen et al. 1988). There are several development options planners can pursue to manage tourism growth, including (1) economic programs, such as tax abatement for residents bearing the brunt of tourist activity; (2) concentration or dispersal of tourism facilities, such as the creation of tourism districts or zones; and (3) urban design that carefully integrates tourism facilities into the community fabric, creating buffer zones between residents and tourists.

There are many other variables that should be considered important to attitudes toward tourism development. Future research might explore the influence of community sentiment or solidarity on attitudes toward tourism development (Harrill and Potts 2003). Solidarity variables include trust, altruism, safety, belonging, leadership, equity, and willingness to move. Future research might also compare actual impacts with perceived impacts. This research would prove valuable because each destination has specific impacts that might result in different attitudes toward tourism development. Similarly, future research might also analyze resident attitudes toward specific types of tourists, particularly in quickly growing market segments, such as heritage and ecotourists. For example, Ap and Pang (2002) found that Hong Kong residents had a low level of awareness and knowledge of ecotourism. The authors argued that this low awareness toward ecotourism might lead to the misrepresentation and abuse of a concept potentially beneficial to the city. However, as suggested in the introduction of this article, there is a growing need to assess resident attitudes in areas that are beginning the development process, such as emerging destinations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Research in these areas would expand knowledge in resident attitudes to encompass many different contexts and settings.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TOURISM PLANNING

Ultimately, the literature on resident attitudes toward tourism development has value in that it thoroughly describes the tourism system to the uninitiated but also provides data that can be used in similar tourism development contexts.

As Lankford points out (2001),

> Tourism impact research is (or should be) designed to provide planners with a database with which to develop a planning process aimed at addressing local concerns and issues. Specifically, the data from a community environmental scan (via survey or series of meetings) become the starting point in developing a citizen involvement process (which may take many years) to discuss impacts, to suggest mitigating strategies, and to decide on the scope and density of tourism developments. Second, using appropriate statistical procedures, the planner can identify which groups of people are more concerned [*sic*] or opposed to tourism development within the community. This analysis assists the planner in developing a network of concerned citizens and enhances our ability to be sensitive to the variations in the level and content of development to reflect local concerns. (P. 316)

The literature presented here represents a basis for integrating resident attitudes into the current tourism planning literature, helping this subfield move away from a strictly physical development approach and toward a more inclusive perspective common in recent sustainable development dialogues and debates. As a global means of economic development, tourism planning is moving gradually from the edges of planning practice toward the center and with this movement will follow important questions regarding socioeconomic, political, and cultural representation and equity.

Tourism planning also deserves a higher profile in planning discussions regarding smart growth and New Urban development. In the case of smart growth, failure to factor tourist numbers into growth projections can severely hinder management plans. In addition, many New Urban developments, such as Seaside, Florida, are rapidly becoming destinations in their own right, with little consideration of how increasing tourism will affect the New Urban community's sense of place and community, so coveted by their designers and residents.

Many communities feeling the impact of free-trade policies are seeking other types of economic develop-

ment to generate badly needed revenue. These communities are beginning to see natural and historical assets they once took for granted as possible sources of tourist income for their community. Increasingly, planners are called on to shape these vague ideas and turn them into specific plans. However, there are several pitfalls to attracting this new industry. Planners should stress that tourism is only one component of a much broader economic development package for the community, which often includes high-technology business and local entrepreneurship. Most important, however, planners should stress that as tourism is introduced into a community, there will be new benefits and impacts experienced by residents and policy makers alike. Residents should be made aware of the terms of the exchange (i.e., the tourism development's costs and benefits), and attempts should be made to reach out to attached and unattached residents, long-term and short-term residents, as well as a community's pro-growth to antigrowth citizens. Finally, given the dearth of tourism research in planning, the profession should actively seek methods of integrating this important subject into research, education, and professional development.

CONCLUSIONS

Although occasionally threatened by war, recession, and epidemic, the international tourism industry continues to grow at a gradual, yet constant, rate. All over the world, new destinations previously unreachable by transportation and technology will require tourism planning at the onset of the development process. Older destinations also require tourism planning as these places attempt to renovate aging amenities and attract new markets. Given the diverse range and contexts of the destinations, tourism planners will need valid and reliable research from which to make decisions. This research should form the core of a new, robust subfield of tourism planning, one that focuses not only on the demand side of the industry—how to attract tourists to the city or region—but the supply side as well—the steps that must be taken to provide an attractive and enjoyable tourism product. Increasingly, however, tourism planners should also address how to protect an area's social, economic, and environmental quality of life enjoyed by residents and tourists alike. To understand the tourism industry, one needs to be more than an experienced traveler to many exotic locations—one should also be a resident who understands the value of tourism to his or her community and has an interest in protecting the locality's quality of life.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks the editors of the *Journal of Planning Literature* and the anonymous referees for their comments and suggestions on previous drafts of this article. He also thanks Georgia Tech's Economic Development Institute (EDI) for its encouragement and support during the writing of the article. In particular, he thanks EDI's Lincoln Bates for this editorial insight and skill. The author retains full responsibility for the ideas contained in it.

