

Residents' Perception of the Economic Impacts of Tourism in Kavala, Greece

Dimitrios Stylidis, Dr. Edith Szivas, Dr. Avital Biran

Faculty of Management and Law
University of Surrey
d.stylidis@surrey.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper investigates how residents of a tourist destination perceive the economic impacts of tourism on their community and examines whether residents' socio-demographic characteristics influence these perceptions. Although many studies have examined residents' perceptions of tourism impacts on various destinations around the world there is a paucity of research in urban environments with moderate tourism development. This paper filled this gap in the literature by collecting data from the city of Kavala in Greece. The data was collected through a questionnaire distributed to the host population. The findings of the study indicate that respondents attribute to tourism both positive and negative economic effects. A number of statistical tests performed revealed differences in residents' perceptions due to socio-demographic factors. Among them, there is evidence that a potential economic benefit and the level of attachment to the place influence residents' evaluation of tourism.

Keywords: Impacts of tourism, Economic benefit, Attachment to the community, Residents' perception of tourism, Kavala

JEL Classification: O20, L83

Introduction

A plethora of studies (e.g. Akis et al., 1996; Korca, 1996; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; Choi and Sirakaya, 2005) have been undertaken in order to identify and explain residents' perceptions of tourism impacts and their support for tourism development- the latter being one of the most important factors in the overall attractiveness of tourist regions and an influencer on tourists' destination choice (Hoffman and Low, 1981). Apart from the impacts of tourism, researchers attempted to determine the antecedents of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts with the results showing that perceptions are influenced by a number of factors ranging from respondents' economic condition to destination's stage of development.

Building on past research the current study focuses on one of the least studied areas, an urban environment with moderate tourism development. More precisely, after illustrating the importance of measuring the economic impacts, the following part reviews the relevant literature regarding the major economic impacts of tourism and the factors that seem to influence residents' perception of them. Then, the methodology employed is presented followed by the presentation of the findings and a discussion of the results.

Economic Impacts of Tourism

The impacts associated with tourists' activities are considered as a way of understanding some of the costs and benefits of tourism. Although the impacts of tourism are often described as economic,

social, cultural and environmental, the present paper focuses only on the economic side which is considered vital for a destination. Economic are the most frequently cited impacts and have been given priority in the tourism literature, often used by governments and private sector enterprises in order to justify tourism activity, as well as because its evaluation provides necessary information for the formulation of tourism development policies (Vellas and Becherel, 1995). Along with Page et al. (2001) the justification for tourism development usually focuses on the potential for positive economic impacts and tourism has flourished across the world because of its perceived economic benefits.

A proper development of tourism can be a catalyst for national and regional development, by increasing employment, earnings and important infrastructure developments that benefit locals and visitors alike (Theobald, 1997). According to Okumus et al. (2005), the neglect of economic impacts of tourism on a destination (and especially of the negative ones), can harm in future even a flourishing tourism industry. Some of the main economic benefits and costs of tourism are further analysed.

Income

Tourism stimulates economic activity in a destination and generates income (Mules, 1998) as it is the case in Botswana (Mbaiwa, 2003), in the Canary Islands (Gil, 2003), in Malta (Ioannides et al., 2001) and Cyprus (Ioannides et al., 2001), just to mention a few. Several studies (e.g. Pizam, 1978; Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Long et al., 1990; Akis et al., 1996) in the past have shown the importance of tourism for the standard of living and the income of the residents.

Employment Opportunities

Tourism results in increased employment opportunities (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Liu and Var, 1986; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Schroeder, 1996; Faulkner and Tideswell, 1997; Lawson et al., 1998; Ap and Crompton, 1998; Tomljenovic and Faulkner, 1999; Weaver and Lawton, 2001) with the level of unemployment being much lower in tourist areas than in other parts of the country. More precisely, tourism provides three types of employment; direct, indirect and induced. Direct employment, are jobs created by the tourist industry like hotels, travel agencies, etc. Indirect employment, involves jobs created in the process of manufacture of products consumed by tourists like in factories that supply beverages. Both direct and indirect employees of tourism, by purchasing goods and services increase the labour required for the provision of these services, creating in this way induced employment (Inskeep, 1994; Goeldner et al., 2009; Page et al., 2001).

State Revenues

Tourism increases also the state revenues (Sheldon and Var, 1984; Perdue et al., 1990), a fact that often contributes to the improvement of public facilities (Dwyer et al., 2004). The main state benefits derived from tourism usually result from greater tax revenues (Goeldner et al., 2009; Ioannides et al., 2001).

Investment Stimulation (Development and infrastructure)

Furthermore, investment in infrastructure and superstructure by the

government stimulates investment in numerous smaller businesses. As a result, the initial investment in tourism brings forth tourist infrastructure development like hotels, restaurants, shopping centres, marinas and so on (Akis et al., 1996; Ap and Crompton, 1998; Goeldner et al., 2009).

Inflation

A common negative impact of tourism development is an increased cost of living for host populations and especially an inflation in the markets of land, goods and services (Long et al., 1990; Ross, 1992; Prentice, 1993; Akis et al., 1996; Faulkner and Tideswell, 1997; Lawson et al., 1998). House prices rise quickly, due to tourists seeking holiday homes and the increasing competition for land and housing between the tourist industry and the locals (Korca, 1998; Page et al., 2001). Sometimes, the inflationary pressure is often caused due to the significant disparity between the spending power of the tourists and the host population (Goeldner et al., 2009) as well as due to the 'demonstration effect', which changes the consumption behaviour of the host population, who tend to prefer imported goods (Briguglio et al., 1996).

