



# Comparison of Multi-Stakeholder Perception of Tourism Sustainability in Goa

**Carmelita D' Mello\***, **Ling-Chen Chang\*\***, **Subhash Kizhakanveatil Bhaskaran Pillai\*\*\***,  
**Kaustubh Kamat\*\*\*\***, **Friedrich M. Zimmermann\*\*\*\*\***, **Klaus Weiermair\*\*\*\*\***

**Abstract** *Despite being researched so widely for a considerable period of time, sustainable tourism remains a controversial issue in tourism literature with very little consensus about the understanding of the term, its practical implementations, as well as its implications. The practice of sustainability in tourism can take diverse paths as evidenced in tourism research, but recently debate is on collaboration and involvement among tourism stakeholders is gaining importance as a key to sustainable tourism development, although research in support in this issue requires further support. This study investigates the perceptions about various dimensions of sustainable tourism among four groups of tourism stakeholder's; viz.; Residents, Tourists, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials. To discover if difference exists, an ANOVA test was conducted for each dimension, followed by a Scheffes' test to determine inter-group differences of perceptions and result shows that statistically significant differences exists in perception among stakeholder groups for six out of the seven dimensions. Differences were identified between tourist and residents, entrepreneurs, government officials in the case of understanding sustainability, focus of sustainable tourism, attitude towards participation in sustainable tourism, between residents and tourists, entrepreneurs, government officials in the case of sustainable tourism management, between tourists and residents, government officials in the case of support for sustainable tourism development and between tourists, residents and entrepreneurs, government officials in the case of economic focus of sustainable tourism. In the case of tourism industry and sustainability, none were significant.*

**Keywords:** Stakeholders, Sustainability, Entrepreneurs, Government Officials

## INTRODUCTION

Tourism as an economic activity is widely linked to a variety of economic sectors and activities. As a result of these linkages it enjoys positive multiplier effects and acts as a spur

for economic development in general of any region. It creates opportunities for employment and income generation at all levels. More specifically, it encourages local and regional economic development for destinations with limited options for development. Tourism has been identified as one of the

\* Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, St. Xavier's College of Arts, Science & Commerce, Mapusa, Goa, India.  
E-mail: litad@rediffmail.com

\*\* Associate Professor, Department of Hotel Management, Taiwan Hospitality & Tourism College No.268, Zhongxing St., Shoufeng Township, Hualien County 970, Taiwan, R.O.C. Email: monica@mail.tht.edu.tw; monicachang970@gmail.com

\*\*\* (Corresponding Author), Professor and Dean of the Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, Department of Commerce, Goa University, Taleigao Plateau, Goa, India. E-mail: subhash@unigoa.ac.in

\*\*\*\* Ph.D Candidate, Department of Commerce, Goa University. Assistant Professor and Head, Business Administration Department, Goa Multi-Facility College, Dharbandora, Goa, India. E-mail: kamatkau@gmail.com

\*\*\*\*\* Professor and Director, RCE Graz-Styria: Regional Center of Expertise on Education for Sustainable Development, University of Graz, Graz, Austria. E-mail: friedrich.zimmermann@uni-graz.at

\*\*\*\*\* Prof. Emeritus, Schulich School of Business, York University Toronto, Canada, and Professor Emeritus, Department of Tourism and Service Management, Institute of Strategic Management, Marketing and Tourism, University of Innsbruck, Universitätsstrasse 15, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria. E-mail: Klaus.Weiermair@uibk.ac.at

primary industries with potential to assist local communities in developing economic diversity. (Long et al., 1990; Allen et al., 1993; Hassan, 2000; Davis & Morais, 2004; Mc Gehee & Andereck, 2004). Gunn (1994) states that there is no other form of development “that has so many far reaching tentacles as tourism.” However, tourism cannot be considered an all purpose remedy to prevent economic decline.

The tourism industry inherently has both positive and negative impacts on the community, the economy and the environment in which it exists. The unplanned growth of tourism has damaged the natural and socio-cultural environments of destinations all over the world. Inskip (1991) emphasized the importance of responsible tourism stating that, “ill conceived and poorly planned tourism development can erode the very qualities of the natural and human environment that attract visitors in the first place.” Carrying this concept further, Martin, 1995; Yuskel et al., 1999; Puzcko & Ratz, 2000; Southgate & Sharpley, 2002; De Oliviera, 2003; stated that only if tourism is responsibly planned and managed can be successful and sustainable.

Sustainability therefore, has become a key concern in relation to tourism planning and development. An important factor in the successful development and implementation of sustainable tourism is the support and involvement of the stakeholders of the community (Ap, 1992; Gunn, 1994; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Gursoy et al. 2002; Andriotis, 2005). Recognizing the importance of the role that stakeholders play in sustainable tourism development, most of the research done in the past, in this area, focuses on the perceptions and attitudes of individual stakeholder groups and their relationship with tourism. (Murphy, 1983; Long et al., 1990; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Pizam et al., 2000; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Gursoy et al. 2002; Andriotis & Vaughn, 2003; Weaver & Lawton, 2004).

In comparison to the magnitude of research work carried out on individual stakeholder groups, relatively limited amount of research has been done on comparison of the perceptions of multiple stakeholder groups. Hardy & Beeton (2001) emphasized the need to carry out research studies that compare multiple stakeholder groups based on their interests. Research studies conducted between various stakeholder groups such as Residents and Entrepreneurs (Pizam, 1978; Andriotis, 2005); Residents & Tourists (Puzcko & Ratz, 2000); Residents, Entrepreneurs and Tourists (Kavallinis & Pizam, 1994); Residents, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials (Murphy, 1983; Lankford, 1994) indicated that differences do exist between groups in terms of their attitudes and perceptions about tourism. However, very few studies have been done on comparison of all four stakeholder groups together; viz.; Residents, Tourists, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials as well as in terms of their perceptions about the sustainability of tourism. Even where research has been carried out to investigate the perceptions of multiple

stakeholder groups, the bulk of research concentrates on the differences in their perceptions of tourism's impacts. Statistically significant differences in perceptions existed between Tourists and Residents (Puzcko & Ratz, 2000), Residents, Entrepreneurs and Tourists (Kavallinis & Pizam, 1994); Residents, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials (Murphy, 1983; Lankford, 1994), depending on the issues researched. However it was found that while Entrepreneurs and Government Officials did not differ significantly in their perceptions of tourism development between themselves, they did differ from the perceptions of Residents and Tourists. Multi-stakeholder perception on sustainability of tourism as an issue has been researched to a very limited extent; hence the purpose of this study is to discover differences in the perceptions about sustainable tourism exist among four different stakeholder groups. The research result will provide insights on otherwise unexplored area and fills the gap by adding valuable knowledge, new perspectives, and presents possibilities for consideration. The research result will offer valuable inputs for different stakeholders of tourism industry, especially residents, entrepreneurs, tourists, government, academic institutions, NGO's, tour operators, and financial institutions who may plan venturing in to sustainable tourism investments.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Sustainable Tourism

