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In evaluating the social implications of tourism it can best be described as representing an achievement crisis. An achievement crisis exists when the implementation of a plan or policy results in some definite benefit or achievements but which in making these achievements, brings with it a number of problems or crises as well.

Dr. Farley Braithwaite, Barbados
This study addressed the issue of residents' perception of tourism in two Small Island developing states and sought to compare resident's support for tourism between a mature destination and a less developed destination. This was achieved using a linear model, based on previous work by Jurowski et al (1997). Another objective was to compare the findings with those of a previous study conducted in 1990. Employing ethnographic techniques, the research was carried out on the two peripheral communities of Speightstown and Charlotteville in the Caribbean islands of Barbados and Tobago, respectively. The first stage involved a pilot study which consisted of two focus group meetings. The outcome of these sessions provided useful information for refining the draft questionnaire, which underwent further refinement after piloting on the streets. The second stage was the main survey of 420 residents conducted over 8 weeks using the questionnaire as an interview schedule.

The findings suggest that there is widespread support for tourism development in both communities despite their varying levels of tourism sophistication and residents' perceptions of negative consequences of tourism. This apparent paradox was explained by Social Exchange Theory. Key variables which influence support for tourism were found to be personal and community benefits, socio-environmental impacts and community attachment. A proposed Caribbean Tourism Support Model was found to be more applicable in the Barbados context and this may suggest that several other factors influence tourism support in emerging destinations such as Tobago.

This study makes a useful contribution to the body of knowledge on hosts' perceptions of tourism as it builds on previous research conducted in other countries while it provides empirical evidence of the applicability of established theories reported in the subject literature. Further, its significance is also derived not only from its use of consistent methodologies in each of the two study areas, but also in the fact that both surveys were conducted within the same timeframe. In this light, it may be considered pioneering research. Nonetheless, this study remains exploratory in nature indicating that further research is necessary in developing a deterministic model of support for tourism development in a contemporary Caribbean context.
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Tourism as a social phenomenon

Murphy (1985) defines tourism as a sociocultural event for both the guest and host. He suggests that more emphasis has been placed on the convenience of tourists, and any local disillusionment with the industry has been given less of a priority. Nevertheless, destinations have been inconvenienced by congestion and debased by certain staged events and attractions, and there is also growing concern over the acculturation process of tourism. He argued that if tourism is to merit its pseudonym of being ‘the hospitality industry’ it must look beyond its own doors and employees to consider the social and cultural impacts it is having on the host community at large (p.133)

The rapid expansion of tourism in the latter part of the 20th century has led to changes in the structure of society. Some of these may be welcome: improving income, education, employment opportunities and local infrastructure and services (Lankford 1994; McCool and Martin 1994; Ross 1992). Others may be less welcome: social and family values challenged, new economically powerful groups emerging, and cultural practices adapted to suit the needs of tourists (Ap and Crompton 1993; Johnson, Snepenger and Akis 1994).

Other consequences of tourism development arise because consumers must travel to collect the goods (Crick 1989 p.310). In this context, the expansion of international
tourism has increased the contact among different societies and cultures. To some, interaction threatens to destroy traditions, while to others, it represents an opportunity for peace, understanding and greater knowledge among different societies and nations. Such social impacts can be described as those which have a more immediate effect on both tourists and host communities in terms of their quality of life (Sharpely 1994). As Mathieson and Wall (1982) suggest, these impacts can change through time in response to structural changes in the industry, and the extent and duration of the exposure of the host population to tourist development. For instance, Allen Long Perdue and Kieselbach (1988) argue that residents' attitudes toward tourism may be directly related to the degree or stage of development.

**Background of the study**

Throughout the world, development in tourism has been generally concerned with increasing tourist flows through market penetration and expansion. This focus has evolved primarily because destination governments aim to exploit the potential of the industry in order to generate income and employment for their citizens. Perhaps more significantly, this approach is fuelled by the forces of competition among destinations vying for higher levels of tourist traffic, a common indicator of success in tourism marketing.

In the case of developing countries, tourism brings much-needed foreign exchange to service international debts. However this pre-occupation with market orientation, while important, has resulted in a skewed approach to tourism development on the part
of authorities charged with the responsibility for managing the industry. In the process, governments and local authorities, the purveyors of the tourism product, have paid token attention to institutional and infrastructural maintenance duties, critical to the sustainable development of tourism. To this end, it is asserted that in many developing countries, the industry faces severe threats to its competitiveness and its long-term survival.

Tourism Impact studies

In recent years, the impact of tourism on host governments and residents has been a growing area of research as it has become widely recognized that planners and entrepreneurs must take the views of the host community into account if the industry is to be sustainable in the long term (Allen Long Perdue and Kieselbach 1988; Ap and Crompton 1998; Belisle and Hoy 1980; Doxey 1975; Maddox 1985; Murphy 1983). There are several reasons why resident reaction to tourism is important, not least of which is the quality of life of the host community. Additionally, commercial tourism ventures may be hampered or terminated by excessive negative resident sentiment toward this development. Research into the antecedents of resident reaction to tourism can help planners (Williams and Lawson 2001). If it is known why residents support or oppose the industry, it will be possible to select those developments which can minimize negative social impacts and maximize support for such alternatives. As such, quality of life for residents can be enhanced, or at least, maintained, with respect to the impact of tourism in the community.
Social Impact Studies on Caribbean Tourism

This researcher has developed a keen interest in the subject, having been closely involved for several years in the administration of tourism on the Caribbean island of Tobago. This experience allowed the author an opportunity to monitor changing trends in the industry and to observe how these changes impacted the destination community. It is pertinent to this study to briefly explore some of the author’s observations which have contributed toward the rationale for undertaking this piece of research.

Despite its long history of being involved in tourism, research on Caribbean tourism is mainly restricted to socio-economic analyses and environmental studies, with few attempts made to investigate social phenomena relating to tourism. With regard to Tobago, empirical research on social impacts date as far back as 1974 (Abdullah). This study was later supplemented by a report commissioned by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, which focussed on four Caribbean islands, including Tobago (UNECLAC 1992) and Barbados (UNECLAC 1991). That study addressed two main objectives:

1. To analyze the positive and negative socio-cultural aspects of tourism as perceived by the local population, and
2. To analyze the positive and negative socio-cultural aspects of tourism as perceived by employees and employers. (UNECLAC 1991)

The UNECLAC study explored many of the parameters investigated in the present study and provides a useful baseline against which the results of the present study can
be viewed. However, being national in scope, it differed from the present study in that it did not focus exclusively on residents' perceptions nor did it address peripheral communities. Further the UNECLAC study did not seek to draw a comparative analysis between the islands surveyed. Following that study, several unpublished studies targeted visitor harassment and crime in relation to tourism in Barbados (Rowling 1992; Poulter 1992; CTO 1993; Applied Marketing Consultants 1994; Carnegie 1994; Barrow 1994; Long and Ciotta 1999; Durant 2000), a subject that bears some correlation with this area of research. This apparent rash of commissioned research into crime and tourism would suggest that there is a widely held perception of a causal relationship between the two variables.

Social Exclusion

In the Caribbean, development, particularly that of the hotel variety, appears to have been largely imposed on local communities on the premise that it is the panacea for the endemic high levels of unemployment. Jalousie Plantation Resort in St. Lucia is just one example, among many, of this insular approach to development. Quite contrary to the rhetoric found in many policy documents and national development plans, this has been the common experience of wide cross-sections of the Caribbean community. It has led to marginalization of local people to such an extent that many seem to have become apathetic, assuming the role of passive bystanders in the development process. This perceived failure on the part of public administrations and private developers to adopt a consultative approach and to engage in meaningful
dialogue over the community’s concerns, has contributed to an industry increasingly characterized by latent tensions, strife and animated protests.

This progressive and implicit alienation of residents, is often compounded by a system which frustrates local entrepreneurial spirit, relegating locals to menial work, while perpetuating dominance of the industry by local elites and foreign interests (Matthews 2000). Governments’ rhetoric in promoting tourism as a means for improving the quality of life for its citizens therefore, seldom matches the reality of daily living. Over the last decade, these issues have become of greater concern to the international community, particularly among pressure groups and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO).

Tourism and Fair Trade

Recent development in the Fair Trade Movement has been placing increasing pressure on the trade organizations and consumers to redress the blatant inequity in North-South trading relations. While these initiatives seek to influence international treaties such as the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS), more targeted efforts are being made by Tourism Concern, a registered charity headquartered in London as well as similar organizations around mainland Europe.

Tourism Concern has strategic links with major tour operators and wholesalers who control the bulk of outbound travel to long haul destinations, such as the Caribbean. Despite their limited resources, this charity has been making significant strides in
increasing awareness of the need for local host people to benefit from the tourism trade.

At the time of writing, the researcher was invited to present a southern perspective to a cross-section of the British travel trade at a seminar on Corporate Social Responsibility. While this initiative has sparked a significant debate on the issue of tour operators' responsibility to their destination communities, it has also generated some discussion on how tour operators can better accommodate host communities as important stakeholders in the tourism chain. Given the fact that tourism flows are controlled, even manipulated by a cartel of foreign tour operators, the prognosis for meaningful change weighs heavily on ethics in the tourism trade.

The need for empirical research

Sharpely (1994) points out that a considerable amount of research has been undertaken into the desires, motivations and behaviour of tourists in relation to their impact on host societies. Krippendorf (1987) also notes that the psychology and sociology of tourism have so far been largely concerned with the tourists' views and behaviour. More recently, however, numerous studies have focused on residents' attitudes, tourists, and tourism development (Ap and Crompton 1993; Hernandez, Cohen and Garcia 1996; Johnson Snehenger and Akis 1994; Lankford 1994; Lankford and Howard 1994; Lankford, Williams and Knowles-Lankford 1997; Lea, Kemp and Willetts 1994; Me Cool and Martin 1994; Schroeder 1996; Ross 1992; Ryan and Montgomery 1994).
Matheson and Wall (1982) point out that although many studies make passing reference to the existence of social impacts, both positive and negative, most cast little light on their nature or the means for their investigation. They argue that research should be directed more explicitly at determining the perceptions and attitudes of the host population towards the presence and behaviour of tourists; and unless local inhabitants are contacted, it may not be possible to identify the real significance of any change.

Some scholars have suggested that although the social impact of tourism has been extensively studied, it should be further investigated in other geographical locations. This is necessary in order to ‘form the foundation of some new hypotheses in the development of a theory of the social impacts of tourism’ (King Pizam and Milman 1993 p.663). However, Dann Nash and Pearce (1988) and van Doorn (1989) have argued that it is not easy to derive theory from individual tourism impact case studies, since each individual case brings with it so many idiosyncratic peculiarities.

Formulation of the problem

Levels of tourism dependency

The Caribbean islands present an interesting comparative case study because each island can be classified into one of three development scenarios: emerging, intermediate or mature (Alburquerque and McElroy 1992). Appendix 1 shows a stage classification of small Caribbean islands. To this extent they are indicative of Butler’s
Tourism Life Cycle model which characterizes destinations according to their stage of evolution: exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation or decline (discussed in Chapter Three). Further, their individual reliance on tourism varies from country to country; some having more diversified economies than others.

For example, tourism contributes less than 2% of national output in Trinidad and Tobago, while on the other hand, it constitutes the mainstay of the Barbados economy. The actual significance of tourism to the economy of Tobago alone is not known as statistics are aggregated on a country level. However, it is estimated that tourism activity in Tobago presently accounts for more than 20% of economic output (Tobago News 1995 quoted in Weaver 1998). In such circumstances, it would seem reasonable to assume that the extent to which local people are dependent on tourism for their individual and collective welfare, would influence their attitudes to development of the industry. Moreover, in communities which derive little or no benefit from tourism activity, support for such type of activity is likely to be low.

This hypothesis is challenged by other theories which state that communities which personify the exploration stage in Butler's Tourist Area Life Cycle or which are categorized as 'emerging' destinations by other scholars (Albuquerque and McElroy 1992), may be considered as 'tourism-hungry' under the tourism-dependence typology suggested by Smith and Krannich (1998). In this paradigm, residents are eager to receive tourists and to get involved in the industry because of the benefits it promises to deliver. Accordingly, it is postulated that residents are likely to be motivated to
favour further development to such an extent, as to become a tourism-realized destination.

**Heterogeneous Community**

Previous research has shown that residents' perceptions vary even within a single community (Mason and Cheyne 2000; Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996; Tomljenovic and Faulkner 2000), demonstrating that perhaps, level of reliance on tourism is not the only variable to be considered in researching support for tourism. The presence of such heterogeneity among the constituents of a host community has presented a challenge to researchers in their quest for developing a deterministic model to predict level of support for further tourism development. Over the last three decades, empirical studies have explored the impact of several independent variables ranging from such demographic factors as age, income, employment and education to distance from the centre of tourist activity to the destination's level of tourism activity.

**Impacting Variables**

Empirical research has also engaged other issues such as crowding and congestion (Burns and Holden (1995), access to recreation (Peristianis and Warner 1996), level of tourism awareness (Keogh 1990), community attachment (McCool and Martin 1994), personal benefits (Madrigal 1993), community benefits, involvement in tourism (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997) and residents' perception of economic, social and environmental impacts on hosts and their community. A discussion of the variables
explored in empirical research is undertaken in the next chapter and a summary is presented in Appendix 2.

Researchers have demonstrated that economic benefits positively impact resident perceptions of tourism and that social and environmental detriments have the opposite effects (Ap 1992a; Lui and Var 1986; Pizam 1978; Prentice 1993; Tyrell 1984). Matheson and Wall (1982) suggest that most of the specialized academic articles on the subject ‘are descriptive and they usually lack a strong theoretical or analytical foundation’ (p.134). A decade later, Ap (1992b) described the theoretical orientation of the literature on residents’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism as ‘underdeveloped.’

**Contradictory Findings**

What is particularly noticeable on perusing the findings, is the existence of contradictory results that have been generated by different researchers. For example, with regard to distance from centre of tourism activity, studies conducted by Belisle and Hoy (1980), Sheldon and Var (1984) and Mansfeld (1992) all found that residents in higher tourist density areas were most positive about tourism while the reverse was found to be true in findings reported by Keogh (1990). A similar pattern emerged in the investigation of level of contact with tourists; Pizam (1978) reported that residents with more contact were negative about tourism while Rothman (1978) revealed that high levels of contact resulted in positive perceptions of tourism.
Local community support

The support of the indigenous population is essential for the development, successful operation and sustainability of tourism (Jurowski et al 1997). The literature on tourism has emphasized that resident attitudes have significance in creating a hospitable (Coccossis and Parpairis 1992) and an attractive (Var, Beck and Loftus 1977) environment for tourists in general. Further, there is increasing evidence that the appropriate level for analyzing tourism impacts is the community, since the greatest impacts of the industry are felt within the host system (Tyrell and Toepper 1991). Most of the community studies have therefore focussed on residents’ attitudes and perceptions of tourism and its impacts.

Achieving the goal of favourable community support for the tourism industry requires an understanding of how residents formulate their attitudes towards tourism. Ayers and Potter (1989) noted that even though attitudes toward community change are subjective, they can and should be measured:

The attitudes of residents and leaders toward change in the community are believed to play a very important part in determining the types of social action undertaken in the community and the levels of support or resistance to change (p.13).

Perceptions inform Planning

From a management perspective, social and cultural impacts of tourism should be considered throughout the planning process, so that benefits can be optimized and
problems mitigated. An important general planning policy to reinforce positive and mitigate negative impacts is the involvement of communities so that residents understand tourism, have participated in its decision-making, and receive benefits from the industry (Kavallinis and Pizam 1994; McIntyre Hetherington and Inskeep 1993). Likewise, Ap (1992) and Lankford (1994) point out that the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards the impacts of tourism are likely to be an important planning and policy consideration for successful development, marketing and operation of existing and future programmes and projects.

Small scale

It has been argued that community size is important in relation to the degree of reaction to tourism development and that small communities will reveal the most concern (Capenerhurst 1994). Pearce et al (1996) argued the need for investigations of ‘fewer sites, explored in greater detail’ (p.137). They claim that it is not dependence and seasonality that affects resident responses, but the issue of small community size and the visibility of tourism. They suggest that the smaller the community, the more visible the tourism development and hence the stronger the views. Pearce et al argued specifically for more detailed small-scale studies of locations in New Zealand affected by tourism, as an alternative to the large-scale national surveys. The field research conducted by Mason and Cheyne (2000) in the Pohangina Valley has tended to confirm the arguments of Capenerhurst and of Pearce and associates that the smaller the community, the more visible the tourism development and the stronger the views held.
Comparative Studies

Gaps in Research

While there have been some comparative studies, these have largely addressed communities located within the same state (Smith and Krannich 1998) or country (Murphy 1983; Lankford 1994). Very few have sought to compare the data for cross-cultural communities in different countries (Pizam Milman and King 1993). The same is true for comparative studies involving the application of consistent methodologies to different types of community (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997). Among those that have been done, there has been a tendency to focus on one dimension of variation only. Murphy (1981) studied three communities experiencing different types of tourist influx while Allen et al (1988) examined reactions in 20 communities where the percentage of retail sales attributable to tourism was used as a surrogate for the level of tourism development. Other studies involving multiple communities (e.g. Perdue et al 1990) do not explicitly explore the linkage between the stage of tourism development and resident reactions.

Cross cultural comparisms

Pizam Milman and King (1994) compared the perceptions of tourism industry employees and their families in a developing country (Nadi, Fiji), with their equivalents in a developed country (Central Florida, USA). More recently, however, Tosun (2002) conducted an analysis of residents’ perceptions on Urgup, Turkey and compared his findings with the same two previous studies in Nadi, Fiji (King Pizam and Milman 1993) and in Central Florida (Milman and Pizam 1988). Faulkner and
Tideswell’s (1997) work on Australia’s Gold Coast has some parallels with the present study in that it employed consistent methodology in every sample surveyed, while Tosun, on the other hand, explored the cross-cultural dimension albeit over different time scales and employing different methodologies.

Significance of this study

Consistent research design and implementation

In contrast, the present study was carried out over a two-month period (February to March) 2001, on two communities in the Caribbean islands of Tobago and Barbados. While some commentators may argue that there are no cultural differences between Caribbean communities, this researcher begs to differ on account of his personal experience of living and travelling in the region. This study builds on previous work done by other researchers on hosts’ perceptions of tourism’s impact on their communities. It explored residents’ perceptions across two culturally diverse communities at different stages of development. It employed strict controls on the research methodology to ensure that the data were gathered and recorded under similar controlled conditions. A detailed discussion of the research design is presented in Chapters 7 and 8.

Introduction of new variables

There is no evidence to suggest that residents’ perception of tourism work had been considered as a factor influencing support for tourism. Additionally, residents’ experience of travel (which puts them in the role of tourist) has not undergone any
investigation in empirical research recorded to date. Brunt and Courtney (1999), in their study of Dawlish, a British coastal resort, first suggested that travel experiences should be considered as an independent variable in the determination of support for tourism development. The present study therefore set out to test some of the variables which have undergone previous analysis, as well as these two new parameters.

Suitability of Research Areas

Tobago and Barbados are appropriate subjects for examining hosts’ perceptions in a comparative context for several reasons related to their history, economy and size. While Tobago is regarded as an emerging destination, Barbados, on the other hand, has a well-established, mature tourism economy. This distinction presents the researcher with an opportunity to examine perceptions at two different development stages in the destination life cycle. Historically, both islands share a colonial past, having been dependencies of the British Empire which controlled much of the Caribbean region. As plantation economies, their people suffered the same fate at the hands of the white plantocracy before achieving independence in the 1960s.

Economically, they also share a common history. Formerly agrarian-based, the islands possess no significant mineral resources (although recent explorations lay claim to oil and natural gas reserves off the coast of Tobago) or manufacturing capacity. The evolution of both island economies has revealed a structure characterized by declining agriculture and fisheries, progressively displaced by rapid tourism expansion. Finally, the islands both submit to categorization as small developing states, although Tobago,
as part of the twin-island republic of Trinidad and Tobago, is not a politically independent entity.

Contribution to knowledge

Perceptions of various impacts of tourism have been extensively researched since the 1970s. Most of the studies have concentrated on how various segments of host communities react to tourism impacts. The majority of this body of research has focussed on a single host community or small numbers of neighbouring areas (Smith and Krannich 1998). The present study therefore seeks to contribute to the body of knowledge concerning hosts’ perceptions of tourism and tourists and to extend the work done in previous studies through its comparative analysis of two sample surveys of residents’ perceptions of tourism in the Caribbean region.

Research Objectives

The previous brief exploration of the literature has indicated the gaps in empirical research on the subject of residents’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism. While this study intends to explore some of the established relationships in a Caribbean context, the present research focuses on the juxtaposition of hosts’ perceptions of tourism across varying levels of tourism development as well as diverse cultural backgrounds.

This study therefore seeks to address four fundamental questions:
1. How do residents' experience of travel and perceptions of tourism work affect their support for tourism development?

2. What are the key factors which influence residents' support for new tourism development?

3. How do these variables behave in a comparative analysis of two communities differentiated by cultural background and level of tourism development?

4. How do the findings of this study compare with the UNECLAC study of 1990?

Finally, the study also aims to attempt an application of Social Exchange Theory as a framework for explaining the findings.

The Study Areas

This research focuses on two village communities on the Caribbean islands of Tobago and Barbados. Tobago is representative of a destination that is still in its early stage of development, whilst on the other hand, Barbados is a more advanced destination in terms of its level of tourism development. The villages of Charlotteville in Tobago and Speightstown in Barbados constitute the study areas. The selection of rural communities is deliberate, as it has been demonstrated that it is the rural areas that are most acutely affected by the development of tourism (Capenerhurst 1994; Pearce et al 1996; Mason and Cheyne 2000).
Organization of the study

The study is presented in ten chapters, each of which provides a synopsis of its contents in the concluding paragraphs. Each chapter is also structured with an opening introduction outlining the subjects are covered in the ensuing discussion.

Chapter One introduces the study by exploring the concept of tourism as a social phenomenon. It then presents a discussion of the rationale for engaging in research on the chosen subject and identifies some of the gaps in previous empirical research reported in the literature. This chapter also gives a background to the research, placing it in context of previous studies on the subject. It concludes with a statement of the research objectives.

Chapter Two concerns itself with a thorough exploration of the subject literature to date. It explores the major empirical relationships associated with tourism's social impacts and clarifies key definitional parameters such as 'community' and 'perceptions'. The bulk of the literature review addresses the independent variables reported in the literature, and their influence on support for tourism development.

Chapter Three focuses on an examination of the major theories which dominate tourism impact literature. The discussion addresses Butler's Destination Lifecycle model, Doxey's Irritation Index (Irridex) and Social Exchange Theory, the model of this study.
Chapter Four presents a comprehensive overview of the study target region. This provides an account of Caribbean tourism in the context of small-island developing states and their peculiarities.

Chapter Five deals with the Barbados Tourism industry in which the key characteristics of Speightstown, the first community targeted for study, are discussed.

Chapter Six concentrates on the Tobago tourism industry. It presents an overview of tourism activity on the island and then describes the second target area, Charlotteville.

Chapter Seven addresses the first stage in the methodological approach taken in this study. Key issues include the rationale for selection of the study areas and choice of investigative techniques. The discussion centres on the pilot study using the technique of focus groups.

Chapter Eight presents the second stage of the methodology which entails the main study employing administered questionnaires. A discussion of the administrative and implementation problems that were encountered follows along with a review of limitations in the methodology used.

Chapter Nine deals with the analysis and interpretation of the sample data gathered from the two study areas. Univariate analysis is followed by an exploration of bivariate and multivariate relationships among the variables being tested. The
appropriate qualifying tests for attempting multivariate manipulations are also presented along with the results of factor analysis and multiple regression analysis. The key findings in both cases are reported and the variances in the two sets of results are noted.

Chapter Ten presents a synthesis of the study through a discussion of the findings while linking them to results of previous empirical research. This chapter also attempts an explanation of the outcomes in light of established theoretical models as well as current industry practice. It also offers suggestions for addressing the shortcomings associated with tourism policy and planning issues which this study generated. Finally, the significance of the study is articulated, its deficiencies are acknowledged and opportunities for further research are cited.
CHAPTER TWO

RESIDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL IMPACTS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter deals with the theoretical background of the study. Firstly, it gives an overview of the areas of socio-cultural impacts on which most research has focussed, while clarifying some of the concepts in common usage. This is followed by a review of the contributions made by various empirical studies over the last two decades including some of the contradictory results that have been reported. An examination of the main variables impacting residents’ perceptions of tourism development is undertaken, while exposing some of the inconsistencies in the methodology employed by researchers.

Socio-cultural Impacts: The Theoretical Background

Definition

The social and cultural impacts of tourism refer to the ways in which tourism is perceived to contribute to changes in value systems, individual behaviour, family relations, collective lifestyles, safety levels, moral conduct, creative expressions, traditional ceremonies and community organizations (Fox 1977).

Tourism as a change agent

Many commentators have suggested that tourism often contributes to social and cultural change rather than being the cause of such change. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that the effects of international tourism on host cultures are generally
exaggerated. For example, Mathieson and Wall (1982:16) assert that even if tourism's effects are acknowledged, they are not of the same magnitude of those produced by industrialization and urbanization. Furthermore, empirical studies have shown that local inhabitants who appear to change their behaviour in the presence of the tourists return to their customary lifestyle after the tourists have gone.

Hovik and Heiberg (1980) stress that the absence of strong interpersonal relationships between the guests and hosts reduces the former's influence on the latter. Boissevain (quoted in Cohen 1979) believes that the sociocultural effects of tourism are often confused with other factors. Because of the dynamic character of society, when other factors change rapidly, tourism also changes, and this creates a dilemma for researchers. Similarly, McElroy and De Albuquerque (1986) point to research findings which indicate that tourism may influence hosts' consumptive behaviour, but that tourism's impact is considerably weaker than, and not easily distinguished from, the more encompassing influences associated with societal modernization.

Over the last two decades, an increasing number of studies have focused on residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism and there has also been evidence of a growing concern over the socio-cultural impacts of the industry on host communities, particularly in developing countries. Dogan (1989) acknowledged that tourism from developed countries has negative socio-cultural impacts such as a decline in traditions, consumerism, increase in criminal activity, social conflicts, crowding, environmental deterioration and dependency on the industrialized countries on the part of the members
of the developing world. Moreover, Dogan claimed that tourism development has changed the socio-cultural structure and diversified previously homogenous host communities. Huang and Stewart (1996) also support this view, suggesting that tourism may gradually transform a relatively homogenous rural community into a heterogeneous one.

**Types of Impacts**

These perceived impacts on host communities or destination areas may be classified into two categories (Butler 1974; Affeld 1975; Keogh 1989). One category concerns the characteristics of the destination area, which includes the perceived social impacts of the resident-visitor encounter. For example, cultural gap effects, crime, prostitution and the demonstration effect (changes in values, attitudes, or behaviour of the host population, which can result from observing tourists) (de Kadt 1979) are in this category. The other category of perceived impacts concerns social impacts on infrastructure development and their perceived effects on local resources, for example, pressure on local resources (e.g. water supply) and facilities (e.g. recreation), local versus imported labour, local language and cultural effects and life style changes.

**Host-Guest Interface**

Butler (1974) identified five factors related to tourists that he suggested were important in influencing their interactions with residents:

1. Number of visitors
2. Length of stay of visitors
3. Ethnic characteristics of visitors
4. Economic characteristics of visitors
5. Activities of the visitors

Determinants of Impacts

He also identified five factors related to the characteristics of the destination area that influence the nature of perceived social and cultural impacts:
1. Economic state of the area
2. Degree of local involvement in tourism
3. Spatial characteristics of tourism development
4. Viability of the host culture
5. Other characteristics e.g. political attitudes of the local population

In a similar manner, Brunt and Courtney (1999) postulated that the degree to which sociocultural impacts influence, or are experienced by host communities depends on a number of factors, including the number and type of tourists, the nature of tourism development in the area and the pace of development. In view of this, it seems that perceptions of social and cultural impacts of tourism are likely to be complex and diverse.

In some instances, tourism development may create social conflicts at the destination community. This may arise because of socio-cultural differences, economic welfare and purchasing power gaps between the host community and tourists. In fact, it was found
that the host communities' attitudes and perceptions toward development and tourists fluctuate continuously between the negative and the positive (King, Pizam and Milman, 1993; Pizam 1978). In this regard, most conclusions on the impacts of tourism development are that economic impacts are perceived as mostly positive, while socio-cultural and environmental impacts are viewed as negative.

The Unit of Analysis

The literature places existing research into two main categories, where the distinction is drawn with regard to the unit of analysis. The first group includes community studies. These assess residents' reaction to tourism at the local level and using the overall level of agreement as a measure of support for the industry. Influences on resident perceptions are gauged in terms of community attributes, including host/guest ratio or tourism's contribution to the local economy.

The second category contains individual studies. They address variation at the individual level of respondents and assess the effect of socio-demographic variables on attitude to tourism in respect to age, income, community attachment, economic dependence on/benefit from the industry. Some studies have addressed both community and individual issues, but this is the exception rather than the norm. The present study falls into the latter category.
The concept of Community

Some authors have recognized the need to define the concept of community (Snepenger, Reiman, Johnson and Snepenger 1998; Prentice 1993; Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996).

With regard to community level studies, as Madrigal (1995) points out, the fact that a group of people live in the same geographical area does not mean that they belong to the same community. In any given geographical region, there may be several communities, such as the homosexual community, the elderly community, or communities defined by ethnic groups. Thus, Williams and Lawson (2001) warn that care must be taken when deciding on the appropriate basis of aggregation for describing groups of individuals. They suggest that a better definition of community may simply be a group of people who share common goals or opinions.

Rural and Urban Communities

Research has been carried out on urban communities as well as on rural communities and more recently, on communities on the urban–rural fringe (Weaver and Lawton 2001). However, most of the work seems to have targeted the rural areas (Smith and Krannich, 1998; Perdue, Long and Allen 1987; LaFlamme 1979; Keogh 1990; Perdue, Long and Allen 1990; Long, Perdue and Allen 1990; Snepenger, Reiman, Johnson and Snepenger 1998; Madrigal 1993; Priester 1989; Prentice 1993; Allen, Hafer, Long and Perdue 1993). In such studies, researchers have justified their focus by arguing that impacts are more easily discernible in small and isolated communities where tourism often has a

Conversely, it is argued that in an urban area, residents may not have to rely on tourism businesses because of a more diversified economy and therefore, urban residents' concerns about the presence of tourism may differ from that of rural residents (Chen, 2000). Chen’s study showed that some inconsistencies exist with regard to the attitude of urban residents versus the attitude of rural residents. Perdue et al (1990) and Johnson, Snepenger and Akis (1994), in their review of rural residents’ attitudes toward tourism, concluded that demographic characteristics were unrelated to residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts. On the contrary, Chen’s study disclosed that age and gender do affect urban residents’ views of tourism impacts. These findings seem to suggest that urban residents’ opinions are likely to be divided among different demographic groups.

**Perception vs. Attitudes**

In the literature, 'perception' has been distinguished from 'attitude' in a few cases, although the majority of studies have used the terms interchangeably. There is no universally accepted definition of attitude and there is considerable debate regarding basic conceptualization. Aegly and Chaiken defines attitude as:

a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degrees of favour or disfavour... evaluating refers to all classes of
evaluative responding whether overt or covert, cognitive, affective or behavioural

(1993:1)

An evaluative component (an assessment of desirability) is inherent in the conceptualization of attitude. Parenthetically, the term attitude has a technical meaning to social psychologists and consumer behaviourists. In the tourism literature this word is often used in the colloquial sense. To a social psychologist, what is often described as an attitude in tourism would be better termed as an opinion (Williams and Lawson 2001).

Heterogeneity of perceptions

There is increasing evidence that residents of communities that attract tourists hold diverse opinions about tourism development in their region. In fact, a number of researchers have reported heterogeneity of community responses and diversity of resident attitudes (Pizam 1978; Thomason, Crompton and Kamp 1979; Murphy 1983; Tyrell and Spaulding 1984; Ap and Crompton, 1993; Brougham and Butler, 1981; Husbands, 1989; Lawson, Williams, Young and Cossens, 1998; Ryan and Montgomery, 1994). Ryan and Montgomery, for example, in their study of the English Peak district, found that residents held views which were not homogenous.

Although residents are generally supportive of tourism, they also hold negative perceptions on such issues as high property prices and congestion. Hall (1994) and Joppe (1996) also support the existence of this heterogeneity and report that communities do not necessarily have shared interests, but are made up of groups and individuals with very
mixed views. In their study of ten New Zealand towns, Williams and Lawson (2001) sought to identify relatively homogenous groups in the overall sample and to describe these groups in terms of their opinions toward tourism, importance ratings of community issues and demographic characteristics. Their study groups respondents on their common characteristics rather than geographical location. They constructed profiles of these segments on demographic and other dimensions to allow a deeper understanding of the nature of the people in each opinion group, giving insight into factors which explain why they hold the opinion they do. By recognizing that residents and their opinions are heterogeneous, they argue that this approach allows a more targeted examination of resident opinion.

