CHAPTER 7
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

7.1 Introduction

Goa is undoubtedly one of the most sought after tourist destinations in the world. When travelogues and travel brochures describe Goa in the stereotypical fashion highlighting its sunny beaches, its golden sands, its balmy climate, its verdant greenery, its tiny hamlets with their trademark white washed churches, abounding with streams and natural springs, its laid back friendly locals, one really must agree with it all, irrespective of whether one is a tourist or a resident because Goa truly is all of that, and more. Goa’s unique culture with its blend of east and west, tradition and modernity, faith as well as scientific temper all go to create an experience one neither can, nor wants to forget. The ever increasing number of tourists who throng Goa’s shores not only during season time but throughout the year bear testimony to the special place that Goa occupies in the hearts of tourists, worldwide. However, to maintain this exalted position and to seek further opportunities for the right kind of growth will not be an easy task, but grow, we must. We, the people, (stakeholders) can no longer afford to live in our ivory towers or like the proverbial ostrich, bury our heads in the plentiful sand and refuse to acknowledge our duties, our obligations and our commitment to our state. We have to critically assess the current scenario and chalk out the future course of action keeping in mind the carrying capacity of our small yet well endowed state, not only from the economic and environmental standpoint as is so often the
case, but also from the equally fragile and often ignored socio-cultural standpoint. This may require a paradigm shift in our thinking and approach, but, if Goa’s unique character is to sustain itself, change is a must. It is in precisely this context that the research study in question was undertaken – an attempt to understand what ails Goan tourism, not merely from the point of view of the “Babus” or in Goa’s case, the “Patrãos” who decide for us, but from the point of view of the stakeholders in this destination - the residents, the tourists, the entrepreneur and the government as well. It was an attempt to find out what the real Goan thinks about the ‘state’ of our State. Keeping all trivia aside, it is an indisputable fact that Tourism in Goa needs to be planned, managed and sustained. But this planning cannot be a top-down affair with policies, guidelines and regulations thrust on us (the locals), expecting blind obedience and acceptance. To ensure that we protect, maintain and sustain our abundant natural and manmade treasures, we the stakeholders, must be made party to these efforts, by creating awareness, by education, by transparency, good governance and by involvement and participation in every aspect of planning and decision making that affects our lives and livelihood in the state.

7.2 Summary

While sustainable planning and development particularly in terms of tourism appear to be a catch phrase for all tourism destinations with regard to the preservation of natural and man-made tourist attractions, the importance of physical planning in the conservation of resources, both natural and man-made, as well as for the achievement of a desirable pattern of development, was emphasized by Crooks (1973). The increasing interest in sustainability as an approach to planning has resulted in a renewed emphasis on planning for development and how tourism is being integrated into the process. (Page & Thorn, 1997) Earlier studies on sustainability have
focused on the need for certain preconditions such as cooperation, industry coordination etc. to achieve a sustainable approach to planning, (Dutton & Hall, 1989) a paradigm shift in the operation and consequent effects on tourism by the tourism industry and public sector, (Page & Thorn, 1997) difficult choices based on trade-offs in-terms of environmental, economic and social implications involving a larger view than the traditional community planning and decision-making etc. (McIntyre et al., 1993) However, Pigram (1990), states that despite increasing awareness of sustainable tourism and its concomitant planning, a gap exists between policy endorsement and implementation as a result of conflicts between the various stakeholder groups in tourism and stressed that continuous education of all tourism interest groups is compulsory, if greater tourism-environment compatibility is to be achieved. Wanhill (1997), emphasizes that while policy acceptance of the principles of sustainable development is the first step toward sustainable tourism, commitment through action, in the form of stakeholder involvement in planning and developing tourism strategy is essential. These and other studies emphasized the necessity of investigating tourism in a destination, understanding the various stakeholder perspectives about the same, increasing stakeholder involvement in the process of planning and developing tourism in a destination and emphasized that such research would provide a thorough understanding of the challenge of sustainable tourism to a destination and thus help destination managers, planners and all tourism practitioners to formulate realistic, acceptable and sustainable strategies for tourism. Understanding of the reasons why residents do or do not support the tourism industry and its growth would help to develop models for tourism development in a community that would minimize their negative impacts while maximizing support for them, thus giving credence and relevance to the need and importance of research in this field (Vargas- Sanchez et al., 2009).
With these objectives in mind, this study was carried out to evaluate the state of tourism in Goa and through the findings, suggest how tourism could be managed sustainably in the state. This study on managing tourism sustainably and successfully in the state had four main objectives, which then had corresponding hypotheses developed around them for evaluating the destination’s health from the point of view of all its stakeholders.