While tourism is believed to be a truly global activity accounting for the single largest peaceful movement of people across cultural boundaries in the history of the world (Lett, 1989) and is often viewed as an environmentally friendly industry in comparison to other industries (Wilson et al., 2001; Davis & Morais, 2004) and is seen as a strategy for economic development that is easier and cheaper to establish largely because it makes use of infrastructure already available in the community in which it develops, it does present considerable challenges to the local environment and communities on which it is dependent (UNEP & WTO, 2005). As a result, sustainable tourism has been propagated as the new ideal to stop the damaging effects of tourism.

Despite being well researched, the concept of sustainable tourism still remains vague. The recent virtual special issue by the well known publisher Elsevier on sustainable tourism around the world covered wide range of subjects; viz.; volunteer tourism, sustainable development, ecotourism, climate change, green tourism, and tourism education; all of which revolved around the main theme of sustainable tourism. The geographical area covered in different studies include Africa (Wyngaard and Lange, 2013), Arctic (Grimwood et al, 2015), Asia (Sin and Minca, 2014; Mostafanezhad, 2014; Xu and Fox, 2014; Chan, 2013; Klähn and Edwards, 2014),

Australia (Schweinsberg et al, 2013), Central America (Blackman et al., 2014; Little, 2014; Weaver, 2015), Europe (Ekinci, 2014; Farmaki. et al., 2015; Bujosa. et al., 2015; Øian, 2013; Alberti and Giusti, 2012; Buta et al., 2014), UK (Currie and Falconer, 2014; Jarvis et.al, 2010; La Lopa and Day, 2011; Ali et al, 2014), US (Fjelstul, 2014; Terry, 2014; Doiron and Weissenberger, 2014; NamyunKil et al, 2014), and also few studies on global level (Zhang et al, 2015; Zahra and McGehee, 2013). This being the case, still sustainable tourism continues to remain a concept that can be modified to fit different perceptions and flexible enough to convey different meanings to different groups of people (Farsari et al., 2007) without having any universally accepted definition. However, the World Tourism Organization (WTO, 2004) defines sustainable tourism as that which “*meets the needs of the present tourists and host regions, while at the same time protects and improves opportunities for the future*”. It focuses on the management of all resources in such a way that all economic, social and aesthetic needs are met while the cultural integrity, key ecological processes, bio diversity and life support systems are respected. The six main principles of sustainable tourism development considered under WTO’s definition of sustainability include (a) *high level of tourist satisfaction*, (b) *optimal use of environmental resources*, (c) *respect for socio-cultural authenticity of host community*, (d) *providing socio-economic benefits to all stakeholders*, (e) *constant monitoring of impacts*, and (f) *Informed participation of all relevant stakeholders as well as strong political leadership* (Kruja, D. & Hasaj, A., 2010). With particular reference to the tourism industry, sustainability implies the regulated use of tourism’s resources in such a manner that they are not consumed, depleted or polluted so as to render them unfit or unavailable for use by future generations of stakeholders. Understanding the concept of sustainable tourism and ensuring its practical use helps educate the community to protect and conserve resources for the benefit of all its stakeholders.

## Stakeholders and Tourism

A review of relevant tourism literature reveals the importance given to understanding stakeholder perceptions for achieving sustainable tourism in any destination or community. The concept of stakeholder and stakeholder participation gained prominence in management literature (Freeman, 1984), wherein a stakeholder is defined as, “any individual or group who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives”. This definition was further refined by Donaldson & Preston (1995) who stated that an individual or group must have a legitimate interest in the organization in order to be identified as a stakeholder. The four major stakeholder groups or perspectives identified in the tourism development process includes *Tourists*,

*Residents*, *Entrepreneurs* and *Government Officials* (Nunkoo and Ramkissoon, 2011; Yoon et al, 2001; Koa and Stewart, 2002; Dyera et al, 2007; Ballantyne et al, 2011; Hallak et al, 2012; Ong and Musa, 2012; Ramkissoon et al, 2013; Xu and Fox, 2014; Romão et al, 2014; Arsezen-Otamisa & Yuzbasioglu, 2013; Deutsch et al, 2013). While all stakeholders need not be equally involved in the decision making process, all their interests should be identified and understood (Donaldson & Preston, 1995) especially since failure to identify the interests of even a single primary stakeholder group may cause the process to fail. (Clarkson, 1995). Tourism literature abounds with research work done on stakeholder groups and the significance of their interests (Murphy, 1983; Allen et al., 1993; Gunn, 1994; Yuskel et al., 1999; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Gursoy et al. 2002; Davis & Morais, 2004). This is because one of the main causes of conflict between stakeholder groups is the difference in perceptions and interests that exist between them in terms of tourism development (Byrd, 1997; Marwick, 2000; Davis & Morais, 2004; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). However, as agreement across stakeholder groups increases, so does the likelihood of collaboration and compromise (Sautter & Leisen, 1999). A necessary precursor to planned and sustainable tourism for a destination or a community therefore, is a thorough understanding of the attitudes, perceptions and interests of the stakeholders of that community (Byrd et al., 2009) particularly because it is peoples’ perceptions which influence the pathways considered appropriate for achieving sustainable outcomes. (Yuskel et al., 1999; Sautter & Leisen, 1999; Hardy & Beeton, 2001; Vincent & Thompson, 2002)

## Social Exchange Theory

It is well established fact under social exchange theory (**SET**) is that “*understanding the exchange of resources between individuals and groups in an interaction situation*” (Ap, 1992) is crucial for any harmonious development of a region. According to the **SET**, people evaluate or exchange based on the relative costs and benefits incurred as a result of that exchange. From a tourism development standpoint, **SET** assumes that stakeholder attitude towards tourism and their consequent support for its development will be influenced by the actual and perceived outcomes that tourism has in their community (Andereck et al., 2005). Positive tourism development will occur in a community if there is an exchange between stakeholders (Ap. 1992; Mc Gehee & Andereck, 2004) and the goal of tourism development is “*to achieve outcomes that obtain the best balance of benefits and costs for all stakeholder groups*” (Ap, 1992). Thus stakeholder theory indicates that all stakeholder groups should be involved in planning for tourism development (Byrd et al., 2009) and benefits to be shared proportionately.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Research Background and Location

The study examined stakeholder attitudes and perceptions towards sustainable tourism in the state of Goa. A sample of stakeholders who were above the age of 18 years, which included 1000 Domestic and International Tourists who visited the state of Goa as well as 1000 local Residents comprising residents engaged in tourism businesses, not engaged in tourism businesses, Entrepreneurs engaged in tourism the Tourism Sector as well as Government Officials employed in the Tourism Sector. Four types of stakeholders are surveyed, viz., tourists, residents, entrepreneurs, and government officials.