**Contradictory Empirical Results**

The most diverse set of perceived impacts reported in the literature are those related to the social and cultural health of host societies. While there tends to be general agreement on the positive and negative perceptions of economic and environmental impacts, there is some ambivalence and contradictory evidence regarding perceptions of some types of social and cultural impacts. For example, Bystrzanowski, (1989) found that tourism did not increase residents’ perceptions of the availability of recreation facilities and opportunities, a finding that contradicts those found in other studies on this issue.

Similarly, Milman and Pizam (1988) in their study of Central Florida residents, reported that those residents did not perceive tourism as a contributor to the social virtues of morality, honesty, politeness and manners, mutual confidence, and attitude toward work.
Other perceived negative impacts have been identified as:

1. Increased exploitation of local natives (Sheldon and Var 1984; Lui and Var 1986; Lui, Sheldon and Var 1987),
2. Avoidance of shopping in tourism areas (Sheldon and Var 1984; Lui and Var 1986; Lui, Sheldon and Var 1987)
3. Increased sexual permissiveness (Sethna and Richmond 1978; Milman and Pizam 1988).

Other perceptions of social impacts for which contradictory findings have been reported are crime and vandalism, drug use and addiction and family and social structure. This ambivalence is also found in studies concerned with the relationship between tourism and perceptions of crime. Some studies reported that it did exist (Jud 1975; Walmsley, Boskovic and Pigram 1983; Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986), while others found no evidence of this (Lin and Loeb 1977; Pizam 1982; Stokowski 1996b).

On the related issues of crime and vandalism, some studies have reported that tourism increased crime and vandalism (Rothman 1978; Belisle and Hoy 1980; Sheldon and Var 1984; Perdue, Long and Allen 1987; Ross 1992), while others have not confirmed this (Lui and Var 1986; Milman and Pizam 1988; Bystrzanowski 1989).

With respect to perceptions of drug use and addiction, two studies found that an increase was attributed to tourism (Pizam 1978; Belisle and Hoy 1980), and two studies did not (Lui and Var 1986; Milman and Pizam 1988).
The effects of tourism on social and family structure were reported to have no perceived adverse impact by the Turkish sample of Lui, Sheldon and Var’s (1987) cross-national study. Church attendance in the Virgin Islands was also not seen as being adversely affected by tourism (Sethna and Richmond 1978). On the contrary, Huang and Stewart (1996) found that tourism development alters rural residents’ relationships to one another and to their community. Residents of Delaware noted that tourism resulted in less time spent with the family (Rothman 1978). Similar adverse effects were reported by Brougham and Butler’s (1981) study of residents from Gwynedd, Wales, who perceived that tourism caused a decline in traditional forms of socializing.

These contradictory findings may be attributed to problems of distinguishing the effects of tourism from those of industrialization or modernization (Noronha 1979). However, the extent to which these effects can be attributed to either tourism or modernization is not clear. Crick (1989) argues that the industry has often become the scapegoat for sociocultural change because it is highly visual. Brunt and Courtney ((1999) caution that because of the inevitable difficulty that arises in attempting to separate tourism-induced changes from those which result from other processes of modernization, great restraint must be exercised in the interpretation of findings. Their warning is echoed by Sharpley (1994), who emphasizes that the dynamic character of all societies and cultures should not be overlooked and all potential influences need to be considered.

**Impacting Variables**

Certain key variables have dominated the literature as impacting residents’ attitudes toward tourism and future tourism development. Over the years, most research in this
area has concentrated on testing the same group of independent variables and only in a few cases, have new variables been introduced. A summary of the findings of empirical research in this field is presented in Appendix 2.

Demographic factors

Previous research (Belisle and Hoy 1980; Perdue, Lui and Var 1986; Perdue, Long and Allen 1987; Long and Allen 1990; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Brogham and Butler 1981; Madrigal 1993; Frater 1998; Richins 1996) has demonstrated that socio-demographic factors (age, gender, income, education, etc.) contribute little or no variance toward an understanding or prediction of the perceptions of tourism impacts. However, in some cases, researchers have reported contradictory findings. For example, gender (Pizam and Pokela 1985; Ritchie 1988) has explained some of the variance in attitude toward tourism and tourists. Age (Murdock and Shriner 1979; Rojek, Clemente and Summers 1975) has also been implicated in explaining some of the variability in attitude toward local community change and development.

A clear departure from this position of ambivalence was found by Chen (2000) and subsequently in another study by the same author that was published a year later. Both studies were based on urban communities and revealed that demographic characteristics influence residents' perceptions of tourism development. Conversely, according to previous studies (Johnson et al. 1994; Perdue et al. 1990) on rural communities, regardless of demographic status, residents tended to have similar attitudes toward the effects of tourism development. Chen suggests that such a reversal might be because an
urban population is likely to be more demographically heterogeneous, especially with regard to income and ethnicity, as these variables demonstrated significant impacts in his study.

**Size of community**

Capenerhurst suggested that the size of the host community is important in relation to residents' reaction to tourism. He argues that small communities are likely to react more strongly to development, as it will be far more visible for them. As Capenerhurst claimed, reactions are stronger here because it is at the local level where facilities are seen to be built, where land and other resources are allocated between competing users, and where the wishes of permanent residents need to be accommodated as well as visitors (1994:152).

This view is supported by Pearce et al (1996) in their critique of a study carried out by the New Zealand Ministry of Tourism (New Zealand Ministry of Tourism 1992). They refuted claims that resident responses were affected by dependence and seasonality. They postulated instead, that it was the small community size and the high visibility of tourism that impacted residents' responses.

**State of the Local Economy**

Many regions with a narrow or diminishing resource base have embraced tourism as a cure for the ills of economic decline (Cater 1987). Because of the perceived monetary
benefits, reactions of local residents of economically depressed regions are likely to be favourable. Several researchers have concluded that such residents underestimate the cost and overestimate the economic gains (Lui and Var 1986; Sheldon and Var 1984). For example, residents in Turkey acknowledge a willingness to put up with some inconvenience in exchange for tourist money (Var, Kendall and Tarakcoglu 1985:654). Therefore the more negatively the state of the local economy is perceived, the more positive the local reaction will be.

**Level of development**

A destination’s level of development may also be termed the level of tourist penetration (McElroy and de Albuquerque 1998; Akis, Peristianis and Warner 1996; Allen, Hafer, Long and Perdue 1993; McCool and Martin 1994; Wall 1996). As Mathieson and Wall (1982) suggest, impacts can change through time in response to structural changes in the industry, and the extent and duration of the exposure of the host population to tourist development. For instance, Allen, Long, Perdue and Kieselbach (1988) argue that residents’ attitudes toward tourism may be directly related to the degree or stage of development. Long Perdue and Allen (1990) examined the changes which occurred in resident perceptions with increasing levels of tourism development. In their survey of twenty-eight rural communities in Colorado, they found that the perceived impacts of tourism, both positive and negative, increased with increasing levels of tourism. With regard to resident attitudes toward additional tourism development, however, it was hypothesized that with increasing tourism development, residents’ attitudes would become more favourable, but at some point, they would begin to deteriorate after a
threshold level of development was achieved. They reported that such a threshold existed when approximately 30% of retail sales were derived from tourism.

Another important contribution to the literature on level of development was a study conducted by Smith and Krannich (1998), in which they surveyed four rural communities in the United States Rocky Mountain West. They sought to evaluate a 'tourism dependence' hypothesis that increasing levels of tourism dependence in a community are associated with increasingly negative attitudes about its development. They suggest a typology of rural communities experiencing tourism growth that includes tourism-saturated, tourism-realized and tourism-hungry community types. The results of their analysis were found to be generally consistent with the pattern predicted by the tourism dependence hypothesis. However, they caution that the findings should be interpreted with some reservation due to important qualifications and limitations in the methodology.

Of particular relevance to this study, is previous research on perceptions of tourism in four Caribbean islands commissioned by United Nations Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNECLAC). Conducted on a national scale, that study included the islands of Barbados and Tobago, the field targets of this study. While no explicit attempt was made to compare the findings between the islands, the survey reported on views expressed by residents, employees and employers. Key variables examined included local participation in decision making, tourism awareness, contact with tourists, type, scale and spatial distribution of future development, cultural traditions, education, employment in tourism, impact on standard of living, prostitution, crime, drugs, AIDS and others. In
both cases, the findings revealed a positive disposition of residents toward tourism development, in spite of some negative perceptions of the industry’s impacts on their community.

Balance of Power

Much of the tourism literature represents the relationship between tourists and hosts as severely asymmetrical in terms of power for it is the latter that have to bear the burden of adjustment economically, socially and culturally. This position has been argued in the now classic studies by Nash (1977, 1981) and Greenwood (1977) and reiterated by other scholars studying the impact of tourism at various sites (Eastman 1995; Eliot 1983; Palmer 1994; Pearce 1982) and from different perspectives (Bryden 1973; Freitag 1994; Hunter 1997; Lafant 1980). These studies approach host mediation primarily from the tourists’ perspective and are oriented to understanding their participation in local culture. Joseph and Kavoori (2001) argue that while tourism does in fact impose a one-sided power asymmetry in contact situations between hosts and guests, the latter are not merely passive subjects that are acted upon.

Participation in decision making / control over tourism planning

Resident involvement with local development decision making appears to influence the level of support and attitude toward tourism and tourists (Cooke 1982). When residents are given the opportunity to participate in making planning decisions, they appear to be more favourable toward community change and development (Allen and Gibson 1987;

**Economic dependence on tourism**

Focusing on residents of five rural communities in Colorado, Perdue, Long and Allen reported that residents' attitudes toward tourism were more favourable, as their economic dependency on tourism increased (1990). They concluded that those people who benefit from tourism perceive less social and environmental impact from tourism and have more favourable attitudes toward additional tourism development. This finding contradicts with the finding reported some years later by Smith and Krannich (1998) in their study of four communities in the Rocky Mountains West.

In their study of the Greek island of Samos, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) reported that a direct economic dependency on tourism was the single most important factor affecting residents' views. Similarly, the relationship between community members' views and their dependency on tourism was a major finding of the work of Murphy (1985). Residents (or their relatives, friends and neighbours) who depend upon tourism-based employment have been found to be more favourable toward tourism and tourists. Several studies found that residents who benefit from tourism have a higher level of support for it and thus report more positive impacts (Lui and Var 1986; Milman and Pizam 1988; Murphy 1980; Pizam 1978; Pizam and Pokela 1985; Thomason, Crompton and Kamp 1979; Tyrell and Spaulding 1984; Husbands 1989; Madrigal 1993; Lankford and Howard 1994).
However, King, Pizam and Milman (1993) pointed out that those people with personal benefits from tourism are also more likely than others to report negative impacts. In other words, perceptions of positive benefits are significantly related to personal benefits from tourism but they themselves do not explain very much the perceived negative impacts (Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996).

**Distance of residence from tourist centre**

The literature also reveals that urban and rural residents and the distance they live from tourism centres explains some of the variation in attitude (Belisle and Hoy 1980; Murphy and Andressen 1988; Pearce 1980; Sheldon and Var 1984; Tyrell and Spaulding 1984; Wall, 1996; Korca, 1996). In general, rural residents and those living further from the tourist centre are more apathetic toward tourists and tourism. However, Belisle and Hoy (1980) and Mansfield (1992) found that people living further from tourism areas were more negative about the impacts, while Sheldon and Var (1984) reported that residents in higher tourist density areas were more positive about the industry. In his research in the United Kingdom and Canada, Murphy (1985) reported that host communities which were closest to a tourism zone, held the strongest views. Similar relationships have been found subsequently by Sheldon and Var (1984) elsewhere in the United Kingdom, Keogh (1990) in Canada, and by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) on the Gold Coast of Australia.
Utilization of the Resource base

Access to recreational amenities

Local reactions to tourism can be either positive or negative based upon how the host perceives the impact on their ability to use the tourism resources. They may react positively if they perceive tourism as a factor that improves the recreational facilities that they enjoy or increases opportunities for recreational activities for the community (Allen, Hafer, Long and Perdue 1993; Kendall and Var 1984). On the other hand, their reaction may be negative if they believe that tourism may result in crowding the local population out of their traditional leisure pursuits (O'Leary 1976). Lankford and Howard (1994) suggested that perceptions of outdoor recreation opportunities and participation are the most significant predictor of attitudes toward tourism.

Perdue et al (1987) hypothesized that outdoor recreation participants, when compared to non-participants, would perceive more negative impacts from tourism because of the opportunity costs associated with tourists' use of local outdoor recreation areas. However, their findings failed to support this hypothesis. According to Gursoy, Jurowski and Uysal (2002), there are two possible explanations for this:

1. That participants may have adopted coping mechanisms to avoid competition with tourists (Bryant and Napier 1981). They explain that such coping behaviours may take the form of limiting participation to off-peak periods or altogether avoiding areas used by tourists.
2. That residents felt that tourism had improved rather than reduced the quality of outdoor recreation opportunities.

Researchers who examined the effects of tourism development on the use of resources have generally concluded that the industry improves entertainment and recreational opportunities for the residents (Davis et al 1988; Jurowski et al 1997; Lui et al 1987; Murphy 1983; Pizam 1978; Rothman 1978). O'Leary (1976) provided significant support for the hypothesis that residents who participated in outdoor recreation would have more negative perceptions of touristic impacts.

Traffic congestion

Some researchers have found that residents' support for tourism development is dependent on their perceptions of crowding and congestion (Moisey, Nickerson and McCool 1996). More recently, in an examination of urban residents' loyalty to tourism development, Chen (2000) determined that loyal residents perceived that the benefits of tourism outweighed its negative impacts, and non-loyal residents worried about the escalating value of land and traffic congestion.

Length of Residence

Typically, length of residence in a community has been shown to be influential in determining residents' attitudes to tourism, with several studies suggesting that the longer people live in a community the more negative their attitudes to tourism become (Allen and Cosenza 1988; Lankford 1994; Lankford and Howard 1994; McCool and Martin
1994; Ryan and Montgomery1994; Brougham and Butler 1981; Lui and Var 1986; Sheldon and Var 1984; Um and Crompton 1987). Other studies suggest that newer residents may have negative attitudes toward tourism and tourists (Goudy 1977; Ayers and Potter 1989; Patton and Stabler 1979).

**Birthplace**

The literature suggests that birthplace influences attitude toward tourism (Brougham and Butler 1981; Davis, Allen and Cosenza 1988; Um and Crompton 1987). Goudy (1977) found that birthplace also influenced residents' attitude toward community change and development.

**Community attachment**

Attachment to the community has been defined as the level of social bonds such as friendships, sentiment, and social participation (Goudy 1990; Jurowski 1994). The way in which researchers have sought to measure the notion of community attachment seems to be evolving. Most studies on the subject have used 'length of residence', 'attachment to people' or 'attachment to the place' as indicators. However, Tosun (2002) argues that using place of birth and length of residency may be poor measures to indicate the association between attachment to place or community and residents' perceptions toward the industry and its customers. In this recent study, he therefore added a variable representing the 'respondents' sense of belonging'.

A few studies have examined community attachment in relation to attitudes toward tourism development (Jurowski et al 1997; McCool and Martin 1994; Um and Crompton...
1987; Yoon 1998). However, their findings have been contradictory. While Um and Crompton (1987) concluded that the more attached residents are to their community, the less positively they perceived tourism impacts, Jurowski et al (1997) ascertained that attached residents are likely to evaluate the economic and social impacts positively but the environmental impacts negatively.

A number of studies indicate that the longer residents have been living in a community, the more negative they are towards tourism development (Allen, Long, Perdue and Kieselbach 1988; Lui and Var 1986; Sheldon and Var 1984; Um and Crompton 1987). Davis, Allen and Cosenza (1988) found that residents who were natives were more positive about tourism than newcomers to the community. On the other hand, Lankford and Howard (1994) reported no significant relationship between community attachment and perceptions of tourism.

McCool and Martin (1994) also discussed the attachment residents have for their community and investigated whether those with strong feelings were more negative towards tourism than those who were less attached. They were unable to find a clear connection between attachment and perception of the impacts. In their study of Montana, they found that those with stronger attachment had stronger views relating to both positive and negative impacts, and that those with more attachment were more informed and hence more concerned. The unclear findings suggest that other factors may be mediating the effects of community attachment.
When investigating the relationship between community attachment and length of residence, McCool and Martin (1994) reported that some old timers were very attached but newcomers were similarly attached, particularly in rural areas where they had chosen specifically to live. They indicated that this finding is consistent with the notion, as discussed by Williams, Patterson, Roggenbuck and Watson (1992) that community attachment is less about friendship networks than about residents selecting a place on the basis of certain desirable attributes and which contributes to them becoming place-dependent. The community development literature supports this finding in that it suggests that newer residents in addition to long term residents may also be negative towards increased development in their communities (Ayers and Potter 1989; Goudy 1977).

Community Concern

Tourism development may cause fears among some community members who perceive negative changes in their environment. Not surprisingly, such persons may hold very romantic views of their community and environment (Newby 1979). Some authors argue that if community members feel that their identity is threatened by tourism's growth, then they can develop negative attitudes towards the industry (Capenerhurst 1994).

According to Gursoy, Jurowski and Uysal (2002), the level of concern residents feel about their community may also influence their willingness to support tourism. Apart from affecting the way in which costs and benefits are viewed, community concern is likely to influence how the local economy is perceived. The authors argue that the more concern residents have for their community, the more likely they are to perceive that the
local economy needs assistance. This in turn, is likely to mediate how they perceive the costs and benefits of the industry. If they feel that new investments are needed in their region, they are likely to evaluate the benefits more positively and minimize the negative impacts.

Concerns about local issues such as the environment, schools, crime and recreational opportunities may affect the manner in which they view the costs and benefits of tourism. Unfortunately, research on this area has produced conflicting results, particularly the perceived impact on the environment (Allen et al 1988; Ritchie 1988), on host culture (Mathieson and Wall 1982) and on recreation opportunities (Keogh 1990; O'Leary 1976; Perdue et al 1990).

**Frequency of tourist contact**

Brougham and Butler (1981) have found that the level of contact with tourists (operationalized in their study as development of friendship with them and frequency of visitation to tourism areas) influences the residents' attitude toward tourism and tourists.

Although Pizam (1978) found that residents with more contact felt negatively about tourism, Rothman (1978) reported that residents with high contact had positive perceptions. Some authors suggest that this apparent contradiction may be explained by the site-specific conditions under which tourists and hosts interact. To Varley (1978), some of the social problems emerged in Fiji because of the relatively wealthy
international tourists in a developing country characterized by relatively low standards of living.

**Cultural Differences**

Part of the literature has dealt with the issue of the level of disparity between the cultures of the visitor and the host societies as being responsible for the eventual level of discord or conflict which emerges over time. The greater the gap, the greater the probability of the hosts harboring negative attitudes toward their guests. Reising (1994) has argued that the consequences of social contact between tourists and hosts largely depend on their cultural backgrounds, and the conditions under which they interact. Social contact between individuals from different cultural backgrounds might result in negative attitudes, perceptions and experiences.

**Crime**

A number of researchers have examined the link between the perception that tourism contributes to increased crime and support for tourism development. However, findings have been contradictory and inconclusive (Lankford 1996). While several researchers reported that crime is related to resident perceptions of tourism development (Nicholls 1976; Belisle and Hoy 1980; Lankford 1996; Lui et al 1987; Long et al 1990; Milman and Pizam 1988; Pizam and Pokela 1985; Rothman 1978; Runyan and Wu 1979; Sethna 1980), others were unable to confirm the relationship between crime and tourism. (Allen et al 1993; Jurowski et al 1997; McCool and Martin 1994; Pizam 1978; Var et al 1985). Lankford (1996) examined the link between crime and tourism by exploring the
perception of it from a socio-demographic perspective. He reported that long-term rural residents, farmers, recreationists and younger segments perceive that tourism contributes to an increase in crime.

**Prostitution**

Current research indicates that tourism as a factor of change can lead to negative elements such as prostitution Cohen (1988). King et al (1993) reviewed the perceptions of the residents of Fiji and found that tourism created a negative impact on morality and community quality of life. However, the awareness of those negative impacts did not lead to diminished community support for tourism due to economic dependence on tourism.

**Public education programmes**

The general level of knowledge about tourism and the local economy has been shown to influence attitude toward tourism development and tourists (Davis et al 1988). Robertson and Crotts (1992) investigated the impact of tourism awareness on residents' attitudes toward tourism development. Their study was conducted on two Florida counties, one with an on-going public relations campaign and the other, without any such campaign. They found that host community support for tourism development is related to exposure to tourism information and education programmes. However, their findings could not be regarded as conclusive because of limitations in the methodology employed.
Conclusion

This chapter summarized the key sources of literature on the subject of resident perceptions of tourism development. Some terms in common usage throughout the literature were examined and their meanings established for the purposes of this study. This review of the literature surrounding social impacts revealed that there are several variables impacting support for tourism development. A broad array of impacting variables was discussed and their influence on resident perceptions were examined. It was noted that in several cases, findings of previous research have produced conflicting or inconclusive results and this has led researchers to question the scientific basis of their research techniques or the hypotheses which they originally formulated.

What can be established is that these factors have some influence on residents' support for tourism, although it is difficult to confirm whether the relationship is positive or negative. Part of the cause seems to be the lack of a sound methodology or the existence of many extraneous factors which also exert influences on residents' perceptions.

One striking conclusion that can be drawn is that there are few consistent relationships or patterns observed, a point of view reinforced in several other reviews of the literature (Ap 1990; King et al, 1993; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Milman and Pizam, 1988). For example, in some places, residents living closer to areas of higher tourism concentration are more positive about tourism, while in other cases, such residents are more negative than those living farther away. Sometimes attachment to a community is related to greater support for tourism, and sometimes it is related to lesser support. Pearce et al (1996)
suggest that some of these inconsistencies are the result of the use of different measures. In the case of community attachment, for instance, some researchers have used place of birth and length of residency as indicators of likely attachment to a community. McCool and Martin (1994) and Lankford (1994) provide evidence that these may be poor measures of attachment.

In light of these observations, this study restricted its focus to an investigation of six of these variables which measure residents’

1. attachment to their community
2. level of tourism awareness
3. perception of personal and community benefits from tourism
4. perception of social and environmental impacts generated by tourism activity
5. perception of cultural impacts of tourism
6. personal involvement or, desire to be involved in tourism

Additionally, a seventh variable, ‘perception of tourism work’, was introduced for the first time and residents’ ‘experience of travel’ was incorporated into the variable ‘tourism awareness’ for the first time. The following chapter examines some of the major theoretical models which have been associated with impact studies.
CHAPTER THREE

THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

In this chapter, three of the theories that have dominated the literature on tourism impacts are presented. Each construct is critically examined and evaluated on its applicability in various empirical situations. The chapter concludes with a suggestion that Social Exchange Theory is perhaps the most appropriate model which can adequately provide an explanation of the findings generated in this type of study.

The Major Theories

The first concerted research into community attitudes is associated with the cautionary platform of the 1970s which focused on identifying the socio-cultural impacts of tourism (Jafari 1989). Popular models of this era, including the Irridex (Doxey 1975) and the resort cycle (Butler 1980) suggest that intensified tourism development will generate a resident backlash that would ultimately make the destination less attractive. Resident attitudes were more explicitly linked to the long-term well-being of destinations during the 1980s and 1990s as part of the sustainable development paradigm (Jurowski, Uysal and Williams 1997). Stages or step models are commonly used in determining tourism impacts and community responses. However, they are limited in their applications and a more appropriate framework is likely to be found in Social Exchange Theory.

Butler's Destination Lifecycle Model

Butler (1980) devised a model of the evolution of tourism destinations, a concept which he borrowed from the product lifecycle model used in commerce. Since a destination can
also be considered a product that is developed and marketed, it can be expected to evolve in the same pattern suggested for a commercial product. The model considers the attitudes of residents and community support for the industry as part of wider issues of development. Butler argued that destinations evolve via the stages of exploration, involvement, development, consolidation and stagnation, followed by a period of either decline or rejuvenation. Unless special efforts were made to extend the cycle, the final stage would be characterized by a decline in tourist arrivals. Prior to this final stage, a consolidation stage would exhibit a marked slowdown in the rate of growth and a succeeding stagnation stage would see the peak arrival number reached. He claims that it is in the stages of consolidation and stagnation when the social impacts become apparent. Butler's Model of the hypothetical evolution of a tourist area is illustrated in Appendix 3.

In an unpublished paper presented at an Australian conference, Butler (1998) summarized the essential tenets of his model. They include:

1. Unless there is recognition of capacity or limits to growth, tourist numbers can be expected to decline as the physical appearance of the destination and the quality of experience deteriorate.

2. Triggers are factors that bring about change in the destination and are important to consider for potential rejuvenation at the end of the tourism cycle.

3. If good overall management is lacking, decline is probably inevitable.

4. Long-term planning of destinations is necessary to avoid eventual decline.


Limitations

Since its inception, the limitations of Butler's general cycle model have been emphasized both in conceptually based critiques (Haywood 1986; Prosser 1995; Wall 1982) and in case study applications (Bianchi 1994; Hovinen 1982; Russell and Faulkner 1998). One of its main limitations is that it does not allow for intermediary stages of development outside those defined in his continuum. Further, his model assumes that a community must progress from one stage to the next in a pre-determined fashion. Experience has shown that this is not always the case and it depends on the existing socioeconomic conditions at the particular destination. Alternatively, some destinations may at any point in time, display a mix of the characteristics attributed to different stages (Getz 1992).

King, Pizam and Milman (1993) reported that with particular reference to Nadi, Fiji, in spite of the high levels of development and contact with tourists, residents perceived impacts to be positive. Dowling's (1993) study agreed with the above conclusion and noted that although tourist ratios increased dramatically (from 1:10 to 1:150) in six years along with the emergence of considerable environmental impact problems, residents of Shark Bay in western Australia were still very positive about the industry and strongly support its expansion.

In an unpublished paper, Prosser (1995: 6-9) provides a useful review of the five types of criticism of the destination lifecycle model. However, he concludes that the concept provides a useful framework for research that seeks to enhance understanding of development processes and their implications. The usefulness of this model as a general
framework for description and analysis of the evolution of tourism is acknowledged in several case studies (Baum 1998a; Cooper and Jackson 1989; Hovinen 1981; Meyer-Arendt 1985; Russell and Faulkner 1998; Williams 1993).

Various proposals for modifications or additions to Butler’s stage model have been published. Agarwal (1994:199) argues that the model assumes that a destination has a single product rather than being comprised of several different elements (hotels, theme parks, etc.). Each of these elements exhibits its own life cycle and at a given point in time some may show growth while other may display signs of stagnation or decline. Therefore the unit of analysis, or geographical scale is of critical importance.

Baum proposes a reinvention stage to the model, which could be viewed as a subset of rejuvenation. The reinvention process allows for an extension of the lifecycle through a process of exit and re-entry (1998b).

Russell and Faulkner (1999) also propose an alternative framework for analyzing development processes based on chaos / complexity theory (Waldrop 1992). They attempt to combine this conceptual framework with Butler’s Stage model by emphasizing the role of entrepreneurs in creating the conditions for shifts from one stage in the evolutionary cycle to another.

**Doxey’s Irridex**

Undertaking the initial case study in the Caribbean island of Barbados, Doxey (1975) proposed an Irritation Index or ‘Irridex’ to gauge the interactions between hosts and
guests over time. His theory is based on the hypothesis that varying levels of irritation arise as a consequence of the interface between locals and tourists at the destination. These irritants or impacts may range from over crowding to such issues as threats to the hosts’ way of life. Developed as a monitoring tool for planners, the Irridex is categorized in four levels: Euphoria, Apathy, Annoyance and Antagonism. A diagrammatic representation of the Irritation Index (Irridex) Model is shown in Appendix 4.

The first stage, euphoria, is usually associated with the initial phase of the development of the tourism industry when both visitors and investors are welcomed. This stage is characterized by little or no planning and controls. In stage two, apathy develops as tourists are taken for granted and contacts between them and the locals become more formal. There is an emphasis on marketing the destination to the exclusion of any planning. In the next stage, annoyance sets in with the ever-increasing growth in tourist arrivals. As saturation point approaches, residents begin to display misgivings about the tourist industry, while policy makers focus on increasing infrastructure instead of establishing limits to growth. The final stage, antagonism is reached when irritations are overtly expressed verbally and physically. Mutual politeness gives way to mutual antagonism and the tourist is blamed for all the ills of society. At this stage, planning efforts are remedial with increased promotional efforts to salvage the destination’s deteriorating reputation.

Application of the stage models

The models of Doxey (1975) and Butler (1980) both suggest a change in resident attitudes to tourism, and involvement in tourism, over time. These theories have been
applied in the work of several researchers who conducted longitudinal studies of the attitudes of host communities. In particular, Getz (1982, 1994) studied the Spey Valley in the United Kingdom in 1978 and again in 1992, while Johnson, Snepenger and Akis (1994), investigated community sentiment over a six-year period in a developing ski area in Idaho, USA. Both studies found general support for tourism but recognized that a greater degree of negativity had become apparent by the latter stages of the study. Getz attributed this to the poor performance of the industry in this UK region during the 80s and the generally depressed state of the Scottish economy at the time. He also indicated that ‘truly’ local people were not receiving enough of the benefits and a growing conservation ethic was evident. Getz concluded that the increase in negative feeling only partially supports the Doxey Irridex as the residents were willing to accept more arrivals, possibly due to the lack of alternatives to tourism.

Both Doxey’s (Irridex) theory and Butler’s destination lifecycle model suffer the limitation that they assume homogeneity of perceptions across a given society. (Cohen, 1979; Teo, 1994). However, insights derived from social exchange theory described by Ap (1992) and others (Nash 1989; Perdue et al 1990) seem to offer remarkable advancements in contribution to theory.

Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory, a model rooted in social psychology was developed by Emerson (1962) and has been used with much success. Several researchers have applied this theory to account for the diversity of perceptions encountered in a single community

Social Exchange doctrine suggests that individuals will engage in exchanges if:

1. the resulting rewards are valued
2. the exchange is likely to produce valued rewards and
3. perceived costs do not exceed perceived rewards (Skidmore 1975).

The theory assumes that individuals select exchanges after having assessed rewards and costs (Homans 1961). According to this notion, perceptions are affected by the perceptions of exchange people believe they are making. Consequently, individuals who evaluate the exchange as beneficial perceive the same impact differently than someone who evaluates the exchange as harmful. These principles suggest that residents will be willing to enter into an exchange with tourists if they can reap some benefit without incurring unacceptable costs (Turner 1986). Theoretically, residents who view the results of tourism as personally valuable and believe that the costs do not exceed the benefits will favour the exchange and support tourism development. In attempting to understand resident reactions to tourism, researchers have been applying these precepts.

As a step toward synthesizing these different perspectives, Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) identified two broad dimensions of the tourism development / community interface which characterize both models:
1. The extrinsic dimension, which refers to the characteristics of the location with respect to its role as a tourist destination — including the nature and stage of tourism development in the area and reflecting this, the level of tourist activity and the types of tourists involved, and

2. The intrinsic dimension, which refers to the characteristics of members of the host community that affect variations in the impacts of tourism within the community.

Appendix 6 presents a suggested classificatory framework for analyzing the social impacts of tourism.

The framework suggests that negative impacts of tourism will be accentuated in destinations at a mature stage of tourism development, and were there is a high tourist ratio, an emphasis on international tourism and high seasonality. If the variable impact of the intrinsic dimension is ignored, negative community reaction to this set of circumstances is likely to result. On the other hand, destinations at an early stage of tourism development with a low tourist ratio, domestic visitor orientation and low seasonality, might be expected to elicit a more positive community response. However, in conjunction with these generalized effects, perceptions of tourism within the community are likely to vary when the dynamics of intrinsic elements are considered. These intrinsic variables include level of involvement in tourism, residential proximity to the centre of tourist activity and duration of residence. The potential influences of extrinsic and intrinsic variables on resident reactions are graphically represented in Appendix 7.
Application of Social Exchange Theory

Earlier research has recognized that the elements being exchanged by the host community include not only economic components but also social and environmental factors (King, Pizam and Milman 1993; Perdue, Long and Allen 1990; Shluter and Var 1988). Residents appear to be willing to enter into an exchange with tourists if they feel the transaction will result in a gain (Pizam 1978; Tyrell and Spaulding 1984). Prior studies have shown that economic gain, along with social and environmental factors, affect resident perceptions of tourism and their support of, or opposition to, tourism. The results of these studies suggest that the evaluation of several elements of exchange affect the way tourism is perceived and the manner in which residents react to tourism.

Social exchange theorists suggest that the evaluation of the value of an exchange is complex and dynamic (Blau 1964; Homans 1967). Furthermore, the behaviourists acknowledge that individuals are likely to be evaluating a range of interacting rewards and costs in making rational decisions (Turner 1986). A study by Lui and Var (1986) demonstrated this complexity. They found that residents regarded environmental protection as more important than economic benefits of tourism but they were unwilling to sacrifice their standard of living for environmental conservation. Jurowski et al (1997) argues the complexity and dynamism of the exchange process suggests that our understanding of resident reactions to tourism would be enhanced by an analysis of the interplay of values residents place on the elements being exchanged and their perceptions of how tourism impacts what they value.
Ap (1992a) also based his research on social exchange principles in an exploration of the relationship between resident perceptions of their power to control tourism and their support for tourism development. However, according to Ap, ‘the power discrepancy variable did not emerge as the most important variable in explaining the variance of perceived tourism impact’ (p.236). He attributes the failure of the study to test the exchange relation concept to the non-experimental design of the study that precluded manipulating the power variable. He suggested that a study of the value of the resources and perceived benefits and costs may provide further insight into exchange relationships.

