

## Article

# Local perceptions of the relative contributions of enclave tourism and agritourism to community well-being: The case of Mauritius

Naidoo, Perunjodi and Sharpley, Richard

Available at <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/12939/>

*Naidoo, Perunjodi and Sharpley, Richard (2015) Local perceptions of the relative contributions of enclave tourism and agritourism to community well-being: The case of Mauritius. Journal of Destination Marketing and Management . ISSN 2212-571X*

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2015.11.002>

For more information about UCLan's research in this area go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/researchgroups/> and search for <name of research Group>.

For information about Research generally at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

# Local perceptions of the relative benefits of enclave tourism and agritourism to community well-being: the case of Mauritius.

Perunjodi Naidoo  
University of Technology Mauritius

[pnaidoo@uemail.utm.ac.mu](mailto:pnaidoo@uemail.utm.ac.mu)

and

Richard Sharpley  
University of Central Lancashire, UK  
[rajsharpley@uclan.ac.uk](mailto:rajsharpley@uclan.ac.uk)

## **Abstract**

To date, limited attention has been paid to the contribution of tourism to the well-being of island residents in general and to whether such well-being varies according to the nature of tourism development in particular. Specifically, island tourism is frequently manifested in resort-based enclave development, a form of tourism that is often criticised for its assumed limited benefits to the wider community. As a consequence, alternative approaches such as agritourism, are increasingly proposed as a means of enhancing community development and well-being yet the relative merits of enclave and agritourism have not been explored within an island tourism context. This paper addresses this notable gap in the literature. Drawing on a questionnaire-based survey in Mauritius, it considers and compares the perceptions of local people of the extent to which enclave tourism and agritourism contribute to their well-being. The results reveal that both types of tourism development contribute both positively and negatively to community well-being although enclave tourism is perceived to have fewer positive outcomes. On the one hand, enclave tourism provides valuable cultural opportunities but damages the environment, restricts entrepreneurship and favours local elites; on the other hand, agritourism, although not yet well-established in Mauritius, is perceived to positively enhance the cultural and social spheres of community life whilst supporting entrepreneurship.

## 1.0 Introduction

Islands, according to Gillis (2007, p. 278) ‘have always been viewed as places of sojourn . . . from the beginning they were seen as remote liminal places’. Nowadays, the particular allure of islands, manifested in the juxtaposition of their tangible physical, cultural and climatic features with the less tangible characteristics of ‘island-ness’ (King, 1993; Lockhart 1997; Conkling, 2007) continues to ensure their popularity amongst tourists. Indeed, it has long been claimed that, collectively, islands represent one of the most visited categories of tourist destination (Marín, 2000). It is not surprising, therefore, that tourism has increasingly become fundamental to the economic growth and development of islands, particularly small island developing states where it has become an ‘essential component of. . . economic development’ (Ashe, 2005, p. 5). In other words, the remarkable growth in international tourism since the mid-twentieth century has coincided with the need for many small islands to restructure their economies away from a dependence on the production and export of primary commodities (McElroy, 2003). As a consequence, tourism has come to assume a significant role in many island economies (Sharpley & Ussi, 2014) and it is no coincidence that in 2014 the top ten countries in which tourism contributed relatively most to GDP were all islands (WTTC, 2015).

It is also not surprising that the development of island tourism has long benefited from significant academic scrutiny (e.g. Bastin, 1984; Conlin & Baum, 1995; Croes, 2011; Lockhart, Drakakis-Smith & Schembri, 1993; Graci & Dodds, 2010; Wilkinson, 1989). Much attention has been paid in particular to the issue of dependency, with many commentators arguing that the ‘vulnerabilities’ (Briguglio, 1995) of small islands enhance their susceptibility to dependence on the tourism sector. As Scheyvens and Momsen (2008, pp. 23) suggest, ‘tourism can perpetuate unequal relations of dependency as well as encourage uneven and inequitable socio-economic and spatial development’. Conversely, others have observed that not only are some islands with small populations amongst the wealthiest states in the world in terms of per capita GDP, but also that many islands with significant tourism sectors, particularly those in the Caribbean and Mediterranean, enjoy high average incomes and advanced levels of economic and social development (McElroy, 2006). Hence, there is evidence to suggest that, under some circumstances, tourism may indeed be an effective driver of development in island states.

Either way, however, little attention has been paid specifically to the implications of tourism development for the well-being of the populations of small island states. That is, although recent research has focused on resident perceptions of tourism on community well-

being in general (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Kim, Uysal & Sirgy, 2013; Moscardo, Konovalov, Murphy & McGehee, 2013), not only are such studies relatively rare but few have considered the contribution of tourism to the well-being of island residents in particular (Nawijn & Mitas, 2012). Moreover, the extent to which local community well-being varies according to the nature of tourism development has largely been overlooked in the island tourism research. In other words, island tourism or, more precisely, warm-water island tourism, is frequently manifested in resort-based enclave development, a form of tourism that is often criticised for its assumed limited benefits to the wider community. Conversely, alternative, sustainable approaches to tourism development on islands are considered to be more beneficial (Carlsen & Butler, 2011; Graci & Dodds, 2010). Nevertheless, no attempt has been made to assess the contribution to the well-being of the local community deriving from enclave tourism relative to other, alternative forms of tourism, such as agritourism.

The purpose of this paper is to address this gap in the literature. Based on research in Mauritius, an Indian Ocean island tourism destination widely renowned for its primarily enclave tourism sector, it considers the outcomes of a study that compares the perceptions of the local community of the extent to which enclave tourism and agritourism contribute to their well-being. In so doing, it seeks to identify a number of implications for tourism policy and planning in Mauritius. The first task, however, is to review briefly tourism, development and well-being in the context of enclave tourism and agritourism as a conceptual framework for the research.

## **2.0 Island tourism, development and well-being**

Tourism has long been favoured as a development option and officially endorsed as such. Indeed, more than three decades ago the World Tourism Organisation claimed that ‘World tourism can... ensure the steady acceleration of economic and social development and progress, in particular in developing countries’ (WTO, 1980: 1) and, since then, tourism has become fundamental to the development policies of an increasing number of countries and sub-national regions around the world (Lee & Chang, 2008). The reasons underpinning the adoption of tourism as a development option are well-known. Not least, tourism boasts a record of sustained growth and is, hence, seen as a ‘safe’ path to follow although, more specifically, it is its potential to generate and redistribute wealth, contribute to government revenues, stimulate employment and act as a catalyst for wider economic growth and development that justifies its inclusion and prominence in development policies.

Nevertheless, debate continues to surround the developmental benefits or outcomes of tourism for destination communities. That is, as an essentially economic activity, tourism undoubtedly possesses the potential to contribute to the destination economy – though this is not always guaranteed (Blake, 2008; Oh, 2005) – but the extent to which it contributes to wider social development and well-being, particularly in less developed nations, is less certain. Undoubtedly, tourism has to a lesser or greater extent underpinned the economic development of many destinations, and examples exist of its localised contribution to community well-being (Briedenhann & Wickens, 2004). Others, however, suggest that there is little empirical evidence of tourism's direct contribution to developmental goals (Novelli & Hellwig, 2011) whilst Durbarry (2004) suggests that the economic benefits of tourism do not necessarily translate into development more generally.

This is, however, unsurprising, particularly given contemporary understandings of development and well-being. As discussed in detail elsewhere (Sharpley, 2015), development remains a contested concept and one that is best thought of only in relation to the needs or aims of particular societies and the ways in which those societies seek to address their societal challenges (Hettne, 2009). Nevertheless, there is consensus that the meaning of development has evolved over time, from the narrow conceptualisation of being synonymous with economic growth, through being considered a process related to socio-economic progress and distributive justice, to the broader goal of the betterment of the human condition or what is referred to simply as 'human development' (Knuttsen, 2009). Though variously defined, human development is neatly summarised by the UNDP (2010, p.22) as:

the expansion of people's freedoms to live long, healthy and creative lives; to advance other goals they have reason to value; and to engage actively in shaping development equitably and sustainably on a shared planet. People are both the beneficiaries and drivers of human development, as individuals and in groups.

