



Residents' Preferences for Involvement in Tourism Development and Influences from Individual Profiles

Ye Zhang , Shu T. Cole & Charles H. Chancellor

To cite this article: Ye Zhang , Shu T. Cole & Charles H. Chancellor (2013) Residents' Preferences for Involvement in Tourism Development and Influences from Individual Profiles, *Tourism Planning & Development*, 10:3, 267-284, DOI: [10.1080/21568316.2012.747984](https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2012.747984)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2012.747984>



Published online: 14 Jan 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 439



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 14 View citing articles [↗](#)

Residents' Preferences for Involvement in Tourism Development and Influences from Individual Profiles

YE ZHANG, SHU T. COLE AND CHARLES H. CHANCELLOR

Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA

ABSTRACT *Community involvement in tourism development is a subject that has attracted the attention of tourism researchers largely due to the potentially unfair power distribution between residents and powerful interest groups. This attention, however, has not produced significant literature regarding the possibly varied levels of involvement in tourism planning and development preferred by different residents. The present study addresses that lack of information by exploring the range of residents' preferred involvement approaches based on their demographic and perceptual profiles. Study findings should help all residents with different involvement needs being fairly represented in community engagement. Extending Tosun's typology of community involvement with new content about involvement scope, this study identifies four types of involvement preferences: (1) involving all residents in decision-making; (2) involving some residents in decision-making; (3) excluding residents from decision-making; and (4) excluding residents from any tourism planning effort. Respondents' perceptual profiles, including perceived social costs, perceived environmental sustainability or costs of tourism, and self-evaluative tourism knowledge influences their preferences for involvement in tourism development, as do their demographic profiles, including tourism industry employment status and household income. The limited variance explained in the preference measures, however, suggests the need to explore additional individual profiles.*

Introduction

Concerns about community involvement in tourism planning and development have increased as a result of unfair power distribution between powerful interest groups and local communities (Jamal and Getz, 1995; Trakolis, 2001). When lacking such power, community concerns about potential negative impacts of tourism and corresponding compensation may not be addressed by groups governing tourism development (Cole, 2006; Mowforth and Munt, 2008; Okazaki, 2008). As in many countries, US residents are rarely involved in tourism planning, let alone important decision-making (Blackstock, 2005). When developers or governments do involve residents in the planning process, the primary purpose is usually to garner support for tourism development,

Correspondence Address: Ye Zhang, Recreation, Park, and Tourism Studies Department, HPER Building 133, 1025 East Seventh Street, Bloomington, IN 47405-7109, USA. Email: zhangye@indiana.edu

rather than allowing residents to evaluate these plans. Consequently, residents' concerns may be ignored and potential problems resulting from this lack of engagement are left unresolved.

Tourism scholars thereby stress the importance of community empowerment, which delegates residents with authority and resources to make decisions about local tourism development (Choi and Sirakaya, 2006; Cole, 2006). However, less attention was paid to variations in resident involvement preferences (Tosun, 2006; Kibicho, 2008). Given the heterogeneity of residents' individual characteristics and tourism perceptions, their willingness and readiness to be empowered would differ as well. Decisions are most likely made by those who prefer active engagement, generally more visible, vocal, educated, or wealthy residents, rather than larger group who better reflect the socioeconomic and cultural structures of communities (Botes and Van Rensburg, 2000). Effective community empowerment not only requires the delegation of decision-making power to the broader population, but also stresses every resident's spontaneous participation in tourism decision-making, which results in a more just power distribution among residents and powerful interest groups (Jago *et al.*, 2006). To achieve this balance of influences, it is crucial to understand possible differences in involvement preferences amongst residents and factors responsible for such variation. Powerful interest groups could thus identify residents with a desire for empowerment and examine whether such involvement needs have been satisfied. Residents less passionate about empowerment could also be identified by authorities, and relevant strategies could be developed to encourage their more active involvement in tourism affairs. Such effort would not only move tourism development towards social equality, but also can help tourism developers better ensure support from the local community (Okazaki, 2008) and avoid controversy thereafter.

Community Preferences for Involvement in Tourism Development

Abundant tourism literature has studied community-based tourism, participatory tourism planning, community inclusive tourism, and sustainable community tourism (Reed, 1997; Blackstock, 2005; Hall, 2008; Bhattacharya, 2011). These studies investigated a range of community involvement initiatives, some of which advocated distribution of power and benefits fairly among residents, whereas others, such as those with business or government agendas working to strengthen the power of such authorities over communities, only gave lip service to community involvement and concerns (MacLeavy, 2009; Shani and Pizam, 2012).

The heterogeneity of community involvement initiatives in power distribution has been depicted by various typologies in urban planning literature, but very few are represented in tourism literature. Arnstein (1969) provided a hierarchy of community involvement approaches based on power assignment from the administrative perspective, ranging from non-participation (manipulation of residents), degrees of tokenism (consultation by residents), to maximum participation (citizen control). Petty (1995) developed a typology based on the spectrum of resident spontaneity in participation, ranging from manipulative participation, passive participation, to self-mobilization. Building on Arnstein and Petty's work, Tosun (2006) designed a typology of community involvement in the context of tourism that contains three comprehensive involvement approaches: spontaneous participation, induced participation, and coercive participation that includes perspectives of both administrative bodies (e.g. consultation, manipulation, and citizen control) and local communities (i.e. spontaneous or passive).

Spontaneous Participation

Spontaneous participation is a “bottom-up” (Tosun, 2006, p. 494) process in which community members, through participation in decision-making, have full authority in tourism planning processes. This approach not only empowers individuals by improving their income, but also strengthens their sense of autonomy, community service and involvement, and self-confidence in influencing events affecting their lives (Scheyvens, 1999; Tosun, 2000; Cole, 2006). On a larger scale, spontaneous participation could socially empower local communities through the enhancement of community and family solidarity and psychological investment, and their active involvement in political and business decision-making structures.

