

Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences



Volume 3 Number 1 January 2010

SIDIP

ISSN 1855-0541

Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences (IIASS)

Publisher:

Slovensko društvo za inovativno politologijo - SDIP
Slovenian Association for Innovative Political Science – SIDIP

Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor: PhD. Uroš Pinterič

International Editorial Board:

PhD. Li Bennich Bjorkman	Uppsala University
Simon Delakorda	Institute for Electronic Participation
PhD. Michael Edinger	University of Jena
Mateja Erčulj	SIDIP
PhD. Bela Greskovits	Central European University
MSc. Sandra Jednak	University of Belgrade
M.A. Mira Jovanović	University of Zurich
PhD. Karl Koth	University of Manitoba
PhD. Jose M. Magone	Berlin School of Economics
PhD. Aleksandar Marković	University of Belgrade
Warren Master	The Public Manager
PhD. Piotr Sitniewski	Bialystok School of Public Administration
PhD. Ksenija Šabec	University of Ljubljana
PhD. Inga Vinogradnaite	Vilnius University
Phd Lasha Tchantouridze	University of Manitoba

Secretary:

Klementina Zapušek SIDIP

Language editor:

Marjeta Zupan

Publishing information:

IIASS is exclusively electronic peer reviewed journal that is published three times a year (initially in January, May and September) by Slovenian Association for Innovative Political Science – SIDIP and it is available free of charge at <http://vega.fuds.si/>

Scope:

IIASS is electronic peer reviewed international journal covering all social sciences (Political science, sociology, economy, public administration, law, management, communication science, etc.). Journal is open to theoretical and empirical articles of established scientist and researchers as well as of perspective young students. All articles have to pass double blind peer review.

IIASS welcomes innovative ideas in researching established topics or articles that are trying to open new issues that are still searching for its scientific recognition.

Copyrights

IIASS is product of SIDIP. All rights concerning IIASS are reserved. Journal and Articles can be spread and cited only with information on author of article and journal. Articles published in the IIASS are the work of individual authors and do not necessary represent ideas and believes of SIDIP or Editorial board of IIASS. The responsibility for respecting copyrights in the quotations of a published article rests with the author(s). When publishing an article in IIASS, authors automatically assign copyright to the journal. However, authors retain their right to reuse the material in other publications written or edited by themselves and due to be published at least one year after initial publication in IIASS.

Abstracting and Indexing services: COBISS, *International Political Science Abstracts*, *CSA Worldwide Political Science Abstracts*, *CSA Sociological Abstracts*, *PAIS International*.

Editorial correspondence

All correspondence or correspondence concerning any general questions, article submission or book reviews should be addressed to the iass.sidip@gmail.com

Subscription to IIASS

IIASS is available free of any charge at <http://vega.fuds.si/> but if you like to get your electronic copy personally you can write to iass.sidip@gmail.com

Advertising

If you would like to inform your colleagues around the world on new book or forthcoming event we can offer you this possibility. Please find our advertising policy at <http://vega.fuds.si/>. For additional questions or inquiries you can contact as on the general e-mail iass.sidip@gmail.com with subject: Advertising inquiry or secretary of the journal on tina.zapusek@gmail.com

TOWARDS THE SUSTAINABLE CONCEPT OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN POSAVJE REGION IN SLOVENIA

Božidar Veljković¹
Milan Ambrož²

Abstract

This study examines the role of a sustainable natural and social environment and contextually developing tourism based on visiting tourist type in tourism development in Posavje region in Slovenia. Overall results suggest that local residents' are generally satisfied with the tourism development. Their satisfaction is based on their quality of life the industry and cultural heritage that attract new tourists. Study reveals the fact that future tourism will be based on sustainable development where quality of life of the local residents has a primary role. The findings suggest that strong knowledge base about the tourists' psychographics changes that could indicate the destination life cycle and help destination managers to design appropriate strategies.

Key words: local residents, tourism development, tourist type, sustainability, planning, knowledge base, behaviour pattern

Introduction

The interest in community tourism has been building over past three decades. For a variety of reasons, many local communities have turned to tourism as a means of economic development. Tourism development evolves out of the urge for an economic benefit, and causes social, cultural and environmental destruction if it is not properly managed. In many cases, it is a vital step to economic growth of a community. It should be a source of new employment, revenues, and the

¹ Božidar Veljković, Ph. D. is a lecturer at Višja komercialna šola Celje, Slovenia

² Milan Ambrož, Ph. D. is a project manager at B&B education and training d.o.o., Kranj, Slovenia

enhancement of a community infrastructure that attracts other industries (Lankford and Howard, 1994: 145). Tourism development produces various impacts. Some of them are very positive and others can be very destructive for a local community and can hinder the tourism development. Many communities that enter the national and global tourism market face many difficulties in these areas. Negative impacts on host communities can be lessened by resident involvement in the planning of tourism development (Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001). Further, Thomas and Long (2000) argue that the tourism contribution to sustainable economic development is based on public and private sector attractions that must be nationally and internationally competitive. This is often because they misread the market and the communities' true competitive value. For better understanding of the tourism opportunities good knowledge of trends can lead to a better understanding of the community tourism system and may provide useful information to community and tourism planners (Mueller et al., 1970). In some cases, the tourism development is the only alternative for the local community, and should be carefully considered and researched. Developmental tourism practices that communities can use to satisfy tourists and local residents must be clearly articulated, tested and value based (Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001; Ambrož, 2008). Otherwise negative developmental and financial consequences can emerge.

