

A Stage-Based Model Development Study on Tourism Social Impact Assessment

Fatemeh Shafaei*, Badaruddin Mohamed*

* School of Housing, Building and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia

Abstract- The study of tourism impacts has been the topic of studies by several researchers since many years ago. Social impact, as one of the fundamental pillars of tourism impacts, has been consequently investigated from different perspectives. This study aims at demonstrating the developmental stages of tourism social impacts assessment including model development, instrument design, and instrument testing. Therefore, a comprehensive literature review on social impact studies has been conducted to acknowledge the major theories. The attitudinal surveys have been found to be the common method of addressing a range of social-cultural impacts, especially with the focus on communities' attitude towards social impacts of tourism in touristic destinations.

Index Terms- Assessment, model development, social impact, tourism

I. INTRODUCTION

Tourism as one of the world's fastest growing industries is affecting different features of human's life such as economy, culture, and environment. The more tourism develops in an area, the more its impacts can be detected. Due to the positive or negative impacts, tourism can be praised or criticized in any destination.

Study of social impacts and issues regarding its measurement has been the subject of studies since many years ago (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Ap and Crompton, 1993; Deery et al., 2012). However, Hall and Richards (2000) claimed that measuring the social and cultural impacts of tourism is often a difficult task because firstly, they are mostly indirect and secondly, the lack of accepted methodology prevents exact measurement. On the other hand, Deery and Jago (2010) claimed that the methods to collect and analyze data regarding social impacts are often similar. Haley et al. (2005) noted that in addition to the lack of underpinning theory, the choice of different methodologies in examining perceptions has resulted in a fragmented rather than coherent view. However, there is something in common in most of the studies that is monitoring both positive and negative indicators when measuring social impacts. In order to contribute to better understanding of the social impacts of tourism and their measurement models, this study reviewed the related literature comprehensively and has provided evidences for each stage of development in tourism social impact assessment.

II. BACKGROUND OF THE RESEARCH

There are different studies on tourism social impact which affected its measurement. The concept of "Social Impact Assessment (SIA)" opened a new gate in social impact studies.

This concept provides an integrated approach to the measurement of social impacts (Finsterbusch, 1995). Burdge and Vanclay (1995) defined social impact assessment as the process of assessing or estimating the social consequences which are likely to follow from specific policy actions or project development, especially in the context of appropriate national, state, or provincial environmental policy legislation. Finsterbusch et al. (1983) asserted that Social impact assessment is an anticipatory research that gathers data on the likely impacts of a number of alternative development options and uses the results to decide on the best alternative to implement. One of the methods of social impact assessment is the Interactive Community Forum that seeks community members' judgments of social impacts resulting from project alternatives in an environmental impact assessment (Becker et al., 2003). While social impact assessment studies focus on individuals' perception of, or attitudes toward a proposed project, the Interactive Community Forum seeks to empower individuals by using their knowledge and local expertise to identify community-level impacts (Becker et al., 2003). The process of Interactive Community Forum involves "community selection", "citizen sampling", "small group structure and facilitation", and "data collection".

According to Deery et al. (2012), social impact research has reached the stage where much of the works have focused on single issues which do not meet the needs of providing a holistic perspective. For example, Tassiopoulos and Johnson (2009) discussed about social impacts of events and Goodwin (2006) worked on the impact of tourism on poverty. The socio-cultural impacts have been frequently explained by Tourism Area Life Cycle (Butler, 1980), Doxey Irritation Index (Doxey, 1975) and Social Exchange Theory (Ap, 1992) (Zamani-Farahani and Musa, 2012). Mathieson and Wall (1982) suggested that only two frameworks have emerged which appear to be widely applicable to social impact research related to tourism. These frameworks belong to Bjorklund and Philbrick (1972) and Doxey (1975). Wearing and Laresn (1996) affirmed that these two were the initiators of development of a conceptual basis for the assessment of social impacts. These theories are going to be explained in the next section.

In a recent study about social impacts of tourism, Deery et al. (2012) investigated on a literature about social impacts of tourism and the process of models' development in this area. The researchers followed the stage-based model of Deery et al (2012) and added other studies to their examples by the aim of describing and extending each stage (Table 1). Since stage one in Deery et al's (2012) study is related to definition and concept of social impacts, this stage was removed from the study in order to concentrate only on the stages directed to the social impact assessment.

