CHAPTER 4

RESIDENTS’ PERCEPTION ABOUT IMPACTS OF TOURISM

4.1 Introduction

Tourism is one of the most dynamically developing sectors in the world economy and the largest Global Industry (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2006). It has been often referred to as “the goose that lays a golden egg, but also fouls its own nest” (Julio, 2001) since, if carried out without planning and due consideration of local values and environment may result in socio-cultural, environmental and economic degradation to the host population. The growth of tourism causes important impacts worldwide and locally which are both positive and negative (Gursoy et al., 2002; Haley et al., 2004). An increasing amount of research has been conducted to understand the impact of tourism development from the point of view of local residents, (Ap, 1992; Getz, 1994; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Jurowski et al., 1997 etc.) probably due to the fact that while tourism helps both the community and the nation to grow, it does create certain inevitable economic, socio-cultural, environmental impacts on the people or the host community and the destination. (Allen et al., 1988; Chen and Chen, 2010; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Long and Kayat, 2011; Long, 2011; Liu et al., 1987; Liu and Var, 1986; Perez and Nadal, 2005; Nepal, 2008; Jackson, 2008; Long et al., 1990) Economic effects of tourism affect the economic base of residents and its positive impacts include employment opportunities, economic growth, higher
standard of living, infrastructure development while its negative aspects include inflation, economic instability, seasonal temporary employment, tax burdens. Socio-cultural impacts affect the fabric of the social and cultural life of residents and have as their positive aspects, quality of life improvement, intercultural communication and understanding, resurgence of traditional practices, community pride, while the negative aspects include increase in crime rates, loss of authenticity, worsening residents’ attitude etc. Environmental tourism impacts include impacts of tourism on the environment comprising positive elements such as preservation of historical buildings and monuments, improved area’s appearance while negative elements include crowding, pollution of air, soil, water, noise, litter, traffic and parking congestion, depletion of natural resources, land construction etc.

The tourism industry relies heavily on the goodwill, participation and support of the local residents or host community who play a vital role in developing a healthy and prosperous tourism industry (Ap, 1992; Latkova 2012). Tourism should therefore be developed according to local residents’ needs and desires and a thorough understanding of local residents’ perception of tourism impacts and their consequent attitude towards the development of tourism is vital to the success and sustainability of tourism in any destination. (Allen et al., 1988; Gursoy et al., 2009; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Yoon et al., 2001) The aim of this chapter is to study the perceptions of all categories of residents, (locals engaged and not engaged in tourism related businesses, those employed in tourism in both government as well as private sector, those from tourist centric as well as non tourist centric areas, from both districts, north as well as south Goa) towards tourism in the state.
In any empirical research investigating the perception of tourism’s impacts on residents of the host community, both its multi-dimensional impact and its duality (negative-positive) should be taken into consideration. In general, there is a divergence of perceptions about tourism’s impacts on the host community wherein residents who perceive tourism’s impacts positively are more likely to support additional tourism and willingly participate in exchanges with tourists visiting the destination. Residents who view its impacts more negatively and believe its costs outweigh its benefits, are more likely to oppose tourism development. (Chen and Chen, 2010; Liu and Var, 1986; Jackson, 2008; Lankford and Howard, 1994) This trade-off between costs and benefits of tourism is explained on the basis of the Social Exchange Theory which suggests that individuals will engage in and support activities where they believe the benefits outweigh the costs and consequently, in tourism too, if residents believe that the benefits accruing from tourism and its development will exceed its potential costs they will willingly participate in the same and extend their support to further tourism development.(John, 1990; Yoon et al., 2001; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004)

Tourism in Goa capitalizes on what has traditionally been considered its ‘Unique Selling Proposition’ i.e. its beaches and its sunshine along with its unique blend of indo-portuguese cultural and historical heritage. The state promotes a kind of heterogeneous tourism development wherein both upscale as well as charter tourism exist and both international as well as domestic tourists visit. The growth of coastal tourism in particular, in the state, has been rampant, rapid and uncontrolled resulting in impacts which have had a widespread effect on the local life and environment. Despite an awareness of the impacts of tourism, the complex mixture of customary rights, land ownership, a variety of stakeholders with differing interests and ineffective
in institutional and political structures, all combine to make it difficult to define and implement a tourism strategy for the state. (Sawkar et al., 1998) Unlike in many other tourist destinations of the world, in Goa, due to the lack of specifically demarcated areas for tourists and residents and the consequent vying for the use of local resources such as water, beaches, transport etc. conflicts frequently arise. Compounding this, is the porosity of the state’s borders with the neighbouring states which though encourages domestic tourism, also gives rise to a large inflow of migrant labour force and further exacerbates the social impacts. While various mechanisms (panchayats, comunidades, courts) do exist to resolve conflicts among various stakeholders, the delays and dissatisfaction in resolution of the same is indicative of the need for an improved institutional response. (Sawkar et al., 1998) Yet, Goa does have a fairly active and aware lobby among its citizens which highlights, documents and brings to the notice of the public a variety of issues, including tourism related concerns, for their active participation, which is essential for the sustainability of the tourism industry in the state in the long run.

