

## Residents' Support for Tourism Development - Role of Demographic Factors: A Case of Udaipur City

---

NIKITA MAHESHWARI\* and PROF. ASHOK SINGH\*\*

\*Nikita Maheshwari, Research Scholar, Department of Tourism & Hotel Management, M.L.S. University, Udaipur

\*\*Prof. Ashok Singh, Director, Department of Tourism & Hotel Management, MLS University, Udaipur

---

### ABSTRACT

This study examined the influence of demographic factors on the attitude of local residents towards tourism development in Udaipur city. The study also tries to find out the correlation between residents' personal characteristics and their attitude to support for tourism development activities. It also explores the role of residents' demographic factors i.e. personal characteristics in shaping their positive attitude towards tourism development. This study used Social exchange theory as foundation of this study. As the statistical tool, ANOVA test and correlation test has been applied to identify the influence and relationship between predictors and final consequence. The findings of this study gave four predictors such as age, gender, income, and education. These four factors have predicted the residents' attitude towards support for tourism developmental activities. Ultimately, the results are mixed and found conformity with the social exchange theory.

**KEYWORDS:** *Residents', Attitude, Support for Tourism Development, Demographic Factor, Udaipur City.*

### Introduction

Indian tourism industry is capable of generating employment to locals' and has immense power to generate foreign exchange for country. This industry promotes the overall economic and social development of the country. (Khan, 2012; Singh a, 2001). In India, from last few years tourism has become recognized as the largest service industry that includes variety of tourism activities such as heritage, cultural, medical, business, and sports tourism. "The main objective of this sector is to develop and promote tourism, maintain competitiveness of India as tourist destination and improve and expand existing tourism products to ensure employment generation and economic growth. However, tourism business can be considered as fuel for the economic growth of both the locals and country (Davis, Allen, & Cosenza, 1988; Getz, 1986; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1990). Tourism industry plays a key role in sustainable development and dilution of poverty in country. Many government and non-government agencies are trying hard to build positive attitude towards tourism development. It has been proved that careful research planning of tourism development is required by keeping local people in mind.

Plenty of researches have been conducted on residents' perception of tourism impacts and their support for tourism development. This type of study has been

conducted in developed countries by many researchers such as in U.S.A., since 1980's till now resident perception and attitude is being researched. Some studies conducted in the following destinations: Alaska studied by Huh and Vogt (2008), Hawaii Islands by Liu and Var (1986), Sheldon and Abenoja (2001), Cyprus by Akis et al. (1996), Crete by Andriotis and Vaughan (2003), Andriotis (2005), Colombia by Belisle and Hoy (1980), U.K.by Brougham and Butler (1981), Murphy (1981), Sheldon and Var (1984), Brunt and Courtney (1999), Snaith and Haley (1999), Haley et al. (2005), Belize by Diedrich and García (2009), Australia by Tomljenovic and Faulkner (2000), Weaver and Lawton (2001), Lawton (2005), Dyer et al. (2007), Gursoy, Chi, and Dyer (2009), Greece by Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), Puerto Rico by Hernández et al. (1996), Fiji Islands by King et al. (1993), Korea by Ko and Stewart (2002), Turkey by Var et al. (1985), Korca (1996), Kuvan and Akan (2005), Africa by Sirakaya et al. (2002), Teye et al. (2002), Lepp (2007), New Zealand by Mason and Cheyne (2000), Williams and Lawson (2001), Saint Lucia Island by Nicholas, Thapa, and Ko (2009), Mauritius Island by Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012), Canada by Ritchie (1988), Mexico by Mendoza and Monterrubio (2012), Cape Verde by Castillo, Osuna, and López (2012), Spain by Aguiló et al. (2004), SOPDE (2004), Paniza (2005), Marrero(2006), Vargas, Plaza, and Porras (2009), Vargas et al. (2011). The earlier research work has been focused majorly on the residents' perception of tourism impacts in developed countries and very less studies focused on residents' attitude towards tourism development.

