

1st

**International
Scientific
Conference**

2-4 June, 2016

Vrnjačka Banja, Serbia

2

0

1

6

**TOURISM
IN FUNCTION OF DEVELOPMENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA**

Spa Tourism in Serbia and Experiences of Other Countries



**THEMATIC
PROCEEDINGS**

II



**UNIVERSITY OF KRAGUJEVAC
FACULTY OF HOTEL MANAGEMENT
AND TOURISM IN VRNJAČKA BANJA**



IMPACTS OF DEVELOPMENT OF TOURISM ON LOCAL POPULATION OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF SUBOTICA

Jelena Tepavčević¹; Nataša Gršić²;

Abstract

Subotica as the most northern city of the Republic of Serbia and the city that is the main transit point to all travelers, has many attractions that can be included in its tourist offer and, therefore, in tourism development, too. The way in which this will be carried out partly depends on residents of Subotica. The local population plays a significant role in its development. It is important to know the opinion of residents who would directly or indirectly be involved in the development of tourism. The basic method is a review and the use of the existing literature, but the method which is provided for data collection is a method of survey after which the resulting data will be processed in the software package SPSS version 20. Methods of processing data are: descriptive statistical analysis, t-test, analysis of variance ANOVA. The expected results should provide a valid picture of the attitudes of the local population regarding the further development of Subotica as a tourist destination.

Keywords: *Subotica, the local population, attitudes of population*

Introduction

In municipalities across Serbia, tourism development is gaining in importance as a regional economic development strategy. Tourism is perceived as a basic industry that offers employment opportunities, tax revenues and economic diversity of the municipality. Also, tourism is an activity that allows small businesses flourish, especially those in family ownership. The development of tourism increases the positive and negative impacts on the area in which it develops. Tourism changes the environment in which it develops and affects the local population. A

1 MSc Jelena Tepavčević, Ivana Milutinovića 99, 21460 Vrbas, 062/8445457, e-mail: jelenat91@gmail.com

2 BSc Nataša Gršić, Bolmanska 2/6, 24000 Subotica, 064/1851888, e-mail: natasa.grsic@gmail.com

tourist comes with his culture and wishes to get to know the traditions, language, cultural – historical heritage, while locals live in a space that is designed to satisfy the tourist needs. Different attitudes of the local population in relation to the tourists and their preferences mostly depend on whether the residents depend on revenues generated by tourism. The entire development should respect the principles of sustainable development. Namely, it should ensure that uncontrolled development does not destroy the resources, but preserve it for future generations, with the aim of continuous improvement of quality of life in the tourist destination.

Changes that happen for the local population may be positive (employment possibilities, infrastructure improvement, etc.) or negative (traffic jams, crime, increased property taxes, etc.). A contact of tourists with and local population leads to the formation of different relationships. If tourist destinations want to be competitive, they must ensure local residents adequate quality of life.

The impact of people's thinking about a place or production may change. The environment can be seen as a non-verbal way of communicating with costumers (Miljanić & Tepavčević, 2013).

In the unfolding of life in the tourist destination, the presence of tourists can cause positive impacts to the local population (for example, to be proud of the past, tradition, satisfaction with the progress of the city, etc.) and/or negative ones (for example, the sense of capturing of their own space, intolerance towards tourists in their own environment, traffic jams and noise resulting from the constant tourist flow, etc.). The strength of individual impacts can be varied; it can even be a mixture of positive and negative impacts. The attitudes of residents contribute to the advantages which tourism development brings, such as increasing the income of the population (ensuring economic independence and stability of municipal areas), ensuring the construction of municipal infrastructure, creating a recognizable tourist destination and the branding of indigenous offerings. However, there are also disadvantages brought by the development, such as emigration of population, destruction of natural and cultural resources, destruction of autochthony, lack of full-year employment in a seasonal business destinations, etc.