Leakage

According to researchers (e.g. Hall and Page, 1996; Harrison, 2003; Cooper and Hall, 2005) foreign exchange generated by tourism activity may often not totally benefit the economy of the particular tourist destination due to leakages. These capital leakages may occur for reasons like: a) the cost of imported goods and services used by tourists, b) repatriation of profits generated from foreign capital investment and c) payment for holidays made in generating country (Page et al., 2001). As Bull (1995) states, large destinations (like Kavala) demonstrate lower leakage rates because they have supply industries and thus retain more money in the local economy. Contrary, less developed countries import more goods due to a lack of supporting industries.

Factors Influencing Residents' Perception of Tourism Impacts

The factors that seem to influence residents' perceptions of tourism impacts are known to vary from an individual to a community level and are often described by researchers (e.g. Faulkner and Tideswell, 1997; Fredline and Faulkner, 2000; Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003) as intrinsic and extrinsic respectively. In line with Faulkner and Tideswell (1997), the extrinsic factors refer to the macro level and as such have an impact on the community as a whole. Although they are considered important in the literature, it is usually the intrinsic factors that shape residents' perceptions, as revealed from the literally infinite number of studies that examined their influence. The major intrinsic factors found in the literature to be associated with residents' perceptions and will be examined in this study are:

Economic Dependency - Economic Benefits from Tourism

The expectation of economic benefits possibly has the largest positive effect on residents' perceptions of tourism impacts. A plethora of studies (see names beyond) considered employment and/or income related to tourism as a measure and examined the existence of a positive relation between perceptions and economic dependence on tourism. In support of social exchange theory, almost all study

findings confirm that residents who depend on tourism and/or receive economic benefits (through income and employment), favour tourism and its growth more than others who receive fewer or no benefits (e.g. Pizam, 1978; Prentice, 1993; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Madrigal, 1995; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Lindberg et al., 2001; Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; McGehee and Andereck, 2004; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Wang and Pfister, 2008).

Among the first researchers who proved this relationship was Pizam (1978), who confirmed that the more dependent a person on tourism, the more positive his overall attitude towards the industry. Likewise, a study in Spey Valley conducted by Getz (1994) reported that owners and managers of tourism business expressed the most positive attitudes towards tourism, a relation that was examined and confirmed also in the study of Milman and Pizam (1988) for residents whose family members were employed in tourism. As an exemption, Liu and Var (1986) in Hawaii did not confirm previous literature probably due to the fact that their study was conducted in a mature destination where almost all residents were well aware of the importance of the industry.

Even though residents who receive financial benefits tend to favour tourism more, research shows that they also pay attention to the negative impacts of tourism on their community. Researchers (e.g. King et al., 1993; Madrigal, 1993; McGehee and Andereck, 2004) claim that hosts who benefit from tourism not only acknowledge the negative impacts, but have no difference from others in their assessments. In Fiji, King et al. (1991) uncovered that even highly dependent on tourism residents recognised all the negative effects of tourism.

Distance from the Tourist Zone

An important factor which seems to explain variation in residents' responses for the impacts of tourism is the distance that residents live from the tourist zone (Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Sheldon and Var, 1984; Mansfeld, 1992; Korca, 1996; Williams and Lawson, 2001; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2004; Lee et al., 2007). Studies however, are not unidirectional; Belisle and Hoy (1980) reported that respondents living closer to tourism zones are more positive about the impacts than those living far away. These authors concluded that as the distance from attractions increased, the negative perceptions of the impacts increased. On the other hand, studies (Korca, 1996; Jurowski and Gursoy, 2004) revealed that hosts who reside in proximity to tourist zones have less favourable attitudes toward tourism. Tyrrell and Spaulding (1984) and Jurowski and Gursoy (2004) attributed these attitudes primarily due to residents proximity to problems like traffic, congestion, litter and noise.

Length of Residence - Attachment to the Community

Another variable that very often explains variations in residents' attitudes is community attachment, usually measured either as length of residence (Pizam 1978; Sheldon and Var 1984; Liu and Var, 1986; Um and Crompton, 1987; Madrigal, 1995; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Jurowski et al., 1997; Weaver and Lawton, 2001; Tosun, 2002; Bestard and Nadal, 2007) and/or as having been born- grown up in the community (Um and Crompton, 1987; Lankford and Howard 1994; McGehee and Andereck, 2004).

Despite authors belief (e.g. Sheldon and Var, 1984; Hsu, 1998; McCool and Martin, 1994) that residents who feel emotionally involved to

their place have different approach in assessing the impacts than less attached residents, however the direction of this relationship is not yet conclusive (McCool and Martin, 1994; Gursoy et al., 2002; Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; McGehee and Andereck, 2004).

According to a stream of research (Um and Crompton, 1987; Mansfeld, 1992; Madrigal, 1995; Weaver and Lawton, 2001), residents' attachment is negatively correlated to their attitudes towards tourism. Davis et al. (1988) reported that the largest percentage of natives in Florida were negatively oriented towards tourism, while Weaver and Lawton (2001) confirmed that longer residents tended to be more 'opponents' than 'supporters'. Similarly, a study in Samos by Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) supported the notion that the more attached residents were to the community, the less positively they perceived the tourism impacts, and contrary, the fewer the number of years respondents lived in the area, the more supportive they were for further tourism development.

