Daniela Soldić Frleta / Dora Smolčić Jurdana

Insights into differences in residents' attitudes: Tourism impacts and support for future development

Abstract

This study investigates the differences in residents' perceptions of various tourism impacts as well as residents' level of support for future tourism development with regard to their employment status (employed in tourism, employed in other industries, and others: students, unemployed persons, retirees). Moreover, the objective was to find out in what way those perceptions influence the residents' level of support for future tourism development. The results show that there are statistically significant differences in perceptions of economic, socio-cultural, environmental and overall tourism impacts between the three groups of stakeholders. Respondents working in tourism expressed the strongest support for future development, while students, unemployed persons and retired residents tended to be less supportive. The main contribution of this study lies in the insights it provides into the attitudes of different groups of destination stakeholders regarding tourism impacts as well as into their support for future tourism development.

Key words: residents; tourism impacts; support; Istria

1. Introduction

Given the constant changes in tourism demand and, consequently, in tourism supply, particularly when many destinations are facing challenges connected with negative tourism impacts (i.e. overtourism), more and more studies are focusing on the attitudes of local residents regarding tourism. Tourism development generates various (positive and negative) economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts on the host community (Lee, 2013) and can, therefore, potentially affect residents' living standards (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011). By evaluating these impacts, local residents develop their attitudes toward tourism and its future development. It has been widely recognized that residents play an essential part in tourism development and that their support is imperative for tourism destination sustainability. In order for destination managers to be sensitive to and capable of anticipating the attitudes of stakeholders and quick to respond to change, thus, ensuring greater support for tourism and long-term sustainability, it is very important they understand residents' attitudes towards tourism impacts and future tourism development. Hence, this study investigates the differences in residents' perceptions of various tourism impacts as well as their level of support for future tourism development with regard to their status (employed in tourism, employed in other industries, and others: students, unemployed persons, retirees). The objective was also to find out in what way those perceptions influence the residents' level of support for future tourism development. Generally, there are many studies that examine residents' attitudes towards tourism because it has been recognised that this is necessary for planning successful tourism development (Ap, 1992; Pappas, 2008). However, no similar studies have been conducted in Istria, one of the most visited destinations in Croatia and a very popular one

Daniela Soldić Frleta, PhD, Assistant Professor, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Rijeka, Croatia; e-mail: danielas@fthm.hr

Dora Smolčić Jurdana, PhD, Full Professor with tenure, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Rijeka, Croatia; e-mail: doras@fthm.hr

Original scientific paper
Daniela Soldić Frleta / Dora Smolčić Jurdana
Vol. 68/ No. 2/ 2020/ 170 - 180
UDC: 338.481.2(497.571); https://doi.org/10.37741/t.68.2.5

in the Mediterranean area. With the rapid growth of tourism in Istria, the region is facing a variety of economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts of such development. In that context, there is a need to find out how residents see such development and whether they support it. The main contribution of this study lies in the insights into the attitudes of different groups of destination stakeholders regarding tourism impacts as well as into their support for future tourism development, considering this is an approach that has not been used so far.

2. Theoretical background

Early studies regarding residents' opinions and attitudes considered communities as relatively homogenous places whose residents either generally supported or opposed tourism (McGehee & Andereck, 2004). However, it was quickly realised that there is a great variety when attitudes toward tourism are concerned (McGehee & Andereck, 2004, given that stakeholders in a destination are heterogeneous with different views and interests. Many authors have tested the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics and perceptions toward tourism impacts and support for tourism. For instance, Iroegbu and Chen (2001) found that male residents with a colleague degree and earning more than $25.000 per year tend to support tourism development no matter the region of residence. McGehee and Andereck, (2004) confirmed the negative relationship between age and the negative impacts of tourism. Long and Kayat (2011) also confirmed that younger residents tend to be more supportive of tourism development than older ones and, similarly, males are more supportive than females. Kuvan and Akan (2005) and Long and Kayat (2011) have found monthly household income to be a significant predictor of residents' attitudes to tourism. Further, some authors have confirmed that educational level is a significant predictor of tourism development support (i.e. Látková & Vogt, 2012; Rasoolimanesh, Jaafar, Kock, & Ramayah, 2015).