### Questionnaire Development

A structured questionnaire was developed based on previous similar research studies carried out by Byrd et al., 2009; Kruja, D. & Hasaj, A., 2010; Quintano et al., 2011; Ong & Smith, 2013. The questionnaire had four parts, Part I with Biographical Details and Part IV with Tourism Sustainability Issues was used for this research paper. Part IV included 44 items or statements covering aspects of sustainable tourism such as the (a) understanding of sustainability, (b) focus of sustainable tourism, (c) sustainable tourism management, (d) attitude towards participation in sustainable tourism development, (e) support for sustainable tourism development, (f) economic focus of sustainable tourism, and (g) the tourism industry and sustainability. Each statement was represented on a five point Likert scale as recommended by Maddox (1985), where 1 represented a response of “strongly disagree”, 5 represented a response of “strongly agree” and 3 represented the “neutral” point.

### Data Collection and Analysis Techniques

Primary and secondary data was collected for the study. The sample size for the collection of primary data was determined using Judgement / Convenience sampling method. Of the 2000 questionnaires given out (1000 residents & 1000 tourists), 1657 questionnaires were returned (805 tourists and 852 residents), giving a response rate of 82.8%. However, the total number of usable questionnaires was 1570 giving a final response rate of 78.5%. Secondary data was collected from relevant research journals, data procured from Department of Tourism (Government of Goa), Goa Tourism Development Corporation (GTDC), other relevant government departments, information was also collected from booklets and other relevant government publications like the Economic Survey etc.

Data collected was analyzed using SPSS 20. Descriptive statistics, Mean Analysis, Factor Analysis and One Way ANOVA using Scheffe's Post Hoc test were used. Mean Analysis was used to find out the mean of stakeholders perceptions about the sustainability of tourism in the state and was obtained from their responses to the Tourism Sustainability Issues statements. Factor analysis reduced the original set of 44 Tourism Sustainability Issues statements into 7 factors with minimum loss of information. To discover if differences existed among the stakeholder groups in terms of the sustainability factors, an ANOVA test was conducted for each of the seven dimensions of tourism sustainability for all four groups of stakeholders followed by Scheffe's Post Hoc test to determine which groups were different. Hypothesis developed for the final testing is:

**H1: There is no significant difference in the perception of Stakeholders; viz.; (1) Residents, (2) Tourists, (3) Entrepreneurs and (4) Government Officials with respect to:**

**(F1) Understanding of Sustainability [US] \***,

**(F2) Focus of Sustainable Tourism [FST] \***,

**(F3) Sustainable Tourism Management [STM] \***,

**(F4) Attitude towards Participation in Sustainable Tourism [ATPST] \***,

**(F5) Support for sustainable Tourism Development [SSTD] \***,

**(F6) Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism [EFST] \***, and

**(F7) Tourism Industry & Sustainability [TIS]**

## RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION/ FINDINGS

Of the 1570 stakeholders (respondents) who completed the survey (Refer **Figure 1**), the largest percentage of stakeholders were youngsters in the age group 18-27 years (28.5%), followed by those in the age group 28-37 (24.7%) and 38-47 (20.8%). The percentage of males and females surveyed were approximately equal with males accounting for 49.6% and females 50.4%. In terms of education, the largest number of respondents 47.6% reported graduation as their level of education, followed by post graduation at 21.1% and HSSC / Pre-University at 15.5%. Age and education levels probably indicating that youngsters, having high level of education, are better able to understand the concept of sustainability. With respect to marital status, 53.9% of respondents were married and 46% were single. Further, in terms of stakeholder category, tourists constituted 48.5%, residents were 37.5%, entrepreneurs involved in tourism businesses were 7.5% and government employees involved in tourism were 6.5%. The lowest response rates from entrepreneurs and Government officials indicates the

lethargic attitude towards providing their opinion about sustainability status of tourism in Goa. Although these two stakeholder groups receive direct benefits from tourism, they are not bothered about providing their opinion about sustainability. In terms of location, 52.4% were from North Goa while 47.6% were from South Goa.

Demography	#	%
<b>Age</b>		
18-27	447	28.5
28-37	388	24.7
38-47	326	20.8
48-57	263	16.8
58 & Above	146	9.3
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	778	49.6
Female	792	50.4
<b>Education</b>		
SSC & below	104	6.6
HSSC/Pre University	244	15.5
Graduate	748	47.6
Post Graduate	332	21.1
Professional	142	9.0
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married	846	53.9
Single	724	46.1
<b>Location</b>		
North Goa	822	52.4
South Goa	748	47.6
<b>Stakeholder Category</b>		
Tourist	761	48.5
Resident	589	37.5
Entrepreneur (Tourism)	118	7.5
Government (Tourism)	102	6.5

**Fig. 1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N=1570)**

Source: Compiled from Primary data

Factor Analysis of the 44 items on the Sustainability Issues Scale generated 7 factors with the minimum loss of information. The overall scale reliability with  $n=1570$  had a very high alpha coefficient of 0.924 (Refer **Figure 2**). The sustainability issues scale (44 items) had a very high overall alpha coefficient of 0.924, with subscales:

Understanding of Sustainability – **US** (8 items;  $\alpha = 0.884$ )

Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **FST** (9 items;  $\alpha = 0.848$ )

Sustainable Tourism Management – **STM** (7 items;  $\alpha = 0.761$ )

Attitude Towards Participation in Sustainable Tourism – **ATPST** (5 items;  $\alpha = 0.802$ )

Support for Sustainable Tourism Development – **SSTD** (5 items;  $\alpha = 0.752$ )

Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **EFST** (4 items;  $\alpha = 0.726$ )

Tourism Industry and Sustainability – **TIS** (6 items;  $\alpha = 0.639$ )