On the other hand, McCool and Martin (1994) found that strongly attached residents rated the positive dimensions of tourism higher, and simultaneously were more concerned about the costs of tourism than the less attached residents in Montana, results similar to the study of Sheldon and Var (1984) who found that life-long residents appeared more sensitive to the impacts of the industry (both positive and negative) on their daily life.

Residents' Demographic Characteristics

After summing most of the studies that examined the influence of residents' socio-demographic characteristics on their perceptions of tourism, no consistent relationships have emerged, and thus there is no consensus in the literature regarding their significance as influencers (King et al., 1993; Sirakaya et al., 2002; Tosun, 2002; McGehee and Andereck, 2004).

In particular, a stream of research supports that gender (Milman and Pizam, 1988; Lankford, 1994; Huh and Vogt, 2008), age (Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Weaver and Lawton, 2001; Tosun, 2002; McGehee and Andereck, 2004; Gu and Wong, 2006; Bestard and Nadal, 2007; Terzidou et al., 2008), education (Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Hsu, 1998; Korca, 1998; Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Andriotis, 2004), income (Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Lee et al., 2007; Huh and Vogt, 2008) and ethnicity/heritage/language (Um and Crompton, 1987; Besculides et al., 2002; Andereck et al., 2007), can explain variation in residents' perception of tourism impacts.

Regarding the influence of age, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) and Weaver and Lawton (2001) found that in general, the younger the residents, the more positive the perceptions they have towards the tourism industry, findings opposite to those of McGehee and Andereck (2004). For education, researchers like Hsu (1998) and Andriotis and Vaughan (2003) concluded that the highly educated residents were less favourable toward the impacts of tourism than the less educated, whereas the findings of Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) in Samos, Korca (1998) in Antalya and Teye et al. (2002) in Ghana are opposite, with the more educated residents having more positive perceptions of tourism. As for income, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) and Lee et al. (2007) reported that the higher the income of respondents, the more positive were their attitudes towards tourism.

On the other hand, numerous studies (e.g. Belisle and Hoy, 1980;

Allen et al., 1993; Madrigal, 1993; Tomljenovic and Faulkner, 2000; Andereck et al., 2005; Nepal, 2008) did not find any significant relations between socio-demographic characteristics and residents' perceptions and rejected their use as important influencers.

Methodology

Measuring the economic contribution of tourism has been a complex task because tourism takes place over a number of sectors like transport, accommodation, retail and so on. Although various methodologies for the measurement of tourism's economic impacts exist, the majority of the studies in the tourism literature measured how residents perceive the benefits and costs of the industry. The current author adopted this measurement technique and decided that a structured questionnaire delivered at residents' home (self-administered questionnaires) like in face-to-face interviews but completed personally by each respondent combines the advantages of both methods. All of the questions used are closed-ended and scale questions using Likert and rating scales (from 1 to 5) have been employed, because they are credible in measuring people's perceptions (Davis et al., 1988; Oppenheim, 1992).

The questionnaire used examined residents' perceptions of tourism impacts by providing respondents with neutral statements and asking them to assess the direction of impact tourism has in their place. This technique leads to less biased answers (King et al., 1991; Ap and Crompton, 1998; Tosun, 2002). More precisely, in the first section of the questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate the direction of impact tourism has on each issue and their responses were measured on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 'very negative' (1 point) to 'very positive' (5 points), with 3 signifying the absence of impact. The list of the items employed was constructed based on previous studies (Liu and Var, 1986; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Lankford and Howard, 1994; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Akis et al., 1996; Ap and Crompton, 1998; Ko and Stewart, 2002; Vargas-Sanchez et al., 2009) and the 6 items chosen covered the major economic impacts of tourism. Section B covered the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. Information gathered includes gender, age, education, income, economic benefit from tourism, attachment to the community and distance from the tourist zone. All of them have been utilised in past research to explain variation in residents' responses and equally they were used in forming the 7 hypotheses of the current study. The seven hypotheses formed are:

- H1: Residents who gain financially from tourism will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those who do not
- H2: Residents who feel attached to Kavala will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those who do not
- H3: Females are more positive towards the economic impacts of tourism than males
- H4: Residents who live closer to the tourist zone will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those who live far
- H5: Residents with lower income will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those with higher income
- H6: Residents with lower education will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those with higher education
- H7: Younger residents will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than older residents

The study took place in the city of Kavala, Greece. Kavala (population 60,802) is an urban setting, the second largest city in

Northern Greece and a main hub for passengers to Northern Aegean islands. The city though, not only serves as a hub but it is considered as one of the most beautiful urban destinations in Greece. It is usually visited for city-breaks by domestic tourists, by international charter flights or even by car from other Balkan countries due to its proximity to the borders. The Prefecture of Kavala has 15.317 hotel-beds which brings it in the third place behind Chalkidiki and Thessaloniki in the Northern Greece. According to the Hellenic Statistical Authority, in 2006, the tourist arrivals in the city of Kavala were 110.724 and the nights spent 244.697, both indicating that tourism has a mediocre effect in the local economy.