Analytic and Explanatory Framework

While the previous research findings remain inconclusive, sufficient evidence was found to suggest that exchange theory provides a suitable framework for analyzing resident attitudes about tourism and for discovering why there may be a spectrum of different attitudes within the same community. The study conducted by Jurowski et al (1997) explored how the interplay of exchange factors influence not only attitudes about tourism but also host community resident perceptions of tourism’s impact. It demonstrates that the perceptions of the economic, social and environmental impacts combine to formulate resident attitudes about tourism and that these perceptions and attitudes are influenced by several exchange elements.

Since the exchange of value objects or sentiments from which a gain or loss could be realized in the tourism exchange process may involve economic, social and environmental resources, an understanding of resident evaluations of the exchanges made
in the three domains is critical to explaining the interplay of factors that influence resident attitudes toward tourism. Social exchange theory can be used to explain why earlier research demonstrated that support for tourism is dependent on resident perceptions of tourism's impact. Theoretically, the relationship holds true because the perception of tourism's impact is a result of assessing rewards and costs. Consequently, residents who perceive the exchange with tourists as beneficial will support tourism, while those who perceive the exchange as deleterious will oppose tourism development. The perception of tourism's impact is affected by the exchange the perceivers believe they are making. Therefore, expressed support for tourism development may be considered as a willingness to enter into an exchange with tourists.

The theory also helps to explain why there appears to be a relationship among four factors that influence the perception of the impacts of tourism - economic gain, use of the tourism resource, attachment to community and attitudes toward the environment. Theoretically, those who gain economically from tourism should view the impacts of tourism more positively and should lend more support to tourism. Individuals who use the same resource as do tourists may view tourism positively when tourism improves the resource and negatively when an influx of visitors prevents the resident from enjoying the resource. The perception of tourism's impact will vary with the individuals' assessment of how tourism impacts their resource. Many of the elements that create the ambience of a community are affected by tourism, and one's attachment to that community should affect how one perceives the impacts of tourism. An ecocentric attitude, which reflects a
strong belief in the preservation and protection of the environment, would result in a more negative perception of any type of development.

**Limitations of Social Exchange Theory**

While a selective view of the research evidence supports an exchange or equity system (as suggested by Social Exchange Theory), in the case of evaluating tourism, a deeper investigation suggests a more complex relationship (Pearce et al, 1996). It has been reported that residents who are likely to benefit from tourism are more likely to support tourism. Several studies, however, report that these people are also more likely than others to report negative impacts (King et al, 1993), or that personal benefits are significantly related to perceptions of positive benefits but explain very little in the case of perceptions of negative impacts.

Consistent findings by Madrigal (1993) and Lankford and Howard (1994) who report a positive relationship between perceived personal benefits and beliefs about personal influence on tourism decision-making, may possibly indicate an alternative to perceived equity in the explanation of perceptions about tourism (Pearce et al, 1996). The nature of this relationship requires further detailed investigation and can only be described as exploratory in the context of a theoretical development.

**Modelling Support for Tourism**

Jurowski et al (1997) proposed a model based on Social Exchange Theory to integrate factors influencing hosts’ reactions:
S = F (ECI, SI, EVI, U, EA, G, A) + U

Where

ECI = F (U, EA, G, A)  
SI = F (U, G, A)  
EVI = F (U, EA, G, A)

Where

S = Support for nature-based tourism  
ECI = Economic Impact  
SI = Social Impact  
EVI = Environmental Impact  
U = Use of tourism resource area  
EA = Ecocentric attitudes  
G = Potential Economic Gain  
A = Attachment to the community  
U = Unknown variable

Their model proposed that perceived potential for economic gain, use of the resource base, attachment to one’s community and attitudes toward the preservation of the natural environment influenced how residents perceived the economic, social and environmental impacts of tourism development. While the model provided some evidence concerning the interaction of various factors and the influence of these on support for tourism
development, it aggregated the costs and benefits into three categories of impacts, namely, economic, social and environmental.

Gursoy, Jurowski and Uysal (2002) advanced the concept by segregating the impacts into costs and benefits and then by examining the influence of the perceptions of the costs and benefits on support for tourism. In their study of the five counties surrounding the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area located in South West Virginia, they demonstrated how each factor affects the perceptions of the costs and benefits separately and shows the relationships among the factors. Their findings revealed that the host community support for tourism development is affected by six factors:

1. Level of community concern of local residents
2. Utilization of tourism resource base by local residents
3. Level of ecocentric values of local residents
4. The state of the local economy
5. The perceived costs, and
6. The perceived benefits of tourism development

One of the most important theoretical contributions of this study is that its findings confirm the usefulness of exchange theory principles in explaining residents’ attitudes toward tourism. Factors which the community rated as important were identified as the determinants of the perceptions of the impact of tourism and thus, support for tourism. A second theoretical contribution of their study is the integration of the 'state of the local
economy’ and community concern’ constructs into the model. While the former was found to be the most influential factor on local residents support / opposition for tourism, ‘community concern’ was found to be the third most influential construct.

Social exchange theory formed the basis for another recent study conducted by Chen (2002). He sought to develop an Urban Tourism Impact Scale from social, cultural and environmental perspectives and to test the relationship between residents’ perceptions of tourism’s impacts, total impact, and residents’ support for future tourism development. Although this study focussed on urban rather than rural communities, it holds significance for this research because Chen surveyed three groups of residents, each with different attitudes toward tourism development namely, supporters, moderators and opponents.

A similar typology of residents was reported by Weaver and Lawton (2001), in their study of resident perceptions of tourism on Tambourine Mountain, a destination on the urban-rural fringe of Australia’s Gold Coast. They categorized residents as ‘supporters’, ‘neutrals’ and ‘opponents’. This study and others before it (McKenzie, 1996; DIMA 1997) represent a further development on the work done on resident perceptions as it focuses on an area that is neither urban nor rural. While in Butler’s (1980) life cycle construct, rural areas are characterized by low population growth and slow pace of change (exploration or decline), in contrast, Weaver and Lawton describe the urban-rural fringe as indicative of the ‘involvement’ stage closer to the rural boundary and the ‘development’ stage near the urban boundary. However, they caution that comparisons
between studies must be approached with care as much of the work referred to in relation to their study, was conducted in developed countries.

Conclusion

The findings revealed in this chapter serve to confirm that the relationship between residents' perceptions of tourism and their support for the industry is very complex. As a consequence, the predictive models suggested so far have not been. The major theories were scrutinized at length, including Butler's (1980) Tourist Area Life Cycle model, Doxey's (1975) Irridex and Emerson's (1962) Social Exchange Theory. While Butler's Lifecycle model and Doxey's Irridex have been widely employed in empirical research, they both have several limitations, which were identified here. To the extent that they provide a useful framework for identifying and describing the stage of tourism development, they remain virtually useless in accounting for variations in perceptions among groups in a community. From the analysis, it would appear that Social Exchange Theory is the most applicable model for this study as it provides a basis for explaining much of the contradictory findings that have been reported. Having therefore established the theoretical basis of the study, the next chapter will discuss the context in which the research work was undertaken.
CHAPTER FOUR

AN OVERVIEW OF CARIBBEAN TOURISM

Introduction

In this chapter, an overview of small-island developing economies is presented and their unique characteristics are highlighted in relation to their economic viability. This is supplemented by an examination of tourism’s importance to the Caribbean as a whole and the key factors which typify the industry’s performance in the region.

Peculiarities of Island Economies

It is widely documented and acknowledged that small island developing states (SIDS) face a number of challenges to their economic survival and prosperity; challenges that are related to their size, insularity, remoteness and proneness to natural disasters. These factors render the economies of these states vulnerable to forces outside their control. Briguglio (1995) argues that this condition sometimes threatens their economic viability as the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or Gross National product (GNP) per capita indices often mask their actual status.

Firstly, their small size places restrictions on their capacity to achieve economies of scale in every sphere of economic activity. In turn, this gives rise to high per unit costs of production, high costs of infrastructure construction and utilization per capita, high per unit costs of training specialized manpower and a high degree of dependence on imported technologies (Briguglio 1995). This places them at a distinct disadvantage, as they cannot be truly competitive in the marketplace.
Secondly, as an island separated by water, the costs of transport and taxes are levied on the supply of all imports. This is compounded by the fact that these countries rely heavily on imports to service the tourism industry. Further, islanders are known to suffer the effects of isolation, arising from deep-seated feelings of dependency on outside forces for survival. In Tobago, the island’s dependency on the inter-island ferry for its daily sustenance evokes similar sentiments amongst its inhabitants (Weaver 1998).

Thirdly, as a developing country, the concomitant realities of high levels of unemployment, poor health facilities and limited opportunities for tertiary education conspire to generate a sense of neglect, frustration and hopelessness, to varying degrees.

While this scenario may seem exaggerated, it is a reality that confronts small-islanders in most developing countries. To the extent that these endemic frustrations may be sufficient cause for either complacency or rebellion, island governments often welcome tourism development in the hope that it would be the panacea for all societal ills. Experience has shown and many experts would argue that in fact, tourism often creates more problems than it solves.

**Importance of Tourism to the Caribbean**

Geographically, the Caribbean extends from the tip of the South American mainland northwards to Florida on the south coast of North America. Wedged between two continents, the islands are influenced by many aspects of both cultures as well as a colourful heritage wrought by its varied experiences of European colonialism. Both
factors, geographical location and historical legacy, play a significant role in determining the structure and diversity of Caribbean tourism (McElroy, Albuquerque and Dioguardi 1993). A map showing the location of the Caribbean islands is presented in Appendix 8.

For many decades, the Caribbean has been romanticised in glossy tourist brochures. Seeking to lure affluent northerners, tour operators and promoters have conjured up images of sun, sea and sand to create illusions of paradise. Linton (1987) has argued that tourism in the developing world has been set up by agreements between foreign image-makers and local elites, to the exclusion of host peoples. It is these enduring images that, over the years, have helped to perpetuate the region’s reputation as the playground of the rich and famous. Although this cliché still applies to some extent, the growth of charter airlines has made the islands more accessible to a wider cross section of travellers, largely eroding the exclusivity for which they were once known. Appendix 9 indicates tourist arrivals to selected Caribbean islands during the period 1996-2000.

To Caribbean people, there is nothing romantic about their homeland. They see tourism as an essential part of their lives, as it offers them a means to earn a living. According to WTO estimates, Caribbean tourism accounts for one in every four jobs and employs an estimated 613,000 persons (CTO 1998). Undoubtedly, tourism plays a role in every island but its significance to the livelihood of the local people varies from place to place. Appendix 10 shows employment in tourism throughout the islands of the Caribbean.
Tourist-Dependent Economies

Tourism is unlike any other industry by virtue of its multi-faceted nature. Its interdependence with other industries is demonstrated whenever there is a downturn in travel. While threats to the agriculture industry such as diseases and natural disasters are largely confined to farmers and distributors, the impact is much more dramatic when tourists fail to travel. In the latter case, thousands of livelihoods are adversely affected because tourism depends on the output of a host of other industries for a wide variety of products and services needed to satisfy the demanding tourist appetite. The chain extends from agriculture to transport and manufacturing, to communications and retail services. Therefore, whenever there is a fall in demand for a product or service, this triggers a ripple effect in other areas. Appendix 11 illustrates the multiplier effect of tourism.

Tourism varies in its importance to the national economies of the region. When expressed as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), tourist expenditure in 2000 accounted for a mere 4% of GDP in oil and energy-rich Trinidad and Tobago, while contributing 21% in the Jamaican economy. In Barbados and the Bahamas, income from tourists generated 33% and 44% of the domestic output, respectively, while in Antigua and Barbuda, the level rose to 63%. Even more significantly, tourist spending produced as much as 83% of the GDP in British-controlled Anguilla (CTO 2001). From such a cursory overview, it would seem reasonable to conclude that the more tourist-dependent islands are likely to be more severely affected from any downturn in travel from the tourist-generating countries in the north. Appendix 12 shows the contribution which tourist expenditure makes to GDP for selected Caribbean islands.
Market Profile

The American influence throughout the region is clearly evident in the type of facilities and range of services provided for the demanding American tourist. Everywhere, prices are quoted in US dollars and an increasing number of American chain hotels have taken root in the region. However, it would be wrong to assume that the same applies throughout the Caribbean.

American travellers have traditionally displayed a preference for several short-break holidays compared to the European demand for longer stays of two or three weeks, a reflection of distance and the cost of travel. Furthermore, the geographical proximity of the Caribbean provides a perfect opportunity for vacationing in a completely different environment near to home. For this reason, the islands that are located in the northern reaches such as the Bahamas and Jamaica tend to enjoy more prolific American patronage than their southern counterparts. Tourist arrivals in 2001 by main markets are shown for selected Caribbean islands in Appendix 13.

Traditional Markets

The cultural heritage of the Caribbean and its historical links with several European powers, also play a key role in determining the profile of tourist traffic to the region. While some islands such as Martinique and Aruba have retained strong political ties with France and Holland respectively, others such as Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago, although now independent, have a common British colonial history. To this end, Europe
provides a consistent segment of the overall tourist market for many of the Caribbean islands. Appendix 14 illustrates the market segments for Caribbean tourism in 2000.

**Product Differentiation**

Typically, the Caribbean is often labelled as a single sun, sea and sand product in the tourist brochures. This homogenous image that has been created by brokers outside the region, has contributed to a rigorous stereotyping of these destinations among trade organizations as well as consumers. On the other hand, Caribbean Tourism authorities have invested huge sums of money in trying to convince travellers that each island has a unique product to offer (CTO, 1997). This image gap between sellers and buyers of tourism products is a serious cause for concern as it often leads to disenfranchisement of local communities whose fates are inextricably linked and controlled by external agents. Despite these challenges, a few destinations, such as Costa Rica, Belize and Dominica, are now clearly emerging as eco-tourism destinations in their own right. This stereotypical branding of Caribbean destinations is likely to continue indefinitely unless there is a more assertive intervention by destination representatives in determining how their products should be marketed.

**Chronic Seasonality**

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the region’s welfare is significantly determined by the travel habits of rich northerners. Caribbean tourism is intrinsically unsteady, even under normal circumstances, as hotels must shed staff during the four months when occupancy levels fall during the northern summer. Local people are
therefore deprived of work for a third to a half of the income year and have to seek alternative jobs until they are recalled at the start of the high season (December to April). This seasonal work cycle presents a recurring dilemma to tourism workers who may need bank loans, as such persons are often not considered credit-worthy prospects because of the erratic nature of their income stream. Appendix 15 illustrates the seasonal flow of Caribbean tourist arrivals during 2000.

**Tourism Policy and Planning**

'Few Caribbean territories have any tourism policy beyond that of unlimited growth, and many of their sporadic plans are often idealistic' (Dann, 1992, p.162). Arguing that Caribbean commitment to tourism as a long-term vehicle of development is weak and in some cases, absent, Holder (1988) believes that the dilemma is related to the perception by the Black majority populations of the 1960s of tourism as 'an alien industry, where non-Caribbean personnel, managing low-level Caribbean staff, catered to a non-Caribbean clientele' (p.12). As a result, tourism was widely perceived as an extension of the colonialist syndrome traditionally associated with sugar plantations (Holder, 1993).

Bloomestein (1988) argues that many Caribbean states demonstrate a weak commitment to formal comprehensive planning because of a lack of realism in terms of constraints and barriers to achieve stated goals. Moreover, because many plans have been formulated by experts without much local consultation, these often do not reflect the aspirations of the wider community. Consequently, many plans never go beyond the status of a mere technical document. This failure of implementation is key to the development problems
in many of the islands and largely results from the public sector’s lack of a clear structure of authority and delineation of decision-making areas. Wilkinson (1997) identifies five key factors that confound Caribbean tourism development:

1. Lack of integration with national development
2. Weak institutional arrangements
3. Preoccupation with tourist numbers rather than benefits
4. Lack of regional co-operation
5. Need for investment

It would be misleading however, to conclude more than a decade later that the situation has remained unchanged. Over the ensuing period, and to varying degrees, tourism planning and practice have embraced the new emerging technologies in many destinations. This has occurred in parallel with a more competitive approach to marketing and some attempt to address the vital issue of sustainable development. These efforts have been largely facilitated by support provided by the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO).

Conclusion
This brief overview of Caribbean tourism highlighted the fundamental issues associated with the development of tourism in the region. The discussion revealed that the structure and performance of Caribbean tourism are influenced by the geographical and historical realities as well as by issues of size and scale. While it does not pretend to be
comprehensive, this account serves as a platform on which to introduce the two study areas of Charlotteville, Tobago and Speightstown, Barbados. The next chapter addresses the first target area of this study, Charlotteville, Tobago.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE TOBAGO TOURISM INDUSTRY

Introduction

This chapter gives a general account of tourism on the island of Tobago and the village of Charlotteville, the first target community selected for research purposes. It also examines the structure of the industry and the policies and programmes which are employed in its development.

Tourism in Tobago

Tobago forms part of the twin-island state of Trinidad and Tobago, an independent country since 1962 and a Democratic Republic since 1976. The seat of parliament is located in the capital city, Port of Spain on the larger island, Trinidad. Tobago is served locally by a House of Assembly, which presides over the administration of the island’s affairs. With a population of only forty-seven thousand on Tobago (1990 census) and 1.2 million in Trinidad, each island has its own distinctive character. While Trinidad, rich in petroleum and natural gas, is cosmopolitan, Tobago’s inhabitants are mainly people of African descent, many of whom depend on tourism for their livelihood.

It is claimed that Tobago has been romanticized in the famous novel by Daniel Defoe as 'Robinson Crusoe Island'. Indeed, it is often described as the last island because it still retains much of its pristine glory, still relatively unscarred by the impacts of
development. Tobago possesses a quality of character that epitomizes the holiday spirit. The pace of life on the island is unhurried and the people are genuinely hospitable to strangers. Quite apart from its natural beauty, these cultural attributes constitute an essential part of the Tobago tourism product.

Only 300 square kilometres in area, the island has a rich diversity of flora and fauna as well as spectacular topographical and other natural attributes, including beaches, rain forests and marine parks. Its rich heritage is in part, due to its strategic location at the southern tip of the Caribbean chain of islands and just fifty kilometres off the South American mainland. The waters which surround the island, are fed by the Orinoco River from Venezuela and this accounts for the wealth of marine life-forms which abound. Appendix 16 shows a map of Tobago.

**Economy**

Tobagonians have courted tourists since the 1950s. Over the ensuing years, the industry persisted without any endorsement from Government. It was not until 1986, shortly after the industry found support from a newly elected government, that tourism began to receive recognition as an economically viable industry. It came into prominence in the early 1990s at a time when the new Government realized that there was an urgent need to diversify the economy in order to rid itself of a total reliance on the vagaries of the global petroleum markets. What was formerly a dormant industry, has now become an economic sector of significance; tourism is now the second largest employer after the state. Yet, tourism in Tobago can be considered to be in its infancy,
or in Doxey's (1975) well-documented continuum, still in the 'involvement' stage of evolution.

The island of Tobago is divided into parishes, the most populated being St. Andrew where the main town, Scarborough is located. Scarborough with a population of ten thousand, is the commercial centre of the island with government offices and retail businesses. There are few statistics on Tobago, most records having been subsumed in the national reports for the country of Trinidad and Tobago as a whole. Tobago's economy is built around the civil service, which, it is estimated, accounts for 25% of employment on the island. It is not certain what percentage of the workforce are employed in the tourism sector, however rough estimates indicate that the industry accounts for some 20% – 30% of overall employment (author's estimates).

Tobagonians rely on agriculture, fishery and tourism for their livelihood. Agriculture, once a thriving industry, has now been whittled down to mainly subsistence farming, as over the years, farmers have abandoned the land in favour of more lucrative service sector jobs, including tourism. Consequently, the majority of produce must of necessity, be imported from Trinidad to meet local demand. Fishing has remained largely intact except where established fishing facilities have been displaced by tourism development, particularly hotels. Unlike agriculture, fishing seems to be a vocation that is steeped in cultural heritage and as such, its welfare is fiercely guarded by local people. While the island does not engage in any significant manufacturing,
there is a small commercial sector comprising small businesses and micro enterprises, some of which have been established to service tourism.

Over the last two decades, there has been little or no effective population growth due to the continuous migration of youth in search of educational and employment opportunities in nearby Trinidad, the larger and more sophisticated of the twin-island republic. This haemorrhage of its human resource base is a perennial problem, as there are limited opportunities for jobs and inadequate skills-training facilities on the island. Apart from this inter-island drift, there is also an intra-island movement of people from the outlying districts to the town, in search of jobs. This forced displacement of the population has had significant socio-economic implications for the sub-economies of the various communities and for the island as a whole.

Historically, Tobago has suffered from high unemployment levels ranging from 20% to 25% (CSO, 2000). A recent boom in hotel construction on the island may have led to a reduction in this level, although empirical evidence shows that a significant proportion of the construction workforce comes from neighbouring Trinidad (from author’s observation as a resident). Informants on the island have suggested that this happens only because many Tobagonians do not possess the necessary skills while others are unwilling to work for the level of wages offered. Whatever the reason, it is clear that this situation has significant implications for the welfare of the island and its people and therefore needs to be addressed.
Chapter Five

The Tobago Tourism Industry

Tourist Arrivals

Tobago has recorded consistent growth in its stayover arrivals over the last decade, with an average annual increase of 30%. Visitors arrive either directly or via Trinidad. In the latter case, there are no records of arrivals in-transit to Tobago. Direct tourist arrivals to Tobago was 22,117 in 1994 and by 1998 that number had increased to 56,001, a 153% increase over the five-year period (TIDCO 2000). If average annual growth were to remain at this level (30%), it was projected that arrivals would have exceeded the 100,000 mark by the end of 2002. However, this is unlikely to materialize, as the island suffered a loss in tourist traffic because of the pullout by two major charter airlines in 2001. Table 5.1 shows tourist arrivals to Tobago over the period 1994 to 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DIRECT ARRIVALS</th>
<th>% CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>22,117</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>26,558</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>28,386</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>42,189</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>56,001</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 Direct Tourist Arrivals to Tobago 1994 - 1998

Source Markets

Since 1990, Tobago has consistently received positive publicity in the British travel press and this has contributed in large measure, to building awareness in the marketplace of a destination, which was previously, relatively unknown. As a result, the United Kingdom represents Tobago’s most important market (38%), while
Germany contributes another 28% and other Europe, a further 16%. (TIDCO 2000).

Unlike most of its Caribbean neighbours, Tobago is not reliant on the American market; it only accounts for 9% of arrivals. Appendix 17 illustrates the markets for Tobago tourism in 1999. The main reasons for this are because the island is located furthest south (in the Caribbean archipelago) from the North American continent and also because it does not offer the shopping and nightlife facilities which the typical American tourist craves.

**Accommodation sector**

The island possesses a wide range of accommodation facilities from luxury hotels and condominiums to apartments, villas and self-catering units. Over 90% of the properties are locally owned and operated, the majority of which are small establishments of less than 50 rooms. The destination’s largest hotel, Tobago Hilton (250 rooms) is owned by a local consortium but Hilton International, a British conglomerate, manages its operations. The fastest growing sub-sector has been guesthouses (properties of 10 rooms or less), perhaps due to the fact that Government offers investors (reserved for local participation) an attractive package of incentives. Accommodation providers voluntarily subscribe to a regulatory system for monitoring the standard of visitor accommodation on the island.

In terms of the national agenda, Tobago was identified as the focus for Tourism development, having the natural attributes of a typical resort destination, when compared to Trinidad (GOTT, 1990). In 1990, legislation (Foreign Investment Act)
was introduced to amend the Aliens’ Landholding Act to allow foreigners to acquire land and property for both residential and commercial purposes. As a consequence, the island experienced a gradual but consistent boom in construction coupled with a steady growth in tourist arrivals. Growth of Tobago room stock over the period 1978 to 2001 is shown in Appendix 18. This transition from what was largely a dormant state, to a fully activated industry over a relatively short period of 10 years, had marked implications for the resident Tobagonians. One such impact was an explosion in the value of real estate.

**Infrastructure**

The infrastructure on Tobago is relatively well developed. A modern deep-water harbour with cruise ship, roll-on-roll-off cargo and ferry facilities was commissioned in 1992 and so was the airport which was then upgraded to international status. The road network is well-defined and reasonably well maintained with street lighting in many populated areas and on the main ‘highway’ which spans a mere five kilometres. The communication infrastructure is also of modern standard, with only a few areas on the north coast being devoid of telephone and television reception. Internet access is available at public libraries and at certain public and private schools. Moreover, in 1998, the Government made a provision for all public servants to acquire a home computer through a low-interest loan facility.

Despite its small size, Tobago has a wide diversity of attractions and facilities, particularly its spectacular reefs, deep-sea fishing, SCUBA diving and all the various
types of water sports. Apart from its marine attractions, the island also has the oldest protected rain forest in the Western Hemisphere (since 1763), and a 400-acre offshore island that has been designated a bird sanctuary and research station. The topography is dramatic and varied and the landscape is punctuated in several points by ruins and historic fortifications, reminiscent of its turbulent military history. Tobago’s culture is influenced by a diverse patrimony steeped in the traditions of Africa, Spain, France and Britain, elements of which are showcased in its annual Heritage Festival.

Tourism Awareness

In the last study on residents’ perception of tourism on Tobago, findings indicated a growing awareness and acceptance of tourism among residents (UNECLAC 1992). The general population’s awareness of tourism appears to be relatively high, perhaps due in part to the small size of the island and hence the enhanced opportunity for host-guest interaction. Residents inadvertently find themselves in direct contact with visitors both in the public domain and in the course of conducting tourism business. It is also remarkable that tourism has been incorporated as a subject of study in the school curriculum. Additionally, in 1990, the Tourism Division initiated a tourism awareness programme, which targets schools and community groups on an on-going basis. Unfortunately, the programme is grossly under-funded and faces severe setbacks in planning and implementation.
Tourism Development Policy in Trinidad and Tobago

Being a twin island state with a central Government, the national policy governing tourism development applies to both islands (TIDCO, 2000). However, the policy acknowledges that each island has different attributes and to this extent, special consideration must be accorded Tobago in light of its small size and fragile environment, among other factors.

The national policy envisions that tourism in Tobago will develop in a controlled manner with respect to the built infrastructure and the islands’ carrying capacity. To this end, there are restrictions on the height of hotels (three levels) and the spatial distribution of hotel rooms in designated zones around the island. The policy also recognizes the need for local participation in the tourism business sector and as such, certain small business opportunities such as guesthouses, dive shops and restaurants, have been reserved for local investors. On the marketing side, Tobago will not be promoted to the sun, sea and sand mass tourist, but rather, it will seek to attract selected niche markets for its unique products: weddings and honeymoons, SCUBA diving and bird-watching.

The Tobago Development Plan

In 1998, the Tobago House of Assembly (THA) produced a draft plan for the integrated development of the island. The document, which was first published for public comment, cited Agro-tourism as a strategic opportunity with huge potential for development. It rationalized that such an approach to exploiting Tobago’s natural resources, would not only place the destination in a position of competitive advantage
in the marketplace, but would also achieve the worthy objective of revitalization of the ailing agriculture industry. The plan outlined a number of strategies including a regime of incentives to investors for research and development, fiscal and financial support as well as legislative reform in land distribution. Additionally, the plan also envisions the establishment of an offshore banking industry, which it claims, would provide a further stimulus to the tourism sector (THA, 1998).

**Beach Access**

There are no private beaches in Trinidad and Tobago, despite claims made to the contrary in some hotel operators' brochures. According to the Three Chains Act of 1865, anyone has free access to the beach once they are within 3 chains (66 metres) from the high tide watermark: 'reserved around the coast of the island a strip or belt of land of three chains breath from the high water mark.'

In light of the tendency of hotel developers to build their properties on the beach, beach access for locals has become a thorny issue, as hoteliers seek to retain the precincts of the beach for the exclusive use of their paying guests. This controversy came to a head during the fieldwork stage of this study, when a security guard was fatally wounded at Pigeon Point, one of the island's most popular beaches. Beach games such as cricket and football, a traditional past time of every West-Indian community, are now restricted on the more popular beaches. **Appendix 19** is a newspaper article on the lockout of fishermen from Pigeon Point beach, Tobago.
Study Area Number One

Charlotteville

The key characteristics of the Charlotteville study area may be summarized as:

- Small rural community (less than 1000 adult residents)
- Approximately 300 households
- Geographically spread over a 2-3 kilometre radius
- Fishing and subsistence farming are its mainstay
- High level of unemployment
- Emerging tourism small business sector
- Peripheral to the main tourist centre
- Recreational beaches
- Aspects of natural beauty
- Poor tourist infrastructure e.g. accommodation
- Informal tourist sector (bed and breakfasts / guest houses)
- Low level of development

Charlotteville is a seaside village with a population of approximately 2,000 inhabitants. It is located on the Caribbean coastline and on the northeastern tip of the island. The mainstay of this community was traditionally fishing and agriculture. However, over the last ten years, tourism has been slowly replacing the traditional industries as a means of livelihood. Today, the village has retained much of its rustic charm although there has recently been a surge of construction activity adding guesthouses, villas and residential homes mainly for retirees.
The village has a deep-water harbour with jetty facilities capable of accommodating small cruise ships apart from the resident fishing fleet of some fifty pirogues (based on author's actual count in February 2001). There is also an unofficial yachting community in Charlotteville. In 2000, the village was designated an official port of entry, despite the fact that yachting facilities are virtually non-existent. This has led to severe friction between yachts people and some residents who consider the visitors as poachers, competing with locals for berths, limited supplies of potable water and polluting their beaches by disposing sewerage from their holding tanks.

Excursionists also arrive by road, mostly in self-drive vehicles, but also by bus on organized sightseeing tours. The guest-host ratio increases dramatically on occasions of cruise ship arrivals and during the high season: December to April. Due to the small size of the community, there is a high level of interaction between residents and tourists. While no statistics are available, the last few years have seen a small but consistent growth in the arrival of visitors, many of whom have a penchant for the tranquil lifestyle. To this end, some outsiders have taken up residence in Charlotteville. This development has also brought with it the associated issues of changing community relations and social stratification, and increasing pressures on the limited infrastructure.

Charlotteville presently has a visitor accommodation capacity of approximately one hundred rooms (estimated, as many families take in guests in their homes on an unofficial basis). Its employable population has remained static or may have even decreased over the last ten years as opportunities for paid work are few and constantly
dwindling. Young persons therefore tend to move away from home after finishing secondary school, there being a dearth of opportunities for further education or skills training in the vicinity. Some gravitate to the capital town, Scarborough, while others move on to nearby Trinidad in search of work or further education. Very few remain in the village to work in family businesses or as fishermen and farmers.

This displacement of youth from the village has contributed to a certain malaise and sense of hopelessness among the residents. In an effort to address this, the Tobago House of Assembly (THA) and the Small Business Development Company have attempted to discourage this exodus by developing programmes to create employment opportunities through entrepreneurship. Unfortunately, these efforts have achieved little success, as most of the youth openly declare their aspirations to hold a job in the civil service.

Conclusion

This chapter covered the essential aspects of the character and structure of the tourism industry in Tobago. It was shown that tourism is not a significant contributor to the national treasury of the twin-island republic although it plays a much greater role in the economy of Tobago. It is difficult to obtain accurate data on Tobago, as the statistics are subsumed within the national reports for Trinidad and Tobago and this has resulted in the need to estimate tourism statistics. The chapter also described the first study area, Charlotteville and discussed some of the problems which affect its local residents. The following chapter examines the second target area, Speightstown, Barbados.
CHAPTER SIX

THE BARBADOS TOURISM INDUSTRY

Introduction

The contextual relevance of Barbados and its second largest town, Speightstown, is explored in this chapter. The discussion examines the main tenets of the national tourism plans, the economic climate and the fundamental aspects of the Barbados tourism product. An overview of key Government strategies and programmes which shape the tourism environment, is also presented.

Tourism in Barbados

Barbados is the most easterly of the Caribbean islands and is located 400 kilometres north-east of Venezuela (South American continent) and 300 kilometres north-east of Trinidad and Tobago. Its population of 262,600 persons are mainly of African extract with small numbers of people of various other racial origins. The country has the distinction of having one of the highest literacy rates in the world perhaps due in part to the fact that formal education is freely available from primary to tertiary level. In 1996, it was ranked 25th in the United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) human development index, thus giving it the third highest ‘quality of life’ rating among developing countries (www.calabashskyviews.com). Only 425 square kilometres in area, Barbados has a tropical climate with summer-like conditions throughout the year, making it an ideal resort for those wishing to flee the harsh northern winters. A map of Barbados is shown in Appendix 20.
Barbados is one of the most mature tourism destinations in the Caribbean region. While large-scale tourism began in the late 1950s, its colonial ties to Britain made the island a popular destination for wealthy British nationals long before World War II. However, the absence of a strong tourism planning and policy framework in the early stages of its development has contributed to a range of environmental and social challenges that can be attributed, if only partially, to tourism development. Nevertheless, tourism continues to be the major foreign exchange earner, providing direct and indirect employment for thousands of residents and serving as a catalyst for growth and development in other sectors of the local economy (Barbados Ministry of Tourism 2001).