Mean analysis (Refer **Figure 2**) indicated that the scale mean value of **Factor 1** - Understanding of Sustainability (**US**) was 4.05 overall. ‘Maintaining and preserving resources for future generations’ (4.28), with the highest mean value indicates that stakeholder understanding of sustainability supports the traditional viewpoint of stakeholders being stewards of resources. However, 3 statements, ‘Economic growth and viability involving long term view’ (3.97), ‘Environmental care along with consideration for visitors’ (3.93), ‘Carrying capacity considerations and using codes of practice’ (3.88) are slightly below average. The first could be indicative of a shift in perception of sustainability from the commonly considered economic perspective, the second perhaps indicates greater concern or focus on residents and less on visitors, while the third may be as a result of lack of clarity about the concept of carrying capacity. With respect to **Factor 2** - Focus of Sustainable Tourism (**FST**), the scale mean value was 4.18 with all statements having above average values. However, ‘Preservation and conservation of all resources’ (4.37) & ‘Reduction of damage to physical environment’ (4.32) with the highest mean values suggest that focus of sustainable tourism should remain the protection of the environment and its resources. ‘The quality of visitor experience’ (4.10), ‘The reduction of disturbance of the attractions’ (4.05), ‘Organised regional plans for tourism’ (4.00), have the lowest mean values. The first two seem to suggest a lack of interest in focusing on visitors/tourists to the destination while the third appears to recognize that regional/ master plans for tourism though theoretically important, never seem to materialize in practice. In terms of **Factor 3** - Sustainable Tourism Management (**STM**), the mean value was 4.04 with ‘tourism must be carefully managed for it to be sustainable’ (4.20) having the highest mean value indicating a unanimous view that tourism needs to be carefully managed for sustainability. 3 items out of 7 have slightly below average values. ‘Administration of Sustainability legislation should be the responsibility of Local and Regional Government’ (3.92), ‘Tourism Industry has the greatest role to play in implementing Sustainable Tourism development policy’ and ‘Marketing is a useful tool for Sustainable Tourism development’ (3.93) are indicative of the need for combined action from stakeholders to bring

about Sustainable Tourism Management and thus support the need for tourism management.

For **Factor 4** - Attitude towards participation in Sustainable Tourism (ATPST), the scale mean is 4.16. 'Help strengthen respect for Goa's natural areas and historic places' (4.29) having the highest mean value seems to continue to support the trend in the previous factors of protection and preservation

of resources. Only 1 factor, 'Help ensure implementation of Code of Conduct to guarantee Sustainable Tourism' (3.98) though below average, tends towards the highest end of the scale and could possibly be because of lack of clarity of the concept 'Code of Conduct'. The one which is almost closer to the average is 'Help promote cultural appreciation and understanding' (4.14).

<b>Tourism Sustainability Issues (44 items, N = 1570, Scale alpha= 0.924)</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>SA</b>	<b>Mean</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>F1. Understanding of Sustainability Scale Mean = 4.05, alpha = 0.884, 8 items</b>						
Environmental care involving a need for economic growth & viability	0.5	2.0	16.8	53.1	27.7	4.05
Environmental care involving a long-term view	0.8	2.8	17.3	42.6	36.5	4.11
Economic growth and viability involving a long-term view	0.7	3.7	21.8	45.7	28.2	3.97
Resource and environmental management	1.1	2.7	13.5	45.2	37.5	4.15
Environmental care with consideration for social factors.	1.5	3.1	17.8	48.4	29.3	4.01
Maintaining and preserving resources for future generations	2.1	2.6	12.4	30.5	52.4	4.28
Carrying capacity considerations & using codes of practice	0.7	4.0	26.7	43.6	25.0	3.88
Environmental care along with consideration for visitors	0.6	4.1	20.6	51.3	23.4	3.93
<b>F2. Focus of Sustainable Tourism Scale Mean = 4.18, alpha = 0.848, 9 items</b>						
The protection of high scenic value	0.2	2.3	10.2	46.8	40.6	4.25
The reduction of damage to the physical environment	0.1	1.8	10.4	41.1	46.5	4.32
The protection of wildlife breeding colonies	0.8	2.0	17.1	42.6	37.5	4.14
The protection of areas of high habitat value	0.5	2.0	12.6	47.5	37.3	4.19
The quality of the visitor experience	0.5	1.3	15.0	53.9	29.2	4.10
The reduction of disturbance of the attraction	0.2	3.3	20.3	46.1	30.1	4.05
Preservation and conservation of all resources	0.1	1.9	10.4	36.1	51.7	4.37
Organized regional plans for tourism.	0.2	3.4	19.3	50.6	26.5	4.00
Consultation between Government, Industry and Local Residents	0.7	2.0	15.8	42.4	39.2	4.17
<b>F3 Sustainable Tourism Management Scale Mean = 4.04, alpha = 0.761, 7 items</b>						
Long term sustainability of tourism is the priority	0.9	3.5	18.3	42.5	34.8	4.07
Education of tourism staff is important in the implementation of sustainable tourism practices	0.6	1.3	11.6	45.2	41.3	4.25
Administration of sustainability legislation should be the responsibility of local and Regional Government	0.2	3.6	27.1	50.3	22.7	3.92
Sustainable tourism development should encourage the spread of tourists throughout the country.	0.2	3.9	18.6	49.4	28.0	4.01
The tourism industry has the greatest role to play in implementing sustainable tourism development policy	0.5	3.0	22.5	41.1	22.8	3.93
Marketing is a useful tool for sustainable tourism development	1.0	4.6	21.5	46.1	26.9	3.93
Tourism must be carefully managed in order for it to be sustainable	0.5	1.2	10.9	52.5	34.9	4.20
<b>F4 Attitudes towards participation in Sustainable Tourism Scale Mean = 4.16, alpha = 0.802, 5 items</b>						
Help improve the quality of community life	0.3	2.4	12.4	50.4	34.5	4.16
Help support the maintenance & improvement of Goa's environment & heritage	0.4	2.2	10.7	46.1	40.6	4.24
Help strengthen respect for Goa's natural areas and historic places	0.1	1.7	8.8	47.8	41.6	4.29
Help promote cultural appreciation and understanding	0.2	1.8	13.7	52.2	32.2	4.14
Help ensure implementation of code of conduct to guarantee sustainable tourism (social, environmental etc.)	<b>0.8</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>47.1</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>3.98</b>
<b>F5 Support for Sustainable Tourism Development Scale Mean = 4.02, alpha = 0.752, 5 items</b>						
Willing to participate in management of local resources	1.2	3.9	21.1	49.6	24.1	3.92
Willing to contribute to ensure greater benefits to community	0.5	2.7	19.2	44.8	32.8	4.07
Willing to participate in sustainable tourism decision making	0.4	3.1	15.8	46.4	34.3	4.11
Willing to contribute to protection & conservation of resources	0.3	3.2	17.3	50.6	28.6	4.04
<b>Willing to contribute to funding and management of solutions for tourism related problems</b>	0.6	3.3	20.1	49.0	27.0	3.99