Table 1: Stages of development in social impact assessment

Stage One: Model Development	Doxey, 1975; Butler, 1980; Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Perdue, Long and Allen, 1990; Ap (1992)
Stage Two: Instrument Design & Development	Ap and Crompton, 1993, 1998; Choi and Sirakaya, 2006
Stage Three: Instrument Testing	Fredline and Faulkner, 2000; Choi and Sirakaya, 2005; Fredline et al, 2006

III. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

A. Stage One: Model Development

The initial model development for tourism social impact refers to the work of Bjorklund and Philbrick (1972) who presented a matrix for residents' attitudes. In their proposed model, the hosts may be active or passive in terms of their behavior towards tourism and negative or positive in terms of their attitudes (Ryan, 1991). Actually, Bjorklund and Philbrick (1972) claimed that attitudes and behaviors of different groups can be positive or negative and active or passive and it depends on the level of their involvement in tourism industry. This makes their model different from Doxey's and Butler's model which represent the general tone of opinion (Ryan, 1991). Doxey (1975) proposed model of irritation which led to further contribution in evaluating social impacts of tourism. Doxey (1975) believed that when numbers of tourists are increased and a more developed tourism industry is attained at the destination, it results in irritation in the host community. In fact, this model indicates the changes in locals' attitude toward tourism according to its impacts. His proposed model for residents' attitudes toward tourism impacts involved four stages which are called "euphoria", "apathy", "annoyance", and "antagonism". At the primary stage of tourism development, residents feel happy and comfortable (euphoria). Then, they start losing interest in tourism (apathy). At next stage, the negative impacts of tourism are increased when the number of tourists grows and residents feel annoyed (annoyance). Finally, in antagonism stage hostile reaction against tourism take place. Doxey claimed that the reciprocating impacts between tourists and community members may be converted into different degrees of community members' irritation which were influenced by the number of tourists and the threats they pose to the way of life of community members (Wearing and Larsen, 1996).

Although Doxey's model is a useful approach towards identifying the four stages of tourism evolution at a destination, it has been criticized for its limitations by Wall and Mathieson (2006) who believed that it is a unidirectional model intended to represent the entire nature of the host community. Zamani-Farahani and Musa (2012) confirmed that the model assumes that it is the whole community that becomes hostile to tourism, but often communities are heterogeneous and different sections of the community have different reactions. Besides, Allen et al. (1993) noted that residents' attitudes are affected by the level of economic activity and not the level of tourism development as what Doxey mentioned. For example, the more the residents are employed in tourism industry, the more they show good reactions to tourism.

Following Doxy, Butler (1980) proposed a very famous model which is called Butler lifecycle model. He suggested that every

tourist destination experiences similar stages of development. Exploration is the first stage of Butler's model which is the presentation of a new place for tourists. In this stage tourists use local amenities and cause the least impacts to local residents. In the next stage which is involvement, services begin to be established to serve the needs of the travelling public and during the third stage (development), prominent physical development in area products and services, together with considerable advertising and promotional efforts will occur (Zamani-Farahani and Musa, 2012). It is the time when the concerns about impacts of tourism start and lead to the last stage which is called "decline". It reflects the host community's inability to cope with identified tourism impacts. If right policies which sustain the balance between resources and demands are adopted, the decline is less likely to happen (Upchurch and Teivane, 2000).

Therefore, the residents' perception of tourism impacts may differ from time to time or from situation to situation according to the either stage of tourism development or decline. Understanding these stages and the impact of underlying changes can help tourism researchers to evaluate local people's positive or negative attitudes toward tourism impacts.

Like Doxey's model, Butler's tourism lifecycle model was also criticized by some researcher. Dyer et al. (2007) stated that Butler's cycle of evolution conceptualizes diminished resident support for tourism development in tourist locations as related negative impacts become evident while Mason and Cheyne (2000) and Zamani-Farahani and Musa (2012) criticized it for its assumption of a degree of homogeneity of community reactions.

