



Property Owners' Attitudes Toward Sustainable Tourism: Comparing Coastal And Mountain Counties

By: Huili Hao, **Carol Kline**, Patrick Long, & Gary Rassel

Abstract

This study explored factors influencing property owners' attitudes toward tourism development in two very different counties in North Carolina: one coastal (n=854) and one in the mountains (n=619). Attitudes toward the impact of tourism and sustainable tourism development were compared for permanent and second-home residents and between the two counties. Findings include the fact that 22% of property owners in the coast and 12.8% of property owners in the mountains thought that the impact of tourism in their community was such that they wished they lived or owned property elsewhere. Permanent homeowners were more likely than second homeowners to have this opinion. Second homeowners in both counties perceived that they had little or no influence over tourism-related issues, a perception stronger in the coastal county than mountain.

Hao, H., et al. (2016). "Property owners' attitudes toward sustainable tourism: Comparing coastal and mountain counties." *Tourism and Hospitality Research*: 1467358416667776. Publisher version of record available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1467358416667776>

Property Owners' Attitudes Toward Sustainable Tourism: Comparing Coastal and Mountain Counties

Huili Hao

University of North Carolina, Wilmington, USA

Carol Kline

Appalachian State University, USA

Patrick Long

East Carolina University, USA

Gary Rassel

University of North Carolina at Charlotte, USA

Abstract

This study explored factors influencing property owners' attitudes toward tourism development in two very different counties in North Carolina: one coastal (n¼854) and one in the mountains (n¼619). Attitudes toward the impact of tourism and sustainable tourism development were compared for permanent and second-home residents and between the two counties. Findings include the fact that 22% of property owners in the coast and 12.8% of property owners in the mountains thought that the impact of tourism in their community was such that they wished they lived or owned property elsewhere. Permanent homeowners were more likely than second homeowners to have this opinion. Second homeowners in both counties perceived that they had little or no influence over tourism-related issues, a perception stronger in the coastal county than mountain.

Keywords

Second homeowner, permanent resident, sustainable actions, tourism impacts, political influence

Introduction

Despite the potentially positive impacts of tourism, rapid and unplanned conventional tourism development can also produce adverse sociocultural and environmental effects. To reduce these negative impacts, more benign forms of tourism such as ecotourism, agro-tourism, and nature-based tourism development have evolved. These alternative forms of tourism can be collectively considered components of a larger developmental paradigm called sustainable tourism (Sirakaya-Turk et al., 2008).

Residents of many communities, recognizing the benefits of tourism but aware of possible adverse impacts have sought ways to make tourism more sustainable. Advocates of this approach find that broad stakeholder support is essential to achieve sustainable tourism development at the community level (Aas et al., 2005; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Byrd, 2007; Choi and

Sirakaya, 2005). The extent to which members of a community have input, feel ownership, and participate in the planning and development of their own tourism industry helps shape the direction and degree of the economic, socio-, and environmental impacts of tourism development (Byrd, 2007; Choi and Murray, 2010). Hence, understanding the extent to which local and seasonal residents view tourism and actively support sustainable development is crucial for tourism business owners, planners, developers, government officials, and other stakeholders. The views of these homeowner-stakeholders are also key to understanding which activities

Corresponding author:

Huili Hao, Department of Environmental Studies University of North Carolina Wilmington 601 S. College Rd. Wilmington, NC 28403-5949, USA.

Email: haoh@uncw.edu

of policy makers and commercial enterprises will be most readily acceptable in sustainable tourism.

One research area in sustainable tourism focuses on developing sustainability indicators (Choi and Sirakaya, 2005; Cottrell et al., 2004; Innes and Booher, 2000; McCool and Stankey, 2004; Miller, 2001). Because communities differ in built and natural environments, economic structures, socioeconomic compositions, and needs and expectations of tourism, sustainable tourism indicators are likely to be subjective and need to be tailored to particular community situations (Johnson and Tyrrell, 2005). However, few researchers have tested sustainable tourism indicators in varied and diverse settings. The few empirical studies examining residents' attitudes regarding sustainable tourism development primarily focused on full-time local residents. Considering the extent of second-home ownership in tourism destination communities, the attitudes of second homeowners regarding sustainable tourism development would appear to be equally important to that of full-time residents. As well, few studies compare attitudes and indicators across different types of communities experiencing rapid tourism growth.