Chapter 1 was an Introduction the state of Goa, a brief history tracing its evolution to the current day, a representation of its infrastructure and facilities both tourism and non-tourism related, the rationale of the research, a brief on the stakeholders of tourism in the state, their role in tourism development, an introduction to the concept of sustainable tourism, the research gap, the methodology, the objectives and the hypotheses raised, the limitations of the study and the chapterization scheme.

Chapter 2 contained the Review of Literature which provided the theoretical background of the study and included a content analysis of relevant tourism literature carried out objective wise and in consolidation, so as to elucidate studies done in the past on related issues, to identify the research gap as well as to establish the uniqueness of the study.

Chapters 3, 4, 5 & 6 dealt with each of the Objectives and Hypotheses which were framed for the study namely: Assessment of infrastructure and facilities available for tourism in the state from the point of view of tourists (Objective 1, Chapter 3), Evaluating the perception about the impacts of tourism in the state from the point of view of residents and investigating whether
these perceptions influenced residents’ support for additional tourism development and support for tourism planning (Objective 2, Chapter 4), Studying Multi-Stakeholder perception about sustainability of tourism in terms of various tourism related sustainability issues in Goa and determining between which specific groups these differences exist (Objective 3, Chapter 5), and finally, Developing and testing the hypothesized model of stakeholder perceptions about sustainable tourism and their consequent support for sustainable tourism, by examining the path relationship between factors related to sustainability and sustainable tourism in an attempt to suggest a model for tourism in Goa that would be sustainable, integrative and participative. (Objective 4, Chapter 6)

Chapter 7 lists the Findings of the study based on the testing of the hypotheses designed so as to be able to draw the necessary inferences for the conclusion and based on the research implications of the study, to make suggestions for further research.

7.3 Findings

For each of the objectives framed, a separate hypothesis was drawn up and was dealt with in a separate chapter which was tested with appropriate statistical tools as indicated from the findings of Literature review, so as to draw appropriate conclusions for the research study.

7.3.1 Findings of Chapter 2

Chapter 2 dealt with the Literature Review and research works (local, national and international) from all relevant tourism and related sources (journals, as well as theses) were
reviewed according to the objectives studied and a ‘Content Analysis’ of Literature relating to the following aspects was prepared objective wise:

7.3.1.1 For Objective 1 - Research articles relating to Tourist preferences, their perceptions, their satisfaction with a destination and in particular, literature relating to the use of the Importance-Performance Analysis (IPA) Matrix or Grid as a tool for evaluating tourist satisfaction with a destination’s offer and consequently destination competitiveness was studied. Literature review revealed the IPA to be one of the simplest, easiest and most commonly used tools in evaluating tourist satisfaction with a destination’s offer which is essential to successful destination marketing and could provide Destination Management Organisations (DMOs) both private and public, with valuable inputs on how to improve the product on offer and increase its competitive value. Thus, literature review revealed the IPA proposed by Martilla & James (1977), to be a low cost – easily managed tool to:

- Evaluate Tourist Satisfaction in the state and through Gap Analysis,
- Audit the state of health of Goa from a tourism standpoint and
- Define the main areas for intervention through the Grid Analysis.

7.3.1.2 For Objective 2 - literature relating to the host community or resident’s perception of the impact of tourism, their attitude toward tourism and tourism development as well as the factors influencing their support for tourism development was reviewed. Given that the residents are considered to be one of the most important stakeholder groups in the development of any region as a tourist destination and their perceptions about tourism's impacts and benefits affects
their consequent support for the growth and sustainable development of the tourism industry, literature review emphasized the need and importance of a study of:

- Residents’ perception of the impacts and benefits of tourism in the State.
- Influence of Residents’ perceptions on consequent support for tourism planning and its growth and development in the state.

7.3.1.3 For Objective 3 - literature relating to sustainable tourism and sustainable tourism development, stakeholders of a tourism destination, their attitudes and perceptions about tourism, their role in tourism development, and their influence on tourism’s sustainability and most importantly multi-stakeholder comparison of perceptions and attitudes relating to tourism was reviewed. Since very few studies on multi-stakeholder comparisons have been made, literature review emphasized the need and importance of such a study to:

- Assess multi-stakeholder perceptions of the sustainability of tourism in the state in order to build on the existing body of knowledge.

