



## Methodological and theoretical advancements in social impacts of tourism research

Kyle Maurice Woosnam & Manuel Alector Ribeiro

To cite this article: Kyle Maurice Woosnam & Manuel Alector Ribeiro (2022): Methodological and theoretical advancements in social impacts of tourism research, Journal of Sustainable Tourism, DOI: [10.1080/09669582.2022.2046011](https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2046011)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2046011>



Published online: 04 Mar 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 947



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)



# Methodological and theoretical advancements in social impacts of tourism research

Kyle Maurice Woosnam<sup>a,b</sup> and Manuel Alector Ribeiro<sup>b,c#</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, USA; <sup>b</sup>School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, University of Johannesburg, Auckland Park, South Africa; <sup>c</sup>School of Hospitality and Tourism Management, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

## ABSTRACT

This lead article introduces the double special issue dedicated to methodological and theoretical advancements in social impacts of tourism research. We begin by providing an overview of five key developmental stages of research within this area: Definitions, typologies, and conceptual model development; the advent of case study-based, atheoretical empirical inquiry; scale design, development, and testing; further scale development/refinement and theoretical application; and theoretical model development and testing. Brief evolutionary histories of the methodological and theoretical advancements of research dedicated to social impacts of tourism are then discussed. This includes a review of the most pertinent predictor variables (along with a visual display of each and key studies) in explaining residents' perceptions of social impacts of tourism and a thorough review of most frequently used theoretical frameworks. Following this, brief synopses of the articles are provided along with key themes (e.g. resident-tourist relationships, social impacts and residents' attitudes, residents' empowerment, overtourism, and methodologies) and salient points of each work. In closing, we suggest numerous lines of inquiry that will continue to advance research into social impacts of tourism. Though these studies were undertaken prior to the COVID-19 outbreak, we emphasize that future work should be designed with the pandemic in mind.

Supplemental data for this article is available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2046011>

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 28 December 2021  
Accepted 18 February 2022

## KEYWORDS

Theory; residents; sustainable tourism; social impacts; review

## Introduction

The mark of most evolving fields growing out of parent disciplines is a continued advancement in methodological approaches and theoretical application. In essence, such advancements serve as the "lifeblood" of efforts that continue to "push the envelope" and ensure we contribute the most substantive research possible. Moving into the fifth decade of research on social impacts of tourism, we find ourselves at a pivotal point in time. Arguably, the question to ponder is not, do we need to advance our field forward but rather, how do we do it? Introspective examination of our past and present will help us to chart a path forward.

**CONTACT** Kyle Maurice Woosnam  [woosnam@uga.edu](mailto:woosnam@uga.edu)  Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, USA.

<sup>#</sup>Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs), University of Algarve, Faculty of Economics Campus de Gambelas, 8005-139 Faro, Portugal



Figure 1. Social impacts of tourism research development stages (as adapted from Deery et al., 2012).

Though we now accept tourism impacts research to encompass inextricably linked social, cultural, environmental, political, and economic aspects, that has not always been the case. The initial push by impacts researchers focused heavily on economics (Deery et al., 2012), with social, cultural, and environmental impacts considered secondarily. Over time, we have seen the pendulum swing in the opposite direction, due in part, to multiple factors. Not the least of these is the realization that financial gain from tourism is not the sole endgame of destinations and their residents (Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2019). This has paved the way for a more widespread acknowledgment of the inextricable link between various impact forms (Mason, 2016). Additionally, we are seeing fewer studies focusing on destinations where tourism is a new discovery. As a result, economic gain does not seem as paramount as the social-cultural, environmental, and political impacts of tourism, especially given COVID-19 and global matters of justice, war, and climate change. Finally, we are witnessing a greater appreciation for sustainability (considering the triple-bottom-line) in tourism across society, industry, and the academy (Ruhanen et al., 2019). This is evidenced in the burgeoning impact and popularity of the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* within the field. As we find ourselves in a time of great uncertainty due to COVID-19, climate change, war/armed conflicts and terrorism, and political and racial divides, no time is better than now to realize the growing need to advance our methodological approaches and theoretical development/testing in our social of impacts of tourism research.

The evolution of social impacts of tourism research is marked by five key developmental stages (Figure 1). Though Deery et al. (2012) highlight some of these stages, we adapted their approach by reorganizing and reclassifying their proposed stages and adding a newly developing stage. The groundwork was initially laid for social impacts research through the definition of key concepts, typologies and conceptual model development, heavily focused on residents' attitudes. In this first stage, works by Doxey (1975), Rothman (1978), Butler (1980), and Mathieson and Wall (1982) highlight the heterogeneous perspectives of destination residents in responding to tourism. In essence, these works are considered seminal by many studying social impacts of tourism. The second stage marked the beginning of more case study-based empirical work that delineated divergent resident perspectives of tourism development. During this time, many studies were atheoretical in nature, employed factor-cluster analysis, or considered a wealth of predictors of residents' attitudes (Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Evans-Pritchard, 1989; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Perdue et al., 1990).

Scale design, development and testing residents' attitudes measures then came about as the third stage. Arguably, this stage is where we see a more concerted effort made in theory development within residents' attitudes research. During this period, Lankford and Howard (1994) were credited with arguably the first multidimensional scale, the Tourism Impact Attitude Scale (TIAS), to measure residents' perceptions of tourism development. Arguing that the TIAS did not capture a more holistic perspective of attitudes in the way of sustainability, Ap and Crompton (1998) created another general scale that encompassed residents' attitudes of perceived tourism impacts in the way of social, economic, and environmental aspects.

The fourth stage involved further scale development and refinement as well as greater theoretical applications. During this period, we see a shift toward considering social impacts of tourism within the context of sustainability. For instance, Choi and Sirakaya (2005) created the Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale (SUS-TAS) and Woosnam and Norman (2010) developed the Emotional Solidarity Scale (ESS), both of which speak to the growing importance of considering

how residents' interactions/relationships with tourists factor into perspectives of tourism development. This stage is also marked by greater application of theoretical frameworks, namely the social exchange theory (see Andereck et al., 2005; Choi & Murray, 2010; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; McGehee & Andereck, 2004).

Over the last decade, we have moved into the most recent stage highlighted by even greater theoretical model development and testing, with the top four tourism journals either explicitly or implicitly calling for theoretical application as grounds for publishing. Much of this current work involves structural equation modeling or other advanced statistical analysis (see Boley et al., 2014; Látková & Vogt, 2012; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2012). In fact, within this stage, we also see research more often treating social impacts of tourism as an antecedent of outcome variables, such as emotional solidarity (Munanura et al., 2021; Phuc & Nguyen, 2020), receptiveness toward tourists during COVID-19 (Tilaki et al., 2021; Woosnam et al., 2021), and pro-tourism behavioral support (Erul et al., 2020; Ribeiro et al., 2017).

To chart a path forward for social impacts of tourism research, this work aims to accomplish numerous endeavours. To begin, we first highlight both the methodological and theoretical advancements dating back to the late 1970s. A reflective examination of how we arrived at this critical juncture is necessary in determining how we move this line of research forward. Following this, we will showcase the valued contributions of the 22 articles comprising this special issue. In closing the article, we will provide various avenues for future research.