The attitude of residents towards tourism is gaining importance as a field of research for a number of reasons and residents are considered a critical factor for the success of tourism industry. Since they are one of the most important stakeholder groups in development of any region as a tourism destination (Choi and Sirkaya, 2005) their support is required for increased taxes to develop and maintain tourism related infrastructure development, for creating a hospitable and attractive environment (Var et al. 1977) which makes tourists feel welcomed, motivates them to revisit and act as advertising medium which results in the inflow of more tourists. (Andriotis, 2005; Yoon et al., 2001) A study of residents’ attitude assumes importance particularly because residents fall into various categories including local residents who may be
involved in the tourism industry and may be termed entrepreneurs, those not engaged in tourism related businesses, those working in the tourism industry in both the private sector as well as the government departments, non-governmental organizations involved in social activism etc.; all of whom may be considered important stakeholders in the tourism industry. This diversity in stakeholder groups will influence their attitudes, perceptions and motivations towards tourism, and consequently their support for it.

Though many studies have been carried out on assessing the factors influencing the attitude of residents towards development of tourism in various destinations, the present study tries to identify the local resident’s attitude towards tourism development in Goa. As far as the authors’ knowledge goes, no similar study has been carried out so far, addressing the above mentioned issues, which makes this study more significant because it throws light on an otherwise unexplored area, which needs to be studied in detail for promoting the tourism industry in the state and for ensuring sustainable development leading to socio-economic transformation.

Despite extensive research on this topic, eminent researchers have suggested the need to replicate such studies in different locations and at different times in order to validate previous finding and/or identify new factors influencing the same. (Andriotis et al. 2003, Cavus and Tanrisevdi, 2003) Therefore, this study fills the gap by adding valuable knowledge, new perspectives and presents possibilities for consideration and offers valuable inputs for the tourism business community, NGO’s, Government and other stakeholder groups.
4.2 Background of the Study

When Goa joined the Indian union in 1961, immediately post liberalization, it had very little development and its main industry was the mining sector with its exports of iron and manganese. However, its rich coastal biodiversity, plentiful natural resources, practically unspoiled natural beauty, peace loving people, its relatively low population pressure all contributed to a superior quality of life for locals and a haven for visitors, particularly the flower children of the west. Recognizing this and fearing industrial pollution, Tourism was adopted as a key sector of the economy in preference to industry in order to generate income and employment of all kinds, but most specifically non-manual employment for the increasingly educated Goan workforce in a scenario of limited industrial growth.

Despite Goa’s myriad natural and historical attractions, most of tourism in the state is concentrated along the coast, particularly in the talukas of Bardez, Tiswadi, Salcete and Mormugao. (Ambli, 1991) As a result, Tourism in the state has developed a perceptibly lopsided approach both geographically (in the coastal areas) and in terms of the product offered (beach tourism). Visitors to the state comprise both domestic tourists who make up the bulk of visitors and international tourists who comprise a minority but can be differentiated into backpackers, charter tourists and very few elite. While the domestic tourists flock to the state to experience its unique culture, relative freedom of lifestyle and dress, its nightlife and its beaches, the international tourists visit the state for its sun-kissed beaches, warm climate and laid back atmosphere. However, while backpackers prefer to mingle with locals and stay as paying guests or in rented premises, charter tourists prefer to stay in the relative luxury of five star hotels. Further, while a tourist season was clearly identifiable in the past, today, while most international
tourists visit the state from October to March, no particular season exists for the domestic
tourists, who visit the state all year round, albeit in larger numbers during the non-monsoon
season, perhaps in part, due to extensive promotion of the state as an all year, all season
destination.