In other words, in comparison of the above studies, less work done in the area of residents' attitude towards tourism and tourism development in developing countries like India. As Indian socio-economic and societal context are different from other countries hence it is difficult to apply the available model in Indian context. This study tries to find out suitable demographic factors predicting the attitude of local people in respect with the Indian context. Here in this study, Udaipur has been chosen as geographical region for conducting the research. The reason is- Udaipur is a popular and mature tourist destination, where variety of tourists usually comes from international borders. Thus, they affect perception and attitude of residents in various manners, which influence the local residents' quality of life. Hence, to understand the various dimensions and aspects of tourism developmental activities, the study has been conducted in not only on extremely developed tourism zone but also far from tourist destination area. On the similar note, the study tries to give a better way to understand the attitude of the local residents both in well-developed tourism zone and far from tourism zone. Moreover, all the determinants examined in this study talked about alteration in the local residents' attitude towards support or restrict for tourism development.

### **Objective of the study**

This study is an attempt to understand urban local residents' attitude towards tourism development. This study tries to observe the influence of demographic factors as predictors on residents' support for tourism development in Udaipur, Rajasthan, India. Specific objectives of this study is :-

1. To investigate the association between demographic factors (age, gender, income, and education) and local residents' attitude towards support for tourism development.

2. To examine the relationship between demographic factors affecting and local residents' attitude for supporting tourism development.

#### **Research on the residents' attitude towards tourism development**

From past more than 50 years, many tourism researchers were trying to research on the topic of impacts of tourism. In 1960's some tourism scholar had discussed about the positive aspects only (Telfer & Sharpley, 2015) and in 1970's few had talked about the negative aspects (Burns, Palmer, & Lester, 2010) but from 1980's many scholars had mentioned about the balance between positive and negative impacts of tourism (Jafri, 1986, cited in Andereck and vogt, 2000). However, seventies was that time when local residents' perception and attitude had become key research point by researchers (Vargas, Plaza & Portas, 2007).

Thus, local residents' of any tourist destination has become key component for developing tourism and tourism business, many researcher have discussed about various theoretical and empirical research to examine residents' perception of tourism impacts (Akis, Peristianis, & Warner, 1996; Ap, 1992; Getz, 1994; Hernandez, Cohen, & Garcia, 1996; Jurowski, et al., 1997; Lankford, 1994; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; Long, Perdue, & Allen, 1990).

Previously, studies of local residents' attitude towards tourism development had majorly focused on the term 'impacts of tourism' with the help of variety of questionnaires. Questionnaire were mostly related to the documented tourism impacts (Liu & Var, 1986). Similarly, some studies have focused on the social and physical aspects of tourism (Ap 1990; Brougham and Butler 1981; Jurowski, Uysal, and Williams 1997; King, Pizam, and Milman 1993; Liu, Sheldon, and Var 1987; Milman and Pizam 1988; Um and Crompton 1987). While, some other tourism scholars have talked about the term 'tourism attitude' and 'tourism perception'. Where they have talked about their perception and attitude about tourism (Allen et al. 1993; Allen et al. 1988; Gilbert and Clark 1997; Johnson, Snepenger, and Akis 1994; Lankford 1994; Lankford and Howard 1994; Lindberg and Johnson 1997; Perdue, Long, and Allen 1987; Long, Perdue, and Allen 1990; McCool and Martin 1994; Siegel and Jakus 1995; Snaith and Haley 1995).

The perception of the host community on individual level is important as this could affect the behaviour of local residents towards tourism activities and tourists. Hence, this argument has been taken into consideration in many research studies related with residents' perceived tourism impacts and their attitude to support for tourism development. Yet there is semantic difference between perceived impact and attitude, still conducted studies generally have used same measures for both terms. Such as, many studies used a series of measurement scale to measure perceived impact and attitude. Many times, these measurement items were pooled into numerous item scales with the use of variety of analytical tools. Such as descriptive univariate analysis (Avcikurt and Soybali 2001; Mason and Cheyne 2000; Sheldon and Abenoja 2001), factor analysis (Andereck and Vogt 2000; Lankford 1994; Lankford and Howard 1994; Liu, Sheldon, and Var 1987; Long, Perdue, and Allen 1990; McCool and Martin 1994; Perdue, Long, and Allen 1990; Snaith and Haley 1995; Yoon, Chen, and Gursoy 1999), cluster analysis (Iroegbu and Chen 2001), or a priori conceptualization (Gursoy, Jurowski, and Uysal 2002; Jurowski, Uysal, and Williams 1997). Although these tools found almost similar factors, there were slight differences.