Overview of studies and models for measuring the attitudes of the local population

Most of the studies about the attitudes of local population are focused on the differences between the the individual categories of local population. These categories are identified by sociodemographic characteristic (Belisie & Hoy, 1980; Liu & Var, 1986; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978), place of residence or the distance the local community from the tourist areas (Belisie & Hoy, 1980; Sheldon & Var 1984) and economic dependence on tourism (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978).

Liu & Var (1986) deal with the study of population in Hawaii and research what they would like to change to improve their living environment. The authors conclude that residents would not change standards of life nor reduce environmental impacts, although they care about environment protection. However, Liu & Var do not show any statistical confirmation of this conclusion, which seems to be derived by an average score rankings of attitudes that are grouped as general areas of concern.

It is logical to conclude that those residents who benefit directly from the tourism development probably support such a policy. However, the program of public relationships of most agencies for tourism development provides that there is a significant relationship between the perception of tourism growth and support for its development by those who do not directly benefit from such a growth (Perdue et al., 1990).

Earlier studies of socio-economic factors mention different elements that determine which of them have an influential effect. For example, a survey conducted in Scotland, where Bourgham & Butler (1981) use segmental analysis to identify differences in attitudes towards their contact with tourists, length of stay, age and language. In North Wales, Sheldon & Var (1984) find proofs which point to attitudes of tourism related to cultural influence. The natives are more concerned about the social and cultural impacts of tourism in comparison to other residents.

Variable age structure is also involved in research and attitudes about tourism. The research conducted in Australia by Tomljenović & Faulkner (1999) suggests that older people, as well as younger, are favorably inclined towards the development of tourism, but that older population are less concerned about the negative impacts of tourism development on

environment. Taking gender as the main variable of research conducted in New Zealand, Mason & Cheyne (2000) point out that more women than men are against tourism development. As the reasons, the authors talk about negative implications, such as increasing traffic, noise and crime.

For a longer period of time, economic dependence was in the focus of social researchers and they wanted to discover the attitudes of the population to whose community tourism brought certain benefits. Many residents and communities have developed a mechanism “to adapt to tourism”. The town of Vermont (Vermont Village – USA) can be taken as an example. Namely, its inhabitants invented a fake folklore tradition, created by stereotype for tourists. Residents have supported social gatherings and celebrations during the winter break in which they would also enjoy (Harril, 2004).

Most literature shows that residents can recognize positive and negative aspects of economic dependence of tourism. The study about the residents of the Turkish resort Marmaris by Var et al. (1985) finds that residents consider that tourism increases values of property and housing prices, although they agreed that tourism creates jobs and reduces unemployment. The study of Liu et al. (1987) undertaken in Hawaii, the North Wales and Istanbul, found out that residents are worried about environmental impacts of tourism and environmental degradation, despite economic benefits.

In the study about Cairns, a touristic town in Australia, Ross (1992) finds that positive attitudes are associated with improved free time and economic activities, while the negative ones are associated with increased cost of accommodation.

Gambling is a trend that is fast becoming an important source of income for many communities, in spite of the controversy that it circulates and causes serious social and economic consequences. Pizam & Pokela (1985) conducted a survey in two municipalities in Massachusetts. The results point out that residents of these communities believe that the establishment of casinos can improve living standards, create employment opportunities and increase the possibility of recreation and entertainment. However, other residents feared that casino will create a negative image of the city and increase the percentage of crime.

Perdies, Long & Allen (1990) developed a model that examines the relationship between the perception of residents towards tourism impacts and their support for tourism. It was discovered that when the personal benefits from tourism are controlled, residents with a positive perception of tourism impact support additional tourism development and specific development policy. Also, the model assumes that the restrictive policy's support, special tourism taxes and fees will negatively affect the support for further tourism development. This model consists of 17 questions that measure attitudes and perceptions of residents. To obtain the answers, the authors used the five-point Likert scale. The survey was conducted in May, 1987 in 16 settlements in Colorado as a part of a development project for rural development. The aim of this study was to test the model and examine perceptions of rural residents, but also to examine the relationship between perceived impacts and support of residents for further development of tourism and specific development policy.