The inbound tourism plays an important role in the economic progress of the Posavje region in Slovenia. So the knowledge of the tourist motives, intentions and their personalities that play the major role in the process of decision making about the destination visit, is important variable in determining the tourism development strategy. The knowledge about the necessities of visitors, comprehensive understanding of visitors, industry and services, quality of life and new jobs opportunities can contribute to the development of tourism in the Posavje region. There has not been developed an adequate tool for evaluating a systemic impact of residents' perception on tourism development. Neither standard economic analysis nor the life cycle approaches have yielded satisfactory results.

In this paper, we examine the impact of local residents' perceptions of industry and services, the quality of life, tourist types and job opportunities on tourism development in Posavje region. Our research

on tourism development is geographically specific. However, it is suggested that the principle of resident's perception of tourists as a planning tool is transferable and should be given serious consideration in any established, developing, or potential tourist-recreation region.

The impacts of tourism development

Many communities experience industrial restructuring and turn to tourism as the known contributor to the economy and as the creator of new jobs. Consequently, many residents are exposed to tourism for the first time, whereas established destinations experience increasing volumes of tourists. As the impacts of tourism development are not very well researched and understood, tourism planners are now challenged with understanding how the public perceives tourism in order to gain local support for its development (Harril, 2004). Two decades ago Pearce and Moscardo (1999) recognized the growing interest in tourism research and planning agendas. Along with some other researchers they propose that tourism should foster local community involvement in sustainable tourism development (Pearce & Moscardo, 1996: 31; Ambrož & Mavrič, 2005; Hall et al, 2005; Ambrož, 2008). Thomas & Long (2001) argue that formalized tourism planning that considers key development factors, strengthens the possibilities for a community to benefit from it. When tourism is based on sound planning and managed in a controlled way, it can generate substantial economic benefits. Besides, long-term sustainability of tourism has been the result of the ability of community leaders and tourism managers to minimize its costs. Therefore, it is very important that managers, leaders, and local residents understand the potential impacts of tourism and the importance of its' planning. Quality tourism planning enables them to integrate tourism industry into their community efficiently (Ambrož, 2008).

Due to the complexity of the impacts, tourism planning is a still very important rationale for today. The majority of tourism planners often consider tourism only in terms of economic impacts like the ability to create a new job and as the producer of the additional tax revenue. The range of tourism impact is usually wider and not linked only to economic issues. Additionally, planning is important to create an order in response to social and environmental degradation (Mason, 2003: 66). Williams

(1988) suggested that the goal of modern planning is to seek optimal solutions to perceived problems. It is possible to increase positive impacts of tourism and maximize development benefits that are the foundation for the production of predictable outputs. Wilkinson (1997), Mason (2003), Ambrož (2008), and Ovsenik (2008) suggested that a plan provides the rationale for and details of how to implement tourism within a country or region. Planning should set tourism within a wider economic and social context to secure its growth.

Hall (2000) sees some perspective in the future directed tourism planning. Gunn (1988: 15) shares the similar opinion and sees planning as clearly forward looking requiring some estimated perception of the future. Formica and Kohtari (2008) research suggest that the tourism industry will be facing major challenges and experiencing swift changes that only can be managed by adoption and implementation of proactive strategies. They link this argument to the global economy, changing market demographics, and emerging technology. Buhalis (1999) is more concrete suggesting that future tourism planning must be closely associated with destination marketing. He argues that marketing of destinations supported by new technologies should balance the strategic objectives of all stakeholders as well the sustainability of local resources. Destination marketing must lead to the optimization of tourism impacts and the achievement of the strategic objectives for all stakeholders. Hughes (2004:368) argues that sustainable tourism strategies should be developed not only in conjunction with the public or through public participation, but as forms of tourism development.

Many researchers propose different tools for the measurement of tourism development. Fesenmaier (2009) uses The Tourism Development Capacity Index (TDCI) that is an assessment tool that provides a framework for communities to benchmark or evaluates the impact of tourism development initiatives. TDCI measures change in both organizational and financial resources. Murphy & Murphy (2004) propose real world situations as the learning tool that can help communities to decide what type of development works best for them. Murphy (2003) concentrates on the event capacity of the local community and emphasizes the importance of community involvement through festivals and events sponsored by residents, and the development of local themes in the tourism product.

Butler (1980), Getz (1992), and Agarwal (1997) develops more holistic stance based on tourist area life cycle approach. They view tourism as an evolutionary activity that is constantly changing. The most relevant variable in their concept is the number of visitors as the most relevant variable for tourism planning. Lundtorp and Wanhil (2001) add the time and path measurement of the destination. They identify tourists that return to the destination and the one time visiting tourists, as a base of the future tourism planning. Further, Fariborz et al (2009), show that the sense of community is the other side of equation in tourism development building.