Variety of models has been propounded for measuring and predicting the attitude of local residents' towards tourism activities and tourism development. These model have used variety of techniques like factor analysis, LISREL, SEM, and cluster analysis (Carmichael 2000; Gursoy, Jurowski, and Uysal 2002; Lee 2013; Lindberg, Andersson, and Dellaert 2001; Fredline and Faulkner 2000; Styliadis et al. 2014). Gursoy, Jurowski, and Uysal (2002) developed a model by using LISREL and found out "host community support is affected by the level of concern, eco-centric values, utilization of resource base, [and] perceived costs and benefits of the tourism development" (p. 79). Styliadis et al. (2014) drawn triple bottom line approach for tourism impacts and adopted a non-force approach to identify residents perceived tourism impacts. They also found that there is an effect of place image on residents support for tourism development. This study gave a model and through factor analysis, they found dimensions of place image such as "Community Service", "Physical Appearance", "social environment" and "entertainment".

Numerous scholars (Ap 1992; Bystrzanowski 1989; Pearce 1989) have used variety of theories to investigate the local residents' attitude towards tourism such as play theory, compensation theory, conflict theory, and dependency theory. But, it is also not proved that any one of them could give clear explanation for residents attitude towards tourism development. The tourism literature has found two theories to be dominating amongst rest of the all named social exchange theory and social representations theory. However, in this research study, researchers have used Social Exchange Theory as a founding theory.

### **Social Exchange Theory**

Undoubtedly, SET has been predominantly used in measuring the residents' perception and attitude towards tourism activities. As explained by Blau, (1964, P 91) Social exchange "refers to voluntary actions of individuals that are motivated by the returns they are expected to bring and typically do in fact bring from others". Similarly, according to Ap (1992), social exchange theory is "a general sociological theory concerned with understanding the exchange of resources between individuals and groups in an interaction situation" (p. 668). This exchange of resources has been occurred within the community between host and guest. This exchange could consider an important part of host-guest interaction. This host – guest interaction is directly related to the cost and benefits associated with this interaction. In other words, if residents' gets benefits from this interaction, they promotes and develops the tourism activities in their community. While, cost id higher than benefits then they reacted negatively towards tourism activities. Hence, this theory gives logic to assess the cost-benefit analysis due to the exchange. If perceived benefits are generated from this exchange, then it is being evaluated as positive exchange. Whereas, If perceived costs are generated from this exchange, then it is being evaluated as negative exchange.

Sharpley (2014: 45) explained "the basis of social exchange theory is that both parties engage voluntarily and proactively in the process. However, for many residents in tourism destinations, any form of interaction with tourists, as considered earlier in this paper, may be unintentional and involuntary whilst, in many cases, no tangible interaction (or exchange) may occur. Moreover, almost without some exception studies of residents' perceptions focus on 'variables used to

predict residents' attitudes that exist within the resident or as part of a resident's identity and not the relationship that exists between resident and tourist (Woosnam, 2012: 316)"

There are mixed results for considering this theory as a base theory. Some researchers have hold support for this theory and some others hold confusion with the implementation of this theoretical concept (Ap 1992; Jurowski, Uysal, and Williams, 1997; Gursoy, Jurowski, and Uysal 2002; Lindberg and Johnson 1997)

### **Researches on effect of demographic variables and residents' attitude towards tourism development**

Previously, studies on residents attitude had relay on the ontological point of view that people who lives in homogeneous community generally has homogenous attitude towards tourism. However, researchers have examined and found that there is variation in the attitude of community member towards tourism development (Iroegbu and Chen 2001; Mason and Cheyne 2000; Snaith and Haley 1999). In reality, it was found that residents of same community has common attitude with the residents of neighbour community. Therefore, many researchers have found these types of variation due to their personal characteristics such as gender, age, education level, income level.