Moreover, according to UNDP (2010), human development comprises three key elements, namely, well-being, empowerment and agency, and justice, the latter including the expansion of equity, sustaining outcomes over time and respecting human rights and other goals of society.

Interestingly, although well-being is identified above as an element of human development, it may also be seen for the purposes of this paper as synonymous with human development. It is also equally difficult to define precisely, being both an objective and

subjective concept (McCabe, Joldersma & Li, 2010; Schueller, 2009). On the one hand, objective measurements of well-being include income, education, literacy, life expectancy, access to clean water, housing, healthcare and so on which, not coincidentally, are commonly applied indicators of human development. On the other hand, well-being is subjective in as much as individual members of a society inject a personal, subjective element into the assessment of their own well-being (Dissart & Deller, 2000). That is, subjective measurements of well-being ‘empower individuals to define their own well-being’ (Schueller, 2009, p. 925) and are broadly concerned with factors that contribute to an individual’s happiness and satisfaction with life. These may include good health, prosperity and integration into society (McCabe et al., 2010) – conversely, poverty is associated with reduced levels of subjective well-being (Amato & Zuo, 1992) – and also the extent to which individuals perceive their aspirations to have been met (Diener, 1994). Hence, parallels may also be drawn between subjective well-being and contemporary understandings of human development, distinctions reflecting not what is being assessed, but how.

Of particular relevance to this paper, Moscardo et al. (2013) contend that community well-being consists of multiple forms of capital: cultural, social, human, political, natural, financial and built. In other words, for tourism to be contributing to community well-being, it should be contributing to the accumulation of all of these capitals. Hence, an assessment of the relationship between tourism and development should, according to Moscardo et al. (2013), should be focused around capitals-defined community well-being which, as the preceding discussion suggests, necessitates an exploration of the community’s perceptions of their own well-being.

### ***2.1 Tourism and well-being: local community perceptions***

As noted above, research into local community perceptions of tourism’s contribution to well-being in particular is relatively recent and limited. However, local community perceptions of tourism more generally have long been the focus of academic scrutiny; according to McGehee & Andereck (2004: 132), it has become ‘one of the most systematic and well-studied areas of tourism’. The relevant literature is reviewed in-depth elsewhere (Deery, Jago & Fredline, 2012; Harrill, 2004; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012) but for the purposes of this paper, it is important to note that typically, the research ‘has been, and continues to be, concerned with identifying, measuring and comparing the variables that may influence the manner in which tourism and its impacts are perceived’ by members of the local community in destinations (Sharpley, 2014: 44). Such variables are numerous and diverse, reflecting the

diversity of the research itself. However, given the inherent duality of the concept of well-being discussed above, a number of key variables commonly identified in the literature not only reflect both objective and subjective indicators of well-being but also, as noted below, also part-informed the development of the questionnaire in this research. These variables are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Variables in local community perceptions of well-being

Variables	Study examples
Job creation / small business opportunities (Economic dependency / limited distribution of benefits)	Brougham & Butler (1981); Choi & Sirakaya (2005); Kuvan & Akan (2012); Nunkoo & Ramkissoon (2011); Prayag et al. (2010)
Enhances standard of living (lower standard of living, increased costs)	Andriotis & Vaughan (2003); Kuvan & Akan (2012); McDowall and Choi (2010)
Enhances pride in community / sense of community and social identity (loss of identity / unwelcome in tourism businesses)	Andereck & Nyaupane (2010); Choi & Sirakaya (2005); Huh & Vogt (2008); Tovar & Lockwood (2008); Vargas-Sánchez et al. (2009); Woosnam (2012)
Strengthens local culture / traditions (weakens local culture)	Andereck et al. (2005); Johnson et al. (1994); McGehee & Andereck (2004)
Improves public services and infrastructure; improves local shopping, entertainment	Andereck & Nyaupane (2011); Kuvan & Akan (2012); Prayag et al. (2010); Wang & Pfister (2008)
Conserves / improves the natural environment (degrades the natural environment)	Andereck & Nyaupane (2010) ; Prayag et al. (2010) ; Dyer et al. (2007) ; Andriotis & Vaughan (2003)
Impacts on day-to-day life: traffic jams, crowds, increases crime	Diedrich and Garcia-Buades (2009); Gursoy & Rutherford (2004); McDowall & Choi (2010);
Increases supply and quality of recreational opportunities (exclusion from tourism facilities)	Byrd et al. (2009); Dyer et al. (2007)

## 2.2 Enclave or agritourism in islands?

At the same time, however, a significant variable in the relationship between tourism and well-being is the nature of tourism itself. It has, of course, long been recognised that specific forms of tourism development, such as large-scale, mass resort developments, may limit the contribution to local community well-being in comparison to alternative forms of tourism development. Nevertheless, as noted above, much island tourism remains manifested in resort-based enclave tourism development.

The term ‘enclave tourism’ is broadly applied to the spatial concentration of tourism in resort areas where mass tourists consume an homogenous set of products and services (Britton, 1982; Opperman & Chon, 1997). However, it also refers to specific types of tourism

products, such as holiday resorts, casinos, safari lodges, cruise ships and theme parks (Aili, Jiaming & Min, 2007). It is a form of tourism characterised by physically, socially and economically self-contained structures segregated from the local community, providing tourists with all the facilities and services they require, frequently on a pre-paid 'all-inclusive' basis (Anderson, 2011). A number of benefits are associated with enclave resort development. Not only can such resorts be developed rapidly, underpinning the growth in tourism and other economic sectors in the destination (Mbaiwa, 2005), but they may also be a significant source of employment, particularly in islands with few other opportunities (Hernandez, Cohen & Garcia, 1996). Moreover, high quality resorts may enhance the overall destination image whilst also limiting potential negative socio-cultural consequences, as visitors are largely segregated from destination communities (Kokkranikal, McLellan & Baum, 2003).

Equally, enclave resorts have long been criticised for limiting the benefits of tourism accruing to the local community (Freitag, 1994). Principally, the economic benefits of tourism are not spread amongst the local community. As Freitag (1994, p. 551) argues: 'The enclave resort is not designed to produce economic linkages at the community level. Rather, its inherent flaw is that resort management seeks to limit the interactions between tourists and local community to improve its own profits'. Moreover, the resorts are often, though not always, foreign-owned, leading to the repatriation of profits (Anderson, 2011), wider infrastructural development in the destination may be more limited and employment opportunities may be limited to lower paid, unskilled jobs. However, this is a criticism often directed to other forms of tourism development.