7.3.1.4 For Objective 4 - literature relating to successful models of tourism in different destinations and with different focus, models of sustainable tourism in varied destinations at different stages of their life cycle, theoretical as well as conceptual models of tourism using different ideologies and methodologies and most importantly, tourism models using the widely acclaimed and widely applicable statistical technique Structural Equation Modeling and research relating stakeholders to the same, were reviewed. The review revealed that lack of awareness about sustainable tourism and ineffective stakeholder participation and involvement in
sustainable tourism were the major barriers to the successful implementation of sustainable tourism and emphasized the need and importance of such a study to:

- Use the analysis of stakeholder perceptions of sustainable tourism through the technique of Structural Equation Modeling, to develop a path design/model so as to offer destination planners, managers and organizers, a practical solution to the problems of tourism in the state of Goa.

7.3.1.5 Conclusions of Chapter 2

A thorough review of all pertinent literature revealed that every aspect being attempted to be studied in the current research work in terms of all the four objectives, needs to be studied viz. (1) Tourist perceptions about tourism’s infrastructure, (2) Resident perceptions about Tourism’s impacts, (3) Multi-Stakeholder perception about Tourism’s sustainability, and (4) the possibility of Developing a Sustainable Model for tourism in the state. None of these issues / aspects have been studied so far in the state of Goa, indicating clearly, the research gap, which makes this present work unique. The result of this study fill the gap by:

- validating the findings of previous research studies done in different settings and different locations

- identifying new variables which influence resident perceptions

- adding valuable knowledge and new perspectives for the tourism business community, the Government, Non-Governmental Organizations and all interested stakeholder groups.
7.3.2 Findings of Chapter 3

Chapter 3 entitled Tourists’ Perception about Tourism Infrastructure dealt with the first objective of the study i.e. to assess the perception of Tourists’ about the infrastructure and inputs currently available for tourism in the State of Goa and to identify existing gaps. It was undertaken in order to analyze tourists’ perception about the importance of and satisfaction towards the infrastructure, facilities, amenities and services offered by the tourist destination of Goa and dealt with following hypothesis $H_1$: There is no significant difference between Tourist perception about the Importance given to and Satisfaction with a) Tourist Assistance factors (F1) (b) Infrastructure Factors (F2) (c) Attraction/Destination Factors (F3) & (d) Entertainment factors (F4) which are available in the state for tourism, before and after the trip.

In this context, tourists rated their perceptions of the importance of and satisfaction with tourism 34 variables relating to infrastructure, facilities, amenities and services in the state using a five point Likert Scale. EFA of the 34 infrastructural variables generated four factors. It was analyzed using statistical techniques and tools like Descriptive Statistics Reliability Analysis, Mean Analysis, IP Analysis, Gap Analysis and tested using the Paired Sample t-Test.

Following were the findings of Chapter 3 in brief:

- **Reliability** and internal consistency of the scale and factors showed that the Cronbach’s Alpha of the overall scale was 0.921 *(Refer Chapter 3, Table 3.2)*

- **Mean analysis** for all 34 variables shows ‘average’ level for both Importance (3.95) & Satisfaction (3.49). While the mean for ‘Importance’ tends towards the higher end of
average, the mean for ‘Satisfaction’ tends toward the lower end of average. *(Refer Chapter 3, Table 3.2)*

- **Paired t Test** conducted in terms of tourist perceptions of facilities, services and infrastructure before and after the trip found that except for five constructs in two factors, where no significant difference exists in tourist perceptions before and after the trip, there is a significant difference in tourist perceptions for twenty nine constructs in the four factors before and after the trip. *(Refer Chapter 3, Table 3.2)*

- Importance-Performance Analysis (Original - 4 Quadrants) indicated that 10 variables fell in Quadrant I (Keep up the Good Work), 13 variables fell in Quadrant II (Concentrate here), 5 variables fell in Quadrant III (Low Priority) and 6 variables fell in Quadrant IV (Possible Overkill) *(Refer Chapter 3, Figure 3.1)* In the Importance-Performance Analysis (Modified - 2 Quadrants) using the diagonal approach having 2 regions, 5 attributes fall in Quadrant I- the region below the diagonal (‘Keep up the good work’/low priority) and 29 attributes fall in Quadrant II- the region above the diagonal (‘Concentrate here’/ high priority), respectively. *(Refer Chapter 3, Figure 3.2)*

- **Gap Analysis** shows the existence of a gap between the expected/actual mean and the perceived mean: -0.67 for F1 (Tourist Assistance), -0.72 for F2 (Infrastructure), -0.34 for F3 (Attraction/Destination), +0.06 for F4 (Entertainment) For F1, F2 & F3, the satisfaction values are less than expectation - as indicated by the negative gap values while F4, the satisfaction values are more than expectation (generally) as indicated by the positive gap values *(Refer Chapter 3, Table 3.3)*
In terms of the research hypotheses $H_1$ generated and tested statistically:

Since there exist differences between tourist perceptions about the importance given to and their satisfaction with the factors before and after the trip, except for two constructs in F3 - Attraction / Destination Factor and three constructs in F4 - Entertainment Factor which are not significant, the remaining twenty nine constructs in the four factors are significant. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected overall. However, specifically for a) Tourist Assistance factors (F1) - Rejected since all are significant, (b) Infrastructure Factors (F2) - Rejected since all are significant (c) Attraction/Destination Factors (F3) - Rejected for 8 out of 10 items since they are significant and Accepted for 2 items (Friendliness of Locals & Diversity of Cultural & Historical Attractions) since they are not significant & (d) Entertainment factors (F4) - Rejected for 4 out of 7 items since they are significant but Accepted for (Availability of Sport & Recreation Facilities, Possibility for Shopping, Wellness Offer) since they are not. *(Refer Chapter 3, Table 3.2)*

7.3.2.1 Conclusions of Chapter 3

Mean Values for both Importance and Satisfaction are average indicating that in general, while tourists are satisfied with the tourist offer as a whole, the level of satisfaction is not very high. *(Refer Chapter 3, Table 3.2)* In the original IPA, 13 variables/attributes and in the modified IPA, 29 variables/attributes fall in Quadrant II (Concentrate Here i.e. high priority) respectively. All 29 attributes (13 original + 16 new) appearing in Quadrant II are listed below with the 16 new attributes added after using the modified IPA being listed in bold. *(Refer Chapter 3, Figures 3.1 & 3.2)*

- Knowledge & quality of help at Tourist Office,
• Traffic management,

• Power Supply situation,

• Availability & cost of private transportation,

• Availability of public transportation,

• Roadside signages & their condition,

• Conditions of street lighting,

• Quality/condition of Roads (Internal/Highways),

• Garbage disposal,

• Sewerage and drainage system,

• Overall cleanliness of the destination,

• Availability, quality & hygiene of wayside Eateries,

• Public Conveniences/Utilities along roads.

• Availability of Tourist guidance centers

• Availability of authorized tour operators,

• Parking facilities

• Rural Tourism,

• Accessibility of the destination,

• Assistance at Airport/Railway Station

• Condition of the Airport/Railway station,

• Natural beauty & climate,

• Friendliness of the local people,

• Diversity of cultural/historical attractions,

• Personal safety and security,
• Tariff levels of Accommodation (all kinds),
• Availability & quality of Accommodation,
• Opportunities for Rest & Relaxation,
• Availability, quality & tariff of local cuisine
• Conference offer

In terms of the Gap Analysis, for factors F1, F2 & F3, the satisfaction values are less than expectation indicated by the negative gap values indicating dissatisfaction. For F4, the satisfaction values are more than expectation (generally) indicated by the positive gap values however, when considered with their position on the Grid, F4 variables all fall in Quadrant III (Low Priority) & Quadrant IV (Possible Overkill), which possibly indicate that the gap values though positive, are not very promising, as they occur for variables that tourists do not appear to value highly. *(Refer Chapter 3, Table 3.3)*

Thus,

• The lack of balance between perception of importance of infrastructure and facilities for tourism in the state and the actual satisfaction with the same, by tourists, is an indication for Government, Service Providers and those responsible for tourism in the state, to improve the tourist offer by identifying the main areas where intervention is both necessary and desirable according to the tourists’ perceptions, particularly in view of sustaining the destination’s competitiveness.

• This study supports the adoption of the IPA as a framework for evaluating tourist satisfaction and the framework used for the State of Goa could be used in other Mass tourist destinations, as a benchmarking tool.
7.3.3 Findings of Chapter 4

Chapter 4 entitled, an ‘Residents’ Perception about Impacts of Tourism” dealt with the second objective of the study i.e. to evaluate the perception of Residents about the impacts of tourism in the state of Goa. It was undertaken to examine the perceptions of residents of the state of Goa by using the model developed by Perdue et al. (1990); later extended by Mc Gehee, et al. (2002). Based on Social Exchange Theory it tried to determine whether personal characteristics and personal benefits from tourism influence perception of tourism as well as support for tourism development, and what factors influence support for tourism development and management. It also dealt with the second, third and fourth hypotheses namely,

- $H_2$: Personal Characteristics along with Personal Benefit (PB) from tourism affects residents perception of positive (PI) and negative (NI) impact of tourism
- $H_3$: 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);
- $H_4$: 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).

