

Michael CHAMBWE*

RAZLIČITA ISKUSTVA ZAJEDNICA U BLIZINI ZAŠTIĆENOG PODRUČJA: KOMPARATIVNA SOCIOEKONOMSKA ANALIZA

DIVERGENT COMMUNITY EXPERIENCES OF TOURISM NEAR A PROTECTED AREA: A COMPARATIVE SOCIO-ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

SAŽETAK: U ovoj se studiji uspoređuju utjecaji turizma i sudjelovanja u turizmu na susjedne zajednice koje okružuju isti prirodni rezervat. Istraživanje kućanstava provedeno je u tri zajednice koje okružuju park uKhahlamba Drakensberg, UNESCO-ov lokalitet svjetske baštine u Južnoj Africi. Istraživanjem kućanstava (n=326) procjenjuju se percipirani socioekonomski utjecaji, prepreke sudjelovanju i uključenost u turizam. Rezultati otkrivaju značajne razlike: Bonjaneni bilježi veće pozitivne ekonomske utjecaje, ali i veće negativne učinke, dok se Engodini suočava s najvećim preprekama sudjelovanju. Općenito, uključenost zajednice u turizam ostaje niska, uz strukturne prepreke poput ograničenog pristupa kapitalu, vještinama i tržištima koja ometaju pravedne koristi. Temeljeći se na teoriji dionika, u studiji se naglašava potreba za kontekstualno specifične politike koje se bave tim nejednakostima i potiču inkluzivni razvoj turizma. Ova studija doprinosi literaturi propitivanjem stavova o ujednačenim utjecajima turizma na susjedne zajednice i zalaganjem za pravedne i prilagođene intervencije.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: socioekonomski utjecaji, sudjelovanje zajednice, razvoj turizma, zaštićena područja, park uKhahlamba Drakensberg

ABSTRACT: This study compares the impacts of tourism and participation in tourism on neighbouring communities surrounding the same nature reserve. A community household survey was undertaken in three communities surrounding the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park, a UNESCO World Heritage Site in South Africa. The survey (n=326) assesses the perceived socio-economic impacts, barriers to participation, and involvement in tourism. The findings reveal significant disparities: Bonjaneni reports higher positive economic impacts but also greater negative effects, while Engodini faces the most barriers to participation. Overall, community involvement in tourism remains low, with structural obstacles such as limited access to capital, skills, and markets hindering equitable benefits. Grounded in the stakeholder theory, the study underscores the need for context-specific policies that address these inequalities and foster inclusive tourism development. This study contributes to the literature by challenging the notion of uniform impacts of tourism on neighbouring communities and advocates for equitable, tailored interventions.

KEY WORDS: socioeconomic impacts, community participation, tourism development, protected areas, uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park

* Michael Chambwe, PhD, Post-Doctoral Researcher, North-West University, Mahikeng, South Africa, e-mail: michael.chambwe@nwu.ac.za, ORCID: 0000-0002-1170-2089

1. UVOD

Turizam je odavno prepoznat kao snažni pokretač gospodarskog rasta i razvoja, nudeći obećanja prosperiteta i poboljšanih uvjeta života za zajednice diljem svijeta (Kelfaoui *et al.*, 2021; Wijijayanti *et al.*, 2020). Međutim, odnos između turizma i lokalnih zajednica složen je i višestruk, često dajući rezultate koji odstupaju od idealiziranih narativa napretka i prosperiteta (Njoya i Seetaram, 2018; Mowforth i Munt, 2016). Iako su brojne studije istraživale utjecaje turizma na zajednice (Budhiasa *et al.*, 2017; Chiutsi i Saarinen, 2017; Latip *et al.*, 2018; Mogomotsi *et al.*, 2018; Rasoolimanesh *et al.*, 2017; Steele i Scherrer, 2018; Swapan, 2016; Towner, 2016), i dalje postoji značajan jaz u razumijevanju razloga zbog kojih susjedne zajednice u blizini iste turističke destinacije različito doživljavaju i percipiraju te utjecaje.

Cilj istraživanja bio je provesti komparativnu analizu socioekonomskih učinaka turizma na ruralne zajednice koje okružuju jedan nacionalni park na temelju kvantitativnog istraživanja kućanstava. Uspoređujući percipirane socioekonomske utjecaje turizma, razine sudjelovanja u turističkim aktivnostima i prepreke sudjelovanju u tim zajednicama, ovo istraživanje osvjetljava nijansiranu i kontekstualno specifičnu prirodu interakcija između turizma i zajednice. Također se unaprjeđuje znanje empirijskim dokazivanjem da susjedne zajednice neravnomjerno doživljavaju utjecaje turizma unatoč blizini istog zaštićenog područja, što dovodi u pitanje homogenizirane pretpostavke u literaturi o razvoju turizma i zagovara prostorno nijansirane politike koje uključuju sve dionike.

Istraživanje je provedeno u zajednicama koje okružuju park uKhahlamba Drakensberg (UDP) (ranije Nacionalni park Natal), u pokrajini KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) u Južnoj Africi. Velik dio ruralnog zemljišta koje okružuje UDP u vlasništvu je kralja Zulu

1. INTRODUCTION

Tourism has long been recognised as a potent force for economic growth and development, offering promises of prosperity and enhanced livelihoods for communities worldwide (Kelfaoui *et al.*, 2021; Wijijayanti *et al.*, 2020). However, the relationship between tourism and local communities is complex and multifaceted, often yielding outcomes that diverge from the idealised narratives of progress and prosperity (Njoya and Seetaram, 2018; Mowforth and Munt, 2016). While numerous studies have explored the impacts of tourism on communities (Budhiasa *et al.*, 2017; Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017; Latip *et al.*, 2018; Mogomotsi *et al.*, 2018; Rasoolimanesh *et al.*, 2017; Steele and Scherrer, 2018; Swapan, 2016; Towner, 2016), there remains a notable gap in the understanding of how neighbouring communities close to the same tourism destination experience and perceive these impacts differently.

As such, this study aimed to conduct a comparative analysis of the socioeconomic effects of tourism on rural communities surrounding one national park using a quantitative household survey. By comparing the perceived socioeconomic impacts of tourism, levels of participation in tourism activities, and barriers to participation across these communities, this research sheds light on the nuanced and context-specific nature of tourism-community interactions. It also advances knowledge by empirically demonstrating that neighbouring communities experience tourism impacts unevenly despite their proximity to the same protected area, challenging homogenised assumptions in tourism development literature and advocating for spatially nuanced, stakeholder-inclusive policies.

The research takes place in the communities surrounding the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park (UDP) (formerly Natal National Park), in the KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) prov-

preko Zaklade Ingonyama koja je zadužena za očuvanje zemlje u ime Kraljevstva Zulu na „korist, materijalno blagostanje i društvenu dobrobit članova plemena i zajednica koje žive na zemlji“ (Ingonyama-Trust, 2019). Osnajivanje lokalnih zajednica putem vlasništva nad poduzećima u turističkom lancu usklađeno je s mandatom Zaklade. Unatoč tomu, te zajednice ostaju zarobljene u siromaštvu. Upravo u tom kontekstu, u ovoj se studiji nastoje razjasniti i predstaviti percepcije okolnih zajednica o turizmu u njihovoj blizini.

Turizam je glavna gospodarska aktivnost UDP-a i okolnih područja. Studija se usredotočuje na zajednice koje okružuju sjeverni dio UDP-a, koji nudi najviše mogućnosti smještaja u UDP-u. Glavni kampovi za odmor u blizini su Royal Natal, Cathedral Peak i Injisuthi. Fokus na ruralne zajednice oko UDP-a stavljen je zbog njegovog međunarodnog priznanja i statusa mjesta svjetske baštine. Međutim, treba napomenuti da, iako jedinstven, nije drugačiji od drugih ruralnih područja u Južnoj Africi te da je vjerojatnije da će se rezultati istraživanja moći primijeniti na druga područja u Južnoj Africi. S obzirom na blizinu tako poznatog mjesta, pripadnici zajednica koje okružuju UDP trebali bi biti u poziciji glavnih korisnika socio-ekonomskih dobiti koje donosi ovaj golemi turistički resurs.

2. TEORIJSKA PODLOGA I SOCIOEKONOMSKI UTJECAJI TURIZMA NA ZAJEDNICE

2.1. Teorijska pozadina

Teorijski temelj ove studije zasniva se na teoriji dionika. Ta teorija omogućuje menadžerima razumijevanje vanjskih složenosti kako bi mogli planirati i upravljati na sukladan način (Bonnafeous-Boucher i Pesqueux, 2005; Freeman *et al.*, 2010). To je možda najrelevantnija teorija jer stavlja u središte uključivanje i sudjelovanje zajednice. Do-

ince of South Africa. Much of the rural land surrounding the UDP is owned by the Zulu king through the Ingonyama Trust, whose mandate is to hold the land on behalf of the Zulu Kingdom for the “benefit, material welfare, and social well-being of the members of the tribes and communities living on the land” (Ingonyama-Trust, 2019). Empowering of the local communities through ownership of tourism value chain enterprises is aligned with the mandate of the Trust. Yet, these communities remain entrenched in poverty. Hence, this study seeks to understand and present their perception of tourism in their vicinity.

Tourism is a major economic activity of the UDP and its surrounding areas. The study focuses on the communities surrounding the northern section of the UDP, which offers the most accommodation possibilities. The main resting camps in the vicinity are Royal Natal, Cathedral Peak, and Injisuthi. Focus on the rural communities around the UDP has been because of its international acclaim and its World Heritage Site status. However, while unique, it is not dissimilar to other rural areas in South Africa and research results are more likely to be applicable to its other areas. With proximity to such a renowned site, members of the communities surrounding the UDP should stand to be the chief beneficiaries of the socio-economic gains that this immense tourism resource brings.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TOURISM ON COMMUNITIES

2.1. Theoretical Background

The theoretical footing of this study is grounded on the stakeholder theory. The stakeholder approach allows managers to understand external complexities so that they can plan and manage accordingly (Bonnafeous-Boucher and Pesqueux, 2005; Free-

nohoe *et al.* (2015) definiraju dionike kao skupine ili pojedince koji mogu utjecati na aktivnosti organizacije ili te aktivnosti imaju utjecaj na njih. Oni tvrde da je teorija dionika razrađena kako bi se pokušali razumjeti organizacijski izazovi i kako bi se pokazalo da menadžment organizacija ima puno više posla od samog upravljanja zaposlenicima, kupcima i zalihama te od ostvarivanja profita. Predlaže se promjena paradigme u poslovnom upravljanju gdje se vanjsko okruženje i zanemarene skupine uključuju u uspjeh organizacije (Perdue, 2004).

Pristup usmjeren na dionike temelji se na tri načela: (i) da bi organizacije bile uspješne, potrebna je osjetljivost na širok raspon potreba skupina (dionika) oko njih; (ii) menadžment bi trebao imati jednake i pravedne obveze prema svim dionicima; i (iii) donošenje odluka usmjereno je na razumijevanje osjetljivosti prema različitim dionicima (Perdue, 2004; Donohoe *et al.*, 2015). Teorija daje prednost pravednom uvažavanju svih interesa i istovremeno stavlja predstavničku moć dionika u središte doktrine (Bonnafo-us-Boucher i Pesqueux, 2005).

Perdue (2004: 253) tvrdi da je teorija dionika bila ključna u prepoznavanju problema i poteškoća u identificiranju turističkih dionika, njihovih složenih odnosa i moguće dinamike moći. Teorija je bila temeljna ne samo za informiranje menadžera o vrijednostima, stavovima i ponašanju turističkih dionika, već i u pružanju boljeg uvida u njihove percepcije, potrebe, motivacije i sposobnost utjecaja na turističko poduzeće (Donohoe *et al.*, 2015). Nadalje, teorija dionika također je inspirirala bolje i inovativnije strategije rješavanja sukoba u ekološki i kulturno osjetljivim područjima demistificiranjem dinamike moći dionika i poboljšanjem dugoročnog planiranja i održivog razvoja turizma (Donohoe *et al.*, 2015; Perdue, 2004).

Teorija dionika vrlo je prikladna za ovu studiju jer naglašava važnost prepoznavanja i rješavanja različitih potreba, percepcija i utjecaja na različite skupine zajednice koje

man *et al.*, 2010). It is perhaps the most relevant theory that places community involvement and participation at its core. Donohoe *et al.* (2015) identify stakeholders as groups or individuals who can affect or are affected by the activities of an organisation. They argue that the stakeholder theory was developed to try and understand organisational challenges and to show that management of organisations had a lot more to do than just managing employees, customers, and supplies and making a profit. A paradigm shift is proposed in business management where the external environment and overlooked groups are incorporated for the success of the organisation (Perdue, 2004).

The stakeholder approach is premised on three principles: (i) for organisations to be successful there is need for sensitivity to the wide array of needs of the groups (stakeholders) around them; (ii) management should have an equal and fair obligation to all stakeholders; and (iii) decision making is centred on understanding sensitivity to the various stakeholders (Perdue, 2004; Donohoe *et al.*, 2015). The theory champions the importance of fair attention to all interests while placing the representative power of the stakeholders at the centre (Bonnafo-us-Boucher and Pesqueux, 2005).

Perdue (2004: 253) contends that the stakeholder theory has been instrumental in recognising issues and problems therein in identifying tourism stakeholders their complex relations and possible power dynamics. The theory has been fundamental in informing managers on the values, attitudes and behaviours of tourism stakeholders in giving greater insight into their perceptions, needs, motivations, and ability to influence tourism enterprise (Donohoe *et al.*, 2015). Further, it has inspired better and innovative conflict resolution strategies to ecologically and culturally sensitive areas by demystifying the stakeholders' power dynamics and improving long-term planning and sustainable tourism development (Donohoe *et al.*, 2015; Perdue, 2004).

okružuju park uKhahlamba Drakensberg. Prema ovoj teoriji, upravitelji parkova i kreatori politika moraju priznati spomenuta različita iskustva kako bi osigurali pravedan i održiv razvoj turizma. Primjenom teorije dionika studija ističe se potreba za uključivim politikama koje se bave strukturnim preprekama (npr. nedostatkom kapitala, vještina i pristupa tržištu) i osnažuju marginalizirane skupine u cilju poticanja pravednijeg razvoja turizma. U konačnici, teorija dionika pruža perspektivu za kritiku trenutnih isključujućih praksi i zagovara participativne, kontekstualne strategije koje usklađuju rast turizma s dobrobiti zajednice.