The current research attempts to fill these gaps by identifying and exploring factors related to property owners' attitudes (full-time residents and second-home property owners) toward the impact of tourism and sustainable actions in tourism development in two amenity-rich communities: a coastal community with a predominance of second-home properties and a mountain community with a growing, but smaller proportion of second-home properties. The research questions identified for this study include:

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied are property owners with the impacts of tourism development in their community? Does length of residence affect their attitude? Is a difference found between full-time residents and second homeowners?
2. To what degree do homeowners feel that they have political influence over tourism issues in the county? Does their perceived political influence relate to their attitude about tourism? Is a difference found between full-time residents and second homeowners?
3. What factors relate to property owners' perceptions of the importance of sustainable actions in tourism development? Are these factors different for full-time residents and second homeowners?
4. Do the attitudes and perceptions of permanent homeowners and second homeowners differ in different communities?

Stakeholder perceptions

Sustainable tourism can be an instrument to address adverse effects of traditional mass tourism and achieve longer term viability of a destination. Bramwell and Lane (1993) suggested that sustainable tourism is a positive scheme that would reduce the tension and friction resulting from the complicated interactions among tourism stakeholders: the host communities and government, industry, tourists, and the natural environment. Likewise, Aas et al. (2005) emphasize the necessity for stakeholder collaboration and involvement in management of a destination's resources. The predominant focus of sustainable tourism research has been to identify how tourism destinations can be economically viable and profitably maintained while minimizing negative environmental effects and by doing so, preserving the natural and cultural resources and future generations of tourists (Dolnicar et al., 2008). Hunter (1995) suggested that multiple stakeholders' participation should be required when the community develops its vision, goals, and objectives. Sharpley (2000) maintained that sustainable tourism implies integrated public planning that attempts to balance the needs of three critical elements comprising tourism development: community members, visitors, and the tourism industry.

Researchers have studied residents' attitudes toward tourism extensively over the past three decades (Allen et al., 1993; Almeida-García et al., 2016; Huh and Vogt, 2008; McCool and Martin, 1994; McGehee and Andereck, 2004; Mason and Cheyne, 2000), however such examination began much earlier (Pizam, 1978; Williams, 1979). To explain resident attitudes toward tourism, researchers have investigated the relationship between attitudes and respondents' demographic, social, and economic characteristics including gender, age, income, education, personal benefits from tourism, degree of community attachment, residential tenure, and residents' economic dependence on tourism. In general, no consistent role of socioeconomic factors has been found in explaining residents' attitudes toward tourism development (McCool and Martin, 1994; McGehee and Andereck, 2004). Some researchers have found that economic dependence on tourism and personal benefits from tourism are positively related to residents' attitude toward tourism (Deccio and Baloglu, 2002). Recently, Almeida-García et al. (2016) found negative attitude toward tourism to be correlated with residential tenure, native-born status, and educational attainment.

Ap (1992) sought to answer, from a theoretical perspective, why residents expressed positive or negative

attitudes toward tourism development by applying social exchange theory. This theory suggests that residents evaluate tourism development in terms of expected benefits or costs experienced in return for their services. From a tourism development perspective, social exchange theory assumes that property owners' attitudes toward tourism are influenced by their evaluations of the actual and perceived impacts tourism has in their community (Andereck et al., 2005). Although the majority of tourism attitude literature focuses on residents' needs, perceptions, and requests, one goal for tourism development is to achieve a balance of benefits and costs across stakeholders (Ap, 1992). In more recent years, tourism planners and developers have adopted cultural, environmental, and economic sustainability as a key goal (Byrd, 2007; Choi and Murray, 2010; Sharpley, 2000). Second-home property owners are an important emerging stakeholder group in many amenity-rich destination communities and thus should be involved in the tourism development planning and management process (Hao et al., 2014). Particularly in Nordic settings, some second homeowner research has been conducted (Lundberg, 2016; Müller, 2002, 2007), however, not much exists regarding the east coast of the U.S., where the majority of the national population resides.