Such extensive promotion of tourism has undoubtedly increased the number of visitors to the
state and in turn put pressure on the state’s limited resources. The carrying capacity of the
destination is being severely tested in terms of the existing infrastructure, services, facilities and
resources which have to be shared between visitors and local residents, many of whom do not
receive any direct and sometimes even indirect benefits from tourism. (Akhtar and Shah, 2012)
While Goa’s infrastructure has been developed to a much greater extent in the past decade, it still
is fairly unplanned and while some stakeholders, particularly those in tourism related public
undertakings believe further infrastructural development and up gradation of existing
infrastructure is needed, (GTDC, 2009) others feel that no further infrastructural additions are
needed as the state needs no more tourist arrivals, since infrastructure created to cater to peak
season demand remains unutilized in the off season (Planet, 2005). Issues regarding
environmental degradation due to tourism and tourism related activities (ground water pollution,
solid waste disposal, pollution of water bodies due to off shore casinos, sand dune degradation,
etc.) social degradation due to tourism (casinos and gambling, drugs, child sex trafficking and
prostitution etc.), urbanization and construction due to tourism (conversion of agricultural land
and rural areas into amusement and water parks, unplanned and unprecedented constructions of
tourist accommodation, migration of labour from agricultural sector to service sector), economic
impacts due to tourism (leakage of foreign exchange, benefits accruing to outsiders since
majority of jobs are held by non-goans as opposed to locals, loss/leakage of potential income due to dependency of food products on neighbouring states) raise further concerns about the impacts of tourism and its continued sustainability in the state. Tourism industry in any region can grow and develop only when local residents have a positive attitude towards it and when they feel they have a role to play in the process of tourism planning, development, and management. A healthy nexus should exist between the local residents and the government at every stage of tourism planning and development. Therefore, the perception of local residents about the impacts of tourism on their home destination assumes great significance and becomes a vital area of concern in the assessment of the destination’s future sustainability.

The Social Exchange theory (Allen et al., 1993; Jurowski et al., 1997; Andereck et al., 2005; Gursoy et al., 2002) states that people evaluate any exchange based on the costs and benefits received as a result of that exchange. When residents find the exchange, in terms of tourism, beneficial to them and increases their well being, they will most likely have positive attitudes towards tourism and therefore support tourism development and vice versa. Using the Social Exchange Theory as a foundation, this study attempts to explore the following research questions; viz.; **RQ1**: Whether personal characteristics affect the perception of the impacts of tourism when considered along with the personal benefit derived from Tourism; **RQ2**: Whether the extent to which personal benefit from tourism development influenced perceived positive impacts, perceived negative impacts and support for additional tourism; **RQ3**: Whether the extent to which personal benefit from tourism development, perceived positive impacts of tourism and perceived negative impacts of tourism affected support for additional tourism; and **RQ4**: What variables contributed to support for tourism planning?
In most studies regarding the perceptions of residents towards tourism in a destination, the Social Exchange Theory (which basically compares the costs versus benefits received from tourism) plays a major role as it helps to understand how the residents of a community perceive and react to the complex phenomenon of tourism in their destination, given the fact that it affects their lives both positively and negatively. Personal benefit refers to the extent to which a resident derives benefit directly and indirectly from tourism and is generally believed to have a direct relationship with perception of impacts. Further, perceptions of impacts are also influenced by
determinants such as personal benefit derived from tourism as well as biographic variables such as age, income, gender, education, years of residence, birth place, place of residence etc. In this study, Personal benefit derived from tourism when considered along with personal characteristics, perception of positive and negative impacts is hypothesized to influence the support for development of additional tourism. Further, Personal benefit derived from tourism, perception of positive and negative impacts and support for development of additional tourism is hypothesized to influence the support for tourism planning. The research framework for the present study based on the four research questions is shown in Figure 4.1.

The hypotheses framed in respect of the research questions are:

\[ H_{2a}: \text{Personal Characteristics along with Personal Benefit (PB) from tourism affects residents’ perception of Negative Impacts (NI) of tourism.} \]

\[ H_{2b}: \text{Personal Characteristics along with Personal Benefit (PB) from tourism affects residents’ perception of Positive Impacts (PI) of tourism.} \]

\[ H_3: \text{Extent of Personal Benefit (PB) derived from tourism influences residents' perception of positive (PI) and negative (NI) impacts of tourism as well as Support for Additional Tourism (SAT).} \]

\[ H_4: \text{Extent Of Personal Benefit (PB) derived from tourism, residents perception of positive (PI) and negative (NI) impacts of tourism & Support for Additional Tourism (SAT) influences Support for Tourism Planning (STP)} \]

