

A COMPARISON OF THE VIEWS OF INVOLVED VERSUS NONINVOLVED CITIZENS ON QUALITY OF LIFE AND TOURISM DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Claudia Jurowski

Northern Arizona University

Desmond Omotayo Brown

University of Kentucky

Rural communities seeking to improve the quality of life for their residents often turn to tourism as a means to improve their economic position. The sustainability of any economic development plan is dependent on community organizations that are actively trying to control and shape their quality of life within their community. This study reveals that involved residents evaluate their quality of life higher than do the noninvolved residents. Even though the results indicated that there are no statistically significant differences in how involved versus noninvolved citizens evaluate the potential impacts of tourism, differences in the support each group indicated for the development of cultural tourism infrastructure were identified. The views of the involved citizens are important to decision makers because the involved citizens are the ones most likely to influence public policy.

KEYWORDS: *tourism; community organizations; empowerment; involvement; quality of life; Kentucky.*

Rural communities seeking to improve the quality of life for their residents often turn to tourism as a means to improve their economic position and create jobs to maintain the existence of their community (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Jurowski, 1998). At the same time, rural residents who value their clean environment and social structure resist efforts that would result in a deterioration of their lifestyle. For development strategies to be sustainable, they must be socially equitable, provide economic security, and maintain the integrity of the environment (Flint, 1999). Faced with such a challenge, many community organizations have become proactive and are attempting to control and shape their own destiny through both collective organization and social action (Heskin, 1991; Logan & Rabrenovic, 1990). Such involvement provides individuals with a direct link to the larger social and political structure and empowers individuals to effect changes (Miner & Tolnay, 1998).

Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, Vol. 25, No. 4, November 2001, 355-370
© 2001 International Council on Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Education

Scope of Community Organizations

In estimating the scope of community organizations in the United States, two main issues tend to make the discussion somewhat obscure. First, the total number of community organizations or the memberships they reach are virtually impossible to estimate. However, some estimates by the Alliance for Volunteerism estimate more than 6 million voluntary associations, and a study by ACTION indicates greater than 40 million volunteers, or one fourth of all Americans older than age 13.

Second, the range in the scope of grassroots community groups complicates such estimates considerably. For example, in a field study of grassroots groups conducted by Langton (1978), at least three multistate organizations, a dozen city-wide alliances, and thousands of neighborhood associations were identified. However, given that there are some 10,000 block clubs in New York City alone, the national estimates would be astronomical. In addition, these groups are expanding at an overwhelming rate.

Problem Area

An understanding of the views of citizens who are involved in community organizations is critical to any development effort that seeks their cooperation and assistance. Community planners need to know how these residents view their quality of life and how they might react to proposed strategies. To date, little is known about community organization members' perceptions of tourism in a community. Hence, this study sought to better understand community involvement through community organizations by comparing the similarities and differences among citizen groups based on various levels of their community involvement and perceptions of their community's tourism-related quality-of-life indicators. It expanded knowledge about how a specific subset of the population, that is, those who are members of community organizations, might respond to tourism development. Community organization membership was operationalized in this study as self-reported membership in one or more of the following types of organizations: school related, religious, civic, service, hobby oriented, organized sports for children, organized sports for adults, and neighborhood.

The specific research question this study sought to answer is whether highly involved residents differed from those who are not at all involved or less involved on three specific aspects. The research question was as follows: Are there differences in the way each group (a) viewed its quality of life in relation to its community, (b) evaluated the impacts of tourism, and (c) expressed support for different types of tourism infrastructure development?

The null hypotheses tested in this study were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There is no relationship between the viewpoints of residents on the quality of life in their community and membership in community organizations.

Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between the viewpoints of residents on the impacts of tourism on their community and membership in community organizations.

Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between residents' support for different types of tourism and membership in community organizations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Role of Community Organizations

The literature on community organizations has become a focal theme in urban research in recent years. Most of the research in this area has centered on defining the role of such organizations and their meaning to society. For example, Logan and Rabrenovic (1990) described them as civic associations whose goals are to maintain and improve neighborhood quality of life and to protect common economic and social interests. Some posited that they are place specific, volunteer driven, shaped by the direct involvement of members, and defined by problem solving as their principal reason for existence (Berry, Portney, & Thompson, 1993; Florin & Wandersman, 1990; Haberle, 1989; Sampson, 1991). They defined the role of community organization as a means by which residents acting collectively with little or no professional help take control of their neighborhoods. Their objectives are often to obtain better city services, to fight crime, to engage local youths in prosocial activities, to protest and clean up environmental problems, or merely to organize a block party. Other researchers have concluded that participants' economic resources or investments (e.g., home ownership) and the material benefit of protecting those investments were important reasons for their existence (Hyman & Wright, 1971; Prestby, Wandersman, Florin, Rich, & Chavis, 1990). From this perspective, it can be concluded that community involvement seeks to foster self-efficacy as residents work collectively to solve community problems (Perkins, Brown, & Taylor, 1996).

Others have researched their changing status during recent years. For example, Hogan (1986) and Graham and Hogan (1990) have concluded that community organizations have recently assumed the roles of visible local organizations that confront public and private agents that pose threats to the social and physical well-being of the neighborhood. Schwirian and Mesh (1993) concluded that neighborhood residents have learned that there are limited prospects for outside political or economic help in their struggle against large-scale agents of change—city hall, the “growth machine” (a powerful coalition of government officials and local businesses that are united in the pursuit of economic development), and big development interests. Perkins (1995) contended that the concepts of empowerment are more apparent in small community-based organizations than in larger, more complex organizations.

Reasons for Involvement

Membership in community organizations at the individual level has been identified as an intrapersonal component of psychological empowerment that defines how people think about their capacity to influence social and political systems (Rappaport, 1984; Zimmerman, 1994). It describes a self-perception that includes control, self-efficacy, motivation to exert control, and perceived competence (Berger & Neuhaus, 1977; Cornell Empowerment Group, 1989; Kieffer, 1984; Paulhus, 1983; Rappaport, 1984, 1987; Schulz & Israel, 1990; Swift & Levin, 1987; Zimmerman, 1990). Citizen involvement in grassroots community organi-

zations can be viewed as either an integral component of self-empowerment or as both a cause and effect of such empowerment (Perkins, 1995; Zimmerman, 1990). Thus, it is essential to understand why some individuals in communities are motivated to be more actively involved than others are.

To date, there have been two major studies in the social psychology literature that have addressed community-focused predictors of citizen involvement in block associations. Unger and Wandersman (1983) examined neighboring behavior (such as loaning a tool or looking after each other's house) on residential blocks in Nashville, Tennessee. They found that informal assistance facilitated block organizing. They also found that once a block is organized, association members engaged in more social interaction, which may lead to more neighborhood collaboration.

From the same study, Florin and Wandersman (1990) derived person-community predictors of involvement based on cognitive social learning variables (CSLVs). Their version of the CSLV expectancies includes self- and collective efficacy, which are similar to the concept of psychological empowerment. They found encoding strategies (residents' perceptions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with community problems) to be a better predictor of involvement. One problem with this finding is that community satisfaction and perceptions may be related to involvement in different ways (Perkins, Florin, Rich, Wandersman, & Chavis, 1990). Residents may be satisfied with their community as a place to live and, at the same time, be critical of community problems.

Thus, satisfaction alone may encourage involvement by enhancing other social cognitions and behaviors. Being satisfied with one's community may give residents a greater sense of community and collective efficacy and may result in more favorable interaction among neighbors, all of which are predicted to lead to greater collective involvement.

A psychological sense of community is also important to community involvement (Ahlbrandt, 1984). Chavis and Wandersman (1990) have clarified this process at the individual level by showing that, over time, a sense of community can lead, through greater self-efficacy, to collective involvement. Their results also suggest that involvement itself further enhances an individual's sense of community.

A major study of block associations was conducted in New York City. It systematically examined both the physical and social context of crime, fear, and citizen involvement in community organizations at the block level. No significant relationship was found between involvement and reported crime, perceived crime problems, victimization, fear, and informal social controls, despite considerable block variability. The built environment (as opposed to the natural environment), territoriality, neighboring (e.g., loaning a tool or looking after each other's house), block satisfaction, and organizational efficacy, however, were significantly related to block association involvement, even after controlling for income, length of residency, and race. This latter finding suggests that perceived and actual problems or deficiencies in the physical environment may serve as catalysts for involvement and that community social cohesion may be an even more effective enabler of involvement.