Because the second-home economy is a major economic engine in some tourism communities and revenue from construction of second homes along with property taxes on second homes are major resources for public service provision, it could be argued that second-home owners' attitudes regarding tourism are equally important to that of full-time residents (Müller, 2002). However, very little research compares the attitudes of permanent and second home-owners. A recent study by Lundberg (2016) found that more than residency type, local involvement has a greater significance on the attitudes of different resident groups. Additionally because both tourism impacts and resident attitudes toward tourism are shaped by site-specific conditions (Tosun, 2002), it is critical to assess local contexts to determine how these impacts and interactions play out. The current study combines the principles of Social Exchange Theory with the Tourism Area Life Cycle model (TALC) to examine two cases in North Carolina. Butler (1980) proposed that tourist destinations go through a life cycle of various stages including *exploration*, *involvement*, *development*, *consolidation*, and *rejuvenation*. Although Butler's model has been applied widely in different political contexts and sociospatial situations (Butler, 1994, 2006a; Gale and Botterill, 2005;

Weaver, 2006; Williams and Shaw, 1997), the main analytical focus of the model is the evolving tourist numbers and their impacts on the transforming local character of the destination (Butler, 2004, 2006b). Butler (2004) points out that "the nature of much contemporary destination development... would suggest that lessons have not been learned from some of the failures of the past, and therefore the [TALC] is still highly relevant in the applied sense" (17). The model can be applied to the two counties within this study to "describe and interpret destination development in varying locations" (Butler, 2004: 167).

Attitudes toward sustainable tourism in two counties

This research seeks to address the scarcity of research on local and seasonal residents' attitudes toward the impact of tourism and the importance of sustainable actions in tourism development, by examining resident perceptions in two North Carolina tourist destinations: Dare County, a tourism dependent, second-home-dominant coastal area and Macon County, a mountain destination, whose economy depends greatly on tourism although less so than Dare.

Dare County

The natural resources, climate, and reputation as a family destination of the North Carolina coast attract 9.5 million travelers a year (North Carolina Division of Tourism, Film and Sports Development (2012a)). Following designation of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in 1953 and completion in 1963 of a major bridge connecting two key land masses of the "Outer Banks" barrier islands of North Carolina, oceanfront building increased dramatically and the county's economic structure transitioned from commercial fishing to tourism. Dare County is a significant part of the state's Outer Banks tourism destination region, with estimates of 2012 visitor expenditures at \$926,320,000 (North Carolina Division of Tourism, Film, and Sports Development, 2012c). Researchers estimate that Dare County supports services for a population nearly seven times the size of its full-time resident population.

Applying Butler's TALC would describe Dare County as moving from the development stage to the consolidation stage. Butler (1980) describes tourism destinations in the development stage as those exhibiting a decline in local involvement and control, the introduction of modern facilities operated by nonlocal organizations, reliance on imported labor for tourism

industry, predominance of tourists over permanent local residents during peak seasons, and a changing physical appearance. Dare County has experienced many of these phenomena. Property owners whose main residence is outside of Dare County own over 70% of the county's housing stock either for investment or personal use. Thus, the number of second homeowners or renters equals or exceeds the permanent local population during peak season. Many of these properties have been greatly altered from their original "cottage" appearance to a new large, modern esthetic. In 2010, the year-round population in Dare County was 33,920 (U.S. Census State and County QuickFacts, 2012); the County's Planning Department estimated the seasonal population peak to be approximately 200,000. Many of the local food services, recreation, and entertainment companies rely on Eastern European employees during the peak season. Dare County's economy is structured to support the tourist orientation particularly as they relate to (1) construction, where homes and businesses are built for a growing tourist and retiree population; (2) retail trade, ranging from souvenir shops to grocery stores; (3) real estate, the renting and selling of beach houses and second homes; and, (4) leisure and hospitality services, meeting the recreation, accommodations, and food services needs of both residents and visitors (Kleckley, 2008). The marketing and advertising from the regional convention and visitor bureau is wide reaching and designed to extend the visitor season and market area. The tourism economy provides some economic stability for Dare County but has come at the price of cultural and environmental erosion. Local residents lament that they no longer know their neighbors and that tourists sometimes even sabotage the commercial fisherman's nets and catches (Lee, 2008). With escalating increases in property values and taxes, many locals complain that they won't be able to afford to live in their hometown anymore. Some residents have also become irritated by the number of tourists, and the fact that private entrepreneurs and public economic developers provide more and more amenities to meet tourist demands and expand infrastructure to accommodate increasing tourist flows. With increasing incidents of negative resident responses to tourism and diminished community capacity, Dare County is fast approaching the peak level of its carrying capacity and may eventually reach stagnation.