### 4.3 Research Methodology

A structured questionnaire developed based on previous research studies carried out by Lankford & Howard (1994) Allen et al., (1993); Long et al., (1990), was administered to 1000 residents
who were above 18 years of age from the state of Goa, out of which 809 fully completed were received back giving a response rate of 80.9%. The survey was carried out during September 2013 to December 2014. The questionnaire used had three parts: **Part I** - Biographical Data, **Part II** - Determinants Influencing Residents Attitude towards Tourism Impacts, **Part III** - Statements on Tourism Impacts. Part III used a 5 point Likert Scale type format where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, with 3 was the neutral point. Variables used for the survey include several composite scales developed ad hoc from the attitude items and one additional variable measuring perceptions of *personal benefit* from tourism. The first subscale was composed of 9 items that measure residents opinions about *negative impacts* of tourism (NI); the second, 14 items that measure residents opinions about *positive impacts* of tourism (PI); the third, 2 items that measure residents opinions about perceived *personal benefits* from tourism (PB); the fourth, 2 items that measure residents *support for tourism planning* (STP); and the fifth, 8 items that measure residents opinions about *support for additional tourism* (SAT). *(Table 4.1)* The scale had an reasonably high overall alpha coefficient of 0.834, with Positive Impacts (PI) having alpha of 0.797, Negative Impacts (NI) having alpha of 0.769, Support for Additional Tourism (SAT) having alpha of 0.874, and Support for Tourism Planning (STP) having alpha of 0.835; whereas Personal Benefits (PB) from tourism with alpha of 0.341, but as it is conceptually related, it was deemed appropriate and included. *(Diekhoff 1992; Nunally, 1978)*

The **Mean Analysis** indicates the Residents’ perception of the positive and negative impacts of tourism in the state, the benefit they derive from it, their support for additional tourism development and tourism planning and is obtained from resident responses on a 5 point Likert scale where 1 = very unimportant / very unsatisfactory, 2 = unimportant / unsatisfactory,
Tourism Attitude Items | SD 1 | D 2 | N 3 | A 4 | SA 5 | Mean
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Personal Benefits from Tourism (PB):**
I benefit personally from tourism development in my community | 8.7 | 26.5 | 31.1 | 20.5 | 13.2 | 3.03
Tourism in my community benefits me personally to a great extent | 14.0 | 10.5 | 22.7 | 33.4 | 19.4 | 3.34
Scale Mean=3.19, alpha=0.341, 2 items

**Tourism Positive Impacts (PI):**
Tourism development in my community has provided more jobs opportunities & employment for local people | 6.7 | 11.9 | 20.5 | 45.0 | 15.9 | 3.52
Standard of living has increased considerably because of tourism | 0.5 | 5.9 | 18.0 | 52.5 | 23.0 | 3.92
Tourism has given economic benefits to local people and small businesses. | 2.2 | 3.8 | 13.7 | 56.9 | 23.4 | 3.95
Tourism development in my community has attracted more public& private investment | 1.0 | 8.5 | 27.6 | 46.6 | 16.3 | 3.69
Tourism development helps to maintain assets for local Community | 3.0 | 12.0 | 31.5 | 44.3 | 9.3 | 3.45
Tourism has encouraged a variety of cultural activities by the local residents | 0.9 | 11.4 | 22.1 | 51.5 | 14.1 | 3.67
Tourism has resulted in more cultural exchange between tourists and Residents | 0.9 | 9.1 | 25.0 | 52.3 | 12.7 | 3.67
Tourism has resulted in positive impacts on the cultural identity of the community | 3.1 | 19.4 | 29.5 | 35.7 | 12.2 | 3.35
Tourism development has led to an increase in quality of life in the host community | 2.3 | 6.9 | 26.6 | 52.2 | 12.0 | 3.65
Tourism has provided an incentive for the restoration of historical buildings and for the conservation of natural resources | 0.7 | 7.2 | 22.0 | 48.5 | 21.6 | 3.83
Tourism provides more parks and other recreational areas/facilities for local residents | 6.1 | 19.0 | 26.5 | 42.3 | 6.2 | 3.23
Shopping opportunities are better in my community as a result of tourism | 2.0 | 13.1 | 21.0 | 50.4 | 13.5 | 3.60
The quality of public services has improved due to more tourism in my community | 7.3 | 20.8 | 25.6 | 37.6 | 8.8 | 3.20
Roads and other public facilities are kept at a high standard | 13.3 | 28.1 | 28.6 | 23.9 | 6.2 | 2.81
Scale Mean=3.54, alpha=0.797, 14 items

**Support for Tourism Planning (STP):**
Locals are to be encouraged to take part in decision making process to influence tourism development in the community | 0.6 | 2.2 | 13.6 | 45.4 | 38.2 | 4.18
Community should be more involved in the management of local resources | 0.4 | 2.7 | 13.3 | 48.1 | 35.5 | 4.16
Scale mean= 4.17, alpha=0.835, 2 items