Analysis of the Findings

The first part of the analysis presents the profile of the respondents in terms of their demographic characteristics.

Demographic characteristics of the respondents

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are summarized in Table 1. Both male and female are almost equally represented in the sample (male 47 per cent, female 53 per cent), with the vast majority of them (98 per cent) being Greek. As for the educational level of respondents, after summing some of the groups together the first cluster consisted of those who had completed studies up to Lyceum as their highest educational level (41 per cent), the second cluster included those with a college degree (32 per cent) and the third cluster consisted of residents who hold a university degree or higher (27 per cent). Regarding age, most age groups are almost equally represented. Residents aged over 65 years are the largest group accounting for 21 percent of the sample, whereas the 18-24 is the smallest age group accounting for 12 percent of all the respondents. When asked about their family annual net income, the greatest proportion of respondents (35.2 percent) reported earnings between 10,000 and 19,999 Euro, one quarter of the sample has an income of 20,000-29,999 Euro whereas only 10 percent gain more than 40,000 Euro. Finally, participants of the study were asked to state the distance they lived from the tourist zone, with most of them reporting living close (36 percent) or in the middle (37 percent), contrary to one quarter who lives far (27 per cent).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percent %
Male	227	46.9
Female	257	53.1
Nationality		
Greek	473	98.1
Not Greek	9	1.9
Education		
Up to Lyceum	198	41
College degree	154	32
University or higher	133	27
Age		
18-24	59	12.2

25-34	89	18.4
35-44	88	18.1
45-54	80	16.5
55-64	66	13.6
65+	103	21.2
Income		
0 - 9,999	83	18.0
10,000 - 19,999	163	35.2
20,000 - 29,999	109	23.6
30,000 - 39,999	58	12.6
40,000+	49	10.6
Distance from the tourist zone		
Close	172	35.8
In the middle	180	37.5
Far	128	26.7

Residents' Economic Gain from Tourism Development

Since residents' economic gain from tourism development will be tested as a predictor variable, the appropriate question was used to identify which part of the sample will gain financially from tourism development. Table 2 summarizes the responses given.

Table 2: Economic gain from tourism

Personal economic benefit	Frequency	Percent %
Yes	135	28.8
No	334	71.2

According to the responses presented in Table 2, when residents were asked to report whether they will gain financially in case tourism will be further developed in Kavala, 135 of them (29 percent) reported expecting a personal economic benefit whereas 71 percent does not expect any financial gain from further tourism development.

Residents' Attachment to Kavala

Residents' level of attachment to Kavala was measured with the use of three statements that served as indicators for this variable.

Table 3: Attachment to Kavala

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Like home	485	3.55	1.258
Interested	486	3.57	1.250
Sorry to leave	487	3.31	1.351
Reliability Statistics			
Cronbach Alpha	.80		

From the responses presented in Table 3 it can be noticed that in all

three statements that formulate the 'residents' level of attachment' scale, the mean scores are around 3.5, indicating a relative attachment to Kavala. More precisely, half of the respondents stated that they feel like home in Kavala, are interested about the place and that they would feel sorry if they had to leave from the city. Almost one out of four respondents expressed neutral feelings about the city, while the rest 25 percent does not feel emotionally attached to the place. These responses indicate that most residents feel strongly attached to their city. The last row of Table 3 presents the result of the reliability test conducted in order to examine the internal consistency of the attachment scale. The Cronbach alpha value of .80 indicates a high level of reliability (over .70).

Residents' Perceptions of Tourism Impacts

The first part of the questionnaire measured residents' perceptions of the economic impacts of tourism in Kavala. The five-point scale used requested from respondents to assess the direction of influence tourism has on their place, with 1 signifying a very negative impact, 3 the absence of impact and 5 a very positive impact. Residents' opinions are depicted on the following table (Table 4) which displays the mean scores, standard deviations and responses in percentages. For easier interpretation the impacts' mean scores are presented in a descending order.

Table 4: Economic impacts of tourism in Kavala

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Revenue generated	484	3.74	1.031
Standard of living	481	3.61	.949
Number of jobs	484	3.51	1.132
Infrastructure	480	3.51	1.095
Price of goods and services	483	2.69	1.18
Price of land and housing	481	2.66	1.151
Reliability Statistics			
Cronbach Alpha	.87		

From the size of the standard deviations presented in Table 4 it can be concluded that they have a reasonable spread around the mean scores of responses. Continuing with the mean values, citizens of Kavala believe that tourism has a positive effect on most economic matters like revenue generated (3.74), standard of living (3.61), infrastructure (3.51) and the number of jobs (3.51).

On the other hand, the tourist industry is considered responsible for negatively affecting the level of prices in Kavala. More precisely, residents believe that tourism boosts inflation by raising the price of land-housing(2.66) and goods-services (2.69).

A reliability test was conducted in order to examine the internal consistency of the economic impact scale and the Cronbach alpha value of .87 indicates a high level of reliability. Further inspection of the 'corrected item-total correlation' and 'Cronbach alpha if item deleted' rows in the 'item-total statistics' table (not presented here) did not reveal any variables that their elimination would

significantly increase the alpha value of the scale.