Involvement and Tourism

Several studies on resident attitudes toward tourism have determined that variability in support for tourism development differs by population segments (Allen, Long, Perdue, & Kieselbach, 1988; Ap, 1992; Jurowski, 1998; Murphy, 1983; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Tyrell & Spaulding, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987). There is evidence to suggest that positive attitudes toward tourism may be related to how residents feel about life in their community. An expressed positive attitude toward tourism was positively correlated with a concern about the economic future of their community in the Perdue, Long, and Allen (1990) study. Another relationship was found by Johnson, Snepenger, and Akis (1994), who suggested that attitudes toward tourism might be a result of self-image and group-identity feelings rather than a belief that tourism will result in personal benefits. A few studies have focused on the relationship between attachment to a community and attitudes toward tourism (Brougham & Butler, 1981; Davis, Allen, & Cosenza, 1988; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997; Lankford & Howard, 1994; Liu & Var, 1986; McCool & Martin, 1994; Pizam, 1978; Um & Crompton, 1987; Williams, McDonald, Riden, & Uysal, 1996). In some of these studies, the more the resident was attached to the community, the less support that resident expressed for tourism development. The findings of other studies were either inconclusive or contradictory. As suggested by Pearce, Moscardo, and Ross (1996), the contradictory findings may be attributable to differences in the way the community sentiment was measured. Three basic concepts were used to measure what was called attachment in the cited studies: (a) birthplace or length of residency, (b) sentiments about the community, and (c) involvement in the community. A more recent study demonstrated that the concept of attachment is composed of two elements, sentiment and involvement (Jurowski, 1998). The results of this study indicate that those who were willing to commit time and energy to improving their community were less optimistic about the impacts of tourism and somewhat less supportive of tourism development than those who evaluated their quality of life and emotional attachment to the community as being higher.

METHOD

Sample

The study took place in Lexington, Kentucky, internationally known as the home of the thoroughbred, which each year brings thousands of race fans and buyers to the city. Located about 81 miles south of Cincinnati and 74 miles east of Louisville, the area is generally known as the Bluegrass area and is located at the center of a 31-state distribution area and is within a 500-mile radius of nearly three fourths of the manufacturing employment, retail sales, and population of the United States. Planners have emphasized controlled growth as the key to the future of Lexington, because thoroughbred horse farms surround the city. The questions were designed to summarize public perceptions of the impact of tourism on the local economy and the level of public support expressed toward a variety of development options.

The sample was composed of individuals eligible to vote in households with telephones in the Lexington/Fayette area. Using the Walsbery random-digit dialing method, a procedure that gives every residential telephone an equal probability of being called, the researchers attempted 760 calls in June 1998. Of those numbers called, contact was made with 497 individuals, 17 of whom were from households with no eligible respondent and 80 of whom refused to participate. Among the refusals, many were hang-ups in which it was impossible to determine whether there was an eligible person in the household. One refusal conversion attempt was made, and households who asked us to call back were called back up to seven times before the abandoning the number. The 163 remaining were not contacted because of one of the following conditions: disconnected phone, computer tone, business/government, perpetual no answers or busy signals, and abandonment after 15 attempts. Overall, 400 completed interviews were obtained, yielding a response rate of 52.6% for the study.

Variables

Organization membership was measured by a question that asked respondents to indicate the number of organizations to which they currently belong or are involved in one of six categories. The categories were developed based on Babchuk and Booth's (1969) typology. They included school-related organizations, such as a parent-teacher association or site-based council; religious organizations; civic organizations, such as Rotary, Kiwanis, or Lions organizations; service organizations, such as Red Cross, God's Pantry, or Newcomers; hobby-oriented organizations, such as music, crafts, and so forth; organized sports for children; organized sports for adults; and neighborhood associations. Respondents were asked to mention any other organizations to which they belonged that were not mentioned.

Residents' evaluations of their quality of life were measured by questions that asked them to rate the quality of specific aspects of their community. The aspects selected included those defined in the literature as factors that are affected by tourism (Jurowski, 1998). Added to the list were education, quality of air transportation, and quality of public transportation.