In this context, local residents rated their perceptions of the impacts of tourism in their destination using a five point Likert Scale having 35 variables. Techniques and tools like Descriptive Statistics, Mean analysis & Multiple Regression using OLS were used to analyze data.
Following were the findings of Chapter 4 in brief:

- **Reliability** and internal consistency of the 35 item Tourism Attitude Items and Composite Scales (N = 809) showed that the Cronbach’s Alpha of the overall scale was 0.841 (*Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.2*)

- **Mean analysis** 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 scales it ranged between 3.19 (average - tending towards the lower end of the average) to 4.17 (above average). (*Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.2*)

- **Regression Analysis** (*Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.3*)

  **Model 1 Findings**: Education has a statistically significant positive relationship while Place of Residence has a statistically significant negative relationship with Negative Impacts (NI) of tourism. Model 1 explains only 1.2% of the variation between the dependent variable, Negative Impacts & Resident Characteristics which are the independent variables.

  **Model 2 Findings**: Personal Benefit (PB) has a statistically significant positive relationship with Tourism’s Positive Impacts (PI) Age, Education & Birth place enjoy a small but negatively significant relationship with Tourism’s Positive Impacts. Model 2 explains 10.4% of the variation between the dependent variable - Positive Impacts (PI) and the Personal Benefit and Resident Characteristics which are Independent Variables.

  **Model 3 Findings**: Support for Additional Tourism (SAT) shares a statistically significant relationship with PB, PI & NI. PB & PI are significant in a positive direction while NI is significant in a negative direction. Model 3 explains 46.6% of variation between the dependent variable SAT & the independent variables PB, PI & NI.
Model 4 Findings: There is a statistically significant positive relationship between PB, SAT, NI & Support for Tourism Planning (STP). This model explains 6.1% of the variation between the dependent variable STP & the independent variables PB, PI, NI & SAT. 

In terms of the research hypotheses $H_2, H_3, H_4$, generated and tested statistically:

$H_2$: Personal Characteristics along with Personal Benefit (PB) from tourism affects residents’ perception of positive (PI) and negative (NI) impact of tourism: For Negative Impacts (NI) of tourism the Null hypothesis accepted overall as only Education & Place of residence are significant. For Positive Impacts (PI) of tourism the Null hypothesis is rejected for Personal Benefits, Age, Education & Birth Place which are significant but the Null hypothesis is accepted for Gender, Income, Years of Residence & Place of Residence which are not significant. (Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.3)

$H_3$: 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): The Null hypothesis is rejected since there is a significant relationship between all three of the independent variables; PB, PI & NI and the dependent variable, Support for additional tourism (SAT). (Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.3)

$H_4$: Extent of Personal Benefit (PB) derived from tourism, residents perception of positive (PI), negative (NI) impacts of tourism & Support for Additional Tourism (SAT) influences Support for Tourism Planning (STP): The Null hypothesis is rejected since there is a significant
relationship between the majority of the independent variables - PB, NI & SAT and the dependent variable, Support for Tourism Planning, but PI is not significant. *(Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.3)*

7.3.3.1 Conclusions of Chapter 4

Personal Benefit (PB) does not have a statistically significant relationship with Tourism’s Negative Impacts (NI) however, two Personal Characteristics - 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. (2003)] 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 [consistent with the findings of Perdue et al. (1990) but inconsistent with Mc Gehee et al. (2003)]. *(Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.3)*

Personal Benefit, Tourism’s Positive Impacts & Tourism’s Negative Impacts are statistically significant. PB & PI were significant in a positive direction indicating that residents who perceived PB from tourism, tended to agree with positive impacts of tourism & were more likely to Support Growth of Additional Tourism, while NI is significant in a negative direction indicating that with increasing perception of Negative Impacts, Support For
Additional Tourism would be lowered. [Consistent with Perdue et al. (1990) & Mc Gehee et al. (2003)] (Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.3)

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. Those who received personal benefit from tourism were supportive of additional tourism and recognized the reality of negative impacts of tourism but also recognized the need for tourism planning. The positive relationship between NI & STP is consistent with Perdue et al. (1990) & Mc Gehee et al. (2003). However, the positive relationship between SAT & STP is inconsistent with Perdue et al. (1990) but consistent with Mc Gehee et al. (2003). However, in contrast to both Perdue et al. (1990) & Mc Gehee et al. (2003) PB shares a statistically significant positive relationship with STP. (Refer Chapter 4, Table 4.3) PI is not significant. Thus,

- 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.(2003) which aligns with SET validating the fact that residents who have a vested interest in tourism development would like to see it properly planned. Residents should be informed about tourism’s positive and negative economic, social cultural and environmental implications & the
kinds of tourism development that exist in the community in order to make informed
decisions about the types and levels of tourism that are most attractive to them and which
they are willing to support.