REFERENCES

Akis, Sevgin, Nicos Peristianis, and Jonathan Warner. 1996. Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management* 17, 7: 481-94.

Allen, Lawrence R., Harry R. Hafer, Patrick T. Long, and Richard R. Perdue. 1993. Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research* 31, 4: 27-33.

Allen, Lawrence R., Patrick T. Long, Richard R. Perdue, and Scott Kieselbach. 1988. The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life. *Journal of Travel Research* 27, 1: 16-21.

Andressen, Betty, and Peter E. Murphy. 1986. Tourism development in Canadian travel corridors: Two surveys of resident attitudes. *World Leisure & Recreation* 28, 5: 17-22.

Ap, John. 1992. Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19, 4: 665-90.

———. 1990. Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 17, 4: 610-16.

Ap, John, and John L. Crompton. 1998. Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. *Journal of Travel Research* 37, 2: 120-30.

———. 1993. Residents' strategies in responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research* 31, 1: 47-50.

Ap, John, and Dora Pang. 2002. Community perceptions of eco-tourism. Retrieved August 22, 2003, from http://www.ttra.com.

Belisle, Francois J., and Don R. Hoy. 1980. The perceived impact of tourism by residents: A case study in Santa Marta, Columbia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 7, 1: 83-101.

Bosselman, Fred P., Craig A. Peterson, and Claire McCarthy. 1999. *Managing tourism growth: Issues and applications*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Brougham, J. E., and R. W. Butler. 1981. A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8, 4: 569-90.

Butler, R. W. 1980. The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer* 24, 1: 5-12.

Buttel, Fredrick H., Oscar B. Martinson, and E. A. Wilkening. 1979. Size and place of community attachment: A reconsideration. *Social Indicators Research* 6:474-85.

Canan, Penelope, and Michael Hennessy. 1989. The growth machine, tourism, and the selling of culture. *Sociological Perspectives* 32, 2: 227-43.

Caneday, Lowell, and Jeffrey Zeiger. 1991. The social, economic, and environmental costs of tourism to a gambling community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research* 30, 2: 45-49.

Cavus, Senol, and Abdullah Tanrisevdi. 2002. Residents attitudes toward tourism: A case study of Kusadasi, Turkey. *Tourism Analysis* 7, 3-4: 259-68.

Cooke, Karen. 1982. Guidelines for socially appropriate tourism development in British Columbia. *Journal of Tourism Research* 21, 1: 22-28.

Davis, Duane, Jeff Allen, and Robert M. Cosenza. 1988. Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests, and opinions toward tourists. *Journal of Travel Research* 27, 2: 2-8.

D[CHAR1]gan, Hasan Z. 1989. Forms of adjustment: Sociocultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 16, 2: 8-13.

Doxey, G. V. 1975. *A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants, methodology, and research inferences*. Sixth annual conference proceedings of the Travel Research Association, San Diego, CA: Travel and Tourism Research Association, 195-98.

Evans-Pritchard, Deidre. 1989. How "they" see "us": Native American images of tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research* 16:89-105.

Fridgen, Joseph, D. 1991. *Dimensions of tourism*. Lansing, MI: The Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Lodging Association.

Getz, Donald. 1994. Residents' attitudes towards tourism: A longitudinal study of Spey Valley, Scotland. *Tourism Management* 15, 4: 247-58.

Girard, T. C., and William C. Gartner. 1993. Second home second view: Host community perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20, 4: 685-700.

Green, Gary P., David Marcouiller, Steven Deller, Daniel Erkkila, and N. R. Sumathi. 1996. Local dependency, land use attitudes, and economic development: Comparisons between seasonal and permanent residents. *Rural Sociology* 61, 3: 427-45.

Gunn, Claire A. 1994. *Tourism planning: Basics, concepts, and cases*. 3rd ed. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Gursoy, Dŏgan, and Claudia Jurowski. 2002. *Resident attitudes in relation to distance from tourist attractions*. http://www.ttra.com (accessed August 22, 2003).