2.2. Socioekonomski utjecaji turizma na zajednice

Turizam se često smatra ključnim pokretačem socioekonomskog razvoja, posebno u regijama bogatim prirodnim i kulturnim resursima (Hughes i Scheyvens, 2020; Khan *et al.*, 2020; Vidickienė *et al.*, 2020). Poznata po svojim prekrasnim krajolicima i raznolikom divljem svijetu, Južnoafrička Republika iskoristila je svoje nacionalne parkove kao značajne turističke atrakcije (Giddy i Rogerson, 2023). Ovi nacionalni parkovi nude razne ekonomske, društvene i ekološke koristi zajednicama i narodima (Saayman i Saayman, 2010; Rogerson i Rogerson, 2014). Unatoč tomu, Chambwe i Saayman (2024) tvrde da je interakcija između turizma i lokalnih zajednica koje okružuju te parkove višestruko pitanje s pozitivnim i negativnim posljedicama.

Na ekonomskom planu, različita istraživanja istaknula su generiranje prihoda za lokalna poduzeća i stvaranje mogućnosti zapošljavanja kao neke od glavnih koristi turizma za zajednice koje okružuju zaštićena područja (Dlomo, 2021; Dube, 2020). Na primjer, Fezeke i Stelle (2020) otkrili su da turizam u Nacionalnom parku Addo, u pokrajini Istočni rt u Južnoj Africi, generira značajna izravna i neizravna radna mjesta. Radna mje-

The stakeholder theory is highly relevant to this study as it underscores the importance of recognising and addressing the diverse needs, perceptions, and impacts on different community groups surrounding the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park. According to this theory, park managers and policy-makers must acknowledge these divergent experiences to ensure equitable and sustainable tourism development. By applying this framework, the study emphasises the need for inclusive policies that address structural barriers (e.g., lack of capital, skills, and market access) and empower marginalised groups, thereby fostering fairer tourism development. Ultimately, the stakeholder theory provides a lens to critique the current exclusionary practices and advocate for participatory, context-sensitive strategies that align tourism growth with community well-being.

2.2. The Socioeconomic Impacts of Tourism on Communities

Tourism is often hailed as a key driver of socioeconomic development, particularly in the regions rich in natural and cultural resources (Hughes and Scheyvens, 2020; Khan *et al.*, 2020; Vidickienė *et al.*, 2020). South Africa, known for its stunning landscapes and diverse wildlife, has leveraged its national parks as significant tourist attractions (Giddy and Rogerson, 2023). These national parks offer various economic, social and environmental benefits to communities and nations (Saayman and Saayman, 2010; Rogerson and Rogerson, 2014). Regardless, Chambwe and Saayman (2024) contend that the interaction between tourism and the local communities surrounding these parks is a multifaceted issue with positive and negative consequences.

On the economic front, various studies have highlighted revenue generation for local businesses and the creation of employment opportunities as some of the primary benefits of tourism for communities surrounding the

sta kreću se od ugostiteljstva i usluga vođenja do maloprodaje i prijevoza. Takav rast mogućnosti zapošljavanja, prema navodima autora Steele i Scherrer (2018), često dovodi do poboljšanja životnog standarda lokalnog stanovništva.

Međutim, ekonomske koristi od turizma nisu ravnomjerno raspoređene. Istraživanje Giampiccolija *et al.* (2020) i Kumaila *et al.* (2023) pokazuje da turizam, iako može donijeti značajne prihode, često više koristi većim poduzećima i vanjskim dionicima nego lokalnim zajednicama. Nadalje, Chi (2021) navodi da se nejednakost u prihodima u zemljama u razvoju povećava s povećanjem prihoda od turizma. Ova nejednakost može pogoršati postojeće nejednakosti (poput iskorištavanja rada) i rezultirati osjećajem obespravljenosti među lokalnim stanovništvom. Štoviše, sezonska priroda turizma često dovodi do ekonomske nestabilnosti, s razdobljima visoke aktivnosti nakon kojih slijede izvansezonska razdoblja s malo ili nimalo prihoda (Medina *et al.*, 2022; Martín *et al.*, 2020).

Na društvenom planu, turizam na nekoliko načina utječe na društveno tkivo zajednica. S pozitivne strane, može dovesti do boljeg održavanja cesta i javnih objekata, poboljšati kvalitetu života, poticati kulturnu razmjenu, povećati ponos zajednice i unaprijediti imidž zajednice (Deery *et al.*, 2012). Predstavljanjem svojih tradicija i baštine, kulturne prakse i obrti, koji bi inače možda nestali, mogu doživjeti ponovni procvat (Esfehani i Albrecht, 2019). Kao što je navedeno u studiji koju su proveli Grzelak-Kostulska *et al.* (2015), turističke aktivnosti u nacionalnim parkovima doprinijele su revitalizaciji kulturne baštine i povećanoj koheziji zajednice.

S druge strane, turizam također može poremetiti društveni život zajednica domaćina. Istraživanja su pokazala kako su problemi poput povećanog kriminala, vandalizma na imovini i lokalitetima, sukoba između lokalnog stanovništva i turista, kulturne komodifikacije, prenapučenosti i prometnih gužvi u

protected areas (Dlomo, 2021; Dube, 2020). For example, in a study by Fezeka and Stella (2020), it was revealed that tourism, in the Addo National Park, in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa, generates substantial direct and indirect employment. The jobs range from hospitality and guiding services to retail and transportation. This influx of employment opportunities often leads to improved standards of living for the locals (Steele and Scherrer, 2018).

However, the economic benefits of tourism are not evenly distributed. Research by Giampiccoli *et al.* (2020) and Kumail *et al.* (2023) shows that while tourism can bring significant revenue, it often benefits larger businesses and external stakeholders more than local communities. Further, a study by Chi (2021) revealed that income inequality in developing economies increases as tourism revenue increases. This disparity can exacerbate the existing inequalities (such as labour exploitation) and result in feelings of disenfranchisement among local populations. Moreover, the seasonal nature of tourism often leads to economic instability, with periods of high activity followed by off-seasons with little to no income (Medina *et al.*, 2022; Martín *et al.*, 2020).

On the social front, tourism impacts the communities' social fabric in several ways. On a positive note, it can lead to better maintenance of the roads and public facilities, improve the quality of life, foster cultural exchange, enhance the community pride and advance community image (Deery *et al.*, 2012). Through showcasing their traditions and heritage, cultural practices and crafts that might otherwise have diminished can witness a resurgence (Esfehani and Albrecht, 2019). As noted in a study by Grzelak-Kostulska *et al.* (2015), tourism activities in national parks have contributed to the revitalisation of cultural heritage and increased community cohesion.

On the contrary, tourism can also disrupt the social lives of host communities.

prvom planu društvenih problema uzrokovanih turizmom (Wang *et al.*, 2020; Abukari i Mwalyosi, 2020). Nadalje, priljev turista i komercijalizacija kulturnih dobara mogu generirati kulturnu komodifikaciju i mijenjati tradicije i običaje kako bi se zadovoljila turistička očekivanja (Chi, 2021). Zabilježeni su i problemi poput povećanih troškova života i društvene dislokacije pa je prisutnost turista povezana s rastućim cijenama nekretnina, što lokalnom stanovništvu otežava priuštivost stanovanja (Tkalec i Vizek, 2016).

Sudjelovanje zajednica koje okružuju nacionalne parkove u turizmu već dugo se smatra čudotvornim lijekom za neke od problema turizma s kojima se suočavaju te zajednice (Budhiasa *et al.*, 2017; Chiutsi i Saarinen, 2017; Mogomotsi *et al.*, 2018; Warouw *et al.*, 2018). Kako bi ublažile negativne utjecaje i osigurale da zajednice imaju koristi od zaštićenih područja, uprave parkova diljem Afrike u posljednja su dva desetljeća nastojale surađivati s lokalnim zajednicama u programima zajedničkog upravljanja (Abukari i Mwalyosi, 2020). Zimbabveanski program upravljanja komunalnim područjima za autohtone resurse (CAMPFIRE) (Shereni i Chambwe, 2024), Zambijski način administrativnog upravljanja za područja upravljanja divljači (ADMADE) (Bwalya Umar i Kapembwa, 2020) i Namibijski program očuvanja komunalnih područja (CCP) (Ogbaharya, 2006) značajni su primjeri. Međutim, u Južnoj Africi postoji privid sličnih inicijativa za sudjelovanje zajednice oko parkova i nedostatak dobro koordiniranog programa na različitim razinama vlasti (nacionalnoj, pokrajinskoj, okružnoj i lokalnoj) kao u drugim susjednim zemljama (Chambwe i Saayman, 2024).

Research has shown how issues such as increased crime, vandalism of property and sites, conflicts between locals and tourists, cultural commodification, overcrowding, and traffic congestion are at the forefront of the social ills caused by tourism (Wang *et al.*, 2020; Abukari and Mwalyosi, 2020). Further, the influx of tourists and commercialising cultural assets can generate cultural commodification and alter traditions and practices to meet tourist expectations (Chi, 2021). Issues such as increased cost of living and social dislocation have also been reported. For instance, the presence of tourists has been linked to rising property prices, making it difficult for locals to afford housing (Tkalec and Vizek, 2016).

Participation in tourism by the communities surrounding national parks has long been touted as a panacea for some of the ills of tourism faced by these communities (Budhiasa *et al.*, 2017; Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017; Mogomotsi *et al.*, 2018; Warouw *et al.*, 2018). To mitigate against the negative impacts and ensure that the communities benefit from protected areas, park authorities across much of Africa have, in the past two decades, sought to collaborate with the local communities in co-management programmes (Abukari and Mwalyosi, 2020). Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) (Shereni and Chambwe, 2024), Zambia's Administrative Management Design for Game Management Areas (ADMADE) (Bwalya Umar and Kapembwa, 2020), and Namibia's Communal Conservancy Programme (CCP) (Ogbaharya, 2006), are notable examples. However, in South Africa there is a semblance of similar community-based participation initiatives around parks and a lack of a well-coordinated programme at various levels of government (national, provincial, district, and local) as in other neighbouring countries (Chambwe and Saayman, 2024).

3. PODRUČJE ISTRAŽIVANJA I METODOLOGIJA

3.1. Područje istraživanja

Okvir uzorka za ovo istraživanje sastoji se od ljudi koji žive u zajednicama Bonjaneni, Kokwane i Engodini koje okružuju UDP. Sve zajednice i institucije nalaze se u okrugu uThukela u KZN-u i Južnoj Africi. Fokus na zajednice (Bonjaneni, Kokwane i Engodini) inspiriran je količinom turističkih aktivnosti koje sjeverni i južni dijelovi UDP-a imaju u usporedbi s južnim dijelom. Zajednica Bonjaneni nalazi se uz ulaz u Royal Natal, Kokwane je uz Cathedral Peak, a Engodini je blizu ulaza u Injisuthi.

Kao što se može vidjeti u Tablici 1, Wazimap (2021) predstavlja ključne demografske podatke za zajednice koje čine uzorak ove studije. Što se tiče dobi, 47% stanovništva u Bonjaneniju ima između 18 i 65 godina, dok je 5% u dobi od 65 i više godina. Slika se ne razlikuje mnogo u Kokwaneu ili Engodiniju, gdje dobna kategorija između 18 i 65 godina čini 45% odnosno 48% te 5% odnosno 3% za kategorije iznad 65 godina. Najmanje 95% stanovništva u tri zajednice govori zulu, što ga čini glavnim jezikom. S obzirom na strukture kućanstava, 36% stanovništva u Bonjaneniju živi u tradicionalnim zgradama, dok 59% živi u standardnim kućama. Tradicionalne kuće čine 68% stanovništva Kokwane, dok 16% živi u standardnim kućama. U Engodiniju 47% ljudi živi u tradicionalnim zgradama, dok 39% živi u standardnim kućama.

U odnosu na spol glave kućanstava u Bonjaneni je bilo 58% žena i 42% muškaraca; u Kokwani 49% žena i 51% muškaraca; a u Engodini je bilo 47% žena i 53% muškaraca. Zarade u najmanje 92% svih kućanstava u svim zajednicama bile su manje od 9.000 USD godišnje, dok su u najviše 4% kućanstava zarade premašivale 9.000 USD. Zaposlenih je bilo 19% u Bonjaneni, 5% u Kokwani i u 10% u Engodini. Najmanje 19% stanovniš-

3. THE STUDY AREA AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. The Study Area

The sampling frame for this study consists of the people living in the communities of Bonjaneni, Kokwane, and Engodini that surround UDP. All these communities and institutions are in the uThukela district of KZN, South Africa. The focus on the communities (Bonjaneni, Kokwane and Engodini) was inspired by the amount of tourism activity that the northern and southern sections of the UDP have as compared to the southern part. The Bonjaneni community is located next to the entrance of Royal Natal, Kokwane is adjacent to Cathedral Peak, and Engodini is close to the entrance of Injisuthi.

As can be seen on Table 1, Wazimap (2021) presents the key demographics for the communities that formulate the sampling frame of this study. In terms of age, 47% of the population in Bonjaneni are aged between 18 and 65 while 5% are aged 65 and above. The picture is not very different in Kokwane or Engodini where the age category of between 18 and 65 accounts for 45% and 48% and 5% and 3% for the above-65 categories, respectively. At least 95% of the population across the three communities speak Zulu, making it the main language. With regards to the household structure, 36% of the population in Bonjaneni live in traditional structures while 59% dwell in standard house structures. The traditional house structures account for 68% of the Kokwane population whereas 16% live in the standard house structures. In Engodini, 47% of the people live in traditional structures while 39% live in standard house structures.