As per the research conducted by Iroegbu & Chen (2001), they found that male residents who had college education and resided in urban area with the earning of more than \$25000 per annum had supportive attitude towards tourism development. Similarly, varieties of scholars have variety of opinions with regard to the influence of demographic factors on their attitude towards tourism development.

#### **Gender**

Mason & Cheyne (2000) found that different gender could be a reason to bring changes in the perception and attitude of local residents' towards effects of tourism and tourism development. Therefore, there is a need to research it further. On the similar note, Kuvan & Akan (2005) examined that both male and female have presented their support, but reason behind this attitude might be different, hence their perception towards tourism impacts were different. They conducted this study in the rural area of New Zealand & found that women residents were having more negative attitude than men because they were more concern about the negative impacts of tourism as traffic congestion, increase in crime rate and noise pollution, while, women were quite enough aware with the positive aspects of tourism also. Although, there were some differences between perception of male and female, still there were also many similarities between both the sexes.

The study of Nunkoo & Gursoy (2012) argued that female residents were having more concern for the negative impacts of tourism; therefore, they had less amount of support for tourism development. Hence, their study revealed that gender could be considered as a good predictor of both positive and negative perception towards impacts of tourism and tourism development.

#### **Age**

According to King et al. (1993), and Tomljenovic and Faulkner, (2000), old age residents had more favourable attitude towards tourism activities than younger one. Whereas, tourism scholars like Haralambopoulos & Pizam, (1996); Cavus &

Tanrisevdi, (2002, cited in Harrill, 2004) have conversed of the above that older residents' perceived more negative.

Tomljenovic and Faulkner (2000), conducted a study on Australia's Gold Coast & observed that old age residents had usually more supportive attitude towards tourism than younger one. McGhee and Andereck, (2004) concluded the same, they carried out the study on a dozen of communities in Arizona and identified that older residents were more prima facie towards positive aspects of tourism instead of negative impacts. On the counterpart, Cavus & Tanrisevdi, 2002, cited in Harrill, 2004, did a study in Kusadasi, Turkey and found out that older residents' were more negatively perceived towards tourism than younger one. On the similar note, Huh & Vogt (2008) discovered age as a variable, which influence the perception of local residents over time. They noticed that youngsters had more positive attitude towards economic impact of tourism because tourism provides them job opportunity. As young residents grow, they will have less favourable attitude towards tourism impacts and tourism development.

Thus, according to Ritchie (1988), young age group residents were more inclined towards tourism than old group. Whereas, Sheldon & Abenoja (2001) carried out study in Hawaii and experienced inconsistent results with the above, they noticed that old residents had more satisfaction with the public facilities while youngsters were more interested in future improvement in quality of services. However, age cannot be considered as significant variable since results are mixed and conflicting.

#### **Level of Education**

According to Haralambopoulos & Pizam, (1996); Hernández et al., (1996); and Teye et al., (2002), The residents who had high level of education, usually had strong support for tourism as they had more positive perception towards effects of tourism. While just opposite of the above, Andriotis and Vaughan, (2003) found that low-level education brought more positive attitude towards tourism impacts than highly educated local people. While, in the study of Sheldon & Abenoja, (2001), it was found that highly educated residents were more inclined to the damage to the beach area than lower one. Hernández et al. (1996) talked about an interesting reason that why resident with lower level of education had less favourable attitude? The findings of their study showed that those who had not completed their secondary education had less favourable attitude. They also discussed about the reasons that resident with low level of education might have notion about less chance of getting jobs and not aware about the direct benefits of tourism than high educated one and they might have conservative thinking about their life style.

#### **Level of income**

Many researchers (Deccio and Baloglu 2002; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Jurowski, Uysal, and Williams 1997; Lankford and Howard 1994; Liu, Sheldon, and Var 1987; Sirakaya, Teye, and Sönmez 2002) have found that economic dependency on tourism industry shaped their positive attitude tourism impacts and tourism development.