**Negative Impacts (NI):**
The prices of goods and services have increased because of tourism | 0.7 | 4.8 | 9.9 | 41.4 | 43.1 | 4.21
Tourism industry has larger financial leakages than other Industries | 0.6 | 8.7 | 46.1 | 34.6 | 10.0 | 3.45
Tourism development in my community has provided employment for only limited periods due to seasonality | 0.9 | 6.3 | 21.8 | 48.9 | 22.1 | 3.85
Tourism has negatively altered traditional culture of the area. | 5.4 | 21.4 | 26.9 | 32.4 | 13.8 | 3.28
Tourism has increased the crime and vandalism rate in the area. | 3.5 | 15.3 | 20.4 | 34.7 | 26.1 | 3.65
Construction of hotels and other tourist facilities have destroyed the natural environment. | 1.0 | 8.3 | 10.3 | 42.0 | 37.9 | 4.08
Tourism has resulted in traffic congestion, noise and pollution. | 0.5 | 4.3 | 9.6 | 45.5 | 40.2 | 4.20
Tourism has resulted in unpleasantly overcrowded beaches, hiking trails, parks and other outdoor places in the community. | 0.5 | 6.2 | 12.6 | 45.7 | 35.0 | 4.09
There is more litter in my community due to tourism | 1.7 | 11.6 | 26.1 | 34.4 | 26.2 | 3.72
Scale mean= 3.84, alpha=0.769, 9 items

**Support for Additional Tourism (SAT):**
I support tourism and would like to see it become the main industry in my community | 3.7 | 9.4 | 24.5 | 39.8 | 22.6 | 3.68
The government should improve the promotion of tourist facilities in this community | 1.4 | 6.3 | 19.2 | 57.4 | 15.8 | 3.80
Tourism businesses should be encouraged in the community | 2.7 | 13.7 | 27.7 | 43.3 | 12.6 | 3.49
I believe tourism should be encouraged in the state of Goa | 1.9 | 4.2 | 20.4 | 47.5 | 26.1 | 3.92
I support tourism as having a vital role in my community | 1.9 | 9.5 | 23.2 | 44.9 | 20.5 | 3.73
My community is growing rapidly due to tourism | 3.1 | 13.8 | 28.2 | 39.2 | 15.7 | 3.51
My community should become more of a tourist destination | 4.6 | 19.4 | 25.7 | 35.7 | 14.6 | 3.36
My community should encourage more intensive development of tourists facilities | 3.3 | 10.1 | 25.1 | 45.9 | 15.6 | 3.60
Scale mean=3.64, alpha=0.874, 8 items

Table 4.1: Tourism Attitude Items and Composite Scales (N = 809) Scale alpha = 0.841 (35 items)
Source: Compiled from Primary Data
3 = Important / satisfactory, 4 = above average importance/ above average satisfaction, 5= very important /very satisfactory. If the mean value is from 3-5, it indicates that tourists agree that the infrastructure is important/satisfactory while values from 1-2, mean that they consider it to be unimportant/unsatisfactory.

4.4 Analysis, Research Findings and Discussion

4.4.1 Demographic Profile of Respondents

General profiling of residents based on the survey is shown in Table 4.2. Standard demographic questions were asked of each respondent including age, where the age group 18-27 years had the largest number of respondents – 24.7% followed by 38-47 years with 23% and 28-37 years with 22.2%, gender (approximately even with males being 51.3% and females being 48.7%), education (the largest number of respondents were Graduates – 43.4% followed by Post Graduates – 18.4%, income (most respondents – 74.1% fell in the 10000-70000 p.m. categories which covered the low to medium income groups) with the largest number – 32.8% falling in the 10001-30000 p.m. category followed by 22.4% & 18% in the 30001-50000 & 50001-70000 categories. In terms of length of residence in the community, the largest number of respondents – 31.4% had lived there for 16-25 years followed by an equal number – 26% in 26-35 & 36 years & above categories indicating a pattern of long term residence, place of residence i.e. whether they were living in tourist centric – 54.9% or non tourist centric regions - 45.1%, birth place – whether respondents were born in the community or not with a large majority – 77.9% being born in Goa while 22.1% having been born outside Goa. In terms of category of employment, the largest group were employed – 54.9%, followed by 19.9% and 11.1% being self-employed and
students respectively; while in terms of involvement in tourism decision making, an overwhelming majority – 79.4% were not involved in any sort of tourism decision making. With respect to interaction with tourists (48.2% of the respondents indicated medium interaction with tourists while 27.7% and 14.3% indicated a high degree of interaction and no interaction respectively; for evaluation of the degree of community growth – 79.4% of respondents noted moderate to rapid growth of their community and finally for evaluation of the degree of tourism development in the community - 70% of the respondents noted moderate to extensive degree of tourism development in the community.