Mathieson and Wall (1982) later on discussed about the social and cultural impacts of tourism and considered particular dimensions to be influenced by tourism based on the relationships between tourists and host community. According to them, this relationship has some characteristics which are important to be discussed when the impacts are investigated. First of all, the relationship between tourists and host community is a temporary relationship which cannot be deep and therefore the impacts of this relationship will depend on the return of visitors to the same accommodation. Second, residents may exploit the time pressures under which tourists operate because tourists are forced to enjoy a wide variety of experiences in a short time and therefore delays cause irritation. Third, since tourists spend most of their time in touristic areas with other tourists, they are separated from local people unless the local people are involved in tourism industry and make contact with tourists. Fourth, the relationship between local people and tourists is not instinctive rather it is preplanned. The fifth point is that their relationship is often unbalanced in terms of material inequality and power because residents are seen as servers by tourists and can impose their will on host community (Ramchander, 2004). Later on, Perdue et al. (1990) proposed a model for the residents' support and attitudes toward tourism development. In their model, they considered personal benefits which host community receives from tourism development as a drive factor influencing their perception and attitude.

The next significant stage in tourism development model to be discussed in terms of social impacts of tourism is Ap's (1992) model which involves four stages. In the embracement stage, local people accept tourism and feel positively about its impacts. At the tolerance stage, they start feeling more about the impacts

of tourism. At adjustment stage, they adjust based on their involvement in tourism industry and finally at withdrawal stage, they no longer cope with the impacts of tourism. Similar to Doxey's and Butler's models, it describes the way in which tourism development affects local people's attitudes towards tourism (Alhasanat, 2008). Ap (1992) proposed the model in which local residents evaluate tourism in terms of the costs and benefits they expect to occur in exchange for their involvement in it (Zamani-Farahani and Musa, 2012). Ap (1992) claimed that the higher benefits than costs, the more residents have positive attitudes towards development. In this sense, Ap's model is in congruent with Perdue et al's model which refers to host community's advantages of tourism development as the key factor controlling their attitudes toward tourism development. Like previous theories, this model has some limitations. Alhasanat (2008) believed that even though this theory is a valid indicator to explain both positive and negative attitudes of a host population towards tourism, it presupposes that people always act in a rational way, that is they process the information they receive systematically and make decisions based on this (Alhasanat, 2008).

B. Stage Two: Instrument Design and Development

Ap and Crompton (1993) developed and tested a tourism impact scale comprising of 147 items which were reduced to 35 final items after testing the instrument. This scale included seven domains namely, social and cultural, economic, crowding and congestion, environmental, services, taxes, and community attitudes. Their tested and final scale for measuring socio-cultural impact is shown in table 2.

Table 2: Social and cultural impacts of tourism

Indicators reviewed	Final scales
<p>Positive social impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improves the quality of life ▪ Increases availability of recreation facilities/opportunities ▪ Improves quality of fire protection ▪ Improves quality of police protection ▪ Improves understanding and image of different communities or cultures ▪ Promotes cultural exchange ▪ Facilitates meeting visitors ▪ Preserves cultural identity of host population ▪ Increases demands for historical and cultural exhibits <p>Negative social impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased prostitution ▪ Increased alcoholism ▪ Increased smuggling ▪ Heightened tension ▪ Increasingly hectic community and personal life ▪ Creation of a phony folk culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demand for historical activities and programs ▪ Demand for cultural activities and programs ▪ Variety of cultural facilities and activities in the community ▪ Opportunities to learn about other people and cultures ▪ Awareness/recognition of the local culture and heritage ▪ Variety of entertainment in the area ▪ Opportunities to restore and protect historical structures ▪ Opportunities to meet interesting people ▪ Understanding of different people and cultures by residents ▪ Life and validity of the community

Source: Ap and Crompton (1993)

Choi and Sirakaya (2006) in another study developed indicators to measure community tourism development within a sustainable

framework. As far as related to this research, social indicators of community tourism should be investigated in order to measure social impacts of tourism. In order to develop these indicators the first step is finding the best secondary sources. The required information can be obtained from community stakeholders, tourism experts and scholars who have previously investigated on the same area. The indicators for social dimension in Choi and Sirakaya's model are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Indicators for the social dimension of tourism impacts