Haralambopoulos & Pizam (1996) found a relationship between the larger income group residents and their attitude towards tourism impacts. They categorized residents in two category: resident who were directly dependent on tourism and residents who were not. High-income residents had positive perception

towards tourism impacts, as well as those residents were ready to support tourism development in their locality. Rather, low-income residents' had less favourable attitude towards tourism development. On the other hand, McMinn & Cater (1998) noticed that residents from low-income group had more supportive nature than richer one. They argued a reason behind this that poor residents had their main concern for earning money from tourism activities and it could be fulfilled with the tourism related jobs. However, those local residents who fulfilled their basic needs could think beyond income aspect of tourism and could be conscious for the other aspects like social/ cultural and environmental issues.

### **Methods**

This study has been conducted in the summer and winter season of year 2016. In this study, systematic random sampling technique has been used for collecting the primary data. The respondents under this study were the representative of various age, gender, income group, and education level. A self-administered questionnaire has been distributed to door to door by using systematic random sampling. In which every 10<sup>th</sup> house has been taken into consideration. The questionnaire was made in both Hindi and English language. 400 questionnaire were distributed but response rate was 96% i.e. 386 questionnaire were returned. Survey was done by the researcher with the help of students of MTTM, MLS University. Every member of survey team has requested to the targeted residents and questions were asked from an adult person in the family. In some cases, questions were asked in the form of interview.

A non-comparative Likert's Scale technique was used to measure the attitude towards tourism development. In which, respondents were asked to rate the item capturing their attitude using a 5-point likert type scale where 5 indicated Strongly Agree while 1 represented Strongly Disagree. The demographic variables include age, income, gender, and education.

Questionnaire item for support for tourism development has been taken from the previous work done by Wang & Pfister (2008) and Woosnam (2011). The 6 items for support for tourism development were adopted from the empirical studies of Wang & Pfister (2008) and Woosnam (2011) while using emotional solidarity scale to explain the level of support for tourism development with respect to local community. These 6 items adopted for the study are: I believe tourism should be actively encouraged in my community, I support tourism & would like to see it become an important part of my locality, Long term planning by city officials can control the negative impact of tourism, The city government is correct in supporting the promotion of tourism, This community should control and restrict unplanned tourism development in this area, It is important to develop plans to manage the growth of tourism.

### **Results & Discussion**

To analysis the effect of residents' demographic variable (age, gender, income, and education) on their attitude towards support for tourism development, the statistical tools like ANOVA and correlation is being used.

#### **Age**

With respect to age, following hypothesis has been formulated.

**H1: *There is no significant difference in attitude towards support for tourism across age groups***

**Table 1.1: ANOVA analysis for age and support for Tourism**

Descriptive								
Support tourism								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
20-30 yr	211	4.5782	.54972	.03784	4.5036	4.6528	3.00	5.00
31-40 yr	85	4.2706	.80753	.08759	4.0964	4.4448	2.00	5.00
41-50 yr	65	3.4154	.95020	.11786	3.1799	3.6508	2.00	5.00
50 yr and above	23	2.9130	.28810	.06007	2.7885	3.0376	2.00	3.00
Total	384	4.2135	.86488	.04414	4.1268	4.3003	2.00	5.00

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	108.643	3	36.214	77.378	.000
Within Groups	177.847	380	.468		
Total	286.490	383			

The above table and result of ANOVA analysis revealed that Residents belongs to younger age group of 20-30 have shown more positive attitude and locals belong to 50 and above age group have reflected the lowest attitude score towards support for tourism as compared to other age brackets. Mean is also the evidence for the results. The relation is further verified with correlation.

**Table 1.2: Correlation Result - Age and Support for Tourism**

	Support tourism	Age
Support tourism	1	-.603**
Age	-.603**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The above table confirms the previous findings that there is a significant negative correlation between support for tourism and age of residents. Hence, we can reject the null hypothesis and state that there is a significant difference in perception towards support for tourism across age groups. The result has the contradiction with the studies conducted by (Látková & Vogt, 2012; Tosun, 2002)

### Gender

With respect of gender, following hypothesis has been formulated.