<b>Tourism Sustainability Issues (44 items, N = 1570, Scale alpha= 0.924)</b>	<b>SD 1</b>	<b>D 2</b>	<b>N 3</b>	<b>A 4</b>	<b>SA 5</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>F6 Economic Focus Of Sustainable Tourism    Scale Mean = 3.78, alpha = 0.726, 4 items</b>						
Attracting more high spending domestic tourists	2.5	8.0	31.1	32.1	26.3	3.72
Attracting more high spending foreign tourists	1.1	5.2	24.5	36.9	32.2	3.94
Tourism Industry should focus on attracting more Foreign Tourists.	1.7	10.1	22.0	39.6	26.7	3.80
The number of tourists visiting Goa should be increased.	2.6	11.3	25.0	38.7	22.3	3.67
<b>F7 Tourism Industry and Sustainability    Scale Mean = 3.65, alpha = 0.639, 6 items</b>						
Tourism needs greater industry control.	1.5	6.5	24.5	46.2	21.3	3.79
Tourism is inherently sustainable	2.7	11.0	33.8	41.9	10.6	3.47
Tourism in the most developed locations is unsustainable.	2.0	14.3	39.6	34.7	9.5	3.35
Tourism needs greater Government control	2.9	6.1	17.0	42.8	31.1	3.93
Tourism is more sustainable than other industries.	1.5	6.5	24.5	46.2	21.3	3.57
Tourism needs greater local resident control.	1.2	5.8	23.7	49.4	19.9	3.81

**Fig. 2: Tourism Sustainability Issues Scale (44 items, N = 1570, Scale alpha= 0.924)**

Source: Compiled from Primary data

In terms of **Factor 5** - Support for Sustainable Tourism Development (**SSTD**), the scale mean value was 4.02. 'Willing to participate in tourism decision making' (4.11) having the highest mean value indicates the readiness of stakeholders to be involved in tourism decision making. 'Willingness to participate in management of local resources' (3.92) and 'Willingness to contribute to funding and management of solutions for tourism related problems' (3.99), though slightly below average, tend towards the higher end indicating a slightly lower support for Sustainable Tourism initiatives which would perhaps involve contribution of funds and efforts. The large number of tourists (who do not have as great an attachment to the destination as Residents, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials and who perhaps would not be interested in contribution of funds and efforts) surveyed as stakeholders, could perhaps account for the result. **Factor 6** - Economic focus of Sustainable Tourism (**EFST**) with a scale mean of 3.78 indicates an average perception of where the economic focus of Sustainable Tourism should lie. However, given that 2 of the 4 statements - 'Attracting more high spending foreign tourists' (3.94) and 'Attracting more foreign tourists' (3.80) having the highest mean values in this factor reflect foreign tourists, perhaps a shift in focus to attracting foreign tourists to the destination is seen as an economic path to sustainability. With respect to **Factor 7** Tourism industry and sustainability (**TIS**), the scale mean is 3.65, i.e. average. However, 3 of the 6 statements which have the highest means refer to the aspect of control for sustainability. 'Tourism needs greater industry control' (3.79); 'Tourism needs greater Government control' (3.93); 'Tourism needs greater local resident control' (3.81) seem to indicate that the tourism industry needs the concerted control and action of all 3 major players- government, industry and local residents for sustainability.

One Way ANOVA was carried out (Refer **Figure 3**) to assess whether there is any significance difference exists between 4 different stakeholder groups for each of the 7 sustainability factors indicated that there exists statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ) between 4 stakeholder groups for 6 of the 7 factors, i.e., Understanding of Sustainability – **US**, Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **FST**, Sustainable Tourism Management – **STM**, Attitude Towards Participation in Sustainable Tourism – **ATPST**, Support for Sustainable Tourism Development – **SSTD**, Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **EFST**, and Tourism Industry and Sustainability – **TIS**. But Factor 7 - Tourism Industry and Sustainability (**TIS**) is not showing any significance. Findings of this study support the idea that differences in perception about the sustainability of tourism do exist between 4 different stakeholder groups. For each of the 6 factors, where there was a statistically significant difference between groups, a Scheffe test was conducted to determine which specific groups were different (Refer **Figure 3**).

In terms of understanding sustainability (**US**), Tourist perception differed significantly from Residents, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials and was significantly lower than all three where Entrepreneurs had the highest perception followed by Government Officials, Residents and Tourists. Perception of tourists could be lowest possibly because being visitors to the destination; they lack economic and emotional connection or involvement with the State. Further, perception of Entrepreneurs, Government Officials and Residents is higher possible because being residents of the State and possibly deriving personal benefit from tourism they are more emotionally connected with the destination. While there was no significant difference between the perceptions of Entrepreneurs and Government

Officials on the Understanding of Sustainability, they both differed significantly from the perceptions of Residents and Tourists.

With respect to Focus of Sustainable Tourism (FST), perception of Tourists is significantly lower than that of Residents, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials where

Entrepreneurs have the highest perception, followed by Government Officials, followed by Residents and Tourists. While the perception of Entrepreneurs and Government Officials do not differ significantly the perception of Entrepreneurs differs significantly from that of Residents and Tourists.