### **Highlighting methodological advancements in assessing social impacts of tourism**

Many of us owe a debt of gratitude to Valene Smith for her seminal editorial work, *Host and guest: The anthropology of tourism*. The ethnographic work compiled by Smith (1977) truly set our work in motion concerning social impacts of tourism research from the residents' perspectives. For it was in this work that we were introduced to definitions of tourism as well as the beginnings of social-cultural impacts of tourism research, covering economic contributions as well as social and cultural changes to local communities. By the close of the work, Nunez (1977) introduced us to the notion of acculturation theory and the realization that acculturation effect can be more pronounced among local communities and their residents than among those visiting. From a predominantly qualitative standpoint, we began to understand that it is extremely difficult to disregard the interaction and relationships with tourists in understanding how residents and their communities are impacted from tourism and its development. *Host and guest* also helped pave the way for the argument that perceived impacts of tourism are just as important to consider as the actual impacts brought on from tourism development. As the late American political consultant, Lee Atwater was quoted as saying, "perception is reality." Such a notion has remained at the center of residents' attitudes of tourism impacts to date.

Following Smith's Smith (1977) text, we see a continued focus on conceptual, descriptive and exploratory work in the early 1980s, with much of this research being quantitative (Nunkoo et al., 2013) and helping to pave the way for much of the post-positivistic research to follow (Sharpley, 2014). It should be noted that at that time, we witnessed the creation and development of the top tourism journals—*Western Council for Travel Research* (currently *Journal of Travel Research*) launching in 1968, *Annals of Tourism Research* beginning in 1973; and *The International Journal of Tourism Management* (currently *Tourism Management*) starting in 1980—to disseminate this burgeoning body of research. To help catapult methodological advancements in social impacts of tourism forward, two conceptual texts were written. The first of which was *Tourism: Passport to development? Perspectives on the social and cultural effects in developing countries* by de Kadt (1979). In this work, de Kadt discussed the role that host-guest contact play in contributing to social-cultural impacts. Namely, he mentioned that three primary situations where such contacts occur: in a commercial context, during an exchange of information, and when sharing

destination attractions. Shortly after this, Mathieson and Wall (1982) work *Tourism: Economic, physical and social impacts* ushered in a greater focus on quantitative measures to assess impacts. Echoing what others claimed at the time, Mathieson and Wall argued that although the focus of tourism impacts began as the positive economic impacts for destinations, more research was needed that focused on the social changes brought about by tourism, even if it highlights the negative damages. As Henderson (2018) alluded to in her review of the text, the notion of sustainability is implicit in the work, especially now considering the widespread acceptance of considering residents' perspectives of tourism in planning and managing for sustainable tourism. Of course, this need to focus on sustainability surrounding tourism development was championed by the founders of the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Bill Bramwell and Bernard Lane. The journal, from its onset, has been deliberate in acknowledging the need for both qualitative and quantitative methods to tackle complex issues facing sustainable tourism.

Though Mathieson and Wall (1982) reviewed the current state of research at the time undertaken on residents' perceptions of tourism impacts, it is rather obvious that much of the quantitative work in this line of research began with rather simplistic analytical techniques in describing impacts or comparing means of perceived impacts across various groups (i.e. using t-tests, ANOVAs, etc.) (Nunkoo et al., 2013). Over time, we see a progression of more predictive models employing linear regression analyses to explain perceived social impacts of tourism (Sharpley, 2014). With the advent of multiple-item measures to gauge social impacts of tourism, we began to see segmentation studies employing principal components analysis (PCA)/exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and cluster analysis (see Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Madrigal, 1995; Williams & Lawson, 2001). Then we see formal scales developed and tested to measure social impacts of tourism (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Howard & Lankford). As we moved into the 2010s and 2020s, it has become more commonplace to see more advanced predictive models employing Anderson and Gerbing (1988) two-stage analysis involving confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (Nunkoo et al., 2013; Sharpley, 2014). Such work tests empirically and/or theoretically deduced models, considering a host of predictive constructs in explaining perceived social impacts of tourism as well as residents' support for tourism. To echo these points above, Nunkoo et al. (2013) reviewed statistical techniques used in 140 articles (between 1984 and 2010) concerning social impacts of tourism within *Journal of Travel Research*, *Tourism Management*, and *Annals of Tourism Research* and reported that the primary techniques (some of which were used in tandem within the same study) used were: descriptives (65.9%), t-tests/ANOVA (31.2%), PCA/EFA (29.7%), regression/correlation (26.8%), and CFA/SEM/path analysis (24.6%).

Looking back at the 40-plus years of research surrounding social impacts of tourism research, we can categorise many of the predictors of residents' perceptions of social impacts of tourism into internal, interactive, and external variables (see Deery et al., 2012; Gursoy et al., 2019; Sharpley, 2014) (see Table 1). Internal variables are those that are unique to the residents, oftentimes represented by psychological measures and socio-demographic concepts. Those that have been used with some regularity within the literature to predict residents' social impacts of tourism include community attachment, economic dependence, empowerment, knowledge of tourism, perceived benefits/costs of tourism, personal values, place attachment, socio-demographics, and trust. Interactive variables are those that involve relationship aspects with tourists. Though these variables (i.e. emotional solidarity, degree of interaction, and social distance) have received less attention, they are gaining some momentum as of late. External variables involve measures that are specific to the destination and include density of tourists/tourism development, destination stage of tourism development, distance from the tourism zone, nature/type of tourists/tourism, and seasonality.

Though quantitative research methods and analysis have received the lion's share of attention within social impacts of tourism research, such a trajectory may be slowing down, in favor of a mixed methods approach. As Hadinejad et al. (2019) argue, "There is also a lack of use of mixed methods to collect and analyse data on residents' attitudes literature based on a pragmatic

**Table 1.** Predictor variables in explaining residents' perceptions of social impacts of tourism.

Classification ( <i>Variable</i> )	Key Studies
<b>Internal</b>	
<i>Community attachment</i>	Andereck et al., 2005; Chen & Chen, 2010; Eslami et al., 2019; McCool & Martin, 1994;
<i>Economic dependence</i>	Brougham & Butler, 1981; Smith & Krannich, 1998; Snaith & Haley, 1999; Wang & Pfister, 2008
<i>Empowerment</i>	Boley et al., 2014; Joo et al., 2020
<i>Knowledge of tourism</i>	Davis et al., 1988; Joo et al., 2020
<i>Perceived benefits/costs of tourism</i>	Ap, 1992; Látková & Vogt, 2012; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Wang & Pfister, 2008
<i>Personal values</i>	Choi & Murray, 2010; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2009
<i>Place attachment</i>	Chen & Dwyer, 2018; Eusébio et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2020; Styliadis, 2018
<i>Socio-demographics (age, gender, education, etc.)</i>	Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Huh & Vogt, 2008; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Sharma & Dyer, 2009; Snaith & Haley, 1999; Tosun, 2002
<i>Trust</i>	Mody et al., 2020; Nunkoo & Smith, 2013; Ouyang et al., 2017; Woosnam et al., 2021
<b>Interactive</b>	
<i>Emotional solidarity with tourists</i>	Munanura et al., 2021; Ribeiro et al., 2017; Woosnam, 2012
<i>Degree of interaction with tourists</i>	Aleshinloye et al., 2020; Andereck et al., 2005; Eusébio et al., 2018; Lawson et al., 1998; Teye et al., 2002
<i>Social distance with tourists</i>	Joo et al., 2018; Thyne et al., 2018
<b>External</b>	
<i>Density of tourists/tourism development</i>	Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2011
<i>Destination stage of tourism development</i>	Allen et al., 1988; Lepp, 2008; Long et al., 1990; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2009
<i>Distance from tourism zone</i>	Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; Raymond & Brown, 2007; Sharma & Dyer, 2009
<i>Nature/type of tourists/tourism</i>	Sheldon et al., 1984
<i>Seasonality</i>	Belisle & Hoy, 1980; Sheldon et al., 1984