The gender of household heads for Bonjaneni, Kokwane and Engodini are 58% female, 42% male; 49% female, 51% male; and 47% female, 53% male, respectively. At least 92% of all households in all communities earn less than USD 9 000 a year while at most only 4% earn more than USD

tva u svim zajednicama ima završenu srednju školu, 75% ima srednjoškolsko obrazovanje, a maksimalno samo 1% stanovnika ima visoko obrazovanje.

9 000. The employed stand at 19%, 5% and 10% for Bonjaneni, Kokwane and Engodini respectively. At least 19% of the population across all communities have High School Certificates, 75% have secondary education and at most only 1% have tertiary education.

Tablica 1: Okvir uzorka demografskih podataka zajednice

	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	Engodini
Spol	54% žena; 46% muškaraca	52% žena; 48% muškaraca	52% žena; 48% muškaraca
Dob	47% ih je između 18 i 64 godine; 5% ih je starije od 65 godina	45% ih je između 18 i 64 godine; 5% ih je starije od 65 godina	48% ih je između 18 i 64 godine; 3% ih je starije od 65 godina
Jezik	96% IsiZulu	95% IsiZulu	95% IsiZulu
Vrsta kućanstva	36% tradicionalna; 59% kuća	68% tradicionalna; 16% kuća	47% tradicionalna; 39% kuća
Glava kućanstva	58% žena; 42% muškaraca	49% žena; 51% muškaraca	47% žena; 53% muškaraca
Godišnji prihod kućanstva	96% < 9 tisuća USD; 4% > 9 tisuća USD	97% < 9 tisuća USD; 3% > 9 tisuća USD	99% < 9 tisuća USD; 1% > 9 tisuća USD
Zapošljavanje	19% zaposlenih	5% zaposlenih	10% zaposlenih
Obrazovanje	75% srednja škola ili niže; 21% viša škola; 1% visoko obrazovanje	79% srednja škola ili manje; 19% viša škola; 1% visoko obrazovanje	79% srednja škola ili manje; 19% viša škola; 1% visoko obrazovanje

Izvor: prilagođeno prema Wazimap (2021)

Table 1: Sampling frame of community demographics

	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	Engodini
Gender	54% female; 46% male	52% female; 48% male	52% female; 48% male
Age	47% are between 18-64; 5% are 65+	45% are between 18-64; 5% are 65+	48% are between 18-64; 3% are 65+
Language	96% IsiZulu	95% IsiZulu	95% IsiZulu
Type of household dwelling	36% Traditional; 59% House	68% Traditional; 16% House	47% Traditional; 39% House
Head of household	58% Female; 42% Male	49% Female; 51% Male	47% Female; 53% Male
Annual household income	96% <USD 9k; 4% >USD 9k	97% <USD 9k; 3% >USD 9k	99% <USD 9k; 1% >USD 9k
Employment	19% Employed	5% Employed	10% Employed
Education	75% Secondary or less; 21% High School; 1% Tertiary	79% Secondary or less; 19% High School; 1% Tertiary	79% Secondary or less; 19% High School; 1% Tertiary

Source: adapted from Wazimap (2021)

3.2. Metodološki pristup

U ovoj studiji korišten je kvantitativni pristup u kojem su anketirani članovi kućanstava triju zajednica, Bonjaneni, Kokwane i Engodini koje se nalaze se uz ulaze u tri glavna kampa u parku Drakensberg uKhahlamba, Royal Natal, Cathedral Peak i Injisuthi (Ezemvelo - KZN-Wildlife, 2018). Fokus na ovo područje inspiriran je statusom parka kao mjesta svjetske baštine i turističkim prometom koji bilježi. Ciljana populacija sastojala se od 762 ispitanika kombiniranih iz kućanstava u tri zajednice (Wazimap, 2021). Korištenjem kalkulatora veličine uzorka, potrebna veličina uzorka određena je na 256 kućanstava. Nakon selekcije, izdvojeno je 326 upitnika za obradu. Zatim je korišteno prikladno uzorkovanje jer su terenski radnici obučeni o etici pristupali sudionicima u njihovim domovima na temelju lakoće pristupa i dostupnosti.

Upitnik za istraživanje zajednice sadržavao je 39 pitanja koja su bila podijeljena u tri dijela, i to Odjeljak A, Odjeljak B i Odjeljak C, te je bio formuliran i osmišljen tako da bude jednostavan za korištenje u zajednici. Stoga je umjesto korištenja sofisticiranih Likertovih skala od pet ili sedam stupnjeva, radi lakšeg tumačenja usvojena Likertova skala od tri stupnja s emotikonom nasmijanog lica. Upitnik je kreiran na engleskom jeziku i preveden na zulu, jezik kojim govore mještani u zajednicama koje su predmet istraživanja.

Odjeljak A sadržavao je demografska i socioekonomska pitanja. Pitanjima se nastojalo utvrditi dob ispitanika, spol, jezik, bračni status, stupanj obrazovanja, radni status i zanimanje, godišnji bruto prihod, zajednicu prebivališta i godine života u njoj, veličinu kućanstva itd. Pitanja su uglavnom bila zatvorenog tipa. Demografske i socioekonomske specifičnosti ispitanika bile su ključne u analizi rezultata.

U odjeljku B mjereno je utjecaj UDP-a na jednakost pojedinaca i zajednica kao cjelinu.

3.2. Methodological approach

This study employed a quantitative approach where questionnaires were administered in a survey to the households of the three communities, Bonjaneni, Kokwane, and Engodini. These communities are respectively adjacent to entrances of the three main rest camps of the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park, namely, Royal Natal, Cathedral Peak, and Injisuthi, (Ezemvelo-KZN-Wildlife, 2018). The focus on this area was inspired by the park's status as a world heritage site and the tourism traffic it receives. The target population consisted of 762 respondents combined from households in the three communities (Wazimap, 2021). Using a sample size calculator, the required sample size was determined to be 256 households. With prudence, 326 questionnaires were obtained from the survey. Convenience sampling was then employed as the fieldworkers, who were trained on ethics, approached participants in their homes based on ease of access and availability.

The community survey questionnaire contained 39 questions that were divided into three sections, namely, Section A, Section B, and Section C, and was worded and designed to be community-user-friendly. Thus, instead of using sophisticated five-point or seven-point Likert scales, a three-point Likert scale with smiley face emoticons was adopted for ease of interpretation. The questionnaire was developed in English and translated into Zulu, the language spoken by locals in the communities under study.

Section A carried demographic and socio-economic questions. The questions sought to determine the respondents' age, gender, language, marital status, level of education, occupation status and occupation, annual gross income, community of residence and years they have lived in it, household sizes, etc. The questions were mostly closed-list questions. The respondents' demographic and socioeconomic specifics were pivotal in the analysis of the results.

Pitanja u ovom odjeljku, koja mjere socioekonomski utjecaj Parka na zajednice, razvijena su uz pomoć radova Scholtza i Slabberta (2016), Mowforth i Munta (2016), Masona (2008), Ryana (2003), Beetona (2006), Murphyja i Murphyja (2004), Baiburieva *et al.* (2018), Davida i Terrela (2019), Demirkaye i Çetina (2010), Frenta (2016), Polata (2013), Kreaga (2001) te Wooa *et al.* (2018). Za sva pitanja u ovom odjeljku korištena je trostupanjska Likertova skala za mjerenje razine slaganja ispitanika s pitanjima, gdje je 1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se.

U odjeljku C traženi su podaci o razinama sudjelovanja i uključenosti u turizam. Pitanja u ovom odjeljku inspirirana su literaturom Budhiase *et al.* (2017), Tewes-Gradla *et al.* (2014), Chiutsija i Saarinen (2017), Warouwa *et al.* (2018), Bella *et al.* (2018), Cornwalla (2008), Clarka i Wisea (2018), Giampiccolija i Saaymana (2018), Hatipoglu *et al.* (2016), Hindswortha i Langa (2009), Kimanija *et al.* (2013), Lachapellea i Austina (2014), Lija i Huntera (2015), Naira *et al.* (2015), Prabhakarana *et al.* (2014), Sua i Walla (2014), Tosuna (2007), Velnise Paimin *et al.* (2014) te Dragouni i Fouseki (2018).

Nadalje, u odjeljku C korištena su otvorena i zatvorena pitanja. Kao i u Odjeljku B, za većinu zatvorenih pitanja u ovom odjeljku korištena je Likertova skala. Slično tomu, trostupanjska Likertova skala oblikovana je oko razine slaganja ispitanika s 23 predstavljene tvrdnje, gdje je 1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se. Maree i Pietersen (2019) tvrde da su Likertove skale najprikladniji instrumenti za pružanje ordinalnog mjerenja stava ispitanika o različitim pitanjima od interesa. Likertova skala korištena u Odjeljku C upitnika obuhvaćala je pitanja o trenutnoj uključenosti zajednica u turizam, preprekama vlasništvu zajednice i idealnim turističkim tvrtkama koje su potrebne zajednici.

Podaci su prikupljeni i analizirani korištenjem Microsoft Excela iz 2016. godine i verzije 27 Statističkog paketa za društve-

Section B measured the equity impact of the UDP on the individuals and communities collectively. The questions in this section, which measure the socio-economic impact of the Park on the communities, were developed with the help of work by Scholtz and Slabbert (2016), Mowforth and Munt (2016), Mason (2008), Ryan (2003), Beeton (2006), Murphy and Murphy (2004), Baiburiev *et al.* (2018), David and Terrel (2019), Demirkaya and Çetin (2010), Frent (2016), Polat (2013), Kreag (2001) and Woo *et al.* (2018). A three-point Likert scale was used for all questions to measure the respondents' level of agreement to questions, where 1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree.

Section C solicited the data on the levels of tourism participation and involvement. The questions in this section were inspired by the literature works of Budhiasa *et al.* (2017), Tewes-Gradl *et al.* (2014), Chiutsi and Saarinen (2017), Warouw *et al.* (2018), Bello *et al.* (2018), Cornwall (2008), Clark and Wise (2018), Giampiccoli and Saayman (2018), Hatipoglu *et al.* (2016), Hindsworth and Lang (2009), Kimani *et al.* (2013), Lachapelle and Austin (2014), Li and Hunter (2015), Nair *et al.* (2015), Prabhakaran *et al.* (2014), Su and Wall (2014), Tosun (2007), Velnisa Paimin *et al.* (2014) and Dragouni and Fouseki (2018).

Further, Section C had both open and closed questions. Like in Section B, a Likert scale was also used for most of the closed questions in this section. Similarly, a three-point Likert scale was framed around the respondents' level of agreement on the 23 statements presented, where 1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree. Maree and Pietersen (2019) contend that Likert scales are the most convenient instruments in providing an ordinal measurement of respondents' attitude on various matters of interest. The Likert scale used in Section C covered questions on the communities' current involvement in tourism, barriers to community business ownership, and the ideal tourism businesses required by the community.

ne znanosti (SPSS). Za analizu i usporedbu skupova podataka o zajednici korišteni su deskriptivna statistika, Cronbachova alfa, ANOVA i veličine učinka.

4. REZULTATI

4.1. Sociodemografski profil ispitanika

Ovaj odjeljak predstavlja socioekonomsku demografiju kućanstava ispitanika kako bi se olakšalo bolje razumijevanje zajednica koje su predmet istraživanja. Tražene demografske pojedinosti uključivale su broj osoba u kućanstvu, status zanimanja glave kućanstva, stupanj obrazovanja, dob, spol i razinu pismenosti, kao i pristup komunalnim uslugama i kanalizaciji te glavne izvore prihoda za različita kućanstva. Sažetak dobivenih rezultata prikazan je u Tablici 2.

The data was captured and analysed using the 2016 version of Microsoft Excel and version 27 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, ANOVA, and effect sizes were used to analyse and compare the community data sets.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Socio-demographic profile of respondents

This section presents the respondents' household socio-economic demography to facilitate better understanding of the communities under study. The demographic details sought included the number of persons in a household, the household head's occupation status, level of education, age, gender, and literacy levels, as well as access to utilities and sanitation, and the main sources of income for the different households. The summary of the results obtained is portrayed in Table 2.