**H2: There is no significant difference in attitude towards support for tourism across gender**

**Table 1.3: ANOVA analysis for gender and support for Tourism**

Descriptive								
Support tourism								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Male	217	3.9124	.96546	.06554	3.7833	4.0416	2.00	5.00
Female	167	4.6048	.49037	.03795	4.5299	4.6797	4.00	5.00
Total	384	4.2135	.86488	.04414	4.1268	4.3003	2.00	5.00

ANOVA					
Support tourism					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	45.237	1	45.237	71.628	.000
Within Groups	241.253	382	.632		
Total	286.490	383			

The above table and result of ANOVA analysis conclude that female residents has shown more positive attitude towards support for tourism as compared to male residents. This relation is further tested using correlation.

**Table 1.4: Correlation Result -Gender and Support for Tourism**

	Support tourism	Gender
Support tourism	1	.397**
Gender	.397**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The result and the findings confirm that there is a significant positive correlation between support for tourism and gender of resident. Hence, we can reject the null hypothesis and state that there is a significant difference in perception towards support for tourism across gender. these findings had contradiction with the studies conducted by McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Wang & Pfister, 2008.

#### Income

With respect to income, following hypothesis has been formulated.

**H3: There is no significant difference in attitude towards support for tourism across income groups**

**Table 1.5: ANOVA Analysis for Income and Support for Tourism**

Descriptive								
Support tourism								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
2-5 LPA	172	4.6047	.50214	.03829	4.5291	4.6802	3.00	5.00
6-10 LPA	169	3.9053	.88130	.06779	3.7715	4.0392	2.00	5.00
>10 LPA	43	3.8605	1.24559	.18995	3.4771	4.2438	2.00	5.00
Total	384	4.2135	.86488	.04414	4.1268	4.3003	2.00	5.00

ANOVA					
Support tourism					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	47.725	2	23.863	38.078	.000
Within Groups	238.764	381	.627		
Total	286.490	383			

The above table and result of ANOVA analysis showed that Resident belongs to lower income group of 2-5 LPA has shown more positive and residents belong to >10 LPA reflected a lowest attitude score towards support for tourism. The low-income residents have positive attitude for tourism development in Udaipur, for the sake of increase of their dependent sources of income from tourism business as compared to rich class in the city. This relation is further tested using correlation.

**Table 1.6: Correlation Result -Income and Support for Tourism**

	Support tourism	Income
Support tourism	1	-.372**
Income	-.372**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The result for above table confirms the findings that there is a significant negative correlation between support for tourism and income of resident. Hence, we can reject the null hypothesis and state that there is a significant difference in perception towards support for tourism across income groups.

### Education

With respect to education, following hypothesis has been formulated.

**H4: There is no significant difference in attitude towards support for tourism across levels of education**

**Table 1.7: ANOVA Analysis for Education and Support for Tourism**

Descriptive								
Support tourism								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
No formal education	43	3.5814	.90587	.13814	3.3026	3.8602	2.00	5.00
School	78	3.7051	1.02068	.11557	3.4750	3.9353	2.00	5.00
Graduate	103	4.3010	.79007	.07785	4.1466	4.4554	2.00	5.00
Post Graduate	160	4.5750	.55570	.04393	4.4882	4.6618	3.00	5.00
Total	384	4.2135	.86488	.04414	4.1268	4.3003	2.00	5.00

ANOVA					
Support tourism					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	59.037	3	19.679	32.877	.000
Within Groups	227.453	380	.599		
Total	286.490	383			

From the above table and result of ANOVA analysis, it can be conclude that resident having higher educational degree like post graduate have higher positive perception towards support for tourism as compared to lower educational background. This relation is further tested using correlation.

**Table 1.8: Correlation Result -education and support for Tourism**

	Support tourism	Education
Support tourism	1	.443**
Education	.443**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The result for above table confirms the findings that there is a significant positive correlation between support for tourism and education of resident. Hence, we can reject the null hypothesis and state that there is a significant difference in perception towards support for tourism across education groups. Results were supported with the studies conducted by Látková and Vogt (2012).

