In the view of the authors, looking at the future of tourism policy and planning involves looking at tourism as a complex process which integrates economic, political, cultural, intellectual, and environmental benefits cohesively with people, destinations, and countries in order to improve the global quality of life and provide a foundation for peace and prosperity.
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Residents’ Strategies for Responding to Tourism Impacts

JOHN AP AND JOHN L. CROMPTON

This article reports four strategies that comprise a continuum for responding to tourism impacts: embrace, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal. The behaviors seem to result from reactions to tourists’ numbers and behavior rather than from a cultural gap. Two directions for future research are suggested: to relate residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts to the behavioral strategies they adopt, and to develop an instrument for measuring the strategies continuum described.

Tourism has emerged as a forceful agent of change in many of the communities in which it has been encouraged. Mathieson and Wall (1982) have noted, “The consequences of tourism have become increasingly complex and contradictory... (and) are manifested in subtle and often unexpected ways” (p. 4). In recognition of these consequences, a body of research findings has emerged over the past decade on.
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residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism (e.g., Pizam 1978; Rothman 1978; Husbands 1989; Purdue, Long, and Allen 1990).

Useful conceptual contributions which address residents' strategies to these impacts have been made by Doxey (1975), Butler (1975, 1980) and Dogan (1989). Doxey (1975) proposed an Index of Tourist Irritation which suggested that as impacts from tourism increased, a community passed through a predictable sequence of reactions toward it. This sequence regressed from euphoria through apathy and irritation to antagonism. Butler's (1980) tourist-area life cycle model adopted a similar approach, suggesting that as a destination grows and matures, the changes associated with tourism become more noticeable and more adverse. A change in residents' attitudes from approval to opposition is associated with each stage of the cycle. Both of these models are unidirectional and were intended to represent the prevailing mood of a host community in its entirety.

In contrast to these unidirectional and monolithic approaches, alternative frameworks proposed by Butler (1975) and Dogan (1989) recognize that various 'combinations of strategies may exist simultaneously within a region' (Dogan 1989) as residents react to tourism impacts. Butler (1975) cited a framework developed by Bjorkland and Philbrick to analyze the processes which take place when two or more culture groups interact, and proposed that it was applicable to analyzing resident-tourist relationships. The approach recognized that residents' attitudes could be either favorable or unfavorable, and that residents' behavioral response toward tourism could be either active or passive. These dichotomies facilitated development of a four-cell continuum typology comprised of favorable, aggressive promotion and support of tourist activity; favorable, slight acceptance of and support for tourist activity; unfavorable, silent acceptance, but opposition to tourist activity; and unfavorable, aggressive opposition to tourist activity.

Dogan (1989) suggested the primary strategies used by indigenous populations to cope with the effects of international tourism included adoption, boundary maintenance, retreatism, and resistance. These bore some resemblance to the respective four strategies proposed by Butler (1975). Adoption involved enthusiastic acceptance and promotion of tourists' cultures. The boundary maintenance strategy meant a well defined boundary was kept between visitors and local culture. When retreatism was adopted a society closed itself off from tourists and revived old traditions and customs to save its identity. Resistance occurred when enmity and aggression, stemming from resentment, were focused against tourists and their facilities.

This research note reports a continuum of four strategies adopted by residents from four Texas communities in response to tourism impacts. The study differs from Dogan's (1989) work in two ways. First, the clash of cultures in the Texas communities was much less pronounced than in the international context in which Dogan formulated his framework. Visitors tended to be from similar, or at least familiar, cultures, rather than from contrasting cultures. This distinction resulted in somewhat different types of strategies being adopted. Second, the strategies were derived empirically from primary qualitative data. It has been observed that the frameworks cited earlier from the literature "are best regarded as hypotheses rather than theories because they have yet to be tested by employing empirical data" (Mathieson and Wall 1982, p. 140).

Data were collected from two sources. First, 38 personal interviews were conducted with residents, some of whom were economically dependent on tourism, and civic officials in four well known tourist destinations in different parts of Texas. Second, written comments were solicited from 738 respondents who completed a survey which was undertaken in three of those communities. Respondents were invited to share their thoughts on any aspect of tourism not covered in the questionnaire, and some of the comments reported here were extracted from those responses.

THE CONTINUUM OF STRATEGIES

Residents' reactions to tourism could be placed on a continuum comprised of four strategies: embrace, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal.

Embrace describes those respondents who eagerly welcomed tourists. It was a much more positive reaction than simply accommodating or accepting them. Those who were direct beneficiaries of tourism exhibited embrace by their unqualified, effusive praise, usually accompanied by enthusiasm for more visitors: "I love it! Bring more!". "We love all the tourism, send them here!". "Stand back! Let them come!"