In response to these criticisms, alternative forms of tourism have long been proposed as a means of enhancing the benefits (and minimising the negative consequences) of tourism development to destination communities (Sharpley, 2009) or, more precisely, to contribute to sustainable tourism development. One such form of tourism is agritourism, the consumption of which, according to Arroyo, Barbieri & Rich (2013), has increased significantly over the last decade. Past studies have shown the contribution of agritourism to skill development (Barbieri & Mshenga, 2008; Barbieri & Mahoney, 2009; McNally, 2001; Nickerson *et al.*, 2001; Tew & Barbieri, 2012) and in improving competency for farmers (Brandth & Haugen, 2011). Agritourism is therefore a suitable way to increase income and assist in dispersing risks (Tao & Wall, 2009). The concept of agritourism is widely considered in the literature, in particular the extent to which it may revitalise ailing rural economies and societies, yet consensus on a definition remains elusive; typically, definitions reflect particular contexts



(Philip, Hunter & Blackstock, 2010). Nevertheless, agritourism may be thought of broadly as any tourism experience directly related to the agricultural economy and environment (Jansen-Verbeke & Nijmegen, 1990). As such, it is of evident potential relevance to many island tourism destinations, such as Mauritius, with traditionally dominant agriculture-based economies. In other words, although tourism has become an increasingly important sector in the economies of many small island developing states, agriculture often remains the only other significant sector. Hence, in order to spread the benefits of tourism beyond enclave resorts to those excluded from the tourism sector, extending tourism into the agricultural sector through the development of agritourism is, in principle, both logical and potentially fruitful in enhancing the well-being of the local community. However, not only have few attempts been made to explore the potential of agritourism in small islands in general (for, example, Henderson, 2009) but also, as noted in the introduction to this paper, the local community's perceptions of the relative contribution to their well-being of enclave tourism and agritourism in a particular island context has yet to benefit from academic scrutiny.

## **2.3 The Research: Local community perceptions in Mauritius**

### **2.3.1 Research context**

Mauritius, a small island developing state covering 1,860 square kilometres with 1.2 million inhabitants, is a popular holiday destination for beach resort tourists (Naidoo, Ramseook-Munhurrin & Durbarry, 2010). Tourism is the third pillar of the economy after the manufacturing sector and agriculture. In general, the island has experienced steady growth in international tourism since 1974, when 72,915 tourist arrivals were recorded. By 2014, the number of tourist arrivals reached 1,038,968 and gross tourism earnings amounted to Rs 44,304 million (USD \$1226 million approx.). For the same year, earnings per tourist increased by 4.4% from Rs 40,839 (USD \$1130) to Rs 42,642 (USD \$1180) (Central Statistical Office, 2014). The success of Mauritius is inextricably linked to the island being a destination of choice for Europeans (Prayag, 2009; Prayag & Ryan, 2011), with France being the main tourist generator, accounting for 243,665 arrivals in 2014, followed by the United Kingdom and Germany with 115,326 and 62,231 tourists respectively (Central Statistical Office, 2014). The tourism sector is also an important employment generator, accounting for 28,718 jobs in large establishments in early 2014 (Central Statistical Office, 2014).

Enclave tourism in Mauritius is mainly characterised by hotels and Integrated Resort Schemes (IRS). In 1987, there were 60 hotels offering 3,108 hotel rooms (AHRIM, 2007/2008); by 2014, there were 112 hotels in operation with a total of 12,799 rooms

(Central Statistical Office, 2014). Compared to many developing nations, in Mauritius local hotel groups hold at least a 70% of share of the market for hotel rooms, the principal operators being 'Beachcomber' and 'Sun Resorts' with 2077 and 1262 rooms respectively in 2012. However, a more recent form of enclave tourism in Mauritius is the emergence of the IRS, where luxurious villas are built on former sugar plantations. Following the fall in sugar prices, the aim was to develop IRS to attract foreign direct investment in the country by selling the villas to foreigners at a minimum cost of US\$ 500,000 per villa, upon which the foreigner will automatically be granted a residence permit (Board of Investment, 2009).

These developments are like those found in many other touristy locations around the world – typically a gated community of holiday villas ... with access to a golf course, spa and beach. Residents can enjoy hotel-style services provided by the management company – introducing this scheme the government hopes to capitalise on the island's successful high-end tourism industry (Identity Property, 2007).

The IRS consist of self-contained amenities such as a golf course, marina, nautical and other sport facilities, health and beauty centres, shops and restaurants; day-to-day management of villas is also achieved through maintenance, waste disposal, gardening services, security and other household services. Enclave resorts are mostly characterised by luxury, quality, high value and the higher the standard of hotels, the higher the degree of exclusion. The next section reviews the research methodology adopted for this study.

### ***3.0 Research Methodology***

The study adopts a mixed approach whereby a questionnaire was developed based on the results of in-depth interviews as well as variables used in previous studies on residents' support and perceived impacts regarding tourism development (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Byrd *et al.*, 2009; Choi & Sirakaya, 2005; Dyer *et al.*, 2007; Mcdowall & Choi, 2010; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Nawijn & Mitas, 2012; Prayag *et al.*, 2010). Statements from the existing literature (see Table 1) that were similar to the findings from the interviews were adopted to enhance reliability and validity of the questionnaire. In-depth interviews were conducted amongst key informants since little is known about the topic and the latter could provide a detailed perspective that could not be obtained from representative survey respondents (Decrop, 2004). Twenty seven interviews were carried out amongst key informants

such as government officials, small entrepreneurs, hotel managers, academics and tour operators.

Items used in the questionnaire were slightly rephrased to reflect the specific focus on enclave tourism and agritourism. The scale consisted of thirty items in Section A which assessed the contributions of enclave tourism to community well-being based on seven community well-being domains: economic, social, environment, leisure, culture, education and governance. Two additional items were used to assess community well-being. The same variables were used in Section B of the questionnaire to assess the contributions of agritourism to community well-being. All items were measured on a 1–5 Likert scale ranging from ‘Strongly Disagree’ to ‘Strongly Agree’ which is a common scale for measuring perceptions of residents (see Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). The questionnaire was pre-tested amongst 18 respondents through face-to-face administration. This was done to enhance the validity of the questionnaire before conducting the full-scale survey (Ramseook-Munhurrin, Naidoo & Nundlall, 2010). Following this exercise, ambiguous items were rephrased. Moreover, those who did not have an interest in tourism showed reluctance to participate in the survey and had difficulties to rate the items. These observations were considered when identifying the final data collection procedure and sampling frame.

A sample population of 300 residents of Mauritius was targeted for the study. Cattell (1978) stated that a sample of at least 250 respondents is the minimum desirable sample for statistical analysis. Purposive sampling was used to identify a suitable host community sample in different regions of the island including resorts and agricultural areas. The response rate was 83.4% as 47 incomplete questionnaires were discarded from the survey to avoid biased statistical results (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The data was coded using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 21.0. Principal component factor analysis with Varimax rotation was used to summarise the information in the 30 original variables into a smaller set of new correlated composites community well-being dimensions. Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA) and regression analyses were conducted separately for enclave tourism and agritourism. The results are presented in the next section.

## ***4.0 Results***

### ***4.1 Demographic characteristics***

The results of the descriptive analysis for demographic information indicated that among the sample analysed ( $n=253$ ), there were 51% males and 49% females. 50.6% of the respondents lived in urban areas whereas 49.4% were from rural areas. 13.4% had lived in the area less than 11 years, 40.3% of the participants had lived in the area for 11-20 years and 46.3% for more than 21 years. 24.1% of respondents were employed by enclave resorts, 13.5% by the agricultural sector, 38% were small and medium entrepreneurs with indirect jobs in the tourism sector, 5.2% were small and medium entrepreneurs directly involved in the tourism sector and 19.2% were categorised as “other”. The next section discusses the results regarding the contribution of enclave tourism to community well-being.

#### 4.2 Enclave Tourism

The 30 measurement items in Section A related to enclave tourism were subject to EFA which identified the constructs that underlie a dataset based on the correlations between variables (Field, 2009; Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001). EFA were initially performed using principal axis factoring and Varimax rotation with the Kaiser normalization. The Bartlett test of sphericity was significant ( $\chi^2=2242.636$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ) with a total variance extracted of 65.32%. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO-MSA) was computed to quantify the degree of intercorrelations among the variables, and the results showed an index of 0.83 indicating that the construct was acceptable for factor analysis. A cut-off factor loading of 0.5 and an eigenvalue greater than or equal to 1 were used (Hair et al., 1998). The results of the factor analysis revealed that the original seven-factor structure was not supported. Careful review of the loadings indicated that a number of items did not load strongly on any dimension and needed to be dropped. The new factors were, therefore, re-labelled to better represent the results of the factor analysis.