Tablica 2: Demografski profili kućanstava

Varijabla	Kategorije	Postotak
Broj osoba u kućanstvu	< 4 osobe	21,7%
	5 – 8 osoba	47,3%
	9 – 16 osoba	27,8%
	> 16 ljudi	2,4%
	Prosječno:	7 osoba
Radni status glave kućanstva	Student/Nije na tržištu rada	8,9%
	Plaćeni radnik	9,5%
	Nezaposlen	60,7%
	Umirovljen/a	4,0%
	Samozaposlen/a	12,9%
Razina obrazovanja glave kućanstva	Nije pohađao/la školu	50,6%
	Još uvijek u školi	6,7%
	Matura	35%
	Diploma	7,7%

Table 2: Demographic profiles of households

Variable	Categories	Percentage
Number of persons in household	< 4 people	21.7%
	5 – 8 people	47.3%
	9 – 16 people	27.8%
	> 16 people	2.4%
	Mean:	7 people
Occupation status of household head	Student/Not in labour market	8.9%
	Paid worker	9.5%
	Unemployed	60.7%
	Retired	4.0%
	Self-employed	12.9%
Level of education of household head	No school	50.6%
	Still in school	6.7%
	Matric	35%
	Diploma/Degree	7.7%

Varijabla	Kategorije	Postotak
Dob glave kućanstva	18 – 24 godine 25 – 49 godina 50 – 64 godine 65+ godina Prosječno:	2,1% 55,2% 29,4% 13,2% 48 godina
Spol glave kućanstva	Muški Žena	53,7% 46,3%
Broj odraslih u kućanstvu	1 – 4 odrasle osobe 5 – 8 odraslih 9+ odraslih Prosječno:	76,1% 21,8% 2,1% 4 odrasle osobe
Broj djece u dobi od 5 do 18 godina u kućanstvu	0 – 3 djece 4 – 6 djece 7 – 9 djece 10+ djece Prosječno:	74,8% 20,9% 3,1% 1,2% 3 djece
Broj djece mlađe od 5 godina u kućanstvu	0 – 2 djece 3 – 4 djece 5+ djece Prosječno:	85,9% 12,3% 1,8% 1 dijete
Broj odraslih osoba u kućanstvu koje znaju čitati i pisati	0 – 2 3 – 5 6 – 8 9+ Prosječno:	35,9% 49,7% 12,6% 1,8% 4 odrasle osobe
Opis konstrukcije kuće	Koliba Kamena kuća s crijepnim/čeličnim krovom Neformalni stambeni objekti	39,9% 59,2% 0,9%
Pristup komunalnim uslugama i kanalizaciji	Pristup tekućoj vodi Pristup električnoj energiji Pristup sanitarnim uvjetima	12% 93,3% 4%
Djelatnosti poljoprivredne proizvodnje za vlastite potrebe	Uključenost u proizvodnju usjeva Uključenost u stočarstvo	49,7% 45,4%

Variable	Categories	Percentage
Age of household head	18 – 24 years 25 – 49 years 50 – 64 years 65+ years Mean:	2.1% 55.2% 29.4% 13.2% 48 years
Gender of household head	Male Female	53.7% 46.3%
Number of adults in household	1 – 4 adults 5 – 8 adults 9+ adults Mean:	76.1% 21.8% 2.1% 4 adults
Number of children between ages 5 and 18 in household	0 – 3 children 4 – 6 children 7 – 9 children 10+ children Mean:	74.8% 20.9% 3.1% 1.2% 3 children
Number of children below age 5 in household	0 – 2 children 3 – 4 children 5+ children Mean:	85.9% 12.3% 1.8% 1 child
Number of adults who can read and write in household	0 – 2 3 – 5 6 – 8 9+ Mean:	35.9% 49.7% 12.6% 1.8% 4 adults
Description of house structure	Hut House of stone with tile/steel roof Informal housing structure	39.9% 59.2% 0.9%
Access to utilities and sanitation	Access to running water Access to electricity Access to sanitation	12% 93.3% 4%
Activities of subsistence agriculture	Involvement in crop production Involvement in livestock farming	49.7% 45.4%
Number of livestock units owned	Nil 1 – 10 units 11 – 20 units 21 – 40 units 41+ units Mean:	46.9% 17.8% 14.4% 12% 8.9% 12 units

Varijabla	Kategorije	Postotak
Broj posjedovanih stočnih jedinica	Nula	46,9%
	1 – 10 jedinica	17,8%
	11 – 20 jedinica	14,4%
	21 – 40 jedinica	12%
	41+ jedinica	8,9%
	Prosječno: 12 jedinica	
Glavni izvor prihoda kućanstva	Novčane pošiljke od članova obitelji	30,1%
	Prodana stoka	11,3%
	Proizvodnja usjeva	7,8%
	Skupljanje ogrjevnog drva	7,4%
	Ostalo	33,4%

Što se tiče broja osoba u kućanstvu, kategorija „5 – 8“ postigla je najveću frekvenciju, s udjelom od 47% učestalosti. Slijedi kategorija „9 – 16“ s udjelom od 28%. Kategorija „manje od 4“ zauzela je drugo mjesto s udjelom od 22% učestalosti. Kategorija „iznad 16“ postigla je samo 2%, a prosječan broj osoba u kućanstvu bio je 7.

Sudionici su također zamoljeni da otkriju status zaposlenja nositelja svojih kućanstava. Rezultati pokazuju da su većinom bili nezaposleni, zastupljeni s 61% frekvencija, dok je samo 9% ispitanika navelo da su nositelji njihovih kućanstava plaćeni radnici, 13% samozaposleni, a 9% su bili studenti ili nisu na tržištu rada. Preostalih 4% činilo je kategoriju umirovljenika. Slijedom toga može se zaključiti da je većina i nositelja kućanstava i sudionika bila nezaposlena.

Postojala je gotovo ravnoteža između onih bez škole (51%) i onih s različitim stupnjevima obrazovanja (49%), a tih 49% je dalje bilo podijeljeno na one koji su položili maturu (35%), one koji su još uvijek u školi (7%) i one koji imaju diplomu (8%).

Prosječna dob nositelja kućanstva bila je 45 godina. Kategorija s najvećom učestalošću dobi, a to je „25 – 49“, činila je 55,2% učestalosti. Slijedi je kategorija „50 – 64“ s

Variable	Categories	Percentage
Main source of household income	Remittances from family members	30.1%
	Livestock sold	11.3%
	Crop production	7.8%
	Firewood collection	7.4%
	Other	33.4%

Regarding the number of persons in a household, the ‘5 – 8’ category scored the most, accounting for 47% of the frequencies. This was followed by the ‘9 – 16’ category which registered a frequency of 28%. The ‘less than 4’ category was second, with a 22% score of the frequencies. The ‘above 16’ category scored only 2% and the average number of persons in a household was 7.

The participants were also asked to divulge the occupation status of their household heads. The results show that most of them, represented by 61% of the frequencies, were unemployed, while only 9% of the respondents indicated that their household heads were paid workers, 13% were self-employed, and 9% were either students or not on the labour market, and the remaining 4% accounted for the retired. Therefore, most household heads and participants were unemployed.

There is almost a balance between those with no school (51%) and those that have varying levels of education (49%). The 49% is further divided among those who have passed matric (35%), those still in school (7%), and those who have either a diploma or degree (8%).

The average age of the household head was 45 years. The category with the highest frequency of ages, ‘25 – 49’, accounted for 55.2% of frequencies. This category is followed by that of ‘50 – 64’ with a frequency of 29.4%. The ‘18 – 24’ category scored the lowest frequency of 2.4% while that of ‘65+’ had a frequency of 13.2%. Notably, the majority age of the household head for the communities under study ranges from 25 to

učestalošću od 29,4%. Kategorija „18 – 24“ imala je najnižu učestalost od 2,4%, dok je kategorija „65+“ imala učestalost od 13,2%. Može se primijetiti da se većinska dob nositelja kućanstva u proučavanim zajednicama kreće od 25 do 64 godine, što čini kumulativnu učestalost od 84,6%.

Istraživanje nadalje pokazuje da je spol glava kućanstava gotovo podjednako raspoređen između muškaraca i žena. Muškaraca ima neznatno više od žena, jer čine 54% glava kućanstava, dok žene čine 46%. Budući da su zajednice ruralne i tradicionalne, očekuje se da će muškarci dominirati u vodstvu kućanstava.

Istraživanjem se također nastojalo steći dublje razumijevanje matričnog sastava broja članova kućanstva. Sukladno broju osoba u kućanstvu, ispitanici su zamoljeni da utvrde sljedeću kvantitativnu dinamiku u svojim kućanstvima: broj odraslih; broj djece u dobi između 5 i 18 godina; broj djece mlađe od 5 godina; i broj odraslih koji znaju čitati ili pisati. Rezultati su pokazali da je kategorija „1 – 4 odrasle osobe“ postigla najveću učestalost od 76,1%, kategorija „9+ odraslih osoba“ postigla najnižu učestalost od 2,1%, a prosječan broj odraslih osoba u kućanstvu bio je četiri. Što se tiče broja djece u dobi između 5 i 18 godina, najveća učestalost, koja je iznosila 76% odgovora, bila je u kategoriji „0 – 3“. Druga najviša kategorija, „4 – 6“, postigla je 20,9% učestalosti, a preostale kategorije djece „6+“ postigle su ukupno samo 4,3%. Prosječan broj djece u kućanstvu bio je troje.

Rezultati također pokazuju da je prosječan broj djece mlađe od 5 godina u kućanstvu bio jedno dijete. Kategorija „0 – 2 djece“ imala je najveću učestalost od 86%, a slijedi je kategorija „3 – 4“ s 12,3%. Kategorija „5+ djece“ imala je najnižu učestalost s tek 1,8%, što pokazuje da kućanstva u proučavanim zajednicama imaju mali broj djece mlađe od 5 godina.

Kao što je prikazano u Tablici 2, prosječan broj odraslih osoba u kućanstvu koje znaju čitati i pisati unutar tih zajednica je četiri. Kategorija odraslih „3 – 5“ činila je

64, accounting for a cumulative frequency of 84.6%.

The survey further shows that the gender of household heads is almost equally distributed between males and females. Males are marginally more than females as they account for 54% of household heads while females account for 46%. Since the communities are rural and traditional, it is expected for men to dominate the leadership of households.

The study also sought to gain a deeper understanding of the matrix composition of household family numbers. Pursuant to the numbers of persons in a household, respondents were asked to ascertain the following quantitative dynamics in their households: the number of adults; the number of children between the ages of 5 and 18; the number of children under the age of 5; and the number of adults who can read or write. The results showed that the ‘1 – 4 adults’ category scored the highest frequency of 76.1%, the ‘9+ adults’ category scored the lowest frequency of 2.1%, and the average number of adults in a household was four. Regarding the number of children between ages 5 and 18, the highest frequency, amounting to 76% of the responses, was in the ‘0 – 3’ category. The second highest category, ‘4 – 6’, scored 20.9% of the frequencies, and the remaining categories of ‘6 +’ children scored a combined 4.3%. The average number of children per household was three.

The results also show that the average number of children below the age of 5 in the households was one. The ‘0 – 2 children’ category had the highest frequency of 86%, followed by that of ‘3 – 4’ with 12.3%. The ‘5+ children’ category was the lowest with a paltry 1.8%, showing that the households in the studied communities have a small number of children under the age of 5.

As depicted Table 2 the average household number of adults who can read and write within these communities is four. The

49,7% učestalosti, a zatim 35,5% za odrasle „0 – 2“. Kategorija „6 – 8“ činila je 12,6% učestalosti, dok je kategorija „9+“ bila najniža s učestalošću od 1,8%. Kada se uspoređi prosječan broj odraslih osoba u kućanstvu o kojem je ranije bilo riječi (četiri) s prosječnim brojem odraslih osoba koje znaju čitati i pisati u kućanstvu (također četiri), može se utvrditi da su razine pismenosti u tim zajednicama općenito visoke.

Sudionici su također zamoljeni da opišu strukturu svojih kuća. To je pomoglo u određivanju socioekonomskog pregleda i statusa kućanstava sudionika. Tako je 59,2% navelo da su im kuće izgrađene od kamena s crijevnim ili čeličnim krovovima, a 39,9% je opisalo strukturu svojih kuća kao tradicionalne kolibe. Preostalih 1% navelo je da žive u neformalnim stambenim objektima, što dokazuje da je većina sudionika imala pristojnu strukturu doma.

Ispitanici su nadalje zamoljeni da navedu imaju li pristup raznim komunalnim uslugama i kanalizaciji. Samo 12% njih navelo je da imaju pristup tekućoj vodi, dok preostalih 88% nema. S obzirom na mali broj osoba (12%) s pristupom tekućoj vodi, nije iznenađujuće da je samo 4% sudionika imalo pristup kanalizaciji, dok 96% nije. Ohrabrujuće je da je 93% izjavilo da ima pristup električnoj energiji, dok samo 7% nema.

Na pitanje o svojoj uključenosti u poljoprivredu za vlastite potrebe, gotovo polovica sudionika navela je da se bavi ili proizvodnjom usjeva (49,7%) ili stočarstvom (45,4%). Što se tiče izjava sudionika o broju vlastitih stočnih jedinica: 47% nije imalo nikakvih stočnih jedinica, dok je 53% navelo vlasništvo nad različitim brojem stočnih jedinica. Prosječan broj posjedovanih stočnih jedinica iznosio je 12, što pokazuje ovisnost zajednice o različitim oblicima poljoprivrede za vlastite potrebe.

Tablica 2 također prikazuje rezultate o glavnim izvorima prihoda kućanstava. Novčane pošiljke od članova obitelji bile su do-

category '3 – 5' adults accounted for 49.7% of the frequencies, followed by 35.5% for '0 – 2' adults. The '6 – 8' category accounted for 12.6% of the frequencies whereas the '9+' category was the lowest with a frequency of 1.8%. A comparison of the average number of adults discussed earlier (four) with the average number of adults who can read and write per household (also four), the community literacy levels can be deemed generally high.

The participants were also asked to describe their house structures. This helped in determining the socio-economic outlook and status of the household participants. Thus, 59.2% indicated that their houses were made of stone with either tile or a steel roofs and 39.9% described their house structure as traditional huts. The remaining 1% stated that they lived in informal housing structures, which proves that most participants had decent home structure.

The respondents were further asked to indicate whether they had access to various utilities and sanitation. Only 12% indicated that they had access to running water while the remaining 88% did not. Considering the paltry number (12%) with access to running water, it was not surprising that only 4% of the participants had access to sanitation, while 96% did not. On an encouraging note, 93% disclosed that they had access to electricity while only 7% did not.

When asked to state their involvement in subsistence agriculture, almost half of the participants indicated that they were involved in either crop production (49.7%) or livestock farming (45.4%). Regarding the participants' declarations on the number of owned livestock units: 47% did not have any livestock units while 53% indicated ownership of varying numbers of livestock units. The average number of livestock units owned stood at 12, which shows the community's reliance on various forms of subsistence agriculture.

Table 2 also shows the results on the main sources of income for the households.

minantan izvor prihoda s udjelom od 30,1%. Prodaja stoke bila je na drugom mjestu s ukupnom učestalošću od 11,3%, dok su proizvodnja usjeva i prikupljanje ogrjevnog drva bile gotovo izjednačene, s udjelom od 7,8% odnosno 7,4%. Preostalih 33,4% imalo je druge izvore prihoda, za koje se nakon istraživanja pokazalo da se kreću od zaposlenja do mirovina i državnih potpora.