A richer form of embrace was exhibited by respondents who sought relationships with visitors that in some cases were long-term. One respondent reported close friendships that he and his wife had developed, which were carefully nurtured and protected:

During a time that my wife was helping me at the Citrus Fiesta Parade, we got to meet some of the Winter Texas people. Through those connections she has about five or six different women who come over and baby sit for us. It started out innocently enough but because they miss their grand-kids, my kids are treated like their grandchildren. My kids think they have about five different sets of grandparents. They actually call them "grandma or grandpa," or they call them "uncle Bob and aunt June" etc. and I think that is really a nice relationship to have with them. Certainly for my family, my kids have learned a lot from these close interactions which has been nice for us. My wife is so protective of those relationships that a lot of our friends will say "Well, they can take care of our kids." My wife’s reaction to that is "They’re not your kids’ grandparents. They’re our kids’ grandparents."

For other residents, interactions with visitors were more ephemeral, but the stimulation they received from them explained their embrace.

Meeting a constant stream of new people is just fascinating to me. I could go and live in any other small town and not experience that. But here I feel that every once in a while just talking with someone on vacation makes me feel like I'm on vacation, because they're in a very different frame of mind and it takes me away from my daily routine and worries.

The energy that tourists brought to the community was cited as a reason for their embrace of tourists: "All the people it brings in, and the crowds give the place vitality and vibrance . . . . I enjoy helping people by telling them what sights they could go to and what the unknown tourist spots are."

Tolerance meant residents exhibited a degree of ambivalence towards tourism. That is, there were parts they liked and elements they disliked. They endured it in the sense that they had a capacity to bear some of its unpleasant aspects.
without resentment, and often this was because they recognized its contribution to the community’s economic vitality. Typical comments from this group were “I personally like having tourists around. Sure, sometimes they’re a nuisance when it comes to driving, but it’s no big deal,” and “In my opinion, tourism is a necessary evil for the local economy. It is an important source of many people’s income and livelihood. Therefore, I will tolerate the hassles that come along with it.”

There was some recognition that an influx of visitors should be tolerated since it is an inherent characteristic of the place when a decision is made to live in a resort area:

“A lot of local residents will make the comment, “There are too many tourists staying here on the island,” “We can’t go to our favorite fishing hole,” or “We can’t fish on the beach like we always do because there is an infiltration of people.” But this is a part of life in choosing to live in a resort area. This is what you’re going to have to put up with.

It was suggested by one respondent that learning to tolerate inconveniences created by visitors may contribute to a community being more tolerant in other respects such as social differences:

Tourism definitely gives Galveston a flavor that’s different from an inland city or a city that does not have tourism. By that, I mean we’re definitely more cosmopolitan. We have an influx of people from all over the world. I think there’s a greater tolerance of social differences because there is a lot of diversity that is tolerated and we’re more exposed to it. Residents develop a mode of tolerating.

A third strategy was that residents adjusted to tourism. This usually meant they rescheduled activities to escape crowds:

Is tourism negative to the point that you will leave Mission? No, but you accustom yourself to it. A winter Texan friend of mine said, “I go to Mission when I want to get away from all the tourists.”

Alternatively, residents sometimes used local knowledge to avoid the inconveniences that the presence of visitors may create, as an adjustment strategy:

If I want to go to the beach and enjoy the beach when there are a lot of tourists, I’ll go to the more private areas which tourists don’t know about. I know the roads that the locals use when it’s busy on Broadway and the Seawall Boulevard. I know all the alternate routes through Galveston, so tourists doesn’t really affect me that much compared to living somewhere else.

The most extreme negative strategy expressed by respondents was withdrawal, which usually meant that residents removed themselves temporarily from the community:

During Oktoberfest weekend I asked several friends if they were going to Oktoberfest and they said, “Are you kidding? We are leaving! Just because we had a horde of people descending on our little community, they were ready to panic. But I was excited about it because last year was the first time I attended Oktoberfest and frankly I had a lot of fun. I would say the locals would tend to leave that weekend because of the concept of being invaded and that probably occurs at certain intervals during the year.

One respondent was so incensed by the inconveniences created by Winter Texan visitors that he had made a decision to leave permanently: “I plan to move out as soon as I can. I refuse to be here next year to have to battle them again.” Another expressed similar sentiments but lacked the resources or energy to execute a permanent move:

I think that tourism is just one big mess. We are taxpayers, and we as owners cannot enjoy our town, not even our streets. Our homes are so choked up with tourism. We loved Galveston when we first moved here in 1948, but we don’t like Galveston anymore. If you were a young person, you’d move to the country as all my children did. Our neighbors feel the same as I do. Galveston is not really our home anymore. It belongs to the tourist.

A public official noted that some Mexican-Americans in his community who had negative experiences with visitors could not physically withdraw, and they handled the situation by psychologically withdrawing:

Mexican-American residents often will not argue with Winter Texans. They keep quiet and carry their hurt feelings inside. This changes their attitudes to Winter Texans and their manifested behavior. They usually withdraw and don’t get involved in any activity with the other party. In the Mexican-American culture, your personal relationship with someone is important.

**DISCUSSION**

The embrace-left-withdrawal strategy continuum is not prescriptive. It recognizes that at any time there may be a diversity of reactions to tourism in a community, and that these reactions will be manifested by different behavioral strategies. Hence, all four strategies are likely to be adopted concurrently, and over time residents are likely to shift from one strategy to another in either direction on the continuum.