7.3.4 Findings of Chapter 5

Chapter 5 entitled, ‘Multi-Stakeholders Perception towards Sustainable Tourism
investigates Objective 3, namely, to study the perception of Stakeholders about tourism in Goa in
terms of its sustainability. It was undertaken in order to evaluate and compare the perceptions of
multiple stakeholders of tourism in the state of Goa and is an attempt to build on the existing
body of knowledge about stakeholder attitudes and perceptions towards tourism. It also dealt
with the fifth hypothesis namely, \( H_5: \text{There is no significant difference in the perception of }
Stakeholders; \text{viz.; (1) Residents, (2) Tourists, (3) Entrepreneurs and (4) Government Officials}
with respect to: (F1) Understanding of Sustainability [US], (F2) Focus of Sustainable Tourism
[FST], (F3) Sustainable Tourism Management [STM],(F4) Attitude towards Sustainable
Tourism [AST], (F5) Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development [PST], (F6) Economic
Focus of Sustainable Tourism [EFST], and(F7) Tourism Industry & Sustainability [TIS]. In this
regard, local residents who were above the age of 18 and included all stakeholder groups: Locals
(engaged & not engaged in Tourism businesses), Service providers (Private & Public sector),
Government officials employed in Tourism offices & other related offices were surveyed. The
reliability of the 44 item Tourism sustainability issues scale & data was tested using Cronbach’s
Alpha, Mean Analysis, Exploratory Factor Analysis & One way ANOVA using Scheffe’s Post
Hoc Test were used to analyse the data.
Following were the findings of Chapter 5 in brief:

- **Reliability** and internal consistency of the 44 item Tourism Sustainability Issues Scale (N = 1570) showed that the Cronbach’s Alpha of the overall scale was 0.924 *(Refer Chapter 5, Table 5.2).*

- **Mean Analysis** While the individual subscale means of the 44 item Tourism Sustainability Issues Scale vary from 4.18 to 3.65, the overall scale mean was 3.98 which though average, tended toward the higher end of average and was almost equal to the upper limit of average so as to be considered *above average.* *(Refer Chapter 5, Table 5.2).*

- **Exploratory Factor Analysis** (EFA) using Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation generated 7 factor solution with Eigen values above 1, with minimum loss of information, having 44 variables in total and which explained 49.887% of the overall variance. *(Refer Chapter 5, Table 5.2)*

- **One Way ANOVA using Scheffe’s Post Hoc Test** revealed that the findings of this study support the idea that differences in perception about the sustainability of tourism do exist between 4 different stakeholder groups. For each of the 6 factors viz. (F1) **Understanding of Sustainability** (US), (F2) **Focus of Sustainable Tourism** (FST), (F3) **Sustainable Tourism Management** (STM), (F4) **Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism** (AST), (F5) **Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development** (PST), (F6) **Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism** (EFST) where there was a statistically significant difference between groups, a Scheffe’s Post Hoc test was conducted to determine which specific groups were different. For (F7) **Tourism Industry &**
Sustainability (TIS), none of the groups have statistically significant differing perceptions of sustainable tourism. *(Refer Chapter 5, Table 5.3).*

In terms of the research hypotheses $H_5$, generated and tested statistically:

Since there is a significant difference in perception of stakeholders with respect to *(F1)* Understanding of Sustainability [US], *(F2)* Focus of Sustainable Tourism [FST], *(F3)* Sustainable Tourism Management [STM], *(F4)* Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism [AST], *(F5)* Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development [PST], *(F6)* Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism [EFST], the null hypothesis is *Rejected*. But, since there is no significant difference in perception of stakeholders with respect to *(F7)* Tourism Industry & Sustainability [TIS], the null hypothesis is *Accepted* *(Refer Chapter 5, Table 5.3)*

**7.3.4.1 Conclusion of Chapter 5**

The results of the study indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the perceptions about the sustainability of tourism between stakeholder groups studied where for Five of the seven factors namely Understanding of Sustainability (US), Focus of Sustainable Tourism (FST), Sustainable Tourism Management (STM), Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism (AST), Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism (EFST), **Government Officials & Entrepreneurs** have the highest/most positive perception about sustainability which is a possible outcome of their close involvement with tourism planning & management and the high level of personal benefit they derive from it. For four of the seven factors namely US, FST, AST & EFST, **Tourists** have the lowest or least positive perception about sustainability of tourism, which given the fact that they are only visitors to the state and have very little emotional or
economic connection with it is a logical outcome. However, for Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development (PST), Tourists have the highest perception. The fact that any participation or contribution to sustainable tourism by tourists, would by definition, be short term since they are only visitors to the state, could possibly account for their willingness to participate and their high perception unlike other stakeholders, who by virtue of being residents would have to make a more long term commitment. Further, for STM & PST, Residents have the lowest/least positive perception which is understandable given that they are most emotionally attached to the destination and can view the effects of tourism development most closely, possibly derive the least personal benefit from tourism yet perhaps pay the highest price for it.