Given its function of economic, psychological, social and political empowerment, such a self-governed process is thus defined as “community empowerment,” acknowledged by many researchers as the final goal of community involvement (Arnstein, 1969; Sofield, 2003; Cole, 2006; Petrić, 2007). Local communities from this perspective are entitled to substantial control over all tourism development decisions and are expected to initiate plans, but often need assistance from political, governmental or non-governmental organizations, or other influential advocates, to be successful (Leksakundilok, 2006).

Induced Participation

Induced participation refers to the situation where government bodies and developers who largely dominate the tourism planning and management process consult community opinion regarding tourism development, but where residents are excluded from actual decision-making throughout the process (Jamal and Getz, 1995; Tosun, 2006). Although this approach is more practical than residents' spontaneous participation in terms of time and financial cost (Simmons, 1994), induced participation carries the risk of ignoring important community concerns.

Coercive Community Participation

Coercive community participation is the most “manipulated and contrived” approach (Tosun, 2006, p. 495), where power-holders may manipulate the entire tourism development process to serve their interests rather than those of the local communities, who may or may not share the benefits of tourism. At best, power-holders in this case merely inform host communities of planned programmes and potential benefits of tourism to reduce resident resistance (Richards and Hall, 2000). This approach, however, may cause socio-political risks for tourists and economic risks for tourism developers and investors if communities do not support these plans.

Tosun's (2006) typology depicts the “depth” of community involvement based on levels of power authorized to residents, such as their participation in tourism planning, and in turn, whether they join in the decision-making of tourism planning or are only consulted. This topology nevertheless fails to consider the “breadth” dimension, “involvement scope”, another potential criterion for effective community involvement that evaluates the scope of residents who are potentially involved in tourism planning and development. A major issue here is whether all residents are involved in such decision-making, or would rather be represented by a group or spokesperson in planning participation. While every resident in the community should ideally be empowered to make decisions that influence their lives, many even when invited or urged choose to not participate. In any case, a minority of influential residents end up representing the community in these matters, and the

majority are left unheard (Botes and Van Rensburg, 2000; Blackstock, 2005). Even with power delegated to residents as an entity, however, the goal of community empowerment cannot be achieved without fair power allocation among residents. The involvement scope as a measurement of power allocation within local communities should thus be included in involvement approaches.

Moreover, the gradual process towards community empowerment not only takes the effort of influential interest groups to empower communities, but also requires the spontaneous participation by the majority of residents. Researchers have noted that residents may lack interest in or awareness of the importance of their engagement in tourism planning, or might prefer to rely on elected representatives to claim their benefits (Sawyer, 1995; Tosun, 2006). Others may doubt the effectiveness of their involvement to make changes, even if they choose to act (Sawyer, 1995), or have work or personal priorities that prevent or discourage their involvement (Tosun, 2000). Resident lack of knowledge and capabilities to contribute to the planning process and consequent lack of self-confidence may also result in their reliance on others, including power-brokers, to control this process (Cole, 2006; Marzuki, 2008).

As spontaneity of residents is a key indicator in assessing effective empowerment (Tosun, 2006), raising resident interest in active engagement is important, starting with exploring their current involvement and possible barriers to active participation (Rowland *et al.*, 1997). Although Tosun (2006) described the overall preferences among residents of Turkey for three involvement approaches, he failed to identify the variation of preferences among residents. The dearth of research on these involvement preference differences within a community is thus addressed in the current study.

Individual Profiles Influencing Resident Involvement Preferences

A handful of studies have investigated the correlations between residents' individual profiles and attitudes towards involvement in tourism planning and development, but not the influences of individual profiles on residents' attitudes (Kibicho, 2008; Michael, 2009). Existing studies also focused primarily on socio-demographic profiles including age, gender, education level, household income, and occupation. Kibicho (2008), for example, found those interested in tourism planning involvement tended to be younger, female, have higher education levels, and did not work in the tourism industry. Individual profiles other than demographic characteristics have not been investigated, despite the implications from some studies about the possible linkage between several perceptual profiles and residents' attitudes towards tourism.

Keogh (1990) stated that residents who perceive negative impacts from tourism claim their right to be informed of and involved in tourism planning. Oviedo-Garcia *et al.* (2008) further divided perceived impacts from tourism into three dimensions: economic, environmental, and social. Based on that classification, Hibbard and Lurie (2000) found a great passion for participation from locals with economic and environmental concerns about tourism. Jamal and Getz (1995) explored tourism planning in Canada, dominated by interest groups and residents concerned with environmental sustainability. Unsatisfied with the impact of tourism on their community, these residents quickly became more involved with planning processes (Jamal and Getz, 1995).

Puhakka *et al.* (2009), however, found that residents living around a national park in Finland resisted opportunities for future involvement in tourism planning because they were unsatisfied with their previous involvement experience. Similarly, Simmons (1994) discovered that resident perception of how their input in time and energy may influence outcomes affects future involvement.

Self-evaluative tourism knowledge should be an important determinant for residents' attitudes towards involvement in tourism concerns. Simmons (1994) indicated that the more knowledge residents feel they have about tourism, the more confident they are in participating in tourism development. Keogh (1990) and Trakolis (2001) also revealed that the more familiar locals are with a tourism project, the more interest they have in the project. Examination of these differing resident profiles thus contributes to understanding possible factors that encourage or prevent their active participation in tourism planning.

Researcher Objectives

The current project is based on Tosun's (2006) typology of community involvement in tourism planning and development. The study also adds a new "breadth" dimension of community involvement to his typology, involvement scope, to enhance the comprehensiveness of his scale.