**Economy**

The island of Barbados may be considered a highly developed tourist economy. In 1998, the tourism industry earned over 70% of the country’s foreign exchange and accounted for 40% of Gross National Output, making it the most important sector to the national economy. In the same year, tourism’s share of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) stood at US$482.2 million and total visitor expenditure was US$1406 million, surpassing all previous achievements (Government of Barbados 2000). Appendix 21 shows tourism receipts over the period 1991 to 2000. In its review of the economy for 1999, the Central Bank of Barbados indicated that real Gross Domestic Product increased by 3.1%, growth that was spurred by new investment in the tourism sector (Central Bank of Barbados 1999). The Government, in its Medium Term Investment Plan for the period 1998-2003 projects an injection of capital investment totalling US$868.9 million (Barbados Ministry of Tourism 1999).
Direct employment in the tourism sector amounted to 14,100 persons in 2000. However, when the overall economic impact of the industry is considered including such spin off industries as retail services and transport, official estimates of tourism's impact on employment are likely to exceed 20,000 persons. Despite this, there are high unemployment levels on the island, averaging 23% (Barbados Statistical Service 2000).

Infrastructure

Barbados possesses an excellent road network and modern telecommunication infrastructure. Grantly Adams international airport is an air traffic hub for the southern Caribbean and handles a range of scheduled and chartered airline services from major gateways in both North America and Europe. Appendix 22 lists charter and scheduled airline services serving Barbados in 2002. The destination is also a key feature of several intra-Caribbean itineraries operated by at least two regional air carriers as well as a strategic airport facilitating fly-cruise packages to the southern and eastern Caribbean. The cruise shipping facilities on Barbados are well established to service the growing cruise-market as the island is a popular port of call on most Caribbean itineraries. Appendix 23 shows key tourism targets for the period 2002 – 2010.
Tourism Development Policy in Barbados

The Barbados Development Plan, 1993-2000 acknowledges that the country’s marketing focus on ‘sun, sand and friendly people’ was even then, no longer relevant for achieving success in tourism and in it the Government alluded to inherent challenges which the destination faced at the time:

.... insufficient air access, tourism fatigue (including waning attitudes to visitors), a reduced sense of security, ageing plant and high operating costs....

(Government of Barbados 1993 p.161)

The history of tourism in Barbados shows that tourism was largely unplanned, characterized by a laissez faire approach. In fact, it has been described as passive or reactive, rather than active (Marshall 1977 p.5). Formal and strategic economic development planning has been random and haphazard. Rather than having a tourism policy or a tourism plan, the Government deals with tourism primarily through two mechanisms: national development plans and physical development plans. The former deals predominantly with social and economic policies, whereas the latter translate these into land-use policies. It has been argued therefore, that the Barbados Government is really only involved in tourism land-use planning and not tourism development policy or planning (Wilkinson, 1997).

of tourism a great deal of attention, but provides few solutions. Specifically, it called for the need to avoid the displacement of Barbadians by visitors, to preserve and enhance Barbadian rights, to define acceptable standards of conduct and behaviour by visitors, and to strengthen the social and cultural fabric of the country. While research, development and planning regarding the social and cultural influences of tourism was initiated some three decades ago (Press 1978 p.110), evidence of real progress in this area remains elusive.

Later attempts to introduce a formal approach to tourism development arose out of the ‘Barbados Tourism 2000’ Strategic Plan. Indeed, it was not until 1997, that the government initiated steps to develop a National Tourism Policy leading to a more structured approach to managing the industry. Two years later, in an effort to encourage public participation in the planning process, the Ministry of Tourism produced a Green Paper on tourism for public consultation. It was intended that the outcome of this exercise would provide valuable input before the draft policy was finalized.

The policy has as its objective:

To pursue sustainable tourism development through improvement and optimal use of our land, human resources and services, and through the conservation and managed use of our cultural, built and natural heritage, in order to ensure a product of the highest quality whilst improving the life and economic development of the people of Barbados. (Barbados Ministry of Tourism 2001)
Of particular relevance to this study is the aspect of the policy which articulates the government's vision of the role for local people in tourism:

The strategies for achieving this objective include:

1. Develop an action plan for deepening the involvement of communities in tourism
2. Develop mechanisms to sensitize communities on the scope and impact of tourism and opportunities in the sector
3. Collaborate in the development of a mechanism to co-ordinate and facilitate community tourism projects

Destination Image

Like all Caribbean islands, Barbados is firstly a warm weather destination to the travel market. While it has a broad based appeal to the sun-seeking tourists, the island has also developed an image as a luxury product for the rich and famous. Now commonly referred to as the platinum coast because of its reputation as a retreat for the many British millionaires and celebrities who frequent its shores, the affluent west coast of the island has been featured in many international publications as home of the world's most expensive real estate (Kennaway, 2000).

Market Profile

Tourist arrivals to Barbados have been steadily increasing since 1994 and reached a peak of 545,027 in 2000 (Barbados Statistical Service 2001). Appendix 24 shows trend data
for tourist arrivals to Barbados during 1991-2001. Commonly referred to as 'Little England' because of its staunch British traditions, the island enjoys strong support from the UK market, which alone accounted for 43% of annual arrivals in 2001. North America (Canada and USA) is the next market of significance contributing 31% to total market share, while the English-speaking Caribbean accounts for 16%. Appendix 25 shows tourist arrivals to Barbados in 2001 by principal markets.

The Tourism Product

Barbados’ tourism product is largely based on sun, sea and sand. However it possesses a diversity of well-packaged tourist attractions including natural underground caves, and marine parks, heritage sites, festivals, duty-free shopping and vibrant nightlife. The accommodation plant of 6,781 rooms ranges from guest houses to budget apartment hotels to five star luxury resorts most of which are located along the south and west coasts of the island. There is no Bed and Breakfast accommodation for visitors, and perhaps, this is an indication of the level of local participation in tourism commerce (Barbados Statistical Service 2001). Appendix 26 shows the growth in room stock over the period 1993-2001.

Tourism Awareness

A Barbados Tourism Awareness and Involvement Programme was developed in 1996 with the assistance of the Organization of American States (OAS). The programme, which has been ongoing since that time, was designed to sensitize Barbadians to the importance of tourism to the economic welfare of the country and to demonstrate how
local people can become involved in the industry. Tourism courses also form part of the curriculum for all primary and secondary schools.

Community Tourism Programme

In 1999, the Ministry of Tourism initiated a Community Tourism Programme consistent with its vision for encouraging sustainable development. The initiative focused on helping communities to develop tourism products within their own communities so ensuring that all the benefits would be retained there. The programme envisages that local people will gain a sense of ownership and pride in the industry as they became more involved as planners, managers and beneficiaries. Projects included bed and breakfast operations, nature tours and food and craft businesses.

Impediments to Beach Access

Part of the aesthetic appeal of islands is the scenic beauty of their coastlines. Like many other Caribbean islands, Barbados' coasts are flanked by main arterial roads, which allow travellers a commanding view of the seaside at almost every point on the journey around the island. Such visual access is often taken for granted by local people until some man-made structure appears and interrupts that accustomed window to the sea. Tourism's penchant for hugging the coastlines wherever the industry develops on a resort basis, naturally represents a constant threat to the maintenance of such viewpoints. In light of this, it is rather surprising to find that as early as 1978, this threat was recognized by Barbadian environmentalists led by a Senator Reverend Andrew Hatch. The senator, then a
director of Christian Action for Development in the Caribbean (CADEC),
recognized that the galloping rate of development was shutting the sea off from
the view of a large majority of the population.

Essentially the report made pragmatic recommendations for maintaining visual access at
key points along the coastline. It is not certain whether these proposals have been
implemented to date. However, concern over the issue has not dissipated over the years
as was clearly evident to this researcher during March 2001, when a vocal protest
demonstration was held outside Mullins Beach Resort over the management’s decision to
build concrete structures on the beach (Barbados Advocate 2001). Appendix 27 exhibits
a newspaper report on the protest at Mullins Beach. In January of the previous year, the
same hotel operator constructed a brick wall between the beach and the roadside so
obliterating travellers’ views of the sea. This created a terrible outrage among local
pressure groups and eventually, the authorities had it broken down (Nation Newspaper,
30 January 2000). The threat to free access to beaches for locals was also evident at other
locations as is shown in another newspaper report (Appendix 28) on beach blockage in
St. James.

All-Inclusive Hotel Development

Referring to his experience while holidaying in the Dominican Republic, Benjamin Carey
wrote:

Understanding the all-inclusive product is a key to identifying the conflict
between international tourism and community development. (1997 p. 13)
In tourism, the all-inclusive concept is often described as an innovative marketing response to changing consumer needs. First manifested in the form of Club Med in the 1970s, the concept was vigourously marketed in the Caribbean by the Sandals Group (Patullo 1997). Introduced in the Caribbean in the 1980s by Butch Stewart, a Jamaican hotel magnate and owner of Air Jamaica, it grew out of a dire need to protect tourists from the burgeoning criminal elements that threatened to destroy the Jamaican tourist industry. By keeping visitors under close scrutiny and within confined areas, it was considered the ideal solution to the growing menace of crime against tourists. While it succeeded in many ways to exclude tourists from interaction with locals, at the same time, it created heightened animosities and alienation among host communities.

Tourists who purchase an all-inclusive holiday package would have prepaid for all the services they would normally be required to pay for on demand, at the destination. This transaction typically takes place in the origin country and is handled by a tour operator or travel agent. In this way, no money is exchanged between seller and buyer during the course of the holiday. The hotel would normally broker most, if not all the services required providing its own car rental, tours, water-sports and other amenities apart from the usual accommodation and meals. Alternatively, these ancillary services may be arranged by a destination management company acting on behalf of the foreign tour operator. In any case, foreign currency seldom enters the destination country and whatever monies are exchanged locally, remain within a small clique of business people.
This researcher talked to several local entrepreneurs in Speightstown who confirmed that their businesses had suffered tremendously when the Almond Beach Village Hotel was converted to all-inclusive status in the year 2000. Indeed, some small businesses particularly, restaurants and taxi operators, were forced to either close or relocate, as a result of the loss of patronage from resident guests. The new hotel had opened more restaurants and had even purchased their own tour bus to meet the needs of their affluent guests.

These findings confirm that 'all-inclusives' have a smaller trickle-down effect than traditional hotels. According to a detailed analysis of Jamaica's tourist industry (OAS 1994), 'all-inclusives generate the largest amounts of revenue but their impact on the economy is smaller per dollar revenue than other accommodation subsectors. They imported more and employed fewer people per dollar revenue than other hotels.' It is noteworthy that there are 10 other all-inclusive hotels on Barbados and there are plans to build more properties of this type. (Barbados Advocate, 10 June 2002). Jenny Holland (1997), writing on Jamaica's all-inclusive hotel industry comments:

While all-inclusives and endless marketing have worked in the past, and may remain a viable segment of the market, they may well be insufficient to drive the future growth of Jamaican tourism. Endlessly reproducing the pattern of the last twenty years not only leads to unacceptable environmental degradation, but also to increasing social divisiveness, to the detriment of the tourism industry as well as the Jamaicans. In the future, diverse and integrated economic development
needs to be based on the principle of inclusion, not exclusion of the Jamaican people.

Study Area Number Two

Speightstown

The key characteristics of Speightstown as a target for this study are:

- Small community (less than 2000 adult residents)
- Approximately 600 households
- Geographically spread over a 3-4 kilometre radius
- Fishing and tourism are its mainstay
- High level of unemployment
- Established commercial centre
- Peripheral to the main tourist centre
- Recreational beaches
- Heritage attractions
- Good tourist infrastructure e.g. accommodation
- Medium level of development

One of the last eighteenth century seaports in the Caribbean, the town was named after William Speight who owned the land on which it was built. It was known as ‘Little Bristol’ on account of its trading links with Bristol, England (Barbados Tourism Authority Heritage sites of Barbados). Located in the northern parish of St. Peter, Speightstown has a number of outstanding buildings of architectural interest, some dating
back to the 18\textsuperscript{th} century. Plantation Great Houses, old churches, chattel houses and scattered features of European architecture all reflect the cultural heritage of its residents (Barbados Tourism Authority n.d).

The second town of significance after the capital, Speightstown has a fairly well developed infrastructure to cater to a growing tourist industry. It's adult population of 2,166 persons (Elections Register 2000) are mainly employed in the surrounding hotels and in the established fishing trade. Despite its commercial character, it retains a strong semblance of a rural community with an unhurried pace of life. Many of the small businesses are owned and operated by the local residents who are eager for new growth and development in the area. In a report on proposals for a re-vitalization of Speightstown, the planning consultants observed that while people were supportive of the development efforts through increased tourism, they also expressed concern about the potential negative consequences, in particular, crime and tourist harassment. The report concluded:

A common thread running through the business community was that more intensive tourist-related commercial activity was desirable but not at the expense of the character and culture of Speightstown (Design Collaborative Limited 1998 p 8.9).

A jetty was recently built to encourage cruise tours and some restoration work on the public buildings was already in progress during the fieldwork stage of this study.
Conclusion

This chapter presented an overview of the key features of the island destinations of Barbados. The tourism policies and programmes were also reviewed in establishing the general ideological context. The author focused on the target community of Speightstown where the study was based. In particular, the issues of all inclusive resorts and restricted access to beaches as areas of public recreation, were highlighted for attention. Throughout the account, the researcher has taken the liberty of injecting his informed insights in an attempt to enrich the presentation of the material. With the research context now well established, it would be appropriate to indicate the methodology that was employed in conducting the study. The next chapter therefore addresses the first stage of the fieldwork, the pilot study.
CHAPTER SEVEN

METHODOLOGY: THE PILOT STUDY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology which was used in conducting the study. It deals with each stage of the process in chronological order, from identification of the research sites through the logistical issues associated with planning and implementing the survey. A combination of techniques were employed in the primary data collection phase. Focus group meetings were first held to gauge the issues which residents considered pertinent to a discussion of tourism. A small pilot survey was carried out to test the efficacy of the interview schedule and to provide the researcher with an opportunity to refine the instrument in preparation for the main survey. Details of the design of the questionnaire and its revision are also presented along with a justification for making the required amendments. The final section discusses the challenges encountered during planning and implementation and the potential impact on the quality of the data gathered.

Selection of study areas

The study areas selected were:

- Charlottesville in Tobago and
- Speightstown in Barbados

Both these communities were selected for the following reasons:
The author wished to focus his research on rural communities since it is here that the impacts are more profound and therefore more evident (Korca 1996; Madrigal 1993; Long Perdue and Allen 1990; Snepenger Reiman Johnson and Snepenger, 1998).

The populations of these areas are relatively small (1000-2000 adults) with about 300-500 households, spread over a 2-3 kilometre radius. These characteristics make it more manageable in terms of efficient use of resources needed for surveying. Accordingly, it would be possible to poll a more significant percentage of the population and so provide richer and more in-depth data for analysis.

Both communities are working fishing villages, Charlotteville being involved in tourism to a greater extent than Speightstown. The structural and historical similarities favour a comparative analysis of both communities along the lines of Doxey's 'Irridex' model; Barbados is a more developed tourist destination than Tobago. In light of this, Tobago can be considered the 'control entity' in the study.

The author is familiar with the Charlotteville area and the tourism issues affecting it. While the author has a general knowledge of Barbados and its tourism industry, his level of familiarity is limited to knowledge gained during short stays on the island for business and holidays and from professional contacts he maintains with colleagues and friends who are based there.

The Timing

The fieldwork phase of the research was sub-divided into two sub-sections:
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- The Pilot study
- The Main study

The pilot study was scheduled for November 2000 during the tourism low season (April-December). It extended over a four-week period, two weeks in each of the islands under study. This period was selected because it allowed the author adequate preparation time, having commenced the study in October of the previous year. It also allowed for a necessary review period prior to the main study’s fieldwork stage which was scheduled to take place over a two month period beginning February 2001. A one-month period was allocated for each of the study areas: Charlotteville, Tobago and Speightstown, Barbados.

**Preparatory work**

Certain elements of research work had to be completed in order to proceed to the fieldwork stage. The fieldwork activity presupposes that the researcher has a clear focus of the issues or themes to be investigated as well as a thorough appreciation of the relevant body of literature. Before approaching the pilot study, the following tasks were addressed:

- Selected a general area of interest for study, namely, social impact of tourism on host communities
- Conducted an extensive literature search on the subject utilizing the Articles in Hospitality and Tourism (AHT) index and cross referencing the sources listed in those very articles.
- Studied the broad field covered in the literature
• Identified gaps in the research reported and selected aspects to be the target of research
• Decided the main objective of the study and other sub-objectives
• Classified the literature into themes and sub-themes and recorded the findings of earlier research
• Studied various methodological approaches to researching the subject at hand and selected a technique, having provided a rationale for the choice.
• Considered the possibility of conducting a pilot study and its ramifications on cost and time limitations.
• Established formal contact with the jurisdictions in the study areas (Barbados and Tobago) and secured their support for the project.
• Prepared budgets and timetables for the fieldwork stages of both the pilot and main studies.
• Sought administrative as well as financial support for the research from both state and private sectors in the two target areas.
• Arranged focus group meetings and other meetings with government officials in advance of travel.
• Prepared draft questionnaire for testing using the literature and knowledge of local situation as guides.

Administrative support

In order to conduct this fieldwork successfully, it was important to tap the resources of the various stakeholders at the tourism destinations. A formal application was made to the tourism administrations on both islands in March 2000, some six months in advance of the planned pilot study. In it, the purpose of the research was outlined demonstrating its
benefits for tourism planners and administrators. Having projected the total costs of the fieldwork activities, it became clear that support was necessary to underwrite some of the costs, given the researcher's small budget. As such, requests were made for the supply of trained interviewers, meeting space, assistance in arranging meetings with community groups and government officials, computer facilities and data entry personnel, access to official reports and statistics. The main collaborating agencies on the study were Tobago Division of Tourism and the Ministry of Tourism and International Transport, Barbados.

**Pilot study**

The purpose of this pilot study was to verify the assumptions that were made about the target groups. It also presented an opportunity to collect first hand data on the status of tourism in the study area. To this end, certain key persons in the tourism industry were interviewed. Thomas (quoted in Greenfield 1996) refers to these entities as the 'gatekeepers', whose co-operation is critical to the success of the survey. The following agencies were involved in this study:

1. Ministry of Tourism and International Transport, Barbados
2. Barbados Tourism Authority (BTA)
3. Community Development Department, Barbados
4. Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO), Barbados
5. Ministry of Tourism, Trinidad & Tobago
6. Ministry of Planning and Development, Trinidad & Tobago
7. Policy Research and Development Institute, Tobago
8. Tourism and Industrial Development Company of Trinidad & Tobago
9. Division of Planning, Tobago
10. Division of Tourism, Tobago

11. United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and The Caribbean (UNECLAC), Trinidad

12. Institute of Social & Economic Research (ISER), University of the West Indies (UWI), Barbados

Statistical data and special reports were also gathered during this brief phase. This phase of the study also sought to test the efficacy of the draft questionnaire which was developed out of the subject literature and the researcher's own familiarity with the target communities. However, it was anticipated that the interview schedule would need to be refined by utilizing the results of the focus group discussions. For this phase of the study, one liaison person was assigned to work with the researcher in each of the countries involved.

Why Focus Groups

It was decided to conduct the research using two methods. Firstly, Focus Groups were used to gauge the views and feelings of a cross-section of the resident population and this was complemented by a more rigorous random survey of residents' perceptions employing the interview technique.

Mann (1985) warns that these groups work best at the initial stages of research when concepts still have to be clarified and they cannot replace a properly constituted sample. Further, he cautions that the results of a focus group discussion 'would be hypothesis-provoking only, not in any way hypothesis-testing' (p. 131).
With regard to the decision to solicit the active involvement of residents, Kreuger and Casey (2000) refer to such use of Focus Groups as participatory research. They define it as an approach "which places emphasis on involving people in a community in conducting the research, because of what the process does for that community in terms of developing commitment, capacity and talents as well as improving utilization" (p.18).

Morgan (1993) suggests the use of Focus Groups in the following scenarios:

- When there is a power differential between participants and decision makers
- When there is a gap between professionals and their target audiences
- When investigating complex behaviour and motivations
- To learn more about the degree of consensus on a topic
- When you need a friendly research method that is respectful and not condescending to your target audience (p.15)

It is important that any survey of residents of an area bear some relevance to the local context. The medium of focus groups was used to glean a knowledge of the issues which were of relevance to the various sectors of the local community and to uncover any peculiar phraseology used in local speech that might be appropriate for use in the interview test items. This attempt to approximate local conditions aims to avoid any misinterpretation of questions that were composed in the researcher's own words, and hence likely to be misinterpreted by the respondents. This approach is supported by Kreuger and Casey, (2000) who justify its use as a first step in developing a product or programme to gain understanding of the target audience.

The goal of these focus groups is to learn how a target audience sees, understands, and values a particular topic and to learn the language used to talk about the topic.
How do they think about it? How do they feel about it? How do they talk about it?
What do they like about it? What do they dislike about it? (p.15)

How Many Groups

To reduce the risk of bias entering the study, two focus group meetings were held, each with different participants. According to Krueger and Casey (2000), the rule of thumb is to plan three or four focus groups. To determine how many sessions to conduct depends on when saturation point is reached, that is, when no new information is forthcoming from. It is also dependent on the resources available to the researcher.

In this case, limiting the investigation to two groups was justified in light of:

- The fact that this was an exploratory exercise used to support a more rigorous investigative technique; not a stand alone research method which would be expected to generate conclusive results
- The limited time available for conducting fieldwork
- The limited budget available for fieldwork costs

In addition to these practical considerations, the number of focus groups is largely determined by the number of break characteristics that are necessary to differentiate groups in the population. Typically, at least one group needs to be conducted for each combination of break variables used to define a group. To this end, Morgan (1993) suggests that differentiation should be made along the lines of the most important break characteristics, keeping them to an absolute minimum. Otherwise, the cost in terms of both money and time, increases substantially.
In large measure, the second focus group served as a check on the results of the first one, confirming the issues raised in the first group and exploring the possibility for new issues to emerge. In fact, the second group did not contribute any ideas to the discussion that had not already been raised in the first group. This was indicative that the opinions expressed were likely to be widely shared among residents of the community. Appendix 20 shows a summary of the issues generated in the focus group meetings.

**Composition of Group**

For each Focus Group session, one of each of the following representatives of each sector of the community were invited to participate:

- Guest House owner / manager
- Tour Guide
- Farmers
- Dive shop Operator
- Beach vendor
- Shopkeeper
- Social worker
- Handicraft maker
- Police officer
- A religious leader (priest)
- Village Council member
- Fisherman
- School Teacher / Principal
- Community Development Officer

The subject literature identifies four design options:

1. Single category Design
2. Multiple category design
3. Double layer design
4. Broad Involvement design
While the selection of participants reflected the broad range of interests in the subject matter (tourism), the implementation does not conform to any of the typologies defined by Krueger and Casey (2000). In fact, it can be considered an adaptation of the Broad-Involvement design, which the authors claim is suitable for studies with widespread public interest. (p.33). The overriding intent was to engage an exchange of ideas and viewpoints on as wide a cross-section of publics as possible and to facilitate this in an environment free of intimidation. Krueger and Casey suggest that the purpose should drive the study, more specifically, the purpose should guide the invitation decision. They cite three factors which determine the selection of participants:

1. The purpose of the study
2. Information on the target and those close to the target audience. For example, is the target audience distinctive, easily identifiable and reasonable to locate?
3. The budget determines what type of people will give the most meaningful information.

The literature recommends that the composition of the focus group must be characterized by homogeneity but with sufficient variation among participants to allow for contrasting opinions. (Krueger and Casey, 2000). Morgan (1993) believes that holding separate sessions with homogeneous but contrasting groups produces information in greater depth than would be the case with heterogeneous groups, because it will be easier for participants sharing similar key characteristics to identify with each other's experiences.

Morgan (1993) states that focus group studies will often incorporate different subsets with potentially contrasting views or experiences concerning the issues under
investigation. How these subsets are differentiated is determined by what the author refers to as 'break characteristics or variables'. Krueger and Casey (2000) refer to these characteristics as 'screens'. Morgan argues that incorporating break characteristics into a design is useful not only for contrasting views between subgroups but also for establishing which views are common. In this study, no break variables were introduced; both focus groups were similarly constituted, reflecting a broad cross-section of representative views from a variety of interest groups as well as professions/vocations. There was no basis to justify grouping participants by age, location, gender or other breaking variable.

Morgan defines yet another characteristic which needs to be considered when targeting participants in a focus group - 'control characteristics'. Even when focus groups sessions are held with different subsets of the population, he contends that it is important to ensure that the groups all share some common characteristics. These control characteristics may be uniform characteristics or may specify a common composition for each group (p.39).

In this study, the only common characteristic that was used to describe these groups was 'place of residence'. In order to be selected, one had to be a resident of the local area under study. While no attention was given to ensuring that both women and men were equally represented in each group in which case the common composition control characteristic would be 'gender', the final selection of participants was fairly evenly split among males and females.
Operators of hotels and restaurants were noticeably absent in the Speightstown sessions, and in hindsight, one may conclude that placing big business along with others in one group may have been insensitive to the politics of commerce in the area. On the other hand, their absences may have simply been due to the timing of the sessions during the evening hours which happens to be a peak period for hospitality businesses. Interestingly enough, this was not the case in Charlottesville where the term 'big business' is relegated to the likes of a 20-room cottage operation and where the foremost restaurant boasts no more than 10 tables. This outcome suggests that the issue of scale and level of development are variables which cannot be overlooked in the research design process.

Size of the Focus Group

Krueger and Casey (2000) suggest that an ideal size of a focus group for non-commercial topics is six to eight participants. Groups of ten or more participants are difficult to manage and limit each person's opportunity to share insights and observations. The smaller groups are preferable when the participants have a great deal to share about the topic or have had intense or lengthy experiences with the topic of discussion (p.74).

This researcher, having lived and worked in the Caribbean environment and being familiar with the cultural mores of the people, estimated that twice the intended number of participants would have to be invited in order to cater for no-shows. As it turned out, even this estimation was understated in the case of Speightstown, where only four persons attended a meeting, out of a total of twelve invitees. Of course, such a high level of no-shows may also arise out of a number of causes including lack of interest in the topic: a belief that the invitee has nothing to contribute, that it would not lead to any positive action in the community, the timing is inconvenient, advance notification is too
short, or that the incentive to participate was not enticing enough (refreshments are less likely to draw people than monetary compensation).

**Finding Participants**

Krueger and Casey (2000) recommend some strategies for selecting participants:

1. Set exact specifications or screens. These can be demographic and observable characteristics of the people who need to be included
2. Researcher should maintain control over the selection process
3. Use the resources of the sponsoring organization (p.79).

According to the literature, once the characteristics for selection have been determined, the researcher might contact existing groups in the community to find out if they have members with these characteristics. Organizations are more co-operative when the researcher explains the purpose of the study and how the participants and their community will benefit from it. (Krueger & Casey, 2000 p. 75).

Having identified the generic profiles of the participants, the selection of participants was left up to the liaison person in each community. Such a selective process finds support in the literature. Mann (1985) advises that the participants need to be carefully selected and not in a random fashion, as it is important that they are familiar with the subject matter being researched (p.131).

In Barbados, the invitees' names were sourced through a local contact person who was identified by the Ministry of Tourism’s Community Tourism Officer. With regard to
Tobago, The Division of Tourism's liaison person provided the names since he is a resident of Charlotteville, one of the study areas. This approach finds support with Krueger & Casey (2000) who suggest that the sponsoring agency should introduce the researcher to individuals in the target audience, with whom they may have connections. (p.80).

There were occasions when the liaison person was unable to nominate representatives for every category specified. In such cases, the snowball technique was adopted, where individuals who were selected as participants, were asked to nominate other persons meeting the selection criteria, that is, a resident of the community who is a tour guide, farmer or fisherman, etc. Krueger and Casey (2000) explain that the logic in such an approach, is that people know other people like themselves (p.77). The researcher used this method of recruitment primarily because it seemed appropriate in the context of small communities, where people are in close contact with each other on a regular basis and where the local channel of communication is word-of-mouth. While the literature offers several alternative modes of recruitment such as use of professional screening agencies, random telephone screening and public advertisements, these methods were ruled out for various reasons:

1. High costs
2. Not all homes have telephones
3. Local newspapers are not widely read
4. Not everyone is literate
The Venue

In a letter issued by the collaborating Tourism authority, participants were invited to attend a meeting at which tourism issues would be discussed. This letter explained the general purpose of the meeting, its expected duration and that refreshments would be served. In the Tobago instance, the researcher was asked to prepare an invitation letter, to which was attached a letter of endorsement from the Department of Tourism. Care was taken to issue invitation letters about two weeks in advance (local mail is slow) and to follow up with telephone call reminders, where possible. Edmunds (1999) suggests that recruitment of focus group participants should be conducted approximately two weeks prior to the meeting – early enough to allow for potential problems that arise to be rectified, yet not so early that participants forget to attend. The choice of venue was left to the authorities, with a proviso that the venue should afford relative privacy. The time of day for the meeting was also left up to the authorities, again on the condition that it is a convenient time for all or most of the participants, so as to improve attendance levels. The meetings were arranged prior to the researcher’s arrival in Tobago.

In the case of Barbados, the study area was only identified after the researcher's arrival and so invitations could not have been dispatched two weeks in advance as planned. It was decided that it would not be prudent to select the study area in advance of the researcher's arrival, because of his relative unfamiliarity with the Barbadian environment. Instead, a short reconnaissance survey was carried out over the first three (3) days during which the researcher visited several rural towns and villages around the island. He
consulted with the Ministry's personnel and other local people before arriving at a decision. The criteria used in the selection process were:

- Adult Population size: 1000 - 2000
- Rural character
- Fishing or farming community
- Involved in tourism activities
- Geographic spread over a 2-3 kilometre radius
- Peripheral to the main tourist centre

Moderation of the Focus Groups

This researcher served as moderator of all the sessions. Having once been a participant in a professionally run focus group exercise, in addition to his long-standing experience as chairperson of various committees, the researcher felt confident in this role. The clear and concise guidelines suggested by Edmunds (p 69-85) were applied. She summarizes the qualities of a good moderator as:

- Ability to learn quickly
- Experience
- Organizational skills
- Flexibility
- Good memory
- Good listening skills
- Strong probing skills
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- Time management skills
- Good personality

The meetings were audiotaped, with the permission of the participants. A brief on focus group procedures, adapted from Edmunds, was prepared by the researcher and this was used to brief participants on the expected behaviours during the session. The key points raised in the participants’ brief were:

- Speak clearly and one at a time
- No right or wrong answers
- Need for active participation
- Breaking the ice (self-introduction)

A discussion guide was developed, an approach recommended by Edmunds (1999):

The general questions posed by the researcher to the groups were:

1. How do you feel about the growth of tourism in your village/town?
2. What do you like best about the tourism activities taking place in your village/town?
3. What do you dislike most about the tourism activities taking place in your village/town?
4. What changes if any, would you like to see take place?
5. What role if any, would you like to play in the development of tourism?

These prompts produced a wealth of information that was later analyzed and used to reformulate the questions on the interview schedule. It must be noted that there were certain
issues that were peculiar to each of the communities. For example, while people were concerned about the sale of land to foreigners in both cases, the pollution caused by yachts did not feature on the agenda in Speightstown. Similarly, the issue of increasing property taxes is of grave concern to Barbadians, whereas it is of no consequence to Tobagonians, principally because taxes have not yet been affected by development. 

**Appendix 29** provides a summary of the issues raised by the focus groups. Therefore, the instruments used in each case were basically similar, but incorporated an element of variation as some items appeared in one but not in the other. However both questionnaires carried twenty-six (26) items, some of which comprised several sub-items.

**Appendix 30** shows the interview schedules for Charlotteville and Speightstown that were employed in this survey.
Why use interviews for data collection?

When compared to postal questionnaires, interviews have been shown to yield improved response rates (Oppenheim 1992). The format employed in this study was the structured interview based on a carefully constructed interview schedule. The schedule acts as a standardized instrument. It enables a team of interviewers to give the same information in the same pre-determined order and to record the responses in a standardized way. According to Mann (1985), this also means that the interviewer is relieved of having to remember what questions to ask and of having to take notes or enter responses after the interview (p.133).