When it comes to the relationships between individual characteristics and attitudes toward tourism impacts, results have been inconsistent (Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1990; Ritchie & Inkari, 2006), but, in general, more studies have confirmed that residents who depend on tourism or perceive greater personal benefits from tourism tend to support tourism development more than other residents (i.e. Deccio & Baloglu, 2002; Sirakaya, Teye, & Sönmez, 2002). The results obtained by Dev (2018) indicate that residents' perception of tourism impacts tend to be higher for those who derive economic benefits from tourism and participate in tourism planning as well as for those who are in contact with tourist in comparison to those who are not involved in tourism. Further, Nejati, Mohamed, and Omar (2014) found that the residents with higher level of control over the tourism development (i.e. in destination where tourism services are controlled by locals) have a significantly higher level of perception towards the positive economic impacts of tourism than the residents who are not controlling tourism in their community. Moreover, McGehee and Andereck (2004) have found that residents who perceive greater personal benefits from tourism tend to perceive fewer negative impacts of tourism and, at the same time, more positive impacts. Similar to Gursoy et al. (2002), they confirmed that the place of residence also predicts the negative impacts of tourism, with people who lived in the destination as a child tending to perceive fewer negative impacts of tourism. Additionally, Zhu, Liu, Wei, Li, and Wang (2017) found a positive relationship between collective tourism benefits perceived by residents and support for tourism development; however, they also found perceived personal benefits and costs not to be significant predictors of tourism development support. Results obtained by Wang & Pfister (2008) indicate that when tourism costs exceed the benefits, residents tend to be less supportive of tourism development.

In that context, many authors (i.e. Ap, 1990; Andriotis, 2005: Long & Kyat, 2011; Wang & Pfister, 2008; Yoon, Gursoy, & Chen, 2001) have pointed out that residents' attitudes and perceptions could be explained by the social exchange theory, which according to Ap (1992: 668) is "a general sociological theory concerned with understanding the exchange of resources between individuals and groups in an interaction situation". Accordingly, residents who perceive this exchange to bring benefits to them are more likely to be more supportive of tourism development and vice versa (Long & Kayat, 2008).

Due to the mixed results, no consistent relationship has been found between socio-demographic characteristics and residents' attitudes regarding tourism (McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Long & Kayat, 2011; Sirakaya et al., 2002). This could be explained by the fact that the residents of different destinations have different characteristics and that tourism impacts (positive or negative) are generated considering site-specific conditions under which residents and tourists interact (Long & Kayat, 2011; Kuvan & Akan, 2005). This indicates that the residents' attitudes should be researched in different destinations, given that each destination is a unique combination of people, natural and cultural resources, traditions and way of living.

Perceptions about tourism, its impacts and development have been investigated for a long time; however, only a small number of studies have investigated the relationship between residents' attitudes and their support for tourism development (Andereck & Vogt, 2000). Perdue, Long, and Allen (1990) have confirmed a positive relationship between positive perceptions, personal benefit from tourism, and support for attracting more tourists in a rural destination. Similarly, in their model, McGehee and Andereck (2004) confirmed a significant positive relationship between personal benefit, positive tourism impacts and support for tourism development, as well as a significant negative relationship between the perception of negative impacts and support for tourism development. In their study, Andereck and Vogt (2000) found that none of the negative tourism impacts result in lack of support for tourism development. They also revealed that positive attitudes are not necessarily strongly related to the support of additional tourism product development, just as negative attitudes may not decrease support for tourism development.

Tourism development depends heavily on a destination's stakeholders and, therefore, it is of great importance to gain knowledge on their attitudes and perceptions regarding tourism, given that development relies on their participation and support (Androtis, 2005; Long & Kayat, 2011). Due to the fact that stakeholders have different attitudes and interests, in order to gain their support, their attitudes need to be examined separately. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to get an insight into the attitudes and perceptions of different stakeholders.

3. Method

3.1. Study site, data collection and data analysis

The County of Istria was chosen as the research area because it hosts the highest number of tourists in Croatia. In 2018, Istria registered 4.3 million arrivals and 26.2 million overnights that account for 29.2% of the total overnights in the Republic of Croatia. Moreover, these numbers continue to grow from year to year; for example, there were 5.6% more arrivals and 3.0% more overnights in this county in 2018 than in the previous year.

In order to gain insight into residents' attitudes on tourism and its impacts, an on-site survey approach was used to collect data from Istrians. Data were collected in the period from the November 2017 to January 2019.