Tosun's (2006) typology, first developed in Turkey, differs from the current US-based study due to cultural and government differences in their approach to tourism. Turkey has a highly centralized and undemocratic government planning system that generally promotes private investment in tourism over local interests. Tourism planning in rural US destinations are largely at the local level, with little federal government involvement (Marcouiller, 1997). Nonetheless, community involvement is rarely introduced into tourism planning in the U.S., as the main concern of state tourism agencies is creating niche markets and attracting visitors. Profit-oriented private planning may also ignore possible benefits to local people far more than centralized planning systems (Blackstock, 2005).

The current study is designed to detect variances explained by individual profiles in preference measures, such as socio-demographic profiles (including tourism industry employment) and perceptual profiles, perceived impacts of tourism, self-evaluative tourism knowledge, and evaluation of current community involvement in tourism planning that are assumed to influence residents' preferences for tourism involvement. This study focuses on the following research questions:

1. In what ways do community involvement preferences vary across rural and small town U.S. residents, at the level of power authorized and preference for scope of residents involved in tourism development?
2. In what ways do individual profiles of residents influence their involvement preferences, in particular, their concerns about levels of their power authorization and involvement scope in these issues?

Methods

Data Collection

Data was collected during January and February 2010 via a self-administered questionnaire mailed to randomly selected households in 11 counties in Southeastern Indiana, USA. The minimum sample size for this study is calculated using Cochran's (1963) formula. At a 95% confidence level and with $\pm 5\%$ precision, a minimum of 384 usable household surveys are needed to be representative of the study population. To achieve this sample size, 2,000 households in the region received the survey, a number determined by the response rate of a previous study with a similar population.

Surveying such a large geographical area is beneficial, as the majority of existing community studies in tourism are single-community case studies (Timothy, 1999; Cole, 2006;

Tosun, 2006; Okazaki, 2008). Tourist attractions in the study location include protected natural areas such as state parks, heritage and cultural resources, and three riverboat casinos opened in the mid 1990s. One fourth of employment in this area is based on the services industry (Commerce Region 9, 2009). The tourism industry should thus be a familiar topic for local residents, which corresponds with the assumption of this study that residents possess a basic understanding of tourism.

The questionnaire uses a multiple wave contact system designed by Salant and Dillman (1994) for maximum response rates. Residents first contacted via an advance-notice post-card briefly describing the study are alerted to a survey questionnaire coming in the mail five days later. Two weeks later a replacement questionnaire is sent to non-responders. A total of 354 completed questionnaires are used in the study, a response rate of 17.7%.

Instruments

Resident preference for involvement in tourism planning and development is measured with eight items, labelled a to h (see Table 1). Residents rate their level of agreement with questionnaire statements on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). This study derives three items from Tosun's (2006) survey (which did not involve a reliable scale to measure the three levels of power authorization: spontaneous participation, induced participation, and coercive participation), and borrows five items from Choi and Sirakaya's (2005) SUS-TAS scale on residents' attitudes towards sustainable tourism development. This helps improve scale reliability, and involves measurement of the additional dimension, involvement scope. Factor analysis is conducted to confirm whether the dimensionality of these eight preference items is in line with the "breadth" and "depth" of involvement dimensions.

Perceived tourism impacts are measured through perceived economic benefits, perceived environmental sustainability, and perceived social costs, adopted from a modified SUS-TAS scale (the Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale) verified by Chancellor *et al.* (2011) (Table 1). The study uses the 5-point SUS-TAS scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) proposed by Choi and Sirakaya (2005). Cronbach's alpha values indicate the scales to be internally reliable for economic benefits ($\alpha = 0.82$), environment sustainability ($\alpha = 0.87$), and social costs ($\alpha = 0.84$) (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1978). A mean score is calculated for each scale. The higher the mean score, the stronger a resident feels about the corresponding aspect of tourism. Respondents are asked to rate their knowledge level of tourism using a 5-point scale (1 = not at all knowledgeable, 5 = very knowledgeable) and evaluate their current participation in tourism decision-making and planning on a 5-point scale (1 = very low, 5 = very high). Finally, socio-demographic characteristics are measured with single items (see Table 1).

Results

Profiles of Respondents

As shown in Table 2, more men (54.5%) responded in this study than women (45.5%), where 39.8% of residents are 60 years or older, with those between 41 and 60 accounting for 41.8%.

Most respondents possess at least a college degree, where 70% have post-secondary education (graduate school, four-year college, technical, vocational or trade school, junior college, or some college) and 26.5% have a high school diploma or GED. The respondents are spread evenly across annual household income levels, from \$20,000 to \$100,000. Most (71.5%) do not have a tourism-related job.

Table 1. Items for measurement of all the variables

Variable	Item
Dependent variable	
Preference for involvement in tourism planning and development	(a) Residents must be encouraged to assume leadership roles in tourism planning committees (b) Full participation by everyone in the community regarding tourism decisions is a must for successful tourism development (c) Tourism decisions should be made by all members in a community regardless of a person's background (d) Community residents should have an opportunity to be involved in tourism development decision-making (e) Local residents should be involved in tourism planning discussions, but not in the decision-making process (f) Sometimes it is acceptable to exclude community residents from tourism development decisions (g) Local residents should be consulted in the tourism planning process but should not be decision makers (h) It is necessary to include local residents in the tourism planning process
Independent variable	
Individual profile 1: Perceived economic benefits	(i) Tourism benefits businesses other than just tourism industries in our community (j) Tourism generates substantial tax revenues for our local government (k) Tourism brings new income to our community (l) Tourism is a strong economic contributor to our community
Individual profile 2: Perceived Environmental sustainability	(m) Our community's diversity of nature is valued and protected by the tourism industry (n) Tourism development in our community protects wildlife and natural habitats (o) Tourism in our community is developed in harmony with the natural environment (p) Tourism development in our community promotes positive environmental ethics (q) Our community's natural environment is being protected now and for the future by the tourism industry
Individual profile 3: Perceived social costs	(r) Tourists in our community disrupt my quality of life (s) Our community is overcrowded because of tourism (t) Tourism is growing too fast in our community (u) Our community's recreational resources are overused by tourists
Individual profile 4: Self-evaluative tourism knowledge	Based on your experience, how would you rate your knowledge about tourism planning and development effort in your community?
Individual profile 5: Evaluation of current involvement	In your view, how involved are local residents in the tourism planning and decision-making process in your community?
Individual profile 6–10: Demographics	Gender, age, education, household income, and occupation

Differences in Involvement Preferences

To answer the first research question, a factor analysis using SPSS 16.0 program is first performed to determine the underlying dimensionality of involvement preferences and confirm whether it reveals the concerns about “depth” and “breadth” of community involvement. Respondents are then clustered based on their different preference dimensions, with clusters validated via discriminant analysis.