The impact scale was taken from the work of Jurowski (1994), who tested the scale for reliability and validity. Measures of support for the type of tourism residents prefer were based on Jurowski's (1994, 1998; Jurowski et al., 1997) work. Additions to the type of tourism included in the instrument were made to adjust the instrument to local conditions.

Research Method

Respondents were asked to list all of the organizations to which they belonged. The total number of organizations to which each respondent belonged was calculated. Respondents were placed in one of four categories: no group membership, member of one organization, member of two or three organizations, member of four or more organizations. Frequencies and percentages were calculated. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether any of the

observed differences in the level of involvement groups were significant with respect to their evaluation of their quality of life and the impacts of tourism and their support of various types of tourism infrastructure development. ANOVA allows for the comparison of mean scores from multiple samples to determine whether the differences in the means of the populations from which the samples were drawn are statistically significant. The null hypotheses assumed that the four levels of involvement means were equal for all variables. The analysis used an alpha level of 0.05. Tests for homogeneity of variance provided evidence of equality of variance.

LIMITATIONS

In a telephone survey, there is always the potential of sample bias because all eligible respondents may not have telephones or may not be willing to participate. However, this threat is now considered to be minimal (Babbie, 1986). The study is limited by the measurement of community involvement because it was based on the number of organizations to which individuals belong. No attempt was made to classify the types of organizations or to segment the population on the role respondents played in the organization or their level of commitment to the organization.

RESULTS

Demographics

Approximately one half of the respondents were male (49.8%). The sample included a relatively balanced number of people in each age category. The vast majority of the respondents were White (90.5%), with a few other races being represented. A small number had been in the community less than 1 year (5.2%). The largest portions of the sample had incomes of between \$20,000 and \$40,000 or between \$40,000 and \$60,000. Table 1 provides details on the gender, age, race, length of residence, and income of the sample.

Involvement

On the average, respondents belonged to 1.67 organizations within their communities. More than one fifth (20.3%) of the respondents belonged to one organization. Another 16.8% belonged to no organizations. A significant segment (42.5%) belonged to two or three organizations, and about one fifth (20.5%) belonged to four or more organizations (see Table 2).

Quality of Life

The respondents indicated that they evaluated their overall quality of life as generally good. Especially good were the quality of the environment, recreational, shopping, and employment opportunities. The quality of education was also rated fairly high. Only a few items were rated fair: driving flow and traffic flow, the quality of public transportation, and the cost of land and housing. The

Table 1
Demographics of Respondents

Characteristic	%
Gender	
Male	49.8
Female	50.2
Age	
18-34	27.5
35-44	18.0
45-54	23.3
55-64	13.2
Older than 65	18.0
Race	
White	90.5
African American	5.8
Hispanic	0.2
Other	1.3
Length of time in current neighborhood (in years)	
Less than 1	5.2
1-2	13.0
3-5	23.0
6-10	17.7
11-15	10.0
16-20	8.5
More than 20	22.5
Annual income (in dollars)	
Less than 20,000	10.0
20-39,999	24.3
40-59,999	24.3
60-79,999	12.3
80-99,999	9.5
More than 100,000	6.8

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding error.

Table 2
Level of Involvement

Level of Involvement	Frequency	Valid %	Cumulative %
No group membership	67	16.8	16.8
Member of one organization	81	20.3	37.0
Member of two or three organizations	170	42.5	79.5
Member of four or more organizations	82	20.5	100.05
Total	400	100.0	

analysis found statistically significant differences in mean scores in several of the quality-of-life variables. Significant differences were found between the groups in their evaluation of the quality of the environment, recreation opportunities, cultural opportunities, and overall quality of life. In this case, the first null hypothesis