According to Butler's model, following the stagnation stage, the community faces rejuvenation or decline. Researchers suggest two ways to address the changes and challenges required to move from stagnation to rejuvenation: local acceptability and more sustainable development of tourism (Manning, 1999; Sheldon and Abenoja, 2001). Manning (1999) states

that local acceptability must be considered in addition to matching product supply with tourist demand during further tourism development. Recognizing the import of sustainable development in the area, community groups including local residents, commercial businesses, civic organizations, and vacationers as "adopted locals" in Dare County created a BlueGreen Outer Banks Initiative. Also recognizing local interest in solar and wind energy, as well as the popularity of eco-friendly activities such as surfing, kayaking, and running, the Initiative created "BlueGreen Community Standards" to certify local businesses, restaurants, and rental homes as being environmentally appropriate. Energy audits are to be used to establish certification sustained by an annual review. In addition, BlueGreen tries to nourish the local arts and crafts tourism-related industry by producing items made from local and natural materials.

Macon County

Macon County is located in the mountains of southwest North Carolina, approximately 460 miles to the west of Dare County. The county has a long history as progressive, leading the growth and development of businesses with a local economy dominated by agriculture until the 1950s. Beginning in the 1960s, Macon County became home to several manufacturing companies. During the 1980s, the economy began to shift toward second home and tourism development, a primary market being residents from the city of Atlanta, Georgia (current population 420,000), just two and a half hours to the south by car (U.S. Census QuickFacts, 2012). Since the mid-1990s, the second-home market and nature-based and cultural tourism have become an increasingly important part of the local economy. As of 2010, over 32% of the housing units in Macon County were for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use; approximately 25% of the labor force was employed in construction of second homes or the leisure and tourism industry (U.S. Census QuickFacts, 2012). An important segment of the retail trade industry is also significantly affected by tourism. The future economic health of Macon County is constantly being assessed by its many and varied stakeholder groups including the tourists who visit, public policy makers, business owners and operators, as well as resident and second-home property owners. In contrast to Dare County, 69% of homeowners in Macon County were full-time residents while 31% were second homeowners whose primary residence was elsewhere.

As of 2010, Macon County population was 33,922 (U.S. Census QuickFacts, 2012). In area it covers 517 miles² (1339 km²); 46% is owned by the U.S. Forest Service. Living on Forest Service land is

prohibited, however it is open for visitors. Unlike Dare County, whose normal mean temperature in the winter season ranges between 40 and 45°F (4–7°C) and 80 and 85°F (26–29°C) in the summer, Macon County is mountainous; temperatures range between 25 and 40°F (minus 4–4°C) in the winter and 55–75°F (13–24°C) in the summer (State Climate Office of North Carolina, n.d.). The winter is longer in Macon County, and overall the temperatures in the summer are much milder, therefore the region is used as an escape from the summer heat of large cities and warmer areas of the southeastern U.S. However, the temperatures and the proclivity for snow make Macon County subject to greater seasonality in its tourism market.