Table 4.2: Demographic Profile of Residents (n= 809)  
Source: Compiled from Primary Data
4.4.2 Mean Analysis

Mean analysis (Refer Table 4.1) indicated that the grand mean value of the scale or the overall scale mean for the Tourism Attitude Items and Composite Scale was 3.64 indicating an average perception. For Sub scale Personal Benefits from Tourism (PB), it was 3.19 (average, tending towards the lower end of the average scale), for Sub scale Tourism Positive Impacts (PI), it was 3.54 (average), for Sub scale Tourism Negative Impacts (NI), it was 3.84 (average, tending towards the higher end of the average scale), for Sub scale Support for Additional Tourism (SAT), it was 3.64 (average) and for Sub scale Support for Tourism Planning (STP), it was 4.17 (above average). Thus, the mean value for subscales is mid-average in keeping with the overall scale mean (which is mid-average) except for STP which is above-average and PB which is a low-average. Further, this indicates that residents’ generally have a higher perception of the requirement and support for tourism planning.

4.4.3 Regression Analysis

Based on the model developed by Perdue et al. (1990) and later modified by Mc Gehee et al (2002), a series of multiple regression analysis were performed, result of which are shown in Table 4.3, to explore the relationship among the variables based on four models. Model – 1 examined the relationship of tourism’s Negative Impacts (NI) as the dependent variable in relation to independent variables like Personal Benefits (PB) from tourism, and Residents’ Characteristics (age, gender, education, income, number of years of residence, birth place, and location). Model – 2 examined the relationship between tourism’s Positive Impacts (PI) as the dependent variable in relation to the independent variables like Residents’ Characteristics (age, gender, education, income, number of years of residence, birth place, and location) and Personal
Benefits (PB) from tourism. **Model 3** tests the relationship between Personal Benefit from Tourism, Tourism Positive and Negative Impacts, and Support for Additional Tourism Development. Finally, **Model 4** determines the variables that predict resident support for tourism planning from among the variables: Personal Benefit, Tourism’s Positive and Negative Impacts as well as Support for Additional Tourism.

As a result of the analysis, a number of interesting findings were thrown up through the different models analyzed. **Model 1**, indicates that while **Personal Benefit** was not significant, **Education** (beta = 0.085) has a statistically significant **positive** relationship & **Place of Residence** (beta = -0.093) has a statistically significant **negative** relationship with **Negative Impacts of tourism**. These findings indicate that personal benefits received from tourism do not influence the residents’ perception of tourism’s negative impacts. However, Education shares a statistically significant relationship in the positive direction with tourism’s negative impacts indicating that as the level of education of residents’ increases, their perception of tourism’s negative impacts also increases. Further, Place of residence shares a statistically significant negative relationship with tourism’s negative impacts indicating that the location of residence (i.e. tourist centric or non tourist centric) influences, their perception of tourism’s negative impacts i.e. those residents in tourist centric areas tended to view tourism’s impacts less negatively while those in non tourist centric areas tended to view it more negatively. **Model 1** explains a **negligible 1.2%** of the variation between **Dependent Variable - Negative Impacts (NI)** and **Independent Variables - Personal Benefits derived from Tourism (PB), Age, Gender, Education, Income, Number of years of Residence, Birthplace, Tourist Centric/Non Tourist Centric (Location of
Residence) which indicates that it is not a very reliable model and hence the results must be considered with this in mind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal benefit</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-1.447</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of years of</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Goa</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist centric/Non</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-2.593</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourist centric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model statistics</td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = 0.012$, $F=2.198$, $p=0.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal benefit</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>7.333</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-2.646</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-1.612</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-2.441</td>
<td>0.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of years of</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Goa</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-3.840</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist centric/Non</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourist centric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model statistics</td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = 0.104$, $F=12.774$, $p=0.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal benefit</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>13.768</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impacts of</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>17.446</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impacts of</td>
<td>-0.121</td>
<td>-4.683</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model statistics</td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = 0.466$, $F=236.262$, $p=0.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal benefit</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>2.202</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impacts of</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.381</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impacts of</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>6.045</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>2.411</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model statistics</td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = 0.061$, $F=14.179$, $p=0.05$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Regression Analysis of Relationship between Variables

* indicates significance at the $p<0.05$ level

Source: Primary Data

As a result of the analysis in Model 2, it was found that Personal benefit (beta = 0.255) has a statistically significant relationship in a positive direction with the dependent variable Tourism’s Positive Impacts indicating that the more a respondent perceives a gain in personal benefits from tourism, the more likely she/he will agree with the positive impacts of tourism.