Key Themes	Indicators
Host community/residents and stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Host community satisfaction toward tourism development ▪ Host community attitude toward tourism development ▪ Continuance of traditional activities by local residents ▪ Stress in visitors/host relationship ▪ Resident/non-resident ownership of homes (2nd homes/part time residents) ▪ Level of congruency among stakeholders ▪ Resident involvement in tourism industry
Social cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change in social cohesion ▪ Change in community structure evident of a community breakdown and alienation ▪ Change in family cohesion
Sex tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sex tourism ▪ Percent employed in sex tourism ▪ Prostitution number and rate in local sex tourism industry ▪ Community attitude toward sex tourism
Tourist satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tourist satisfaction/attitude toward tourism development
Community resource	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degradation/erosion of natural and cultural resource
Distribution of resources/power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shift in social structure (e.g. power shift and its socio-economic implications) ▪ Percent of managerial employment from local residents
Community health and safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Litter/pollution (air, water, etc.) ▪ Overcrowding ▪ Congestion (road) ▪ Crime rate ▪ Public awareness toward value of tourism ▪ Number of incidents of vandalism reported ▪ Community health (availability of health policy related to tourism) ▪ Loss of traditional lifestyle and knowledge via modernization
Quality of life in general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Levels of satisfaction with community life in general (QOL)

Source: Choi and Sirakaya (2006)

C. Stage Three: Instrument Testing

The last stage is the emergence of testing the instruments for measuring social impacts which starts with Fredline and Faulkner's study (2000). They applied the cluster analysis approach as a tool for investigating the underlying structure of community reactions to tourism and events and explored the profiles of the various clusters. In another study, Choi and Sirakaya (2005) developed and validated a scale assessing residents' attitudes toward sustainable tourism. Perceived social costs was revealed as one of the main domains in their study including eight items regarding overcrowding, overuse of recreation resources, fast growing rate, irritation of local

residents (two items), disruption of quality of life (two items), and environmental degradation.

Later on, Fredline et al. (2006) listed the social indicators suggested during the community consultations. Even though the research has been done for the two case studies in Australia (Coles Bay and Freycinet Surf Coast Shire), the result of the study can be generalized for the similar measurement of social impacts of tourism. Based on this, Fredline et al. (2006) started with collecting secondary data to identify impacts and indicators of social impacts. After selecting a set of indicators they applied these indicators to measure host community's perceptions of tourism impacts and testing them in case studies. Social indicators and potential sources of measurement found by Fredline et al. (2006) are shown in the table 4.

Table 4: Social indicators and potential sources of measurement

Indicator	Potential Measure, data source (s) scale and frequency
Visitors to the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annual visitors by reason and length of stay ▪ Tourist accommodation (by type, occupancy rate) ▪ Number of visitors to the VIC
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rate of development ▪ Area of development ▪ Size of development
Access especially to parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parking space count ▪ Number of parking fines incurred ▪ Over flow car parking space available ▪ Public transport services to area ▪ Occupancy rates in relation to number of cars ▪ Price & timetables for local buses ▪ Traffic count
Business success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Occupancy rates ▪ Bookings ▪ Comparison of previous years performance ▪ Input of monies into local area
Safety in the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The presence of neighborhood watch ▪ Number of reported safety issues in the area
Tourism Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparison between business types and community demands over past years and present
Participation in community activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number and type of community groups/clubs/interest groups ▪ Number of local volunteers esp. at events
Change in character of local community (Positive and negative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Letters to editor of local paper ▪ Number of locals moving from area ▪ Locals perceptions ▪ Change in demographics
Maintenance of heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Policies in place to protect heritage
Cultural development: events (number and type)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of events, annual and special events ▪ Reoccurrence rate of events (success)
Change in crime patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased/decreased amount of incidents reported.
Change in social problems e.g. Alcohol, drugs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased/decreased amount of services required for social problems
Business start-ups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of business openings minus business closures
Business diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Business classification system (which sector do businesses belong to & employment levels)
Labor force participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of persons in employment or seeking employment
Job creation level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change in unemployment levels ▪ Ratio of new business to new positions created in area

Source: Fredline et al. (2006)

Reviewing the mentioned models above, Deery et al. (2012) considered a new approach for social impacts of tourism. As explained by Deery et al. (2012), there are two groups of variables which can be discussed in social impacts researches and they can act as moderators to measure social impacts. One is the group that influences the residents' perception of tourism impacts and the other one is the impacts themselves. According to Deery et al. (2012), the following table can be a key to understand and measure social impacts in terms of residents' perception (Table 5).