Thus,

This research suggests GO & E are more greatly involved in tourism planning & management than Residents or Tourists. Community planners and destination management organizations (DMOs) need to:

- understand the differing interests of all the stakeholder groups and
- include all stakeholder groups in discussions about tourism development and
- involve residents to a much greater extent if sustainable tourism development to have the greatest chance of success.

7.3.5 Findings of Chapter 6

Chapter 6 entitled, a ‘Sustainable Tourism in Goa: A Multi-Stakeholder Perspective Using Structural Equation Modeling and investigates Objective 4 which is, to suggest a model for Tourism in Goa that is sustainable, integrative and participative. It has been undertaken in order
to assess multi-stakeholder perceptions about various aspects about the sustainability of tourism in Goa in an attempt **to predict the direction and consequently the strength of their support** for the same using Structural Equation Modeling. It also deals with the sixth hypothesis namely, \( H_6: \text{There is no significant relationship between a) Understanding of Sustainability (US), b) Focus of Sustainable Tourism (FST), c) Sustainable Tourism Management (STM), d) Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism (AST), e) Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development (PSTD), f) Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism (EFST), g) Tourism Industry and Sustainability (TIS) and Sustainable Tourism (ST), with respect to Stakeholder perception.**

Following were the findings of Chapter 6 in brief:

- **For the study and analysis of Objectives 3 & 4, the data, statistical techniques and analysis are common to a great extent** since they both dealt with the understanding of stakeholder perceptions about the sustainability of tourism in the state. Objective 3 & 4 both used Descriptive Statistics, Mean Analysis, Exploratory Factor Analysis. But while **Objective 3 used One Way ANOVA with Scheffe’s Post Hoc Test, (Refer Section 7.3.4)** Objective 4 used the same techniques and **Structural Equation Modelling.**

- **Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)**
  
  A SEM Model was used to examine the hypothesized relationships between the seven constructs (factors) in the model using Maximum Likelihood Estimates. Model fit was initially tested using the Overall Fit and Regression Paths to determine whether observed variables were generated by corresponding latent factors. The hypothesized model was then analyzed. The evaluation of Goodness of Fit indices indicate mediocre to acceptable levels of fit; viz.; (**Refer Chapter 6, Section 6.2.5.2**) Chi square/df (CMIN) = 4.801
which is acceptable; Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) = 0.883; and Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) = 0.871; both of which are in the acceptable range; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.049; which is a good fit, Root Mean Square residual (RMR) = 0.035 is a good fit; Normed- Fit Index (NFI) = 0.822; mediocre to acceptable; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.853, mediocre.

In terms of the research hypotheses $H_6$, generated and tested statistically:

Since there is a significant relationship of between (F1) Understanding of Sustainability [US], (F2) Focus of Sustainable Tourism [FST], (F3) Sustainable Tourism Management [STM], (F4) Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism [AST], (F6) Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism [EFST]& (F7) Tourism Industry & Sustainability [TIS] and Sustainable tourism with respect to Stakeholder perception the null hypothesis is Rejected. But, since there is no significant relationship between F5) Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development [PST] and Sustainable Tourism, with respect to Stakeholder perception the null hypothesis is Accepted (Refer Chapter 6, Figure 6.2)

7.3.5.1 Conclusion of Chapter 6

In terms of testing the model of stakeholder perceptions about sustainable tourism and their consequent support for sustainable tourism by examining the path relationship between factors related to sustainability and sustainable tourism. Six of the seven sub-hypotheses framed are Rejected at the p<0.05 level of significance. Focus of Sustainable Tourism & Sustainable Tourism Management (0.84 each), along with Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism (0.80)
indicate a high positive association with Sustainable Tourism. Understanding of Sustainability (0.65) shows an above average positive association with Sustainable Tourism. Tourism Industry & Sustainability (0.57) and Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism (0.53) show a positive, moderate association with Sustainable Tourism. (Refer Chapter 6, Figure 6.2) Only with respect to Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development (-0.02), it shows a low, negative relation to Sustainable Tourism. The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development and Sustainable Tourism is Accepted. A possible explanation for this could be that even when stakeholders in a destination have an awareness, understanding and positive attitude toward sustainable tourism, when it comes to actual investment of their time, efforts and resources, commitment is lacking. As the Goodness of Fit Indices do not support the proposed model completely, the measurement model is retained as a Path Diagram indicating relationships between Sustainability Issue factors and Sustainable Tourism.