Variable	MEAN				F ratio	P value	Welch's Test	Scheffe's Test P<0.05
	Tourists n=761 (T)	Residents n=589 (R)	Entrepreneurs n=118 (E)	Govt. Officials n=102 (GO)				
Understanding of Sustainability (F1) US	3.9169 (4)	4.1118 (3)	4.3750 (1)	4.2941 (2)	31.113	0.00**	0.00**	T<R,E,GO R<E,GO; R>T E>T,R GO>T,R
Focus of Sustainable Tourism (F2) FS	4.1126 (4)	4.1969 (3)	4.4153 (1)	4.2810 (2)	12.705	0.00**	0.00**	T<R,E,GO R>T; R<E E>T,R GO>T
Sustainable Tourism Management (F3) STM	4.0528 (3)	3.9590 (4)	4.1852 (2)	4.3067 (1)	18.227	0.00**	0.00**	R<T,E,GO T>R; T<GO E>R GO>T,R
Attitude toward Participation in Sustainable Tourism (F4) ATPST	4.0468 (4)	4.2458 (3)	4.3305 (2)	4.3745 (1)	24.263	0.00**	0.00**	T<R,E,GO
Support for Sustainable Tourism Development (F5) SSTD	4.1180 (1)	3.9260 (3)	3.9797 (1)	3.9373 (2)	13.082	0.00**	0.00**	T>R,GO
Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism (F6) EFST	3.7290 (4)	3.7436 (3)	4.0869 (1)	4.0098 (2)	12.106	0.00**	0.00**	T,R<E,GO
Tourism Industry & Sustainability (F7) TIS	3.6658 (1)	3.6553 (3)	3.5650 (4)	3.6650 (2)	1.178	0.317	0.249	None are significant

**Fig. 3: Test of significance between Tourists, Residents, Entrepreneurs & Government Officials (One-Way Analysis of Variance with Scheffe's Test)**

Source: Compiled from Primary data

The third factor, Sustainable Tourism Management (STM), shows that the perception of Residents is significantly less than Tourists, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials, where Government Officials have the highest perception followed by Entrepreneurs, Tourists and Residents. However, though the perception of Government Officials is greater than that of Entrepreneurs, the difference is not significant. The higher perceptions of Government Officials and Entrepreneurs

could be attributed to their close involvement in Sustainable Tourism Management, while Residents having the lowest perception of the same could be attributed to their high degree of attachment to the destination along with their low level of involvement in Sustainable Tourism Management. About fourth factor, attitude towards Participation in Sustainable Tourism Management (ATPST), the perception of tourists is significantly lower than that of Residents, Entrepreneurs and

Government Officials where Government Officials have the highest/most positive perception followed by Entrepreneurs, Residents and Tourists. This could be due to the fact that Government Officials, Entrepreneurs and Residents, all being residents of the State have more vested interest in participating in Sustainable Tourism than do Tourists, who being visitors lack motivation and commitment to be more deeply involved in the State.

Support for Sustainable Tourism development (**SSTD**) indicated that the perception of Tourists is significantly higher than that of Residents and Government Officials, where the perception of tourists is the highest followed by Entrepreneurs, Government Officials and Residents. The difference in perception between Tourists and Entrepreneurs is not significant. This factor covers the willingness of stakeholders to participate as well as contribute to Sustainable Tourism. A possible reason for the higher perception of tourists could be due to that they are being visitors, their contribution would be limited to the duration of their visit only but for Residents, Entrepreneurs and Government Officials, it would be permanent. In terms of Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism (**EFST**), the perception of Tourists and Residents is significantly lower than that of Entrepreneurs and Government Officials, where Entrepreneurs have the highest perception followed by Government Officials, Residents and Tourists. However, the difference in perception between Residents and Tourists as well as that between Entrepreneurs and Government Officials is not significant. A possible reason or this could be that both Entrepreneurs as well as Government Officials derive greater benefit from tourism than Residents and hence, are more concerned with its economic gains. Further, tourists being only visitors to the destination are generally not concerned with long term focus or gains. Finally, with respect to Tourism Industry and Sustainability (**TIS**) which includes/covers the nature and focus of control of the industry, none of the groups have significantly differing perceptions. This could possibly be because all four stakeholder groups agree that a concerted effort from all stakeholders is needed to ensure the sustainability of the industry.

Hence, since there is a significant difference in perception of stakeholders with respect to: 1) Understanding of sustainability; 2) Focus of Sustainable Tourism; 3) Sustainable Tourism Management; 4) Attitude towards Participation in Sustainable Tourism; 5) Support for Sustainable Tourism Development; and 6) Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism - the null hypothesis is rejected. However, since there is no significant difference in perception of stakeholders with respect to Tourism Industry and Sustainability, the null hypothesis is accepted

**HI:** *There is no significant difference in the perception of Stakeholders; viz.: (1) Residents, (2) Tourists, (3) Entrepreneurs and (4) Government Officials with respect to:*

(F1) *Understanding of Sustainability [US] \**,

(F2) *Focus of Sustainable Tourism [FST] \**,

(F3) *Sustainable Tourism Management [STM] \**,

(F4) *Attitude towards Sustainable Tourism [ATPST] \**,

(F5) *Support for sustainable Tourism Development [SSTD] \**,

(F6) *Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism [EFST] \**,  
and

(F7) *Tourism Industry & Sustainability [TIS]*

## CONCLUSION

As a result of the comparison of the perceptions between 4 different stakeholder groups about Sustainable Tourism issues in Goa, the study concludes that there exists considerable differences in the perceptions of the various stakeholder groups, a result which is supported by previous research studies in this area (Pizam, 1978; Murphy, 1983; Kavallinis and Pizam, 1994; Puczko and Ratz, 2000; Andriotis, 2005; Byrd et al, 2008; Kruja, 2010; Quintano et al, 2011)

Thus, in this study, for 5 of the 7 factors concerning Tourism's Sustainability in the State, viz., Understanding of Sustainability – **US**, Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **FST**, Sustainable Tourism Management – **STM**, Attitude Towards Participation in Sustainable Tourism – **ATPST**, Economic Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **EFST**, and Tourism Industry and Sustainability, Government Officials (**GO**) and Entrepreneurs (**E**) have the highest or most positive perception about sustainability of tourism which could be an outcome of their close involvement with it and the level of personal benefit they derive from it.

Again 4 of the 7 factors, viz., Understanding of Sustainability – **US**, Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **FST**, Attitude Towards Participation in Sustainable Tourism – **ATPST**, Focus of Sustainable Tourism – **EFST**, tourists (**T**) have the lowest or least positive perception of Sustainability of Tourism, which could possibly be a result of them being visitors to the State and thus having little emotional or economic connection with it.

Further in terms of Sustainable Tourism Management – **STM** and Support for Sustainable Tourism development (**SSTD**), Residents have the lowest or least positive perception. This could possibly be an outcome of the fact that being Residents, they are emotionally attached to the destination and can view the negative impacts of tourism most closely, yet may perhaps receive the least personal benefit from tourism while paying a high price for it.

The Research suggests that Government Officials and Entrepreneurs are more deeply involved in Sustainable

tourism planning and management than Residents or Tourists. Thus, Community Planners / Government / Destination Management Organizations need to focus not only on the tangible component of the tourism product (rooms, infrastructure and natural resources) but also the intangible component of the tourism product (the overall experience for all stakeholders). While communication with tourists to market the destination competitively to them is important to ensure economic, socio cultural and environmental sustainability of the destination, educating and informing local community about all aspects of tourism so as to enable all stakeholders to make informed decisions about the level and kind of tourism they will support in their community is equally important.