Table 2. Demographic profiles of respondents

Demographics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Female	158	45.5
Male	189	54.5
Age		
Young (≤ 40)	64	18.4
Mid-age (41–60)	145	41.8
Old (60+)	138	39.8
Job		
No tourism-related job	248	71.5
Tourism-related job	99	28.5
Household income (2009)		
Less than \$20,000	45	13
\$20,000–\$39,999	74	21.3
\$40,000–\$59,999	77	22.2
\$60,000–\$79,999	57	16.4
\$80,000–\$99,999	37	10.7
\$100,000 or more	57	16.4
Education level		
High school and below	103	29.7
Community college	120	34.6
Four-year college	67	19.3
Graduate school	57	16.4
Total	347	100

Dimensionality of Involvement Preferences

To identify whether residents interpret their community involvement in terms of levels of power authorization and involvement scope, the eight individual resident involvement preferences are factor-analysed using a principal components method with varimax rotation (see Table 3). Three factors are extracted with eigenvalues greater than 1 and together account for 67.7% of total variance. Cronbach's alpha values of the three factors are .734, .623, and .631, respectively. Two of three alpha values are less than 0.7 as suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1978), thus showing less acceptable levels of internal consistency for these two factors. Although deleting the item Q7R ("Sometimes it is acceptable to exclude community residents from tourism development decisions") increases the average alpha from 0.663 to the acceptable level of 0.707, the item deletion leads to a change in overall factor structure. With only two factors left, the useful information regarding involvement scope would be lost. Given the exploratory nature of the current study in adding the new dimension of involvement scope into community involvement typology, this data is crucial for understanding contributions of this dimension. Based on criteria established by Kaiser (1974) and Hair *et al.* (1995), with the appropriate factor loading (≥ 0.5) and eigenvalue (> 1), the item Q7R should be retained for further analysis to avoid loss of exploratory power of the factor structure.

The first factor of "community involvement in tourism planning" explains the 35.9% total variance ($\alpha = 0.73$) and does not specify any particular approach or level of involvement in decision-making. The second factor of "community involvement in tourism planning through decision-making" accounts for 12.89% of variance ($\alpha = 0.62$) and focuses on decision-making power of residents versus consultation only (Jamal and Getz, 1995; Tosun, 2006). The third factor of "equal involvement of every resident" explains the

Table 3. Summaries of extracted factors

Factors and items	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance (%)	α
Factor 1: Community involvement in tourism planning		2.87	35.91	0.73
It is necessary to include local residents in the tourism planning process	0.830			
Residents must be encouraged to assume leadership roles in tourism planning committees	0.764			
Community residents should have an opportunity to be involved in tourism development decision-making	0.756			
Factor 2: Community involvement in tourism planning through decision making		1.03	12.89	0.62
Local residents should be consulted in the tourism planning process but should not be decision makers	0.844			
Local residents should be involved in tourism planning discussions, but not in the decision-making process	0.847			
Factor 3: Equal involvement of every resident		1.51	18.89	0.63
Tourism decisions should be made by all members in a community regardless of a person's background	0.832			
Full participation by everyone in the community regarding tourism decisions is a must for successful tourism development	0.708			
Sometimes it is acceptable to exclude community residents from tourism development decisions	-0.631			

18.89% variance ($\alpha = 0.63$) and emphasizes the right of every resident to participate in tourism planning, decision-making, and development.

Tosun (2006) classified spontaneous, induced, or coercive participation based on whether residents are involved in tourism planning and if so, whether this includes decision-making; dimensions are also identified in the current study. The third factor of "equal involvement of every resident" identifies the breadth dimension of resident preferences, that of involvement scope. Both levels of power authorization and involvement scope are thereby revealed in the scale measuring involvement preferences.

New Typology of Community Involvement

To group residents based on their involvement preferences, hierarchical cluster analysis is performed on scores of three factors. Ward's (1963) hierarchical grouping method with squared Euclidean distance measure is chosen as the clustering method due to its ability to minimize distances within a cluster and maximize distances between clusters (Hair *et al.*, 1998). A four-group solution provides the best fit for the data, a conclusion drawn from observation of the dendrogram as well as agglomeration coefficients, which become large or have a large change when two fairly different clusters are combined (Hair *et al.*, 1998).

The identified four clusters have 105 (31%), 97 (28%), 112 (33%), and 27 (8%) cases comprising all 341 observations. A mean for each factor score is calculated for each cluster to help explain the differences among them (see Table 4).

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey's post hoc test compares the three dimensions of involvement preference between clusters and accordingly names clusters by their distinctive preference features: cluster 1: "decision-making by every resident", cluster 2: "decision-making by some residents", cluster 3: "decision-making not by residents" (residents used only as consultants), and cluster 4: "no planning involvement of

Table 4. Mean comparison of preference factor by clusters

Clustering variable	Cluster group				F ratio	p
	Decision-making (of planning process) by every resident	Decision-making (of planning process) not by every resident	Decision-making (of planning process) not by residents	No planning involvement of residents		
Factor 1: Community involvement in tourism planning	0.245 ^a	0.055 ^a	0.220 ^a	-2.094	68.145	0.000
Factor 2: Community involvement in tourism planning through decision making	-0.917	-0.177	0.982 ^a	0.153 ^a	147.767	0.000
Factor 3: Equal involvement of every resident	0.702	-1.023	0.434	0.005	148.577	0.000

^aReads across to indicate differences between clusters was not significant for ANOVA ($p < 0.05$).

residents.” The cluster analysis verifies the differences in Southeastern Indiana resident involvement preferences.