7.4 Suggestions for Further Research

7.4.1 Suggestions from Chapter 3 (Tourists’ Perception)

- While the current study has used the IPA as a framework to determine tourist satisfaction in general with respect to the importance given to and satisfaction with infrastructure, services and facilities before and after their visit to the destination, it can be utilized in further research on tourist satisfaction in terms of different segments i.e. the differences in perceptions among tourists to the two districts of the state viz. North and South Goa, between Domestic & International tourists as well as differing perceptions among International tourists so as to make promotion segment specific and hence more effective.
- Since the main motivation for tourists visiting a destination is pleasure and relaxation, studies which do not involve physically disturbing tourists during their visit for the filling of questionnaires but rather, which allow them to fill and return the same on their return home via email/ prepaid mail questionnaires may be more appropriate and would perhaps result in better data collection. Even better would be the collection of ‘real time’ data through tie-ups among tourism and other service providers both public and private sector, researchers, information technology companies etc. which would enable the collection of data from very large samples. If carried out effectively, the entire population data can be collected on real time basis without interfering with the leisure time of tourists and the movements of tourists at the destination can be even be tracked, their perceptions can be identified using the text / audio / video / photo messaging through social media platforms as such studies are already being carried out in developed countries.

- A similar study could be conducted after a specific period of time to validate the findings of this study and or determine new areas where efforts and investment are to focussed so as to bring about improvement in the tourist offer

7.4.2 Suggestions from Chapter 4 (Residents’ Perception)

- The present study on evaluating Residents’ perception of tourism impacts used the Tourism Impact Attitude Scale (TIAS) scale developed by Lankford and Howard (1994) which is one of the most widely recognized and used scales in measuring Tourism
Impacts. Other scales such as the Attitude towards Sustainable tourism by Ap &
Crompton, (1998) could perhaps be used which could assess tourism impacts by
measuring both belief and affect toward the impact attributes thus giving the study a
broader perspective.

• Rather than studying residents as a homogenous group, the study could further have been
refined by clustering residents into supporters, opposers and neutral groups and assessing
whether this clustering affected their perceptions about tourism’s impacts as well as the
level of support for tourism development and tourism within each cluster.

• The variable Personal Benefit which is used in this study is an abstract concept having
subjective meaning. Further, it has been defined in the study only two statements and
hence may not have accurately measured the concept from the point of view of residents.
The number of statements defining the concept as well as the type of statements included
could be increased be so as to make it more measurable, i.e. more quantifiable and
economic statements as well as more qualitative statements, which would indicate not
only how residents perceive this variable but also the reasons for their perceptions.

7.4.3 Suggestions from Chapter 5 (Multi-stakeholder Perception)

• A structured questionnaire was developed based on previous similar research studies
carried out by Byrd et al., 2008; Kruja, D. & Hasaj, A., 2010; Quintano et al., 2011; Ong
& Smith, 2013 and used to collect data on stakeholder perceptions about sustainable
tourism. The use of the Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale (SUS-TAS) scale by Choi
and Sirkaya (2009), which in addition to measuring perceptions of stakeholders towards
sustainable tourism would also measure sustainable action in tourism development, may add new dimensions to the research work.

- In addition to collecting information on stakeholder perceptions, if future research instruments/scales be designed or could incorporate items which could assist in gathering data on the specific manner/ avenues/aspects, in which stakeholders would like to get involved in the tourism planning process, researchers, planners, destination management organizations would be better able to reach out to and involve stakeholders in sustainable tourism with best results.

7.4.4 Suggestions from Chapter 6 (SEM Modeling)

- The Path Diagram which resulted provides a valid basis for the implementation of the Multi - Stakeholder Involvement Model (MSIM) Framework for sustainable tourism in the state but further research needs to be carried out in this context, to transform it into an acceptable model and to provide inputs for the understanding of the non-significant relationship between Participation in Sustainable Tourism Development and Sustainable Tourism.

- Further analysis between the demographic variables and stakeholder attitude toward sustainable tourism could do much to align the goals the Industry, Government, Entrepreneurs and Residents in this regard, to determine a mutually acceptable route to sustainable tourism in the state.