Stakeholder inclusion in tourism development, though considered important and well researched (Ap, 1992; Yuskel et al, 1999; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Gursoy et al, 2002; Andriotis, 2005) has not been fully realized because of the practical difficulties involved in its implementation. However, understanding and awareness of the differing perceptions and awareness of 4 different stakeholder groups, yet offering a common platform for interaction will provide stakeholder inclusion, education, opportunities to generate awareness, understanding as well as open minded communication between all stakeholder groups as well as stakeholder inclusion will ensure better and more informed decisions utilizing collective wisdom of stakeholders. This, in turn, will lead to the development of a stronger tourism product, a more fulfilling and satisfying experience for all stakeholders, thus ultimately contributing to the sustainability of tourism in the destination and giving it the greatest chance of success.

#### NOTE:

Earlier version of this paper "Comparison of Multi-stakeholder Perception of Tourism Sustainability in Goa" was presented at the 3rd world Research Summit for Tourism and Hospitality & 1st USA-China Tourism Research Summit; (jointly organized by Elsevier and UCF Rosen College of Hospitality Management); Florida, USA, 15-19 December 2015.

#### REFERENCES

- Alberti, F. G., & Giusti, J. D. (2012). Cultural heritage, tourism and regional competitiveness: The Motor Valley cluster. *City, Culture and Society*, 3, 261-273.
- Ali, A., Murphy, H. C., & Nadkarni, S. (2014). Hospitality students perceptions of digital tools for learning and sustainable development. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & tourism Education*, 15, 1-10.
- Allen, L., Hafer, H., Long, P., & Perdue, R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 27-33.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27-36.
- Andriotis, K. (2005). Community groups' perceptions of and preferences for tourism development: evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 29(1), 67-90.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, D. R. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes towards tourism development: the case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 172-185.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665-690.
- Arsezen-Otamisa, P., & Yuzbasioglu, N., (2013). Analysis of Antalya tourism cluster perceived performance with structural equation model. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 99, 682-690.
- Ballantyne, R., Jan Packer, J., & Falk, J., (2011). Visitors' learning for environmental sustainability: Testing short- and long-term impacts of wildlife tourism experiences using structural equation modeling. *Tourism Management* 32, 1243-1252.
- Blackman, A., Naranjo, M. A., Juan Robalino, J., & Alpi'Zar, F., (2014). Does tourism eco-certification pay? Costa Rica's Blue Flag Program. *World Development*, 58, 41-52.
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of socio-cultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515.
- Bujosa A., Riera A. M., & Torres, C. M. (2015). Valuing tourism demand attributes to guide climate change adaptation measures efficiently: The case of the Spanish domestic travel market. *Tourism Management*, 47, 233-239.
- Buta, N., Holland, S. M., & Kaplanidou, K. (2014). Local communities and protected areas: The mediating role of place attachment for pro-environmental civic engagement. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 5/6, 1-10.
- Byrd, E. T., (1997). Barriers to rural tourism: A comparison of the perceptions of the host community, local business owners, and tourists. *Unpublished Master's Thesis, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.*
- Byrd, E. T., Bosley H. E., & Dronberger M. G. (2009). Comparisons of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina. *Tourism Management*, 30(5), 693-703.

- Byrd, E. T., Cardenas, D. A., & Greenwood, J. B., (2008). Factors of stakeholder understanding of tourism: the case of Eastern North Carolina. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 8(3), 192.
- Chan, E. S. W. (2013). Managing green marketing: Hong Kong hotel managers' perspective. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 442-461.
- Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluation corporate social performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 92-117.
- Currie, C., & Falconer, P., (2014). Maintaining sustainable island destinations in Scotland: The role of the transport-tourism relationship. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 3, 162-172.
- Davis, J. S., & Morais, D. P. (2004). Factions and enclaves: Small towns and socially unsustainable tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 3-10.
- De Oliveira, J. A. P. (2003). Governmental responses to tourism development: Three Brazilian case studies. *Tourism Management*, 24, 97-110.
- Deutsch, K., Seo Youn Yoon, S. Y., & Goulias, K., (2013). Modeling travel behavior and sense of place using a structural equation model. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 28, 155-163.
- Doiron, S., & Weissenberger, S., (2014). Sustainable dive tourism: Social and environmental impacts - The case of Roatan, Honduras. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 10, 19-26.
- Donaldson, T., & Preston, L. E. (1995). The stakeholder theory of the corporation: concepts, evidence, and implications. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(1), 65-91.
- Dyera, P., Dogan Gursay, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28, 409-422.
- Ekinci, M. B. (2014). The Cittaslow philosophy in the context of sustainable tourism development: The case of Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 41, 178-189.
- Farmaki A., Altinay L., Botterill, D., & Hilke, S. (2015). Politics and sustainable tourism: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism management*, 47, 178-190.
- Farsari, Y., Butler, R., & Prastacos P. (2007). Sustainable tourism policy for Mediterranean destinations: issues and interrelationships. *International Journal Tourism Policy*, 1(1).
- Fjelstul, J. (2014). Vehicle electrification: On the "Green" Road to Destination Sustainability. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 3, 137-139.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Grimwood, B. S. R., Yudina, O., Muldoon, M., & Qiu, J. (2015). Responsibility in tourism: A discursive analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 50, 22-38.
- Gunn, C. A. (1994). *Tourism planning: Basic concepts cases* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C.: Taylor and Francis.
- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: a structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79-105.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: an improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Hallak, R., Brown, G., & Lindsay, N. J. (2012). The place identity e performance relationship among tourism entrepreneurs: A structural equation modelling analysis. *Tourism Management*, 33, 143-154.
- Hassan, S. S. (2000). Determinants of market competitiveness in an environmentally sustainable tourism industry. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 239-245.
- Hardy, A. L., & Beeton, R. J. S. (2001). Sustainable tourism or maintainable tourism: Managing resources for more than average outcomes. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9(3), 168-192.
- Inskeep, E. (1991). *Tourism planning: An integrated and sustainable development approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Jarvis, N., Weeden, C., & Simcock, N. (2010). The benefits and challenges of sustainable tourism certification: A case study of the green tourism business scheme in the West of England. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 17, 83-93.
- Kavallinis, I., & Pizam, A. (1994). The environmental impact of tourism: whose responsibility is it anyway? The case study of Mykonos. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(2), 26-32.
- Klähn, D. T., & Edwards, D. (2014). Conference Report: The best education network think tank XIII: Engaging communities in sustainable tourism development, Taylors University, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 2013. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 14, 1-5.
- Ko, D. W., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 23(5), 521-530.
- Kruja, D., & Hasaj, A. (2010). Comparisons of stakeholders' perception towards the sustainable tourism development and its impacts in Shkodra Region (Albania), *Turizam*, 14(1), 1-12.
- La Lopa, J. M., & Day, J. (2011). Pilot study to assess the readiness of the tourism industry in wales to change to sustainable tourism business practices. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 18, 130-139.