To assess the classification accuracy of cluster membership and identify which preference factors drive these differences (Hair *et al.*, 1998), a multiple discriminant analysis is performed with four cluster groups and three preference factors. The results (Table 5) show a reliable separation of the four groups. A Wilks’ lambda test and a univariate *F* test reveal that all preference factors make a statistically significant contribution to the three discriminant functions.

Individual Profiles as Predictors of Involvement Preferences

The second research question is examined with multivariate stepwise regression to explore possible influences of residents’ individual profiles on involvement preferences. Gender is recoded in the dummy variable before the regression, the three dimensions of preference (three factor scores) as dependent variables, and individual profiles as independent variables, noted in Table 6.

Table 5. Summary of discriminant analysis results

Statistic	Discriminant function 1	Discriminant function 2	Discriminant function 3
% of variance	45.6	37.5	16.8
Cumulative %	45.6	83.2	100
Eigenvalue	1.511 ^a	1.242 ^a	0.557 ^a
Canonical correlation	0.776	0.744	0.598
Wilks’ lambda	0.114	0.286	0.642
Chi-square	730.602	420.841	149.092
df	9	4	1
Significance level	0.000	0.000	0.000

Table 6. Stepwise regression analyses for involvement preferences and individual profiles

Independent variables	Dependent variables															
	Preference for community involvement in tourism planning					Preference for community involvement in tourism planning through decision making					Preference for equal involvement of every resident					
	<i>b</i>	SE	β	<i>t</i>	VIF	<i>b</i>	SE	β	<i>t</i>	VIF	<i>b</i>	SE	β	<i>t</i>	VIF	
Perceived social costs	-0.287	0.073	-0.200***	-3.91	1.004						0.239	0.089	0.144**	2.7	1.008	
Perceived environmental sustainability						-0.267	0.088	-0.164**	-3.05	1						
Tourism knowledge	0.197	0.042	0.239***	4.64	1.018											
Tourism employment	-0.313	0.099	-0.163**	-3.17	1.016											
Household income											-0.103	0.033	-0.167**	-3.14	1.008	
Intercept	0.241	0.197				0.864	0.283				-0.146	0.232				
Adjusted R^2	0.114					0.024					0.047					
<i>F</i> ratio	15.571***					9.326**					9.392***					

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$.

The values of VIF for all the independent variables, the tests of the extent of multicollinearity were very small. Therefore, there was no significant evidence of multicollinearity problem in the regression models.

Preference for Community Involvement in Tourism Planning

A combination of three profiles explains the 11.4% (adjusted R^2) total variance in measure of preference in tourism planning involvement ($F(3, 336) = 15.57, p < 0.001$). Self-evaluative tourism knowledge ($t = 4.64, p < 0.001$), perceived social costs from tourism ($t = -3.91, p < 0.001$), and tourism industry employment ($t = -3.17, p = 0.002$) uniquely explain the 5.1%, 3.9%, and 2.4% (adjusted R^2) the total variance, respectively.

As residents become increasingly confident about their tourism knowledge ($\beta = 0.24$), they tend to get more involved in tourism planning. This is in line with the previous research confirming that the absence of residents in tourism planning is often due to disinterest rooted in lack of knowledge (Keogh, 1990; Trakolis, 2001; Nicholas *et al.*, 2009). This study further proposes the importance of raising resident awareness of local tourism planning and development (e.g. through workshops and forums) to inspire such participation.

Additionally, the negative relationship between perceived social costs of tourism and preferences about involvement in tourism planning ($\beta = -0.20$) is in accordance with conclusions of Nicholas *et al.* (2009), which found that positive resident perceptions of tourism impacts could result in support for and participation in tourism development. Kibicho (2008) demonstrated that higher education levels correspond to active participation in tourism planning, as seen in this study, showing that those not working in the tourism industry tend to have a higher education level ($r = -0.17, p = 0.002$) and thus prefer joining tourism planning.

Preference for Community Involvement In Tourism Planning Through Decision-Making

Perceived environmental sustainability ($t = -3.05, p = 0.002$) explains the 2.4% (adjusted R^2) total variance in the measure of preference for community involvement preference in tourism planning through decision-making ($F(1, 338) = 9.33, p = 0.002$). The less environmental sustainability perceived from tourism, the more likely tourists are to become involved in tourism decision-making ($\beta = -0.164$). This is consistent with existing research results by Jamal and Getz (1995), who discovered that Canadian residents active in tourism decision-making feel the local environment suffers rather than benefits from tourism development. Residents in this case hope to take control over local tourism development as a way to solve tourism-related environmental problems overlooked by powerful interest groups.

Preference for Equal Involvement of Every Resident

Household income ($t = -3.14, p = 0.002$) and perceived social costs from tourism ($t = 2.70, p = 0.007$), respectively, explain the 2.9% and 1.8% (adjusted R^2) total variance in measure of preference for everyone's involvement ($F(2, 337) = 9.39, p < 0.01$). Lower-income residents may hope to share economic benefits of tourism, and those who perceive more social costs from tourism may hope to claim compensation for their loss. Their unresolved concerns and a feeling of being under-represented or excluded from tourism development may also reflect an awareness of the need for all residents to become involved.