4.2. Mišljenja u zajednici o društveno-ekonomskim utjecajima i uključenosti u turizam

Kao što je prikazano u Tablici 3, različite različitog stupnja bile su uočljive u odgovorima zajednice. S obzirom na varijablu pozitivnog društvenog utjecaja, ispitanici su zamoljeni da na trostupanjskoj Likertovoj ljestvici (gdje je 1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se) ocijene stupanj u kojem se slažu sa sljedećim tvrdnjama: zbog turizma i UDP-a, slika moje zajednice se poboljšala; zbog turizma i UDP-a, ponos zajednice se poboljšao; zbog turizma i UDP-a, ceste i javni objekti su bolje održavani; zbog turizma i UDP-a, svakodnevni način života članova zajednice se poboljšao; zbog turizma i UDP-a, poboljšana je kvaliteta života; zbog turizma i UDP-a, osobno sam zadovoljan/na.

U pogledu kategorije pozitivnog društvenog utjecaja, zajednica Bonjaneni imala je najvišu prosječnu srednju vrijednost od 1,9259, dok je Engodini zabilježio najnižu prosječnu srednju vrijednost od 1,5578. Prosječna srednja vrijednost kombiniranih zajednica na ovoj varijabli bila je 1,7929. Iako su sve ove srednje vrijednosti bile bliže 2 kao cijeli broj, što implicira da su zajednice ravnodušne prema pozitivnom društvenom utjecaju na svoje zajednice, neke imaju više koristi od drugih. Pozitivni društveni utjecaji UDP-a i turizma bolje se osjećaju u Bonjaneniju nego u ostalim zajednicama.

Slično tomu, za varijablu negativnog društvenog utjecaja, ispitanici su zamoljeni

Remittances from family members was the dominant source of income that accounted for 30.1%. The livestock sold came in second with a total frequency of 11.3%, while crop production and firewood collection were almost tied, registering 7.8% and 7.4% respectively. The remaining 33.4% had other sources of income, which were revealed, after probing, to range from employment to pension and government grants.

4.2. Community descriptions of the socio-economic impact and involvement in tourism

As depicted by Table 3, the differences of varying extents were noticeable in the community responses. For the positive social impact variable, the respondents were asked to score on a three-point Likert scale (1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree) the extent to which they agreed to the following statements: because of tourism and the UDP, the image of my community has improved; because of tourism and the UDP, the community pride has improved; because of tourism and the UDP, the roads and public facilities are better maintained; because of tourism and the UDP, everyday lifestyles for community members have improved; because of tourism and the UDP, the quality of life is improved; because of tourism and the UDP, I am satisfied personally.

In view of the positive social impact category, the Bonjaneni community had the highest average mean of 1.9259, while Engodini registered the lowest average mean value of 1.5578. The average mean of the combined communities on this variable was 1.7929. While all these mean values were closer to 2 as a whole number, which implies that the communities are indifferent towards the positive social impact on their communities, some experience more benefits than others. The positive social impacts of the UDP and tourism are better felt in Bonjaneni than in the other communities.

da na trostupanjskoj Likertovoj ljestvici (1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se) ocijene stupanj slaganja sa sljedećim tvrdnjama: zbog turizma i UDP-a, kohezija zajednice se smanjila; zbog turizma i UDP-a, vandalizam na imovini i mjestima se povećao; zbog turizma i UDP-a, društveni sukobi između stanovnika i turista su se povećali; zbog turizma i UDP-a, iskorištavanje lokalnog stanovništva se povećalo; zbog turizma i UDP-a, kulturne tradicije blijede; zbog turizma i UDP-a, stopa kriminala se povećala.

Prosjeck zajednica za varijablu negativnog društvenog utjecaja bio je 1,9402. Zajednica Kokwane zabilježila je najviši prosječni prosjek zajednice (2,0018) u ovoj kategoriji, dok je Engodini postigao najnižu prosječnu srednju vrijednost (1,8946). Sukladno tomu, i usporedno, negativni društveni utjecaji UDP-a i turizma bili su najveći u Kokwaneu, a najmanji u Engodiniju.

Similarly, for the negative social impact variable, respondents were asked to score, on a three-point Likert scale (where 1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree), the extent to which they agreed to the following statements: because of tourism and the UDP, community cohesion has decreased; because of tourism and the UDP, vandalism of property and sites has increased; because of tourism and the UDP, social conflicts between residents and tourists have increased; because of tourism and the UDP, exploitation of locals has increased; because of tourism and the UDP, cultural traditions are fading; because of tourism and the UDP, crime rate has increased.

The communities' average for the negative social impact variable was 1.9402. Kokwane community registered the highest community average mean (2.0018) in this category, while Engodini scored the lowest average mean (1.8946). Accordingly, and comparatively, the negative social impacts of the UDP and tourism were the highest in Kokwane and the least in Engodini.

Tablica 3: Prosječni odgovori zajednice o socioekonomskim utjecajima turizma, sudjelovanju u turizmu i preprekama poslovanju

Varijabla	Kokwane (n=93)	Engodini (n=95)	Bonjaneni (n=135)	Prosjeck zajednica (n=326)
Pozitivan društveni utjecaj	1,85	1,56	1,93	1,79
Negativan društveni utjecaj	2,00	1,89	1,93	1,94
Pozitivan ekonomski utjecaj	1,63	1,53	1,74	1,64
Negativan ekonomski utjecaj	2,24	2,01	2,53	2,29
Prosječna uključenost u turizam	1,91	1,33	1,92	1,74
Prosječne poslovne prepreke	2,21	2,54	2,41	2,40

Table 3: Average community mean responses on the socio-economic impacts of tourism, tourism involvement and barriers to business

Variable	Kokwane (n=93)	Engodini (n=95)	Bonjaneni (n=135)	Communities' average (n=326)
Positive social impact	1.85	1.56	1.93	1.79
Negative social impact	2.00	1.89	1.93	1.94
Positive economic impact	1.63	1.53	1.74	1.64
Negative economic impact	2.24	2.01	2.53	2.29
Average tourism involvement	1.91	1.33	1.92	1.74
Average barriers to business	2.21	2.54	2.41	2.40

Sukladno tomu, za varijablu pozitivnog ekonomskog utjecaja, ispitanici su zamoljeni da na trostupanjskoj Likertovoj ljestnici (1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se) ocijene stupanj u kojem se slažu sa sljedećim tvrdnjama: zbog turizma i UDP-a, mogućnosti zapošljavanja su se povećale; zbog turizma i UDP-a, poslovne mogućnosti su se povećale; zbog turizma i UDP-a, životni standard se poboljšao; zbog turizma i UDP-a, promet lokalnih poduzeća se poboljšao; zbog turizma i UDP-a, javno financiranje aktivnosti zajednice se poboljšalo; zbog turizma i UDP-a, tradicionalni ručni radovi se sada oporavljaju. Prosječna srednja vrijednost pozitivnog ekonomskog utjecaja svih zajednica, zabilježena na 1,64, bila je najniža za sve četiri socioekonomske varijable. To implicira da su zajednice osjetile manje pozitivnih ekonomskih utjecaja od ostalih varijabli. Pri usporedbi zajednica pod pozitivnom ekonomskom varijablom, zajednica Bonjaneni s 1,74 ima najvišu prosječnu vrijednost, dok je najniža za Engodini 1,523. To se prevodi u bolje pozitivne ekonomske utjecaje u Bonjaneniju nego u bilo kojoj drugoj zajednici.

U odnosu na varijablu negativnog ekonomskog utjecaja, ispitanici su zamoljeni da na trostupanjskoj Likertovoj ljestnici (1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se) ocijene stupanj slaganja sa sljedećim tvrdnjama:

Correspondingly, for the positive economic impact variable, respondents were asked to score, on a three-point Likert scale (1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree), the extent to which they agreed to the following statements: because of tourism and the UDP, employment opportunities have increased; because of tourism and the UDP, business opportunities have increased; because of tourism and the UDP, standard of living has improved; because of tourism and the UDP, turnover for local businesses has improved; because of tourism and the UDP, public funding for community activities has improved; because of tourism and the UDP, traditional handicrafts are now being recovered. The average positive economic impact mean of all the communities, recorded at 1.64, was the lowest for all four socio-economic variables. This implies that the communities felt less positive economic impacts than the other variables. When comparing the communities under the positive economic variable, the Bonjaneni community 1.74 has the highest mean average, while the lowest is 1.523 for Engodini. This translates to better positive economic impacts in Bonjaneni than any other community.

Concerning the negative economic impact variable, the respondents were asked to score on a three-point Likert scale (1

zbog turizma i UDP-a cijene roba i usluga su porasle; zbog turizma i UDP-a cijene nekretnina su porasle; zbog turizma i UDP-a troškovi života su porasli; zbog turizma i UDP-a samo mali broj ljudi ima koristi. Varijabla negativnog ekonomskog utjecaja ima prosječnu srednju vrijednost od 2,29 za sve zajednice i najviši je prosjek za sve četiri socioekonomske varijable. Sve zajednice zajedno osjetile su negativne ekonomske utjecaje više od bilo koje druge varijable. Kada se zajednice uspoređuju prema ovoj varijabli, u Bonjaneniju je najviša prosječna srednja vrijednost 2,523, dok Engodini bilježi najnižu s 2,01. Sukladno tomu, najviše negativnih ekonomskih utjecaja osjeća se u Bonjaneniju, a najmanje u Engodiniju.

S obzirom na prosječne varijable uključenosti u turizam, ispitanici su zamoljeni da na trostupanjskoj Likertovoj ljestvici (1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se) ocijene stupanj slaganja sa sljedećim tvrdnjama: vrlo sam informiran/a o razvoju turizma u svojoj zajednici; sudjelujem u rješavanju problema vezanih uz turizam u svojoj zajednici; lokalne zajednice se potiču na uključivanje u turizam; postoje poticaji za lokalne turističke aktere; zajednice imaju vlastite turističke atrakcije; zajednica ima velike koristi od turizma. Za varijablu prosječne uključenosti u turizam s kombiniranim prosječnim rezultatom zajednice od 1,74, što je negativna ocjena, Bonjaneni je imao najviši prosjek (1,92), a Engodini (1,33) najniži. To implicira da, iako se sve zajednice osjećaju isključenima iz turizma, neke su više isključene (Engodini) od drugih (Bonjaneni).

U vezi varijable prepreka poslovanju, ispitanici su zamoljeni da na trostupanjskoj Likertovoj ljestvici (1 = ne slažem se, 2 = neutralno i 3 = slažem se) ocijene stupanj u kojem se slažu sa sljedećim tvrdnjama: zajednica nije bila uključena u procesu planiranja; nedostatak stručnosti u turističkom poslovanju i marketingu; nedostatak svijesti o prednostima turizma; nedostatak kohezije i koordinacije; turizam se ne smatra važnim;

= disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree) the extent to which they agreed to the following statements: because of tourism and the UDP, the prices of goods and services have increased; because of tourism and the UDP, the property prices have increased; because of tourism and the UDP, the cost of living has increased; because of tourism and the UDP, only a small number of people are benefiting. The negative economic impact variable has an average mean of 2.29 for all communities and is the highest average for all four socio-economic variables. All the communities combined have felt negative economic impacts more than any other variable. When comparing the communities by this variable, the Bonjaneni community scores the highest average mean of 2.523, whereas Engodini registers the lowest at 2.01. Accordingly, the most negative economic impacts are felt in Bonjaneni and the least in Engodini.

With regard to the average tourism involvement variable, respondents were asked to score, on a three-point Likert scale (1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree), the extent to which they agreed to the following statements: I am highly informed about tourism development in my community; I participate in solving tourism related problems in my community; local communities are encouraged to be involved in tourism; there are incentives in place for local tourism players; the communities have their own tourism attractions; the community benefits a lot from tourism. For the average tourism involvement variable with a combined community average score of 1.74, a negative rating, Bonjaneni had the highest average (1.92) and Engodini (1.33) the lowest. This implies that, while all communities feel excluded from tourism, some are more excluded (Engodini) than others (Bonjaneni).

Concerning the barriers to business variable, respondents were asked to score, on a three-point Likert scale (1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, and 3 = agree), the extent to which they agreed to the following statements:

nedostatak razumijevanja zakonodavstva; nedostatak financijskih sredstava; ograničen pristup informacijama; nedostatak bogatstva i političke snage; nedostatak vladine podrške i inicijativa. Prosječna vrijednost varijable prepreka poslovanju bila je 2,40 za sve zajednice, što znači da se zajednice slažu s postojanjem opsežnih poslovnih prepreka. Prosječna vrijednost od 2,54 u zajednici Engodini pokazuje da se oni suočavaju s više prepreka nego Bonjaneni (2,41) i Kokwane (2,21).

4.3. Socioekonomski utjecaji: Analiza varijance

ANOVA je korištena kako bi se utvrdilo razlikuju li se značajno odgovori različitih zajednica na pozitivan i negativan socioekonomski utjecaj, prosječnu uključenost u turizam i prosječne poslovne prepreke.

community not considered in planning process; lack of tourism business and marketing expertise; lack of awareness of benefits of tourism; lack of cohesion and coordination; tourism is not considered important; lack of understanding legislation; lack of financial resources; limited access to information; lack of wealth and political strength; lack of government support and initiatives. The average mean for the barriers to business variable was 2.40 for all the communities, which translates to communities agreeing to the existence of extensive business barriers. Engodini's average mean value of 2.54 reflects that they face more barriers than Bonjaneni (2.41) and Kokwane (2.21).

4.3. Socio-economic impacts: Analysis of variance

ANOVA was used to determine whether the different communities' responses on the positive and negative socio-economic impact, average involvement in tourism, and average barriers to business are significantly different from one another.