- Lankford, S. V. (1994). Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 35-43.
- Lett, J. (1989). Epilogue. In V. Smith (Ed.), *Hosts and Guests: An Anthropology of Tourism* (pp. 275-79). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Little, K., (2014). Mr. Richie and the tourists. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 12, 92-100.
- Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 3-9.
- Maddox, R. N. (1985). Measuring satisfaction with tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(3), 2-5.
- Markwick, M. C. (2000). Golf tourism development, stakeholders, differing discourses, and alternative agendas: the case of Malta. *Tourism Management*, 21(5), 515-524.
- Martin, S. R. (1995). Montanans' attitudes and behavioral intentions toward tourism: implications for sustainability. In S. F. McCool, & A. E. Watson (Eds.), *Linking tourism, the environment, and sustainability-Topical volume of compiled papers from a special session of the annual meeting of the National Recreation and Park Association* (pp. 69-76). Ogden, UT: Intermountain Research Station.
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 131-140.
- Mostafanezhad, M. (2014). Volunteer tourism and the popular humanitarian gaze. *Geoforum*, 54, 111-118.
- Murphy, P. E. (1983). Perceptions and attitudes of decision making groups in tourism centers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 21(3), 8-12.
- NamyunKil, N. B., Holland, S. M., & Stein, T. V. (2014). Structural relationships between environmental attitudes, recreation motivations, and environmentally responsible behaviors. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 7/8, 16-25.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Developing a community support model for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 964-988.
- Øian, H. (2013). Wilderness tourism and the moralities of commitment: Hunting and angling as modes of engaging with the natures and animals of rural landscapes in Norway. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 32, 177-185.
- Ong T. F., & Ghazali Musa, G., (2012). Examining the influences of experience, personality and attitude on SCUBA divers' underwater behaviour: A structural equation model. *Tourism Management* 33, 1521-1534.
- Ong, L. T. J., & Smith, R. A. (2013). Perceptions and reality of managing sustainable coastal tourism in emerging destinations: the case of Sihanoukville, Cambodia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(2), 256-278.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8-12.
- Pizam, A., Uriely, N., & Reichel, A. (2000). The intensity of tourist-host social relationship and its effects on satisfaction and change of attitudes: The case of working tourist in Israel. *Tourism Management*, 21(4), 395-406.
- Puczko, L., & Ratz, T. (2000). Tourist and resident perceptions of the physical impacts of tourism at Lake Balaton, Hungary: Issues for sustainable tourism management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8(6), 458-477.
- Quintano, C., Pagliuca, M. M., Rosciano, M. (2011) Comparisons of Stakeholder Perceptions of Sustainable Tourism in Naples. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 295-304.
- Ramkissoon, H., Smith, L. D. G., & Weiler, B. (2013). Testing the dimensionality of place attachment and its relationships with place satisfaction and pro-environmental behaviours: A structural equation modeling approach. *Tourism Management*, 36, 552-566.
- Romão, J., Neuts, B., Peter Nijkamp, P., & Asami Shikida, A. (2014). Determinants of trip choice, satisfaction and loyalty in an eco-tourism destination: A modelling study on the Shiretoko Peninsula, Japan. *Ecological Economics*, 107, 195-205.
- Sautter, E. T., & Leisen, B. (1999). Managing stakeholders: a tourism planning model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 312-328.
- Schweinsberg S., Wearing, S. L., & McManus, P. (2013). Exploring sustainable tourism education in business schools: The honours program. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 20, 53-60.
- Sin, H. L., & Minca, C., (2014). Touring responsibility: The trouble with 'going local' in community-based tourism in Thailand. *Geoforum*, 51, 96-106.
- Southgate, C., & Sharpley, R. (2002). Tourism, development and the environment. In R. Sharpley, & D. J. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues*, 231-262. Cleveland, OH: Channel View Publications.
- Terry, W. (2014). Solving labor problems and building capacity in sustainable agriculture through volunteer tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 94-107.
- UNEP & WTO. (2005). Making Tourism More Sustainable: A Guide for Policy Makers. from *UNEP Tourism: Publications*. Retrieved from <http://www.uneptie.org/pc/tourism/documents/part1.pdf>
- Vincent, V. C., & Thompson, W. T. (2002). Assessing community support and sustainability for ecotourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41, 153-160.
- Weaver, D. B. (2015). Tourism and the Chinese Dream: Framework for engagement. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 51, 54-55.

- Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2004). Visitor attitudes toward tourism development and product integration in an Australian urban-rural fringe. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 286-296.
- Wilson, S., Fesenmaier, D., Fesenmaier, J., & Van Es, J. (2001). Factors for success in rural tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40, 132-138.
- World Tourism Organization. (WTO). (2004). *Sustainable development of tourism: Conceptual definition*. Retrieved from <http://unaa.org.au/praxis.php/category/view/8>
- Wyngaard, A. T., & De Lange, R. (2013). The effectiveness of implementing eco initiatives to recycle water and food waste in selected Cape Town hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, pp 309-316.
- Xu, F., & Dorothy Fox, D. (2014). Modelling attitudes to nature, tourism and sustainable development in national parks: A survey of visitors in China and the UK. *Tourism Management*, 45, 142-158.
- Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. C. (2001). Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation Modeling. *Tourism Management*, 22, 363-372.
- Yuksel, F., Bramwell, B., & Yuksel, A. (1999). Stakeholder interviews and tourism planning at Pamukkale, Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 20, 351-360.
- Zhang, X., Zhou, L., Wu, Y., Martin Skitmore, M., & Deng, Z. (2015). Resolving the conflicts of sustainable world heritage landscapes in cities: Fully open or limited access for visitors? *Habitat International*, 46, 91-100
- Zahra, A., & McGehee, N. G. (2013). Volunteer tourism: A host community capital perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 42, 22-45.