Hypothesis Testing

Aiming to test the hypothesis formed in the theoretical part, a number of independent samples t-tests and Anovas were conducted for assessing if there are significant differences in residents' responses regarding the economic impacts of tourism. More precisely, a series of independent samples t-tests were undertaken in order to examine differences in responses due to respondents' gender, age, education, attachment to the community and economic benefit from tourism development. Additionally, in order to examine the variance in responses between three or more subgroups, one way between groups Anova (with post-hoc tests) was employed for assessing the potential influence of income and distance from the tourist zone. In total, exempt from residents' economic dependence on tourism and residents' level of community attachment, none of the others appeared to influence their perceptions of economic impacts.

H1: Residents who gain financially from tourism will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those who do not

Previous studies have shown that residents who receive economic benefits from tourism have more positive perceptions regarding the impacts of tourism (Pizam, 1978; Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; McGehee and Andereck, 2004; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Wang and Pfister, 2008). In order to test the first hypothesis of the study, independent samples t-tests were undertaken and the results in all variables revealed significant differences between the two groups (Table 5). Residents who gain financially from tourism were more positive in their evaluation of all six economic impacts than those who do not gain from tourism. Hypothesis 1 is consequently accepted.

Table 5: Independent samples t-tests for economic gain

Variables	Mean		t-value	p-value
	gain	not gain		
Number of jobs	3.84	3.35	-4.307	.000*
Standard of living	3.82	3.50	-3.404	.001*
Revenue generated	3.98	3.62	-3.490	.001*
Infrastructure	3.80	3.38	-3.751	.000*
Price of land and housing	3.07	2.47	-4.864	.000*
Price of goods and services	3.14	2.50	-5.036	.000*

*statistically significant at .05 or less

H2: Residents who feel attached to Kavala will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those who do not

The second hypothesis required an examination of potential differences in responses between those residents who feel attached to Kavala and those who feel not. Residents who stated that would not feel sorry to leave/not interested in the community/do not feel like home (scored 3 and under) formed one group labeled 'community unattached', whereas the rest (scored over 3) formed the second group labeled 'community attached'.

The hypothesis was tested by running a series of independent samples t-tests (Table 6). The p value in the first four impacts suggests that there are significant differences among the mean scores on these four dependent variables.

Table 6: Independent samples t-tests for level of attachment

Variables	Mean		t-value	p-value
	unattached	attached		
Number of jobs	3.29	3.71	-4.117	.000*
Standard of living	3.48	3.72	-2.712	.007*
Revenue generated	3.60	3.86	-2.789	.005*
Infrastructure	3.38	3.62	-2.422	.016*
Price of land and housing	2.59	2.73	-1.287	.199
Price of goods and services	2.62	2.74	-1.098	.273

*statistically significant at .05 or less

By examining the mean scores of the first four impacts for each group, presented in Table 6, it can be noticed that those who feel attached to the community rated higher the economic impacts of tourism than those who feel less attached. Therefore, the above hypothesis was confirmed since in fact in four out of six impacts there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups, indicating that residents who feel attached to Kavala perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than residents who feel less attached.

H3: Females perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than males

A series of t-test were undertaken in order to identify any perceptual differences in responses between male and female. The results presented in Table 7 depict that male respondents did not have statistically different opinions in any variable than female respondents. Consequently, the Hypothesis 3 can be rejected.

Table 7: Independent samples t-tests for gender

Variables	Mean		t-value	p-value
	male	female		
Number of jobs	3.52	3.49	.308	.758
Standard of living	3.58	3.63	-.471	.638
Revenue generated	3.75	3.73	.236	.813
Infrastructure	3.44	3.57	-1.307	.192
Price of land and housing	2.60	2.71	-.992	.322
Price of goods and services	2.63	2.72	-.888	.375

H4: Residents who live closer to the tourist zone will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those who live far

A number of one way between groups Anova were conducted to explore the influence that the 'distance living from the tourist zone' has on residents' perception of tourism impacts. Respondents were divided into three groups according to the distance they live from the centre of the city which represents the actual tourist zone. The Levene's test was not significant for all the variables and as such the assumption of homogeneity of variances has not been violated.

The results presented in Table 8 are not significant, suggesting that

there are no significant differences in residents' responses that can be attributed to the distance they live from the tourist zone. As such, hypothesis 4 can be rejected.

Table 8: One-way Anova for distance from the tourist zone

Variables	F	Sig.
Number of jobs	.501	.606
Standard of living	.532	.588
Revenue generated	.496	.609
Infrastructure	1.821	.163
Price of land and housing	.735	.480
Price of goods and services	2.092	.125

H5: Residents with lower income will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those with higher income

Residents were divided into three groups according to their income level (low, medium, high), with the aim to explore the potential influence of their annual earnings on their perception of economic impacts of tourism.

In all six variables the Levene's test was not significant indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variance has not been violated. A series of one way between groups Anova were undertaken in order to investigate whether residents who have lower income will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those with a higher income.

After examining in Table 9 the results of the dependent variables, it can be assumed that apart from the 'number of jobs', there are no statistically significant differences in residents' responses that can be credited to their earnings.

Table 9: One way Anova for income

Variables	F	Sig.
Number of jobs	4.173	.016*
Standard of living	.704	.495
Revenue generated	.714	.490
Infrastructure	.586	.557
Price of land and housing	2.080	.126
Price of goods and services	.088	.916

*statistically significant at .05 or less

Regarding the variable 'number of jobs', an inspection of Table 10 reveals that a statistically significant difference in residents' evaluation for this statement exists between those who have low and medium income.