Table 3
Comparison of the Evaluation of Quality-of-Life Variables by Group

Organization Membership/ Variable	Overall Mean	Mean = 0 (<i>n</i> = 66)	Mean = 1 (<i>n</i> = 82)	Mean = 2-3 (<i>n</i> = 170)	Mean = 4 or more (<i>n</i> = 82)	<i>F</i>	Significance
Overall quality of life	3.12	2.99	3.04	3.18	3.20	3.08	.027*
The environment	3.06	2.93	2.93	3.10	3.23	4.11	.007*
Shopping opportunities	3.05	2.84	3.09	3.07	3.12	2.06	.106
Employment opportunities	2.97	2.86	2.92	3.03	3.11	1.53	.206
Recreation opportunities	2.84	2.62	2.72	2.82	3.17	6.59	.000*
Education	2.77	2.70	2.79	2.74	2.88	0.84	.471
Cultural opportunities	2.66	2.39	2.68	2.68	2.82	3.29	.021*
Costs of goods and services	2.58	2.48	2.53	2.56	2.72	1.72	.161
Quality of air transportation	2.58	2.57	2.48	2.54	2.74	1.87	.135
Crime rate	2.47	2.27	2.48	2.50	2.59	2.08	.103
Cost of land and housing	2.26	2.10	2.33	2.24	2.37	1.54	.204
Quality of public transportation	2.24	2.35	2.35	2.14	2.27	1.65	.178
Driving flow and traffic flow	1.97	1.97	1.91	1.94	2.06	0.456	.713

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate how they would rate the quality of the variables listed in their community on a scale in which 4 = *excellent*, 3 = *good*, 2 = *fair*, and 1 = *poor*.

*Significant at the .05 level.

(Hypothesis 1) was rejected because a Tukey *b* multiple comparison test verified that individuals who belonged to four or more organizations were more likely to evaluate the quality of the environment, recreation opportunities, cultural opportunities, and overall quality of life significantly higher than those of other groups. An observation of the means indicates that those who belonged to no community organizations evaluated the quality of most aspects of their lives lower than those that were the most involved. Differences in the mean scores of the four groups along with ANOVA statistics are displayed in Table 3.

Impacts of Tourism

The second null hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) was not rejected. No significant differences were found among the groups in reference to their evaluation of the impacts of tourism. However, those who belonged to no organizations appeared to be more optimistic than the average about the impact of tourism on employment opportunities, opportunities for shopping and recreation, the price of goods and services, the cost of land and housing, improvements in local services, relationships between residents and tourists, and the ability of tourism to preserve the local culture. This group appeared to be the most optimistic in more categories than other groups. Those who belonged to four or more organizations were also more optimistic than the average on three of the same items (recreation opportu-

nities, the cost of land and housing, and preservation of the local culture). However, the latter group was more pessimistic about employment opportunities, opportunities for shopping, the price of goods and services, and the relationship between residents and tourists. Members of this group were, on the other hand, the most optimistic about the potential for improving traffic congestion and the crime rate. The mean scores and ANOVA statistics are displayed in Table 4.

Types of Tourism Infrastructure Development

Overall, there was considerable support for the development of tourism infrastructure. In fact, the groups differed little on the type of tourism infrastructure they would support or oppose. The highest level of support was found for preserving rural land and horse farms. Nearly equally strong support was indicated for improvements in transportation, the development of cultural and folk events, and cultural or historic-based attractions. The types of tourism infrastructure development the Lexington residents were likely to oppose are theme parks, a new convention and civic center, and new facilities for sporting events. The third hypothesis (Hypothesis 3) can only be rejected for two of the types of tourism infrastructure the citizens would oppose or support. Significant differences were found in cultural or historic-based attractions and cultural and folk events. Support for these types of cultural tourism increased as the level of involvement increased. Details concerning the variations in support or opposition for various types of tourism infrastructure along with ANOVA statistics are delineated in Table 5.

DISCUSSION

This study found evidence to confirm earlier research that noted a positive relationship between membership in community organizations and residents' satisfaction with their quality of life (Florin & Wandersman, 1990). In addition, the relationship between group membership and concern about the built environment identified by Perkins et al. (1990) was confirmed. Residents who were members of a greater number of organizations evaluated their quality of life as higher than those who were not involved in community organizations did. They appeared to be slightly more supportive of specific types of tourism infrastructure development, especially those types of tourism infrastructure that will preserve the culture and history of their community. On the whole, the residents opposed large-scale infrastructure development such as a new convention center, theme parks, or a sporting events arena.