The continuum identified here was reasonably consistent with the conceptual framework proposed by Butler (1975). Embrace-left mirrored Butler’s favorable, aggressive promotion strategy, and was most characteristic of those who perceived they derived direct economic benefits from tourism. Tolerance was consistent with Butler’s favorable, slight acceptance description. It appeared to embody residents’ internalizing inconveniences or costs and being sufficiently cognizant of its benefits to accept it “warts and all,” without changing manifest behavior to adjust to it.

Those adopting an adjustment strategy appeared to be disinterested in tourism. That is, they accepted it as a reality associated with living in their community and accommodated it, without expressing any feelings towards it. These residents also did not indicate the slight feeling of acceptance which characterized the tolerance strategy. This type of “neutral” or “neither favorable nor unfavorable” reaction could not be captured by Butler’s (1985) four-cell typology. This strategy was observed by Rothman (1978), who commented, “Residents of the community also find their personal lives change. Not only do they come in contact with vacationers on the streets and in the stores, they change their patterns of behavior. They tend to avoid areas frequented by seasonal visitors.”

Withdrawal was a stronger response than Butler’s first unfavorable category — silent acceptance, but opposition to tourism activity. Tourism was not accepted by these individuals. They resented it, but instead of engaging in resistance, which was Butler’s most unfavorable behavioral response, they withdraw.
The study offered no examples of resistance through aggressive opposition. There appear to be two possible reasons for this. First, Mathieson and Wall (1982) note that aggressive opposition is likely to be fostered by a “small but highly vocal group, uninvolved in tourism.” Hence, it is possible that the sample was too small to include any of these people. Alternatively, since none of the public officials interviewed commented that such opposition existed, the pressures on these four communities from tourism may not have been sufficiently acute to elicit this kind of response.

The strategies reported here are more a function of residents’ reactions to tourism numbers and the behavior of individual tourists than of the existence of a cultural gap which underpinned Doğan’s (1989) conceptualization. This led to the identification of a distinctively different set of strategies to those which Doğan proposed. Residents and visitors to three of the four communities from which data were collected in this study had a similar cultural background. Hispanics were the dominant resident cultural group in the fourth community, and they were very familiar with, and used to functioning within, the cultural mores of their Anglo Winter Texan visitors.

The findings reported here suggest two directions for future research. First, there is a need to relate residents’ perceptions of impacts to the behavioral strategies they adopt in reaction to those impacts. A body of knowledge related to impacts is emerging, but the range of strategies that occurs in response to different levels of these impacts has not been empirically addressed. It is probable that there are impact thresholds that cause a quantum number of individuals to shift their behavioral reaction from, for example, tolerance to adjustment. This was implicit in the comments of the respondent who said, “I think tourism is like seasoning on food. Some can make an improvement, a little more can make it perfect. A lot ruins it and makes a good thing disgusting.” Second, to explore the relationship between impacts and behavioral strategies, probably an instrument that measures dimensions of the strategies continuum will be needed. This suggests that development of a residents’ strategies scale should be undertaken.
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Tour Operator Brochure Design Research Revisited

PETER HODGSON

This research note points out that a great deal of money is spent on tourism brochures with little return in the way of bookings. In the United Kingdom, for example, brochures result in a 90% "wastage" rate. The suggestion is made that market research is needed on the effectiveness of brochures so that the function of brochures in the vacation selection process is better understood.

Much of the travel and tourism industry relies on brochures to market its products to the public. Brochures produced by commercial tour operators and by national, provincial, and local tourism authorities can often run to hundreds of pages and can involve print runs of millions, thus committing significant amounts of money. In the United Kingdom, for example, for the four brochures produced by the commercial operators alone, an estimated £200 million is spent on printing approximately 200 million brochures to yield an estimated 15 million bookings per annum. This results in a "wastage" rate of well over 90%. The consumer pays nothing for these expensive-to-produce glossy brochures and thus does not "value" them, and some U.K. operators are considering charging clients and/or travel agents for brochures, especially for specialist niche products where the conversion ratio can fall to one booking per 30 brochures. Any contribution which research can make in cutting these costs must therefore be valuable.

In a recent Journal of Travel Research article, Gilbert and Houghton (1991) put forth a model of consumer brochure use for consideration. This model included the way brochures are displayed in travel agencies, the actions of agency staff in dealing with customer requirements, and brochure content/presentation style as perceived by the consumer. Another variable which needs to be included is the consumer's purpose in obtaining the brochure and the consumer's requirements from that brochure.

Gilbert and Houghton commented that "improving the effectiveness of the design and use of brochures will increase company profits. Any guidelines which might improve the effectiveness of brochure design are therefore important to the tourism industry" (p. 20). While this is true, one needs to go beyond the purely physical aspects of the brochure and understand both why brochures are collected and the function which they fulfill in the vacation selection process. While broad guidelines for brochure design are possible (for exami-