Table 10: Multiple comparisons for income

Dependent Variable	(I) Income	(J) Income	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower	Upper
Number of jobs	low	medium	-0.36	.129	.016	-.66	-.05
		high	-.212	.130	.235	-.52	.09

More precisely, as Table 11 shows residents with medium income tend to be more positive than those with low income regarding the influence of tourism on the number of jobs in Kavala. Since this is the only significant difference found, Hypothesis 5 is rejected.

Table 11: Descriptives for income

Variables	Mean		
	low	medium	high
Number of jobs	3.39	3.6	3.75

H6: Residents with lower education will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than those with higher education

The potential effect of education on a number of variables was examined by conducting a series of independent samples t-tests. Residents were divided in two groups according to their level of education (lower and higher educational level).

The results presented in Table 12 depict that respondents with lower educational level did not have statistically different opinions in any variable than respondents with higher educational level. Consequently, Hypothesis 6 can be rejected.

Table 12: Independent samples t-tests for education

Variables	Mean		t-value	p-value
	lower	higher		
Number of jobs	3.51	3.51	.082	.935
Standard of living	3.59	3.62	-.345	.731
Revenue generated	3.77	3.71	.616	.538
Infrastructure	3.56	3.45	1.087	.278
Price of land and housing	2.69	2.64	.515	.607
Price of goods and services	2.7	2.66	.376	.707

H7: Younger residents will perceive more positively the economic impacts of tourism than older residents

The last hypothesis examined the influence of age on a number of variables used to measure residents' perception of tourism economic impacts. Residents were divided in two groups according to their age (18-44 and 45+).

After examining Table 13, no significant differences were found between the two groups, except in one variable (prices of goods and services). Older residents evaluated more positively the impact of tourism on the price of goods and services than the younger residents.

Therefore it can be assumed that in total (in five out of 6 variables) there are no statistically significant differences on the responses given that can be attributed to respondents' age and hence, Hypothesis 7 can be rejected.

Table 13: Independent samples t-tests for age

Variables	Mean		t-value	p-value
	younger	older		
Number of jobs	3.43	3.58	-1.447	.149
Standard of living	3.53	3.67	-1.561	.119
Revenue generated	3.69	3.77	-.871	.384
Infrastructure	3.42	3.6	-1.838	.067
Price of land and housing	2.57	2.75	-1.729	.084
Price of goods and services	2.56	2.81	-2.366	.018*

*statistically significant at .05 or less

Discussion - Conclusion

In total, residents of Kavala perceived the economic impacts of tourism favourably with the exemption of inflation that tourism development brought in the city.

Regarding the rest of the findings, only two out of the seven factors that were examined as potential influencers of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts were found to be significant in this study. More precisely the gender, age, education, income and distance residents' live from the tourist zone did not appear to play a significant role in residents' evaluation process. These results (apart from distance from the tourist zone) are in line with previous study findings and en-strength the debate regarding their significance as intrinsic factors. In addition, the results underline the fact that in areas where the tourism industry is not over-developed and consequently the economic impacts are not of major importance to the destination, the perceptions that various local groups have about the economic impacts of tourism do not differ significantly amongst them.

On the other hand, the outcomes of this study confirmed the role of residents' economic gain from tourism as a significant factor determining their perception of tourism. In accordance with past research, citizens of Kavala who gain financially from tourism were more positive in their evaluation of all six economic impacts than those who do not gain from tourism.

A second major finding of this study is the role that residents' attachment to Kavala plays in their evaluation of tourism impacts. Along with the responses given, those who felt emotionally attached to the city rated higher the economic impacts of tourism than those who felt less attached. This finding is similar to Lee et al.'s (2007) finding, but different from Haralambopoulos and Pizam's (1996) study which found that respondents who felt more attached to the destination tended to be less positive towards tourism.

Concluding, the theoretical implication of this study should be highlighted as it enhances the current knowledge about residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in an urban destination with moderate tourism development. In addition, as researchers (e.g. Murphy, 1985;

Allen et al., 1988; Ritchie, 1993; Williams and Lawson, 2001) advocate that tourism needs to have the support of the host community in order to thrive in the long run, this study offers a practical implication by providing to those responsible for tourism, information regarding the factors that influence residents' perceptions of tourism in Kavala. It is vital for the city planners and the tourist industry to recognize which factors influence residents in being more positive towards tourism, in order to achieve a sustainable development of the industry.