Tablica 4: Višestruke usporedbe prosjeka zajednica o socioekonomskim utjecajima turizma, sudjelovanju u turizmu i preprekama sudjelovanju

Zavisna varijabla	Osnovna zajednica	Uspoređivanje zajednice	Srednja razlika
Pozitivan društveni utjecaj	Kokwane	Engodini	0,28985*
		Bonjaneni	-0,07826
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0,28985*
		Bonjaneni	-0,36810*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0,07826
		Engodini	0,36810*
Negativan društveni utjecaj	Kokwane	Engodini	0,10723
		Bonjaneni	0,07093
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0,10723
		Bonjaneni	-0,03631
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	-0,07093
		Engodini	0,03631
Pozitivan ekonomski utjecaj	Kokwane	Engodini	0,10890
		Bonjaneni	-0,10139
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0,10890
		Bonjaneni	-0,21029*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0,10139
		Engodini	0,21029*
Negativan ekonomski utjecaj	Kokwane	Engodini	0,23187*
		Bonjaneni	-0,8315*
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0,23187*
		Bonjaneni	-0,51502*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0,28315*
		Engodini	0,51502*
Prosječna uključenost u turizam	Kokwane	Engodini	0,58396*
		Bonjaneni	-0,01127
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0,58396*
		Bonjaneni	-0,59523*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0,01127
		Engodini	0,59523*
Prosječne poslovne prepreke	Kokwane	Engodini	-0,33199*
		Bonjaneni	-0,19895*
	Engodini	Kokwane	0,33199*
		Bonjaneni	0,13305
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0,19895*
		Engodini	-0,13305

Table 4: Multiple community mean comparisons on the socio-economic impacts of tourism, tourism involvement and barriers to participation

Dependent variable	Base community	Comparing community	Mean difference
Positive social impact	Kokwane	Engodini	0.28985*
		Bonjaneni	-0.07826
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0.28985*
		Bonjaneni	-0.36810*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0.07826
		Engodini	0.36810*
Negative social impact	Kokwane	Engodini	0.10723
		Bonjaneni	0.07093
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0.10723
		Bonjaneni	-0.03631
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	-0.07093
		Engodini	0.03631
Positive economic impact	Kokwane	Engodini	0.10890
		Bonjaneni	-0.10139
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0.10890
		Bonjaneni	-0.21029*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0.10139
		Engodini	0.21029*
Negative economic impact	Kokwane	Engodini	0.23187*
		Bonjaneni	-0.28315*
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0.23187*
		Bonjaneni	-0.51502*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0.28315*
		Engodini	0.51502*
Average tourism involvement	Kokwane	Engodini	0.58396*
		Bonjaneni	-0.01127
	Engodini	Kokwane	-0.58396*
		Bonjaneni	-0.59523*
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0.01127
		Engodini	0.59523*
Average barriers to business	Kokwane	Engodini	-0.33199*
		Bonjaneni	-0.19895*
	Engodini	Kokwane	0.33199*
		Bonjaneni	0.13305
	Bonjaneni	Kokwane	0.19895*
		Engodini	-0.13305

Tablica 4 pokazuje da su razlike između odgovora zajednice značajne, iako u različitoj mjeri, za sve dotične varijable osim za varijablu negativnog društvenog utjecaja. Pod varijablom pozitivnog društvenog utjecaja, zajednica Engodini polučila je značajno manje koristi od Kokwane i Bonjanenija, koji su postigli više prosjeke s marginama od 0,28985 odnosno 0,36810 u odnosu na Engodini. Još jedna značajna razlika zabilježena je pod pozitivnom ekonomskom varijablom između prosjeka Engodinija i Bonjanenija. Prosječni prosjek Bonjanenija iznosi 0,21029, što je više od onog u Engodiniju. Značajne razlike u prosjeku zabilježene su između svih zajednica pod negativnom ekonomskom varijablom. Najveća razlika u tom pogledu je između Engodinija i Bonjanenija (0,51502 viša), dok je najmanja značajna razlika između Engodinija i Kokwane (0,23187 viša).

U pogledu prosječne varijable uključenosti u turizam, postoje značajne razlike između Engodinija, koji ima značajno nižu srednju vrijednost od Kokwane (0,58396) i Bonjanenija (0,59523). Postoje značajne razlike između srednjih vrijednosti Kokwane i onih Engodinija te Bonjanenija za prosječnu varijablu prepreka za poslovanje. Engodini i Bonjaneni bilježe više srednje vrijednosti od Kokwane s iznosima od 0,33199 odnosno 0,19895.

4.4. Uključenost zajednica u turizam: veličine Cramerovog V učinka

Budući da su raniji deskriptivni i ANOVA rezultati otkrili različite socioekonomske utjecaje (npr. Bonjaneni je imao veće pozitivne ekonomske utjecaje, ali i veće negativne učinke, dok je u Engodini bilo više prepreka), bilo je razborito potražiti daljnju validaciju korištenjem drugačije mjere statističke analize. Sukladno tomu, korišten je Cramerov V test. Za razliku od hi-kvadrat testova koji samo pokazuju postoji li veza, Cramerov V označava veličinu učinka mjerenjem snage povezanosti između dvije kategoričke

Table 4 shows that the differences between community responses are significant, although to varying extents, for all the variables in question except for the negative social impact variable. Under the positive social impact variable, the Engodini community experienced significantly lower benefits than Kokwane and Bonjaneni, who scored higher means with margins of 0.28985 and 0.36810, respectively, over Engodini. Another significant difference is registered under the positive economic variable between the means of Engodini and Bonjaneni. The average mean of Bonjaneni is 0.21029, higher than that of Engodini. Significant mean differences are recorded between all communities under the negative economic variable. The biggest difference in this regard is between Engodini and Bonjaneni (0.51502 higher), while the smallest significant difference is between Engodini and Kokwane (0.23187 higher).

On the average tourism involvement variable, there are significant differences between Engodini, which has a significantly lower mean than Kokwane (0.58396) and Bonjaneni (0.59523). There are significant differences between the means of Kokwane and those of Engodini and Bonjaneni for the average barriers to a business variable. Engodini and Bonjaneni register higher means than Kokwane by margins of 0.33199 and 0.19895, respectively.

4.4. Communities' involvement in tourism: Cramer's V effect sizes

Since earlier descriptive and ANOVA results revealed divergent socio-economic impacts (e.g., Bonjaneni had higher positive economic impacts but also higher negative effects, while Engodini faced more barriers), it was prudent to seek further validation using a different statistical analysis measure. Accordingly, the Cramer's V was utilised. Unlike chi-square tests that only indicate whether a relationship exists, Cramer's V

varijable s dvije ili više vrijednosti po kategoriji i ima tri glavne kategorije: veličine učinka manje od 0,3, koje ukazuju na slabu povezanost; veličine učinka između 0,3 i 0,6 koje pokazuju umjerenu povezanost; i veličine učinka iznad 0,6 koje odražavaju jaku povezanost. Veličine učinka Cramerovog V učinka korištene su za usporedbu zajednica na temelju njihovih odgovora da/ne na pitanja koja su nastojala utvrditi njihovu zaposlenost u UDP-u, pružanje turističkih usluga UDP-u, potrebu za turističkim poslovima, trenutno vlasništvo nad poslovanjem, razmatranje vlasništva nad poslovanjem, uključenost u projekte zajednice UDP-a, poznavanje projekata zajednice UDP-a i razmatranje poslovanja povezanog s turizmom.

indicates the effect size by measuring the strength of association between two categorical variables with two or more values per category and has three main categories: effect sizes of less than 0.3, which indicate a weak association; effect sizes of between 0.3 and 0.6 which show a moderate association; and effect sizes of above 0.6 which reflect strong association. The Cramer's V effect sizes were used to compare the communities based on their yes/no responses to questions that sought to ascertain their employment at UDP, supply of tourism services to the UDP, need for tourism-related businesses, current business ownership, consideration of business ownership, involvement in the UDP community projects, knowledge of UDP community projects, and consideration of tourism-related business.

Tablica 5: Razlike u zajednici u uključenosti u turizam i vlasništvo poduzeća

Varijabla		Bonjaneni	Engodini	Kokwane	Ukupno	Cramerov V
Radi za UDP	Da	2	9	4	15	
	Ne	133	89	89	311	0,15
Pružanje turističkih usluga UDP-u	Da	1	6	6	13	
	Ne	134	92	87	313	0,14
Potreba za poslovanjem vezanim uz turizam	Da	61	34	59	154	
	Ne	74	64	34	172	0,22
Trenutno vlasništvo nad poduzećem	Da	6	14	19	39	
	Ne	189	84	74	287	0,21
Razmatra se vlasništvo nad poslovanjem	Da	31	50	47	128	
	Ne	104	48	46	198	0,28
Uključenost u UDP projekte	Da	1	0	7	8	
	Ne	134	98	86	318	0,21
Poznavanje UDP projekata	Da	1	1	6	8	
	Ne	134	97	87	318	0,16
Smatra se turističkim poslom	Da	9	34	26	69	
	Ne	126	64	67	257	0,31

Table 5: Community differences in tourism involvement and business ownership

Variable		Bonjaneni	Engodini	Kokwane	Total	Cramer's V
Work for UDP	Yes	2	9	4	15	
	No	133	89	89	311	0.15
Supply of tourism services to the UDP	Yes	1	6	6	13	
	No	134	92	87	313	0.14
Need for tourism-related business	Yes	61	34	59	154	
	No	74	64	34	172	0.22
Current business ownership	Yes	6	14	19	39	
	No	189	84	74	287	0.21
Business ownership considered	Yes	31	50	47	128	
	No	104	48	46	198	0.28
Involvement in UDP projects	Yes	1	0	7	8	
	No	134	98	86	318	0.21
Knowledge of UDP projects	Yes	1	1	6	8	
	No	134	97	87	318	0.16
Considered a tourism-related business	Yes	9	34	26	69	
	No	126	64	67	257	0.31

Kao što je prikazano u Tablici 5, rezultati pokazuju da su razlike između zajednica u pogledu njihovih odgovora na dotične varijable uglavnom značajne. Sve varijable, osim jedne, imale su vrijednost veličine učinka Cramerovog V učinka ispod 0,3, što ukazuje na slabu povezanost. Što su vrijednosti Cramerovog V slabije, to su veće razlike u percepciji testiranih varijabli u zajednici. Jedina varijabla s blago umjerenom vrijednošću Cramerovog V učinka od 0,31 bila je ona koja je pokušavala utvrditi jesu li ispitanici razmatrali vlasništvo nad poslovanjem vezanim uz turizam. Kod ove varijable, postoci onih koji su potvrdili bili su 34%, 53% i 38% za Bonjaneni, Engodini i Kokwane. Postoji bolja povezanost, iako umjerena, između zajednica na ovoj varijabli. Veličine Cramerovog V učinka pojačale su razlike koje su pokazale ranije analize pokazujući da je lokacija zajednice bila slaba, ali značajno povezana s razlikama u uključenosti u turizam.

As shown in Table 5 above, the results indicate that the differences between communities regarding their responses to the variables in question are mostly significant. All the variables, save one, had a Cramer's V effect size value of below 0.3, which indicates a weak association. The weaker the Cramer's V values are, the greater the differences in community perceptions of the tested variables. The only variable with a marginally moderate Cramer's V value of 0.31 was the one that sought to establish whether the respondents had considered owning a tourism-related business. On this variable, the percentages of those who confirmed were 34%, 53%, and 38% for Bonjaneni, Engodini and Kokwane, respectively. There is a better association, albeit moderate, between the communities on this variable. Cramer's V effect sizes reinforced the disparities shown by earlier analyses by showing that community location was weak but significantly associat-

Cramerov V također ukazuje na značajne razlike između zajednica, što implicira da, iako se mnogi stanovnici zajednice slažu da nisu uključeni u različite aktivnosti koje se ocjenjuju kao turistički resurs (zapošljavanje, poslovanje ili projekti), stupanj njihovog slaganja značajno se razlikuje.

4. RASPRAVA

Rezultati ove studije nude kritičan uvid u nijansirane i raznolike utjecaje turizma na zajednice koje okružuju park uKhahlamba Drakensberg. Unatoč zajedničkom obilježju, tj. lokaciji u blizini glavne turističke atrakcije, zajednice Bonjaneni, Kokwane i Engodini doživljavaju različite socioekonomske utjecaje i razine sudjelovanja u turističkim aktivnostima. Te nejednakosti naglašavaju značaj analiza koje su specifične za kontekst razumijevanja i rješavanje izazova djelovanja turizma na lokalne zajednice.

Podaci pokazuju da su pozitivni socioekonomski utjecaji neravnomjerno raspoređeni među zajednicama. Bonjaneni bilježi veće pozitivne društvene i ekonomske utjecaje od Engodinja, koji za pozitivne utjecaje dosljedno pokazuje najniže prosječne srednje vrijednosti. To se može pripisati nekoliko čimbenika, kao što su npr. moguća bolja integracija Bonjanenija s turizmom i potencijalno robusnija infrastruktura ili lokalne politike orijentirane na turizam. Ovi rezultati u skladu su s postojećom literaturom koja sugerira da zajednice bliže turističkim središtima ili s boljim pristupom turističkoj infrastrukturi imaju značajnije koristi (Rogerson i Rogerson, 2014; Saayman i Saayman, 2010).

Suprotno tomu, Bonjaneni također izvještava o najvećim negativnim ekonomskim utjecajima, što sugerira složen odnos u kojem koristi turizma prate značajni nedostaci. To je u skladu sa studijama koje pokazuju da turizam, iako može generirati značajne ekonomske koristi, često donosi izazove poput povećanih troškova života, ekonomskih

ed with differences in tourism involvement. The Cramer's V further indicate significant differences between the communities, implying that though many community residents agree that they are not involved in the various tourism-rated activities (employment, business, or projects), the extent to which they agree is significantly different.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study offer critical insights into the nuanced and varied impacts of tourism on communities surrounding the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park. Despite the commonality of being adjacent to a major tourism attraction, the communities of Bonjaneni, Kokwane, and Engodini experience different socio-economic impacts and levels of participation in tourism activities. This disparity underscores the importance of context-specific analyses in understanding and addressing the impacts of tourism on local communities.