Visitor expenditures in Macon County in 2012 were \$135,760,000 (North Carolina Division of Tourism, Film, and Sports Development, 2012c). The occupancy tax rate in Dare County is 5%; total collections in 2011–2012 were USD \$15.4 million, of which \$3,832,000 was returned to the Visitor Bureau for further marketing. In comparison, the occupancy tax rate in Macon County is 3% and their 2011–2012 collections were USD \$508,000. Macon County does not have a visitor bureau, but instead houses two Chambers of Commerce in the towns of Highlands and Franklin, each of which operates a tourism development authority; these entities received \$467,630 for marketing from the occupancy tax collections (North Carolina Division of Tourism, Film, and Sports Development, 2012b). Besides scenic waterfalls and mountainous vistas, the tourism product in Macon County centers around outdoor recreation, mountain heritage and craft, the history of Scottish Tartan roots, the historical gem and mining industries, and upscale dining and boutique shopping in Highlands (Franklin North Carolina Chamber of Commerce, 2013). Related to Butler's lifecycle, the town of Franklin in Macon County is in the Development stage, while the town of Highlands is in the Consolidation stage.

Poverty in Macon County decreased between 1990 and 2000 and has been below NC average since 2000. However, in 2010 unemployment rose to about 13%, well above the state average. Based on Butler's tourism life cycle model, Macon County tourism has never evolved as far as Dare County. Although more dependent on tourism than in previous years, Macon County is not nearly as dominated by transient tourists and tourism-related development.

Methods

Separate surveys were conducted in each county. The Dare County survey was completed prior to beginning the survey in Macon County; however, similar sampling and survey procedures were used for each

county. The study samples consisted of two distinct groups: full-time permanent property owners and single family residence second homeowners. The Geographic Information System Tax Records of each county provided a list of the county's housing stock from which samples of both resident and second-home property owners were selected. In Dare County, a random sample of 4000 permanent resident and 4000 second-home property owners was selected in November 2008; the sample was drawn by selecting every "Xth" name on the record. These property owners received a cover letter by postal mail inviting them to visit the study's website and complete an online questionnaire or request a hard copy of the questionnaire be sent to them. A follow-up postcard was mailed three weeks after the initial mailing to everyone in the sample. The study garnered 858 usable surveys for a response rate of 11%.

In Macon County, the sample included the full population of single family second-home property owners, 2517, and a random sample of 50% (2742) of the 5483 full-time permanent property owners. In June 2009, members of this sample were sent a cover letter inviting them to visit the study's website, insert a participant code number, and complete an online questionnaire. Recipients could also request a hard copy of the questionnaire. Follow-up postcards were mailed three weeks and six weeks after the initial mailing. Six hundred and nineteen usable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 11.8%.

The Dare and Macon survey solicited opinions on the importance of a range of sustainable actions to the county's tourism economy on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Sustainable action indicators represented those actions identified and promoted by Sustainable Travel International (STI), an internationally recognized nongovernmental organization (NGO) created to affect change in all aspects of sustainability within the tourism industry. They are as follows: reducing and managing greenhouse gas emissions; managing, reducing, and recycling solid waste; reducing consumption of our freshwater; managing wastewater; being energy efficient; conserving the natural environment; use of public land for tourism; protecting air quality; protecting water quality (used on the Macon County survey only); reducing noise; preserving the culture/heritage of our local communities; providing economic benefits to local communities; purchasing from companies with certified green practices; and training and educating employees and clients on sustainability practices (STI, n.d.). They were also asked to rank their satisfaction level with tourism development regarding community land use, the economy, service provision, cultural opportunities, infrastructure, and general community life using a 5-point Likert-type scale.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for Dare County and Macon County property owners.

Characteristics	Dare County			Macon County		
	All property owners	Full-time residents	Second homeowners	All property owners	Full-time residents	Second homeowners
Sample size	844	457	384	607	348	259
Percentage male	63%	59.9%	66.7%	95.7%	94.7%	97.7%
Percentage Caucasian	93%	93.4%	92.5%	56%	57.1%	57.4%
Age						
<35 years	2.5%	3.5%	1.3%	2.1%	2.3%	1.2%
35–44 years	9.5%	13.8%	4.4%	6.3%	8.3%	3.5%
45–54 years	23.2%	22.3%	24.5%	19.1%	18.7%	19.1%
55–64 years	36.3%	33.3%	40.1%	37.7%	35.1%	41.3%
65–74 years	22.7%	20.8%	25.0%	25.0%	23.6%	27.0%
75 and over	5.8%	6.3%	4.7%	9.7%	11.5%	7.3%
Household income						
Less than \$24,999	2.4%	3.8%	.6%	8.3%	12.8%	1.7%
\$25,000–\$49,999	15.1%	24.3%	3.3%	22.2%	31.6%	8.9%
\$50,000–\$99,999	35.9%	41.8%	28.4%	33.5%	33.5%	30.2%
\$100,000–\$399,999	44%	29.4%	62.9%	32.6%	19.7%	52.0%
\$400,000 and over	2.4%	.7%	4.6%	3.3%	.6%	7.1%
Education						
Some high school, GED, or high school graduate	7.8%	9.2%	6.1%	9.1%	11.0%	6.5%
Some college, technical, or two-year degree	28.6%	36.0%	19.6%	27.9%	34.3%	19.2%
Bachelor's degree	32.0%	30.7%	33.6%	62.9% ^a	54.7% ^a	74.2% ^a
Postgraduate, professional	31.7%	24.1%	40.7%			