The questionnaire included questions regarding different tourism impacts, as well as the level of support for tourism development, which respondents rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). These questionnaire items were adopted from several previous studies (Meimand, Khalifah, Zavadskas, Mardani, Najafipour, & Ahmad, 2017; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Pappas, 2008; Yoon et al., 2001).

The last part of the questionnaire included socio-demographic items (age, gender, educational level, employment, average income, place and length of residence).

SPSS for Windows 25.0 was used for data analysis (a sample of 865 respondents). Data analysis includes descriptive statistics, reliability test, ANOVA and regression analyses.

3.2. Sample profile

Istria has 206,344 inhabitants (4.65% of the population of Croatia), with the majority of the population (70%) living in cities (Croatian Bureau of Statistics, Census 2001). In total a sample of 865 respondents, who are Istrian residents, properly filled the questionnaires and were included in further analysis. Because the main purpose of this paper is to find out whether there are any differences in the attitudes toward, and perceptions of, tourism between residents working in tourism, residents working in other industries, and others (students, unemployed persons and retirees), the sample was divided into three groups, accordingly.

The first group of respondents, accounting for 22.4% of the sample, were those working in tourism (directly or indirectly). The second group comprised respondents working in other industries (34.9% of the sample) and the third group included students, unemployed persons and retirees (42.6% of the sample).

Among the respondents working in tourism there were more males (47.4%) and the majority of respondents hold high school or faculty degrees (89.6%). Average income of up to 760 EUR was reported by 55.2% of the sample. Almost 80% of the respondents employed in tourism live in the coastal parts of Istria and, on average, are 36.8 years old (Table 1).

Table 1
Respondents' profile

Status	**Employed in tourism (n=194)**		**Employed in other industries (n=302)**		**Others* (n=369)**		**F sig.**
Variable	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	
Gender							F=5.407 0.005
• Female	102	47.4	160	53.0	149	40.4	
• Male	92	52.6	142	47.0	220	59.6	
Education							F=42.241 0.000
• Elementary school	3	1.6	1	0.3	24	6.5	
• High school	106	54.9	161	53.3	268	73.0	
• Faculty	67	34.7	119	39.4	73	19.9	
• Master/PhD	17	8.8	21	7.0	2	0.5	
Average monthly income							F=4.437 0.012
• Up to 760 EUR	107	55.2	143	47.4	222	60.5	
• 761 – 1,140 EUR	42	21.6	90	29.8	81	21.8	
• More than 1,141 EUR	45	23.2	69	22.8	66	17.7	
Place of residence							F=7.643 0.001
• Coastal part of Istria	155	79.9	218	72.2	238	64.5	
• Other parts of Istria	39	20.1	84	27.8	131	35.5	

Table 1 **Continued**

Status	Employed in tourism (n=194)		Employed in other industries (n=302)		Others* (n=369)		F sig.
Variable	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	**Frequency**	**%**	
Age - mean	36.8		40.4		32.3		F=24.859 0.000
Length of residence - mean	31.1		35.1		28.1		F=20.058 0.000

Note: *students, unemployed persons and retirees.

Regarding respondents employed in other industries, 53% are female and 47%, male; 73% hold a high school degree; and 47.4% have an average monthly income of up to 760 EUR (Table 1). Fully 72.2% of them live in the coastal part of Istria, and the average length of residence of 35.1 years. On average, they are 40.4 years old.

As seen in Table 1, there are more males (59.6%) than females (40.4%) in the third group of respondents. Because there are many students in this group, the majority of respondents have finished high school (73%), have an average monthly income of up to 760 EUR (60.5%) and are 32.3 years old on average.

ANOVA was conducted to verify whether significant differences exist between the three groups with regard to socio-demographic profile. The results reveal that gender, education level, monthly income, place of residence, age and length of residence differed significantly across the three groups.

4. Findings

At the beginning of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement, using a 5-point Likert-type scale, with statements regarding the economic, socio-cultural and environment impacts that tourism is generating in their community as well as regarding overall tourism impacts and support for tourism development. Reliability tests for those five groups of statements revealed that they all are reliable, given that all alpha coefficients are above 0.7, which is considered acceptable by Nunnally & Bernstein (1994). Cronbach's λ is 0.826 for the economic scale, 0.802 for the socio-cultural scale, 0.797 for the environmental scale, 0.709 for the overall tourism impact scale and 0.84 for the support scale.