The new factor structure resulted in a total of five factors (Table 2). The first factor was relabelled ‘Education & Culture’, with eight items loading on this dimension which accounted for 27.7% of variability. The results revealed that all the original items from the Education domain, three items from the Cultural domain, 1 item from the Social domain and 1 item from the Governance domain loaded on this factor. The statement “Shopping, restaurants & entertainment options are better as a result of enclave tourism” was initially identified as a “Social” factor; however, since it also consisted of a cultural component, it was found suitable as an item of the “Education & Culture” dimension. Moreover, past studies have often grouped social and cultural items as they were intricately linked (Kuvan & Akan, 2012). The item “Exists a lack of coordination and cooperation between public and private stakeholders in the development of enclave tourism” was also appropriate to be included in Factor 1 since coordination and cooperation amongst stakeholders determine the types and extent of education opportunities provided by enclave tourism.

**Table 2**  
**Factor Structure and Mean Scores for the Contributions of Enclave Tourism to Community Well-being**

<i>Items</i>	<i>Loadings</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Eigen Value</i>	<i>Mean Scores</i>
<b>Factor 1: Education &amp; Culture</b>		27.7	.90	5.4	2.89
Provides valuable experiences for tourists to appreciate local culture and heritage	.72				3.10
Promotes better understanding between cultures	.72				2.83
Enhances professional skills of locals	.85				3.16
Enhances personal development of locals	.84				3.01
Enhances level of education of locals	.86				3.08
Enhances shopping, restaurants & entertainment	.64				3.04
Preserves local traditions and way of life	.67				2.82
Exists a lack of coordination and cooperation between stakeholders	.60				3.88
<b>Factor 2: Socio-Economic Benefits</b>		16.96	.77	3.4	3.57
Improves public services and infrastructure	.78				3.93
Increases positive interaction between locals and tourists	.66				3.53
Enhances community pride	.68				3.17
Increases standard of living of locals	.70				3.66
Reduces crime rates	.64				2.41
<b>Factor 3: Job &amp; Business Opportunities</b>		9.02	.82	1.8	3.95
Improves job opportunities for locals	.88				4.02
Provides business opportunities for locals & small/medium enterprises	.87				3.88
<b>Factor 4: Negative Impacts on Leisure</b>		6.31	.62	1.3	3.27
Reduces the quality of outdoor recreational opportunities	.68				3.11
Increases pollution and traffic jam	.67				3.50
Reduces spaces for leisure	.60				3.20
<b>Factor 5: Coastal Environment Loss</b>		5.87	.60	1.2	3.61
Puts pressure on beaches, coral reefs & fishing activities	.78				3.91
Locals do not feel welcome within enclave tourism properties	.72				3.33

Notes:  $p < 0.000$ ; KMO-MSA = 0.83; Bartlett's test of sphericity = 2242.636

Factor 2 was re-labelled 'Socio-Economic Benefits' and consisted of five items accounting for 16.96% of the variance. The factor consisted of four originally proposed items from the social domain and one item from the economic domain, namely "Enclave tourism increases the standard of living of locals". Factor 3 was renamed 'Job & Business Opportunities' and comprised of two items related to employment and business prospects explaining 9.02% of the variability. The fourth factor was named 'Negative Impacts on Leisure' and consisted of

three items with 6.31% of variance explained. Two items from the leisure domain and one item from the environment domain loaded on this factor. Factor 5 was labelled 'Coastal Environment Loss' and accounted for 5.87% of the variability. After these modifications were completed, Cronbach's coefficients for each of the five dimensions were calculated to investigate the reliability of the scale. A Cronbach's alpha value of 0.73 was obtained for the overall scale with the first three factors having coefficients ranging from 0.77 to 0.90. Factor 5 and 6, had lower coefficients but research suggest that alpha coefficients for scales with few items can often be as small as 0.6 and still considered acceptable (Petrick, 2002). Table 2 also provides the mean scores for the items assessing the contributions of enclave tourism to community well-being. The highest mean score was obtained for Factor 3 - 'Job & Business Opportunities' (3.95), followed by Factor 5- 'Coastal Environment Loss'(3.61), Factor 2- 'Socio-economic Benefits' (3.57) and Factor 4- 'Negative Impacts on Leisure' (3.27). The respondents had mixed views regarding Factor 1- 'Education & Culture' (2.89) as they perceived that it contributed more to education but rated two of the cultural items rather poorly and perceived that there was a lack of coordination and collaboration amongst stakeholders.

A regression analysis was conducted to identify the relative importance of the factors which influenced residents' perceptions of the contributions of enclave tourism to community well-being. Community well-being was used as a dependent variable and the five factors identified as independent variables. The findings indicated that community well-being was influenced by the factors. The adjusted  $R^2 = .413$  revealed that a relationship existed and accounted for 41.3% of the variance. The strongest positive effect was observed for 'Education & Culture' ( $\beta = 0.57$ ) whilst 'Coastal Leisure & Environment Loss' ( $\beta = -0.19$ ) and 'Job & Business Opportunities' ( $\beta = 0.12$ ) negatively influenced community well-being.

#### 4.3 Agritourism

This section explains the findings obtained from the scale related to agritourism. Similar statistical tests as discussed in the previous section were used to conduct EFA amongst the 30 variables related to agritourism. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy indicated an index of 0.82 and the Bartlett test of sphericity was significant ( $\chi^2 = 2184.907$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ) with a total variance of 63.84%. The results of the factor analysis revealed that the original seven-factor structure was not supported (Table 3). The first factor was renamed "Education & Culture" and accounted for 26.45% of variability. All the

original education items and three items from the culture dimension loaded on this factor. Factor 2 was renamed “Socio-Economic Benefits” and accounted for 10.18% of variability. Four items from the proposed social domain and one item from the economic factor loaded on this dimension.

**Table 3**  
**Factor Structure and Mean Scores for the Contributions of Agritourism to Community Well-being**

<i>Items</i>	<i>Factor Loadings</i>	<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>	<i>Eigen Value</i>	<i>Mean Scores</i>
<b>Factor 1: Education &amp; Culture</b>		26.45	.86	6.03	3.65
Promotes better understanding between cultures	.86				3.51
Enhances professional skills of locals	.58				3.80
Enhances personal development of locals	.71				3.70
Enhances level of education of locals	.65				3.41
Provides valuable experiences for tourists to appreciate local culture and heritage	.60				3.91
Preserves local traditions and way of life	.81				3.63
<b>Factor 2: Socio-Economic Benefits</b>		10.18	.74	2.31	3.51
Increases standard living of locals	.60				3.69
Improves public services and infrastructure for locals	.70				3.48
Enhances community pride	.73				3.26
Increases positive interaction between locals and tourists	.75				3.73
Locals do not feel welcome within agritourism properties	.53				3.37
<b>Factor 3: Socio-Environmental Impacts</b>		7.13	.74	1.76	2.66
Restricts access to prime regions	.52				2.91
Enhances shopping, restaurant and entertainment options	.73				2.83
Increases pollution and traffic jam	.80				2.46
Spoils the natural beauty of landscape	.79				2.42
<b>Factor 4: Job &amp; Business Opportunities</b>		5.51	.83	1.60	3.94
Improves job opportunities for locals	.88				3.94
provides business opportunities for locals and small/medium enterprises	.88				3.94
<b>Factor 5: Leisure</b>		4.87	.60	1.33	2.66
Reduces the quality of outdoor recreational opportunities	.60				2.85
Reduces spaces for leisure	.58				2.74
Provides an incentive for conservation of natural resources	.72				2.40
<b>Factor 6: Governance</b>		4.07	.66		2.57
Exists a lack of coordination and cooperation between stakeholders	0.85				2.91
Government has a long-term vision	0.82				2.23