The data reveals that positive socio-economic impacts are unevenly distributed among the communities. Bonjaneni reports higher positive social and economic impacts than Engodini, which consistently shows the lowest average mean values for positive impacts. This could be attributed to several factors, including Bonjaneni's possible better integration with the tourism sector and potentially more robust infrastructure or tourism-oriented local policies. These findings align with the existing literature suggesting that communities closer to tourism hubs or with better access to tourism infrastructure benefit more significantly (Rogerson and Rogerson, 2014; Saayman and Saayman, 2010).

Conversely, Bonjaneni also reports the highest negative economic impacts, suggesting a complex relationship where significant drawbacks accompany the benefits of tourism. This is consistent with studies

ovisnosti o nestabilnoj industriji i dohodovne nejednakosti (Giampiccoli *et al.*, 2020; Chi, 2021). Najveći negativni društveni utjecaji zabilježeni u Kokwaneu, kao što su porast kriminala i komodifikacija kulture, dodatno ilustriraju društvene troškove turizma kao što je navedeno u literaturi (Abukari i Mwalyosi, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2020).

U studiji se ističe ključno pitanje ograničenog sudjelovanja lokalnih zajednica u turističkim aktivnostima. Unatoč lokaciji u blizini glavne turističke destinacije, zajednice, posebno Engodini, osjećaju se isključenima u pogledu ekonomskih mogućnosti turizma. Ta se isključenost očituje u niskim razinama zaposlenosti u turizmu, vlasništvu poduzeća i sudjelovanju u turističkim projektima. Ovi rezultati odražavaju šire kritike u turističkoj literaturi o marginalizaciji lokalnih zajednica u razvoju turizma (Budhiasa *et al.*, 2017; Chiutsi i Saarinen, 2017).

Zapreke sudjelovanju utvrđene u ovom istraživanju – poput nedostatka kapitala, vještina i pristupa tržištima – značajne su prepreke koje se moraju riješiti kako bi se povećalo sudjelovanje zajednice u turizmu. Posebno se Engodini suočava s najvećim barijerama, što pokazuju više prosječne vrijednosti utvrđene za prepreke u poslovanju. Ovaj rezultat u skladu je s prethodnim istraživanjima koja ističu strukturne i sustavne prepreke koje lokalnim zajednicama sprječavaju potpuno sudjelovanje u turizmu i ostvarivanje koristi od njega (Giampiccoli i Mtapuri, 2017; Saayman i Saayman, 2010).

Teorija dionika pretpostavlja da bi interesi svih skupina na koje utječu aktivnosti organizacije trebali biti priznati (Perdue, 2004). Međutim, istraživanje je otkrilo nisko sudjelovanje u turističkom zapošljavanju i poslovanju (samo 15 od 326 ispitanika radilo je za UDP); minimalno sudjelovanje u projektima UDP (sudjelovalo je samo osam od 326); i visoke prepreke ulasku (nedostatak kapitala, vještina, državne potpore). Ti rezultati sugeriraju da su lokalne zajednice marginalizirani dionici, a unatoč tomu što su

indicating that while tourism can generate substantial economic benefits, it often brings challenges such as increased cost of living, economic dependence on a volatile industry, and income inequality (Giampiccoli *et al.*, 2020; Chi, 2021). The highest negative social impacts reported in Kokwane further illustrate the social costs of tourism, like increased crime and cultural commodification as noted in the literature (Abukari and Mwalyosi, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2020).

The study highlights a critical issue: the limited participation of local communities in tourism activities. Despite the location in the vicinity of a major tourist destination, the communities, particularly Engodini, feel excluded from tourism's economic opportunities. This exclusion is manifested in low levels of tourism-related employment, business ownership, and involvement in tourism projects. These findings resonate with broader critiques in the tourism literature about the marginalisation of local communities in tourism development (Budhiasa *et al.*, 2017; Chiutsi and Saarinen, 2017).

The barriers to participation identified in this study – such as lack of capital, skills, and access to markets – are significant impediments that must be addressed to enhance community involvement in tourism. Engodini, in particular, faces the most substantial barriers, reflected in their higher mean values for barriers to business. This finding aligns with the previous research highlighting the structural and systemic barriers that prevent local communities from fully participating in and benefiting from tourism (Giampiccoli and Mtapuri, 2017; Saayman and Saayman, 2010).

The stakeholder theory posits that all groups affected by an organisation's activities should have their interests acknowledged (Perdue, 2004). However, the study found: low participation in tourism employment & businesses (only 15 out of 326 respondents worked for UDP); minimal involvement in UDP projects (just 8 out of 326 had partic-

najizravnije pogođene turizmom, imaju malo utjecaja na njegov razvoj. Ovakvo isključenje proturječi načelu teorije dionika o pravednoj zastupljenosti i pojačava neravnotežu moći gdje vanjski investitori i uprave parkova dominiraju koristima. Teorija dionika nadalje naglašava da različite skupine neravnomjerno doživljavaju utjecaje na temelju svoje snage i pristupa resursima (Donohoe *et al.*, 2015). Rezultati istraživanja to podupiru jer su otkrili ekonomske razlike i jaz u sudjelovanju i zastupljenosti koji pokazuju nejednak utjecaj dionika. To se slaže s kritikama da se tijekom planiranja turizma često isključuju lokalni glasovi (Tosun, 2007), što dovodi do obespravljenosti i ogorčenosti.

Značajne razlike u načinu na koji zajednice doživljavaju turizam i sudjeluju u njemu naglašavaju potrebu za prilagođenim političkim intervencijama. Univerzalni pristup nije dovoljan za rješavanje specifičnih potreba i izazova svake zajednice. Zato bi politike trebale biti osmišljene na način da se poboljšaju pozitivni učinci turizma, a istovremeno ublaže negativni učinci i osigura pravednija raspodjela koristi. To uključuje inicijative za izgradnju lokalnih kapaciteta, poboljšanje infrastrukture, pružanje financijske podrške te osiguravanje uključivog i participativnog razvoja turizma.

Ovo istraživanje daje značajan znanstveni doprinos empirijskim demonstriranjem prostorne heterogenosti socioekonomskih utjecaja među susjednim zajednicama u blizini zaštićenog područja, čime se dovodi u pitanje pretpostavka da geografska blizina osigurava ujednačene koristi od turizma. Rigoroznim komparativnim ispitivanjem kućanstava u istraživanju otkrivaju se statistički različita iskustva koja se mogu pripisati strukturnim nejednakostima u pristupu kapitalu, vještinama i institucionalnoj isključenosti. Utemeljeno na teoriji dionika, istraživanje unaprjeđuje metodološke inovacije putem kontekstualno prilagodljivih metrika (pojednostavljene Likertove skale) i kvantitativne analize dispariteta (ANOVA,

ipated); and high barriers to entry (lack of capital, skills, government support). These findings suggest that local communities are marginalised stakeholders, despite being the most directly impacted by tourism, they have little influence over its development. This exclusion contradicts stakeholder theory's principle of fair representation and reinforces power imbalances where external investors and park authorities dominate benefits. The Stakeholder theory further highlights that different groups experience impacts unevenly based on their power and access to resources (Donohoe *et al.*, 2015). The study's results support this as it revealed economic disparities and participation and representation gaps that reflect unequal stakeholder influence. This aligns with critiques that tourism planning often excludes local voices (Tosun, 2007), leading to disempowerment and resentment.

The significant differences in how communities experience and participate in tourism highlight the need for tailored policy interventions. A one-size-fits-all approach is inadequate for addressing each community's specific needs and challenges. Therefore, policies should be designed to enhance the positive impacts of tourism while mitigating the negative effects and ensuring a more equitable distribution of benefits. This includes initiatives to build local capacity, improve infrastructure, provide financial support, and ensure that tourism development is inclusive and participatory.

The present study makes significant scientific contributions by empirically demonstrating the spatial heterogeneity of socio-economic impacts among adjacent communities near a protected area, challenging the assumption that geographic proximity ensures uniform tourism benefits. Through a rigorous comparative household survey, it reveals statistically divergent experiences, attributable to structural inequities in capital access, skills, and institutional exclusion. Grounded in the stakeholder the-

Cramerov V) te istovremeno ističe neuspjehe u upravljanju, što dokazuju minimalna zaposlenost zajednice (4,6%) i svijest o projektu (2,5%). Ovi rezultati zahtijevaju prostorno prilagođene politike koje daju prioritet mikrofinanciranju, razvoju vještina i reformama zajedničkog upravljanja kako bi se riješile lokalizirane barijere, nudeći ponovljivi model za pravedno planiranje turizma u zaštićenim područjima diljem svijeta.

5. ZAKLJUČAK

Ova studija pružila je vrijedne uvide u nijansirane i različite utjecaje turizma na ruralne zajednice koje okružuju park uKhahlamba Drakensberg u Južnoj Africi. Istraživanje je osvijetlilo složenu dinamiku koja oblikuje interakcije između turizma i zajednice te razjasnilo izazove i prilike svojstvene razvoju turizma. Rezultati daju otrežnjujuću sliku utjecaja turizma na te zajednice, otkrivajući niske razine sudjelovanja u turističkim aktivnostima i potvrđujući prisutnost različitih prepreka angažmanu. Značajno je da su uočene razlike između zajednica, što je istaknulo nejednakosti u iskustvima i percepcijama utjecaja turizma unatoč njihovoj blizini istoj destinaciji.

Ovo istraživanje daje nekoliko doprinosa kako akademskoj spoznaji tako i praktičnom kreiranju politika. Prvo, ono se bavi značajnim pomanjkanjem literature i koncentrira se na raznovrsne utjecaje turizma na susjedne zajednice, čime se produbljuje naše razumijevanje kontekstualnih čimbenika koji oblikuju dinamiku turizma i zajednice. Drugo, zalažući se za prilagođene pristupe politikama i praksi koje su specifične za potrebe različitih zajednica, nude se praktični uvidi za promicanje pravednog razvoja i poboljšanje održivosti turističkih inicijativa.

Ova studija nije bez ograničenja. Iako kvantitativni pristup istraživanju pruža vrijedne podatke za komparativnu analizu, on može previdjeti nijansirane kvalitativne as-

pekte, the research advances methodological innovation via context-adaptive metrics (simplified Likert scales) and quantitative disparity analysis (ANOVA, Cramer's V), while highlighting governance failures, as evidenced by minimal community employment (4.6%) and project awareness (2.5%). These findings necessitate spatially tailored policies prioritising microfinance, skills development, and co-management reforms to address the localised barriers, offering a replicable framework for equitable tourism planning in protected areas globally.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has provided valuable insights into tourism's nuanced and divergent impacts on rural communities surrounding the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park in South Africa. This research has illuminated the complex dynamics shaping tourism-community interactions and shed light on the challenges and opportunities inherent in tourism development. The findings of this study paint a sobering picture of tourism's impact on these communities, revealing low levels of participation in tourism activities and confirming the presence of various barriers to engagement. Significantly, differences were observed between the communities, highlighting disparities in the experiences and perceptions of tourism impacts despite their shared proximity to the same destination.

This research makes several contributions to both scholarly knowledge and practical policy-making. Firstly, it addresses a notable gap in the literature by focusing on the divergent impacts of tourism on neighbouring communities, thereby deepening our understanding of the contextual factors shaping tourism-community dynamics. Secondly, by advocating for tailored policy and practice approaches specific to the needs of different communities, this study offers practical insights for promoting equitable development and enhancing the sustainability of tourism initiatives.

pekte iskustava i percepcija zajednice. Osim toga, opseg istraživanja bio je ograničen na tri specifične zajednice oko parka uKhahlamba Drakensberg, a to može ograničiti i generalizaciju rezultata na druge kontekste. Buduća istraživanja trebala bi nadopuniti kvantitativnu analizu kvalitativnim metodologijama kako bi se sveobuhvatno razumjela iskustva i percepcije zajednice. Štoviše, proširenje opsega studije na širi raspon zajednica i turističkih odredišta omogućilo bi nijansiranije istraživanje utjecaja turizma u različitim kontekstima.

This study is not without limitations. While the quantitative approach in this research provides valuable data for comparative analysis, it may overlook the nuanced qualitative aspects of community experiences and perceptions. Additionally, its scope was limited to three specific communities around the uKhahlamba Drakensberg Park, which may restrict the generalisability of the findings to other contexts. Future research should complement quantitative analysis with qualitative methodologies to comprehensively understand community experiences and perceptions. Moreover, expanding the scope of the study to include a broader range of communities and tourism destinations would facilitate a more nuanced exploration of tourism impacts across diverse contexts.

LITERATURA – REFERENCES

- Abukari, H. & Mwalyosi, R. B. (2020). Local communities' perceptions about the impact of protected areas on livelihoods and community development. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 22, e00909. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e00909>
- Baiburiev, R., David, L., Abdreyeva, S., Zhakupova, A. & Artemyev, A. (2018). Impacts of tourism activities on economy of Kazakhstan. *GeoJournal of Tourism & Geosites*, 22, 480-488. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.22217-304>
- Beeton, S. (2006). *Community Development Through Tourism*. Collingwood: CSIRO Publishing. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1071/9780643093881>
- Bello, F. G., Lovelock, B. & Carr, N. (2018). Enhancing community participation in tourism planning associated with protected areas in developing countries: Lessons from Malawi. *Tourism & Hospitality Research*, 18, 309-320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358416647763>
- Bonnafous-Boucher, M. & Pesqueux, Y. (2005). *Stakeholder Theory: A European Perspective*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230524224>
- Budhiasa, S., Wakarmamu, T. & Firman, A. (2017). Community participation as agent for sustainable tourism: A structural model of tourism development at Bali province, Indonesia. *International Journal of Economic Research*, 14, 73-83.
- Bwalya Umar, B. & Kapembwa, J. (2020). Economic benefits, local participation, and conservation ethic in a game management area: evidence from Mambwe, Zambia. *Tropical Conservation Science*, 13, 1940082920971754. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940082920971754>
- Chambwe, M. & Saayman, A. (2024). A framework for tourism value chain ownership in rural communities. *Community Development Journal*, 60, 323-340. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsae022>
- Chi, J. (2021). Revisiting the tourism-in-equality nexus: evidence from a panel of developed and developing economies.