^aThe Macon County survey combined Bachelor's degree and graduate degree categories.

Factor and regression analyses were performed using the questionnaire results. Respondents in both counties were asked about: (1) sociodemographic factors—age, annual household income, level of formal education, and gender; (2) length of property ownership; (3) degree of political influence on issues regarding tourism; (4) property owners' general attitude toward tourism in the community (dummy variable); (5) residential status (full-time resident property owner or second-home property owner). In addition, Macon County respondents were asked (6) if they were in a tourism-related occupation; (7) their level of agreement with the statement that “tourism industry in Macon County is environmentally sustainable”; and, (8) about personal benefits from tourism development.

Results

The descriptive statistics for the Dare and Macon County samples (full-time residents and second-home property owners) are presented in Table 1.

The majority of the 85 Dare County respondents are 45–64 years old (65% of second homeowners and 55% of full-time residents). Over 92% of each group is Caucasian, 53.7% of the resident homeowners, and 71.8% of the second homeowners have at least a college degree. Over 76% of full time and 80% of second-home property owners have annual household incomes above \$50,000 with the second-home property owners showing greater annual household income beginning at the \$100,000 level (30.1–67.5%). Many of the full-time residents may have started out with a second home in Dare County and then retired there thus converting to full-time residents.

Census demographic categories were used to investigate the degree to which the sample represented the resident population. The median age for Dare County reported by North Carolina Department of Commerce is 44 years in 2009; 55.3% of the resident sample falls in the age range of 45–64 years. The racial composition of Dare County is predominantly White (94.7% in 2008); 93.4% of the full-time resident property owner respondents are Caucasian. In 2008,

50.1% of the population in Dare County was male and 59.9% of the resident sample is male. The median household income for Dare County in 2009 is \$53,979. Approximately 50% of the full-time resident respondents fall within the income range of \$50,000–\$99,999. Over 27.7% of the resident population in Dare County has a Bachelor’s or higher degree whereas 53.7% of the full-time resident sample has a Bachelor’s degree or higher.

Approximately 85% of the second-home property owners have their primary residency located in four states: Virginia (42%), North Carolina (32%), Maryland (6%), and Pennsylvania (5%). In the sample, about 85% of the second-home property owner respondents have their primary residency in the same four states with a slightly different distribution: Virginia (55%), North Carolina (11%), Maryland (9%), and Pennsylvania (5%). Thus, it appears that the sample reasonably represents the second-home property owner population in Dare County with regard to location of primary residency.

In Macon County, 619 questionnaires were completed (43% second homeowners and 57% of full time/permanent property owners) for a response rate of 11.8%. The descriptive statistics for the sample are presented in Table 1. Of the 607 respondents shown in the table, the majority are over 55 with the largest number of respondents falling into the 55–64 age group (37.7%). The estimated median age for Macon County residents in 2010 is 49 years (NC Department of Commerce). Over 95% of the comparison groups are Caucasian and over 56% are male. About 63% of the respondents have at least a four-year college degree, full-time residents 55%, and second homeowners 74%. Just under 35% of property owners have annual household incomes at or above \$100,000, full-time residents 21.3%, and second homeowners 59% (see Table 1).