Conclusions

This study contributes to the understanding of community involvement in tourism planning and development by extending Tosun's (2006) typology based on the "depth" of

involvement with a new dimension that reveals the “breadth” of involvement, “involvement scope”. Residents’ varied involvement preferences are accordingly identified based on their different perceptions about the depth and breadth of community involvement. The four identified involvement preferences confirm that spontaneity of residents in tourism planning participation is heterogeneous. The distribution of residents across these four involvement preferences could identify at which stage local communities may be placed in reaching towards the goal of effective community empowerment. In this study, 31% of residents look forward to the empowerment of everyone, 28% prefer the empowerment of some residents in decision-making, 33% only hope to be consulted by authorities rather than make decisions, whereas 8% prefer not to participate in tourism planning at all. Indisputably, these response levels are superior to some regions where literacy rates are low and residents generally rely on governments to plan their tourism development (Choguill, 1996). To reach the highest level of spontaneity required in full community empowerment, wherein every possible resident willingly initiates plans and makes decisions, the study region has room for improvement.

In order to avoid exclusion of any residents who prefer involvement approaches other than those assigned by authorities, the powerful interest groups have two possible approaches to involve residents: to respect the variety of involvement preferences within local communities, or to convince residents into community empowerment. For the former approach, applying a combination of involvement approaches from which residents can freely choose helps collect as much support from them as possible, and reduces the portion of non-participants whose concerns may be ignored, as well as subsequent negative outcomes. However, the problem arises of whether residents’ opinions expressed through different involvement approaches are weighted equally in the final decision-making process. If not, then the unfair empowerment still exists within the community despite the fact that residents themselves choose the involvement approaches. This application requires further exploration, as most existing applications of multiple involvement techniques are designed for the purpose of project efficiency, rather than for maximizing residents’ involvement (Rowat and Engelhardt, 2007). The other option is for powerful interest groups to enhance the desire for empowerment among the less active residents, starting by educating them on the impacts of the decision-making process in tourism development even if it goes against some of their financial interests and complicates the process. The merit of such action is to maximally prevent the voice of every resident from being ignored.

Besides analysing different types of involvement preferences among residents in this study, individual profiles that may affect preferences for depth and breadth of community involvement are investigated to reveal possible reasons for encouraging or discouraging residents to pursue empowerment. With the goal of community empowerment in these processes and outcomes, strategies are accordingly proposed to enhance and satisfy residents’ desire for empowerment.

First of all, building resident confidence in their potential contribution to local tourism development is crucial for attracting active involvement in planning and decision-making. As shown in study results, whether or not lack of involvement is connected to lower education levels or less knowledge about tourism, both are likely to result in residents’ lack of confidence in their capability to influence the planning process and the future of their community as a whole. Several strategies should thus be adopted to raise self-confidence in planning participation. Primarily, residents should be educated about local tourism development and planning, and how their participation may affect specific outcomes, and they should also be given the skills to implement action. An obstacle to this is current planning descriptions and reports, which are full of technical jargon that prevents most residents

from comprehending and thus influencing the planning process (Shani and Pizam, 2012). A more understandable planning process designed to be easily accessible to each resident is necessary for encouraging input and raising their confidence in contributing. Also, local residents often have a better understanding of community resources, limitations, needs, and consequences of tourism development than industry planners. Their rich local knowledge should thus be respected and fully utilized in tourism planning. Treating them as partners would also inspire them to be committed to local tourism development as well as other forms of development, where the community's acceptance or welcoming of tourists and businesses thereafter would bring benefits for all parties and help sustain these developments into the future.

Secondly, previous studies have suggested that "perceived economic benefits" is the most crucial factor influencing residents' spontaneous pursuit of power in tourism planning (Nyaupane *et al.*, 2006; Nicholas *et al.*, 2009; Wyman and Stein, 2010). This study, however, identifies perceived environmental sustainability rather than perceived economic benefits as influencing residents' desire for empowerment. Yet the personal economic benefits from tourism may not be the primary concern among most residents involved in this study, given their relatively high household income in average. Of course, residents with higher incomes may also be concerned for their community at large, especially when addressing detrimental environmental effects, increased or decreased property values, or community resource improvements or depletions resulting from tourism development. The increased environmental ethics and less economic concern of residents in developed regions as opposed to underdeveloped regions may in any case explain some of these results.

The strong desire for empowerment from residents with high environmental ethics may suggest their dissatisfaction with the authorities' resolution of environmental issues and the wish to initiate sustainable tourism development. Authorities should thus involve residents concerned with the environment in decision-making, as these residents could be the leaders in promoting the overall sustainability of local tourism development in the future. For example, a committee composed of these residents should be allowed to decide on environmental issues in league with powerful interest groups, a process that can extend beyond tourist issues to encompass many important community projects, improvements, and planning procedures. For residents who lack interest in empowerment in tourism development, education that raises their environmental ethics and connects the process to specific outcomes that may affect their lives may help raise their interest in community empowerment, protection, and enhancement in general.

The identified influence of perceived environmental sustainability on involvement preferences, together with the influence of planning involvement on residents' perception of tourism impacts claimed by Lankford (1994), suggest a possible mutually influential relationship between residents' perceived tourism impacts and their involvement in tourism planning.

Thirdly, the results also suggest that residents who may have been underrepresented in current tourism planning are active supporters of equal community involvement. These residents often have lower income levels, or perceive more social costs of tourism. Their desire for sharing benefits from tourism or receiving compensation for social costs has generally not yet been satisfied. As such, influential groups and individuals should voluntarily ensure the involvement of more disenfranchised groups within local communities to better achieve equal empowerment and to enhance operations of tourism industries that draw employees from this population. All residents possibly influenced negatively by tourism projects, whether in economic, environmental, or social costs,

should be empowered in tourism planning and contribute to a more democratic and comprehensive process in decision-making.