Composing the interview schedule

As mentioned earlier, the interview schedule was drafted prior to the pilot study. The process was guided by Oppenheim (1996) and Mann (1985). The variables to be tested originated from the literature as well as from the researcher's own familiarity with the study areas. Having first established clear hypotheses for the study, the questions were derived from the object of the research, a procedure recommended by Mann (1985). The sequence of the questions was carefully considered drawing on Oppenheim's advice to start with awareness questions followed by factual ones, then attitudinal issues and finally ending with personal data such as age and income, etc. The funnel approach was employed in designing each module or section. This dictates that questions at the beginning are more general in nature but that they progressively become more focused in scope and finally they address some specific point or points (p. 110).
Most of the items were closed and offered multiple-choice answers and where appropriate, an ‘other’ option was offered to cater for respondents whose responses would not have been anticipated. By using a closed approach, the results of several groups can be compared because all respondents would have considered the same information in determining their response (Oppenheim 1992). The final item was open-ended. It was felt that it would be beneficial to use this information to gauge the mood of the respondents and for verbatim quotation to add richness to the data. Responses obtained were later categorized into five groups and coded as such. The risk with asking open-ended questions is that respondents may mention whatever happens to be uppermost in their thoughts at that particular time. Whether it is the most important issue to them is debatable (Oppenheim 1992).

It was not possible to test all the variables which appeared in the literature, as some were not applicable. For example, ‘crowding’, ‘competition for use of recreational amenities’, ‘congestion’ and ‘traffic’ are not yet apparent in these jurisdictions and therefore did not arise in any discussion on tourism. ‘Level of development’ was also excluded as the distinction was already drawn between Barbados and Tobago, the former being established as the more advanced tourism destination.

Measurement scales

As is often the case with attitudinal surveys, the majority of the data collected needed to be categorized in an ordinal or ranked format. To this end, the author employed the five-point Likert Scale to measure respondents’ perceptions ranging from ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘don’t know’, ‘disagree’ to ‘strongly disagree.’ For the other items which sought
demographic data, nominal scales were used with the exception of ‘age’ and ‘income’ which required measurement of quantitative data and therefore, interval scales were applied.

**Level of measurement**

It is important to acknowledge that data collected from Likert scale type responses are commonly considered as ordinal (non-metric) data and therefore limited to certain type of analyses. However, in some cases, it can also be considered to be interval in character, and therefore lends itself to parametric statistical techniques of analysis (Diamantopoulos and Schlegemilch, 1997 p.29). It is the latter approach that was adopted in this study. Diamantopoulos and Schlegemilch warn that if this pragmatic approach is followed, ‘it is recommended in this context, to appropriately number the response alternatives on the scale so as to communicate to the respondent that the intervals between the scale points are intended to be of equal distance’ (p.30).

**Testing the Questionnaire**

The revised questionnaire was then tested on random subjects whom the researcher approached on the streets of the study areas. Oppenheim (1992) warns against the practice of habitually trying out questionnaires on samples of university students for differences in age, educational and social background, literacy and social values may produce very different levels of understanding and capacity to respond, when compared to a general population sample.
This exercise was carried over a one-day period when about 10 such test interviews were held. Respondents were told that they are taking part in a trial exercise for a tourism survey and they were encouraged to make suggestions for re-wording if in their view, it was necessary. Opppenheim (1992) supports the involvement of respondents at this stage of inquiry: 'when difficulties arise, say 'How would you ask a friend about this?' and engage their co-operation' (p.62). Wherever ambiguities were discovered in the phraseology or wording, these were noted at the time of interviewing. They were later amended to reflect the author's intended interpretation in each case. This test demonstrated clearly that the issues raised by the focus groups were relevant and of serious concern to the community at large.

Revising the Questionnaire

The first item (see Appendix 30) which dealt with length of residence in the particular community, was amended to include a response which identified whether the respondent lived there since birth, as this is precisely how many persons responded when asked 'How long have you lived in Charlottesville'?

The order of the items appearing on the questionnaire was changed, as the interview did not flow logically during the test. It was important to first establish the respondent's concept of a tourist and the tourism industry before raising issues concerning those concepts. On the other hand, the five point Likert-type response scale ('strongly agree' through to 'strongly disagree') proved easy to understand especially with the assistance of the show cards on which it was also written.
Item 9, 'Who has greatest control over tourism in Charlottesville / Speightstown?' was not in the original draft when the instrument was piloted. However, the decision to introduce this aspect of control arose out of the views expressed by some persons that tourism decisions were imposed on them. It was felt that it would be useful to investigate the extent to which this view was shared by other community members. Additionally, this issue of control hinges on the critical matter of public participation and involvement in tourism development.

Item 12, 'Do you or someone you know, work in the tourism industry?' was also introduced in the revision process. This was done to establish the level of familiarity the respondent might have had with tourism work and related issues. By making this distinction, the researcher hoped to discover how opinions between the informed and the ignorant, might differ, if at all. It was thought that it was not adequate to ask if any family member was a tourism employee since this would exclude friends and work colleagues, the latter being regarded as valuable sources of information and opinions.

Item 15: 'What are your views on these issues?' was later expanded to include sub-items dealing with the impact of yachting on the community (Charlottesville only), this having been the most nagging issue that surfaced in every discussion of tourism. In Barbados, it was necessary to include two other issues that were peculiar to their situation:

- All-inclusive hotels and their impact on the community, and
- The construction of walls along the beaches and its implications
In its original form, the instrument contained some items that were subsequently deleted in the revision exercise. One item sought to test residents' perceptions of tourist behaviour as acceptable or exemplary, while the other dealt with the emotive response which tourist behaviour elicits. A third one: 'Tourists should pay taxes like we do' introducing the notion of taxing tourists for the services they consume, was removed as it was not a widely understood concept or one that had been contemplated before by most residents of Charlottesville. It is noteworthy that this issue did not arise in any of the focus group sessions. However, the researcher noted that in both study areas, the issue of tourists competing with locals for limited seats on buses was very evident and it would not be long before overt animosity sets in, as these fares are subsidized by the respective governments.

Among the demographic items (placed at the end of the questionnaire), the suggested responses to 'marital status' were regrouped as it was thought that it served no useful purpose to gather such detailed data. This decision is supported in the literature, which confirms that no correlation has been found between demographic variables and residents' perception of tourism (Belisle and Hoy 1980; Lui and Var 1996; Lankford and Howard 1994; Milman and Pizam 1988; Ryan and Montgomery 1994). 'Married' was therefore placed in the same category with 'Living with partner (Common Law)' and 'Divorced, separated and widowed' were all put together in another category. The third category was 'single'.

Additionally, this researcher introduced a variable which has never been tested before: the impact of travel experience on perceptions of tourism. Two travel-related items were therefore included in the draft questionnaire. The first, which was retained, establishes the
extent of the respondent's experience of travel abroad. The second sought to form a picture of the respondent's own view of himself as a traveller, but the statements were misconstrued by respondents during the piloting phase and therefore they were omitted from the final version. Nonetheless, it is believed that this variable could be further developed and tested with further research.

**Coding the Questionnaire**

Throughout the composition of the questionnaire exercise, the need for converting the responses received into a computerized format remained in focus. To this end, the way in which the suggested answers were numbered corresponded with the numerical format required for data entry.

In the case of the items conforming to the Likert scale, the responses were numbered as follows:

5 = strongly agree,
4 = agree,
3 = don't know,
2 = disagree, and
1 = strongly disagree.

With the exception of the last item which was open-ended, each response category was denoted as (a), (b), (c), and (d), etc. which could be easily translated into 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively. The responses were not numerically described so as to avoid confusion with the items themselves which were numerically labeled for ease of reference. In hindsight, since there were 26 items, each could have been assigned a letter from A-Z with the
responses being numbered exactly as required for data entry. In this case, there would be no need for translation (a=1, b=2, etc).

The final item (26) was an open-ended question and therefore responses had to be categorized into general subject areas and then the appropriate code assigned. For example 1 = access to beaches, 2 = crime, etc. In this case, coding was reserved until the main study was in progress. Rather than deferring the assignment of codes until the last questionnaire was completed, the researcher applied codes as new topics appeared. The software used for data processing was SPSS version 10.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the first phase of the methodology which included planning and design as well as pilot work. It was shown that focus groups was an appropriate technique for gathering data to be used in composing the survey instrument. The rationale for decisions regarding logistical issues such as size and composition of groups were examined and the revision of the interview schedule was discussed in great detail. A continuation of the fieldwork and the associated methodological issues are presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER EIGHT

METHODOLOGY: THE MAIN STUDY

Introduction

This chapter continues the discussion of the methodological approach to the study and deals with the main study, in particular. Such issues as sampling frame, sample size and sampling technique are examined and the data collection methods employed are explained. The chapter also highlights the main difficulties presented in the fieldwork activity and some of the limitations in the methodology used.

Fieldwork Objectives

1. To collect data on residents' perceptions of tourism
2. To minimize bias at every stage of the process

The main study benefited from the findings of the pilot study in many ways. Thomas (Greenfield ed. 1996) recommends that whenever there are uncertainties in the planning of a survey, it is useful to draw on evidence from similar surveys or better still, from a pilot study. The questionnaire was refined and adapted to the local contexts in which it was to be administered. The interviewers were now more familiar with the idiosyncrasies of each community and with the contents of the survey instrument. In general, they were therefore better prepared to handle the task.

At the end of the first day in the field, a recall session was held to uncover the challenges which had arisen and to work out appropriate solutions. This type of trouble-shooting
exercise was invaluable not only to the interviewers but also to the researcher. It provided additional data that could be used in the analysis stage of the study.

The sampling frame

The sampling frame consisted of all adult residents (eighteen years and older) in the villages of Charlotteville, Tobago and Speightstown, Barbados. The most accurate representation of this population was the Electoral Register which was easily obtained from the relevant authorities on the islands. The boundaries of the villages were determined in accordance with the electoral register for the respective areas. A plan of the Speightstown survey area is shown at Appendix 31. Where the constituency extended beyond the village as in the case of Charlotteville / Lans Fourmi, only the lists bearing the relevant addresses were considered. The level of accuracy of these two lists varied, in that, Tobago had just had a local government election and its register was updated only a month earlier. There were 967 names on the electoral roll at 12th January 2001.

In contrast, the Speightstown register carried many names of persons who were either deceased or had moved away from the area, the last general elections having been held three years prior to this survey. There were 2,158 names on the electoral register at 31st January 2000.

In both jurisdictions, there were persons who were resident in the area, having recently moved there, but who were still registered to vote in their former constituency. Similarly, it was discovered that residents had chosen to continue voting at their former address and
still others who had neglected to report their change-of-address particulars to the Elections and Boundaries Commission. In the absence of a more accurate record, one had to rely on local intelligence to update that list. Residents and local postal workers were instrumental in this regard and their knowledge of the whereabouts of persons was remarkably precise and detailed.

The sampling technique

A simple random sample was taken from the register of voters. According to Yule and Kendall, the selection of an individual from a population is random when each member of the population has the same chance of being chosen (quoted in Mann 1985 p.121). The residents to be polled were selected randomly by applying a list of random numbers to the list of electors in the Charlotteville and Speightstown areas. Each name was assigned a number starting from one (1) at the top and then increasing in increments of one right through to the end of the list. The names selected were those assigned the number which matched the random number appearing on the list. This approach finds support from Mann (1985 p.124) who cautions against what Moser and Kalton (1989) calls 'quasi-random' sampling where every nth name is selected from a list. The danger here is that regular-interval sampling makes every case dependent upon the first choice and so each individual unit does not have the same chance of being sampled.

The selected names were then categorized by address. The names of all persons who lived on the same street were written on a sheet of paper. In the case of housing developments, all those residents' names were grouped. This geographic classification of
respondents was a critical activity to ensure that the exercise was tackled in an orderly and efficient manner.

Sample size

Originally, a target of three hundred completed questionnaires was set for Charlotteville and four hundred for Speightstown. Given the inaccuracies identified in the lists, it was necessary to select a sample far greater in size than what had been originally estimated. Accordingly, 400 names were selected from the Charlotteville register and 500 from the Speightstown list.

In accordance with the literature (Pallant 2001), the statistically significant sample sizes were calculated as:

Charlotteville - 274 and Speightstown - 326

These figures were determined at a 95% level of confidence and 5% sampling error, based on population statistics supplied by the respective offices of the Elections and Boundaries Commission. Eventually, 220 interviews were held in Charlotteville and 200 in Speightstown. These figures do not include interviews that had to be aborted for any of the reasons identified above. The reduced samples arose as a result of a much smaller population size in each case. The fall in the population figures were a direct result of the following causes:

1. Deceased persons
2. Persons who had left the country to live abroad (emigrants)
3. Persons who declined to be interviewed
4. Persons who were absent from home on three occasions when the interviewer visited
5. Persons who were hard of hearing
6. Blind or partially blind persons
7. Incarcerated persons
8. Mentally unstable persons
9. Persons who moved to another parish or town without updating the authorities

In the case of Speightstown, it was necessary to sample a second time due to problems cited above. This approach is consistent with Oppenheim (1992), who suggests that the problem of non-response can be remedied quite simply by conducting additional interviews (p. 106).

Data collection

During both the pilot and the main fieldwork phases of this study, the researcher was resident in the respective communities. It was felt this approach to the research produced many advantages which would eventually be manifested in better quality data and deeper insights into community life. Such a close-up view may be considered participant observation or in Wolcott's terms 'being there' (1995 p. 95). He regards participant observation as a complement to interviewing, rather than inclusive of it. Geertz (1988) offers his perspective on the role of a fieldworker:
What a proper ethnographer ought properly to be doing is going out to places, coming back with information about how people live there, and making that information available to the professional community in a practical form (p.1).

**Primary data**

The study relied on both primary as well as secondary data sources. Empirical data was collected from a battery of questions that formed the interview schedule. Each respondent was interviewed on a one-on-one basis in their home by a trained interviewer. There were some occasions when, the interviews were conducted in the street or at the place of work. These exceptions were either made for the convenience of the respondent or in cases when call back visits to the respondent's home met with no success.

**The Interview Process**

To facilitate the interview process, show cards were used to avoid respondents having to recall the statements on which they were asked to respond. It also helped to avoid feelings of embarrassment or guilt where the issue was particularly sensitive (age, marital status and income) and thus, it encouraged honest responses. In cases where the prospective interviewee was absent, the interviewer recorded this and arranged to return at a more convenient time, on the suggestion of the occupant. Where there was no one at home, the date and time of the return visit was left to the interviewer's discretion. It was agreed that no more than three attempts would be made to secure an interview with a respondent. However, in light of the difficulties experienced in contacting persons, as many as five callback visits were made in some cases.
Before commencing the interview, the interviewer introduced the survey and assured the respondent that their responses would not be identifiable as no names were written on the questionnaire. Such assurance of anonymity was meant to put the respondent at ease and encourage more honest responses. All the responses given were recorded by the interviewer on the schedule specially developed for this study. In the initial stages of the survey, interview duration was 20 minutes. However, as interviewers became more familiar with the flow of the interview topics, the average time taken for an interview was reduced to 15 minutes.

There were some instances when the interview time was protracted because of disturbances from other persons and children. Due to the fact that the interview was held on an impromptu basis (no prior notice to the respondent), there were occasions when respondents agreed to be interviewed whilst nursing a baby, for example. Such an activity was not considered to be distracting to the respondent, and as such, the interview proceeded. However, where other persons sought to prompt the respondent, the interviewer asked them to desist from doing so, as it was only the views of the respondent that were needed. This occurrence was more likely at the home of a respondent and especially when there were other family members whose names were also selected to participate in the survey. In this latter case, the interviewer asked the person concerned to withhold their opinions until it was time for them to be interviewed.
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On a general level, respondents were extremely co-operative, often opting to leave whatever they were doing at the time, or delaying their departure, in order to give their full attention to the interviewer.

Secondary Data

To supplement this bank of data, recorded interviews were held with key stakeholders in tourism, particularly in the planning and tourism ministries of government. Other regional and international agencies which participated in this aspect of the project included the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO), United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNECLAC) and the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER) which is based at the University of the West-Indies in Trinidad.

With regards to secondary data, these consisted of statistics and reports furnished by the various tourism bodies and the country’s Central Statistical Office (CSO). A record was also made of relevant studies in progress that were commissioned by the governments or their agents.

Manpower requirements

In order to achieve the stated objectives, it was necessary to recruit a team of interviewers to assist over the one-month period allocated for data collection in each area. The main collaborating authorities provided interviewers for the survey:

- Charlotteville - 2 persons: Researcher and 1 trained male interviewer assisting on a full-time basis.
- Speightstown - 4 persons: Researcher and 3 trained female interviewers working on a part-time basis.

In both cases, the participants were members of staff and had all worked on similar assignments before. The researcher was satisfied that they were well suited to the task.

**Training**

It was considered essential that all interviewers were familiar with the contents of the questionnaire and so further training was required before they were allowed to go into the field. Firstly, a preliminary briefing was held for all interviewers to prepare them for the task ahead. This was also considered necessary in order to reduce the incidence of bias which each interviewer can bring into the data collection exercise because of unfamiliarity with the content as well as inexperience in dealing with difficulties which can arise in the interview situation. This training took two forms:

1. A seminar presented (only in Barbados) by an expert in survey work from the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO), and
2. An interactive session where the researcher employed role-play techniques to assist trainees to internalize the skills taught.

Source material for conducting the training exercise was adapted from Oppenheim (1992). The interviewer’s brief developed for this survey is shown in Appendix 32.
The Implementation Process:

1. The names on the voters' register were assigned consecutive numbers starting from 1.
2. Using a list of random numbers, names with the matching numbers were selected.
3. 400 names were selected from the Charlotteville list and 500 from the Speightstown list.
4. The names were then grouped by street address for each of the research areas.
5. The work schedule was planned according to geographic area, so as to optimize time and effort.
6. Each interviewer was assigned a group of streets, or areas such as housing settlements.
7. All interviewers were free to work at the time of day most convenient to them.
8. While no daily quotas were set, all interviewers had an appreciation for how much had to be done over the whole period.
9. All interviewers regrouped either at the start or end of the day to discuss experiences and find solutions to challenges that may have arisen.
10. Data from completed questionnaires were input into the computer on the next day.

Data Processing

Before the analysis could begin in earnest, the data had to be cleaned. This entailed:

- checking through the variable matrix to ensure that no invalid values were entered
- eliminating duplicated entries
- filling in spaces where there was no value entered; in most cases, this arose because the designated missing-value digit '9' was inadvertently omitted. In other cases, a
check on the appropriate questionnaire revealed a valid score that was simply overlooked in the data entry process. In such instances, the importance of properly identifying completed questionnaires (using a numbering system), became fully apparent.

In an initial attempt at summarizing the data, SPSS version 10 was used to:

- generate frequencies of each variable and this was expressed in terms of tables and graphs

- A cross tabulation of variables was also produced in order to give the researcher an overview of the basic character of the samples surveyed.

- Produce summary statistics to estimate the mean and standard deviation of the distributions of each of the variables under scrutiny.

- Tests were also applied to establish whether the distributions were normal or skewed. The outcome of this exercise would later determine the validity and reliability of the more advanced tests, such as multivariate analysis.

At this juncture, a decision was taken to embark on a methodical process that would logically lead to the selection of appropriate statistical tests. The recommended procedure (Pallant, 2001) involved the following steps:

1. Identify the questions to be addressed by the research

To achieve this, it was necessary to examine the questionnaire closely, item by item, and list the hypotheses which each item sought to test. These hypotheses or research questions were grouped by subject area, for example, employment, lifestyle, land
ownership, beach access, etc. Research questions which addressed the relationship between different variables were also included.

2. Develop a matrix indicating for each research question, the variables involved, whether dependent or independent, their level of measurement, the range of its assigned values, and a reference to the questionnaire item number to which it pertains.

This exercise uncovered a number of issues that needed to be addressed. For instance, some scales such as 'age' were collapsed from an interval scale into a three-category scale denominated as 'young adult', 'mature' and 'senior.' Pallant warns about the disadvantages of adopting such an approach as it may result in loss of important information and potentially important differences among groups.

Additionally, it became apparent that negatively worded items had to be reversed so that there would be consistency in the interpretation of the scales used throughout the study. Further, because of the preconditions attached to parametric tests, some variables had to be transformed in order for the normal distribution pre-condition to be satisfied.

**Challenges encountered**

1. The voters' registers were inaccurate; moreso in the case of Speightstown, with significant numbers of persons having moved out of the area or deceased. In the case of Charlottesville, the list was current, as elections were held a month prior to this
survey. However, the Speightstown list was dated January 2000 and although it was subsequently updated by a national census, that information was not yet publicly available. Eventually, the original sample sizes had to be revised downwards, because of the many 'missing persons' on the lists.

2. With probability sampling, a great deal of time and effort may have to be expended in repeated call-backs before a new name is substituted. However, because this technique reduces bias in the sample of respondents, it is often favoured by researchers (Oppenheim 1992 p.81). In this study, a significant amount of time was wasted in making call-back visits, as most persons were away from their homes during the daytime hours of the weekdays. This problem was compounded by the fact that the assistant interviewers in Barbados, were only available during the hours of 3-6pm on weekdays. Since it was not considered appropriate to visit peoples' homes after nightfall, the weekends were a critical time for conducting interviews. The interview team co-operated well in overcoming this challenge.

Although we faced this same problem in Charlottesville, it was not as debilitating because

- There were many more unemployed persons as well as task workers (government employed labourers who were assigned daily tasks and could leave whenever they were completed), and so many more people were at home during the daytime.
• My assistant, who is resident in the village, knew the informants' daily routines and was able to find them even when they were not at a home. Additionally, he was able to conduct interviews at night because of his familiarity with the villagers.

3. Some persons declined to participate, regarding the exercise as a sinister plan by the Government to trap them into paying more taxes, or simply because they were not convinced that the interviewer had honourable intentions. This latter reason may have applied in the case of this researcher in Barbados, where he was considered a foreigner, easily identifiable by his oral accent. The response rate as well as the level of co-operation from informants may have been better if an advisory was published in the press. The Ministry of Tourism and International Transport had requested the preparation of an infomercial for publicizing the survey on national television and radio, but this did not take place as planned.

4. Finding the informants proved more challenging in Speightstown, as none of the interview team members was familiar with the town or its residents, much unlike the situation which obtained in Charlotteville. At first, this was resolved by asking the first person on the street for directions to the informants' homes. In the majority of cases, houses were unnumbered and alleyways unnamed, so it was necessary to rely on descriptions of people and buildings in order to find targets. Later on, the help of the local postman/woman was solicited, as they made their rounds delivering mail. As a final identity check, each respondent was asked to confirm their name, before the start of the interview.
Limitations of the methodology

Electoral registers seem to be notorious for under representing the younger members of the electorate. It was evident in the data collecting process, that there was an apparent predominance of old age pensioners (OAP) in the sample. The youths are known to be cynical about the electoral process and hence may be reluctant to register with the Elections and Boundaries Commission (EBC). Whatever the reason, other situational factors contributed to the poor representation of young persons in the sample.

Use of the voters' list implied that specific persons' views were sought and as such, the availability of those persons was a critical factor in getting a true random selection of responses. In reality, it was much more likely to interview a pensioner (age 65 and over) than a young man of twenty-five, simply because young persons were more mobile than senior citizens. It is likely therefore, that despite the several callback visits that were made, young persons were placed at great disadvantage in having an opportunity to participate in this survey.

The problem is compounded when the social stratification of the societies under study is considered. It became clear that people who live in exclusive areas are more mistrustful of strangers at their gate and are more likely to decline an interview, overtly or otherwise, than those belonging to the lower income groups. This phenomenon was clearly demonstrated in Speightstown where the study area encompassed exclusive developments such as Heywoods. The response rate in this area was appallingly low despite several callback visits. Accordingly, the survey suffered from a marked under
representation of the upper income groups in the data collected. It must be noted however, that this situation did not arise in Charlottesville, where there are no exclusive residential zones.

Interviewer bias is a criticism often levied at surveys such as this one, especially where people of different cultural and educational backgrounds serve as interviewers. Despite the researcher's efforts to minimize this through training and ongoing consultation and feedback, it is likely that each interviewer would have inadvertently influenced the content and quality of their respondents' responses in differing ways. Short of approximating laboratory control conditions, this type of bias is a necessary accessory to the interview, as a data collecting technique.

It could be argued that in the case of Charlottesville, an element of bias would have entered the data collected by the researcher's assistant who is a resident of the community. Due to his familiarity with the respondents, he may have imposed his own value-based judgements on the issues posed in the interview and so influenced the responses given. Conversely, his respondents may have chosen to give socially acceptable answers aimed at either making a positive impression or avoiding embarrassment by withholding confidential information.

Conclusion

This chapter presented a detailed account of the methodology employed in conducting this piece of research. It also provided the theoretical basis founded in the literature, for
the course of action which the researcher chose to take in conducting the various aspects of the fieldwork. An assessment of the limitations of the methodology was also offered to give an appreciation of the constraints which the researcher faced in the implementation process.

Without the assistance received from the trained interviewers, this exercise would have been more costly and time consuming. In total, several hundred hours of valuable interview time was invested in conducting the fieldwork. The high level of professionalism evident throughout the entire project was a function of detailed planning and the commitment and dedication demonstrated by the survey team. The collaboration of several agencies also played an important part in the success of this venture.

Despite the many challenges, this survey achieved its objectives. This was due in large measure, to the openness and sincerity of all the stakeholders. Informants were very generous in sharing their views and in elaborating on their responses and this contributed toward the richness of the data that was collected. In essence, this fieldwork exercise constituted the foundation of the study and as such, the eventual outcome of the study depends on its successful implementation. With the fieldwork completed, it is now appropriate to turn to the next chapter for an analysis of the data collected and the interpretation of results.
CHAPTER NINE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Introduction

In this chapter, the treatment and manipulation of the data are described, the analyses explained and the results interpreted. Due to the comparative nature of the study, the results are reported for each sample in matrix form where possible. Firstly, uni-variate analytic techniques are discussed along with certain key statistical tests such as the Cronbach Alpha test for scale reliability. This approach is continued in a progressive manner through the bi-variate analyses and ending with an investigation of the multi-variate relationships among the variables in the proposed scale. In particular, factor analysis is used as a data reduction technique and a test of construct validity. A linear model measuring total support for tourism development is then tested employing multiple regression analysis. SPSS version 10 is the software package used in all computations.

Uni-Variate Analysis

Frequencies

Frequency tables were generated for each variable in order to formulate a general overview of the respondents' profile and their perceptions of tourism. This data was then used to construct profiles of the typical Charlottesville respondent and their Speightstown counterpart. Appendix 33 shows the profiles of the typical respondent in each of the study areas.
Data manipulation

In order to carry out more in-depth data analyses (bivariate and multivariate), it is necessary to manipulate the data. Pallant (2001) recommends the following steps:

- the scores for negatively worded items need to be reversed
- wherever the variable distribution of scores do not approximate the normal distribution, they must be transformed, and
- total scale scores are computed (2001, p. 74).

Two of these manipulations were carried out on the data sets for Tobago and Barbados. No transformations were done as the large sample size and the few extreme values did not warrant this.

Firstly, the scores of the relevant negatively-worded items were reversed. It is critical to ensure that all items are scored so that a high scores indicate a high level of support for tourism (Pallant 2001 p.75). In this context, some negatively-worded items may not require re-coding. Since a five-point Likert-type scale was used, the scores for each item ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). For example, in reversing the scores, all responses bearing a score of five, now carry a score of 1, 4 becomes 2, 3 stays as 3 and 2 becomes 4. This re-coding exercise affected 15 items in the Tobago sample and 16 in the sample of Barbados residents and is shown in Appendix 34.
The total scale scores for the eight variables comprising the ‘Total Support for Tourism Development’ scale were then computed. For example, in Barbados, residents’ perception of the socio-environmental impact of tourism was assumed to comprise the sum of the individual’s perception of tourism’s relationship with crime, prostitution, HIV Aids, drug addiction, pollution, degradation of reefs, rising property taxes and access to recreational pursuits. A comprehensive listing of the composition of the scale and each sub-scale is presented in Appendix 35.

Descriptives

The mean, standard deviation and the range of values associated with each composite variable are shown below in Appendix 36.

Skewness and Kurtosis

The skewness value provides an indication of the symmetry of the distribution. Kurtosis on the other hand, provides information about the ‘peakedness’ of the distribution. If the distribution is perfectly normal, both values would be zero. However, as is evident in the values generated, this is a rather rare occurrence in the social sciences (Pallant p.53). Positive skewness values indicate positive skew; scores clustered at the low end of values, and vici versa for negative values. Positive kurtosis indicates that the distribution is rather peaked (clustered in the centre) with long thin tails, and vici versa for negative values; too many cases in the extremes. ‘With reasonably large samples, skewness will not make a significant difference in the analysis’ (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p.73).
Kurtosis can also result in an underestimate of the variance. However, this risk is also reduced when the sample is large (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996, p.730). According to these authors, the usual tests for evaluating skewness and kurtosis values are too sensitive with large samples. Instead, they suggest an inspection of the shape of the distribution from a histogram.

From the ‘explore’ results, it was evident that the distribution of values for ‘total support for tourism development’ were negatively skewed and peaked. These conclusions are clearly visible on inspection of the histogram as shown in Appendix 37. This is also confirmed by the normal probability plots (labelled Q-Q plots). In these plots the observed value for each score is plotted against the expected value from the normal distribution. A reasonably straight line suggests a normal distribution. In this case, the points, when joined together, approximated a straight line as shown in Appendix 38.

The detrended Normal Q-Q Plots were obtained by plotting the actual deviation of the scores from the straight line. For a normal distribution, there should be no real clustering of points, with most collecting around the zero line (Pallant, 2001, p.59). While there was no clustering of points in the distribution of the dependent variable (support for tourism), most points did not collect around the zero line as Appendix 39 demonstrates.

Outliers

The boxplot in Appendix 40 shows a distribution of scores for Total Socio-environmental Impact. The rectangle represents 50% of the cases, with the whiskers
(lines protruding from the box) going out to the smallest and the largest values. Outlier values are indicated outside this area by circles. As indicated earlier, these outlier values do not have any significant impact on the means and therefore it is not necessary to change them or to exclude them from the data set. (Pallant, 2001, p. 62)

Test for Normality

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic is a test for Normality. A non-significant result (Sig. value of more than .05) indicates normality. Appendix 41 demonstrates that in most of the cases, the Sig. Values for both distributions (Speightstown and Charlotteville) are equal to 0.000, suggesting violation of the assumption of normality. However, Pallant (2001) suggests that this result is quite common in large samples (200 cases and over).

An assessment of Normality was also done for the dependent variable – support for tourism development and the results are shown in Table 9.1. The extreme scores had no significant impact on the mean as shown by the negligible variation between the 5% trimmed mean value (7.09) and the mean (7.08) in the Speightstown sample. For the Charlotteville sample, the corresponding values were 7.13 and 7.07. Due to the large sample size, normality was assumed and therefore there was no need to investigate these extreme cases further.
Descriptives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.0859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval for Mean</td>
<td>Lower Bound 6.9154, Upper Bound 7.2564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Trimmed Mean</td>
<td>7.0954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>7.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.2165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interquartile Range</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-.676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1 Descriptive Tests for Normality – Support for Tourism - Speightstown

Scale Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are the scale construction counterparts of precision and accuracy in physical measurement (Tinsley and Brown 2000). In the social sciences, reliability is indicated by internal consistency. The high correlation among items or subsets of items signifies that the items on the scale behave equivalently, as though they were a single measure. On the other hand, validity can be considered as the degree to which scale scores, as sampling estimates approximate the population parameter (p.86). Construct validity or validity for theory as opposed to practice, refers to the degree to which a scale is supportable as a measure of a theoretical construct. In this study, exploratory Factor Analysis was employed in testing for construct validity (see section on Multi-variate Analysis).
Reliability

The reliability of the scales used in investigating support for further tourism development, was subjected to a test for internal consistency. This refers to the degree to which the items that make up the scale share some common character. In other words, by testing for internal consistency, the researcher seeks to establish whether the items contained in the scale all measure the same underlying construct. The indicator of this measure is Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient.

Ideally, this coefficient should be more than 0.7. However, Cronbach’s Alpha values are very sensitive to the number of items in a scale. With scales of less than 10 items, it is common to find quite low Cronbach’s values. Pallant suggests that in such cases, it may be more appropriate to report the mean inter-item correlation for the items. Briggs and Cheek (1986) recommend an optimal range for the inter-item correlation of 0.2 to 0.4. In this study, all the scales used were short (less than 10 items) and therefore, it was necessary to consider the inter-item correlation values in measuring their reliability. Despite their small size, some scales were found to have Cronbach Alpha values in excess of the required magnitude.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Speightstown Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients</th>
<th>Charlottesville Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Attachment</td>
<td>0.7280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-environmental Impact</td>
<td>0.7696</td>
<td>0.7681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2 Cronbach Alpha values for each sample by domain
In the majority of cases, the inter-item correlation values fell within the stipulated range as indicated in Appendix 42.

**Socio-environmental Impacts**

This composite variable sought to measure respondents' perception of a host of socio-economic and environmental phenomena and their relationship with the development of tourism. In particular, subjects were asked to indicate whether tourism was responsible for a rise in prostitution, AIDS infection, drug addiction, marine pollution, destruction of ecosystems (reefs), property taxes and barriers to traditional recreational pursuits (beach cricket).