These approaches show that more integrated and systemic approach is needed to develop tourism that is based on the needs, expectations and desires of tourists that visit tourist destination. From this point of view, the identification of the natural and cultural resources which are the main attractions of the tourist destination is the capital question. For example, when deciding on holiday destinations in 2008, most Europeans named the location's environment and its overall attractiveness as the key consideration (31%). Cultural heritage (24%) and entertainment (15%) was the second and third ranked decisions in regard to factors that influenced a choice of destination. Cultural heritage was considered as a relatively more important attraction by those who plan to travel abroad (Eurobarometer, 2009: 47).

Resident perceptions towards the tourism development

The role of residents' attitudes and tourism development

There are many advantages to tourism development when local residents' perceptions about tourists visiting their region, are included in regional tourism planning. Attitudes that are formed out of residents' perceptions are solid base for the development of new tourism products and services. Attitudes have generally been defined as an enduring predisposition toward a particular aspect of the one's environment. This predisposition can be reflected in the way one thinks, feels and behaves with respect to that aspect. Thus, attitudes are structured along three dimensions: (1) cognitive, (2) affective, and (3) behavioral (McDoughall

and Munro, 1987: 87). A cognitive, affective, and behavioral component of attitudes is influenced by a number of factors, including situation factors, the way attitudes are formed, and the importance of an attitude (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980). Ap and Crompton (1993) provide limited support for this model comprising four strategies: embracement, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal. In summary, different types of residents cope in different ways with their perceived impacts of tourism development and tourists. By observing tourism development local residents know if they like or dislike it, and may react accordingly. The level of their reaction is likely to depend on the importance that they place on the perceived impact and the likelihood of it affecting their quality of life (Jennings and Nickerson, 2006: 119). Resident attitudes are influenced by the types of tourism and tourism development, by their lifestyles and personal values (Pitts & Woodside, 1986, Belisle & Hoy, 1980). Besides, they are influenced by the perceived community and personal benefits or negative impacts. It is evidently why resident attitudes are used to examine the development of different types of tourism (Bramwell, 2003; Jennings and Nickerson, 2006: 123).

Ap (1990: 615), Pearce et al (1996) and Perdue et al (1999) first recognized that a new theory is needed to address the resident attitudes toward tourism development. Three theoretical approaches and directions followed and were reviewed within the context of lifecycle (Butler, 1980; Doxey, (1975; Androtis, 2005), carrying capacity (Long et al, 1990), social disruption (Mason and Cheyne, 2000), social exchange (Ap, 1990; Ambrož, 2008), and social representation (Moscovici, 1984; Pearce et al, 1996; Ambrož and Mavrič, 2005). Recently, resident attitudes were modeled with the use of structural equation modeling (Gursoy et al, 2002). That type of modeling provides evidence of the importance of different perceived benefits and costs in influencing attitudes towards tourism and makes incremental progress in development of quality tourism planning.

Quality of life impact on tourism development

There is a need for a more systemic and dynamic tool of analysis and planning in order to lead tourism development towards a trajectory that satisfies needs, expectations and desires of both tourists and local

residents. The long term welfare of host communities is a very important goal that increases the possibilities of tourism development.

Economic benefits of tourism are usually considered to improve quality of life. Sometimes socio-cultural, economic, and environmental factors may not be as positive as it is desired by tourism planners (Liu et al, 1987). Jennings and Nickerson (2006:130) identified five factors that dynamically influence the quality of life for residents: a type and number of tourists, a type and number of residents, social exchange relations, social representations, and type of tourism development that can be used as a base for the tourism development. The perception held by local residents about the quality of their life may significantly affect the viability of a region as a tourist region and accordingly the efficiency of tourism development in the region. The results indicate that the perceived impacts of tourism, both positive and negative, increase with increasing levels of tourism (Long and Perdue, 1990). Though a tourism region may contain a wide spectrum and high quality of tourism resources, a distorted image may detract from realizing the potential use or optimum economic development. Wandered and Vogt (2000) argues that communities differ with respect to residents' support of specific tourism development options and attitudes toward tourism. Nevertheless, residents perceive tourism positively and support most specific types of development, especially when residents of the entire community are included in the development process (Jurowski & Uysal, 1997). Dong Wan Ko and Stewart (2002) argued that community satisfaction is influenced by perception of tourism impacts, and may be seriously considered in tourism development planning. Community satisfaction can vary because tourism destinations change over time. Changes are based on a variety of factors. Among them the most important are needs and preferences of tourists, changes in their life styles and changes in the quality of visiting place and facilities. It is often the case that natural and cultural attractions change, and the popularity of the area decreases. Dissatisfaction of residents' often brings distortion in the perception of tourists and tourism development.