Age (beta = -0.096), Education (beta = -0.092), and Birth place (beta = -0.132) enjoy a small but negatively significant relationship with Tourism’s Positive Impacts indicating that as they
increase, perception of positive impacts of tourism decreases i.e. the less likely they are to agree with the statements about positive impacts of tourism. Model 2 explains only 10.4% of the variation between the **Dependent variable - Positive Impacts (PI)** and the **Independent Variables - Personal Benefits from Tourism (PB), Age, Gender, Education, Income, Number of years of Residence, Birthplace, Tourist Centric/Non Tourist Centric (Location of Residence)**. A note of caution is worthwhile while considering the results of Model 2 because of its relatively low R square value which though acceptable in social sciences research, suggests that it is not a very reliable model and hence the results must be considered with this in mind. [R$^2$ values between 0.10-0.20 though low, are acceptable in social science research *(Gaur & Gaur 2006)*]

**Model 3** tests the relationship between Personal Benefit derived from tourism, Tourism’s Positive and Negative Impacts and Support for Additional Tourism Development. The analysis interestingly indicates that when Support for Additional Tourism Development is used as the dependent variable, all three independent variables (Personal Benefit, Negative Impacts and Positive Impacts) are statistically significant. Negative Impacts (beta = -0.121) are significant in a negative direction indicating that as the perception of negative impacts of tourism increases, residents support for additional tourism in the community will decrease. Personal Benefits (beta = 0.368) and positive Impacts (beta = 0.468) are significant in a positive direction, indicating that residents who perceive personal benefit from tourism and tended to agree with the positive impacts of tourism were more likely to support the growth of additional tourism in their community. Model 3 explains 46.6% of the variation between Dependent Variable - Support for
Additional Tourism Development (SAT) and Independent Variables - Personal Benefit derived from tourism (PB), Tourism’s Positive Impacts (PI) and Negative Impacts (NI).

Finally, in Model 4, the focus is on tourism planning and the analysis helps to determine the variables that predict resident support for tourism planning. There is a statistically significant positive relationship between Support for Tourism Planning, Personal Benefit (beta = 0.087), Support for Additional Tourism (beta = 0.113) as well as Tourism’s Negative Impacts (beta = 0.210). The variable Personal Benefit (0.087) shares a statistically significant positive relationship with Support for Tourism Planning and is a significant predictor of Support for Tourism Planning, indicating that, support for planning is related to the extent to which people benefit from tourism. Further, despite being aware of the negative impacts of tourism and perhaps because of them, residents support additional tourism because of the personal benefit they derive from it but at the same time recognize the need for tourism planning. There is a no statistically significant relationship between Support for Tourism Planning and Tourism’s Positive Impacts indicating that it is not a significant predictor of support for tourism planning.

Model 4 explains 6.1% of the variation between Dependent variable - Support for Tourism Planning (STP) and Independent Variables – Personal Benefit from Tourism (PB), Tourism’s Positive Impacts (PI), Tourism’s Negative Impacts (NI) and Support for Additional Tourism (SAT) which indicates that it is not a very reliable model and hence the results bearing this in mind must be considered with caution.
4.5 Summary

In terms of the research questions posed at the beginning of this research study, the following answers may be put forward. In general, in terms of the first research question answered in Model 1 and 2, as to whether personal characteristics affect perceptions of the impacts of tourism when controlling for personal benefit from tourism, While Personal Benefit (PB) does not have a statistically significant relationship with Tourism’s Negative Impacts (NI), two Personal Characteristics (PC), Education (positive) & Place of residence (negative) are statistically significant indicating that as education increases, perception of tourism’s negative impacts also increases and that residents from tourist-centric areas have a lower perception of tourism’s negative impacts & vice-versa [(generally consistent with the findings of Perdue et al.(1990) & Mc Gehee et al. (2002)]. Personal benefit has a statistically significant positive relationship with Tourism’s Positive Impacts (PI) indicating that with increasing gains from tourism, likelihood of agreement with the positive impacts of tourism increases. Age, Education & Birthplace enjoy a small but negatively significant relationship with Tourism’s Positive Impacts indicating that as they increase, perception of positive impacts of tourism decreases [generally consistent with the findings of Perdue et al. (1990) but inconsistent with Mc Gehee et al.(2002)].

Model 3 provided findings that answer the second research question. The variables Personal Benefit from tourism, Positive Impacts of tourism (both having positive relationship) and Negative impacts of tourism (negative relationship), predicted support for additional tourism (positive relationship), which was consistent with Perdue et al., (1990) and with the findings of Mc Gehee et al., (2002), If a respondent perceived personal benefited from tourism, she/he was
more supportive of additional tourism in the community. Further, those who perceived the impacts of tourism to be positive were supportive of additional tourism, while residents who perceived tourism more negatively were less supportive of additional tourism. This finding corroborates the findings by Andereck and Vogt, (2000) and King et al., (1993); who concluded that support for tourism development, could be associated with the belief that tourism induced positive as well as negative impacts. Despite their awareness of tourism’s negative impacts, the local residents still support tourism development.