The results seem to point to an overwhelming concern over these negative consequences, although the cause and effect relationship suggested, found no support from certain quarters. For example, when comparing Speightstown with Charlotteville, a significant number of respondents refrained from expressing either agreement or disagreement. Of the remainder, the majority in each sample perceived no relationship between tourism growth and crime nor did they perceive a link between prostitution and tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speightstown</th>
<th>Charlotteville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of tourism, crimes have increased</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of tourism, more of our young people are becoming prostitutes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.3 Residents' perception of tourism, crime and prostitution
Views among Speightstown respondents are divided on the issue of the spread of HIV/AIDS, with a remarkable 40% of them indicating that they 'do not know' as opposed to 15% in Charlotteville. In the latter case however, the majority (57%) blames tourism for the scourge.

On the issue of drug addiction, both communities also appear to be equally divided, although there is some indication that tourism is seen as responsible for this affliction by a small margin (18%) of respondents in Speightstown.

With regard to environmental degradation, Charlotteville respondents felt that tourism was the major cause of the problems, while those in the other sample were equally divided on the issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Variable</th>
<th>Charlotteville Majority View</th>
<th>Speightstown Majority View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Degradation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Beach Recreation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addiction</td>
<td>Divided</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4 Residents' perception of relationship between socio-environmental ills and tourism

In a general sense, it is not surprising to encounter such ambivalence, as it is often difficult to exact a cause and effect correlation on social phenomena. This is borne out by
the fact that between 20% - 40% of respondents simply did not know or did not wish to express either agreement or disagreement.

**Community and Personal Benefits**

People often find it difficult to make a link between their personal prosperity and the growth of tourism. In Speightstown just over half of respondents felt that their improved standard of living was attributable to developments in tourism. In Charlotteville however, tourism bore no relevance to their standard of living for the majority (62%) of respondents.

As regards community benefits, both groups concede that tourism has benefited their respective countries, even though some may still argue that the benefits have not trickled down to them. Whether people made the connection between better roads or more schools, for example, and an improved standard of living is not known. Overall, there is consensus among respondents of both communities that tourism creates employment and that any further development of the industry in their towns bodes well for their future. Indeed, such an overriding sense of confidence in the potential of the industry to deliver a better quality of life for residents is an encouraging sign for policy makers and planners alike.

**Community Attachment**

While it is acknowledged that community attachment can be considered as comprising several different attributes including birthplace and length of residence, in this study, the
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The notion of community attachment was operationalized as the affective component of people's sense of belonging to a place. If respondents expressed strong liking for their town on a number of attributes, they were considered as strongly attached to their community. The parameters tested in this context were:

- Friendliness of residents
- Proximity of friends and relations
- Integrity of the environment
- Tranquillity
- Crime rate

On all counts and in both samples, respondents unanimously expressed strong sentiments in favour of their community.

Involvement in Tourism

From the frequency results generated, it seems clear that both communities would like to be involved in tourism to some extent. However that desire was more widespread in the case of Charlottesville. This viewpoint can also be substantiated when the issue of power and control is considered. The perception that local residents should control the industry was strongly put forward by Charlottesville residents (44%), whereas only 20% expressed that desire among respondents in the Speightstown sample.
Cultural Impacts

Three items were applied in measuring this dimension of impacts:

- Whether beachwear was considered appropriate for the street
- Respect for local customs
- Offensiveness of tourists' attire

While both groups sent a clear message that tourists should show respect for their local way of life, residents of Charlottesville were much more reserved than their Barbadian counterparts on the issue of freedom of dress. Perhaps due to their greater familiarity with tourism over the years, the people of Speightstown seem less offended by the way tourists tend to dress. However, the strong message coming from Charlottesville that residents' sensibilities are offended by lax tourist behaviour seem to echo the words of one respondent who told the researcher that it is not acceptable for tourists to kiss in public view of the local children.

Perception of Tourism Work

Generally, both samples show marked similarity in their perceptions of tourism work:

- They do not regard it as easy
- It has great potential for generating extra income from gratuities
- It is not the best job available
- It is not the only type of job available.

However, it seems clear that the only aspect on which their opinions differ significantly is on the matter of remuneration. In Speightstown, 50% of respondents perceive tourism
jobs as more lucrative than fishing. On the contrary, only 26% are of this view among the Charlottesville residents. It is likely that this perception is based on the reality that many families are boat owners in Charlottesville and some even revealed, in conversations with the researcher, that they can easily make $3000 in a single day when fish is plentiful.

Two Samples Compared

Similarities in Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Speightstown</th>
<th>Charlottesville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Largest age group is 35-46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Mix - female : male</td>
<td>57 : 43</td>
<td>51 : 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:Female in Tourism job</td>
<td>50 : 50</td>
<td>48 : 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed in a Tourism job</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.5 Comparison of respondents' demographics by sample

When a comparison of the two samples is drawn, the results reveal a close resemblance in certain key demographic aspects (Table 9.5):

- The majority of respondents belonged to the same age group
- The proportion of females to males were similarly distributed
- The distribution of respondents in the low, medium and high income brackets were roughly the same
- The proportion of those who had the opportunity to have a tertiary education was dramatically different
The number of persons employed in tourism were evenly split between males and females.

Similar proportions of those sampled in each case were employed in tourism.

**Similarities in Perceptions**

The frequency results revealed a number of commonly held viewpoints in both samples as shown in Table 9.6. It is noteworthy that both sets of respondents favour a growth in tourism as demonstrated by their expressed desire to see an increase in tourist arrivals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speightstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism provides jobs</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development will benefit town</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists should cover up on street</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'd like to be more involved</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government should consult us</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand tourism promotion</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more hotels in town</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism &amp; Crime unrelated</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism &amp; Prostitution unrelated</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the best jobs available</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism work is easy</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers make good tips</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not the only job available</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism has made us wealthier</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are not enough tourists</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.6 Commonly-held perceptions
Policy Guidelines for future development

It seems clear that both sets of respondents are interested in greater level of involvement in tourism as well as more opportunities to participate in decisions which affect the industry. Interestingly, the results indicate that although residents of Speightstown would like to have free access to beaches much like their Tobago counterparts, they are not opposed to foreign ownership of the beachfront. The reverse holds true for Charlotteville residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Issues</th>
<th>% agree or strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speightstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to be involved</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to participate in decisions</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of all-inclusives</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of land to foreigners</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign ownership of Beachfront</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free access to beach</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More tourists</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More hotel development</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.7 Respondents’ perceptions of future tourism development

Bivariate Analysis

Chi-Square Test

It is important to ensure that only continuous variables can be used when measuring Pearson’s product-moment Correlation coefficient r (Pallant, p.106). The outputs of Pearson Chi-Square tests for categorical variables were inspected for significant correlation between variable pairs. The categorical variables included age, income, education, gender, birthplace and job. However many of them had to be eliminated
because they violated the assumption concerning the 'minimum expected cell frequency' which should be 5 or greater.

In the case of Barbados, wherever the assumption held, none of the Asymp. Sig. Values were found to be equal to .05 or smaller and therefore the conclusion was drawn that the result was NOT significant. Therefore there were no significant differences in the relationships between the pairs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>9.336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>8.233</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>9.301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>9.265</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.8 Chi-Square Tests - Gender and Tourism Job (Charlottesville)

In contrast, the Tobago sample revealed one significant result when gender was measured against Tourism / Non-Tourism Job. The Asymp. Sig. Value for Continuity Correction was 0.004 and no cells had an expected frequency less than 5. This result is shown in Table 9.8. It can therefore be concluded that there was a significant difference between the percentage males and females employed in tourism jobs. The analysis also revealed that 60% of respondents were employed in tourism jobs. When broken down by gender, 30% of all males and 57% of all females were tourism workers.
Pearson Product-Moment Correlation

Pearson Correlation coefficient, r was computed for nine continuous (ordinal) composite variables to identify any significant relationships between pairs. Care was exercised to ensure that the assumptions of the test were not violated, before the result could be taken as significant.

Summary of Bi-variate Results

A Correlation Matrix was generated using SPSS version 10. Pearson’s Correlation Coefficient \( \rho \) was computed and only those relationships of high and medium levels of significance were extracted for further analysis. A high level of correlation is defined as relationships with coefficients (r-value) of 0.50 to 1.00. A medium level correlation was defined as those relationships which recorded values between 0.30 to 0.49.

Speightstown

There were no high level correlations. The relationships of significance (two-tailed) as identified in the Correlation Analysis for a split sample and whole sample were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRELATED VARIABLES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MALE / FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefit / Support for Development</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.343 / 0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefit / Tourism Awareness</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefit / Community Benefit</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.352 / 0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefit / Support for Development</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.351 / 0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefit / Perception of Job</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Awareness / Tourism Involvement</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefit / Tourism Involvement</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.9 Correlation matrix by gender (Speightstown)
It is worth noting from this result that the correlations among female respondents were higher than the correlation coefficient for the entire sample. There were only two cases where both males and females generated significant relationships: Community Benefit / Support for Development and Personal Benefit / Community Benefit.

In other words, both males and females

- who perceived some benefits to the community were likely to be supportive of tourism development, and
- who perceived community benefits were more likely to be those who were personally dependent on the industry

**Charlotteville**

Like the Speightstown sample, there were no high level correlations. Medium level Pearson's Correlation coefficients are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRELATED VARIABLES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>MALE / FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Awareness / Personal Benefits</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.366 / 0.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Involvement / Personal benefits</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Job / Tourism Involvement</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Job / Tourism Awareness</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Job / Personal Benefits</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.10 Correlated variables by gender (Charlotteville)
There was only one instance where both males and females held the same relationships:

Those who perceived themselves as personally benefiting from tourism were more aware of the industry. The views of female respondents did not correlate on any other subscales, quite unlike the females in the Speightstown sample.

**Multi-Variate Analysis**

Having analysed the data for relationships between pairs of variables and pairs of subscales, the next logical step was to search for multi-variate relationships.

There were 68 variables in the data set; 17 were categorical and 51 were continuous. Only those variables which showed a significant correlation coefficient ($> r = 0.3$) were subjected to factor analysis to determine whether it would uncover any underlying fundamental influences in the group of related variables. (Pallant 2001).

Factor Analysis can only be done on continuous variables. This technique was used to identify groups of variables which might be said to characterize or account for, the variability in patterns of correlation. In this sense, factor analysis summarizes the data using a smaller set of factors or components.

**Steps involved in Factor Analysis:**

1. Proceed with factor Analysis if:
   - Sample is large (200-300 cases) or if there are 5-10 cases per item
Inter-correlations among items show coefficients (strength) of 0.3 or above

2. Factor Extraction

The smallest number of factors that can be used to best represent the inter-relations among the set of variables, was determined using Principal Component analysis (PCA). To decide the minimum number of factors to retain, Catell’s Scree Test was applied. The Scree plot was examined to ascertain how many components to extract. ‘What you are looking for is the point where a line drawn through the points, changes direction’ (Tabachnick & Fidell page 635).

The authors suggest that ‘if you are unsure about the number of factors, perform several factor analyses each time specifying a different number of factors, repeating the Scree test, and examining the residual correlation matrix.’ (p.636). For example, a model generated with five factors is equally interpretable as a 6-factor one. The main difference between them is that the items associated with factor five merely splits into two different factors in the latter solution. There is therefore more than one interpretable solution in a single analysis (Tinsley and Brown 2000). To this end, matrices were generated for 3 and 4 components in the case of Barbados and 5 and 6 components in the Tobago instance.

3. Factor Rotation and Interpretation

Varimax Rotation (most commonly used Orthogonal approach) was conducted to assist in interpretation. Tabachnick & Fidell (1996) advise that it is useful to determine a cut-off value for the variable loading values and suggest a limit of 0.45 (page 659). This
study employed the same cut-off value. The rationale for taking this approach is based upon the fact that there are many variables with moderate loadings, making them complex variables, that is they load on more than one factor. The authors suggest that using a fairly high cut-off loading value to deal with this dilemma.

**Interpretation of the Output of Factor Analysis**

**Speightstown**

There were several correlation coefficients of + or - 0.3 and above in the Correlation Matrix. The 30 items of the Total Support for Development Scale were subjected to Principal Component Analysis (PCA) using SPSS. Prior to performing PCA the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of 0.3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin value was 0.682, exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser 1970. 1974) and the Bartlett’s test of Sphericity (Bartlett 1954) reached statistical significance at 0.00, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

PCA revealed the presence of 9 components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining a total of 58.39 percent of the variance. An inspection of the Screeplot (Appendix 43) revealed a clear break after the fifth component. Using Catell’s (1966) Scree Test, it was decided to retain 4 components for further investigation. To aid in the interpretation of these 4 components, Varimax Rotation was performed. The rotated solution presented in Appendix 44 did not reveal the presence of simple structure (Thurstone 1947) with all four components showing medium to high loadings. Seven variables were complex
(loaded on more than one component), so a cut-off value of 0.45 was applied to screen out the weak ones.

The 4 factor solution explained 37.12 percent of the variance with component 1 contributing 10.82 percent, component 2 contributing 9.82 percent, component 3 contributing 8.49 and component 4 contributing 7.99 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Perception of Socio-environmental Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 2</td>
<td>Perception of Community &amp; Personal Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3</td>
<td>Community Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 4</td>
<td>Perception of Tourism Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charlottesville**

The 33 items of the Total Support for Development Scale were subjected to Principal Component Analysis (PCA) using SPSS. Prior to performing PCA the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of 0.3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin value was 0.684, exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser 1970, 1974) and the Bartlett’s test of Sphericity (Bartlett 1954) reached statistical significance at 0.00, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

PCA revealed the presence of 11 components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining a total of 61.70 percent of the variance. An inspection of the Screeplot (**Appendix 45**).
revealed a clear break after the seventh component. Using Catell's (1966) Scree Test, it was decided to retain 6 components for further investigation. To aid in the interpretation of these 6 components, Varimax Rotation was performed. The rotated solution presented in Appendix 46 revealed the presence of a complex structure (Thurstone 1947) with all 6 components showing medium to high loadings. Twelve variables were complex (loaded on more than one component), so a cut-off value of 0.45 was applied to screen out the weak ones.

The 6-factor solution explained 44.50 percent of the variance with each component contributing as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Contribution to Variance (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variables loading on each component were not clearly representative of a single subscale, but instead represented a combination of variables belonging to more than one sub-
scale. However in 4 of the 6 components, a clearly discernible grouping of variables emerged:

Component 2  Perception of Socio-environmental Impacts
Component 3  Community Attachment
Component 4  Perception of Cultural Impacts
Component 6  Perception of Community benefits

**Common themes between samples**

From the results, it is apparent that there is a certain amount of congruency between both samples. Both sets of responses were found to aggregate according to the following three domains:

1. Perception of Socio-environmental Impacts
2. Perception of Community & Personal Benefits
3. Community Attachment

**Key differences between samples**

It is noteworthy that the Tobago sample differed from its Barbados counterpart on three grounds. These are the key issues which set them apart and which warrant further investigation:

- Respondents perception of their own involvement in tourism
• Their concern over the industry's impact on their cultural norms

• An absence of any influence arising from their perception of tourism work

The absence of the ‘Involvement’ domain in the Speightstown output from Factor Analysis therefore is probably a reflection of the respondents’ aspirations. However, despite this, both groups overwhelmingly expressed the view that they would like to be involved in the decisions made regarding tourism development, through a participatory consultative process between Government and stakeholder communities.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Having identified the core variables involved, a multiple regression analysis was performed after taking the following facts into consideration:

1. Dependence method or independence method of multivariate analysis?

The data permits a distinction between dependent and independent variables. Additionally, ‘support for more tourism development’, a notion that was captured in the statements ‘we should bring more tourists’ and ‘we should (not) build more hotels’ is clearly a dependent variable and it is measured on the metric level (continuous) with values ranging from 1-5. Therefore, it was appropriate to apply a dependence method of analysis.

2. How many dependent variables and what is the level of measurement?
There was one dependent variable which was measured on a metric scale. Therefore, according to Diamantopoulos, Multiple Regression Analysis would be the appropriate multivariate method of analysis in this case.

**The Caribbean Tourism Support Model**

Regression analysis seeks to establish the degree of influence a group of independent variables exert on a single dependent variable. To this end, variance in the dependent variable can be attributed to variances in one or more members of the group. A Tourism Support Model suggested here, was subjected to multiple regression analysis employing the variables generated previously from Factor Analysis. The fundamentals of this model may be summarized as:

\[ S = F(AC, TA, PCB, TI, IM, SEI, CI) + U \]

Where

- \( S \) = Total Support for Tourism Development
- \( AC \) = Attachment to Community
- \( TA \) = Tourism Awareness
- \( PCB \) = Personal and Community Benefits
- \( TI \) = Involvement in Tourism
- \( IM \) = Image of Tourism Work
- \( SEI \) = Socio-Environmental Impact
- \( CI \) = Cultural Impact
- \( U \) = Unknown variable
Interpretation of Output of Regression

Speightstown

Checking the Assumptions

Multicollinearity

There were two correlation coefficients above 0.3 between the independent variables and the dependent variable, in the Correlations Matrix. The correlations between the independent variables was low (<0.7) and so the variables were retained (Pallant, p.143)

Tolerance

A check of Tolerance in the Coefficient Matrix shows that multicollinearity (multiple correlation with other variables) was low as the Tolerance values were all high (>0.5 in this case). In fact, the values were all over 0.7 so it did not appear that this assumption was violated.

Outliers, Normality, Linearity, Homoscedasticity, Independence of Residuals

On inspection of the Normal Probability Plot (Appendix 47), it was apparent that the points (standardized residuals) generally conformed to a straight line from the bottom left to the top right. This suggested no major deviations from normality. From the scatterplot the residuals were mostly distributed in a rectangular fashion with most of the scores concentrated at the centre along the zero point. Pallant warns against plots which are curvilinear or higher on one side than on the other (p.144). It is noted however that the scatterplot showed three outlier points below –0.3.
Evaluating the Model

On examination, the model summary (Table 9.11) showed a value for $R^2$ of 25.7. This indicated that 25.7 percent of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by this model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>1.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Predictors: (Constant), Total Cultural Impact, Total Tourism Awareness, Total Socio-environmental Impact, Total Community Attachment, Total Perception of Job, Total Community Benefit, Total Tourism Involvement, Total Personal Benefit  

*b* Dependent Variable: Total Support for Tourism Development

Table 9.11 Regression Model Summary – Speightstown

Evaluating each of the independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Un-standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.681</td>
<td>2.645</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Attachment</td>
<td>-1.999E-02</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Awareness</td>
<td>1.061E-02</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Involvement</td>
<td>3.036E-02</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Benefit</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>2.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefit</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>1.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Job</td>
<td>3.168E-02</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Impact</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-1.114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Dependent Variable: Total Support for Tourism Development

Table 9.12 Beta Coefficients for Independent variables - Speightstown
It would be useful to know which of the variables in the model contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable. Inspection of the Beta Column under Standardized Coefficients in the Coefficients Output box (Table 9.12), revealed that the variable ‘Community Benefits’ was the best predictor of ‘support for tourism development’ and it made a significant unique contribution (Sig. Value is less than 0.05) No other variables made a unique significant contribution.

Charlotteville

Checking the Assumptions

Multicollinearity

There are no correlation coefficients above 0.3 between the independent variables and the dependent variable, in the Correlations Matrix. The correlations between the independent variables was low (<0.7) and so all the variables were retained (Pallant, p.143)

Tolerance

A check of Tolerance in the Coefficient Matrix showed that multicollinearity was low as the Tolerance values were all high (>0.5 in this case). In fact, the values were all above 0.7 so it did not appear that this assumption was violated.

Outliers, Normality, Linearity, Homoscedasticity, Independence of Residuals

On inspection of the Normal Probability Plot, it was observed that the points (standardized residuals) generally conformed to a straight line from the bottom left to the top right. This suggested no major deviations from normality. From the scatterplot the
residuals were mostly distributed in a rectangular fashion with most of the scores concentrated at the centre along the zero point.

Evaluating the Model

On examination, the model summary showed a value for R Square of .099. This indicated that only 9.9 percent of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by this model. Consequently, it cannot be considered a good predictor of support for tourism development.

Evaluating each of the independent Variables

Inspection of the Beta Column under Standardized Coefficients in the Coefficients Output box, reveals no variable predicting 'support for tourism development' and no variable made a significant unique contribution (Sig. Value is less than 0.05). Of the 8 variables included in the analysis, none emerged as making a unique contribution when accounting for variances in the dependent variable.

Applicability of CTS Model

Importantly, the proposed Tourism Support Model seems more applicable in the Speightstown context, where it accounts for 26 percent of variance in residents support for tourism development, when compared to just 10 percent in the case of Charlottesville. The relatively low predictive capacity of the model suggests that it may not be very useful in its present form. However, on account of its ability to predict 25% variance in the dependent variable, it serves a useful purpose as an exploratory model which can be
subjected to further refinements before undergoing more empirical tests. As was intimated in the introduction to the study, social phenomena such as those being investigated here, are rather complex and so too are their relationships with other variables. The previous contradictory results in the various studies reported earlier serve to confirm this observation. Indeed, it would be useful to consider whether support for tourism development bears a curvilinear relationship, as opposed to a linear relationship, with the group of independent variables tested in this study.

Conclusion

This chapter described the various processes which were used in analyzing the data. Brief explanations were also undertaken in order to assist in presenting the rationale for applying certain statistical tests as well as for purposes of interpreting the output. The data manipulations were carried out in a progressive manner, beginning with univariate methods and ending with multivariate techniques of analysis. In the interest of maintaining clarity and focus, only the key findings were reported in the text. However, the relevant detailed results generated by SPSS 10 have been included in the appendices.

The analyses revealed that because of the relatively large sample sizes (over 200), it was not essential to carry out tests for Normality as large samples are assumed to approximate the normal distribution. All assumptions regarding the suitability of the data for more rigorous testing such as reliability analysis and multi-variate analyses, were explored and their application in the study were discussed. The results indicated certain common themes between both samples as well as some stark differences.
In Speightstown, Factor Analysis revealed that there are 4 main influences which can be said to categorize the responses:

- Perception of Socio-environmental Impacts
- Perception of Community & Personal Benefits
- Community Attachment
- Perception of Tourism Work

On the other hand, respondents’ perceptions in Charlotteville appear to be characterized by 5 such factors:

- Tourism Involvement
- Perception of Socio-environmental Impacts
- Community Attachment
- Perception of Cultural Impacts
- Perception of Community benefits

Further, it is noteworthy that the Charlotteville sample differed from its Barbados counterpart on three grounds:

1. Respondents perception of their own involvement in tourism
2. Their concern over the industry’s impact on their cultural norms
3. An absence of any influence arising from their perception of tourism work
A Caribbean Tourism Support Model was proposed and tested using Multiple Regression Analysis. The model seems more applicable in the Barbados context, where it accounts for 26 percent of variance in residents support for tourism development, when compared to only 10 percent predictability in Tobago’s case.
CHAPTER TEN
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction
This final chapter summarizes the discussions developed at every stage of the study and attempts a synthesis of the findings. The discussion is presented in the context of the main theoretical model of the study, Social Exchange Theory. Conclusions are drawn with respect to each of the study areas and in response to the objectives set out in Chapter One. Strategies are also proposed for improvements in the policy and planning frameworks in both Tobago and Barbados. Key issues, which pose threats to the welfare of the tourism industry, are identified and suggestions are given regarding management and mitigation measures. The significance of the study is explored and the chapter concludes with an acknowledgement of the limitations of the study and suggests opportunities for further research.

The Research Process
This study began with the primary aim of exploring the main motivations for determining resident support for tourism development. It sought to achieve this by uncovering residents’ perceptions of a host of issues associated with the development of tourism in a developing country context. A pilot study was carried out in each of the target areas and this was informed by structured focus group sessions with key individuals in the respective communities. A few weeks later, the main data collection exercise was conducted, yielding 420 completed questionnaires. A group of impacting variables, taken
from previous empirical work, were subjected to rigorous statistical manipulations and then used to construct a Caribbean Tourism Support Model.

**Key Outcomes**

From the foregoing account, it was noted that this study is unique in that it examined residents' perceptions of tourism in two communities in differing stages of development across national and cultural boundaries. It was demonstrated that the socio-cultural environments in the two selected study areas of Charlottesville and Speightstown bear some resemblance and indeed many parallels can be drawn between them. However, there seems to be a host of overriding influences arising from the inherent character of both islands as SIDS. The vulnerability of these communities to external influences seem to place them at a special disadvantage. In light of their varying levels of tourism-dependence, strong cultural traditions and their close-knit community structure, it may not be unreasonable to expect that local people may express some ambivalence toward the development of the industry.

Having been conducted under similar conditions in the two carefully selected areas, this study found that three key variables account for variances in the data in both communities. These variables were resident's perceptions of:

1. Community attachment - a measure of residents' sense of belonging to their community
2. Personal and community benefits – an indication of the value residents place on the benefits which the tourism industry delivers

3. Socio-environmental impacts – an evaluation of the consequences which residents attribute to the development of tourism

It was revealed in the previous chapter that the variable ‘Community Benefits’ was the best predictor of ‘support for tourism development’ and that it made a significant unique contribution in the case of Speightstown. This finding is consistent with that of Gursoy et al, 2002) in which it was shown that perceptions of the economic well-being of the community had the strongest effect on whether or not residents will support tourism development.

Further, what distinguished Speightstown from Charlotteville was that that residents’ responses also indicated ‘perception of tourism work’ as a major impact variable, whereas, no such outcome was evident in Charlotteville. Further, this study also showed that residents of Charlotteville, the less developed of the two target destinations, considered two other variables in their assessment of the industry:

1. Cultural Impact – their perception of the effect that tourism activity was having on their way of life, and

2. Involvement in tourism – residents’ participation in tourism and their desire to become more involved in the industry.
Finally, a simple linear model to gauge tourism support was proposed and tested using multiple regression analysis. Application of the 6-domain output from exploratory factor analysis yielded a 26% model fit in the case of Speightstown, indicating that together, the six identified variables account for 26% variation in support for tourism development. The model was not as good a predictor of tourism support in the Charlotteville context, explaining only 10% of variance in the dependent variable.

It was noteworthy that awareness of tourism was not indicated in the results from the factor analysis of both samples of respondents. This outcome, though surprising, may point to the need for a more comprehensive composition of the awareness scale to include other items beyond knowledge of commercial linkages alone.

**A Longitudinal Comparism**

It was indicated in the introduction to this report, that the findings of this study would be viewed against those of a similar study conducted by UNECLAC in 1990, in order to glean the degree of change that may have occurred during the intervening ten-year period. Table 10.1 shows the percentage change in resident perceptions on key social domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOBAGO</th>
<th>1990 UNECLAC STUDY</th>
<th>2001 STUDY</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL DOMAIN</td>
<td>% Residents Agree</td>
<td>% Residents Agree</td>
<td>2001/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism delivers a better standard of living</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals want to participate in making tourism decisions</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Ten
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism is responsible for:</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>31.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More prostitution</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread of AIDS</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalating drug problem</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1 Longitudinal comparison on residents of Tobago

Assuming that both samples of respondents, then and now, were representative of the population in the respective countries, the comparison revealed a remarkable increase in resident sentiment in all six social domains mentioned. On the positive side, there is more widespread acknowledgement of tourism's contribution to an improved standard of living and a greater majority of residents seek involvement in decision making. In contrast, residents' perceptions of the industry's alleged ills have escalated dramatically. With regard to the perception of tourism as a propagator of the AIDS virus, resident endorsement has almost quadrupled, with 1 in every 2 residents now apportioning blame on tourism for the scourge. Similarly, tourism is seen as being responsible for increased crime by 1 in every 3 residents as opposed to 1 in every 40 persons, 10 years ago.

The ramifications of the changes reported here are succinctly expressed in the comments made by the author of the UNECLAC report:

(this) confirms the already established conceptualization of Tobago as an incipient tourism destination associated with the 'pre-take off' stage of tourism development. One logical manifestation of this would be the inclination on the
part of residents to see its impact on the significant life domains and social
domains as essentially minimal. Even in the three negatively assessed problem
areas most closely associated with tourism namely, AIDS, drugs and prostitution,
over 70% of the respondents attributed these ills to factors other than tourism.’
(UNECLAC 1992 p.22)

The demonstrated dramatic shift in public opinion would therefore suggest that the
destination is no longer at the embryonic stage of tourism evolution.

On the other hand, the changes in Barbados are not as consistent as in Tobago (Table
10.2). While 44% more Barbadians seemed convinced that their improved standard of
living can be attributed to tourism growth, 75% of them object to any expansion in all-
inclusive hotel development, a rise of 56% over the 1990 level of dissent. In light of this,
it is interesting to note that the Barbados tourism authorities have recently endorsed
expansion in this sector in a recent newspaper report (The Barbados Advocate, 10 June
2002). Marginal changes in perceptions appear to have been manifested with regards to
the democratization of decision making, and tourism’s role in the spread of prostitution
and AIDS. However, the changes are more profound in the domains of crime and
narcotics. Whereas, 1 in every 20 residents formerly saw tourism as the cause of rising
crime, that view is now held by 1 in every 4 persons. In 1990, 1 in every five persons
blamed tourism for worsening drug problems. 28% more or, 1 in every 2 people, now
support this view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BARBADOS</th>
<th>1990 UNECLAC STUDY</th>
<th>2001 STUDY</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL DOMAIN</td>
<td>% Residents Agree</td>
<td>% Residents Agree</td>
<td>2001/1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more all-inclusive hotels</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tourism delivers a better standard of living & Locals want to participate in making tourism decisions & Tourism is responsible for:
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locals want to participate in making tourism decisions</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased crime</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More prostitution</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread of AIDS</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalating drug problem</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.2 Longitudinal Comparison on residents of Barbados

Application of Theoretical Models

Butler’s Destination Life Cycle Model

According to Butler’s Life Cycle model, described in Chapter Three, it seems that Charlottesville, and on a wider level, the island of Tobago, are neither at the early exploration stage nor at the subsequent involvement stage. Rather, it would be more appropriate to categorize Charlottesville as having evolved to a point on the spectrum somewhere between the early exploration stage and the involvement stage of tourism development. On the other hand, Speightstown may be regarded as being at the involvement stage, having a higher tourist-host ratio and a more developed tourism industry. However, if one were to consider the situation at the destination level, it would be more appropriate to regard the island of Barbados as being at the consolidation stage of the cycle.
What is clearly obvious in both towns is that residents are eager to become involved in the industry in several ways. Most interestingly, the vast majority expressed a keen desire to get involved in the commercial sector, most probably, at the small business level. This implied endorsement of tourism as holding out promise for the well-being and prosperity of locals is a very encouraging sign particularly when it is considered in the context of the vast potential which tourism presents as a platform for economic development at the country level. This result also points to the role of the state as facilitator in the development of an entrepreneurial spirit among its citizens. While it is acknowledged that both governments have small business development programmes in train, it would seem appropriate to suggest that a comprehensive review of such programmes is needed to ensure that they are aligned in accordance with the needs and aspirations of the wider population.

**Applicability of Doxey’s Irridex Model**

In this study, no evidence was presented to indicate that residents were either harbouring or exhibiting any antagonistic feelings towards tourists. In the Barbados sample, while some respondents expressed agreement that they did not feel welcomed in hotels, the hostility meted out to them sprung from their fellow natives. There was also no evidence to suggest that such rejection has led to resident disillusionment with tourists or tourism, per se. However, it must be noted here, that this finding may not typify the situation in urban areas which are located in the heart of the tourist zone.
Therefore, it would be reasonable to conclude that Speightstown is at a stage between euphoria and apathy along Doxey’s continuum of attitudes towards tourists. There was no clear evidence of apathy in the resident sample. In the case of Charlotteville, where residents openly welcome tourists and new tourism development, residents’ attitudes may be described as euphoric. It would seem that the distinction between both towns, lie in the view expressed by one respondent in Charlotteville: ‘We want tourism, but only on our terms...we want to keep our culture.’ Such deep sentiment is borne out in the results of this study. It was noted that cultural impacts was one of five dimensions which characterized the Tobago sample, while it did not feature in the Barbados case. This reverence for local mores was abundantly evident to the researcher while living and working in the community. Indeed residents regard their heritage as sacrosanct and take great offence when outsiders overtly violate certain norms. Two such examples of behaviours that elicit negative responses ranging from annoyance to outright condemnation are extreme nudity and kissing, when displayed in public view. Interestingly, no such accounts emanated from the researcher’s experiences in Barbados.

It would seem reasonable to postulate then that residents of Speightstown did not value their cultural heritage in the same way that their counterparts in Tobago did. Further, the findings evoke strong indications that perhaps the debate which now engages residents’ attention is: ‘Tourism, at what cost?’

**Social Exchange Theory**

There is an apparent contradiction in the results obtained, as has occurred in previous studies. Specifically, it would have been expected that where residents perceived that
tourism was responsible for increased threats to their environment, they would be inclined to withdraw support for tourism. However, as revealed in the previous chapter, residents in both jurisdictions were fully supportive of tourism despite their belief, in Charlottesville, that the industry propagated the spread of social diseases (AIDS) and the pollution of the environment. The same outcome relates to Speightstown, where residents claimed that tourism was to blame for the mounting property taxes and the increased incidence of drug addiction in the community. Yet in both instances, it is clear that residents appear to act irrationally by lending their support to the expansion of tourism.