- Current Issues in Tourism*, 24, 755-767. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1743243>
- Chiutsi, S. & Saarinen, J. (2017). Local participation in transfrontier tourism: Case of Sengwe community in Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area, Zimbabwe. *Development Southern Africa*, 34, 260-275. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0376835X.2016.1259987>
- Clark, J. & Wise, N. (2018). *Urban renewal, community and participation: theory, policy and practice*. Cham, Switzerland, Springer. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-72311-2>
- Cornwall, A. (2008). Unpacking 'Participation': models, meanings and practices. *Community Development Journal*, 43, 269-283. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsn010>
- David, M. & Terrel, G. (2019). Dark sky tourism: economic impacts on the Colorado Plateau Economy, USA. *Tourism Review*, 74, 930-942. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-10-2018-0146>
- Deery, M., Jago, L. & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 33, 64-73. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.01.026>
- Demirkaya, H. & Çetin, T. (2010). Residents' perceptions on the social and cultural impacts of tourism in Alanya-Turkey (Antalya - Turkey). *Alanya'da (Antalya-Türkiye) Yerli Halkın Turizmin Sosyal ve Kültürel Etkileri Hakkında Algıları*, 14, 383-392.
- Dlomo, T. O. (2021). *Tourism as a tool for local economic development in King Sabata Dalindyebo Municipality*, University of Johannesburg (South Africa). DOI: <https://hdl.handle.net/102000/0002>
- Donohoe, H., Bianca, R. & Becerra, L. (2015). Theoretical Perspectives on Stakeholders in Tourism Management. In: Bricker, K. S. & Donohoe, H. (eds.) *Demystifying theories in tourism research*. Oxfordshire: CABI Publishing. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1079/9781780647227.0018>
- Dragouni, M. & Fouseki, K. (2018). Drivers of community participation in heritage tourism planning: an empirical investigation. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 13, 237-256. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2017.1310214>
- Dube, K. (2020). Tourism and sustainable development goals in the African context. *International Journal of Economics and Finance Studies*, 12, 88-102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34109/ijefs.202012106>
- Esfehani, M. H. & Albrecht, J. N. (2019). Planning for intangible cultural heritage in tourism: Challenges and implications. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 43, 980-1001. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348019840789>
- Ezemvelo-Kzn-Wildlife (2018). Fees & Charges 2018-2019. Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife Reservations Office, Cascades: Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife. Retrieved from: <https://www.kznwildlife.com/tariffs.html>
- Fezeka, M. & Stella, K. A. (2020). Assessment of the socio-economic impacts of Tourism on three rural communities neighbouring addo elephant national park, Eastern Cape, South Africa. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 9, 1-19.
- Freeman, E. R., Harrison, J. S., Wicks, A. C., Parmar, B. L. & De Colle, S. (2010). *Stakeholder Theory: The State of the Art*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2010.495581>
- Frent, C. (2016). An overview on the negative impacts of tourism. *Revista de Turism*, 32-37. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4316/rdt.22.344>
- Giampiccoli, A., Muhsin, B. A. & Mtapuri, O. (2020). Community-based tourism in the case of the Maldives. *Geo Journal of Tourism and Geosites*, 29, 428-439. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.29204-479>

- Giampiccoli, A. & Saayman, M. (2018). Community-based tourism development model and community participation. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 7, 27-38.
- Giddy, J. K. & Rogerson, J. (2023). Linking state-owned nature-based tourism assets for local small enterprise development: Addo Elephant National Park, South Africa. *Studia Periegetica*, 43, 107-128. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58683/sp.597>
- Grzelak-Kostulska, S. Ś.-M. E., Dąbrowski, L. S. & Smoliński, J. B. P. (2015). Culture-led regeneration as a vital instrument for preserving the cultural heritage of historical parks in Poland. *Journal of Tourism Research*, 17, 591-601.
- Hatipoglu, B., Alvarez, M. D. & Ertuna, B. (2016). Barriers to stakeholder involvement in the planning of sustainable tourism: the case of the Thrace region in Turkey. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 306-317. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.11.059>
- Hindsworth, M. F. & Lang, T. B. (2009). *Community participation and empowerment*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Hughes, E. & Scheyvens, R. (2020). Corporate social responsibility in tourism post-2015: A development first approach. *Tourism and Sustainable Development Goals*. Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2016.1208678>
- Ingonyama-Trust. (2019). *Quick Facts about Ingonyama Trust Land* [Online]. Pietermaritzburg: Ingonyama Trust. Retrieved from: <http://www.ingonyamatrust.org.za/> [accessed 21 February 2020].
- Kelfaoui, A., Rezzaz, M. A. & Kherrou, L. (2021). Revitalization of mountain rural tourism as a tool for sustainable local development in Kabylie (Algeria). The case of Yakouren municipality. *Geo Journal of Tourism and Geosites*, 34, 112-125. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.34115-626>
- Khan, A., Bibi, S., Lorenzo, A., Lyu, J. & Babar, Z. U. (2020). Tourism and development in developing economies: A policy implication perspective. *Sustainability*, 12, 1618. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12041618>
- Kimani, N., Bosire, C. & Luchetu Likaka, A. (2013). *Citizen participation in decision making: towards inclusive development in Kenya*. Nairobi, Kenya: Twaweza Communications.
- Kreag, G. (2001). *The Impacts of Tourism* [Online]. Minnesota: Minnesota Sea Grant. Retrieved from: <http://www.seagrants.umn.edu/downloads/t13.pdf> [Accessed 4 April 2019].
- Kumail, T., Sadiq, M., Ali, W. & Sadiq, F. (2023). The impacts of tourism development on income inequality: how does tourism capital investment contribute to income distribution? *Tourism Agenda 2030. Tourism Review*, 78, 630-645. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/TR-08-2022-0378>
- Lachapelle, P. R. & Austin, E. K. (2014). Community Participation. In: Michalos, A. C. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_471
- Latip, N. A., Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Jaafar, M., Marzuki, A. & Umar, M. U. (2018). Indigenous participation in conservation and tourism development: A case of native people of Sabah, Malaysia. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20, 400-409. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2191>
- Li, Y. & Hunter, C. (2015). Community involvement for sustainable heritage tourism: a conceptual model. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 5, 248-262. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-08-2014-0027>

- Maree, K. & Pietersen, J. (2019). Surveys and the use of questionnaires. In: Maree, K. (ed.) *First Steps in Research*. 3rd ed. Pretoria, South Africa: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Martín, J. M., Salinas Fernandez, J. A., Rodriguez Martin, J. A. & Ostos Rey, M. D. S. (2020). Analysis of tourism seasonality as a factor limiting the sustainable development of rural areas. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 44, 45-75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348019876688>
- Mason, P. (2008). *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. Cambridge: Routledge.
- Mccombes, L., Vanclay, F. & Evers, Y. (2015). Putting social impact assessment to the test as a method for implementing responsible tourism practice. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 55, 156-168. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2015.07.002>
- Mckercher, B., Wang, D. & Park, E. (2015). Social impacts as a function of place change. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 50, 52-66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.11.002>
- Medina, R. M. P., Martín, J. M. M., Martínez, J. M. G. & Azevedo, P. S. (2022). Analysis of the role of innovation and efficiency in coastal destinations affected by tourism seasonality. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 7, 100163. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2022.100163>
- Mogomotsi, G. E. J., Mogomotsi, P. K., Gondo, R. & Madigele, T. J. (2018). Community participation in cultural heritage and environmental policy formulation in Botswana. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources & Environment*, 16, 171-189. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10042857.2018.1480684>
- Mowforth, M. & Munt, I. (2016). *Tourism and Sustainability: Development, Globalisation and New Tourism in the Third World*. Oxon: Routledge. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315795348>
- Murphy, P. E. & Murphy, A. E. (2004). *Strategic Management for Tourism Communities*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781873150856>
- Nair, V., Hussain, K., Chiun, L. M., Ragavan, N. A. & Lekaota, L. (2015). The importance of rural communities' participation in the management of tourism management: A case study from Lesotho. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 7, 453-462. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-06-2015-0029>
- Njoya, E. T. & Seetaram, N. (2018). Tourism contribution to poverty alleviation in Kenya: A dynamic computable general equilibrium analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57, 513-524. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287517700317>
- Ogbaharya, D. G. (2006). A capability theory of CBNRM: The case of Namibia's Communal Conservancy Program. International Conference of the Human Development and Capability Association, Groningen. Retrieved from: www.capabilityapproach.com/pubs/3_6_Ogbaharya.pdf [accessed 18 August 2010].
- Perdue, R. R. (2004). Sustainable Tourism and stakeholder Groups: a Case Study of Colorado Ski Resort Communities. In: Crouch, G. I., Perdue, R. R., Timmermans, H. J. P. & Uysal, M. (eds.) *Consumer psychology of tourism, hospitality and leisure*. 3rd ed. Oxfordshire: CABI Publishing. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851997490.0253>
- Polat, N. (2013). Impacts of tourism projects of development agencies on social peace in Turkey. *Tourismos*, 8, 233-245. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26215/tourismos.v8i1.337>
- Prabhakaran, S., Nair, V. & Ramachandran, S. (2014). Community Participation in Rural Tourism: Towards a Conceptual Frame-

- work. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 290-295. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.298>
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Jaafar, M., Ahmad, A. G. & Barghi, R. (2017). Community participation in World Heritage Site conservation and tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 58, 142-153. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.016>
- Rogerson, J. M. & Rogerson, C. (2014). Maximising the local development potential of Nature Tourism accommodation establishments in South Africa. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 3, 1-20.
- Ryan, C. (2003). *Recreational Tourism: Demand and Impacts*. Sydney: Channel View Publications. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781873150580>
- Saayman, M. & Saayman, A. (2010). Regional Development and National Parks in South Africa: Lessons Learned. *Tourism Economics*, 16, 1037-1064. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2010.0007>
- Scholtz, M. & Slabbert, E. (2016). The relevance of the tangible and intangible social impacts of tourism on selected South African communities. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 14, 107-128. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2015.1031796>
- Shereni, N. C. & Chambwe, M. (2024). Nature-based Tourism in Zimbabwe: Sustainability Issues. In: Stone, L. S. & Stone, M. T. (eds.) *Wildlife Tourism Dynamics in Southern Africa: Contemporary Issues, Challenges and Prospects for Sustainable Development*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57252-4_5
- Steele, J. & Scherrer, P. (2018). Flipping the principal-agent model to foster host community participation in monitoring and evaluation of volunteer tourism programmes. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 43, 321-334. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2018.1457251>
- Su, M. M. & Wall, G. (2014). Community Participation in Tourism at a World Heritage Site: Mutianyu Great Wall, Beijing, China. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16, 146-156. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.1909>
- Swapan, M. S. H. (2016). Who participates and who doesn't? Adapting community participation model for developing countries. *Cities*, 53, 70-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2016.01.013>
- Tewes-Gradl, C., Van Gaalen, M. & Pirzer, C. (2014). *Destination Mutual Benefit: A Guide to Inclusive Business in Tourism*. Frankfurt: GIZ.
- Tkalec, M. & Vizek, M. (2016). The Price Tag of Tourism: Does Tourism Activity Increase the Prices of Goods and Services? *Tourism Economics*, 22, 93-109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2014.0415>
- Tosun, C. (2007). Limits to Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process in Developing Countries. In: Huybers, T. (ed.) *Tourism in Developing Countries*. Cheltenham, UK: Springer. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00009-1)
- Towner, N. (2016). Community participation and emerging surfing tourism destinations: a case study of the Mentawai Islands. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 20, 1-19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775085.2016.1151819>
- Velnisa Paimin, N. F., Modilih, S., Mogindol, S. H., Johnny, C. & Thamburaj, J. A. (2014). Community Participation and Barriers in Rural Tourism: A Case Study in Kiulu, Sabah. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 12, 1-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1051/shs-conf/20141201003>
- Vidickienė, D., Vilké, R. & Gedminaitė-Raudonė, Ž. (2020). Transformative tourism as an innovative tool for rural development. *European Countryside*, 12, 277-291. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/euco-2020-0016>

- Wang, J., Huang, X., Gong, Z. & Cao, K. (2020). Dynamic assessment of tourism carrying capacity and its impacts on tourism economic growth in urban tourism destinations in China. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 15, 100383. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2019.100383>
- Warouw, F. F., Langitan, F. W. & Alamsyah, A. T. (2018). Community Participation for Sustainable Tourism Model in Manado Coastal Area. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 012039. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/306/1/012039>
- Wazimap. (2021). *Community Survey 2016* [Online]. Retrieved from: <https://wazimap.co.za/profiles/district-DC23-uthukela/> [Accessed 2 November 2021].
- Wijijayanti, T., Agustina, Y., Winarno, A., Istanti, L. N. & Dharma, B. A. (2020). Rural tourism: A local economic development. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, 14, 5-13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v14i1.2>
- Woo, E., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. J. (2018). Tourism Impact and Stakeholders' Quality of Life. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 42, 260-286. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348016654971>
- Primljeno: 3. prosinca 2024. / Submitted: 3 December 2024*
- Prihvaćeno: 18. lipnja 2025. / Accepted: 18 June 2025*
- Ovaj je rad izdan pod licencom CC BY-NC (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).
- This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).