Notes:  $p < 0.000$ ; KMO-MSA = 0.82; Bartlett's test of sphericity = 2184.907

Factor 3 was labelled 'Socio-Environment Impact' and consisted of four items accounting for 7.13% of the variance. Four items loaded on this dimension namely three items from the environment factor and one item from the social factor. Factor 4 was labelled 'Job & Business Opportunities' and comprised of two items explaining 5.51% of the variability. The fifth factor was named 'Leisure' and consisted of three items with 4.87% of variance explained. Factor 6 revealed that the proposed 'Governance' factor was supported with the same two items and accounted for 4.07% of variability. Cronbach's coefficients for each of the six factors were calculated to investigate the reliability of the scale. According to Hair et al. (1998), Cronbach alpha values of 0.60 indicates acceptable internal consistency. Moreover, the recommended minimum Cronbach's alpha for exploratory studies is 0.60 (Nunnally, 1978; Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1991). A Cronbach's alpha value of 0.62 was obtained for the overall scale and the values for the six factors ranged from 0.60 to 0.86 indicating that the internally reliability of the factors was moderate to high. Table 3 also provides the mean scores for the items. The factor which scored the highest mean was "Job & Business Opportunities" (3.94), indicating the potential of agritourism to enhance job and business opportunities for locals. The second highest score was for the factor "Education & Culture" (3.65), followed by "Socio-Economic Benefits" (3.51). The lowest mean value was obtained by the "Governance" factor indicating that locals were concerned about the limited coordination amongst stakeholders and the lack of long-term vision by the government.

To further investigate the determinant of community well-being, regression analyses were conducted to identify the factors significant in affecting community well-being. The findings indicate that the overall regression model was significant and community well-being was influenced by the six factors. The adjusted  $R^2 = .457$  explained that a relationship existed between them. 45.7% of the variance could be accounted for by this relationship. The results suggested that four factors were significant and influenced community well-being for agritourism, namely 'Education & Culture', 'Socio-Economic Benefits', 'Socio-environmental Impacts' and 'Leisure'. The strongest positive effect on community well-being was observed for "Education & Culture" ( $\beta = 0.34$ ), followed by 'Socio-Economic Benefits' ( $\beta = 0.20$ ). It was also observed that 'Socio-Environmental' Impacts ( $\beta = -0.20$ ) and 'Leisure' ( $\beta = -0.14$ ) negatively affected community well-being.

## **5.0 Discussion**

Residents perceive that both enclave tourism and agritourism influence community well-being, although the latter to a slightly higher extent. 'Education & Culture' is the only factor positively contributing to community well-being for enclave tourism. Past studies have



shown that education enhances well-being due to its economic and social benefits (Hill & King, 1995). Moreover, education and training are considered as important features which foster growth and efficiency whilst reducing inequality (Becker, 1993). A lack of education is likely to influence an individual's access to opportunities and a better life. Enclave tourism in Mauritius has contributed to personal development by motivating individuals to follow courses in tourism and hospitality in local and foreign institutions. Moreover, there is continuous development since resorts provide several in-house training opportunities and employees benefit from exposure to constant informal learning opportunities through interaction with tourists from different cultures. However, despite the contribution of the factor 'Education & Culture' to community well-being, the social components of sharing experiences with others (Daugstad & Kirchengast, 2013), is limited in enclave tourism. Therefore, the residents perceive that enclave tourism only moderately promotes local traditions and understanding between cultures. The findings confirm the 'environmental bubble' concept (Edensor, 2001; Torres, 2002: 91) where enclave spaces restrict interactions with the locals as tourists are spatially segregated from the community (Edensor, 2001; Fotsch, 2004).

'Education & Culture' also positively influenced community well-being for agritourism as the latter provides the potential to enhance the education not only of local farmers/entrepreneurs but also that of local visitors, such as students and families. Agritourism is important in enhancing the cultural sphere of community life (Karabati, Dogan, Pinar & Celik, 2009) and can offer an incentive to preserve and restore old buildings and farm equipment which can increase the attractiveness of the agritourism enterprise (Barbieri, Mahoney & Butler, 2008). It can also provide an opportunity for tourists to understand the colonial past of the island. It is also not surprising that 'Socio-Economic Benefits' contributes to community well-being since tourists have direct contact with the host while at the same time providing livelihood diversification opportunities.

Despite enclave tourism being a major employer in Mauritius and in developing countries more generally (Andriotis, 2008; Hernandez, Cohen & Garcia, 1996; Sharpley, 2003; Mbaiwa, 2005; Prayag *et al.*, 2010), including small island developing states (Scheyvens & Momsen, 2008), residents perceived that 'Job & Business Opportunities' negatively affects community well-being with regards to enclave tourism. As stated by Baum & Szivas (2008), the quality and sustainability of employment in this sector is questionable. Salaries are often lower in Mauritius and employees in enclave resorts increasingly seek jobs in cruise tourism overseas (Seebaluck, Naidoo & Ramseook-Munhurrun, 2013), which has

resulted in a human resource crisis for the local enclave tourism industry. Furthermore, the factor 'Job & Business Opportunities' has a negative impact on community well-being owing to limited business opportunities for the locals, especially with the rise in all-inclusive resorts, which prevent entrepreneurship opportunities to trickle down to the community at large, thus reinforcing imbalances between the rich and the poor. Despite the majority of hotels being locally owned, the dependency model still persists due to 'internal colonialism' whereby economic power remains with the local elites (Walpole & Goodwin, 2000) and is controlled by the affluent private sector.

Locals also perceived that enclave tourism negatively affects community well-being through the factor 'Coastal Environment Loss'. Any land development is likely to cause negative impacts on the natural environment including hotel infrastructure development (Kuvan & Akan, 2012; Sharma, Dyer, Carter & Gursoy, 2008). Research also contend that that large-scale developments in environmentally sensitive areas, such as small islands, 'not only degrade the natural environment, but also destroy the economic value of natural resources for tourism in the long run' (Lee, 1997: 587). Due to the demand for large stretches of land for the construction of tourism infrastructure, enclave resorts strain local resources with degradation of reefs, beaches, flora and fauna, as perceived by the residents in the current study and confirmed by past studies (Selwyn, 2001; Stonich, 1998; Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2002). Moreover, this study shows that locals felt that they are not welcome in enclave resorts. Similar findings have been reported by Carrier and Macleod (2005), where residents were prohibited to enter tourist resorts in the Dominican Republic. These issues have led to conflicts between host community and hoteliers and, as revealed by Dogan (1989), tourism development may lead to hostilities between different stakeholder groups which may result in resentment from the host community. In Mauritius, access to enclave resorts are strictly controlled and the majority of locals, that is, the less affluent strata of the community may feel that they have sacrificed their coastal environment to the development of enclave resorts.

The study also identified two factors which negatively impact on community well-being with regards to agritourism, namely, 'Socio-Environment Impacts' and 'Leisure'. The respondents perceive that agritourism does not preserve natural resources. Safeguarding natural resources is important in the context of islands due to their restricted natural resources and small geographical area. Since Mauritius is limited in size and agritourism might be expected to occupy larger physical areas than hotels, local people perceive that their leisure may be negatively affected. Moreover, since agritourism remains in its infancy in Mauritius,

residents might associate agritourism with unsustainable agricultural practices with impacts on biodiversity, air quality, water supply and quality (World Wildlife Foundation, 2013). Additionally, the intensive use of fertilisers and heavy water usage are of particular concern to locals given the scarcity of water in Mauritius resulting from frequent periods of droughts.