This apparent contradiction can be explained by Social Exchange Theory, which postulates that residents make trade-offs between costs and benefits of development, and do not rationalize their response in a straightforward manner. In this case, it would appear that Speightstown residents, are willing to accept the high property taxes and burgeoning drug problems in exchange for the personal and wider community benefits which tourism confer. In a similar vein, residents of Charlottesville are willing to sacrifice the integrity of their environment and their own well being, in exchange for benefits such as personal wealth, more jobs, better amenities and an improved standard of life.

Further, Social Exchange Theory can be used to explain, why there were such diverse responses to the various impacting variables and why some residents chose to support, while others withheld their support for tourism growth. Each individual makes their decision based on their own personal assessment of the costs and benefits, and
accordingly, decision outcomes may vary, depending on the weights or significance each person attaches to individual costs and benefits.

Implications for the Planning Authorities

Organizations seeking to increase tourism should recognize the complex nature of formulating support for tourism. When attempting to maximize the benefits for a specific community, planners should gather information about individuals who stand to gain economically from the development, those who are attached to their community, and those with strong environmental concerns.

Important to all of these groups are the social benefits that can be derived from tourism. This suggests that internal marketing campaigns that explain the social benefits of tourism to the host community may help to reduce the potential for opposition.

One of the most significant implications of the study is the importance of maintaining the integrity of the social, environmental and cultural fabric of society. While residents now believe that tourism has a negative relationship with its surrounding environment, their willingness to overlook these issues may be short-lived, as they are called upon to make greater sacrifices on their quality of life. It therefore behoves both the corporate and state sectors to give priority to social and environmental concerns and to incorporate appropriate programmes into the national tourism development plans. Moreover, investors and developers seeking the support of the host community should promote their ecological and social interests not only to their customers but also to the community
residents. Indeed, these businesses have a duty of care to their host communities and therefore, must be held accountable whenever they shirk their social responsibility. In the final analysis, the relationship between business and community needs to operate in a symbiotic manner much like a partnership.

According to Doxey (n.d.), commenting on the tourist industry in Barbados:

In the long run, it is impossible to divorce the social from the economic. Any short-term economic advantage can quickly be lost if it proves incompatible with the social needs of the population. To be effective, any development plan must take cognizance of this and in the case of tourism in the West-Indies, it would be disastrous to do otherwise.

**Image and Involvement**

From the investigations carried out in this study, Charlotteville's residents exhibited an eagerness to become involved in the industry, despite their reservations regarding its capacity to generate more income than the traditional fishing trade. The results indicated that on the other hand, residents of Speightstown expressed a lower level of interest in becoming involved. This result is substantiated by factor analysis, which showed an absence of the 'involvement' dimension. Such findings, may point to early signs of apathy in the Barbados industry, but they cannot be regarded as conclusive and therefore further research would need to be conducted in this area.
It is possible that in making the comparison between both types of jobs, respondents did not consider managerial positions in the industry. This stereotyping of tourism jobs as low-paid and menial and typically in the mould of the bartender or waitress appears to be rife throughout the tourism industry. This poor image is probably triggered by the reality that confronts people on a daily basis, as locals hold few senior positions. The paucity of local role models in the industry can therefore be seen as a powerful deterrent which operates to discourage entry into the industry for some, while also contributing to poor aspiration levels for many others.

Residents' involvement in tourism can range from being included in the consultative process of planning to working in a tourism job or becoming the owner and operator of a tourism business. The evidence uncovered does not suggest however, that there is such a multi-level engagement with the industry. What seems certain is that there is a genuine desire on the part of residents to become involved at every level of tourism. The empowerment of locals to achieve this is quite another matter, especially when the pre-requisites for involvement are considered. While opportunities for vocational skills training are accessible locally, higher-level training for middle management and senior positions is lacking. This is more so in Tobago than it is in Barbados where tourism and hospitality programmes extend to degree level.

**Power and Control**

Further, access to funding is also stymied in circumstances where residents may wish to become guesthouse proprietors, for example, but possess little or no start-up capital. It is
in these disadvantageous conditions, that many locals often find themselves excluded from meaningful participation in the tourism industry. In such cases, it is only the local elites and expatriates who are able to seize the opportunities. Power and control over the affairs of the industry therefore rest with these privileged groups, fulfilling the maxim, ‘money buys power’.

The findings of this study indicate that in both Charlottesville and Speightstown, residents would like to see control of the industry in local hands. Their vision incorporates a partnership role for Government working with local communities to manage the industry. In this context, it seems reasonable to conclude that Government must therefore take the necessary steps to help its constituents realize their aspirations by enacting the appropriate enabling legislation to address this imbalance in the system.

The Essentials of Community Involvement

In view of the repeated calls for local participation in the development of tourism, it would seem appropriate to enter a brief discussion on this issue. Community involvement or community participation refers to Arnstein’s degrees of citizen power: partnership, delegated power and citizen control (1971). Further, it implies a desire to avoid using traditional bureaucratic paternalism in which agencies believe that they know what is best for the members of their community (Skelcher, 1993). Community participation is a form of voluntary action where individuals assume the responsibilities of citizenship. It is also an educational and empowering process in which people, in partnership with those who can assist them, identify problems and needs and increasingly assume responsibility
themselves to plan, manage, control and evaluate the collective actions that are deemed necessary (Askew, 1989). According to Willis:

> In this sense, community participation, as an ideal type, involves a shift of power, from those who have had major decision-making roles to those who traditionally have not had such a role (1995, p.212).

In such light, community involvement / participation is a tool to readjust the balance of power and reassert local community views against those of the developers or the local authority. In this way, intended beneficiaries are encouraged to participate in their own development through defining their own needs, mobilizing their own resources and making their own decisions in resolving problems (Stone, 1989). This approach takes on greater significance, when it is considered that ‘...it is in communities that tourism happens. Because of this, tourism industry development and management must be brought effectively to bear in communities’ (Blank, 1989, p.4).

**Impediments to Community Participation**

Todaro (1994) asserts in the context of developing countries:

> ...it is often not the correctness of economic policies alone that determines the outcome of national approaches to critical development problems. The political structure and the vested interests and allegiances of the ruling elites...will
typically determine what strategies are possible and where the main roadblocks to effective economic and social change may lie...

Although community participation in the tourism development process is highly desirable, there seems to be formidable operational, structural and cultural limitations to this approach in developing countries. Tosun (2000) points to a number of barriers to achieving this goal:

1. Centralization of public administration of tourism
2. Lack of co-ordination in an industry characterized by fragmentation
3. Lack of information dissemination
4. Attitudes of technocrats
5. Lack of expertise
6. Elite domination
7. Lack of an appropriate legal system
8. Lack of trained human resources
9. High cost of implementing community participation
10. Cultural limitations such as apathy and low awareness levels in communities

This study has argued in favour of the need for community involvement in tourism development. Such involvement is desirable at two levels or perspectives, as Timothy (1999) argues. Firstly, involvement in decision-making in the tourism development process should take place through a process of ongoing consultation where local people
can communicate their viewpoints on matters which affect their community. Secondly, involvement should take the form of local participation in the benefits of tourism development (p. 372). The reality in the Caribbean, like in many parts of the developing world, is that community participation has been only recognized as helping local people get more economic benefits via employing them as workers or encouraging them to operate small-scale businesses. Only token attention has been accorded to creation of opportunities for local people to have a say in the decision-making process of tourism development.

To this end, it is suggested that deliberate measures must be taken at the early stages (Butler’s exploration and involvement stages) in the destination’s life cycle, to empower local people to retain control over tourism development before the destination becomes too popular and more attractive for capital owners and brokers. This is particularly applicable in the context of Tobago’s development, where development intensity and tourist visitation are still at a relatively low level. On the other hand, the need for such initiatives becomes more urgent in Barbados where a significant amount of the tourist plant is foreign owned and controlled and where tourism development is advancing at a rapid pace. The problem is further compounded by the apparent absence of controls on growth and expansion, in the face of demonstrated impacts on the environment.

Despite these myriad shortcomings and the poor record of local involvement in tourism, there may still be reason for some optimism. Judging from the pronouncement of Prime
Minister, Owen Arthur, there appears to be a radical shift in tourism development policy in Barbados:

The underlying philosophy of our new approach to tourism development may be expressed in two words – participation and collaboration. We have recognized that unless people are at the centre of our efforts, the industry will fail. We have also learnt that unless effective and functional collaboration exist between the various stakeholders, the industry will stagnate. The new policy for Barbados, which is emerging, will therefore focus on participation of various stakeholders at all levels of the tourism development process. ‘To encourage and facilitate the involvement of communities in all areas of tourism development and the visitor experience (Government of Barbados 2000 p.78).

Areas of serious concern

It is disturbing to note that the very issues identified in this study, were being debated in intellectual and political circles in the Caribbean, more than two decades ago. Recognizing the trend which tourism had taken in the seventies, local pundits had forewarned the authorities of an impending ‘achievement crisis’ in tourism. Braithwaite (1980) foretold of a number of problems which would accompany the accomplishment of government’s economic development objectives. Even at that early stage in the development of the Barbados industry, this respected Caribbean scholar pointed to the need for strategic thinking and prudent management of the industry. It would seem
therefore that such remarkable wisdom and foresight was confined to rhetoric, in light of the present status of tourism in Barbados.

**Windows to the Sea**

Concern over access to the beach arose as early as the 1970s, when Christian Action for Development (CADEC), took an initiative aimed at securing public access to beaches by commissioning a study that would identify the remaining ‘windows to the sea’. (Hutt 1980). The motivation for such decisive action stemmed from a certain sense of alarm over the rapid rate of construction along the south and west coasts of the island. While many locals at that time, may not have recognized the infinite wisdom in such an effort, almost three decades later, it was undoubtedly a strategic step towards sustainable tourism development. John Wickham, in the foreword of the CADEC report, puts its succinctly:

...the irony of a small island community which, from the beginning of its history, was given to regarding ‘the encircling sea’ as the richest of its possessions, being gradually denied so much as a glimpse, was seen in all its tragedy (Hutt 1980).

A similar sentiment was expressed by Doxey et al (n.d.) in a socio-economic assessment he conducted of the Barbados tourist industry:

It will become increasingly important to ensure that access to beaches by locals is not progressively closed. It has been shown that many locals are reluctant or too
shy to make use of accesses through hotels, while some managements do indeed try to prevent entry by locals.

It is encouraging to note that current policy alludes to the issue of access and views to the sea:

Every effort will be made to enhance existing access and views to the sea, and to create new opportunities during the development or redevelopment process. (p.2-24)

Existing public accesses to beaches, used by residents and tourists alike should be maintained. Opportunities for the creation of new public beach access should be maximized wherever possible.


The present study uncovered the strong sentiment which Barbadian residents hold regarding their right of access to the beach. While all beaches are in the public domain, over the years, large coastal developments, mainly of a tourism nature, as well as private ownership of residential properties, have progressively created barriers to the sea. This loss of free and uninhibited access to what Caribbean people consider to be their patrimonial heritage, strikes at the heart of the 'achievement crisis' to which Braithwaite (1980) referred. This therefore begs the question: In order to benefit from tourism, must Barbadians relinquish their inalienable right to beach recreation? Feedback received from
respondents as well as industry stakeholders indicate that this is not a trade-off that many locals would be willing to make. Evidence of this was brought to public attention on at least two occasions during this study, when built structures along the beach had to be removed after animated protests from local interest groups and residents.

**Land Policy**

Related to the problem of access, is the issue of land ownership. Government policy regarding foreign land ownership in Barbados, suggests that there are no limits to foreign acquisition of land and property. Tobago, on the other hand, is governed by the Alien’s Landholding Act, which places restrictions on the amount of land purchased by foreigners. Despite these statutory provisions, locals have expressed grave concerns over the wanton sale of lands into foreign hands.

Matthews (2000), commenting on the policy stance of the Barbados government, argues:

> A land policy is of crucial importance to our future. Not only in relation to foreign land ownership but also to how our land will be used. No single programme more intimately affects our people than land ownership. No other measure is remotely comparable in its power to transform their lives, to release their latent energies and to give them not only economic betterment but hope in the future and their children’s future, confidence in themselves as human beings and, equally important, faith in our democratic process (p.76).
When asked their opinions on sale of land to foreigners, 58% of respondents in the Barbados sample had no objection to the purchase of land by foreigners. On the issue of the sale of beachfront property to foreigners, opinions were somewhat divided with 48% expressing disagreement. It would appear then, that there is no clear consensus on this issue. When both aspects of land ownership (land and property / beachfront) are considered, the results seem inconsistent. One interpretation could be that fewer people (42%) are willing to part with beach frontage as opposed to other property (58%). In other words, residents find it slightly more acceptable to sell land and property to foreigners than to sell them the beachfront.

Matthews (2000) perceives a rising social discontent among the population and argues that this is because ‘they (the locals) are seeing how our country is being sold out to the rich and famous. They are seeing the increase of affluence while poverty is increasing at a rapid rate’ (p.77). He explains:

No one, my friends, is against foreign investment but there must be a balance. Telling the rich and famous: “come, Barbados is for sale to the highest bidder” is not development for sustainable development. This has nothing whatsoever to do with colour or the rejection of foreign investment. It is a fundamental principle we are dealing with. We welcome investment but it must be for the common good. We welcome Whites to our shores but not as our masters. I am totally against the conduct of those foreign Whites who are building sea walls in the sea, putting
signs marked “Private Property” on our beaches, and do not want Blacks too near to them. We are heading for a lot of trouble (p.87).

The way forward

It is not within the terms of reference of this study to provide a recommended course of action to address the weaknesses which surfaced in this study. However, the findings themselves suggest some solutions. Key to the survival and prosperity of tourism in the long term is a strong emphasis on stakeholder participation at the community level. Such an approach embraces the notion of community attachment, personal and community benefits and appreciation of the socio- environmental issues related to tourism. In this regard, the recent initiatives launched by the Barbados Ministry of Tourism towards developing a Community Tourism Programme and a Tourism Awareness and Involvement Programme are steps in the right direction (Ministry of Tourism, 2001). However, careful monitoring and a system for measuring the effectiveness of strategies against agreed objectives, are essential to its success. Further, programmes must be consistently sustained, re-assessed on a regular basis and strengthened as required.

It is also critical to acknowledge the fallacy of pursuing a policy of resident involvement without a supporting framework of policies and programmes which give credence to that ethos. Such a framework facilitates the fulfilment of local aspirations to engage with the industry in a more meaningful way, bringing greater control and ownership into local hands. Braithwaite (1980) referred to this as socialization of the industry or the reduction in ownership by international capital. He opined:
It is only through this public and people control of ownership, and production in the industry, that we stand any chance of effectively controlling and defining the way in which tourism develops. And of using the benefits in the interest of the broad masses of the people (p.11).

Braithwaite’s views bear even greater relevance today, some two decades later. However, given the history of tourism development on the island and the domination of the industry by foreign interests, it would require a significant ideological shift to achieve any degree of success.

Potential Threats to Tobago’s Tourism

The island of Tobago is in a position of advantage for a number of reasons. Principal among these, is its relatively low reliance on tourism because the national (Trinidad and Tobago) economy is predominantly energy-based and possesses a vibrant manufacturing sector. This reality places Tobago in a unique position as the island’s infrastructural development is not wholly dependent on its success in tourism. To this extent, Tobago has the opportunity to develop tourism selectively, and largely on its own terms. In particular, the scale and pace of development can be controlled, as well as the type of tourism. It would be important to discourage all development which threatens the rights and freedoms which local people hold sacred including uninhibited access to the sea, a vital source of people’s livelihood. In like manner, all-inclusive hotel development which
promotes segregation, exclusivity and the formation of enclaves, may not serve the best interest of Tobagonians, in the long term.

**Deficiencies in the study**

While the findings of this study may be applied to host communities of similar scale and character as those examined here, some reservation should be exercised in extending its applicability beyond those boundaries. A number of shortcomings need to be noted.

Firstly, the minimal response from those in the more affluent areas of Speightstown suggests that the final sample on which this study was based would have excluded the viewpoints of a small but important sector of the community. The under representation of the middle class, high-income households implies that the sample obtained would not have been representative of every strata of the community.

It is also likely that because of the greater probability of meeting retirees at their homes as opposed to the younger more mobile generation, it is likely that older residents may have been over represented in the sample.

With regard to the design and composition of the impact scales, it was noted that scale reliability was not achieved in all cases. This was mainly due to the small number (five or less) of items in each scale.
The study is limited to an examination of the relationship between support for tourism development and a selection of independent variables and of the variances in this relationship between two similar communities. It does not purport to deal with the scale design or the measurement of support for tourism development. To this extent, the study is exploratory in nature and scope.

Contribution to Knowledge

This study raises a number of issues associated with the development of tourism in Small Island developing states. Essentially, it explored the dynamics of support for development of a tourism industry, paving the way for a more thorough investigation of the types of trade-offs that residents would be willing to make when considering the future development of tourism. While Jurowski et al (1997) used Path Analysis to trace the impact of four elements of exchange, this study employed Multiple Regression Analysis to establish the influence of six independent variables on support for tourism. Although it is acknowledged that the results of the study are inconclusive, it nonetheless serves to:

1. Complement the work carried out by Jurowski et al utilizing a different analytical technique;

2. Develop on it through the introduction of new variables;

3. Extend the debate by introducing a cross-cultural comparative dimension.
In light of the acknowledged contradictory research results documented in the literature, this piece of research also seeks to add to the repository of empirical studies on the subject with a view to advancing the theoretical base already established by several other researchers over the past two decades. It is hoped that its focus on the Caribbean region will bring new perspectives to the ongoing sociological debate on tourism’s role in community development.

Finally, Tosun (2002) recommends that for better understanding of host perceptions of impacts, more comparative cross-national studies are necessary and that such studies may provide a better set of policy recommendations for more sustainable tourism development (p. 251). In view of the fact that the data in this study addressed two similar host communities in different cultural settings, it offers a unique comparative perspective and builds on previous work done by Tosun and other researchers. To this end, the findings reveal some interesting contrasts in resident reactions to tourism and its consequences.

**Opportunities for further research**

Previous studies have suggested that resident attitudes are influenced by the level of economic activity in an area (Allen et al 1988; Long Perdue and Allen 1990; Johnson Snepenger and Akis 1994). This study was conducted in two areas that are not major tourist zones of activity. They are both peripheral regions and as such, they have a relatively low level of tourist penetration. However, it was previously acknowledged that despite these common characteristics, the destinations in which they are located are at different stages of the tourism development evolutionary cycle. It would therefore seem
reasonable to deduce that the overarching level of tourist activity and commerce would influence the perceptions of communities within the particular country. In other words, it would be reasonable to assume that although Speightstown is on the tourism fringes by dint of its reduced level of tourism, there is nothing to suggest that it cannot be characterized as belonging to the developed destination mould.

While this study determined the relative level of influence exerted by a range of six variables on resident support for new tourism development, further research is needed to refine the variables and to investigate a better set of predictors. Although the model accounted for 26% of variance in support for development in Speightstown, and only 10% in the case of Charlotteville, it is clear that for some yet unknown reason, the model was a far better fit in one case than in the other. Of course, one might wish to speculate that the model is more suited to developed destination communities such as Speightstown.

Clearly, there is scope for significant refinement and, perhaps, expansion to incorporate other variables not included in this study. One case in point is the construct labelled ‘tourism awareness’, which was defined to incorporate respondents’ experience of travel. Brunt and Courtney (1999), in their investigation of socio-cultural impacts in a small coastal town in Devon, suggested that it would be desirable to conduct a more thorough examination of the backgrounds of residents in terms of their own travel experiences. The use of travel experience in this study represents the first attempt to factor in residents’ familiarity with the tourist psyche gained from their own personal experiences as tourists.
As a further development on this work, perhaps it would be useful to reconfigure this variable independently or in association with other elements of awareness. To this end, this study represents an initial step in investigating the impact of historical experience of travel on support for tourism development.

Due to the dynamic nature of social phenomena, it is essential that research is carried out on a timely basis and in this context, a longitudinal research design is desirable.

This study also unearthed what may be considered as initial indications of apathy among Speightstown residents, particularly in light of their moderate level of interest in becoming involved in tourism at any level. Further and more in-depth analysis needs to be done to investigate this critical aspect. Failure to address this proactively, may lead to serious social consequences in tourism in the medium to long term. Indeed, it would be foolhardy to dismiss this as mere conjecture because it has the potential to compromise the sustainability of the Barbados tourism industry, a strategic objective to which the Government is firmly committed.

**Conclusion**

The growth and development of tourism has been associated with many idealistic notions concerning the contribution to society, but experience has shown that tourism, like many other human activities, can have both positive and negative impacts (Murphy 1985). To avoid the deterioration of the tourism industry and the host society or culture, effective planning that both recognizes tourists' demands and emphasizes local values is required.
The preservation of local values comes from the consistent agreement of community residents, local leaders, professional experts and policy makers. In fact, tourism continues to thrive in places that have held on to their identity (Southworth 1985). However the immediate difficulty is that government policy makers and travel advocates continue to accelerate their planning efforts to stimulate tourism without empirical evidence that the tourist will be received hospitably by members of the community. The confluence of these two dimensions result in significant socio-cultural consequences, both positive and negative (Jafari 1986).

Therefore, the goals and strategies of tourism development must reflect or incorporate local residents' views to ensure community consensus on development policies and programmes. If resident perceptions and preferences do not support tourism development policies and programmes, then such programmes are likely to fail or become ineffective in their implementation (Pearce 1980). To ensure that development proceeds with a minimum of confrontation, it has been found desirable to uncover preferences and trade-off positions of such groups at an early stage in the planning process (Murphy 1983).

In this study of two peripheral communities, it has been demonstrated that despite residents' acknowledgement of negative social and environmental impacts, tourism nonetheless, constitutes an important vehicle for their individual and collective prosperity. This study has revealed some disturbing shifts in resident perceptions on both islands, over the last 10 years. In light of this, it is incumbent on politicians and technocrats to place local people at the centre of all policies and plans, if tourism is to
develop in accordance with sound sustainable practice. While it is widely acknowledged that this approach is fraught with many obstacles, particularly in developing countries, there is no justification for responsible governments to avoid this route.
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## APPENDIX 1  Caribbean small-island tourism stages and styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I (emerging)</th>
<th>Stage II (intermediate)</th>
<th>Stage III (mature)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low density</td>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>High density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-staying</td>
<td>Nature tourism</td>
<td>Mass market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>Small hotels</td>
<td>Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter residence</td>
<td>Local control</td>
<td>Short-staying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large hotels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Bermudia
- Bahamas
- US Virgin Islands
- Barbados
- Aruba
- Curacao
- St. Maarten

- Antigua
- Martinique
- Guadeloupe
- Caymans
- British Virgin Islands
- Turks/Caicos
- Bonaire
- St. Lucia
- Anguilla
- St. Kitts/Nevis
- Grenada
- St. Vincent
- St. Eustatius
- Saba
- Montserrat
- Dominica

Source: Alburquerque and McElroy 1993
## APPENDIX 2  Summary of empirical research findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable examined</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Key conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of tourism development</td>
<td>1. Liu et al (1987)</td>
<td>Residents of places with a longer history of tourism development are more aware of both positive and negative impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Allen et al (1988)</td>
<td>There was a curvilinear relationship between perceptions of negative impacts and development of tourism, but this was not as strong a relationship as between perceptions of negative impacts and population growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Long et al (1990)</td>
<td>There was a curvilinear relationship between support for tourism and level of development, but as level of tourism development increases so do perceptions of both negative and positive impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Madrigal (1993)</td>
<td>Level of tourism development is the best predictor of perceptions of negative but not positive impacts of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Economic dependency on tourism</td>
<td>1. Pizam (1978)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs were more positive about tourism than other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Comparisons of residents, business owners and</td>
<td>2. Thomason et al (1979)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs were more positive about tourism than other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government officials</td>
<td>3. Keogh (1990)</td>
<td>There were no significant differences in the perceptions of business owners and residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Lankford (1994)</td>
<td>Residents were more cautious than business owners and public officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Murphy (1983)</td>
<td>There were significant differences between residents, administrators and the business sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job in tourism or perceived positive balance of</td>
<td>1. Pizam (1978)</td>
<td>There was a positive relationship between employment in and support for tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal costs and benefits of tourism</td>
<td>2. Rothman (1978)</td>
<td>Economic dependency on tourism was related to more positive perceptions of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Husband (1989)</td>
<td>Residents employed in tourism were more positive about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Perdue et al (1990)</td>
<td>Personal benefits from tourism were important in explaining perceptions of positive but not negative impacts of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mansfield (1992)</td>
<td>Residents employed in tourism were more positive about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Madrigal (1993)</td>
<td>Personal benefits from tourism were the best predictors of perceptions of positive impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Frentice (1995)</td>
<td>There was a positive relationship between perceived benefits of tourism and positive perceptions of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Lankford and Howard</td>
<td>Those who were more dependent on tourism were more positive about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1994)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable examined</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Key conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Distance from place of residence to tourist areas</td>
<td>1. Belisle and Hoy (1980)</td>
<td>As distance from place of residence to tourist areas increased residents were less positive about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Brougham and Butler (1981)</td>
<td>Some relationships were found between residence in zones of high tourist pressure, but the nature of the relationship differed for different types of tourist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sheldon and Var (1984)</td>
<td>Residents in higher tourist density areas were more positive about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Keogh (1990)</td>
<td>People living closer to a proposed tourist development perceived more negative impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mansfield (1992)</td>
<td>People living further from tourist areas saw more negative impacts from tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of contact with tourists</td>
<td>1. Pizam (1978)</td>
<td>Residents with more contact with tourists were negative about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rochman (1978)</td>
<td>High contact with tourists was associated with positive perceptions of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Brougham and Butler (1981)</td>
<td>Older residents were less positive about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Ritchie (1988)</td>
<td>Older residents were less positive about tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Husbands (1989)</td>
<td>Education and age were related to perceptions of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Perdue et al (1990)</td>
<td>There were no relationships between perceptions of tourism and demographics when personal benefits from tourism were controlled for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Cansedey and Zeiger (1991)</td>
<td>Level of education was related to more positive perceptions of tourism for residents, but it was related to more negative perceptions for entrepreneurs who were not in tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community attachment</td>
<td>1. Brougham and Butler (1981)</td>
<td>People who had lived longer in a community were more positive about some types of tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Davis et al (1988)</td>
<td>People born in a place were more positive about tourism than newcomers to a place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. McCool and Martin (1994)</td>
<td>Greater attachment to a community was associated with higher ratings of both positive and negative impacts of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable examined</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Key conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Keogh (1990)</td>
<td>Residents who used an area proposed for tourism development saw both more positive and negative impacts from the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. General economic conditions of a community</td>
<td>1. Perdue et al (1990)</td>
<td>If residents believe the future of their town is bright they are less supportive of tourism development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Johnson et al (1994)</td>
<td>Lower support for tourism was related to low levels of general economic activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perceived ability to influence tourism decisions</td>
<td>1. Madrigal (1993)</td>
<td>Perceived ability to influence decisions was significantly related to positive perceptions of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Lankford and Howard (1994)</td>
<td>There was a significant positive relationship between perceived ability to influence tourism decisions and perception of positive and negative impacts of tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Keogh (1990)</td>
<td>Greater knowledge of a proposed tourism development was associated with more detailed and more positive perceptions of tourism impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Lankford and Howard (1994)</td>
<td>Greater knowledge of tourism was related to greater support for tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Political self-identification</td>
<td>1. Snepenger and Johnson (1991)</td>
<td>Residents with conservative political views were more negative about tourism than those with moderate or liberal views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Influence of a tourism public relations campaign</td>
<td>1. Robertson and Crotts (1992)</td>
<td>Residents of a community with a public relations campaign were more positive about tourism than those not exposed to a public relations campaign.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several survey studies were not included in this table because they did not examine the relationships between any variables and perceptions of tourism. Rather, these studies provide descriptions of community responses; e.g., Cooke (1982), Andreassen and Murphy (1996), Murphy (1981), Pizam and Pokela (1985) and Milman and Pizam (1986).
APPENDIX 3

Butler’s Model of the hypothetical evolution of a tourist area

Source: Butler R. W. 1980
## APPENDIX 4

Doxey’s Irritation Index (Irridex) Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doxey’s Irridex</th>
<th>Milligan’s ‘modified version’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euphoria</strong></td>
<td>- visitors are welcome and there is little planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curiosity - that people should accept jobs that the hosts consider beneath them in status, pay and career prospects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apathy</strong></td>
<td>- visitors are taken for granted and contact becomes more formal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance - of immigrants on the island, tourism is no longer a concern of the local people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annoyance</strong></td>
<td>- saturation is approached and the local people have misgivings. Planners attempt to control via increasing infrastructure rather than limiting growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annoyance - coupled with an annoyance with tourists is an antipathy towards immigrant workers who are seen as contributing to deteriorating standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antagonism</strong></td>
<td>- open expression of irritation and planning is remedial yet promotion is increased to offset the deteriorating reputation of the resort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antagonism - both sides are aware of resentment, and the situation amongst young people is volatile. Immigrant workers are blamed for all that tourists cannot be held directly responsible for.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ryan 1991
APPENDIX 5 Model of the Social Exchange Process

Source: Ap J. 1992
APPENDIX 6

A framework for analyzing the social impacts of tourism

- Stage of tourism development
- Tourist/resident ratio
- Type of tourist
- Seasonality

- Involvement
- Socio-economic characteristics
- Residential proximity
- Period of residence

Source: Faulkner and Tideswell 1997
APPENDIX 7

Factors affecting resident reactions to tourism

Source: Faulkner and Tideswell 1997
APPENDIX 8  A map showing the location of the Caribbean islands

### Tourist Arrivals in the Caribbean (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commonwealth Caribbean</strong></td>
<td>5,650.1</td>
<td>5,792.1</td>
<td>5,895.2</td>
<td>6,017.9</td>
<td>6,182.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCECS Countries</td>
<td>1,067.4</td>
<td>1,110.9</td>
<td>1,158.7</td>
<td>1,193.9</td>
<td>1,186.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>228.2</td>
<td>240.4</td>
<td>234.3</td>
<td>239.6</td>
<td>236.7</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>243.7</td>
<td>244.3</td>
<td>279.1</td>
<td>285.9</td>
<td>281.1</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>125.3</td>
<td>128.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>235.7</td>
<td>248.4</td>
<td>252.2</td>
<td>260.6</td>
<td>269.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and Grenadines</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Commonwealth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>4,582.7</td>
<td>4,681.2</td>
<td>4,736.5</td>
<td>4,824.0</td>
<td>4,996.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>1,633.1</td>
<td>1,617.6</td>
<td>1,527.7</td>
<td>1,577.1</td>
<td>1,596.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>447.1</td>
<td>472.3</td>
<td>512.4</td>
<td>517.9</td>
<td>544.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>389.7</td>
<td>379.7</td>
<td>368.7</td>
<td>354.0</td>
<td>328.3</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>373.2</td>
<td>381.2</td>
<td>404.2</td>
<td>394.5</td>
<td>354.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1,162.4</td>
<td>1,192.2</td>
<td>1,225.3</td>
<td>1.248.4</td>
<td>1,322.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>265.9</td>
<td>324.3</td>
<td>347.7</td>
<td>358.8</td>
<td>398.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>117.6</td>
<td>151.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dutch West Indies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch West Indies</td>
<td>1,302.9</td>
<td>1,372.1</td>
<td>1,385.4</td>
<td>1,406.4</td>
<td>1,414.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French West Indies</strong></td>
<td>1,102.0</td>
<td>1,173.2</td>
<td>1,241.8</td>
<td>1,275.3</td>
<td>1,333.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US Territories</strong></td>
<td>3,437.7</td>
<td>3,634.7</td>
<td>3,818.4</td>
<td>3,507.9</td>
<td>3,948.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Countries</strong></td>
<td>5,201.1</td>
<td>5,819.9</td>
<td>6,120.2</td>
<td>6,849.8</td>
<td>7,430.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CARIBBEAN</strong></td>
<td>16,693.8</td>
<td>17,792.1</td>
<td>18,461.0</td>
<td>19,057.2</td>
<td>20,308.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARICOM</strong></td>
<td>4,722.8</td>
<td>4,861.5</td>
<td>4,894.8</td>
<td>5,019.8</td>
<td>5,222.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CTO member countries and CTO estimates
APPENDIX 10

Employment in Accommodation Establishments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of Rooms</th>
<th>Persons employed</th>
<th>Employee/Room Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>3,649</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>7,995</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>13,288</td>
<td>16,078</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>5,752</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>3,668</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>51,916</td>
<td>55,937</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>23,640</td>
<td>31,080</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>11,928</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Eustatius</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kitts &amp; Nevis</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucia</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>3,971</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Virgin Islands</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (19 countries)</strong></td>
<td>146,112</td>
<td>165,626</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# October 2000 Statistics  
^ CTO Estimate  
**Caribbean Hotel Trends (CTO, 1994)**  
***La Industria Hotelera Dominicana (ASONAHORES)***  
^11997  ^21996  ^31995  ^41994  ^51993  ^61991