Table 5: Variables which influence residents' perception of social impacts of tourism

Residents' personal profile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Age, gender, income, or on the residents' relationship to the area and to tourists
Residents' external variables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Economic dependence on tourism working in or owning a business in tourism or a related industry ▪ Distance of place of residence from areas of high tourist activity ▪ Level of contact with tourists --Use of facilities also used by tourists ▪ Tourist/resident ratio
Residents' values variables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community attachment ▪ Social, political and environmental values

Source: Deery et al. (2012)

Deery et al. (2012) continued with presenting the most important social impacts of tourism which can be used in measuring the range and type of influence by tourism in a community. The list of impacts provided by Deery et al. (2012), according to previous studies, is shown in the following table (Table 6).

Table 6: Social impacts of tourism on communities

Impacts	Components
Economic benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opportunities for local business ▪ Employment opportunities ▪ The strength of the local economy ▪ Revenue for local government ▪ Funding for public services (e.g. health, police, fire services)
Opportunity cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demand for public services (e.g. health, police, fire services)
Facility maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The standard of maintenance of public facilities such as beaches, parks and roads ▪ Public transport
Interesting things to do	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Shopping opportunities ▪ Entertainment and recreational opportunities ▪ Opportunities to socialize ▪ Intercultural interaction
Disruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The number of people in public places (e.g. parks and beaches) ▪ The availability of parking spaces ▪ Noise levels ▪ The number of people in shops, restaurants, nightclubs etc ▪ Traffic congestion
Pride	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community pride
Delinquent behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alcohol related behavioral problems ▪ Illegal drug use ▪ Rowdy behavior ▪ Gambling ▪ Prostitution
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Litter ▪ The available habitat for local wildlife ▪ The natural environment
Showcase effect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The image of the city in the eyes of others (not residents)

Increased prices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The overall cost of living ▪ Property values ▪ Rents Rates
Access denied	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The number of permanent residents in the region
Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social and moral values ▪ Relationships between local residents
New infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The level of urban development ▪ New shops and restaurants
Town/region character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The physical appearance of the region ▪ The style of architecture on the region ▪ The character of the region

Source: Deery et al. (2012)

IV. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to investigate on the stages of development in tourism social impact assessment. In order to reach the aim of this study, a comprehensive review on the most important models and approaches about social impacts of tourism and their evaluation has been applied. Based on the literature, it was determined that much of the researches into social impacts focus on the host community perceptions and examine the negative and positive effects of tourism on the community as perceived by its members. Therefore, it is very important to adopt the planning policies which can reinforce positive impacts while reduce negative impacts by involvement of communities in tourism industry. This will result in further understanding of residents about tourism and their participation in tourism decision making which will consequently lead them to receive more benefits from the industry. These policies will let local people to be involved in the industry in a positive way and undertake both positive and negative impacts of tourism.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to extend their appreciation to Universiti Sains Malaysia for granting the Research University Grant called Sustainable Tourism Cluster [Grant No. 1001/PTS/8660011] that made this study and paper possible.

REFERENCES

[1] Alhasanat, S. 2008. Sociocultural impacts of tourism on the local communities at Petra, Jordan. Coventry University, UK.

[2] Allen, L.R., Hafer, H.R., Long, P.T. and Perdue, R.R. 1993. Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 27-37.

[3] Ap, J. 1992. Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 665-690.

[4] Ap, J. and Crompton, J.L. 1993. Residents' Strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(1), 47-50.

[5] Becker, D.R., Harris, C.C., McLaughlin, W.J. and Nielsen, E.A. 2003. A participatory approach to social impact assessment: The interactive community forum. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 23(3), 367-382.