approach ...mixed methods can provide both subjective and objective analyses of residents' perceptions" (p. 159). We see a mixed methods approach growing in support as *Tourism Management* has made it a requirement that publications now incorporate multiple forms of data. On their "guide for authors" webpage, *Tourism Management* (2021) states that,

In the case of manuscripts based on a quantitative analysis using data derived from a single survey, such papers should be accompanied by [supplementary materials](#) such as interviews, data from another survey to permit comparative or longitudinal analysis, or similar [supplementary datasets](#) to provide further insights into the quantitative data analysis. This also applies to panel data unless evidence is provided that the panel data are representative of pertinent populations.

Evidence of mixed methods research in social impacts of tourism research is highlighted through the review of articles employing such a design within the leading tourism journals between 1998 and 2019 (Molina-Azorín & Font, 2016; Truong et al., 2020) as well as throughout the work within this special issue (Styliadis & Terzidou, 2021, Fan et al., 2020, and Martín-Martín et al., 2020). From a pragmatic standpoint, the methods one employs are largely contingent upon whether the intent of the research is on theoretical development or theoretical testing. In either case, advancing theory is crucial for the continued evolution of social impacts of tourism research.

### Highlighting theoretical advancements in assessing social impacts of tourism

For the better part of two decades (1984–2003), research centered on social impacts of tourism was largely atheoretical, driven by imminent problems faced by industry practitioners (Gursoy & Nunkoo, 2019; Nunkoo et al., 2013). Though the work surrounding social impacts of tourism has struggled in theoretical application, Ward and Berno (2011) contend that a preponderance of work employing theoretical perspectives have focused on the social exchange theory. This was echoed



in the works by Gursoy et al. (2019), Nunkoo et al. (2013), Nunkoo (2016), and Hadinejad et al. (2019). As Ward and Berno (2011) note, the theory “proposes that individuals’ attitudes towards tourism and their subsequent level of support for its development will be influenced by their evaluations of the outcomes of tourism for themselves and their communities (p. 1557).” Such an approach has been met with criticism from Joo et al. (2021) and Maruyama et al. (2019) indicating that SET boils down the relationship between residents and tourists as one rooted in financial exchanges, shortchanging the social aspects of interactions and relationships between the parties. Additionally, given that SET does not lend itself to a testable model, it oftentimes is considered in tandem with other theoretical frameworks (Ward & Berno, 2011) as some authors have done most recently (Chang, 2021; Erul et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2017; Yeager, Boley, Woosnam, et al., 2020).

Other theories have also been considered in social impacts of tourism research but to a lesser degree. Social representations theory is one framework that has been applied somewhat sparingly by tourism researchers (Monterrubio & Andriotis, 2014; Moscardo, 2011; Sarr et al., 2021) building on the initial work by Moscovici (1984). The theories of reasoned action and planned behavior are two additional frameworks that have attracted some attention as of late to help explain residents’ impacts of tourism (though originally popular in considering antecedents of visitors’ or tourists’ behaviors). Established testable models make these theoretical frameworks popular among researchers, especially when considering residents’ pro-tourism behaviors (Erul et al., 2020; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2010; Ribeiro et al., 2017; Wu & Chen, 2018). Emotional solidarity theory, growing out of the work of Durkheim (1915/1995) to consider how residents’ interactions and relationships with tourists explains social impacts of tourism, has also garnered some growing attention within the literature (Joo et al., 2021; Munanura et al., 2021; Phuc & Nguyen, 2020; Woosnam, 2012). Another theory that is gaining greater traction is Weber’s theory of formal and substantive rationality (Boley et al., 2014; Gannon et al., 2021; Mody et al., 2020; Strzelecka et al., 2017; Yeager, Boley, Woosnam, et al., 2020), especially when considering residents’ empowerment through tourism.

According to Hadinejad et al. (2019), other theories have received the most limited attention in the context of social impacts of tourism research over the last decade. Those include the bottom-up spillover theory (Eslami et al., 2019; Suess et al., 2021), the social dilemma theory (Zheng et al., 2020), social identity theory (Chiang et al., 2017; Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012; Palmer et al., 2013), intergroup contact theory (Joo et al., 2018), and the integrated threat theory (Monterrubio, 2016; Ward & Berno, 2011). Two observations can be made from this work. First, most of it has occurred throughout the last decade. And second, it begins to embrace the idea that residents’ perspectives of social impacts of tourism is shaped, in part, by interactions and relationships with tourists, not solely on the resulting tourism development.

Despite some advancements in the way of theoretical application, research on social impacts of tourism is still largely plagued by lack of theoretical development and testing. As Hadinejad et al. (2019) highlight in their review of articles published between 2011 and 2017 on social impacts of tourism in the leading tourism journals (i.e. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *Journal of Travel Research*, *Tourism Management*, and *Annals of Tourism Research*), 44.5% of the articles were atheoretical in nature. While this is an advancement over the 54.3% of articles between 1984 and 2010 that were atheoretical (Nunkoo et al., 2013), greater focus on theoretical application is needed to move this area of research forward. As a field, we need to do better. Furthermore, considering our existing review of theoretical applications in social impacts of tourism research, we encourage the reader to consult the works by Gursoy and Nunkoo (2019), Hadinejad et al. (2019), and Nunkoo et al. (2013) for a more robust review.

### **Salient contributions of articles within this special issue**

As mentioned, to move social impacts of tourism research forward, methodological and theoretical advancements are crucial. In fact, many of the 22 articles in this double special issue

highlight progress in both arenas. Olya (2020), highlighting a very pragmatic approach, argues that methods and theory are inextricably linked, and we see this through his employment of PLS-SEM and fuzzy set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA) and the theory of change to ultimately develop a framework leading to greater effects of our social impacts of tourism research. Within this special issue, advancements are made in the way of relationships between community residents and tourists, social impacts and residents' impacts, residents' empowerment, overtourism, and methodologies—both qualitative and quantitative in nature. Each will be addressed in turn.