## **6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

Both enclave tourism and agritourism contribute to the enhancement of community well-being in the domain of 'Education & Culture', showing that it is an essential factor to consider in tourism development. The factor has a high potential to further increase community well-being, however, better coordination amongst stakeholders are needed to encourage interaction between the local community and tourists residing in enclave resorts. For example, enclave resorts can develop partnerships with members of the community involved in farming, culinary experiences, arts and crafts. Tourists can thus be encouraged to visit and participate in such activities offered by the community which can be proposed in the holiday package marketed by resorts. This may help to promote understanding of the locals' way of life and traditions and result into meaningful learning experiences amongst hosts and guests whilst enhancing income for the members of the community offering the tourist activity.

The study revealed that 'Coastal Environment Loss' negatively contributes to community well-being in relation to enclave tourism. This is not surprising given that the coast is an important feature of SIDS (Briguglio, 1995; Farran, 2006) and negative impacts on the coastal environment are likely to affect the host community's well-being.

An assessment of residents' perceptions of community well-being is essential for destination managers and policy makers to identify weak areas which need to be addressed in order to manage potential conflicts between tourists and hoteliers. Therefore, a stakeholder collaboration is required to avoid anticipated conflicts which may jeopardise the positioning and sustainability of the destination. Moreover, to ensure limited impacts of resort development on the environment, it is important that regulations are respected. Mauritius is known to have excellent legislation covering environmental impacts, however, laws are not enforced (BBC, 2015). Nevertheless, to mitigate impacts, some resorts are actively collaborating with stakeholders such as non-governmental organizations in the preservation of the marine environment (Heritageresorts, 2015) and also contribute to a yearly environmental

tax. However, there is a lack of transparency regarding how the income derived from taxation is spent to improve the environment. To encourage resorts to further contribute to government initiatives, it is important that the government adopts a transparent approach where all stakeholders concerned including residents and hoteliers are informed how income derived from the latter has been used for improving the environment and the lives of the residents in the destination community.

Since enclave tourism is a major form of economic activity in Mauritius with high potentials to create backward linkages (Telfer & Wall, 1996), it is important to enhance its positive impacts so that it can contribute to broader development goals such as community well-being. Integrating locals into development should not only be the purpose of alternative forms of tourism but can be extended to any form of tourism development, especially enclave tourism which has the potential to contribute to the lives of many locals due to its large scale. Therefore, enclave tourism can increase community well-being if it strives to “unlock opportunities for the poor at all levels and scales of operation” (Ashley *et al.*, 2001: 3). For example, agriculture provides a livelihood for many locals and well-being could be increased if the host community participates more in tourism by providing food supplies to enclave resorts. However, it is important for small agricultural producers in Mauritius to regroup to better access market opportunities and supply the food requirements of enclave resorts.

Additionally, to enhance linkages, enclave resorts can include agritourism as a recreational activity in their package. However, since enclave tourism requires high quality products and services, targeting tourists for agritourism enterprises imply that farmers and entrepreneurs will need to invest in the improvement of their facilities and services which will require financial investment. Moreover, there is a need to identify quality standards for agritourism products so that it will add value to tourism product portfolio and encourage innovation. The overall agritourism package must be able to attract and retain visitors. Clayton and Karagiannis (2008) argue that a diverse product portfolio results in more training and business opportunities, a larger network of stakeholders involved in the industry (Boxill & Frederick, 2002; Hayle, 2002), and better distribution of tourist income (Duperly-Pinks, 2002). Moreover, it will also enhance the consumption of local cuisine and local products (Clayton & Karagiannis, 2008).

Agritourism can also enhance the skills of local farmers in more sustainable farming practices. Studies have highlighted the contribution of agritourism to ensuring food supplies and improving organic practices, given that it provides a platform for tourists and locals to share their knowledge (Karabati *et al.*, 2009). Organic farming is not well established in Mauritius; however, it could represent an opportunity for agritourism due to the increased visitor interest in organic foods (Organic Centre for Wales, 2011). It is important that the Mauritian public be made aware of the potentials of agritourism and its role in sustainable development. Through agritourism, the appeal and demand for local products may be stimulated as supported by (Lobo *et al.*, 1999) and it may help farmers to develop and maintain traditions as well as develop new techniques of farming (Malkanathi & Routry, 2011). Moreover, it could enhance food security and reduce reliance on food imports which would be advantageous for a small island like Mauritius.

Enclave tourism is a well-established form of tourism development in Mauritius. However, the study suggests that to enhance community well-being both forms of tourism development are important. The narrow focus of the tourism development strategy on enclave tourism has resulted in poor knowledge of other forms of tourism. As in several small island destinations, the priority of the Mauritian government has been to focus on enclave tourism and its associated economic benefits. However, the community needs to be sensitised that even small scale tourism can contribute to community well-being. Agritourism can offer the opportunity to spread the socio-economic benefits of tourism to the hinterland. It can become a complement to enclave tourism and diversify the destination portfolio of products while enhancing community well-being.

### 6.1 Limitations and Further Research

The study proposed an instrument for assessing the contributions of tourism to community well-being in a small island destination. However, it is only a first step in a long-term investigation which is needed to improve and further test the scale. Moreover, the relatively small size of the sample and the non-probability sampling technique used may be a possible limitation of the study taking into consideration the community perceptions. Future studies could examine the relationships between demographic variables and their impact on community well-being. Past studies have shown that variables such as age, gender and years of residency affect residents' perceptions of tourism impacts, however, no study have specifically investigated these issues in relation to community well-being in a SIDS.

## References

- AHRIM (2007/2008). Annual Report 2007/2008, available at <http://www.general-files.org/download/g54c4cfd7fh32i0/ahrim%20annual%20report%202007-2008.pdf.html>
- Aili, L., Jiaming, L., & Min, L. (2007). Progress in enclave tourism study of overseas: A literature review. *Chinese Journal of Population, Resources and Environment*, 5(3), 76-81.
- Amato, P., & Zuo, J. (1992). Rural poverty, urban poverty, and psychological well-being, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 33(2), 229-240.
- Andereck, K., & Nyaupane, G. (2011). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 248-260.
- Andereck, K., Valentine, K., Knopf, R., & Vogt, C. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Anderson, W. (2011). Enclave tourism and its socio-economic impact in emerging destinations. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 22(3), 361-377.
- Andriotis, K. (2008). Integrated Resort development: the case of Cavo Sidero, Crete, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(4), 428-444.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes towards tourism development: the case of Crete, *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 172-185.
- Arroyo, C., Barbieri, C., & Rich, S. (2013). Defining agritourism: A comparative study of stakeholders' perceptions in Missouri and North Carolina. *Tourism Management*, 37(1), 39-47.
- Ashe J. (2005). Tourism investment as a tool for development and poverty reduction: the experience in Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Available at: [http://www.sidsnet.org/docshare/tourism/20051012163606\\_tourism-investment-and-SIDS\\_Ashe.pdf](http://www.sidsnet.org/docshare/tourism/20051012163606_tourism-investment-and-SIDS_Ashe.pdf) (accessed 27 March 2015).
- Ashley C., Roe D. and Goodwin H. (2001) Propoor tourism strategies: making tourism work for the poor. Pro-Poor Tourism Report No.1 (April) for the Overseas Development Institute, London. Nottingham: Russell Press