Hall, C. M. 2000. *Tourism planning: Policies, processes, and relationships*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Haralambopoulous, Nicholas, and Abraham Pizam. 1996. Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23, 3: 503-26.

Harrill, Rich, and Thomas D. Potts. 2003. Tourism planning in historic districts: Attitudes toward tourism development in Charleston. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 69, 3: 233-44.

Haukeland, Jan V. 1984. Sociocultural impacts of tourism in Scandinavia: Studies of three host communities. *Tourism Management* 5, 3: 207-13.

Haywood, Michael K. 1986. Can the tourist-area life cycle be made operational? *Tourism Management* 7, 3: 154-67.

Hernandez, Sigfredo A., Judy Cohen, and Hector L. Garcia. 1996. Residents' attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23, 4: 755-79.

Hester, Randolph T. 1993. Sacred structures and everyday life: A return to Manteo, NC. In *Dwelling, seeing, and designing*, D. Seamon, ed. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Husbands, Winston. 1989. Social status and perception of tourism in Zambia. *Annals of Tourism Research* 16, 2: 237-53.

Inskeep, Edward. 1991. *Tourism planning: An integrated and sustainable approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

———. 1988. Tourism planning: An emerging specialization. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 54, 3: 360-72.

Ioannides, Dmitri. 1995. Planning for international tourism in less developed countries: Toward sustainability. *Journal of Planning Literature* 9, 3: 235-54.

Jamal, Tazim B., Stanley M. Stein, and Thomas L. Harper. 2002. Beyond labels: Pragmatic planning in multistakeholder tourism-environmental conflicts. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 22, 2: 164-77.

Jordan, James W. 1980. The summer people and the natives: Some effects of tourism in a Vermont vacation village. *Annals of Tourism Research* 7, 1: 34-55.

Judd, Dennis R., and Susan S. Fainstein. 1999. *The Tourism City*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Jurowski, Claudia. 1998. A study of community sentiments in relation to attitudes toward tourism development. *Tourism Analysis* 3: 17-34.

Jurowski, Claudia, Muzaffer Uysal, and Daniel R. Williams. 1997. A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research* 36, 2: 3-11.

Kang, Yong-Soon, Patrick T. Long, and Richard R. Perdue. 1996. Resident attitudes toward legal gambling. *Annals of Tourism Research* 23, 1: 71-85.

Keogh, Brian. 1990. Resident recreationists' perceptions and attitudes with respect to tourism development. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research* 15, 2: 71-83.

Kincaid, Jamaica. 1988. *A small place*. New York: Penguin.

Korça, Perver. 1998. Resident perceptions of tourism in a resort town. *Leisure Sciences* 20, 3: 193-212.

Lankford, Samuel V. 2001. A comment concerning "developing and testing a tourism impact scale." *Journal of Travel Research* 39:315-16.

———. 1994. Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development. *Journal of Travel Research* 32, 2: 35-43.

Lankford, Samuel V., Barton P. Buxton, Ronald Hetzler, and James R. Little. 1995. Response bias and wave analysis of mailed questionnaires in tourism impact assessments. *Journal of Travel Research* 33, 4: 8-13.

Lankford, Samuel V., and Dennis R. Howard. 1993. Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research* 21, 1: 121-39.

Lawson, R., J. Williams, T. Young, and J. Cossens. 1998. A comparison of residents' attitudes towards tourism in 10 New Zealand towns. *Tourism Management* 19, 3: 247-56.

Liu, Juanita C., and Turgut Var. 1986. Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research* 13, 2: 193-214.

Liu, Juanita C., Pauline J. Sheldon, and Turgut Var. 1987. Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14: 17-34.

Long, Patrick T. 1996. Early impacts of limited stakes casino gambling on rural community life. *Tourism Management* 17, 5: 341-53.

Madrigal, Robert. 1994. Residents' perceptions and the role of government. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22, 1: 86-102.

———. 1993. A tale of tourism in two cities. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20, 2: 336-53.

Marcouiller. 1997. Toward integrative tourism planning in rural America. *Journal of Planning Literature* 11, 3: 337-57.

———. 1995. *CPL bibliography 316: Tourism planning*. Chicago: Council of Planning Librarians, American Planning Association.

Martin, Bonnie, Francis McGuire, and Lawrence Allen. 1998. Retirees' attitudes toward tourism: Implications for sustainable development. *Tourism Analysis* 3, 1: 43-51.

Martin, Bonnie, and Muzaffer Uysal. 1990. An examination of the relationship between carrying capacity and the tourism lifecycle: Management and policy implications. *Journal of Environmental Management* 31:327-333.