### ***Resident-tourist relationships***

The work by Fan and colleagues speaks to the relationships with a focus on Allport's Allport (1954) contact theory. Not only does Fan et al. (2020) incorporate a mixed methods approach (which should be more prevalent in extant work), but it highlights tourists' perspectives of the interaction with residents and how that shapes attitudes about the destination. Fan et al. (2020) demonstrate that perceived cultural distance and social contact with residents (for which the authors develop a new scale encompassing social- and service-oriented contact and quality of contact) are salient constructs in determining tourists' attitudes about the destination. We see this work be most timely in the current COVID-19 pandemic where distance and contact are at the forefront of many travelers' minds. Considering value co-creation and co-destruction, Fan (2020) delivers a conceptual work that highlights four relationships rooted in social contact between residents and tourists: scripted relationship (favorable for residents/unfavorable for tourists); co-creating (favorable for both); co-destructing (unfavorable for both); and egotistical (unfavorable for residents/favorable for tourists). The research agenda she lays out building on this typology will no doubt foster even more timely research centered on destination interactions.

The emotional solidarity theory is also advanced within this issue (Erul et al., 2022; Joo et al., 2022; Maruyama et al., 2020; Munanura et al., 2021; Phuc & Nguyen, 2020). Considering the social exchange theory in tandem with the affect theory of exchange, Erul et al. (2020) demonstrates how Turkish residents' perspectives of existing tourism explained support for future tourism development (69% of the variance), which in turn, predicts emotional solidarity with tourists (25–80% of variance across the three dimensions). Closely related, Munanura et al. (2021) tests a structural model (using constructs developed from the cognitive appraisal theory and social exchange theory) to determine antecedents to Oregon (U.S.) residents' support for tourism. What the authors found was that 78% of the variance in support for tourism was accounted for through perceived impacts (i.e. environmental and community), expected change in subjective well-being, and emotional solidarity with tourists. Two other works within this issue develop emotional solidarity theory by testing models whereby the emotional solidarity construct acts as a mediator between beliefs or values and residents' attitudinal support for tourism. In Japan, Maruyama et al. (2020) demonstrates that both Korean and Brazilian residents' (as minority ethnic groups in two distinct cities) ethnic attitudes toward and emotional solidarity with Japanese explained roughly 70% of the variance in support for tourism focused on the minority groups' culture. In Vietnam, Phuc and Nguyen (2020) show us that residents' values, perceptions of tourism collaboration, and emotional solidarity with tourists all uniquely explain attitudinal support for tourism development. According to the conceptual work by Joo et al. (2022), what may contribute even further to our knowledge of emotional solidarity are interaction rituals (through the interaction ritual theory). Religious tourism contexts would seem to be the most ideal environment in which to test such relationships (Joo & Woosnam, 2020; Klamath et al., 2021).



### ***Social impacts and residents' attitudes***

Eight articles within this special issue advance research concerning social impacts and residents' attitudes about tourism in general. Mair et al. (2021) provide us with one of the first systematic reviews of social impacts of mega-events, highlighting direct impacts on residents (e.g. volunteering, education, and skills, social cohesion, civic pride, and social capital, inclusion and diversity, and sport participation, infrastructure, and health) and indirect impacts on the destination (e.g. business and government networks, destination branding, destination preparedness, and accessibility). Mair et al. (2021) leave us with ample research opportunities to pursue as destinations move closer to welcoming back mega-events.

Three other articles are conceptual in nature. Given the increasing dependence on social media, Nunkoo et al. (2020) work is timely as it pulls together analytical perspectives of the information society, elaboration likelihood model, influence of presumed influence model, and the social exchange theory. A causal chain framework encompassing aspects of social media exposure and influence (e.g. own media exposure, personal exposure, presumed influence, and influence of presumed influence) among destination residents is linked to 25 propositions ripe for future researchers to test through modeling (see Figure 1 in their article). Ramkissoon (2020) also formulates a host of propositions based on a model incorporating six antecedents (i.e. social impacts, interpersonal trust, place attachment, pro-social behavior, pro-environmental behavior, and support for tourism) to residents' overall quality of life. The final conceptual article is by Yeager, Boley, and Goetchus (2020), which proposes a theoretical framework (through socio-ecological systems and chaos theories) for future researchers to test that highlights density, location, and pace by which peer-to-peer accommodations grow are crucial factors in destinations reaching their social carrying capacity.

The remaining four articles pertaining to social impacts present findings from empirical research. Styliadis and Terzidou (2021) report findings from a longitudinal study among residents of Greece to see how perceptions of impacts have changed across three time horizons (between 2009 and 2019). The authors found that (through application of the mere exposure theory) residents' perceptions are fluid and have likely changed in part due to the preponderance of peer-to-peer accommodations within the destination. This adds credence to notions raised by Yeager, Boley, and Goetchus (2020). The theme of examining residents' perceptions of impacts of peer-to-peer accommodations continues in the work by Jordan et al. (2020) along with considerations of general tourism and cruise tourism impacts in Portugal. Jordan et al. report that residents, with relative ease, differentiated between the various forms of tourism. Both Ngo and Pham (2021) and Koščak et al. (2021) present descriptive findings from their respective studies (the former in Vietnam; the latter across six European destinations) concerning residents' attitudes about tourism. The uniqueness of these works lies in the inclusivity of oft-neglected study participants. Ngo and Pham (2021) capture the voices of indigenous residents through a phenomenological qualitative design, while Koščak et al. (2021) garners perspectives of youth—both concerning perspectives of tourism impacts. In essence, understanding such voices is a step in the direction toward empowering residents to actively participate in planning for sustainable tourism.

### ***Residents' empowerment***

Two works within this issue capture advancements made in research on residents' empowerment through tourism. Su et al. (2020) take us to China to learn more about how embroidery tourism has provided women with greater economic stability. Through qualitative means, findings speak back to the three primary dimensions (i.e. psychological, social, and political) of residents' empowerment through tourism (Scheyvens, 1999) but also consider educational and economic empowerment. It is from these three traditional dimensions of empowerment (along with positive and negative perceptions of tourism impacts, trust in political decision making, and quality

of life) that Mody et al. (2020) explain residents' support for peer-to-peer accommodations using Weber's Theory of Rationality and Foucauldian concepts.

### **Overtourism**

Nearly as hot a topic as residents' perceptions of peer-to-peer accommodations is that concerning overtourism in destinations. Martín-Martín et al. (2020) consider the nexus of the two using the human scale development approach to best capture residents' needs (both in negative and axiological contexts). Much like Fan et al. (2020), Martín-Martín et al. (2020) undertake their research using a mixed methods approach. The last article within this area of research, by Wegerer and Nadegger (2020), utilizes netnographical analysis to investigate activists' justification for posting degrowth discourse on social media platforms. As such, protection of the natural environment and disinterest of capitalism within the Austrian Alps were salient drivers.

### **Methodologies**

In addition to some interesting methodological advancements noted by Olya (2020), Ngo and Pham (2021), Styliadis and Terzidou (2021), two others stand out within this issue. The first is the article by Tse and Tung (2020) that examines implicit stereotypes of Mainland Chinese residents among Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, and Thailand using the implicit association test or IAT. The authors use the computerized program to measure study participants' responses and response times to cued images of Mainland Chinese residents (as implicit stereotypes), and then compare these with explicit stereotypes (measured through 12 behavioral likelihood items). The second article, by Chamarro et al. (2021), focuses on how Madrid residents' and its visitors' perceptions of the SUS-TAS (in the context of a destination with a high percentage of peer-to-peer accommodations) may be potentially different (using a multigroup invariance analysis). Such an analytical technique was also employed by Maruyama et al. (2020) within this issue.