The methodology and hypothesis of the current research

The model used in this research is the one used by Perdue et al. (1990), now modified according to the level of development of tourism in Subotica. Some questions have to be reformulated, or customized in the spirit of the Serbian language, but without changing the meaning of the main issues. From the original model, which consists of 17 statements, 11 are taken over, while 7 statements are excluded from the survey because the original questionnaire was designed for the countries with a high level of tourism development. Instead of these 7 statements, 8 new ones are added, adapted to the level of tourism development in Subotica.

The first part of the questionnaire contains sociodemographic questions: gender of respondents, age, education level, occupation and number of years of residence in Subotica, as well as the question of whether they are employed in the tourism industry, because we want to examine whether employees in tourism differently perceive tourism impacts in comparison to residents who are not employed in tourism. The second part of the questionnaire contains 18 dependent variables for which the five-point Likert scale is used (1 – strongly disagree, 2 – partly disagree, 3 – indefinite, 4 – partly agree, 5 – absolutely agree). The last question is a closed type one, and the respondents were able to choose one of the answers concerning Subotica's main potential for tourism development.

The following initial hypotheses are set in the study:

- H1: The positive impacts of tourism on an individual are primarily viewed through an economic dimension, i.e. the development of tourism will bring economic benefit to the city and will impact the unemployment.
- H2: The responses differ significantly according to the gender of the respondents.
- H3: The City Hall, the symbol of the city centre, represents the greatest potential for tourism development in Subotica.
- H4: A lot of tourists in the city would bother the locals, because this would affect their everyday life.

Research results

The survey was conducted during summer, 2014 in the municipality of Subotica. It was conducted electronically - an online questionnaire was created and distributed to the target segments through social networks and forums. Target segments consisted of Subotica residents of all ages, different professions and education levels. A total of 120 valid surveys were collected.

The first part of the research relates to sociodemographic characteristics of local residents. All questions with percentage answers are shown in Table 1. From Table 1, it can be concluded that females dominate the sample, 66.7% of the sample, while the males are represented by 33.3%. The data about the age of the respondents tell us that 53.3% of the respondents that took part in the study were 18 to 30 years of age, because this group most widely uses social networks through which questionnaire was distributed, in comparison to the group of those over 60 years of age, which makes 5% of the participants. The basic assumption is that the members of this age group do not use social networks as often as young people, so that is probably the reason why their percentage in this sample is very small.

The largest number of the respondents, 59.2%, finished secondary school and those with elementary education make 2.5% of the respondents. The number of respondents who finished post-secondary education occupies a significant part of the sample, 34.2%. Analyzing the profession of respondents, it can be noted that the majority of them are either working population or employees. The second and third places are taken by the students and the unemployed, respectively. Pensioners occupy a small

part of the sample, which goes in favour of the above mentioned, that a small number of people over 60 were surveyed because they do not use social networks. Asked how long they lived in Subotica, 32,5% of them answered that they lived there for more than 31 years. 27,5% of the respondents lived there 21-25 years. Other groups in the sample occupy a small part.

Table 1: *Sociodemographic characteristics of respondents*

	Frequency	Percentage
1. Gender		
Male	40	33,3
Female	80	66,7
2. Age		
18-30	64	53,3
34-45	38	31,7
46-60	12	10,0
Over 60	6	5,0
3. Education		
Primary school	3	2,5
Secondary school	71	59,2
Advanced school/university	41	34,2
Master	5	4,2
4. Occupation		
Pupil	2	1,7
Student	33	27,5
Employed	67	55,8
Unemployed	11	9,2
Pensioner	7	5,8
5. Duration of life in Subotica		
0-5 years	7	5,8
6-10 years	4	3,3
11-15 years	6	5,0
16-20 years	12	10,0
21-25 years	33	27,5
26-30 years	19	15,8
31 and more	39	32,5
6. Employment in tourism		
Yes	17	14,2
No	103	85,8

Source: *The work of authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v.20*

Employees in the tourism industry are the most familiar with the attractions of Subotica and with the real situation about tourism in Subotica, so they are the most relevant segment to examine. The question “Are you employed in tourism” is added to the questionnaire in order to compare attitudes of respondents employed in tourism and those employed in other industries to determine whether there is a difference in the responses. Most of the respondents replied that they are not employed in the tourism sector, even 85.8%, so further analysis of this question is not done because the answers would not be relevant.