Table 2
Tourism impacts – respondents' perceptions

	Employed in tourism		Employed in other industries/ sectors		Others		F sig.
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**	
ECONOMIC IMPACTS - TOTAL	**4.23**	**0.599**	**3.95**	**0.679**	**4.02**	**0.673**	**F=10.312 0.000**
• Tourism has improved employment opportunities in my community.	4.39	0.808	4.15	0.946	4.18	0.916	
• Tourism has attracted more investment to my community	4.34	0.748	4.11	0.916	4.13	0.948	
• Tourism has enhanced tourist expenditure.	4.40	0.756	4.16	0.885	4.26	0.854	
• Our standard of living has increased considerably because of tourism.	3.88	1.024	3.54	1.061	3.63	1.011	
• Tourism provides economic benefits for local population.	4.10	0.845	3.85	0.955	3.97	0.929	
• Tourism provides economic benefits for local businesses.	4.26	0.747	3.96	0.846	3.97	0.901	

Table 2 **Continued**

	Employed in tourism		Employed in other industries/ sectors		Others		F sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS – TOTAL	**4.00**	**0.608**	**3.74**	**0.730**	**3.80**	**0.703**	**F=8.745 0.000**
• Owing to tourism development, local people now have more diverse facilities and opportunities.	3.92	0.916	3.75	0.953	3.86	0.978	
• Tourism is encouraging locals to engage in various cultural activities.	3.77	0.944	3.46	1.039	3.55	1.010	
• Tourism promotes understanding, tolerance, knowledge and exchange of cultures.	3.99	0.869	3.65	1.038	3.71	1.001	
• Meeting tourists from different countries presents a valuable experience.	4.40	0.828	4.14	0.961	4.15	0.936	
• Tourism has a positive impact on the cultural identity of our community.	3.95	0.935	3.70	1.097	3.79	0.977	
• Tourism enhances the preservation of cultural heritage.	4.01	0.910	3.76	1.046	3.79	1.022	
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS - TOTAL	**3.52**	**0.876**	**3.57**	**0.869**	**3.71**	**0.821**	**F=3.642 0.027**
• Tourism is the reason for the uncomfortably overcrowded public places in our destination.	3.54	1.170	3.65	1.073	3.76	1.087	
• The construction of hotels and other tourist facilities is destroying the natural environment.	3.36	1.078	3.40	1.168	3.49	1.061	
• Tourism causes crowds and noise.	3.74	1.080	3.80	1.095	3.95	1.020	
• Tourism is the cause of environmental pollution.	3.46	1.073	3.46	1.092	3.63	1.024	
OVERALL TOURISM IMPACTS	**4.16**	**0.685**	**3.89**	**0.802**	**4.00**	**0.794**	**F=7.008 0.001**
• Generally, the overall impact of tourism on our community is positive.	4.22	0.758	4.00	0.833	4.09	0.865	
• The benefits that tourism generates for the local population are greater than the costs.	4.11	0.872	3.79	0.970	3.92	0.928	

In general, the results presented in Table 2 suggest that respondents on average perceive economic and socio-cultural impacts to be more positive, while environmental impacts are perceived to be negative. However, ANOVA results confirmed statistically significant differences between the three groups of respondents with regard to their perceptions of all tourism impacts (economic, socio-cultural, environmental and total impact). Moreover, results indicate that there is a significant difference in the perceptions of economic and socio-cultural impacts between respondents who are employed in tourism and those employed in other industries and others (students, unemployed persons and retirees), while no significant difference was found between those who are employed in other industries and others. Respondents working in tourism perceive the economic and socio-cultural impacts to be more positive than do the other two groups of respondents. Concerning perceptions of environmental impacts, statistically significant differences were found only for respondents employed in tourism and others (students, unemployed persons and retirees).

All groups of respondents perceive overall impacts to be positive; however, those perceptions turned out to be significantly different for all groups, except for those employed in other industries, and students, unemployed persons and retirees. Among the three groups, respondents employed in tourism agreed the most that overall tourism impacts are positive (m=4.16).

All respondents are highly supportive of further tourism development given that on the 5-point Likert scale their overall mean scores are above 4.1. A statistically significant difference was found only for the respondents employed in tourism and others, where those working in tourism tend to be more supportive than students, unemployed persons and retirees (Table 3). In this regard, respondents working in tourism showed the highest level of support for further tourism development.