It is interesting to note that there were no differences in the way the subsegments of the population viewed the impacts of tourism. It seemed as though residents, whether or not they were involved in community organization, were aware of how tourism would affect their lives. They realized that an increase in the number of visitors might provide increased revenues for government and better opportunities for employment, recreation, and shopping. It was clear that the respondents understood the economic benefits and costs. They appeared to be

Table 4
Comparison of the Evaluation of Impact of Tourism Variables by Group

Organization Membership/ Variable	Overall Mean	Mean = 0 (<i>n</i> = 67)	Mean = 1 (<i>n</i> = 82)	Mean = 2-3 (<i>n</i> = 170)	Mean = 4 or more (<i>n</i> = 82)	<i>F</i>	Significance
Revenues for local government	4.25	4.15	4.11	4.35	4.26	1.95	.121
Employment opportunities	3.89	3.91	3.95	3.89	3.82	0.92	.411
Opportunities for recreation	3.69	3.82	3.48	3.72	3.73	2.52	.058
Opportunities for shopping	3.65	3.87	3.56	3.66	3.52	2.59	.052
Preservation of local culture	3.21	3.34	3.05	3.18	3.32	1.68	.170
Relationship between residents and tourists	3.21	3.40	3.19	3.17	3.14	2.20	.088
Price of goods and services	3.02	3.16	3.07	2.97	2.95	0.96	.412
Local services (police, fire, etc.)	2.88	2.73	2.98	2.89	2.88	1.04	.376
Cost of land and housing	2.78	2.90	2.78	2.72	2.82	0.590	.622
Crime rate	2.46	2.44	2.35	2.49	2.51	0.79	.499
Traffic congestion	1.78	1.71	1.72	1.80	1.88	0.82	.483

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate how each item would be for them and other residents of their county if the number of tourists were to increase. Their responses were coded on a scale in which 5 = *much better*, 4 = *somewhat better*, 3 = *about the same*, 2 = *somewhat worse*, and 1 = *much worse*.

most concerned about traffic congestion and the crime rate. Residents in this community apparently evaluated the impacts of tourism similarly to those of other communities (Allen et al., 1988; Ap, 1992; Jurowski et al., 1997; Perdue et al., 1990).

The lack of differences within population segments is important to tourism planners and developers because the viewpoints of the citizens that are most likely to influence public policy are not likely to be different from those of the general population. Similarly, the type of tourism supported or opposed by the various segments were alike. Even though significant differences were found in the intensity of support or opposition, in general all four groups supported cultural tourism infrastructure development and opposed tourism that required building on a large scale.

Because the results indicate that there was little difference based on level of involvement in the support for specific types of tourism infrastructure, planners should develop relationships with community organizations for several reasons. First, the involved citizens appear to reflect the viewpoints of the general populace. Second, the involved citizens are those who are proactive and want to affect the future of their community (Heskin, 1991; Logan & Rabrenovic, 1990).

Table 5
Comparison of the Type of Tourism Supported or Opposed by Group

Organization Membership/ Variable	Overall Mean	Mean = 0 (n = 66)	Mean = 1 (n = 82)	Mean = 2-3 (n = 170)	Mean = 4 or more (n = 82)	F	Significance
Preserving rural land and horse farms	3.70	3.58	3.65	3.73	3.79	1.81	.146
Improved Transportation, facilities, and roads	3.64	3.64	3.71	3.61	3.63	0.59	.621
Cultural and folk events	3.58	3.46	3.49	3.60	3.72	3.43	.017*
Cultural or historic- based attractions	3.54	3.42	3.45	3.58	3.64	2.71	.045*
Nature programs	3.52	3.48	3.53	3.47	3.65	1.63	.181
Outdoor recreation programs and activities	3.48	3.49	3.52	3.42	3.55	0.87	.456
Horse shows and competitions	3.43	3.29	3.49	3.40	3.56	2.32	.075
Dinner playhouse, outdoor dramas, or amphitheaters	3.43	3.28	3.47	3.45	3.49	1.48	.220
Amateur sports competitions	3.29	3.28	3.29	3.49	2.85	1.30	.276
Renovated convention & civic center	3.08	3.05	2.89	3.12	3.21	1.90	.129
Promotion	2.85	3.15	3.17	3.23	3.40	1.78	.151
Professional sports development	2.83	2.95	2.74	2.80	2.89	0.67	.573
New facilities for sporting events	2.62	2.76	2.66	2.56	2.62	0.59	.620
New convention and civic center	2.43	2.58	2.36	2.38	2.49	0.74	.531
Theme parks	2.39	2.54	2.23	2.38	2.46	1.33	.263