### **Moving forward**

Based on the review of pertinent work in the initial portion of this article and the 22 additional articles in this special issue, a host of future research opportunities exist. None of these are in any order of importance. Let us first start with one of the most obvious. It is safe to say that COVID-19 and its mutations will be part of our lives for the unforeseen future. It is nearly impossible to conceive of social impacts of tourism without realizing the sheer presence of tourists (even unseen by residents) is now considered an impact. It is true that all the research comprised in the 22 articles was undertaken prior to the pandemic. That said, as researchers, we should constantly be asking ourselves, "how can our research designs and how are our study findings informed by the ongoing pandemic?" Now more than ever, we should start to emphasize the role of empathy in our research, as residents and as tourists, for one another (Woosnam et al., 2018). Additionally, we might consider presenting residents with hypothetical situations to consider in determining acceptable levels of tourists and under what conditions? This would most certainly be helpful for destinations considering greatest sustainability while trying to attract tourists to return. We might also begin to ask tourists about their willingness to return and under what conditions (see Torres et al., 2021).

This segues nicely into an evolving need to concurrently incorporate perspectives of both residents and tourists when engaging in social impacts of tourism research. Nearly one-third of the articles in this issue focused on the relationship between the parties, providing greater credence to the notion that host and guest are inextricably linked (Styliadis, 2022). Work that continues to operationalize measures of social contact and the contact theory between residents and tourists

(building on the work of Fan, 2020 and Fan et al., 2020) will be most timely. With more research focusing on emotional solidarity between residents and tourists (in this issue and elsewhere), greater work is needed to examine additional outcomes of the construct beyond attitudinal measures. For instance, how does emotional solidarity prompt an individual's likelihood to behave in a certain way (behavioral support or withdrawal) (Erul et al., 2020) or better yet, actual behavior. Future research should also shift slightly to consider the construct from tourists' perspectives (like the work by Woosnam & Aleshinloye, 2013). Finally, the original emotional solidarity theoretical framework should be used in tandem with complementary theories (e.g. cognitive appraisal theory, interaction ritual theory, mere exposure theory, social exchange theory, theory of formal and substantive rationality, theories of reasoned action and planned behavior, etc.).

While we are discussing the subject of social impact outcomes, researchers should consider effects of overtourism and peer-to-peer accommodations since the two are so prevalent in the current tourism literature but also seem to be highly linked, especially in urban destinations (Celata & Romano, 2020). In this special issue alone, eight of the 22 articles focused on one of these two topics. Here again, we suggest that future researchers should examine outcomes of residents' perceptions of overtourism and peer-to-peer accommodations such as intentions to act, such as compromised relations between residents and tourists (Cheung & Li, 2019), protest and resistance (Smith et al., 2019), support of degrowth (Wegerer & Nadegger, 2020), and civic engagement (Torres, 2021). Of course, residents' empowerment may also factor into perceptions of overtourism and peer-to-peer accommodations (given its noted use within this issue). For instance, empowerment through tourism may, in essence, act as a moderator within some future models. One avenue by which to surmise greater outcomes of social impacts would be to investigate perspectives via social media. This approach has grown in recent years (Woosnam et al., 2021) and in fact was highlighted within this special issue by Nunkoo et al. (2020) and Wegerer and Nadegger (2020). Assessing the dynamic nature of social media posts over time would go far to see how residents' perceived social impacts change over time.

Another area of opportunity for research in social impacts of tourism surrounds greater theoretical model testing that encompasses multiple forms of data. Within this issue we see the works by Stylidis and Terzidou (2021), Fan et al. (2020), and Martín-Martín et al. (2020) that employ mixed methods approaches. We suggest that future researchers should design research utilizing multiple case studies (involving both quantitative and qualitative data) as well as panel data. This will help to allay any potential concerns of findings being more idiographic in nature and limited to the immediate study context. Future testable models need to be driven by theoretical frameworks to further advance our field and address the concerns stated by multiple authors regarding limited theoretical development and testing (Gursoy & Nunkoo, 2019, Hadinejad et al., 2019, and Nunkoo et al., 2013). Furthermore, proposed models should include outcome variables measuring either behavioral intentions or actual behavior. This approach will help to ensure greater actionable research with strong practical implications. In fact, where we can most effectively see theoretical findings informing practice is in works focusing on developing countries and destinations. Such countries possess unique cultural, geographical, and political contexts that demand further attention, and by engaging in research within these settings, we will be paying homage to the seminal works by Smith (1977), de Kadt (1979), and Mathieson and Wall (1982).

More research is needed that is longitudinal in nature. This involves data collection at multiple points throughout time from the same study population using the same measures or constructs. All too often we see authors indicating in final sections of their articles that their findings would benefit from longitudinal research designs. Stylidis and Terzidou (2021) take full advantage of this call within the current issue to provide findings of their research data collected at three points in time. We also see other works most recently by Bimonte et al. (2019) and Liang et al. (2021) in the context of residents' perceptions of tourism. Given the ever-changing landscape of travel during the COVID-19 pandemic, now would be an ideal time to engage in research that monitors residents' perspectives and how they change over time—something authors

conducting social impacts research have suggested for years. Along these same lines, greater work that incorporates experimental or quasi-experimental research could be undertaken longitudinally—a mixing of designs that Font et al. (2019) alluded to in their recent work. Such an approach would be highly informative to see how perceived social impacts may vary over time based on residents' assessing multiple scenarios. We suggest researchers consider the work by Kamata (2022) as a guide for undertaking a longitudinal approach. Though financial and time constraints often prohibit engaging in longitudinal research, how much more powerful would results be if researchers presented consistent (or even contrary) findings over time using the same sample populations! Such an approach would quiet the critics that findings lack external validity while providing more credence for nomothetic theory to develop.

Where we can really see the practical implications of our social impacts of tourism research is by undertaking studies that focus specifically on the United Nation's sustainable development goals (SDGs) (UNWTO, 2017). Though Scheyvens (2018) and Bramwell et al. (2017) argue that too few tourism scholars engage in pressing global issues, we need to approach our work in social impacts of tourism with the understanding that though our work may occur in distinct communities, it has global implications. No time is better than now to realize that global concerns highlighted within the SDGs (e.g. poverty, hunger, well-being, clean water and sanitation, decent work and economic growth, sustainable cities and communities, etc.) are compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic as fewer individuals are able to or desire to travel just as destinations are resistant or fearful of allowing visitors to their communities. We implore researchers to engage in research that will address the SDGs, most specifically those focused on alleviating poverty (SDG 1), fostering good health and well-being (SDG 3), providing decent work and economic growth (SDG 8), ensuring cities and communities are sustainable (SDG 11), encouraging responsible consumption and production (SDG 12), and alleviating climate change (SDG 13). Results of such work focusing on the SDGs will help steer us in the direction toward reduced dependencies on fossil fuels, greater empowerment of individuals whose voices have historically been silenced, more sustainably viable tourism enterprises that bring money to impoverished individuals and communities, and greater efforts to preserve cultural and natural resources within fragile ecosystems. Together, in solidarity and synergistic efforts, we can advance our field while making a difference in the world, one destination at a time.