Tourist type impact on tourism development

To see the effects of the tourists' presence and behavior on the residents' perceptions and attitudes, we must first analyse the tourist type. The quality of residents' perceptions of visiting tourist is based on the well modeled and developed tourist type. Cohen perceived this problem three decades ago (1988), stating that there is no such person as the tourist. According to Cohen, tourism is a multivalent activity and there is more than one type of tourist that travels. However, in spite of the Cohen's perceptions of a tourist, closer view of the Jacobsen (1996) investigation shows that the tourist is not a de-differentiated entity. Even if tourists look the same, they experience their vacations and the places they visit in a different way. One comes for relaxation, the other for pleasure, and the third to experience some spirituality. Some of them do not really care where they are. As long as the weather is nice and there is something to experience, they stay in the location. From this point of view Lengkeek (2001) reformulates the modes of the tourist experience by synthesis of the self and environment. The metaphorical context has a quality that can be referred to as 'out-there-ness', where no centre is relevant, but only orientations and metaphorical references. However, many researchers tried to develop several tourist typologies describing ideal tourist types (Cohen, 1972, Jafari, 1989; Jokinen and Veijola, 2002; Ambrož, 2005). Confronting an ideal tourist type with an individual tourist, produces the cognitive gap between those two. As a result, the need for constant comparison of these two tourist types is needed in the process of the development of new type of tourism on the tourist destination. Cohen (1972) and Jafari (1989) based their understanding of the individual tourist on his or her concrete experience that why people are attracted to specific destinations. Typifying tourist experiences are a difficult task, because the number of diverse types of destination visitors is growing rapidly and the destination competition intensively increases. However, future tourism planning can benefit from focusing on diverse tourist types on the long run developing the knowledge base for producing diverse tourism products and services.

Some analysts have recognized that an understanding of the tourist experience and the ideal tourist type requires constructing tourist typologies. Pearce & Lee (2005) developed Travel Career Ladder (TCL)

that examines the relationship between patterns of travel motivation and travel experience. Tourists were perceived to have more than one level of travel motivation. People with a higher travel experience level gave more emphasis to motivations regarding a self-development. Cohen (1972) founded his tourist typology on novelty and strangeness that are essential to the tourist experience constructing the organized mass tourist, the individual mass tourist, the explorer, and the drifter. The degree to which strangeness and familiarity prevailed in the tourist role, determined the nature of the tourists' experience as well as the effect on the host society. Cohen (1979) further developed five modes of tourist experience by analyzing the different meanings including the interests for culture and social life.

Plog (1974) proposed totally different view of a tourist type because he was convinced that motives of tourists change in time and space. He believed that tourism appeal to specific types of people. These types form a relatively predictable pattern of growth and decline corresponding to the evolution of tourists' psychographics change. Mckercher (2005) agreed that motives and personality form the decision for the tourist destination, but added that destination could offer multi-products satisfying different types of tourists, which influence a tourist decision making process. Further, Crouch (1994) found out that time and space additionally influence a decision to visit particular destination arguing that tourists are more attracted by distant destinations. For example, McKercher and Lew (2003) examined the Hong Kong outbound travellers and argued that the longer the distance they traveled, the longer the duration of stay and the more destinations they visit. Nicolau and Mas (2006) added prices as an important factor that affects tourist destination choice. According to them, choice may be moderated by physical, cultural and interpersonal motivations. Therefore, it can be argued that destination choice involves not only psychological, rational or irrational processes but is also affected by physical distance, cost, and time availability. Reisinger and Turner (1997) suggested that cultural backgrounds may affect motivations to travel to a foreign country after they investigated cultural aspects of Indonesian inbound tourism to Australia. Moreover, according to the study conducted by Kim and Lee (2000), the difference in travel motivation is likely to have resulted from a gap between different cultures. Kozak (2002) found similar results in differences between the motives of British and German tourists.

Finally, we can conclude that the tourism destination visit choice is the ultimate result of the personality, motivation and behavior of a tourist constructed by many influencing factors. A matrix consisting of an integration of personality, motivation and cultural familiarity together, should be considered when analyzing a tourist type and his or her choice for a tourist destination. A tourist type and its cultural, personal, and motivational background form a pattern of tourism types as a knowledge base to plan a tourism development in the particular region. When tourists visit tourist destination new offers can be presented to them based on previous interactions, transactions, and the current context of their interactions. Benefits can be substantial, because in particular case 46% new and 48% old products were sold (Infor Global Solutions GmbH, 2007: 5). Extreme types of travelers deserve special attention because they reflect different types of personality and travel behavior, and they fit differently in the time cycle of tourist destination and determine its success at different times.

Methodology

Instruments and sample

According to the purpose of this study, the overall process of developing the instrument for the study of tourism development was divided into three separate parts. Part one generated sample of items by a literature research and by the similar study conducted by Ambrož (2008). In part two data were drawn from a survey originally administered to respondents in Posavje region in 2009. Respondents were asked to rank their opinions on Likert-type scales and coded as 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree). Participants, who volunteered, were asked to respond to a range of questions relating to their views on the tourism development in Posavje region in Slovenia. Respondents were assured that their individual responses would be treated as confidential. The data came from the survey which was administered to a sample of 170 local residents from Brežice, Krško, Brestnica, Kostanjevica, Cerklje ob Krki, Senovo, Dobova, Raka, Jesenice, Bizeljsko, Šentjernej (Table 1). Including the sample of 170 respondents the data were examined using principal component analysis as the extraction method and varimax as a technique of rotation. We did the importance measure in the study through the application of multiple regression analysis.