References

- Akis, S., Peristianis, N., and Warner, J., 1996, "Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus," *Tourism Management*, 17(7), 481-494.
- 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.P., 1993, "Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development," *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 27-33.
- Andereck, K.L., and Vogt, C.A., 2000, "The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options," *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27-36.
- Andereck, K.L., Valentine, K.M., Knopf, R.C., and Vogt, C.A., 2005, "Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Andereck, K.L., Valentine, K.M., Vogt, C.A., and Knopf, R.C., 2007, "A cross-cultural analysis of tourism and quality of life perceptions," *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(5), 483-502.
- Andriotis, K., and Vaughan, R.D., 2003, "Urban Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: The case of Crete," *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 172-185.
- Andriotis, K., 2004, "The Perceived Impact of Tourism Development by Cretan Residents," *Tourism and Hospitality Planning and Development*, 1(2), 123-144.
- Ap, J., and Crompton, J.L., 1993, "Residents' Strategies for Responding to Tourism Impacts," *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(1), 47-50.
- Ap, J., and Crompton, J., 1998, "Developing and Testing a Tourism Impact Scale," *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 120-130.
- Belisle F.J., and Hoy, D.R., 1980, "The perceived impacts of tourism by residents: A case study in Santa Maria Colombia," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(1), 83-101.
- Besculides, A., Lee, M.E., and McCormick, P.J., 2002, "Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 303-319.
- Bestard, A.B., and Nadal, J.R., 2007, "Modelling environmental attitudes toward tourism," *Tourism Management*, 28, 688-695.
- Briguglio, L., Archer, B., Jafari, J., Wall, G., 1996, *Sustainable Tourism in Islands and Small States: Issues and Policies*, New York, Pinter.
- Bull, A., 1995, *The Economics of Travel and Tourism*, (2nd ed.), Melbourne, Longman
- Choi, H.S.C., and Sirakaya, E., 2005, "Measuring Residents' Attitude toward Sustainable Tourism: Development of Sustainable Tourism Attitude Scale," *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 380-394.
- Cooper, C., and Hall, M., 2005, *Oceania: A tourism Handbook*, New York, Channel View Publications
- Davis, D., Allen, J., and Cosenza, R.M., 1988, "Segmenting Local Residents by Their Attitudes, Interests, and Opinions Toward

- Tourism," *Journal of Travel Research*, 27 (2), 2-8.
- Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., and Spurr, R., 2004, "Evaluating tourism's economic effects: new and old approaches," *Tourism Management*, 25, 307-317.
- Faulkner, B., and Tideswell, C., 1997, "A Framework for Monitoring Community Impacts of Tourism," *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(1), 3-27.
- Fredline, E., and Faulkner, B., 2000, "Host Community Reactions: A Cluster Analysis," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 763-784.
- Getz, D., 1994, "Residents Attitudes toward Tourism," *Tourism Management*, 15, 247-258.
- Goeldner, C.R., and Ritchie, J.R.B., 2009, *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies* (11th Ed.), Hoboken, N.J., John Wiley and Sons.
- Gu, M., and Wong, P.P., 2006, "Residents' Perception of Tourism Impacts: A Case Study of Homestay Operators in Dachangshan Dao, North-East China," *Tourism Geographies*, 8(3), 253-273.
- Gursoy, D., Jurovski, C., and Uysal, M., 2002, "Resident Attitudes: A Structural Modelling Approach," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79-105.
- Gursoy, D., and Rutherford, D.G., 2004, "Host Attitudes toward Tourism: An Improved Structural Model," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Hall, C.M., and Page, S.J., 1996, *Tourism in the Pacific*, Boston, Thomson Press.
- Haralambopoulos, N., and Pizam, A., 1996, "Perceived Impacts of tourism: The case of Samos," *Annals of tourism Research*, 23(3), 503-526.
- Harrison, D., 2003, *Pacific Island Tourism*, New York, Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Hoffman, D.L. and Low, S.A., 1981, "An application of the probit transformation of tourism survey data," *Journal of Travel Research*, 20(2), 35-38.
- Hsu, C.H.C, 1998, "Impacts of Riverboat Gaming on Community Quality," *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 22(4), 323-337.
- Huh, C., and Vogt, C.A., 2008, "Changes in Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism over Time: A Cohort Analytical Approach," *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, 446-455.
- Inskeep, E., 1994, *National and Regional Tourism Planning: Methodologies and case studies*, Routledge, New York.
- Ioannides, D., Apostolopoulos, Y. and Sonmez, S., 2001, *Mediterranean Islands and Sustainable Tourism Development: Practices, Management and Policies*, London, Cromwell Press.
- Jurovski, C., Uysal, M., and Williams, D.R., 1997, "A Theoretical Analysis of Host Community Resident Reactions to Tourism," *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(2), 3-11.
- Jurovski, C., and Gursoy, D., 2004, "Distance Effects on Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 296-312.
- King, B., Pizam, A., and Milman, A., 1993, "Social Impacts of Tourism: Host Perceptions," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 650-665.
- Ko, D.W., and Stewart, W.P., 2002, "A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development," *Tourism Management*, 23, 521-530.
- Korca, P., 1996, "Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 695-697.
- Korca, P., 1998, "Resident Perceptions of Tourism in a Resort Town," *Leisure Sciences*, 20, 193-212.
- Kuvan, Y., and Akan, P., 2005, "Residents' Attitudes Toward General and Forest-Related Impacts of Tourism: The Case of Belek,