Another issue to be noticed in study results is that residents perceiving more social costs of tourism hope to be compensated in the tourism development but are not passionate about planning participation, possibly due to a negative image of tourism resulting from its harmful social consequences. The authorities should be mindful of how significant a positive image about local tourism development may be in encouraging residents' participation in tourism planning.

A final word should be said about the fact that the multivariate regression model in this study can only explain the 11.4%, 4.7%, and 2.4% total variance in the three dimensions of preferences with proposed individual profiles. These figures suggest that some other predictive individual profiles are still left to be explored, such as those influential to community involvement in any activity or entity other than tourism development, including individual community attachments, personalities, and so forth. These possible profiles are most likely connected to the inner drive of involvement preferences, and may thus explain the majority of variations in such preferences in this study. Realistically speaking, it is relatively hard or even impossible for powerful interest groups to change certain inner structures already in place during the planning period, where exploring these affective profiles is less practical compared to the investigation of demographic and perceptual profiles.

The less-than-ideal reliability of scales measuring involvement preferences is a limitation of this study. Limited choices of scales to measure resident involvement preferences in tourism planning are due to the fact that outside of Tosun's (2006) study, there is little research on these preferences. Future study is needed to improve the reliability of the scales, for example by rewording the item Q7R from Choi and Sirakaya's (2005) study. Additionally, in the sample distribution of this study, a limited number of residents have tourism-related jobs ($N = 97$), which may cause bias in analysing the variable "tourism industry employment".

Finally, given the different involvement preferences found among residents, this research presents another compelling problem for researchers to investigate: how to step towards the final aspiration of community empowerment that allows most residents in a community to make decisions in tourism planning in light of power interests that may work against this goal, and against residents themselves who choose not to participate. Admittedly, ensuring resident involvement in decision-making is certainly a challenge, as it requires huge amounts of time and resources for both the powerful interest groups and residents alike (Sebele, 2010). Progress has been made in technology to make community involvement in tourism planning easier, by allowing residents to provide feedback through online networks and other communication outlets (Stewart and Draper, 2009). Convenience in communications, however, is not enough to encourage residents to actively participate. Strategies should be developed to inspire their motivation to contribute to community development and meanwhile remove the objective barriers (lack of capability and resources) and subjective barriers (lack of confidence) for their active engagement. Application and evaluation of such strategies are worthy of further study, particularly with regard to the increased quality of life for communities, and the long-term benefits for tourism development (Roseland and Connelly, 2005; Lapeyre, 2010).

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to Cem M. Basman for his comments.

Notes on Contributors

Ye Zhang is a PhD student at Indiana University, USA, majoring in leisure behaviour, with specification in tourism decision-making studies, tourism demand forecasting, and psychological benefits of tourism.

Shu T. Cole is Associate Professor at Indiana University, with expertise in tourist experience management and tourists' service evaluations.

Charles H. Chancellor is Assistant Professor at Indiana University, with expertise in tourist travel patterns, GIS, land trust and tourism collaboration.

References

- Arnstein, S.R. (1969) A Ladder of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Institute of planners*, 35(4), pp. 216–24.
- Bhattacharya, B. (2011) *Community initiatives in achieving sustainability through inclusive tourism practices*. Paper presented at the Articles and Case Studies: Inclusive & Sustainable Growth Conference.
- Blackstock, K. (2005) A Critical Look at Community Based Tourism, *Community Development Journal*, 40(1), pp. 39.
- Botes, L. and Van Rensburg, D. (2000) Community Participation in Development: Nine Plagues and Twelve Commandments, *Community Development Journal*, 35(1), pp. 41–58.
- Chancellor, C., Yu, C.P.S. and Cole, S.T. (2011) Exploring Quality of Life Perceptions in Rural Midwestern (USA) Communities: An Application of the Core–Periphery Concept in a Tourism Development Context, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(5), pp. 496–507.
- Choguill, M.B.G. (1996) A Ladder of Community Participation for Underdeveloped Countries, *Habitat International*, 20(3), pp. 431–44.
- Choi, H.S.C. and Sirakaya, E. (2005) Measuring Residents' Attitude Toward Sustainable Tourism: Development of Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale, *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(4), pp. 380.
- Choi, H.S.C. and Sirakaya, E. (2006) Sustainability Indicators for Managing Community Tourism, *Tourism Management*, 27(6), pp. 1274–1289.
- Cochran, W. (1963) Lattice Dynamics of Sodium, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 276(1366), pp. 308.
- Cole, S. (2006) Information and Empowerment: The Keys to Achieving Sustainable Tourism, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(6), pp. 629–44.
- Commerce Region 9: Southeastern Indiana. (n.d.) Retrieved October 14, 2009, from <http://www.incontext.indiana.edu/2003/may-jun03/workforce.asp>.
- Hair, J.F., Jr, Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W.C. (1995) *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall).
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W.C. (1998) *Multivariate Data Analysis* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall).
- Hall, C.M. (2008) *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*, 2nd ed. (Harlow: Prentice Hall).
- Hibbard, M. and Lurie, S. (2000) Saving Land but Losing Ground, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20(2), pp. 187.
- Jago, L., Fredline, L. and Deery, M. (2006) Tourism in a Small Community: Risks and Benefits, *Tourism Review International*, 10(1), pp. 91–101.
- Jamal, T.B. and Getz, D. (1995) Collaboration Theory and Community Tourism Planning, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), pp. 186–204.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1974) An Index of Factorial Simplicity, *Psychometrika*, 39(1), pp. 31–36.
- Keogh, B. (1990) Public Participation in Community Tourism Planning, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), pp. 449–65.
- Kibicho, W. (2008) Community-Based Tourism: A Factor-Cluster Segmentation Approach, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(2), pp. 211–31. doi: 10.2167/jost623.0
- Lankford, S.V. (1994) Attitudes and Perceptions Toward Tourism and Rural Regional Development, *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), pp. 35.
- Lapeyre, R. (2010) Community-Based Tourism as a Sustainable Solution to Maximise Impacts Locally? The Tsiseb Conservancy Case, Namibia, *Development Southern Africa*, 27(5), pp. 757–72.