Table 3
Support for tourism development

Support	Employed in tourism		Employed in other industries/sectors		Others		F sig.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	F=5.155
	4.32	**0.669**	**4.18**	**0.696**	**4.12**	**0.693**	**0.006**
• I support the development of nature-based tourism	4.33	0.848	4.21	0.929	4.20	0.951	
• I support the development of attractions for a large number of visitors	4.11	0.973	3.90	1.156	3.82	1.079	
• I support the development of cultural and / or historical attractions	4.39	0.828	4.29	0.887	4.21	0.875	
• I support the development of various events and programmes	4.46	0.783	4.43	0.778	4.28	0.798	
• I support the development of additional facilities (i.e. new accommodation facilities, restaurants, entertainment and sports facilities)	4.31	0.880	4.08	0.938	4.11	0.905	

One of the aims of this study was to find out what factors affect this support for future tourism development and, moreover, whether those factors differ among the three groups of respondents. For that purpose, using perceptions of tourism impacts as independent variables and support for tourism development as a dependent variable, three separate regression analyses were conducted on the three groups of respondents: working in tourism, working in other industries, and others. Regression analyses results are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4
Tourism impacts and support for tourism development – regression analyses results

Variables	Coefficients B	Std. error	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
				Tolerance	VIF
Model 1 - Employed in tourism					
• Constant	1.965	0.382	0.000		
• Economic impacts	0.137	0.088	0.120	0.673	1.486
• Socio-cultural impacts	0.345	0.084	0.000	0.709	1.410
• Environmental impacts	-0.060	0.050	0.227	0.969	1.032
• Overall impacts	0.145	0.073	0.050	0.735	1.361
$R^2 = 0.227$; $F(4, 187) = 13.727$; $p < 0.000$					
Model 2 - Employed in other industries					
• Constant	2.342	0.283	0.000		
• Economic impacts	0.109	0.063	0.086	0.696	1.437
• Socio-cultural impacts	0.209	0.058	0.000	0.709	1.410
• Environmental impacts	-0.052	0.042	0.216	0.951	1.051
• Overall impacts	0.209	0.054	0.000	0.679	1.473
$R^2 = 0.218$; $F(4, 296) = 20.644$; $p < 0.000$					
Model 3 - Others (students, unemployed persons, retirees)					
• Constant	1.937	0.276	0.000		
• Economic impacts	0.129	0.056	0.021	0.735	1.360
• Socio-cultural impacts	0.248	0.054	0.000	0.723	1.383
• Environmental impacts	-0.001	0.041	0.988	0.910	1.099
• Overall impacts	0.181	0.049	0.000	0.676	1.480
$R^2 = 0.218$; $F(4, 364) = 25.333$; $p < 0.000$					

Note: Dependent variable: Support for tourism development; VIF - variance inflation factors.

The first regression model refers to respondents who are employed in tourism; the second, to those working in other industries; and the third, to students, unemployed persons and retirees. Regression analyses results indicate that in all cases the perceived positive socio-cultural impacts and overall tourism impacts are significant predictors of residents' support for future tourism development while environmental impacts have no significant effect on support (Table 4). These results are in line with those obtained by McGehee and Andereck (2004) and Long and Kayat (2011) who found that residents who perceive more positive socio-cultural impacts tend to be more supportive of tourism development than others. Additionally, results obtained by Kashif, Faizan, Neethiahnanthan, and Vikneswaranall (2019) confirmed that in their case of all types of tourism impacts (economic, socio-cultural and environmental) have a significant impact on support for tourism development.

The first model involving the support of residents who are working in tourism explains 22.7% of their support for future tourism development ($R^2 = 0.227$; $F (4, 187) = 13.727$; $p < 0.000$). In this case, only perceptions of socio-cultural and overall impacts have been proved to be a statistically significant predictor of support for tourism development. According to the results, residents employed in tourism, who perceive socio-cultural and overall tourism impacts to be more positive, reported higher support for tourism development in Istria than those who perceive the same elements to be less positive. An interesting finding, particularly in the context of residents employed in tourism, was the fact that the perception of economic tourism impacts has no impact on their support for tourism development, just like their perception of environmental impacts. These results indicate that the respondents do not support tourism development only because of economic benefits, a finding consistent with those of Long and Kayat (2011). On the contrary, Jurowski, Uysal, and Williams (1997) found that those residents who do not perceive any direct economic benefit from tourism tend to be neutral with regard to support for tourism development, while Ap (1992) and Andereck and Nyaupane (2011) found that even when residents do not perceive direct economic benefit, they recognise the social benefits gained from tourism and therefore support its development.