Table 1: Demographic data

1	gender	men	88 (51.76%)	
		women	81 (47.65%)	
2	age	average in years	34	
		range in years	17-70	
3	time of residence	average in years	30	
4	employment in tourist organization	average in %	7.5%	
5	education	high school	89	51.76%
		college	24	14.12%
		bachelor/university degree	54	31.76%
		master degree	3	1.76%
		doctorate	1	0,59%

Table 1 one shows demographic variables included in the questionnaire. Men and women are equally represented in the survey sample, and the age distribution is in the frame of expected working age. Average time span of residence of local residents' is long enough to clarify the attitudes of local residents toward tourism development. Only 7.5% of respondents work in the tourist organization.

A principal component factor analysis was applied to further purify the measurement of indicators. The factor structure of the study model is proving reliable by the Cronbach's alfa test. Varimax rotation was employed to principal components in order to extract latent factors and to reduce the number of variables. The independent variables and dependent variable were constructed from different sets of indicators:

1. Quality of life in which eleven survey items were found to load with each other factor loading < 0.50. These indicators include: satisfaction with services, clean, neat and tidy place, safety, minor traffic problems, service availability, leisure and entertainment facilities, well preserved natural environment, guarded privacy, enough shopping malls, "green lungs", cultural and other events. Quality of life scale was found to be reliable

with Cronbach's alpha 0.88, and explains 9.46 % percent of reliability in the factor structure. (Table 2),

Table 2: Factor Loadings on quality of life and tourism development

	factor	average	std	Cronbach's alpha
	Quality of life			
1	0.58	4.42	0.74	0.88
2	0.71	4.43	0.76	
3	0.74	4.50	0.82	
4	0.57	4.08	1.03	
5	0.67	4.54	0.70	
6	0.67	3.96	1.00	
7	0.56	4.24	0.97	
8	0.60	4.22	0.85	
9	0.52	4.36	0.85	
10	0.59	4.36	0.81	
11	0.56	4.07	0.84	
	Tourism development			
1	0.66	3.93	0.89	0.95
2	0.57	3.99	0.94	
3	0.70	3.93	0.91	
4	0.76	3.91	0.91	
5	0.72	3.98	0.86	
6	0.78	4.07	0.85	
7	0.75	3.98	0.87	
8	0.77	3.95	0.91	
9	0.58	4.35	0.82	
10	0.72	4.01	0.86	
11	0.78	3.98	0.90	
12	0.72	4.06	0.90	
13	0.79	4.05	0.82	
14	0.74	4.18	0.84	
15	0.77	3.92	0.95	

2. Industry and services in which seven survey items were found to load with each other factor loading < 0.50. These indicators include: higher education, industrial production, culture, high-tech production, agriculture, services, and handicraft. Infrastructure scale loaded on one factor explaining 48.56% of variance with Cronbach's alpha reliability 0.82. (Table 3),

Table 3: Factor Loadings on industry and services

	factor	average	std	Cronbach's alpha
	Industry and services			
1	0.55	4.18	1.00	0.82
2	0.59	3.93	0.90	
3	0.74	4.14	0.83	
4	0.64	3.75	1.03	
5	0.53	4.14	0.87	
6	0.71	4.31	0.70	
7	0.70	4.32	0.72	

3. Tourist type in eighteen survey items was found to load in three factors with each other factor loading < 0.40. Indicators for the cultural tourist type include: peace and relaxation, fun and pleasure, interested in culture, inheritance and history, other cultures, habits and customs, primitive environment and simple social relations, capture many impressions, seek business opportunities, they return every year. Indicators for the adventure tourist type include: short time visitor, adventure and danger seeker, addictions and sex pleasure seeker, constantly mobile. Indicators for the Casual type include: they are on motorcar round tour, come to our country by low-cost plane travel arrangements, are wanderers, are from Slovenia and just drop by. Tourist type scale loaded on three factors. Cultural tourist type scale explains 26.75% of variance with the Cronbach's alfa reliability of 0.82; adventure tourist type scale explains 11.13% of variance with Cronbach's alfa reliability of 0.57. Casual tourist type explains 6.69% of variance with Cronbach's alpha reliability 0.64. (Table 4),

Table 4: Factor Loadings on tourist type

	factor	average	std	Cronbach's alpha
	Cultural type			
1	0.47	4.42	0.78	0.82
2	0.54	3.85	0.90	
3	0.62	4.07	0.81	
4	0.71	3.90	0.89	
5	0.68	3.95	0.81	
6	0.76	4.04	0.81	
7	0.61	3.76	0.90	
8	0.52	3.76	0.99	
9	0.64	3.91	0.84	
10	0.70	4.07	0.87	
	Adventure type			
1	0.70	3.48	1.19	0.57
2	0.67	3.11	1.10	
3	0.65	2.43	1.25	
4	0.49	3.17	0.95	
	Occasional type			
1	0.71	3.51	0.93	0.64
2	0.42	3.04	1.11	
3	0.69	3.24	0.98	
4	0.70	3.62	0.85	