Note: Respondents were asked to indicate how much they would support or oppose each type of tourism development for the Lexington and Bluegrass, Kentucky, areas on a scale in which 4 = *strongly support*, 3 = *somewhat support*, 2 = *somewhat oppose*, and 1 = *strongly oppose*.

*Significant at the .05 level.

Finally, the organizations provide planners with a direct link to those who are most likely to support or oppose their actions (Miner & Tolnay, 1998).

The findings of this research indicate that planners and developers could use their limited resources most efficiently by working with the most active members of the community. The involved citizens can be an especially valuable asset to the planner because their views are similar to those of the general population and because they are somewhat more optimistic about their quality of life and less pessimistic about the impacts of tourism. In addition, actively involved citizens are

likely to perceive that they can affect the outcome of a proposed development and may be more likely to volunteer their time and resources, especially for the development of cultural or historic events and attractions.

FUTURE RESEARCH

More research is needed to determine if the involved citizens identified in this study are willing to participate in the tourism development process and to verify the hypothesis that suggested that tourism planners can use their resources better by focusing attention on the involved citizen. Knowledge is needed that will uncover which groups are most likely to become involved and to identify what role the individual groups would like to play in community planning and tourism development. More research is needed to determine how the tourism planner can best use those individuals who choose to become involved in their community. In addition, a better understanding of individuals who participate in tourism-related community development projects is needed to understand why they participate and how the tourism planner and/or developer can take advantage of their interest and support.

An earlier study by Jurowski (1998) indicated that the involved citizen was somewhat less supportive of tourism development than were those citizens who were emotionally attached to their community. This study suggested that the involved citizen more strongly supports certain types of tourism than the noninvolved citizen. Future research focused on the involved citizens is needed to determine why these two studies provide conflicting information. Specifically, information is needed that will clarify whether weaker support for tourism infrastructure is based on a belief that other types of development may provide more benefits for the same cost or if weaker support can be equated to opposition to tourism development.

REFERENCES

- Ahlbrandt, R. S., Jr. (1984). *Neighborhoods, people and community*. New York: Plenum.
- 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.
- Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between resident's attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27-36.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 610-616.
- Babbie, E. (1986). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babchuk, N., & Booth, A. (1969). Voluntary association memberships: A longitudinal analysis. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 647-655.
- Berger, P. J., & Neuhaus, R. J. (1977). *To empower people: The role of mediating structures in public policy*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

- Berry, J., Portney, K., & Thompson, K. (1993). *The rebirth of urban democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Brougham, J. E., & Butler, R. W. (1981). A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8, 569-590.
- Chavis, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community in the urban environment: A catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 55-82.
- Cornell Empowerment Group. (1989). Empowerment and family support. *Networking Bulletin*, 1, 1-23.
- Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests, and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 2-8.
- Flint, W. (1999). *Sustainable development* [Online]. Available: <http://205.157.137.10/~sustainrwf/ee00002.htm>
- Florin, P., & Wandersman, A. (Eds.). (1990). Citizen participation, voluntary organizations, and community development: Insights for empowerment through research. [Special section]. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 41-177.
- Graham, L., & Hogan, R. (1990). Social class and tactics: Neighborhood opposition to group homes. *Sociological Quarterly*, 31, 513-529.
- Haberle, S. (1989). *Planting the grassroots: Structuring citizen participation*. New York: Praeger.
- Heskin, A. D. (1991). *The struggle for community*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Hogan, R. (1986). Community opposition to group homes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 67, 442-449.
- Hyman, H., & Wright, C. (1971). Trends in voluntary association memberships in American adults: Replication based on secondary analysis of national sample surveys. *American Sociological Review*, 36, 191-206.
- Johnson, J., Snepenger, D. J., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perceptions of tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 629-642.
- Jurowski, C. (1994). *The interplay of elements impacting resident perceptions of tourism: A path analytic approach*. Unpublished dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Jurowski, C. (1998). A study of community sentiments in relation to attitudes toward tourism development. *Tourism Analysis*, 3(1), 17-24.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). An analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(1), 1-11.
- Kieffer, C. H. (1984). Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. *Prevention in Human Services*, 3, 9-36.
- Langton, S. (1978). *Citizen participation in America*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Lankford, S. K., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a Tourism Impact Attitude Scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 121-139.
- Liu, J., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, 193-214.
- Logan, J., & Rabrenovic, G. (1990). Neighborhood associations, their issues, their allies and their opponents. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 26, 68-94.
- McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29-34.