The model referring to residents employed in other industries explains 21.8% of their support for tourism ($R^2 = 0.218$; $F (4, 296) = 20.644$; $p < 0.000$). In this case as well, the perceptions of respondents, employed in other industries, regarding socio-cultural and overall tourism impacts are predictors of support, while the perceptions of economic and environmental impacts have proved not to be a significant predictor of their support.

The third model explains 21.8% of the support of students, unemployed persons and retirees for future tourism development ($R^2 = 0.218$; $F (4, 364) = 25.333$; $p < 0.000$). Perceptions of economic, socio-cultural and overall tourism impacts proved to be significant predictors of their support. Results indicate that respondents who perceive the mentioned impacts to be more positive are more supportive in comparison with those who perceive them as less positive. In this case as well, the environmental impacts of tourism turned out not to be significant with regard to support for tourism development (Table 4).

Although the economic impacts of tourism are usually the most important for destination stakeholders, in this study Istrians placed more importance on socio-cultural impacts, given that they are found to be significant predictors of their support for future tourism development.

The differences between groups of stakeholders with regard to their perceptions of tourism impacts needs to be addressed by decisions makers and destination managers in order to gain stakeholders' support. In this regard it is necessary to share both the potential positive as well as negative tourism

impacts with all stakeholders in order for them to gain a clear picture of what to expect of the selected tourism development scenario.

5. Conclusion

The outcomes of this research reveal that the residents of Istria (Croatia) understand the extent of the economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts of tourism. The results show that there are statistically significant differences in the perception of all three groups of impacts as well as overall tourism impacts between the three different groups of stakeholders. Additionally, it was found that respondents employed in tourism and those employed in other industries share the same level of support for future tourism development, while respondents in the group of "others" have a significantly different attitude in comparison with those working in tourism. The strongest support for future development is expressed by respondents working in tourism, while students and unemployed and retired residents tend to be less supportive. Nevertheless, the results also suggest that, in general, respondents perceive economic and socio-cultural impacts to be positive, while environmental impacts are perceived to be negative.

It can be concluded that local residents are generally supportive when it comes to future tourism development in Istria, but the level of support differs among different groups of residents and is influenced by the residents' perceptions of certain tourism impacts. Thus, the residents who perceive socio-cultural and overall tourism impacts to be more positive tend to give stronger support for future development, no matter their status of being employed in tourism or not. In addition, although residents have shown some concerns about the environmental impacts of tourism, such concerns do not influence their support for further tourism development.

In terms of practical implication, this research represented an information basis for assisting Istrian tourism planners and managers to understand the residents' perceptions and what factors influence their support for tourism by using a useful research model. The results support the necessity of raising the awareness of all destination stakeholders about the long-term accruing benefits to them personally as a consequence of tourism development, to ensure their support for tourism and to promote sustainable tourism development. Therefore, the insights into differences in residents' attitudes and their perceptions are of great value to local destination management and can be used as a basis for future tourism planning.

Although the results of this study are in line with those of previous studies, the study's main limitation is that it is restricted to the County of Istria, a fact that should be taken into account when discussing findings. Additionally, given that the residents' attitudes tend to vary over time due to the dynamic process of tourism development, this kind of research should be conducted on a regular basis (i.e. every four years or even more often, depending on the destination and the phase of its life cycle). The residents' perceptions and their level of support should be periodically assessed to give decision makers essential input on the opinions of a destination's stakeholders and their point of view concerning future tourism development (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; Pappas, 2008). No matter what kind of methodology is used, when it comes to deciding what direction to take, the most important thing is to take into account the attitudes of different stakeholders towards future tourism development.

Finally, given the fact that various destinations and communities face different tourism impacts, or the same impacts but in different degrees, it is evident that studies, such as this one, need to be conducted in different tourism settings for comparison of results, not only over time but also within similar destinations/sites. Therefore, this research instrument could be expanded and tested in different tourism

destinations using larger samples, more variables and new models in order to gain more detailed insight into residents' perspectives. In that context and given the fact that residents' perceptions and their tourism support depend on various factors, further research and models should include variables such as residents' perceived well-bring, their satisfaction with destination tourism offering as well as destination's stage of development.