The answers given to the question what they consider as Subotica’s potential in tourism development are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: *Subotica’s potentials in tourism development*

Potentials	Frequency	Percentage
City Hall	33	27,5
Raichle House	2	1,7
Sacral objects	3	2,5
Monuments	1	0,8
Festivals	46	38,3
Natural attractions	31	25,8
Sociable inhabitants	1	0,8
Gastronomic specialties	3	2,5

Source: *The work of authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v.20*

According to the survey, festivals are the greatest potential for tourism development in Subotica, and their part in the sample is 38.3%. On the second place is the magnificent the City Hall building, the legacy of Maria Theresia, with 27.5%. Natural attractions are also one of the potentials of Subotica with high percentage of 25.8%, while other potentials occupy only a small part of the sample. From the results, it can be concluded that Hypothesis 3, the City Hall is the greatest potential of Subotica, is not confirmed. The assumption is that the local residents are not informed enough about the importance of tourist attractions in town for tourism development, therefore they do not consider it crucial for tourism development.

Results of descriptive statistical analysis

A total of 18 questions can be divided into four groups, according to four different factors. Factor 1 (F1) *Positive effects of tourism development* is

tested with 6 questions. Factor 2 (F2) *Negative effects of tourism development* is tested with 5 questions; factor 3 (F3) *Support the tourism development* has 4 questions, and *Potentials of Subotica for tourism development* (F4) has 3 questions (Table 3). Factor 1 - *Positive effects of tourism development* has the greatest value of the arithmetic mean (4.2986), while the smallest is given to *Negative effects of tourism development* (2.5333). Top marks were given to the statement “Tourism development would bring economic benefits to Subotica” (4.6333), while the statement “Development of tourism would reduce the quality of outdoor recreation” (2.1417) got the lowest mark.

The lowest value of the standard deviation has the Factor 1 - *Positive effects of tourism* (F1) 0.926681667, and the highest is given to the Factor 2 - *Negative effects of tourism development* (F2), 1.28919. The maximum deviation has a statement “Tourists should pay higher price of tickets to tourist sites in relation to the local population” (1.50768), while the slightest deviation is pointed to the statement “Tourism development would bring economic benefits to Subotica” (.74398).

Within the positive effects of tourism development (F1), “Tourism development would bring economic benefits to Subotica” (4.6333) received the highest rating statement, and “I think I would have benefits of tourism development”, got the lowest mark (3.6250). Overall high score of the factor *Positive effects of tourism development* (4.2986) leads to the conclusion that the local residents would positively receive tourism developments and impacts. Since this research was done on the basis of randomly selected respondents, we cannot find out the opinions of all residents of Subotica.

F2 - *Negative effects of tourism development* has a rating of 2.53334. This factor has 5 questions of which the statement “Tourism development reduces the quality of outdoor recreation opportunities” (2.1417) has the lowest grade; “Tourism development increases traffic problems” (2.7667) has the highest. Within this factor, the statement: “Too many tourists would cause noise and disrupt citizens” is given a low mark (2.3750), that leads to the conclusion that Hypothesis 4, i.e. Too many tourists would disturb the local residents because this would influence their everyday life, is not confirmed.

Within the F3 - *Support the tourism development* statement: “Better tourist propaganda would present Subotica as an interesting tourist place”

is given the highest mark (4.3250), and the statement: “Local government should control development of tourism” got the lowest one (4.1333). This factor has a rating of 3.40625 and the value of standard deviation of 1.2289.