### Conclusion

The attempt of this study was to find out the influence of residents' personal characteristics (such as age, gender, income, and education) on their attitude towards tourism development. As theoretical base, the study adopted Social Exchange Theory as a foundation and used the concept of this theory to building the arguments. The results of this study have supported this theory in a mixed way. The results of the study alluded that the personal characteristics of the residents can definitely shape their attitude towards tourism development. The results are mixed with the results available in the previous literature.

The pragmatic implication of this study leads to support for the social exchange theory. The planning and developing authorities should initiate informing campaign with the aim of increasing the resident education and literacy level about the tourism impacts. To inform about the existing types of tourism development in the city as well as the priority of tourism industry. On the same note, Regulatory authorities and tourism development departments should target young residents specially belongs to age bracket of 20-30 and also put efforts to attract elders with more awareness campaigns and launch programs that increase community involvement. This study is also having its weakness. The study area is limited to Udaipur only; one can go beyond this geographic location. This study was limited to the demographic factor and ignored other various factors that could be important in shaping local residents' attitude. Any future research can include the concept of perceived tourism impacts into this study.

### **References**

- Aguiló, E., Barros, V., García, M. A., & Rosselló, J. (2004). Las actitudes de los residentes en Baleares frente al turismo. *Universitat de les Illes Balears, Palma de Mallorca*
- 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
- Allen, L. R., Hafer, H. R., Long, P. T., & Perdue, R. R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of travel research*, 31(4), 27-33
- Akis, S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus. *Tourism management*, 17(7), 481-494
- Andreck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel research*, 39(1), 27-36
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of travel research*, 42(2), 172-185
- Andriotis, K. (2005). Community groups' perceptions of and preferences for tourism development: Evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 29(1), 67-90
- Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 17(4), 610-616
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of tourism Research*, 19(4), 665-690
- Avcikurt, C., & Soybali, H. (2001). Residents' attitudes towards tourism in Ayvalik, Turkey. *Tourism analysis*, 6(3-1), 259-265
- Belisle, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents a case study in Santa Marta, Colombia. *Annals of tourism research*, 7(1), 83-101
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Social exchange theory. Retrieved September, 3, 2007
- 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
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515

- Burns, P. M., Palmer, C., & Lester, J. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Tourism and visual culture: Theories and concepts* (Vol. 1). CABI
- Bystrzanowski, J. (Ed.). (1989). *Tourism as a Factor of Change: Sociocultural Study*. European Coordination Centre for Research and Documentation in Social Sciences
- Canalejo, A. M., Soto, M. O., & Guzmán, T. L. (2012). Percepción Y Actitudes Del Residente Acerca Del Impacto Del Turismo En La Isla De Santiago (Cabo Verde). *Turydes*, 5(12)
- Carmichael, B. A. (2000). A matrix model for resident attitudes and behaviours in a rapidly changing tourist area. *Tourism management*, 21(6), 601-611
- 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
- Diedrich, A., & García-Buades, E. (2009). Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management*, 30(4), 512-521
- Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism management*, 28(2), 409-422
- Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Host community reactions: A cluster analysis. *Annals of tourism research*, 27(3), 763-784
- Getz, D. (1986). Models in tourism planning: Towards integration of theory and practice. *Tourism management*, 7(1), 21-32
- Gilbert, D., & Clark, M. (1997). An exploratory examination of urban tourism impact, with reference to residents attitudes, in the cities of Canterbury and Guildford. *Cities*, 14(6), 343-352
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2009). An Examination of Locals 'Attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(4), 723-726
- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modelling approach. *Annals of tourism research*, 29(1), 79-105
- Haley, A. J., Snaith, T., & Miller, G. (2005). The social impacts of tourism a case study of Bath, UK. *Annals of tourism research*, 32(3), 647-668
- Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *CPL bibliography*, 18(3), 251-266
- Hernandez, S. A., Cohen, J., & Garcia, H. L. (1996). Residents' attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of tourism research*, 23(4), 755-779
- Hernandez, S. A., Cohen, J., & Garcia, H. L. (1996). Residents' attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of tourism research*, 23(4), 755-779
- Hralambopoulos, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 503-526
- 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
- Iroegbu, H. E. N. R. Y., & Chen, J. S. (2001). Urban residents' reaction toward tourism development: do subgroups exist?. *Tourism Analysis*, 6(2), 155-161
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of travel research*, 36(2), 3-11