4. The dependent variable of tourism development was constructed from a set of fifteen questions based on the principal factor analysis in which all fifteen survey items were found to load with each other factor loading greater than 0.50. Indicators for the tourism development as the dependent variable includes: realistic and feasible tourism politics, politics that retains young people in the region, tourism opportunities in the region and financial investment in infrastructure. Further, dependent variable includes the realization of entrepreneurial opportunities in the field of tourism, locally managed tourism projects, quality information about tourism development, and effective regional and communal collaboration with a private sector in the field of tourism. Broad and open and well known tourism strategy that is nationally wide enough, inclusion of local residents in the tourism development, and strategic networking in the field of public-private partnership, are the indicators that show the

interconnected tourism development. Additional tourism product development and the production of new jobs show the effective side of tourism development in the region. This tourism development scale was found to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha 0.95, and explains 46.10 % of variability in the factor structure (Table 2).

Regression analysis

The independent variables: quality of life, infrastructure and cultural tourist type are significant and explain 60 percent variance on tourism development ($R^2_{adj} = .60$, $p < .001$). Quality of life explains the highest amount of variance ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < 0.05$). Infrastructure explains 23 percent of variance ($\beta = 0.23$, $p < 0.05$), and cultural tourist type explains 22 percent ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.05$) of variance on tourism development (Table 5). Demographic variable age, education, time of residence, employment in tourist organization and gender are not significant. So we can expect the hypothesis that quality of life, infrastructure and cultural tourist type are positively related to the tourism development. Tourists somehow compete with local residents' when local resources are considered. When there are enough resources and the proper industry and services that assure residents' quality of life, positive attitude toward tourism is developed. Industry and services are important, because they are a base for new products and services in tourism and often attract tourists. The perception of tourist type by local residents indicates the current state of the tourism type in the region. Adventure tourism and daily or occasional tourism are not strongly perceived, thus they are not developed. Due to this it is important to mention, that only a small portion of respondents worked in the tourist organization, and their view of the tourism development in the region does not influence attitudes about tourism development.

Table 5: Regression analysis of the tourism development model

Variable	Beta coefficients	Partial coefficients	t
quality of life	0,48***	0.53***	8.04
Infrastructure	0,23***	0.27***	3.57
cultural tourist type	0,22***	0.28***	3.74
	Regression coefficients		
R ²	.78***		
R ² '	.61***		
R ² adj	.60***		
F	68.45		

*p< .05, **p< .01, *** p<.001

Table 6 presents the tolerance of the independent variables and their variance inflation factors respectively. The *tolerance* of a variable is defined as 1 minus the squared multiple correlation of this variable with all other independent variables in the regression equation. Therefore, the smaller the *tolerance* of a variable, the more redundant is its contribution to the regression (i.e., it is redundant with the contribution of other independent variables). Tolerance of quality of life, infrastructure and cultural tourist type in the regression equation shows that all three substantially contribute to the dependent variable »Tourism development«.

Table 6: Tolerance of independent variables and variance inflation factor

Tourism development	Tolerance	Variance inflation factor (VIF)
Quality of life	0.67	1.50
Industry and services	0.56	1.77
Cultural tourist type	0.67	1.49
Maximum (VIF)		1.77
Mean (VIF) valu		1.59

The diagonal elements of the inverse correlation matrix for variables that are in the equation are also sometimes called *variance inflation factors* (VIF; e.g., see Neter, Wasserman, Kutner, 1985). This terminology

denotes the fact that the variances of the standardized regression coefficients can be computed as the product of the residual variance (for the correlation transformed model) times the respective diagonal elements of the inverse correlation matrix. If the predictor variables are uncorrelated, then the diagonal elements of the inverse correlation matrix are equal to 1.0. For correlated predictors, these elements represent an "inflation factor" for the variance of the regression coefficients, due to the redundancy of the predictors. Essentially variance inflation factors show as to which proportion of the variances of the regression coefficient estimates is inflated as in comparison to a situation where the explanatory variables are not linearly related. In empirical econometrics, it is usually a convention to suspect a very high degree of multicollinearity if the (VIF) is greater than 10. In Table 6, the maximum (VIF) is only 1.77, which is not too far from 1. The mean VIF value is only 1.59, which again is not too large a figure to indicate the incidence of multicollinearity in the model. Thus, the results from Table 6 pass the multicollinearity test.

Discussion and conclusion

In this study, we examine factors that contribute to tourism development in the Posavje region. Though much research has focused on tourism development, the study that includes residents' perception of tourist type is new. In the future all successful tourism destinations will be strongly tourist customer oriented. A tourist type and its cultural, personal, and motivational background form a pattern of tourism types. When we put these patterns in the local or regional environment, we can simulate a model of future tourism development.

In addition, we examine the quality of life and its impact on tourism development to support our hypothesis. Only residents' that perceive quality of their life through services and proper industry and services, have positive attitudes to tourism development. Tourists and local residents' especially in developed tourist destinations compete for the local resources. If there are plenty of resources and are easily accessible, residents' attitudes toward tourism are positive. When the situation is reversed, residents' have difficulties to see any benefits from tourism development. As we already found out, no demographic variables significantly explain tourism development. The main reason is

that very little respondents in the study really have some income from tourism. Future research on much wider population might reveal opposite results.