- Baum, T., & Szivas, E. (2008). HRD in tourism: a role for government? *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 783-794.
- Barbieri C., Mahoney, E., & Butler, L. (2008). Understanding the nature and extent of farm and ranch diversification in North America. *Rural Sociology*, 73(2), 205–229.
- Barbieri, C., & Mahoney, E. (2009). Why is diversification an attractive farm adjustment strategy? Insights from Texas farmers and ranchers, *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25(1), 58–66.
- Barbieri, C., & Mshenga, P. (2008). The role of firm and owner characteristics on the performance of agritourism farms. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48(2), 166–183.
- Bastin, R. (1984) Small island tourism: development or dependency. *Development Policy Review* 2(1), 79-90.
- BBC (2015) Sustaining beauty in Mauritius, available at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/7010212.stm>
- Becker, G. (1993). *Human Capital*, 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blake, A. (2008). Tourism and income distribution in East Africa. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(6), 511-524.
- Board of Investment (2009) The Integrated Resort Scheme, Available at <http://www.investmauritius.com/download/Guidelines-IRS.pdf> (accessed December 2012)
- Boxill I. and Frederick O. (2002) Old road, new road: Community protests and tourism development in Antigua, in: I. Boxill, O. Taylor and J. Maerk (Eds), *Tourism and Change in the Caribbean and Latin America*, pp. 101–110 (Kingston: Arawak Publications).
- Brandth, B., & Haugen, M. (2011). Farm diversification into tourism: Implications for social identity? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 27(1), 35-44.
- Briedenhann, J. and Wickens, E. (2004) Tourism routes as a tool for the economic development of rural areas—vibrant hope or impossible dream? *Tourism Management* 25(1), 71-79.
- Briguglio, L. (1995). Small island developing states and their economic vulnerabilities. *World Development* 23(9), 1615–1632.
- Britton, S. (1982) The political economy of tourism in the third world. *Annals of Tourism Research* 9(3), 331–358.
- Brougham, J. and Butler, R. (1981) A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8(3), 569-589.

- Byrd E., Bosley H., & Dronberger M. G. (2009). Comparisons of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina, *Tourism Management*, 30(5), 603-703.
- Carlsen, J., & Butler, R. (Eds) (2011). *Island tourism: Sustainable perspectives*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Carrier, J., & Macleod, D. (2005). Bursting the bubble: The socio-cultural context of ecotourism. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 11(2), 315-334.
- Cattell, R. (1978). *The Scientific Use of Factor Analysis*. New York: Plenum.
- Central Statistical Office (2014). International Travel and Tourism Year 2014, Available at: <http://statsmauritius.govmu.org/English/Publications/Pages/Tourism-Year-2014.aspx> (accessed 18 April 2015).
- Choi, H., & Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitudes toward sustainable tourism: Development of a sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(4), 380-394.
- Clayton A. and Karagiannis N. (2008) Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean: Alternative Policy Considerations, *Tourism and Hospitality Planning & Development*, 5(3): 185-201.
- Conkling, P. (2007). On islanders and islandness. *Geographical Review*, 97(2), 191-201.
- Conlin, M., & Baum, T. (1995). *Island tourism: Management principles and practice*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Croes, R. (2011). Measuring and explaining competitiveness in the context of small island destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(4), 431-442.
- Daugstad, K. (2010). Images, attitudes and measures in the field of cultural heritage in Norway. In T. Bloemers, A. van der Valk, & M. Wijnen (Eds.), *The Cultural Landscape & Heritage Paradox* (pp. 263–272). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Daugstad, K., & Kirchengast, C. (2013). Authenticity and the pseudobackstage of agritourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 170-191.
- Dogan Zafer, H. (1989). Forms of adjustment: Sociocultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 216-236.
- Decrop, A. (2004). Trustworthiness in qualitative tourism research. *Qualitative research in tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*, 156-169.
- Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 64-73.



- Diedrich, A., & García-Buades, E. (2009). Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management*, 30(4), 512-521.
- Diener, E. (1994). Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities. *Social Indicators Research*, 31(2), 103-157.
- Dissart, J., & Deller, S. (2000). Quality of life in the planning literature. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 15(1), 135-61.
- Dogan, H. (1989). Forms of adjustment: Socio-cultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 216-36.
- Duperly-Pinks D. (2002) Community tourism: “Style and fashion” or facilitating empowerment? in: I. Boxill, O. Taylor and J. Maerk (Eds), *Tourism and Change in the Caribbean and Latin America*, pp. 137–61 (Kingston: Arawak Publications).
- Durbarry, R. (2004). Tourism and economic growth: The case of Mauritius. *Tourism Economics*, 10(4), 389-401.
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 409-422.
- Edensor, T. (2001). Performing tourism, staging tourism: (re)producing tourist space and practice, *Tourist Studies*, 1(1), 59-81.
- Farran, S. (2006). The Coastal Zone of Islands: Comparative Reflections from the North and South. *Island Studies Journal*, 1(1), 55-80.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: SAGE.
- Fotsch, P. (2004). Tourism’s uneven impact: History of Cannery Row. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4), 779-800.
- Freitag, T. (1994). Enclave tourism development: For whom the benefits roll? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 538-554.
- Gillis, J. (2007). Island sojourns. *Geographical Review*, 97(2), 274-287.
- Graci, S., & Dodds, R. (2010). *Sustainable tourism in island destinations*. London: Earthscan.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: an improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tathman, R., & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Harrill, R. (2004). Residents’ attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 18(3), 251-266.

- Hayle C. (2002) Issues confronting new entrants to tourism, in: I. Boxill, O. Taylor and J. Maerk (Eds), *Tourism and Change in the Caribbean and Latin America*, pp. 229–72, Kingston: Arawak Publications.
- Henderson, J. (2009). Agro-tourism in unlikely destinations: a study of Singapore. *Managing Leisure*, 14(4), 258-268.
- Hernandez, S., Cohen, J., & Garcia, H. (1996). Residents' attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), 775-779.
- Hettne, B. (2009). *Thinking about development*. London. Zed Books.
- Heritageresorts (2015) <http://www.heritageresorts.mu/en/corporate-social-responsibility.html>
- Hill, A., & King, E. (1995) *Women's education in developing countries: Barriers, benefits, and policies*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Huh, C., & Vogt, C. (2008). Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 446-455.
- Identity Property (2007) Ambitious Mauritius, available at:  
<http://www.villasvalriche.com/press/pdf-int/identity.pdf> (accessed 24 April 2015)
- Jansen-Verbeke, M., & Nijmegen, K. (1990). The potentials of rural tourism and agritourism *Problemy Turystyki*, 13(1-2), 35-47.
- Johnson, J., Snepenger, D., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perception of tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(3), 629-642.
- Karabati, S., Dogan, E., Pinar, M., & Celik, L. (2009). Socio-economic effects of agri-tourism on local Communities in Turkey: The case of Aglasun, *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 10(2), 129-142.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of Life of community residents? *Tourism Management*, 36, 527-540.
- King, R. (1993). The geographical fascination of islands. In D. Lockhart, D. Drakakis-Smith, & J. Schembri (Eds.) *The development process in small island states* (pp. 13–37). London: Routledge.
- Knuttsen, B. (2009). The intellectual history of development: Towards a widening potential repertoire. *Perspectives* No.13. School of Global Studies, Göteborgs Universitet.  
[http://www.globalstudies.gu.se/digitalAssets/1272/1272997\\_Perspectives\\_13.pdf](http://www.globalstudies.gu.se/digitalAssets/1272/1272997_Perspectives_13.pdf)
- Kokkranikal, J., McLellan, R., & Baum, T. (2003). Island tourism and sustainability: A case study of the Lakshadweep Islands. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(5), 426-447.
- Kuvan Y., & Akan P. (2012). Conflict and agreement in stakeholder attitudes: residents' and hotel managers' views of tourism impacts and forest-related tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(4), 571-584.