Table 3: *Results of descriptive statistics analysis*

FACTORS AND QUESTIONS	Arithm. mean	Std. Deviation
F1 – POSITIVE EFFECTS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT	4.2986	0.9266816
Tourism development would bring economic benefits to Subotica.	4.6333	.74398
Tourism development would increase the quality of life.	4.3250	.88082
Tourism development would embellish the appearance of the city.	4.5583	.75366
Built facilities for tourism would be useful to residents of Subotica.	4.3667	.86901
Tourism development would impact unemployment.	4.2833	1.02230
I think I would have benefits of tourism development.	3.6250	1.29032
F2 – NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT	2.53334	1.28919
Tourism development can make traffic problems.	2.7667	1.35803
Tourism development would increase property taxes.	2.6333	1.13710
Tourism development would increase the amount of crime.	2.7500	1.31091
Tourism development would reduce the quality of outdoor recreation.	2.1417	1.30478
Too many tourists would cause noise and disrupt citizens.	2.3750	1.33513
F3 – SUPPORT FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT	3.40625	1.2289
Better tourist propaganda would present Subotica as an interesting tourist place.	4.3250	.88082
Local government should control tourism development.	4.1333	1.06852
Tourists should pay a special tax on hotel room fees.	2.4167	1.45858
Tourists should pay higher ticket prices to tourist sites compared to the local population.	2.7500	1.50768
F4 – POTENTIALS OF SUBOTICA FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT	3.6611	1.1643433
Subotica is an ideal place for tourism development.	3.9917	1.13386
Subotica has a rich offer of tourist facilities.	3.7333	1.10563
The future of Subotica in terms of tourism looks bright.	3.2583	1.25354

Source: *The work of the authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v.20*

For Potentials of Subotica for tourism development (F4) arithmetic mean is 3.6611, and the standard deviation is 1.1643433. The statement with the highest grade is: “Subotica is the ideal place for the development of tourism” (3.9917), and the statement with the lowest grade is: “Future of

Subotica in terms of tourism looks good” (3.2583). According to the results of descriptive statistics analysis, it can be concluded that local population in Subotica has a positive attitude towards the development and impacts of tourism in their city.

The analysis of the questionnaire reliability

The reliability of the questionnaire was tested by using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient (Table 4). The results indicate that the value of Cronbach’s alpha coefficients exceed the value of 0.7 (Kaiser, 1974) in all factors that are in the domain of high reliability.

Table 4: *The analysis of the questionnaire reliability*

Factors	Reliability (Cronbach's alpha)
Positive effects of tourism development	0,970
Negative effects of tourism development	0,981
Support for tourism development	0,930
Potentials of Subotica for tourism development	0,965

Source: *The work of the authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v.20*

The results of t-test

T-test of independent samples was applied in order to compare arithmetic means of responses between male and female (Table 5).

Table 5: *T-test results by gender*

Factors	Arithmetic mean		T - value	p*
	Male (n=40)	Female (n=80)		
Positive effects of tourism development	3,2917	4,8021	-15,085	,000
Negative effects of tourism development	1,1400	3,2300	-14,240	,000
Support for tourism development	2,1000	4,0594	-15,115	,000
Potentials of Subotica for tourism development	2,3500	4,3167	-15,892	,000

Source: *The work of the authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v.20*

Note: * $p < 0.01$

Based on the analysis of the results, it is concluded that there are significant differences in responses based on gender in all factors at the level of significance of $p < 0.01$ within factor F1, or Positive effects of tourism development. The difference reflects in that female members gave positive answers to questions concerning the quality of life in the city. Generally, male respondents gave lower marks to all factors, but the lowest mark was given to factor Negative effects of tourism development. This leads to the conclusion that they are probably not aware of negative impacts of tourism development, or they believe there are no negative effects. This analysis confirmed the Hypothesis 2, i.e., The answers of the respondents significantly differ in relation to gender.