- Johnson, J. D., Snepenger, D. J., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perceptions of tourism development. *Annals of tourism research*, 21(3), 629-642
- King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of tourism Research*, 20(4), 650-665
- Ko, D. W., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism management*, 23(5), 521-530
- Kuvan, Y., & Akan, P. (2005). Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: the case of Belek, Antalya. *Tourism management*, 26(5), 691-706
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Revisiting TIAS. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4), 829-831
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of tourism research*, 21(1), 121-139
- Lawton, L. J. (2005). Resident perceptions of tourist attractions on the Gold Coast of Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(2), 188-200
- Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism management*, 34, 37-46
- Lindberg, K., Andersson, T. D., & Dellaert, B. G. (2001). Tourism development: Assessing social gains and losses. *Annals of tourism research*, 28(4), 1010-1030
- Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modelling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 402-424
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of tourism research*, 13(2), 193-214
- Liu, J. C., Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1987). Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 14(1), 17-37
- Lepp, A. P. (2004). *Tourism in a Rural Ugandan Village: Impacts, Local Meaning, and Implications for Development* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida)
- 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
- Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of tourism research*, 27(2), 391-411
- Marrero Rodríguez, J. R. (2006). El discurso de rechazo al turismo en Canarias: una aproximación cualitativa. *Pasos. Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, 4(3)
- 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
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of tourism research*, 15(2), 191-204
- Nicholas, L. N., Thapa, B., & Ko, Y. J. (2009). Residents' Perspectives Of A World Heritage Site: The Pitons Management Area, St. Lucia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 390-412
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268

- Ontiveros, M. M. M., & Cordero, J. C. M. (2012). Actitud de la comunidad residente en Acapulco hacia los spring breakers y su comportamiento. *Revista de Análisis turístico*, (13), 27-38
- Paniza, J. L. (2005). La percepción social del golf en Andalucía
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599.
- Ritchie, J. B. (1988). Consensus policy formulation in tourism: Measuring resident views via survey research. *Tourism management*, 9(3), 199-212
- Siegel, P. B., & Jakus, P. M. (1995). Tourism as a sustainable rural development strategy: building consensus in resident attitudes. *Southern Journal of Rural Sociology*, 11(1), 17-41
- Sirakaya, E., Teye, V., & Sönmez, S. (2002). Understanding residents' support for tourism development in the central region of Ghana. *Journal of travel research*, 41(1), 57-67
- Sheldon, P. J., & Abenoja, T. (2001). Resident attitudes in a mature destination: the case of Waikiki. *Tourism management*, 22(5), 435-443
- Snaith, T., & Haley, A. (1999). Residents' opinions of tourism development in the historic city of York, England. *Tourism management*, 20(5), 595-603
- Styliadis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J., & Szivas, E. M. (2014). Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tourism Management*, 45, 260-274
- Telfer, D. J., & Sharpley, R. (2015). *Tourism and development in the developing world*. Routledge
- Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Sönmez, S. F. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of tourism research*, 29(3), 668-688
- Tomljenovic, R., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Tourism and older residents in a sunbelt resort. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), 93-114
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring resident's attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of travel research*, 26(1), 27-29
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Porrás-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
- 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
- Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals of tourism research*, 28(2), 439-458
- Williams, J., & Lawson, R. (2001). Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 28(2), 269-290
- Woosnam, K. M. (2012). Using emotional solidarity to explain residents' attitudes about tourism and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(3), 315-327
- Yoon, Y., Gürsoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (1999). An investigation of the relationship between tourism impacts and host communities' characteristics. *Anatolia*, 10(1), 29-44