This study reveals that local residents' were generally satisfied with the tourism development. They see resources for its development in the future. We did not see any statistical relationship between time of residence and tourism development, though all generations were included in the study. It seems that when quality of life is somehow on the accepted level, and there is enough industry that produces jobs, a potential for tourism development is growing. There are no differences regarding male and female residents, the age of residents and their education. When we summarize, we can conclude that future tourism development will be based on sustainability and the quality of the local natural and social environment and its potential resources. Constantly developing tourist destination will further build the potential for production of new products and services shaped by ever changing tourists' needs, expectations and desires.

There were few limitations in the study. The project was pilot by nature. More sophisticated and extensive research is needed to understand the influence of images and attitudes of local residents' toward tourism. The data set was limited in terms of providing heterogeneity in the education variable. More than fifty one percent of respondents have high school education. Although our regression model does not identify education as a significant variable in explaining tourism development in the region, we believe a more heterogeneous sample with respondents with higher education might offer some insights in the role of education in predicting future tourism development.

References

Allen, L., Long, P.T., Perdue, R.R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988): The impact of tourism development on residents' perception of community life. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 27, No 1, pp.16-21.

Andriotis, K. (2005): Community Groups' Perceptions of and Preferences for Tourism Development: Evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism research*, Vol. 29, No 1, pp. 67 -90.

Ambrož, M. (2005): *Sociologija turizma. Izhodišča za proučevanje potovalnih kultur*. Portorož, Turistica.

| 54

Ambrož, M. (2008): Attitudes of local residents towards the development of tourism in Slovenia: the case of the Primorska, Dolenjska, Gorenjska and Ljubljana regions. *Anthropological notebooks*, 2008, Vol. 14, No 1, pp. 63 - 79.

Ambrož, M., Mavrič, M. (2004): Tourist motives and decision for tourist destination. In: Ambrož, M. (ed.), *Strategic partnerships for the development of tourist destinations: international conference proceedings*. Portorož: Turistica, Visoka šola za turizem.

Ambrož, M., Mavrič, M. (2005): Socially represented knowledge about tourism, In: Vodovnik, Zvone (ed.), *Intellectual capital and knowledge management: proceedings of the 5th International Conference of the Faculty of Management Koper*, University of Primorska, 18-20 November 2004, Congress Centre Bernardin, Portorož, Slovenia. Koper: Faculty of management, pp. 365 - 375.

Agarwal, S.(1997): The Resort Cycle and seaside tourism: An assessment of its applicability and validity. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 18, No 2, pp. 63 - 73.

Andereck, K. A.; Vogt, C. A. (2000): The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 39, No 1, pp. 27 – 36.

Ap, John (1990): Residents' Perception Research on the Social Impacts of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 11, No 4, pp. 610 - 616.

Ap, J., Crompton, J. L. (1993): Residents' Strategies for Responding to Tourism Impacts. *Journal of travel research*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 47 – 50.

Belisle, F.J., & Hoy, D.R. (1980): The perceived impact of tourism by residents: a case study in Sta. Marta, Columbia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(1): 83 - 101.

Butler, R. W. (1980): The Concept of a Tourism Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management Resources. *The Canadian Geographer*, Vol. 24, No 1, pp. 5 - 16.

Buhalis, D. (1999): Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 21, No 1, pp. 97-116.

Cohen, E. (1972): Towards a sociology of international tourism. *Social research*, Vol. 39, pp. 164 - 182.

Cohen, E. (1979): A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology*, Vol. 13, pp. 170 - 201.

Crompton, J. (1990): *Tourism research: Redirections for the nineties*. Paper presented at the Outdoor Recreation Trends Symposium III, Indianapolis, IN.

Dong-Wan Ko, Stewart, P. W. (2002): A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism management*, Vol. 23, No 5, pp. 521 - 530.

Doxey, G. (1975): A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: methodology and research inferences in the impact of tourism. In: Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings of the Travel Research Association. San Diego, California, (September), pp. 195.

Fariborz, A., Ma'rof, B. R., Zahid, E. (2009): Barriers of Tourism industry Through Community Capacity Building. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol. 7, Number 3, pp. 126 - 132.

Fesenmeier, J. (2009): The Tourism Development Capacity Index: Measuring change. Laboratory for Community and Economic Development University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, <http://www.extension.uiuc.edu/~lced/resources/factsheets/TourismDevelCI.html>. (date of last access: 29.08. 2009)

Fishbein, M., I. Ajzen, I. (1975): *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Formica, S., Kohtari, T. H. (2008): Strategic Destination Planning: Analyzing the Future of Tourism, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 355 - 367.

Getz, D. (1992): Tourism planning and destination life cycle, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 19 No 4, pp.752 - 70.

Gunn, C. A. (1988): *Tourism planning*, 2nd edn. New York, Taylor and Francis.

Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., Uysal, M. (2002): Resident attitudes: A Structural Modeling Approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 29, No 1, pp. 79 – 10.

Hall, C. M. (2000): *Tourism Planning*. Prentice Hall, London.