- Natalia," *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 691-706.
- Lankford, S.V., 1994, "Attitudes and Perceptions toward Tourism and Rural Regional Development," *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 35-43.
- Lankford, S.V., and Howard, D.R., 1994, "Developing a Tourism Impact Attitude Scale," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121-139.
- Lawson, R.W., Williams, J., Young, T., and Cossens, J., 1998, "A comparison of residents' attitudes towards tourism in 10 New Zealand destinations," *Tourism Management*, 19(3), 247-256.
- Lee, T.J., Li, J., and Kim, H.K., 2007, "Community Residents' Perceptions and Attitudes Towards Heritage Tourism in a Historic City," *Tourism and Hospitality Planning and Development*, 4(2), 91-109.
- Lindberg, K., Andersson, T.D., and Dellaert, B.G.C., 2001, "Tourism Development: Assessing Social Gains and Losses," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(4), 1010-1030.
- Liu, J. and Var, T., 1986, "Resident Attitudes Toward Tourism Impacts in Hawaii," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, 193-214.
- Long, P.T., Perdue, R.R., and Allen, L., 1990, "Rural Resident Tourism Perceptions and Attitudes by Community Level Of Tourism," *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 3-9.
- Madrigal, R., 1993, "A Tale of Tourism in Two Cities," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 336-353.
- Madrigal, R., 1995, "Residents' Perceptions and the Role of Government," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 86-102.
- McCool, S.F., and Martin, S.R., 1994, "Community Attachment and Attitudes toward Tourism Development," *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29-34.
- McGehee, N.G., and Andereck, K.L., 2004, "Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism," *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 131-140.
- Mansfeld, Y., 1992, "Group-Differentiated Perceptions of Social Impacts Related to Tourism Development," *Professional Geographer*, 44, 377-392.
- Mbaiwa, J., 2005, "Enclave Tourism and its socio-economic impacts on the Okavango Delta, Botswana," *Tourism Management*, 26, 157-172.
- Milman A., and Pizam, A., 1988, "Social Impacts of Tourism on Central Florida," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 191-204.
- Mules, T., 1998, "Decomposition of Australian tourist expenditure," *Tourism Management*, 19(3), 267-71.
- Murphy, P., 1985, *Tourism: A Community Approach*, New York, Routledge.
- Nepal, S.K., 2008, "Residents' Attitudes to Tourism in Central British Columbia, Canada," *Tourism Geographies*, 10(1), 42-65.
- Okumus, F., Altinay, M., Arasli, H., 2005, "The impact of Turkey's economic crisis of February 2001 on the tourism industry in Northern Cyprus," *Tourism Management*, 26, 95-104.
- Oppenheim, A.N., 1992, *Questionnaire Design, Interviewing and Attitude Measurement*, London, Continuum.
- Page, S., Brunt, P., Busby, G., Connell, J., 2001, *Tourism: A modern Synthesis*, Derby, Thomson Learning.
- Perdue, R.R., Long, P., and Allen, L., 1990, "Resident Support for Tourism Development," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599.
- Pizam, A., 1978, "Tourism Impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents," *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8-12.
- Pizam, A., and Milman, A., 1986, "The social impacts of tourism," *Tourism Recreation Research*, 11(1), 29-33.
- Prentice, R., 1993, "Community-driven tourism planning and residents' preferences," *Tourism Management*, 14(3), 218-227.
- Ross, G.F., 1992, "Resident Perception of the Impact of Tourism on an Australian City," *Journal of Travel Research*, 3(3), 13-17.

- Ritchie, J.B.R., 1993, "Crafting a destination vision: putting the concept of resident-responsive tourism into practice," *Tourism Management*, 14(5), 379-389.
- Schroeder, T., 1996, "The Relationship of Residents' Image of their State as a Tourist Destination and their Support for Tourism," *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(4), 71-73.
- Sheldon, P.J., and Var, T., 1984, "Residents Attitudes towards Tourism in North Wales," *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40-47.
- Sirakaya, E., Teye, V., and Sönmez, S., 2002, "Understanding Residents' Support for Tourism Development in the Central Region of Ghana," *Journal of Travel Research*, 41, 57-67.
- Terzidou, M., Stylidis, D., and Szivas, E., 2008, "Residents' Perceptions of Religious Tourism and its Socio-Economic Impacts on the Island of Tinos," *Tourism and Hospitality Planning and Development*, 5(2), 113-129.
- Teye, V., Sonmez, S.F., and Sirakaya, E., 2002, "Residents' Attitudes towards Tourism Development," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668-688.
- Theobald, W., 1997, *Global Tourism: The next decade*, Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Tomljenovic, R., and Faulkner, B., 2000, "Tourism and Older Residents in a Sunbelt Resort," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), 93-114.
- Tosun, C., 2002, "Host Perceptions of Impacts: A Comparative Tourism Study," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 231-258.
- Tyrrell, T., and Spaulding, I.A., 1984, "A Survey of Attitudes toward Tourism Growth in Rhode-Island," *Hospitality Education and Research Journal*, 8, 22-23.
- Um, S., and Crompton, J.L., 1987, "Measuring Resident's Attachment Levels in a Host Community," *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(1), 27-29.
- Vargas-Sanchez, A., Plaza-Mejia, M.A., and Porrás-Bueno, N., 2009, "Understanding residents' Attitudes toward the Development of industrial Tourism in a Former Mining Community," *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(3), 373-387.
- Vellas, F. and Becherel, L., 1995, *International Tourism*, Hampshire, MacMillan Press Ltd.
- Wang, Y., and Pfister, R.E., 2008, "Residents' Attitudes Toward Tourism and Perceived Personal Benefits in a Rural Community," *Journal of travel Research*, 47, 84-93.
- Weaver, D.B., and Lawton, L.J., 2001, "Resident Perceptions in the Urban-Rural Fringe," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 439-458.
- Williams, J., and Lawson, R., 2001, "Community Issues and Resident Opinions of Tourism," *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 269-290.