## ORCID

Manuel Alector Ribeiro  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4484-1082>

## References

- Aleshinloye, K. D., Fu, X., Ribeiro, M. A., Woosnam, K. M., & Tasci, A. D. (2020). The influence of place attachment on social distance: Examining mediating effects of emotional solidarity and the moderating role of interaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(5), 828–849. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519863883>
- Allen, L. R., Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(1), 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758802700104>
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056–1076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.03.001>
- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3), 411–423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.3.411>
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(2), 172–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503257488>
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665–690. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(92\)90060-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(92)90060-3)
- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1998). Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759803700203>

- Belisle, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents a case study in Santa Marta. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7(1), 83–101. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(80\)80008-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(80)80008-9)
- Bimonte, S., D'Agostino, A., Grilli, G., & Pagliuca, M. (2019). Tourist season and residents' life satisfaction: Empirical evidence from a longitudinal design in a Mediterranean destination. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 323–333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2263>
- Boley, B. B., McGehee, N. G., Perdue, R. R., & Long, P. (2014). Empowerment and resident attitudes toward tourism: Strengthening the theoretical foundation through a Weberian lens. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.08.005>
- Bramwell, B., Higham, J., Lane, B., & Miller, G. (2017). Twenty-five years of sustainable tourism and the *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*: Looking back and moving forward. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.1251689>
- Brougham, J. E., & Butler, R. W. (1981). A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(4), 569–590. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(81\)90042-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(81)90042-6)
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien*, 24(1), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.1980.tb00970.x>
- Celata, F., & Romano, A. (2020). Overtourism and online short-term rental platforms in Italian cities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1788568>
- Chamarro, A., Cobo-Benita, J., & Herrero Amo, M. D. (2021). Towards sustainable tourism development in a mature destination: Measuring multi-group invariance between residents and visitors' attitudes with high use of accommodation-sharing platforms. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1870988>
- Chang, K. C. (2021). The affecting tourism development attitudes based on the social exchange theory and the social network theory. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2018.1540438>
- Chen, C. F., & Chen, P. C. (2010). Resident attitudes toward heritage tourism development. *Tourism Geographies*, 12(4), 525–545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2010.516398>
- Chen, N., & Dwyer, L. (2018). Residents' place satisfaction and place attachment on destination brand-building behaviors: Conceptual and empirical differentiation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(8), 1026–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287517729760>
- Cheung, K. S., & Li, L. H. (2019). Understanding visitor–resident relations in overtourism: Developing resilience for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(8), 1197–1216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1606815>
- Chiang, L., Xu, A., Kim, J., Tang, L., & Manthiou, A. (2017). Investigating festivals and events as social gatherings: The application of social identity theory. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 34(6), 779–792. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2016.1233927>
- Choi, H. C., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(4), 575–594. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580903524852>
- Choi, H. S. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(4), 380–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287505274651>
- Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests, and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(2), 2–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758802700201>
- de Kadt, E. (1979). *Tourism: Passport to development? Perspectives on the social and cultural effects in developing countries*. Oxford University Press.
- Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research: A new research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.01.026>
- Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants, methodology, and research inferences. In *Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings of the Travel Research Association* (pp. 195–198). Travel and Tourism Research Association.
- Durkheim, E. (1995). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. Free Press. (Original work published 1915)
- Erul, E., Woosnam, K. M., & McIntosh, W. A. (2020). Considering emotional solidarity and the theory of planned behavior in explaining behavioral intentions to support tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(8), 1158–1173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1726935>
- Erul, E., Woosnam, K. M., Ribeiro, M. A., & Salazar, J. (2022). Complementing theories to explain emotional solidarity. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1800718>
- Eslami, S., Khalifah, Z., Mardani, A., Streimikiene, D., & Han, H. (2019). Community attachment, tourism impacts, quality of life and residents' support for sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(9), 1061–1079. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2019.1689224>
- Eusébio, C., Vieira, A. L., & Lima, S. (2018). Place attachment, host–tourist interactions, and residents' attitudes towards tourism development: The case of Boa Vista Island in Cape Verde. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 26(6), 890–909. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1425695>



- Evans-Pritchard, D. (1989). How “they” see “us”: Native American images of tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(1), 89–105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(89\)90032-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(89)90032-7)
- Fan, D. X. (2020). Understanding the tourist-resident relationship through social contact: Progressing the development of social contact in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1852409>
- Fan, D. X., Qiu, H., Jenkins, C. L., & Lau, C. (2020). Towards a better tourist-host relationship: The role of social contact between tourists’ perceived cultural distance and travel attitude. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1783275>
- Font, X., Higham, J., Miller, G., & Pourfakhimi, S. (2019). Research engagement, impact and sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1560673>
- Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Host community reactions: A cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 763–784. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00103-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00103-6)
- Gannon, M., Rasoolimanesh, S. M., & Taheri, B. (2021). Assessing the mediating role of residents’ perceptions toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(1), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519890926>
- Gursoy, D., & Nunkoo, R. (Eds.). (2019). *The Routledge handbook of tourism impacts: Theoretical and applied perspectives*. Routledge.
- Gursoy, D., Ouyang, Z., Nunkoo, R., & Wei, W. (2019). Residents’ impact perceptions of and attitudes towards tourism development: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 28(3), 306–333. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2018.1516589>
- Hadinejad, A., Moyle, B. D., Scott, N., Kralj, A., & Nunkoo, R. (2019). Residents’ attitudes to tourism: A review. *Tourism Review*, 74(2), 150–165. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-01-2018-0003>
- Henderson, J. C. (2018). Classic book review of *Tourism: Economic, physical and social impacts*, by A. Mathieson and G. Wall. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 21(4), 522–524. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2018.1457008>
- Huh, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2008). Changes in residents’ attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 446–455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507308327>
- Joo, D., Cho, H., Woosnam, K. M., & Suess, C. (2022). Re-theorizing social emotions in tourism: Applying the theory of interaction ritual in tourism research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1849237>
- Joo, D., Tasci, A. D., Woosnam, K. M., Maruyama, N. U., Hollas, C. R., & Aleshinloye, K. D. (2018). Residents’ attitude towards domestic tourists explained by contact, emotional solidarity and social distance. *Tourism Management*, 64, 245–257. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.08.012>
- Joo, D., & Woosnam, K. M. (2020). Measuring tourists’ emotional solidarity with one another—A modification of the emotional solidarity scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(7), 1186–1203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519878503>
- Joo, D., Woosnam, K. M., Strzelecka, M., & Boley, B. B. (2020). Knowledge, empowerment, and action: Testing the empowerment theory in a tourism context. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(1), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1675673>
- Joo, D., Xu, W., Lee, J., Lee, C. K., & Woosnam, K. M. (2021). Residents’ perceived risk, emotional solidarity, and support for tourism amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 19, 100553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100553>
- Jordan, E. J., Vieira, J. C., Santos, C. M., & Huang, T. Y. (2020). Do residents differentiate between the impacts of tourism, cruise tourism, and Airbnb tourism? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1833894>
- Jurowski, C., & Gursoy, D. (2004). Distance effects on residents’ attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 296–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2003.12.005>
- Kamata, H. (2022). Tourist destination residents’ attitudes towards tourism during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(1), 134–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2021.1881452>
- Klamath, V., Ribeiro, M. A., Woosnam, K. M., Mallya, J., & Kamath, G. (2021). Determinants of visitors’ loyalty to religious sacred event places: A multigroup measurement invariance model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 004728752110576. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875211057600>
- Košćak, M., Knežević, M., Binder, D., Pelaez-Verdet, A., Işık, C., Mičić, V., Borisavljević, K., & Šegota, T. (2021). Exploring the neglected voices of children in sustainable tourism development: A comparative study in six European tourist destinations. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1898623>
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121–139. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)90008-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)90008-6)
- Látková, P., & Vogt, C. A. (2012). Residents’ attitudes toward existing and future tourism development in rural communities. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 50–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287510394193>
- Lawson, R. W., Williams, J., Young, T. A. C. J., & Cossens, J. (1998). A comparison of residents’ attitudes towards tourism in 10 New Zealand destinations. *Tourism Management*, 19(3), 247–256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(98\)00018-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00018-1)