- Lee, C.(1997). Valuation of nature based tourism resources using dichotomous choice contingent valuation method. *Tourism Management*, 18(8), 587-591.
- Lee, C., & Chang, C. (2008). Tourism development and economic growth: A closer look at panels. *Tourism Management*, 29(1), 180-192.
- Lobo R.E., Goldman G.E., Jolly D.A., Wallace B.D., Schrader W.I. and Parker S.A. (1999) Agritourism benefits agriculture in San Diego County. *California-Agriculture*, 53 (6): 20–24.
- Lockhart, D. (1997). Islands and tourism: an overview. In D. Lockhart, & D. Drakakis-Smith (Eds.) *Island tourism: Trends and prospects* (pp. 3-20). London: Pinter.
- Lockhart, D., Drakakis-Smith, D., & Schembri, J. (Eds.) (1993). *The development process in small island states*. London: Routledge
- Malkanathi S. H. P. and Routry J. K. (2011) Potential for agritourism development: Evidence from Sri Lanka. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 6 (1): 35-45.
- Marín, C. (2000). New tourism challenges on islands: resources, risks and possibilities in the information society. The Canary Islands experience. In *Insula: Biodiversity and Tourism Symposium* (pp. 20-23). Port-Cros, France.
- Mbaiwa, J. (2005). Enclave tourism and its socio-economic impacts in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Tourism Management*, 26(2), 157-172.
- McCabe, S., Joldersma, T., & Li, C. (2010). Understanding the benefits of social tourism: Linking participation to subjective well-being and quality of life. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(6), 761-773.
- McDowall, S. & Choi, Y. (2010). A comparative analysis of Thai residents' perception of tourism's impacts. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 11(1), 36-55.
- McElroy, J. (2003). Tourism development in small islands across the world. *Geografiska Annaler* 85B(4), 231–242.
- McElroy, J. (2006). Small island tourist economies across the life cycle. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* 47(1), 61-77.
- McGehee, N., & Anderek, K. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support for tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 131-140.
- McNally, S. (2001). Farm diversification in England and Wales: What can we learn from the farm business survey? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 17(2), 247–257.
- Moscardo, G., Konovalov, E., Murphy, L., & McGehee, N. (2013). Mobilities, community well-being and sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(4), 532-556.

- Naidoo, P., Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., & Durbarry, B. (2010). Tourist's perspective of the brand image of Mauritius, *International Journal of Management and Marketing*, 3(3), 95-106.
- Nawijn J., & Mitas O. (2012). Resident attitudes to tourism and their effect on subjective well-being: The case of Palma de Mallorca. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(5), 531-541.
- Nickerson, N., Black, R., & McCool, S. (2001). Agritourism: Motivations behind farm/ranch business diversification. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(1), 19-26.
- Novelli, N., & Hellwig, A. (2011). The UN Millennium Development Goals, tourism and development: The tour operators' perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(3), 205-220.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Developing a community support model for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(3), 964-988.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Oh, C. (2005). The contribution of tourism development to economic growth in the Korean economy. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 39-44.
- Oppermann, M., & Chon, K. (1997) *Tourism in developing countries*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Organic Centre for Wales (2011) Why sustainable agri-tourism is a market opportunity for the organic sector available at [http://www.organiccentrewales.org.uk/uploads/agritourisme\\_july11.pdf](http://www.organiccentrewales.org.uk/uploads/agritourisme_july11.pdf) [August 2013]
- Petrick, J. F. (2002). An examination of golf vacationers' novelty. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 384-400.
- Philip, S., Hunte, C., & Blackstock, K. (2010). A typology for defining agritourism. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 754-758.
- Prayag, G. (2009). Tourists' evaluation of destination image, satisfaction and future behavioural intentions- The case of Mauritius. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26(8), 836-853.
- Prayag, G., Dookhony-Ramphul, K., & Maryeven M. (2010). Hotel development and tourism impacts in Mauritius: Hoteliers' perspectives on sustainable tourism, *Development Southern Africa*, 27(5), 697-712.

- Prayag, G., & Ryan, C. (2011). The relationship between the push & pull attributes of a tourist destination: The role of nationality. An analytical qualitative research approach. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2), 121-143.
- Ramseook-Munhurrin, P., Naidoo, P., & Nundlall, P. (2010). A proposed model for measuring service quality in secondary education. *International Journal of Quality and Service Sciences*, 2(3), 335-351.
- Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (Eds.). (1991). *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Scheyvens, R., & Momsen, J. (2008). Tourism and poverty reduction: issues for small island states. *Tourism Geographies*, 10(1), 22-41.
- Schueller, S. (2009). Promoting wellness: integrating community and positive psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 37(7), 922-937.
- Seebaluck, N., Naidoo, P., & Ramseook-Munhurrin, P. (2013). Meetings, incentives, conferences and exhibitions as a tourism development strategy in Mauritius. *Global Conference on Business and Finance Proceedings*, 8(2): 354-364.
- Selwyn, T. (2001). Tourism, development and society in the insular Mediterranean. In D. Ioannides, Y. Apostolopoulos and S. Sonmez (eds) *Mediterranean Islands and Sustainable Tourism Development* (pp. 23–44). London: Continuum.
- Sharma, B., Dyer, P., Carter, J., & Gursoy, D. (2008). Exploring residents' perceptions of the social impacts of tourism on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration*, 9(3), 288-311.
- Sharpley, R. (2003). Tourism, modernisation and development on the island of Cyprus: Challenges and policy responses, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11(2&3), 246-266.
- Sharpley, R. (2009). *Tourism, development and the environment: Beyond sustainability?* London: Earthscan.
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37-49.
- Sharpley, R. (2015). Tourism: A vehicle for development? In R. Sharpley & D. Telfer (Eds.) *Tourism and development: Concepts and Issues, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn* (pp. 3-30). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Sharpley, R., & Ussi, M. (2014). Tourism and governance in small island developing states (SIDS): The case of Zanzibar. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(1), 87-96.
- Stonich, S. (1998) Political ecology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1), 25-54.

- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2001) *Using multivariate statistics* (4th edition). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tao, T. and Wall, G. (2009). A livelihood approach to sustainability. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(2), 137-152.
- Telfer, D. J. and Wall, G. (1996). Linkages Between Tourism and Food Production. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 23 (3) 635-653.
- Tew, C., & Barbieri, C. (2012) The perceived benefits of agritourism: The provider's perspective. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 215-224.
- Torres R. (2002). Cancun's tourism development from a Fordist spectrum of analysis, *Tourist Studies*, 2(1), 87-116.
- Tovar, C., & Lockwood, M. (2008). Social impacts of tourism: an Australian regional case study. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(4), 365-378.
- UNDP (2010) *Human Development Report 2010*. New York: OUP.
- Van der Duim, R., & Caalders, J. (2002). Biodiversity and tourism. Impacts and interventions. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 29(3), 743-761.
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Plaza-Mejía, M., & Porras-Bueno, N. (2009). Understanding residents' attitudes toward the development of industrial tourism in a former mining community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(3), 373-387.
- Walpole, M., & Goodwin, H. (2000). Local economic impacts of dragon tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 559-576.
- Wang, Y., & Pfister, R. (2008). Residents' attitudes toward tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(1), 84-93.
- Wilkinson, P. (1989). Strategies for tourism in island microstates. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 153-177.
- Woosnam, K. (2012). Using emotional solidarity to explain residents' attitudes about tourism and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(3), 315-327.
- WTO (1980) *Manila Declaration on World Tourism*. Madrid: World Tourism Organisation.
- World Wildlife Foundation (2013) Environmental impacts of farming, available at [http://wwf.panda.org/what\\_we\\_do/footprint/agriculture/impacts/](http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/footprint/agriculture/impacts/) (accessed September, 2013)
- WTTC (2015). *League Tables Summary*. London: World Travel and Tourism Council. Available at: [www.wttc.org/focus/research-for-action/economic-impact-analysis/](http://www.wttc.org/focus/research-for-action/economic-impact-analysis/)