Mason, Peter, and Joanne Cheyne. 2000. Residents attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27, 2: 391-411.

McCool, Stephen F., and Steven R. Martin. 1994. Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research* 32, 2: 29-34.

McGehee, Nancy G., Kathleen L. Andereck, and Christine Vogt. 2002. *An examination of factors influencing resident attitudes toward tourism in twelve Arizona communities*. http://www.ttra.com (accessed August 22, 2003).

Meyer-Arendt, Klaus J. 1985. The Grand Isles, Louisiana, resort cycle. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12, 3: 449-65.

Milman, Ady, and Abraham Pizam. 1988. Social impacts of tourism in Central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research* 15, 2: 191-204.

Molotch, Harvey. 1976. The city as growth machine. *American Journal of Sociology* 82, 2: 309-32.

Murphy, Peter E. 1981. Community attitudes on tourism: A comparative analysis. *Tourism Management* 2, 2: 189-95.

Pearce, John A. 1980. Host community acceptance of foreign tourists: Strategic considerations. *Annals of Tourism Research* 7, 2: 224-33.

Perdue, Richard R., Patrick T. Long, and Lawrence Allen. 1990. Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research* 17, 4: 586-99.

———. 1987. Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research* 14:420-29.

Pizam, Abraham. 1978. Tourism's impacts: The social costs of the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research* 16, 4: 8-12.

Pizam, Abraham, and Ady Milman. 1986. The social impacts of tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research* 11, 1: 29-33.

Pizam, Abraham, and Julianne Pokela. 1985. The perceived impacts of casino gambling on a community. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12, 2: 147-65.

Prentice, Richard. 1993. Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences. *Tourism Management* 14, 3: 218-27.

Ritzer, George. 1996. *Sociological theory*. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ritzdorf, Marsha. 1995. Feminist contributions to ethics and planning theory. In *Planning ethics: A reader in planning theory, practices, and education*, Sue Hendler, ed. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research.

Ross, Glenn F. 1992. Resident perceptions of the impact of tourism on an Australian city. *Journal of Travel Research* 30, 3: 13-17.

Rothman, Hal K. 1998. *Devil's bargain: Tourism in the twentieth-century American West*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Rothman, Robert A. 1978. Residents and transients: Community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research* 16, 3: 8-13.

Ryan, Chris, and David Montgomery. 1994. The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism issues in community response tourism. *Tourism Management* 15, 4: 358-69.

Sheldon, Pauline J., and Turgut Var. 1984. Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management* 5, 2: 40-47.

Smith, Michael D., and Richard S. Krannich. 1998. Tourism dependence and resident attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25, 4: 783-801.

Snaith, Tim, and Art Haley. 1999. Residents' opinions of tourism development in the historic city of York, England. *Tourism Management* 20, 1: 595-603.

Soutar, Geoffrey, and Paul B. McLeod. 1993. Residents' perceptions on impact of the America's cup. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20, 3: 571-82.

Tomljenovic, Renata, and Bill Faulkner. 1999. Tourism and older residents in a sunbelt resort. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27, 1: 93-114.

Thomason, Pamela, John L. Crompton, and B. Dan Kamp. 1979. A study of the attitudes of impacted groups within a host community toward prolonged stay tourist visitors. *Journal of Travel Research* 17, 3: 2-6.

Tyrell, Timothy J., and Irving A. Spaulding. 1984. A survey of attitudes toward tourism growth in Rhode Island. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal* 8, 2: 22-33.

Um, Seoho, and John L. Crompton. 1987. Measuring resident's attachment levels in a

host community. *Journal of Travel Research* 26, 1: 27-29.

Var, Turgut, K. W. Kendall, and Enis Tarakcioglu. 1985. Resident attitudes towards tourists in a Turkish resort town. *Annals of Tourism Research* 12, 4: 652-58.

Vesey, Catherine M., and Frederic Dimanche. 2000. Urban residents' perceptions of tourism and its impacts. Unpublished manuscript, University of New Orleans, LA.

Williams, Daniel R., Cary D. McDonald, Carla M. Riden, and Muzaffer Uysal. 1995. *Community attachment, regional identity and resident attitudes toward tourism development*. 26th annual conference proceedings of the Travel and Tourism Research Association. Acapulco, Mexico: Travel and Tourism Research Association, 424-31.

Williams, John, and Rob Lawson. 2001. Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 28, 2: 269-90.

World Tourism Organization. 1994. *National and regional tourism planning: Methodologies and case studies*. London: Routledge.