Results of variance ANOVA

Analysis of variance ANOVA, questions whether between dependent variables (questions related to attitudes towards the development of tourism) and independent variables (socio-demographic characteristic of n) there is a statistically significant correlation. Independent variables included in this study are: age, education and occupation. The results of one-way analysis of variance for identified factors indicated that on the level of significance of $p < 0.01$, there are significant differences in the responses in relation to the age of the respondents. To get a glimpse of the age between which there are significant differences LSD post-hoc test was applied (Table 6).

Table 6: ANOVA analysis of variance by age structures

Factors	AGE				F - value	p	LSD post-hoc test
	18-30 years	31-45 years	46 - 60 years	Over 60			
F1	3,7266	4,9298	5,0000	5,0000	36,625	,000*	1<2,3,4
F2	1,5406	3,2947	4,2167	4,9333	194,150	,000*	1<2,3,4
F3	2,4648	4,2500	4,9583	5,0000	180,932	,000*	1<2,3,4
F4	2,8542	4,3860	5,0000	5,0000	63,234	,000*	1<2,3,4

Source: The work of the authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v.20

Note: * $p < 0,01$

Based on the data given in Table 6, one can conclude that the dominant age group, 18 to 30 years of age, gave the lowest score to all factors, but

the factor Positive effects of tourism development was given a relatively high score.

The results of the analysis lead to the conclusion that people, regardless of age, positively accept tourism development. On the other hand, all the groups gave lower marks to the factor Negative effects of tourism development, which leads to the assumption that they are not aware of all the negative impacts and consequences what tourism can have on the population and attractiveness.

Table 7 shows the results of one-way analysis of the variance between the identified factors and the level of education. People with the highest level of education, i.e. those who completed master studies, gave high marks to all factors. People who completed only primary school are scarce in the sample, so their responses cannot be considered relevant.

Table 7: *Analysis of variance ANOVA by education level*

Factors	EDUCATION				F - value	p*	LSD post-hoc test
	Primary school	High school	College	Master			
F1	1,3333	3,9836	4,9756	5,0000	56,069	,000*	1<2,3,4
F2	1,0000	1,7296	3,7415	4,9600	130,736	,000*	1,2<3,4
F3	1,1667	2,7183	4,5671	5,0000	116,614	,000*	1,2<3,4
F4	1,0000	3,1033	4,6585	5,0000	61,804	,000*	1<2,3,4

Source: *the work of authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v. 20*

Note: * $p < 0.01$

The last variable that was analyzed is a profession of respondents. The results of variance ANOVA by the profession of respondents are presented in Table 8. It can be seen that the unemployed respondents gave the highest marks to Positive effects of tourism and Potentials for tourism development, which leads to the conclusion that they are interested in development and progress of tourism because they see the possibility of employment in it and an improved quality of life. This confirms the Hypothesis 1, Residents perceive the development of tourism primarily through economic benefits, i.e. the unemployed see tourism as a chance for employment.

Table 8: *Analysis of variance ANOVA by occupation*

Factors	PROFESSION					F - value	LSD post-hoc test
	Pupil	Student	Employed	Unemployed	Pensioner		
F1	1,1667	3,3081	4,6915	5,0000	5,0000	96,608	1<2,3,4,5
F2	1,000	1,0788	2,7791	4,1818	4,8857	114,157	1,2,3<4,5
F3	1,1250	2,0909	3,7015	4,9545	5,0000	89,444	1,2<3,4,5
F4	1,0000	2,2424	4,0796	5,000	5,000	133,911	1,2<3,4,5

Source: *The work of the authors based on the analysis in SPSS, v.20*

Note: * $p < 0.01$

Summary

Subotica is the northernmost city of the Republic of Serbia and because of its location, it has great potential for tourism development. A large number of natural and anthropogenic tourism attractions is a sufficient basis for the development of tourism. Considering that the development of tourism brings various impacts, both positive and negative in nature, it is essential to inform the local residents about them. Tourism development largely depends on the local population, and the degree in which they accept the development. It is important to examine the attitudes of the population to the impacts of development, as it can be of great help for tourism development planners to identify the real problems and to take appropriate action to resolve them.