Harrill, R. (2004): Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: a Literature Review with Implications for Tourism Planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, Vol. 18, No 3, 251 - 266.

Infor Global Solutions, GmbH (2007): Continuous Customer Dialogues: Strategies for growth and loyalty in multi-channel customer-oriented organizations. Infor CRM, http://go.infor.com/library/Infor/Continuous_Customer_Dialogue.pdf. 29.08.2009. (date of last access 26.08.2009)

Jacobsen, J. K. S. (1996): Segmenting the use of a scenic highway. *The tourist review*, Vol. 51, No 3, pp. 32 - 38.

Jafari, J. (1989): Sociocultural Dimensions of Tourism. An English Language Literature Review; In: J. Bystrzanowski ed.: *Tourism as a Factor of Change*; The Vienna Centre, Vienna, Austria, pp.17 – 60.

Jennings, G., Nickerson, N. P. (eds.) (2006): *Quality tourism experiences*. Elsevier Butterworth_Heinemann.

Jokinen, E., Veijola, S. (2002): The Disoriented tourist: The figuration of the Tourist in Contemporary Cultural Critique, In: Rojek, C., Urry, J. T (eds) *Touring Cultures: Transformations of travel and theory*, pp. 23 – 51. London, Routledge.

Ko, D.W. & Stewart, W. (2002). A structural model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 23, pp. 521-530.

Lankford, S. V., Howard, D. R. (1994): Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism research*, Vol 21, No 1, pp. 121 - 139.

Lengkeek, J. (2001): Rethinking Cohen's Modes of Tourist Experience Leisure Experience and Imagination. *International Sociology*, Vol. 16, No 2, pp. 173 – 184.

Liu, J. C., Sheldon, P.J., Var, T. (1987): Resident perception of environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 14. pp. 17 - 37.

Long, T. P., Perdue, R. R. (1990): Rural Resident Tourism Perceptions and Attitudes by Community Level of Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 28, No 3, pp. 3 - 9.

Long, T. P., Perdue, R. R. (1990): The Economic Impact of Rural Festivals and Special Events: Assessing the Spatial Distribution of Expenditures. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 28, No 4, pp. 10 - 14.

Mason, P. (2003): *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. Boston, Butterworth – Heinemann.

Mason, P.; Cheyne, C. (2000): Residents' attitude to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27, pp. 391 - 411.

Moscovici, S. (1984). The phenomenon of social representations. In R. M. Farr and S. Moscovici (eds.), *Social Representations*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, P. (1983): Perceptions and attitudes of decisionmaking groups in tourism centers. *Journal of Travel Research*. Vol. 21, No 3, pp. 8 - 12.

Murphy, P., Murphy, A. (2004). *Strategic Management for tourism communities: Bridging the Gaps. Aspects of Tourism*. Channel view Publications.

Mckercher, B. (2001): A comparison of main-destination visitors and through travelers at a dual-purpose destination. *Journal of travel research*, Vol. 39, pp. 433 - 441.

Mckercher, B. (2005): Are psychographics predictors of destination life cycles? *Journal of travel and tourism marketing*, Vol. 19, No 1, pp. 49 - 55.

Nicolau, J.L., & Mas., F.J. (2006): The influence of distance and prices on the choice of tourist destinations: The moderating role of motivations. *Tourism management*, Vol. 27, pp. 982 - 996.

Ovsenik, R. (2008): Perspektive in protislovja razvoja turističnega področja: model turističnega managementa na območju slovenskih Alp. *Academica turistica*, Vol. 1, No 1, pp. 27 - 33.

Pearce, P.L., Moscardo, G.M., & Ross, G.F. (1996): *Tourism community relationships*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., Kang, J. S. (1999): Boomtown Tourism and Resident Quality of Life: The Marketing of Gaming to Host Community Residents. *Journal of business research*, Vol. 44, No 1, pp. 165 – 177.

Pitts, R. E., Woodside, A. G. (1986): Personal Values and Travel Decisions. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 25, No 1, pp. 20 - 25.

Plog, S.C. (1974): Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *Cornell hotel and restaurant administration quarterly*, Vol 14, No 4, pp. 55 - 58.

Ryan, C., Cave, J. (2005): Structuring Destination Image: A Qualitative Approach. *Journal of travel research*. Vol. 44, No 2, pp. 143 – 150.

Sheldon, P.J., & Abenoja, T. (2001): Resident attitudes in mature destination: the case of Waikiki. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22, No 5, pp. 435 - 443.

Survey on the attitudes of European towards tourism: Analytical report. The Gallup Organisation, Flash Eurobarometer, European Commission, 2009.

The Tourism Development Capacity Index: Measuring Change. Laboratory for Community and Economic Development, University of Illinois, Urbana, accessed at: <http://www.ag.uiuc.edu/~lced/resources/factsheets/TourismDevelCI.html>. (date of last access 29.08.2009).

Thomas, R., Long, J. (2001): Tourism and economic regeneration: the role of skills development. *International Journal of Tourism research*, Vol. 3, No 3, pp. 229 – 240.

Williams, S. (1998): *Tourism Geographies*. London: Routledge.