**Model 4**, which provided the required information needed to answer third research question as to which variables contributed to support tourism planning, **Personal Benefit (PB), Support for Additional Tourism (SAT) and Tourism’s Negative Impacts (NI)** have a statistically significant positive relationship with **Support for Tourism Planning (STP)** indicating that as Personal Benefit from tourism, perception of tourism’s negative impacts and support for additional tourism increase, Support for tourism planning will increase. The positive relationship between NI & STP indicating that residents are aware that negative impacts originate from and escalate as a result of lack of tourism planning and is consistent with Perdue et al. (1990) & Mc Gehee et al. (2002) but the positive relationship between SAT & STP indicating that Support for additional tourism was a predictor of tourism planning is inconsistent with Perdue et al. (1990) but consistent with Mc Gehee et al. (2002). However, in contrast to both Perdue et al. (1990) & Mc Gehee et al. (2002, PB shares a statistically significant positive relationship with STP indicating that those who received personal benefit from tourism were supportive of additional tourism but recognizing the reality of negative impacts of tourism also recognized the
need for tourism planning. In general, in terms of accepting or rejecting the hypotheses framed with respect to the research questions:

**H₂a**: Personal Characteristics along with Personal Benefit (**PB**) from tourism affects residents perception of: Negative Impacts (**NI**): **Accepted** [since Personal Benefit and only two out of seven personal characteristics viz. Education & Place of Residence are significant]

**H₂b**: Personal Characteristics along with Personal Benefit (**PB**) from tourism affects residents perception of Positive Impacts (**PI**) of tourism: **Accepted** [for four out of seven personal characteristics viz. Gender, Income, Number of years of Residence and Place of Residence which are not significant] &

**Rejected** [for Personal Benefit and three out of seven personal characteristics viz. Age, Education & Birth Place which are significant]

**H₃**: Extent of Personal Benefit (**PB**) derived from tourism influences residents perception of positive (**PI**) and negative (**NI**) impacts of tourism as well as Support for Additional Tourism (**SAT**): **Rejected** since all are significant*

**H₄**: Extent Of Personal Benefit (**PB**) derived from tourism, residents perception of positive (**PI**) and negative (**NI**) impacts of tourism & Support for Additional Tourism (**SAT**) influences Support for Tourism Planning (**STP**) **Rejected** since three out of four constructs viz. Personal Benefits, Negative Impacts & Support for Additional Tourism are significant* (Refer table 4.3)

In terms of support for social exchange theory, this study fully supports Social Exchange Theory (**SET**). Those who receive greater personal benefits from tourism were more likely to view its impacts positively and support additional tourism. Further, **Personal Benefit is a**
significant predictor of support for tourism planning (inconsistent with Perdue et al.(1990) & Mc Gehee et al.(2002) which aligns with SET validating the fact that residents who have a vested interest in tourism development would like to see it properly planned. This study also lends support to Perdue et al. (1990) assertion that residents should be informed on a priority basis about tourism’s positive and negative economic, social cultural and environmental implications, the various types of tourism development in their community along with their respective benefits and drawbacks and the need for planned and managed tourism development and growth, such that they are able to make informed decisions about the type and levels of tourism development that are most attractive to them and which they are willing to support and which would suit their community needs best.

When viewed in totality this research has certain imperfections which can be addressed through future research. Chief among them would be the personal benefit from tourism variable which is defined in the questionnaire used in this study using only two statements (perhaps accounting for the low alpha of 0.341). However, the variable itself is an abstract concept and irrespective of the number of defining statements, may be subjectively interpreted by each respondent. Further, since the aim of the study is to evaluate resident attitude using the social exchange theory as the basis the variable indicating benefits should either be quantifiable or economic in nature. However the items measuring personal benefit are neither. In addition, from the point of view of tourism research, the variable personal benefit should not only describe the level of resident attitude toward benefits received from tourism but should also explain how and why they perceive they are benefitting from tourism, which has not been answered in this study.
Further, the social exchange theory itself postulates that the decisions making process is one which consistently results in gains for the individual and that individuals constantly make decisions from the point of view of winning or gaining. This reasoning in itself is questionable since, if every exchange results in gains for all parties concerned there would be no losers. Also, many individuals or groups particularly NGOs and other citizens’ forums enter into exchanges in tourism knowing that they will not personally benefit from their actions yet do so for the greater good.

Max Weber’s theory of Substantive and Formal Rationality provides a possible theoretical alternative to the social exchange theory wherein the formal or market and economic based elements as well as the less quantifiable, substantive or value and belief based elements of decision making and risk assessment can be used to understand and interpret resident attitude toward tourism and its planning and development. (McGehee & Meares, 1998) Despite the progress in this field, much scope exists for further research. However, irrespective of the future direction of research, its aim must be to consider the viewpoint as well as the involvement of all stakeholders in tourism related decision making.