The subject of this paper was the attitudes of local residents of Subotica towards impacts of tourism development. The analysis of the results shows that respondents believe that the development of tourism should bring many positive impacts, improve living conditions and bring some economic benefits.

Recently, festivals have become more attractive for tourists and for locals, too. They stimulate the sense of pride in the community and represent an

important potential for tourism development. The results show that local residents of Subotica consider festivals as the greatest potential for tourism development, and it is not unusual because festivals are becoming increasingly popular and have the ability to attract a large number of people to a certain place. The fact that festivals are the most attractive potential in favour of tourism development testifies that tourism industry is changing, and that new ways of satisfying tourists needs should be looked for.

This survey tested the residents of Subotica selected randomly. They showed that they are interested in the idea of tourist offer, but also they are worried about some negative effects that tourism can bring with itself. It goes without saying that the greatest support is given by those who are dependent on tourism and the hotel owners. To work on the development of tourism, it is important to take into account all the direct and indirect aspects that influence tourism development. It means the understanding of the present situation, imagining future, analysis of strategic options, establishing priorities and making responsible decisions.

The general conclusion of this study is that Subotica has a favorable geographical location, significant nature values, rich cultural heritage because of the multi culture present at the area, good offer of tourist attractions, created infrastructure and inhabitants who are ready to support Subotica's tourist offer.

Literature

1. Belisle, F. & Hoy, D. (1980): *The Perceived Impact of Tourism by Residents: A Case Study in Santa Marta, Columbia*, Annals of Tourism Research, 7 (1), 83-101
2. Bourgham, J. E., & Butler, R. W. (1981): *A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism*, Annals of Tourism Research, 8 (4), 569-90.
3. Harrill, R. (2004): *Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: a Literature Review with Implications for Tourism Planning*, Journal of Planning Literature, 18 (3), 251-256.
4. Kaiser, H. F. (1974): *An Index of Factorial Simplicity*, Psychometrika, 39 (1), 31-36.

5. Liu, J.C. & Var, T. (1986): *Resident Attitudes toward Tourism Impact in Hawaii*, Annals of Tourism Research, 13 (2), 193-214.
6. Liu J., Sheldon, P. & Var, T. (1987): *Resident perception of the environmental impacts of tourism*, Annals of Tourism Research 14, 17-34.
7. Mason, P. & Cheyne J. (2000): *Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development*, Annals of Tourism Research 27 (2), 391-411.
8. Milman, A. & Pizam, A. (1988): *Social Impacts of Tourism on Central Florida*, Annals of Tourism Research, 15 (2), 191-204.
9. Miljanić, U. & Tepavčević, J. (2013): *Location and exterior as a quality elements*, Naučni skup sa međunarodnim učesćem CTTH 2013, Novi Sad.
10. Pizam, A. (1978): *Tourism's Impacts: The Social Costs to the Destination Community as Perceived by its Residents*, Journal of Travel Research, 16 (4), 8-12.
11. Pizam, A. & Pokela, J. (1985): *The perceived impacts of casino gambling on a community*, Annals of Tourism Research, 12 (2), 147-65.
12. Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990): *Resident Support for Tourism Development*, Annals of Tourism Research, 17 (4), 586-599.
13. Ross, G. F. (1992): *Resident perceptions of the impact of tourism on an Australian city*, Journal of Travel Research 30, 3: 13-17.
14. Sheldon, P. J. & Var, T. (1984): *Resident Attitudes to Tourism in North Wales*, Tourism Management, 5 (1), 40-47.
15. Tomljenović, R. & Faulkner, B. (1999): *Tourism and older residents in a sunbelt resort*, Annals of Tourism Research, 27 (1), 93-114.
16. Var, T., Kendall, K.W., & Tarakcioglu, E. (1985): *Resident attitudes towards tourists in a Turkish resort town*, Annals of Tourism Research 12, 4: 652-58.