[6] Bjorklund, E. and Philbrick, A. (1972). Spatial Configurations of Mental Recreation and Park Processes. In Belanger, M., & Janelle, D. *Building Regions for the Future* (Eds.), Dept. of Geography, Lowal University, Quebec.

[7] Burdge, R.J. and Vanclay, F. 1995. Social impact assessment: State of the art. *Impact Assessment*, 14(1), 57-86.

[8] Butler, R.W. 1980. The concept of the tourist area life-cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer* 24(1), 5-12.

[9] Choi, H. and Sirakaya, E. 2005. Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(4), 380-394.

[10] Choi, H. and Sirakaya, E. 2006. Sustainability indicators for managing community tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1274-1289.

[11] Deery, M. and Jago, L. 2010. Social impacts of events and the role of anti-social behaviour. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 1(1), 8-28.

[12] Deery, M., Jago, L. and Fredline, L. 2012. Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 33 (1). 64-73.

[13] Doxey, G. 1975. A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: Methodology and research inferences. Proceedings of the 6th Annual Conference of the Travel and Tourism Research Association. 1.

[14] Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B. and Carter, J. 2007. Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28, 409-422.

[15] Finsterbusch, K., Llewellym, L. and Wolf, C. P. 1983. Social impact assessment methods. USA: Sage Publications.

[16] Finsterbusch, K. 1995. In praise of SIA; a personal view of the field of social impact assessment: feasibility, justification, history, methods, issues. *Impact Assessment*, 13, 229-252.

[17] Fredline, E. and Faulkner, B. 2000. Host community reactions: A cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 763-784.

[18] Fredline, L., Deery, M. and Jago, L. 2006. Development of a scale to assess the social impact of tourism within communities. Technical Report. Cooperative Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism, Queensland.

[19] Goodwin, H. 2006. Measuring and Reporting the Impact of Tourism on Poverty. Proceeding Cutting Edge Research in Tourism New directions, challenges and applications. School of Management University of Survey. Available at: www.haroldgoodwin.info/resources/measuring.pdf.

[20] Haley, A.J., Snaith, T. and Miller, G. 2005. The social impacts of tourism: A case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 647-668.

[21] Hall, D. and Richards, G. 2000. *Tourism and sustainable community development* (Eds.). Routledge, London, UK.

[22] Mason, P. and Cheyne, J. 2000. Residents' attitudes to proposed development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391-411.

[23] Mathieson, A. and Wall, G. 1982. *Tourism: Economic and Social Impacts*. Longman Group Ltd, London, UK.

[24] Milman, A. and Pizam, A. 1988. Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 191-204.

[25] Perdue, R.R., Long, P.T. and Allen, L. 1990. Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 586-599.

[26] Ramchander, P. 2004. Towards the responsible management of the socio-cultural impact of township tourism. Pretoria: University of Pretoria, Department of Tourism Management. Available at: <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-08262004-130507/>.

[27] Ryan, C. 1991. *Recreational tourism: A social science perspective*. Routledge, London, UK.

[28] Tassiopoulos, D. and Johnson, D. 2009. Social impacts of events. In Raj, R. & Musgrave, J. (Eds). *Event management and sustainability*. Wallingford and Cambridge: CABI International.

[29] Upchurch, R.S. and Teivane, U. 2000. Resident perceptions of tourism development in Riga, Latvia. *Tourism Management*, 21(5), 499-507.

[30] Wearing, S. and Larsen, L. 1996. Assessing and managing the sociocultural impacts of ecotourism: revisiting the Senta Elena rainforest project. *The Environmentalist*, 16, 117-133.

[31] Zamani-Farahani, H. and Musa, G. 2012. The relationship between Islamic religiosity and residents' perceptions of socio-cultural impacts of tourism in Iran: Case studies of Sare'in and Masooleh. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 802-814.

AUTHORS

First Author – Fatemeh Shafaei, Tourism Scholar, School of Housing, Building and Planning, shabnam.shafaei@gmail.com.
Second Author – Badaruddin Mohamed, Professor, School of Housing, Building and Planning, profbadar@gmail.com.

Correspondence Author – Fatemeh Shafaei, shabnam.shafaei@gmail.com.