- Lee, S., Joo, D., Lee, C. K., & Woosnam, K. M. (2020). Korean DMZ tourists' perceived similarity and shared beliefs in predicting place attachment and support for tourism development. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 18, 100467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100467>
- Lepp, A. (2008). Attitudes towards initial tourism development in a community with no prior tourism experience: The case of Bigodi, Uganda. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost630.0>
- Liang, Z., Luo, H., & Bao, J. (2021). A longitudinal study of residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 24(23), 3309–3323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2021.1874314>
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 193–214. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(86\)90037-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(86)90037-X)
- Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759002800301>
- Madrigal, R. (1995). Residents' perceptions and the role of government. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 86–102. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)00070-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)00070-9)
- Mair, J., Chien, P. M., Kelly, S. J., & Derrington, S. (2021). Social impacts of mega-events: A systematic narrative review and research agenda. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1870989>
- Martín-Martín, J. M., Prados-Castillo, J. F., Jimenez Aguilera, J. D. D., & Porras González, E. (2020). Interferences generated on the well-being of local communities by the activity of online platforms for tourist accommodation. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1861455>
- Maruyama, N. U., Keith, S. J., & Woosnam, K. M. (2019). Incorporating emotion into social exchange: Considering distinct resident groups' attitudes towards ethnic neighborhood tourism in Osaka, Japan. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(8), 1125–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1593992>
- Maruyama, N. U., Ribeiro, M. A., & Woosnam, K. M. (2020). The effect of minority residents' attitudes and emotional solidarity on ethnic neighborhood tourism: A multigroup invariance analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1849238>
- Mason, P. (2016). *Tourism impacts, planning and management* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391–411. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00084-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00084-5)
- Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: Economic, physical and social impacts*. Longman.
- McCool, S. F., & Martin, S. R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29–34.
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268234>
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 191–204. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(88\)90082-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(88)90082-5)
- Mody, M., Woosnam, K. M., Suess, C., & Dogru, T. (2020). Hapless victims or empowered citizens? Understanding residents' attitudes towards Airbnb using Weber's Theory of Rationality and Foucauldian concepts. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1834567>
- Molina-Azorin, J. F., & Font, X. (2016). Mixed methods in sustainable tourism research: An analysis of prevalence, designs and application in JOST (2005–2014). *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(4), 549–573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1073739>
- Monterrubio, C. (2016). The impact of spring break behaviour: An integrated threat theory analysis of residents' prejudice. *Tourism Management*, 54, 418–427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.12.004>
- Monterrubio, J. C., & Andriotis, K. (2014). Social representations and community attitudes towards spring breakers. *Tourism Geographies*, 16(2), 288–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2014.889208>
- Moscardo, G. (2011). Exploring social representations of tourism planning: Issues for governance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(4–5), 423–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.558625>
- Moscovici, S. (1984). The phenomenon of social representations. In R. Farr & S. Moscovici (Eds.), *Social representations* (pp. 3–70). Cambridge University Press.
- Munanura, I. E., Needham, M. D., Lindberg, K., Kooistra, C., & Ghahramani, L. (2021). Support for tourism: The roles of attitudes, subjective wellbeing, and emotional solidarity. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1901104>
- Ngo, T., & Pham, T. (2021). Indigenous residents, tourism knowledge exchange and situated perceptions of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1920967>
- Nunez, T. (1977). Touristic studies in anthropological perspective. In V. Smith (Ed.), *Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism* (pp. 265–279). University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Nunkoo, R. (2016). Toward a more comprehensive use of social exchange theory to study residents' attitudes to tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 588–596. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(16\)30303-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)30303-3)
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243–268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.05.006>

- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2019). Introduction to tourism impacts. In R. Nunkoo and D. Gursoy (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of tourism impacts: Theoretical and applied perspectives* (pp. 1–20). Routledge.
- Nunkoo, R., Gursoy, D., & Dwivedi, Y. K. (2020). Effects of social media on residents' attitudes to tourism: Conceptual framework and research propositions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1845710>
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2009). Influence of values on residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Analysis*, 14(2), 241–244. <https://doi.org/10.3727/108354209789116501>
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2010). Gendered theory of planned behavior and residents' support for tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(6), 525–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500903173967>
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2012). Power, trust, social exchange and community support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 997–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.11.017>
- Nunkoo, R., & Smith, S. L. (2013). Political economy of tourism: Trust in government actors, political support, and their determinants. *Tourism Management*, 36, 120–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.11.018>
- Nunkoo, R., Smith, S. L., & Ramkissoon, H. (2013). Residents' attitudes to tourism: A longitudinal study of 140 articles from 1984 to 2010. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.673621>
- Olya, H. G. (2020). Towards advancing theory and methods on tourism development from residents' perspectives: Developing a framework on the pathway to impact. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1843046>
- Ouyang, Z., Gursoy, D., & Sharma, B. (2017). Role of trust, emotions and event attachment on residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management*, 63, 426–438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.06.026>
- Palmer, A., Koenig-Lewis, N., & Jones, L. E. M. (2013). The effects of residents' social identity and involvement on their advocacy of incoming tourism. *Tourism Management*, 38, 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.02.019>
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586–599. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(90\)90029-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(90)90029-Q)
- Phuc, H. N., & Nguyen, H. M. (2020). The importance of collaboration and emotional solidarity in residents' support for sustainable urban tourism: Case study Ho Chi Minh City. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1831520>
- Ramkissoon, H. (2020). Perceived social impacts of tourism and quality-of-life: A new conceptual model. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1858091>
- Raymond, C., & Brown, G. (2007). A spatial method for assessing resident and visitor attitudes towards tourism growth and development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 520–540. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost681.0>
- Ribeiro, M. A., Pinto, P., Silva, J. A., & Woosnam, K. M. (2017). Residents' attitudes and the adoption of pro-tourism behaviours: The case of developing island countries. *Tourism Management*, 61, 523–537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.03.004>
- Rothman, R. A. (1978). Residents and transients: Community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(3), 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728757801600303>
- Ruhanen, L., Moyle, C. L., & Moyle, B. (2019). New directions in sustainable tourism research. *Tourism Review*, 74(2), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-12-2017-0196>
- Sarr, B., Sène-Harper, A., & Gonzalez-Hernandez, M. M. (2021). Tourism, social representations and empowerment of rural communities at Langue de Barbarie National Park. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(8), 1383–1402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1855437>
- Scheyvens, R. (1999). Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 245–249. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(98\)00069-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00069-7)
- Scheyvens, R. (2018). Linking tourism to the sustainable development goals: A geographical perspective. *Tourism Geographies*, 20(2), 341–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2018.1434818>
- Sharma, B., & Dyer, P. (2009). An investigation of differences in residents' perceptions on the Sunshine Coast: Tourism impacts and demographic variables. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(2), 187–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616680902827159>
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007>
- Sheldon, P. J., Var, T., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40–47. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(84\)90006-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(84)90006-2)
- Smith, V. (Ed.). (1977). *Hosts and guests: The anthropology of tourism*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smith, M. D., & Krannich, R. S. (1998). Tourism dependence and resident attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(4), 783–802. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(98\)00040-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00040-1)
- Smith, M. K., Sziva, I. P., & Olt, G. (2019). Overtourism and resident resistance in Budapest. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 16(4), 376–392. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1595705>
- Snaith, T., & Haley, A. (1999). Residents' opinions of tourism development in the historic city of York, England. *Tourism Management*, 20(5), 595–603. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(99\)00030-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00030-8)