References

Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options. *Journal of Travel Research*, *39,* 27-36.

Andereck. K. L., & Nyaupane. G. P. (2011). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, *50*(3), 248–260. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0047287510362918.

Andriotis, K., & Vaughan D. R. (2003). Urban Residents' Attitudes towards Tourism Development: The Case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*(2), 172 – 185.

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.

Ap, J. (1990). Residents' Perception Research on the Social Impacts of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 610-615.

Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 19*(4), 665-690. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(92)90060-3.

Croatian Bureau of Statistics. (2001). *Census 2001.* Retrieved July 27 2019, from https://www.dzs.hr/Eng/censuses/census2011/censuslogo.htm.

Deccio, C., & Baloglu, S. (2002). Nonhost Community Resident Reactions to the 2002 Winter Olympics: The Spillover Impacts. *Journal of Travel Research, 41,* 46-56.

Dev, J. (2018). Residents' perception of tourism impacts in Kilimanjaro: An integration of the Social Exchange Theory. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 66(2), 148 – 160.

Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident Attitudes: A Structural Modeling Approach. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*, 79-105.

Iroegbu, H., & Chen J. S. (2001). Urban Residents' Reaction toward Tourism Development: Do Subgroups Exist? *Tourism Analysis, 6*(2), 155-61.

Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 34*(2), 3-11.

Kashif, H., Faizan, A., Pradeep, K. N., Neethiahnanthan, A. R., & Vikneswaran, N. (2019). Perceived impacts and residents' support for tourism development in Port Dickson, Malaysia. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 67*(4), 351 – 364.

Kuvan, Y., & Akan, P. (2005). Residents' Attitudes toward General and Forest-related Impact of Tourism: the Case of Belek, Antalya. *Tourism Management, 26*(5), 691-706.

Látková, P., & Vogt, C. A. (2012). Residents' attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities. *Journal of Travel Research*, *51*(1), 50-67. DOI: http:// dx.doi.org/10.1177/0047287510394193.

Lee. T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management*, *34*, 37-46.

Long, P. H., & Kayat, K. (2011). Residents' perceptions of tourism impact and their support for tourism development: the case study of Cuc Phuong National Park, Ninh Binh province, Vietnam. *European Journal of Tourism Research, 4*(2), 123-146.

McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, *43*, 131-140. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268234.

Meimand, S. E., Khalifah, Z., Zavadskas, E. K., Mardani, A., Najafipour, A. A., & Ahmad, U. N. U. (2017). Residents' Attitude toward Tourism Development: A Sociocultural Perspective, *Sustainability, 9*(7), 1170. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/su9071170.

Nejati, M., Mohamed, B., & Omar, S. I. (2014). Locals' perceptions towards the impacts of tourism and the importance of local engagement: A comparative study of two islands in Malaysia. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, *62*(2), 135 – 146.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein. I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pappas, N. V. (2008). City of Rhodes: Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Impacts and Development. *Anatolia, 19*(1), 51-70. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2008.9687053.

Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Rural Resident Tourism Perceptions and Attitudes by Community Level of Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, *28*(3), 3-9.

Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Jaafar, M., Kock, N., & Ramayah. T. (2015). A revised framework of social exchange theory to investigate the factors influencing residents' perceptions. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 16,* 335–345. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.10.001.

Ritchie, B. W. & Inkari, M. (2006). Host community attitudes toward tourism and cultural Tourism Development: The Case of the Lewes District, Southern England. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 8*(1), 27-44. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.545.

Sirakaya, E., Teye, V., & Sönmez, S. (2002). Understanding Residents' Support for Tourism Development in the Central Region of Ghana. *Journal of Travel Research*, *41,* 57-67.

Wang, Y., & Pfister, R. E. (2008). Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Perceived Personal Benefits in a Rural Community. *Journal of Travel Research, 47*(1), 84-93.

Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (2001). Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation Modelling. *Tourism Management*, *22,* 363-372. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00062-5.

Zhu, H., Liu, J., Wei, Z., Li, W., & Wang, L. (2017). Residents' Attitudes towards Sustainable Tourism Development in a Historical-Cultural Village: Influence of Perceived Impacts, Sense of Place and Tourism Development Potential. *Sustainability, 9*(61), 1-15.

Received: 09/09/2019
Accepted: 02/04/2020