- Miner, S., & Tolnay, S. (1998). Barriers to voluntary organization membership: An examination of race and cohort differences. *Journal of Gerontology*, 53B, S241-248.
- Murphy, P. E. (1983). Community attitudes to tourism. *Tourism Management*, 2(3), 189-195.
- Paulhus, D. (1983). Sphere-specific measures of perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 1253-1265.
- Pearce, P. L., Moscardo, G., & Ross, G. F. (1996). *Tourism community relationships*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 586-599.
- Perkins, D. D. (1995). Speaking truth to power: Empowerment ideology as social intervention and policy. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23, 765-794.
- Perkins, D. D., Brown, B. B., & Taylor, R. B. (1996). The ecology of empowerment: Predicting participation in community organizations. *Journal of Social Issue*, 52(1), 85.
- Perkins, D. D., Florin, P., Rich, R. C., Wandersman, A., & Chavis, D. M. (1990). Participation and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17, 83-115.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8-12.
- Prestby, J. E., Wandersman, A., Florin, P., Rich, R. C., & Chavis, D. M. (1990). Benefits, costs, incentive management and participation in voluntary organizations: A means to understanding and promoting empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 117-149.
- Rappaport, J. (1984). Studies in empowerment: Introduction to the issue. *Prevention in Human Services*, 3, 1-7.
- Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 15, 121-148.
- Sampson, R. (1991). Linking the micro and macro dimensions of community social organization. *Social Forces*, 70, 43-64.
- Schulz, A. J., & Israel, B. I. (1990). *Empowerment and empowering processes: A theory development seminar series, academic year 1988-1989*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Center for Research on Social Organization, Program on Conflict Management Alternatives, Ann Arbor.
- Schwirian, K. P., & Mesh, G. (1993). Embattled neighborhoods: The political ecology of neighborhood change. In R. Hutchison (Ed.), *Research in urban sociology* (Vol. 3, pp. 83-110). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40-47.
- Swift, C., & Levin, G. (1987). Empowerment: An emerging mental health technology. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 8, 71-94.
- Tyrell, T. J., & Spaulding, I. A. (1984). A survey of attitudes toward growth in Rhode Island. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal*, 8, 22-23.
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring residents' attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(2), 27-29.
- Unger, D. G., & Wandersman, A. (1983). Neighboring and its role in block organizations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 11, 291-300.

- Williams, D. R., McDonald, C. D., Riden, C., & Uysal, M. (1996). Community attachment, regional identity and resident attitudes toward tourism. In *26th Annual TTRA Conference Proceedings*, Acapulco, Mexico, pp. 424-431.
- Zimmerman, M. A. (1990). Taking aim on empowerment research: On the distinction between psychological and individual conceptions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 169-177.
- Zimmerman, M. A. (1994). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational and community levels of analysis. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *The handbook of community psychology*. New York: Plenum.

Submitted October 28, 1999

First Revision Submitted June 25, 2000

Second Revision Submitted December 1, 2000

Accepted December 20, 2000

Refereed Anonymously

Claudia Jurowski, Ph.D., is an associate professor in the School of Hotel and Restaurant Management at Northern Arizona University (Flagstaff, Arizona), and **Desmond Omotayo Brown**, Ph.D. (e-mail: omotayo@pop.uky.edu), is an associate professor in the division of Hospitality and Tourism Management at the University of Kentucky (Lexington, KY 40506-0050).