Source: National Tourism and Statistical Offices
APPENDIX 11

The multiplier effect of tourism

Tourists spend for:
- Lodging
- Food
- Beverages
- Entertainment
- Clothing, etc.
- Gifts & souvenirs
- Photography
- Personal care, drugs, & cosmetics
- Internal transportation
- Tours & sightseeing
- Miscellaneous

Travel enterprises spend for:
- Wages & salaries
- Tips & gratuities
- Payroll taxes
- Commissions
- Music & entertainment
- Administrative & general expenses
- Professional services
- Purchase of food, beverages, etc.
- Purchases of goods sold
- Purchases of materials & supplies
- Repairs & maintenance
- Advertising, promotion, & publicity
- Utilities—electric, gas, water, etc.
- Transportation
- Licenses
- Insurance premiums
- Rental of premises & equipment
- Interest & principal payments of borrowed funds
- Income & other taxes
- Replacement of capital assets
- Return to government

Ultimate beneficiaries:
- Accountants
- Appliance stores
- Architects
- Arts & crafts products
- Attorneys
- Automobiles & trucks
- Bakeries
- Bank workers
- Beach accessories
- Butchers
- Carpenters
- Cashiers
- Chemists
- Chemists
- Chemists
- Clerks
- Clothing stores
- Confectioners
- Coffee
- Cultural organizations
- Dairy
- Dentists
- Department stores
- Doctors
- Electricians
- Engineers
- Farmers
- Fishermen
- Freight forwarders
- Garages & auto repairs
- Gentlemen
- Gift shops
- Government
- Hospitals
- Health
- Hotels & motels
- Utilities
- Development & others
- Greenhouses
- Furniture stores
- Insurance workers
- Laundries
- Manufacturing workers
- Office equipment suppliers
- Painters
- Painters
- Postal services
- Poultry
- Plumbers
- Power
- Printers & sign painters
- Publishers
- Retailers
- Restaurant
- Room maids
- Sporting events
- Transportation
- Taxi & hired car services
- Wholesale establishments

Leakages of import content

Leakages of import content

Source: World Tourism Organization

Source: Inskeep E. 1991
# APPENDIX 12

Visitor Expenditure as a Percentage of Gross Domestic Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>73.73</td>
<td>79.55</td>
<td>92.03</td>
<td>82.36</td>
<td>83.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>55.28</td>
<td>59.84</td>
<td>64.70</td>
<td>63.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>39.42</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>42.37</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>32.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>40.11</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td>32.87</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>44.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>37.42</td>
<td>36.80</td>
<td>35.93</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>33.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>46.61</td>
<td>48.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td>76.09</td>
<td>79.11</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>11.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>28.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>39.43</td>
<td>37.68</td>
<td>40.13</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>27.23</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>27.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>22.38</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>21.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinique</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>31.31</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td>43.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>30.30</td>
<td>40.77</td>
<td>36.54</td>
<td>28.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>56.31</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>69.97</td>
<td>72.19</td>
<td>63.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and Grenadines</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>28.63</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>32.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>101.44</td>
<td>101.27</td>
<td>129.59</td>
<td>158.67</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Virgin Islands</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>48.90</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>56.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Central Statistical Offices, IBRD and CDB Reports*
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### Tourist Arrivals by Main Market - 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>% ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>30,101</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>-16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua &amp; Barbuda</td>
<td>60,189</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12,839</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruba</td>
<td>443,262</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>18,926</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>106,631</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>52,382</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>214,659</td>
<td>-15.4</td>
<td>27,492</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaire</td>
<td>26,357</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancun (Mexico)</td>
<td>1,619,767</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>86,814</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>270,105</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>13,550</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>78,789</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>350,426</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>31,962</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
<td>2,502</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>14,721</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep*</td>
<td>666,290</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>283,490</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>32,219</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>5,442</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>9,268</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>915,434</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>111,158</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico**</td>
<td>955,666</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13,288</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saba</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Eustatius</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>25,558</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucia</td>
<td>91,243</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>12,253</td>
<td>-18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Maarten</td>
<td>192,898</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>25,093</td>
<td>-11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Vincent &amp; Gren</td>
<td>19,361</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3,929</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks &amp; Caicos Is.</td>
<td>125,085</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15,291</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE – CTO**

Data supplied by member countries and available as at January 17, 2003
Main Markets for Caribbean Tourism 2000

- USA: 49.8%
- Canada: 6.1%
- Europe: 25.9%
- Caribbean: 6.9%
- Other: 11.3%
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Caribbean Tourist Arrivals by Season and Major Market – 2000 & 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market &amp; Season</th>
<th>Total Arrivals (000's)</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Percent Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>3,631.9</td>
<td>3,491.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6,485.1</td>
<td>5,935.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,117.0</td>
<td>9,427.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>658.2</td>
<td>550.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>575.3</td>
<td>524.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,233.5</td>
<td>1,074.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1,892.2</td>
<td>1,671.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>3,363.1</td>
<td>3,357.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,255.3</td>
<td>5,029.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cruise Passengers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>6,414.4</td>
<td>5,295.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>8,103.6</td>
<td>6,852.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,518.0</td>
<td>12,147.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* January-April and May-December are used to approximate the Winter and Summer seasons

Source: CTO
Markets for Tobago Tourism 1999

Other
9.0%

USA
9.0%

Mainland Europe
16.0%

Germany
28.0%

UK
38.0%

Source: Tobago Division of Tourism
Growth in Tobago room stock 1978 – 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Accommodation Units</th>
<th>Annual % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2174</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2424 (est.)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Central Statistical Office, TIDCO and Division of Tourism THA
"This is about taking away people's independence, making them guards and maids. It is a type of slavery," the white fisherman said.

Residents angry at being excluded from their 'own land'

By SANDRA CHOUTM

A BREAKFAST treat fried in a fire on the beach while fishermen cooked and enjoyed duphyn and freshly caught fish for their evening meal.

They were angry and upset at the decision of the 60-acre Club Pigeon Point, Tobago, for denying fishermen access to the beach during the day. They said that they were denied the right to access their land.

"This is about taking away people's independence, making them guards and maids. It is a type of slavery," the white fisherman said.

The government has the power under the Compulsory Acquisitions Act to acquire property, and they have done so. This is a type of slavery." A European man who owns one of the beach houses on the beach said that he had to pay $2000 to acquire his property.

"This is about taking away people's independence, making them guards and maids. It is a type of slavery," the white fisherman said.
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Tourism receipts over the period 1991 to 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RECEIPTS (BDS.$M)</th>
<th>% CHANGE OVER PREVIOUS YEAR</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO GDP (BDS.$M)</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>315.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>317.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>361.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>408.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>419.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>442.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>450.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>482.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
<td>463.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>487.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Barbados Ministry of Tourism 2001
Airlines operating Charter Services into Barbados 2002

Able American Jets
Aero Jet International
Aeropostal Ala De Venezuela
Air Ambulance Care Flight
Air Ambulance Professionals
Air Caraibes
Air Transat
Air Trek
American Trans Air
Bajio Helicopters
Briko Air Services
Britannia
BWIA
Caraibes Air Transport
Carib Aviation
Corporate Air (Formerly Merlin Airways)
DHL Vensecar International
Eagle Air
Global Air Charter

Lan Chile Cargo
LIAT
Lineas Aereas Suramericanas
LTU International
Miami Air Transsy
Mountain Air
Mustique Airways
My Travel Airways (Formerly Airtours)
National Jets
Phoenix Air
Planet Airways Inc.
Servicios Aereos Profesionales
Sky Service
Southern Air
Sundance Air
Surinam Airways
SVG Air
Swiss Air
TIA 2000

Airlines Operating Scheduled Services into Barbados 2002

Air Canada
American Eagle
Amerijet
British Airways
BWIA

Air Jamaica
Caribbean Star Airlines
Condor
Lauda Air
LIAT
US Airways
Virgin Atlantic Airways

Source: Barbados Airport Authority
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**KEY TOURISM TARGETS FOR BARBADOS 2002 - 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stayover Visitors (thousands)</td>
<td>577.8</td>
<td>595.2</td>
<td>624.9</td>
<td>659.3</td>
<td>702.1</td>
<td>754.8</td>
<td>803.9</td>
<td>864.2</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise Ship Arrivals (thousands)</td>
<td>607.5</td>
<td>613.5</td>
<td>659.6</td>
<td>725.5</td>
<td>779.9</td>
<td>818.9</td>
<td>851.7</td>
<td>881.5</td>
<td>903.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Expenditures (million)</td>
<td>1536.7</td>
<td>1590.5</td>
<td>1709.8</td>
<td>1846.5</td>
<td>2031.2</td>
<td>2285.1</td>
<td>2513.6</td>
<td>2765</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Budget (millions)</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Per Visitor</td>
<td>1296</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Room Occupancy (%)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td>6250</td>
<td>6410</td>
<td>6600</td>
<td>7010</td>
<td>8900</td>
<td>9200</td>
<td>9300</td>
<td>9400</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Name Hotels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airlines</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise Berths (thousands)</td>
<td>676.4</td>
<td>683.2</td>
<td>734.5</td>
<td>807.9</td>
<td>868.5</td>
<td>911.9</td>
<td>948.4</td>
<td>981.6</td>
<td>1006.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Employment</td>
<td>14350</td>
<td>15064</td>
<td>15312</td>
<td>16474</td>
<td>21360</td>
<td>22080</td>
<td>22227</td>
<td>22090</td>
<td>22325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Central Statistical Office and Ministry of Tourism
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Tourist Arrivals to Barbados 1991 - 2001

YEAR

Source: Barbados Statistical Service
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Tourist Arrivals to Barbados by Principal Markets 2001

Source: Barbados Statistical Service 2002
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Barbados Room Stock 1993 - 2001

Source: Barbados Statistical Service
Newspaper report on the protest at Mullins Beach

**Peaceful Protest**

By Dyan Cooke

A WEST COAST pressure group calling itself the Mullins and Friends Association brought officers, early morning, protest at Mullins, St. Peter yesterday, demonstrating against what they call "environmental vandalism." 

The protesters, including lawyer James Jeff, Attorney-at-Law, Health Minister Cephas, said for pisms, to be used as an outery, against construction of a new wall that would involve the existing beach garden.

The following, appealing, 30 minutes, used the meet as a peaceful protest, but argued that the new beach house will kill the beach garden.

At right: Protesters, including lawyer James Jeff, Attorney-at-Law, Health Minister Cephas, and Andrew Station, called against "environmental vandalism." 

Source: The Barbados Advocate 19 March 2001
Beach probe call
Residents complain to Town Planning about blockage

by TERRY ALLY

Beachgoers are calling on the Town Planning Department to investigate a case of beach blockage in St James. It is at the entrance of the private West Indian Club. Rachel Wilkie of Property Management Services, which manages La Fulmman, said that the fence would not go back up. "I can give you my promise that will not happen," she told the contractors who lived in England, wanted the fence on top of the boulders which stretched for 140 feet but she resisted it because it made no sense. The contractor was fired, that was last September and a new one beach to walk along, more often than not, the sea is right up to the boulders especially at high tide," Wilkie said. The Nation understands that a resident has written letters of complaint to the Town Planning Department and the Ombudsman urging an investigation.

Source: Daily Nation 28 March 2001
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A summary of the Issues raised by the Speightstown Focus Groups

Likes:

- Tourism is good for the town as it creates jobs and incomes
- Further tourism development should be encouraged

Dislikes and changes perceived:

- Locals are largely excluded from tourism
- Locals not consulted on tourism plans
- Foreign investors get preferential treatment to local entrepreneurs
- Concern over the sale of beachfront property to foreigners
- Increase in property taxes resulting from development thrust
- Impact of foreign lifestyles on youth
- Denial of free access to beaches
- Racial tensions between visitor and local populations
- Tourism promotion messages create false impressions of destination
- Disrespect and/or ignorance of local customs and mores
- Impact of all-inclusive hotels on community
- Erosion of indigenous culture/ local traditions
- Conflicts between fishing and water sports
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International Centre for Hospitality and Tourism Research
School of Service Industries, Bournemouth University

Residents' Perceptions of Tourism
Interview Schedule - Barbados

Introduction
The Ministry of Tourism and International Transport is supporting this study. The questions I am going to ask you will help me to get a clear picture of what you think about tourism in Barbados and how it affects your everyday life. I hope that the results will help the government in planning and managing tourism for the benefit of all residents. The information you give me will not be shared with anyone. Thank you for taking part.

If you do not understand what I am asking please let me know and I will explain the question.

________________________________________________________________________

Interviewers name (in capital letters): ............................................................

Date of interview: .........................................................................................

Comments:
....................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................
....................................................................................................................

Signature of interviewer: .................................................................
How long have you lived in Speightstown?
Less than 5 years
Between 6-10 years
Between 11-20 years
More than 20 years

Whom would you consider to be a tourist?
Someone on holiday from another country
Any white person
All visitors who live outside Barbados
People who don't speak like us
Other. Please specify..........................

Do you have the chance to observe or talk with tourists?
Never
Once in a while
Frequently
Everyday

Which businesses do you consider to be part of tourism?
Hotels and Guest Houses
Restaurants
Tours
Taxi Transport
Watersports
Stores and shops
Other. Please specify..........................

What do you like most about living here?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>KNOW</th>
<th>DON'T</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The people are friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good neighbours or friends &amp; relatives here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is beautiful and peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crime rate is low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you dislike most about living here?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many tourists around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices are higher than in other places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crime rate is high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is too noisy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other. Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does your town benefit from tourism?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism provides jobs for us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists spend little money here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism pays good money when compared to fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism helps preserve our old buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and hotels promote our local foods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners get the better-paid jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you have a say in how tourism develops?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We should be consulted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My opinions on tourism are considered by others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no influence over the way tourism is managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to play a greater role in the development of tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who controls tourism in Speightstown?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businessmen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>DON'T KNOW</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foreigners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The hotel owners and managers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other. Please specify</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How should tourism be developed in the future?**
- We should not build any more hotels
- We should bring more tourists to Barbados
- The government should help local people to own businesses
- Foreigners should be allowed to buy land and property
- Local people should be trained for senior posts in the industry

**How do you feel about work in the tourism industry?**
- It pays good wages
- It is the best kind of job available
- The work is easy
- Workers get the chance to earn US dollars from tips
- It is the only kind of job available

**What are your views on how tourism is developing in Barbados?**
- I do not feel welcome in the hotels
- I have free access to all the beaches
- People lost jobs because of Almond Beach's operations
- Foreigners should not be allowed to buy beachfront property
- Barbados should have more all-inclusive hotels
- Property owners build walls to keep locals away from the beach
- Property taxes are increasing because of foreign investment

**Have you ever travelled outside of Barbados?**
- Yes (Go to next question)
- No (Skip next 2 questions)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>KNOW</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How often do you travel abroad?**
- My last trip was more than 5 years ago
- I have been abroad at least once in the last 5 years
- I went abroad last year
- I travel abroad at least once a year

**What are your views on travel?**
- Visiting other countries helps me understand tourists better
- People who travel often hold the same views as those who don’t
- Having been abroad, I now appreciate my country more
- My travel experiences have not changed the way I view tourism

**How do you feel about the behaviour of some tourists?**
- Tourists should only wear swimsuits at the beach
- Our young people learn good habits from tourists
- Tourists should respect our way of life
- Tourists treat us like their servants
- Tourists should be free to dress as they like

**What changes have tourism brought over the last five to ten years?**
- Crimes have increased in my neighbourhood
- People try to imitate the way the tourists speak & dress
- More of our young people are becoming prostitutes
- Many Barbadians have become more prosperous
- Tourism has raised my standard of living
- There has been an increase in AIDS because of tourism
- I can no longer play cricket on any beach I like

In this last section, I am going to ask you a few questions about yourself.
Are you
Employed  Self-employed  Unemployed

If employed or self-employed, what kind of work do you do?
Public sector  Private sector  Tourism job  Non-tourism job  Manager / Supervisor
Business owner  Clerical worker  Skilled worker  Unskilled worker

What is your age group?
18-25 years  26-34 years  35-49 years  50-64 years  Over 65 years

Gender
Male  Female

Are you
Single  Married  Divorced  Separated  Living with partner (Common Law)

What is the highest level of education you achieved?
Did not go to school  Primary School  Secondary School  Vocational School  University
Other  ................

Which group shows your average monthly income in BDSS$?
Less than 1,000  Between 1,000 and 2,999  Between 3,000 and 4,999  Between 5,000 and 6,999  Over 7,000

Do you want to make any other comment about tourism in Speightstown?

.................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................

This brings us to the end of this interview. Thank you for taking the time to share your views with me.
Residents' Perceptions of Tourism

Interview Schedule - Tobago

Introduction
The Department of Tourism is supporting this study. The questions I am going to ask you will help me to get a clear picture of what you think about tourism in Tobago and how it affects your everyday life. I hope that the results will help the government in planning and managing tourism for the benefit of all residents. The information you give me will not be shared with anyone. Thank you for taking part.

If you do not understand what I am asking please let me know and I will explain the question.

Interviewers name (in capital letters): .................................................

Date of interview: .................................................................

Comments:
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................
.................................................................................................

Signature of interviewer: ............................................................
1. How long have you lived in Charlottesville?

*Please circle all that apply*

a) Less than 5 years
b) Between 6-10 years
c) Between 11-15 years
d) 16 years or more
e) Since I was born

2. Whom would you consider to be a tourist?

a) Someone on holiday from another country
b) Any white person
c) All those who live outside Tobago
d) People who don’t speak like us
e) Other. Please specify .........................

3. Do you have the chance to observe or talk with tourists?

*Please circle one*

a) Never
b) Less than once a week
c) On average, 1-3 times a week
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>4 AGREE</th>
<th>3 DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>2 DISAGREE</th>
<th>1 STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Which of these are tourism businesses?**

*Please circle all that apply*

- a) Hotels and Guest Houses
- b) Restaurants
- c) Tours
- d) Taxi Transport
- e) Watersports
- f) Stores and shops
- g) Other. Please specify ........................................

5. **What do you like most about living here?**

- a) The people are friendly
- b) I have friends or relatives here
- c) The environment
- d) It is peaceful
- e) The crime rate is low
f) Other. Please specify...........................................

6. **What do you dislike most about living here?**
   a) There are too many tourists around from December - March
   b) Prices are higher than in other places
   c) The crime rate is high
   d) It is too noisy
   e) Other. Please specify..........................................

7. **Does Charlottesville benefit from tourism?**
   a) Tourism provides jobs for some of us
   b) Tourists spend little money here
   c) Restaurants sell our local foods
   d) Charlottesville does not benefit from Cruise ship passengers
   e) Charlottesville will benefit if tourism is developed further

8. **Do you have a say in how tourism develops?**
   a) My opinions on tourism are considered by THA
   b) I have no influence over the way tourism is managed
   c) THA should ask for our ideas on how to develop tourism
   d) I would like to get more involved in tourism
9. Who has greatest control over tourism in Charlottesville?

*Place in order of rank with highest level of control = 1*

a) Local businessmen

b) The residents

c) Foreigners

d) The guesthouse owners and managers

e) The THA

f) Other. Please specify.................................

10. Who should have **most** control? .................................................................

11. How should tourism be developed in the future?

a) We should not build any hotels in Charlottesville

b) We should bring more tourists to Tobago

c) The government should help local people to own businesses

d) Foreigners should be allowed to buy land and property

e) Local people should be trained for senior jobs in the industry

f) Everyone should not have free access to all beaches

g) Other. Please specify.................................
12. Do you, or someone you know, work in a tourism job?

Please circle one

a) Yes  b) No

13. How do you feel about work in the tourism industry?

a) Tourism pays better than fishing
b) It is the best kind of job available
c) The work is easy
d) Workers make good money from tips
e) It is the only kind of job available here
f) Foreigners get the better-paid jobs

14. Over the last five to ten years, what changes has tourism brought?

Because of tourism… Read in front of each statement

a) Crimes have increased in number
b) More of our young people are becoming prostitutes
c) Tobagonians have become richer
d) There has been an increase in AIDS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5 STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>4 AGREE</th>
<th>3 DON'T KNOW</th>
<th>2 DISAGREE</th>
<th>1 STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What are your views on these issues?

a) Tourists should only wear swimsuits at the beach
b) Tourists should respect our way of life
c) Foreigners should not be allowed to buy beachfront property
d) Yachties spend a lot of money in Charlottesville
e) To cater for tourists, we need better facilities (explain)
f) Yachties should have to pay for water

16. How is tourism affecting you?

a) I do not feel welcome in the hotels
b) I have free access to all the beaches
c) Tourists treat us like their servants
d) I am not bothered about the way tourists dress
e) Because of tourism I enjoy a better standard of living

Let us now turn to your travel experiences.

17. Have you ever visited another country?

*Please circle one*
18. How often do you travel abroad?

Please circle one

a) My last trip was more than 5 years ago
b) I have been abroad at least once in the last 5 years
c) I travel abroad at least once a year

In this last section, I am going to ask you a few questions about yourself.

19. Are you

Please circle one

a) Employed       b) Self-employed       c) Unemployed

20. If employed or self-employed, what kind of work do you do?

Please circle all that apply

a) Government       b) Private company       c) Tourism job       d) Non-tourism job       e) Manager / Supervisor
f) Business owner    g) Clerical worker    h) Skilled worker    i) Unskilled worker
21. What is your age group?

Please circle one

a) 18-25 years  b) 26-34 years  c) 35-49 years  d) 50-64 years  e) Over 65 years

22. Gender

Please circle one

a) Male  b) Female

23. Are you

Please circle one

a) Single  b) Married / Living with partner (Common Law)  c) Divorced / Separated

24. What is the highest level of education you achieved?

Please circle one

a) Did not go to school  b) Primary School  c) Secondary School  d) Vocational School

e) University  f) Other, please specify ............................................
25. Which group shows your average monthly income in TT$?

*Please circle one*

a) Less than 1,000  
b) Between 1,000 and 2,999  
c) Between 3,000 and 4,999  
d) Between 5,000 and 6,999  
e) Over 7,000

26. Do you want to make any other comment about tourism in general?

..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................................................

This brings us to the end of this interview. Thank you for taking the time to share your views with me.
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A plan of the Speightstown survey area

Source: Elections and Boundaries Commission, Barbados
APPENDIX 32
THE INTERVIEWER'S BRIEF

APPROACHING THE POTENTIAL RESPONDENT
- Identify yourself
- State purpose of your visit
- Assure him/her of confidentiality of information

IF THE SELECTED RESPONDENT IS NOT AT HOME, ASK THE OCCUPANT FOR A SUITABLE TIME TO CALL BACK. Take a note of it.

CONVINCING THE RESPONDENT TO PARTICIPATE
- Put him/her at ease
- Tell him/her that it should take only a few minutes

ASK FOR THE RESPONDENT’S FULL ATTENTION
One should not be looking at TV or tending to the baby while answering questions.

WATCH OUT FOR DISTURBANCES FROM CHILDREN.
Evaluate the situation and ask to ‘call back’ if it is not convenient at that time.

DON’T GET SIDELINED INTO DISCUSSING TOPICS OTHER THAN THOSE ON THE SCHEDULE. Postpone the interview with tact.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACCURACY
Do not add or take away any wording in the questionnaire
Ensure that the respondents answers are correctly recorded using the appropriate box or written verbatim for open questions.

WRITE LEGIBLY
Remember the processing has to be done by others who would need to understand your handwriting.

REMEMBER TO USE THE SHOW CARDS TO HELP RESPONDENTS IN GIVING CLEAR ANSWERS

IF YOU SUSPECT THAT YOUR RESPONDENT MAY HAVE A READING OR SIGHT IMPAIRMENT, ASK IF HE / SHE CAN READ THE CARD.
Where the person has a difficulty, read the choices aloud at intermittent intervals during the interview and note this on the cover sheet.

THANK THE RESPONDENT AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW FOR HIS / HER CO-OPERATION
You may ask the respondent at the end of the interview for the house number of someone in the same street whom you need to interview next.

IF YOU FEEL THREATENED IN ANY WAY, ABORT THE INTERVIEW.
Use tact. A deranged, mentally unstable person, inappropriate sexual advances or an abusive person are instances of compromised safety.

IMMEDIATELY AFTER AND BEFORE YOU GO ON TO THE NEXT INTERVIEW
Re-check that you have recorded the responses accurately.
Write comments on the cover sheet detailing any unusual or unexpected circumstances under which the interview was conducted. Include other pertinent information you think may be useful to either the data processing clerk or the researcher.
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Profile of a Charlotteville Resident

From the results of a recent survey of 220 residents of Charlotteville, Tobago regarding their perceptions of several aspects of the tourism industry, the following resident profile was constructed.

The typical resident has a good appreciation of the wide range of commercial opportunities which tourism offers, although only one in every two residents has been a tourist at sometime when travelling abroad. Only 3 in 10 see tourists on a daily basis and have the chance to talk with them.

Virtually all residents said that they liked living in Charlotteville because it is peaceful, the environment is pleasant, their friends and relatives live nearby, the villagers are friendly and the crime rate is low.

Many of them (84%) have been living there since birth, and almost everyone (93%) have lived there for more than 16 years. They therefore share a strong sense of community and feel extremely attached to their town. This was also clearly evident to this researcher during the four-week period when he lived among them.

They reckon that tourism already provides jobs for many of them (40% are tourism workers), however only half of them feel that Tobagonians have benefited from the growth of the industry. As far as work is concerned, although they are of the view that tourism jobs are not the only jobs available, they agree that the work is easy and that workers make a lot of money from tips. Despite this, they do not think that tourism jobs are the best career opportunities available to them.

With regard to impacts, 3 out of every 5 persons do not attribute increases in crime and prostitution to tourism. However, they are deeply offended by the sight of scantily clad tourists in the streets and shops. Some persons expressed their dislike for overt sexual displays (including kissing) especially when it takes place in the presence of children. A similar proportion of residents linked the spread of the HIV/AIDS menace on the island, to the growth in tourist arrivals.

In addition, the bay is polluted and they have attributed this to the yachting industry which has mushroomed without any supporting infrastructure for managing it. Not surprisingly, 83% of respondents made a connection between tourism and pollution of the marine environment.

In terms of future development, they would like to see an expansion in the tourism industry which, they predict, would bring benefits to the town. To achieve this, they recommend that Government needs to invest more resources in tourism promotion and encourage investors to build hotels in the town. There are no hotels at present; only guest houses and cottages. However, 9 out of 10 residents are against the foreign-ownership of
land, while complaining that their children cannot afford to own a plot of land because of the highly inflated prices.

Finally, 4 out of 5 residents expressed a desire to become more involved in tourism (75% felt that they had no influence on tourism matters), and virtually everyone wanted to have an opportunity to exchange ideas on the development of this industry. Further to their need for consultation, they expressed the desire to open their own businesses, but would like assistance from the government in setting it up.

**Profile of a Speightstown Resident**

From the results of a recent survey of 200 residents of Speightstown regarding their perceptions of several aspects of the tourism industry, the following resident profile was constructed.

The typical resident has a good appreciation of the wide range of commercial opportunities which tourism offers, having themselves been a tourist at sometime or other. They see tourists on a regular basis but have less chance of interacting with them.

Residents like living in Speightstown because it is peaceful, the environment is pleasant, their friends and relatives live nearby, the inhabitants are friendly and the crime rate is low. Many of them have been living there since birth, but a significant number have moved out of the area.

They reckon that tourism already provides jobs for many of them and that Barbadians in general, have become more prosperous as a result of the growth of the industry. As far as work is concerned, although they are of the view that tourism jobs are not the only jobs available, they agree that the work is easy and that workers make a lot of money from tips.

With regard to social impacts, they do not attribute increases in crime and prostitution to tourism. However, they would prefer to see tourists properly dressed when walking the streets. In terms of future development, they would like to see an expansion in the tourism industry and they feel that their town will benefit from it. Firstly, they believe that Government needs to invest more resources in tourism promotion and more hotels must be built in the town.

Finally, residents have expressed a desire to become more involved in tourism, adding that they would like to have the opportunity to contribute ideas toward tourism plans for the town. Further to this need for consultation, they wish to establish their own businesses, but would like assistance from the government in doing this.
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Reversed scores on negatively worded items

**Charlottesville**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Birthplace</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourjob</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Should</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Crimeinc</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prostitu</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Drugs</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aids</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pollute</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reefs</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Spend</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cruise</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Influenc</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Build</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Freeacce</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speightstown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorical</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Birthplace</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tourjob</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Job</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Should</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Crimeinc</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prostitu</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Drugs</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aids</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pollute</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Taxes</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Spend</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Welcome</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Influenc</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Build</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Freeacce</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cricket</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Composition of Tourism Support Variables by item

Total Community Attachment:
Tattach = bplace + resident + friendly + relatives + environ + peaceful + crime

Total Tourism Awareness:
Taware = observe + industry + tourjob + howoften

Total Involvement in Tourism:
Tinvolve = opinions + influence + ideas + involved + should

Total Community Benefits:
Tcombene = jobs + spend + local + cruise + benefit + yachties + richer

Total Personal Benefit:
Tperbene = life + job

Total Perception of Job
Tperjob = tourpays + best + easy + tips + only

Total Socio-environmental Impact:
Teimpact = crimeinc + prostitu + aids + drugs + pollutes + reefs + taxes + cricket

Total Cultural Impact
Tcimpact = swim + respect + dress

Total Support for Tourism Development:
Tsupport = bringmor + buildmor
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Descriptive Statistics for Composite variables (Speightstown)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Stat</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Attachment Tourism</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-.909</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td></td>
<td>.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Awareness Tourism</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-.598</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.518</td>
<td></td>
<td>.397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Involvement Community</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td></td>
<td>.392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-.527</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td></td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Benefit</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-1.221</td>
<td></td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-environment Impact</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>-.337</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td></td>
<td>.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Job Cultural</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td>.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td></td>
<td>.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Tourism</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.676</td>
<td></td>
<td>.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Distribution of scores for ‘total support for tourism development’

Histogram

Total Support for Tourism Development

Std. Dev = 1.82
Mean = 7.1
N = 219.00
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Normal Q-Q Plot of Total Support for Tourism
APPENDIX 39

Detrended Normal Q-Q Plot of Total Support for Tourism (Tobago)
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Boxplot of distribution of scores on Total Socio-environmental Impact
# APPENDIX 41

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality (Charlotteville)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Attachment</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tourism Awareness</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tourism Involvement</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Community Benefit</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personal Benefit</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Socio-environmental Impact</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Perception of Job</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cultural Impact</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Support for Tourism Development</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Lilliefors Significance Correction
## APPENDIX 42

### Scale Reliability Results

#### Charlottesville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>CRONBACH ALPHA</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tattach</td>
<td>0.6011</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taware</td>
<td>0.1410</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinvolve</td>
<td>-0.0380</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcombene</td>
<td>0.4151</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tperbene</td>
<td>0.4912</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tperjob</td>
<td>0.5361</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teimpact</td>
<td>0.7681</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcimpact</td>
<td>-0.7999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsupport</td>
<td>0.1364</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Speightstown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
<th>CRONBACH ALPHA</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tattach</td>
<td>0.7280</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taware</td>
<td>0.2671</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinvolve</td>
<td>0.3157</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcombene</td>
<td>0.4323</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tperbene</td>
<td>0.4084</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tperjob</td>
<td>0.5406</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teimpact</td>
<td>0.7696</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tcimpact</td>
<td>-0.5081</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsupport</td>
<td>0.2010</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scree Plot of Principal Components - Speightstown
## APPENDIX 44

### Rotated Component Matrix - Speightstown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism pollutes the sea</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases property taxes</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases AIDS</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases drugs</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism prevents beach cricket</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increase crime</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases prostitution</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should respect our way of life</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>-.364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not bothered about dress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not wear swimsuits on street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should bring more tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit if developed more</td>
<td></td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy a better standard of living</td>
<td></td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>.565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not build hotels</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend little money</td>
<td></td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>-.358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't ask for our ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism creates wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td>.399</td>
<td></td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to be involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low crime rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives or friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best kind of job available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only kind of job available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers make money from tips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence in tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>-.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism pays better than fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a Rotation converged in 8 iterations.
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Scree Plot of Principal Components – Charlottesville
### APPENDIX 46

#### Rotated Component Matrix - Charlottesville

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
<th>Component 4</th>
<th>Component 5</th>
<th>Component 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THA considers my views</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no influence in tourism</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists should respect our way of life</td>
<td>-.609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only kind of job available</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best kind of job available</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives or friends</td>
<td>-.566</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA should ask for our ideas</td>
<td>-.563</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism pays better than fishing</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases prostitution</td>
<td></td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases AIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increase crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>.681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism increases drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism destroys reefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td>.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low crime rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td>.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants sell local food</td>
<td></td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism provides jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>.357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not build hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td>-.318</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists should wear swimsuits on beach only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not bothered about tourists' dress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism pollutes the sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.457</td>
<td></td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to be more involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottesville will benefit if tourism is developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should bring more tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism work is easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yachts people spend a lot of money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy a better standard of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No benefit from cruise visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists spend little money here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers make money from tips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism creates wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


a Rotation converged in 16 iterations.
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Normal P-P Plot – Total Support for Tourism Development - Speightstown