- Strzelecka, M., Boley, B. B., & Strzelecka, C. (2017). Empowerment and resident support for tourism in rural Central and Eastern Europe (CEE): The case of Pomerania, Poland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(4), 554–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1224891>
- Stylidis, D. (2018). Place attachment, perception of place and residents' support for tourism development. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 15(2), 188–210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2017.1318775>
- Stylidis, D. (2022). Exploring resident-tourist interaction and its impact on tourists' destination image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(1), 186–201. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287520969861>
- Stylidis, D., & Terzidou, M. (2021). Exploring how perceived tourism impacts evolve over time (2009–2019) in an era of uncertainty: Economic crisis, host-guest interactions, and Airbnb. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1939707>
- Su, M. M., Wall, G., Ma, J., Notarianni, M., & Wang, S. (2020). Empowerment of women through cultural tourism: perspectives of Hui minority embroiderers in Ningxia, China. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1841217>
- Suess, C., Woosnam, K. M., Mody, M., Dogru, T., & Sirakaya Turk, E. (2021). Understanding how residents' emotional solidarity with Airbnb visitors influences perceptions of their impact on a community: The moderating role of prior experience staying at an Airbnb. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(5), 1039–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287520921234>
- Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Sönmez, S. F. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668–688. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(01\)00074-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00074-3)
- Thyne, M., Watkins, L., & Yoshida, M. (2018). Resident perceptions of tourism: The role of social distance. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(2), 256–266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2179>
- Tilaki, M. J. M., Abooli, G., Marzbali, M. H., & Samat, N. (2021). Vendors' attitudes and perceptions towards international tourists in the Malaysia Night Market: Does the COVID-19 outbreak matter? *Sustainability*, 13(3), 1553. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031553>
- Torres, R. M. (2021). The empty boxes of Venice: Overtourism—Conflicts, politicisation and activism. In *The power of new urban tourism* (pp. 147–160). Routledge.
- Torres, E. N., Ridderstaat, J., & Wei, W. (2021). Negative affectivity and people's return intentions to hospitality and tourism activities: The early stages of COVID-19. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 49, 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.08.021>
- Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 231–253. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(01\)00039-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00039-1)
- Tourism Management. (2021). *Guide for authors*. Retrieved on 6 October 2021 from <https://www.elsevier.com/journals/tourism-management/0261-5177/guide-for-authors>
- Truong, D., Liu, R. X., & Yu, J. J. (2020). Mixed methods research in tourism and hospitality journals. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(4), 1563–1579. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-03-2019-0286>
- Tse, W. T. S., & Tung, V. W. S. (2020). Assessing explicit and implicit stereotypes in tourism: Self-reports and implicit association test. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1860995>
- UNWTO. (2017). Tourism and the sustainable development goals—Journey to 2030. Retrieved on 1 January 2022 from <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/epdf/10.18111/9789284419401>
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Plaza-Mejía, M. D. L. Á., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287508322783>
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Porras-Bueno, N., & de los Ángeles Plaza-Mejía, M. (2011). Explaining residents' attitudes to tourism: Is a universal model possible? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 460–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.10.004>
- Wang, Y., & Pfister, R. E. (2008). Residents' attitudes toward tourism and perceived personal benefits in a rural community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(1), 84–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507312402>
- Ward, C., & Berno, T. (2011). Beyond social exchange theory: Attitudes toward tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1556–1569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.02.005>
- Wegerer, P. K., & Nadegger, M. (2020). It's time to act! Understanding online resistance against tourism development projects. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1853761>
- Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 269–290. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(00\)00030-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00030-X)
- Woosnam, K. M. (2012). Using emotional solidarity to explain residents' attitudes about tourism and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(3), 315–327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287511410351>
- Woosnam, K. M., & Aleshinloye, K. D. (2013). Can tourists experience emotional solidarity with residents? Testing Durkheim's model from a new perspective. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(4), 494–505. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287512467701>
- Woosnam, K. M., Draper, J., Jiang, J. K., Aleshinloye, K. D., & Erul, E. (2018). Applying self-perception theory to explain residents' attitudes about tourism development through travel histories. *Tourism Management*, 64, 357–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.09.015>

- Woosnam, K. M., & Norman, W. C. (2010). Measuring residents' emotional solidarity with tourists: Scale development of Durkheim's theoretical constructs. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287509346858>
- Woosnam, K. M., Russell, Z., Ribeiro, M. A., Denley, T. J., Rojas, C., Hadjidakis, E., Barr, J., & Mower, J. (2021). Residents' pro-tourism behaviour in a time of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1985128>
- Wu, S. T., & Chen, Y. S. (2018). Local intentions to participate in ecotourism development in Taiwan's Atayal communities. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 16(1), 75–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2016.1253705>
- Yeager, E., Boley, B. B., & Goetcheus, C. (2020). Conceptualizing peer-to-peer accommodations as disruptions in the urban tourism system. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1864387>
- Yeager, E. P., Boley, B. B., Woosnam, K. M., & Green, G. T. (2020). Modeling residents' attitudes toward short-term vacation rentals. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(6), 955–974. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519870255>
- Zheng, D., Liang, Z., & Ritchie, B. W. (2020). Residents' social dilemma in sustainable heritage tourism: The role of social emotion, efficacy beliefs and temporal concerns. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(11), 1782–1804. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1760288>