- Leksakundilok, A. (2006) Community Participation in Ecotourism Development in Thailand, University of Sydney, Geosciences.
- MacLeavy, J. (2009) (Re) Analysing Community Empowerment: Rationalities and Technologies of Government in Bristol's New Deal for Communities, *Urban Studies*, 46(4), pp. 849.
- Marcouiller, D.W. (1997) Toward Integrative Tourism Planning in Rural America, *Journal of Planning Literature*, 11(3), p. 337.
- Marzuki, A. (2008) Decision Making and Community Participation: A Case Study of the Tourism Industry in Langkawi, *Tourism*, 56(3), pp. 227–41.
- Michael, M. (2009) *Community Involvement and Participation in Tourism Development in Tanzania: A Case Study of Local Communities in Barabarani Village, Mto wa Mbu, Arusha-Tanzania*. Unpublished master's thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Mowforth, M. and Munt, I. (2008) *Tourism and Sustainability: Development, Globalisation and New Tourism in the Third World* (New York: Routledge).
- Nicholas, L.N., Thapa, B. and Ko, Y.J. (2009) Residents' Perspectives of a World Heritage Site: The Pitons Management Area, St Lucia, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), pp. 390–412. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2009.03.005
- Nunnally, J.C. and Bernstein, I.H. (1978) *Psychometric Theory* (New York: McGraw-Hill).
- Nyaupane, G.P., Morais, D.B. and Dowler, L. (2006) The Role of Community Involvement and Number/Type of Visitors on Tourism Impacts: A Controlled Comparison of Annapurna, Nepal and Northwest Yunnan, China, *Tourism Management*, 27(6), pp. 1373–85.
- Okazaki, E. (2008) A Community-Based Tourism Model: Its Conception and Use, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(5), pp. 511–29.
- Oviedo-Garcia, M., Castellanos-Verdugo, M. and Martin-Ruiz, D. (2008) Gaining Residents' Support for Tourism and Planning, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(2), pp. 95–109.
- Petrić, L. (2007) Empowerment of Communities for Sustainable Tourism Development: Case of Croatia, *Turizam*, 55(4), pp. 431–443.
- Petty, J. (1995) The Many Interpretations of Community Participation, *Focus*, 16, pp. 5–10.
- Puhakka, R., Sarkki, S., Cottrell, S.P. and Siikamäki, P. (2009) Local Discourses and International Initiatives: Sociocultural Sustainability of Tourism in Oulanka National Park, Finland, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 17(5), pp. 529–49.
- Reed, M.G. (1997) Power Relations and Community-Based Tourism Planning, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), pp. 566–91.
- Richards, G. and Hall, D. (2000) The Community: A Sustainable Concept in Tourism Development, *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*, 7, pp. 1–13.
- Roseland, M. and Connelly, S. (2005) *Toward Sustainable Communities: Resources for Citizens and their Governments* (Gabriola Island, BC: New Society).
- Rowat, D. and Engelhardt, U. (2007) Seychelles: A Case Study of Community Involvement in the Development of Whale Shark Ecotourism and its Socio-Economic Impact, *Fisheries Research*, 84(1), pp. 109–13.
- Rowland, M., Hewitt, S., Durrani, N., Saleh, P., Bouma, M. and Sondorp, E. (1997) Sustainability of Pyrethroid-Impregnated Bednets for Malaria Control In Afghan Communities, *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 75(1), pp. 23.
- Salant, P., and Dillman, D.A. (1994) *How to Conduct Your Own Survey* (New York: Wiley).
- Sawyer, L.M. (1995) Community Participation: Lip Service? *Nursing Outlook*, 43(1), pp. 17–22.
- Scheyvens, R. (1999) Ecotourism and the Empowerment of Local Communities, *Tourism Management*, 20, pp. 245–50.
- Sebele, L.S. (2010) Community-Based Tourism Ventures, Benefits And Challenges: Khama Rhino Sanctuary Trust, Central District, Botswana, *Tourism Management*, 31(1), pp. 136–46.
- Shani, A. and Pizam, A. (2012) Community Participation in Tourism Planning and Development, in: M. Uysal, R. Perdue and M.J. Sirgy (Eds) *Handbook of Tourism and Quality-of-Life Research*, pp. 547–64 (Netherlands: Springer).
- Simmons, D.G. (1994) Community Participation in Tourism Planning, *Tourism Management*, 15(2), pp. 98–108.
- Sofield, T.H.B. (2003) *Empowerment for Sustainable Tourism Development* (Oxford: Pergamon).
- Stewart, E.J. and Draper, D. (2009) Reporting Back Research Findings: A Case Study of Community-Based Tourism Research in Northern Canada, *Journal of Ecotourism*, 8(2), pp. 128–43.
- Timothy, D.J. (1999) Participatory Planning: A View of Tourism in Indonesia, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), pp. 371–91.
- Tosun, C. (2000) Limits to Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process in Developing Countries, *Tourism Management*, 21(6), pp. 613–33.
- Tosun, C. (2006) Expected Nature of Community Participation in Tourism Development, *Tourism Management*, 27(3), pp. 493–504.

- Trakolis, D. (2001) Local People's Perceptions of Planning and Management Issues in Prespes Lakes National Park, Greece, *Journal of Environmental Management*, 61(3), pp. 227–41.
- Ward, J.H. (1963) Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(301), pp. 236–44.
- Wyman, M. and Stein, T. (2010) Examining the Linkages Between Community Benefits, Place-Based Meanings, and Conservation Program Involvement: A Study Within the Community Baboon Sanctuary, Belize, *Society and Natural Resources*, 23(6), pp. 542–56.