Property owners’ general attitude toward tourism and its impact was measured by asking respondents in both counties the question: “Has tourism reached the point that you wished you lived somewhere else or owned property elsewhere?” To measure support for sustainable tourism, survey participants were asked their opinion of the importance of 13 sustainable actions to the future economic success of the county’s tourism industry. Many competing tourist destinations are implementing such sustainable actions so they are emerging as important to a destination’s branding as

being socially and environmentally responsible. Such actions also provide savings on operating costs and protect the destination’s natural resources. Exploratory factor analysis using principal component analysis with the Dare County data showed that 12 of the 13 items loaded highly on one factor (loadings

ranged from 0.578 to 0.804) and explained 53% of the variance; this dimension was thus named “sustainable actions” and was used in further analyses. The Kaiser–Meyer–Oklin statistic was .922 and the Bartlett’s test was significant ($p < .000$), suggesting that the principal component analysis was necessary and appropriate. Reliability analysis on the 12 items produced a Cronbach’s Alpha of .914, further confirming the validity of factor analysis. A summed scale was then created for this sustainable actions factor.

Other researchers have used length of residence to measure community attachment (Sheldon and Var, 1984; Um and Crompton, 1987). Our study measured length of residence for permanent, full-time residents by the number of years an individual had lived in the community. For second-home property owners, length of residence was measured as the number of years an individual owned a second home property in the county.

To answer the first research question, *How satisfied or dissatisfied are property owners with the impacts of tourism development in their community?*, general attitude toward tourism was examined for both counties (Table 2) using the survey question “Has tourism reached the point that you wished you lived somewhere else or owned property elsewhere?”. The majority in each county answered “No”; the percent difference between those answering “Yes” in Dare (21.8%) and Macon (12.7%), however, was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 7.75, p < .001$).

Table 3 shows the difference in length of residence for each county for those answering “Yes” and “No” to the general tourism question asking if they lived elsewhere. Only a slight difference existed between the length of residency for the Yes and No answers in Dare County: 18.8 to 16 years. A larger difference existed between length of residency for the responses in Macon County: 31.6 to 19 years. Clearly the relationship between general tourism attitude and length of residence is stronger in Macon than in Dare County.

Additionally, the relationship was explored between the general attitude toward tourism and resident

Table 2. General tourism attitude by county: Has tourism reached the point that you wished you lived somewhere else?

County	No	Yes	Total n
Dare County	661 (78.2%)	184 (21.8%)	845
Macon County	534 (87.3%)	78 (12.7%)	612

$\chi^2 = 7.75, p < .001$.

status—full time or second homeowner—in both counties. In both counties, full-time residents were more likely than second homeowners to respond “Yes” to the question of wishing to live elsewhere.

Table 3. General tourism attitude by length of residence, Dare and Macon Counties.

County	Residential tenure	Wished lived elsewhere	
		Yes	No
Dare	Mean years	18.8	16
	Median years	15	12
	N¼459		
Macon	Mean years	31.6	19
	Median years	30.4	13.5
	N¼354	59	295

Table 4. General tourism attitude by resident status and county: Has tourism reached the point that you wished you lived somewhere else?

County	Response	Residential status		Total
		Full-time residents	Second homeowners	
Dare County	No	329 (72%)	329 (85.5%)	658
	Yes	128 (28%)	56 (14.5%)	184
	Total	457	385	842
Macon County	No	294 (83.8%)	240 (92%)	534
	Yes	57 (16.2%)	21 (8%)	78
	Total	351	261	612

Dare County chi-square¼22.5; p < .005; Cramer's V¼.163.
Macon County chi-square¼9.4; p < .005; Cramer's V¼.124.

These differences were also statistically significant as shown in Table 4.

Addressing the second research question, Table 5 depicts the relationship between residential status and perceived degree of political influence over tourism issues for Dare and Macon Counties, respectively. The relationship between these two variables is statistically significant for respondents in both counties. However, a larger percent of respondents in Dare (42%) thought they had no political influence over tourism issues than in Macon (34%). And in both cases, a larger percentage of second homeowners than full-time residents responded that they had no political influence over tourism issues. A potential explanation for this latter finding may involve a lesser degree of community attachment and connection that the second homeowner might feel with the community; however, this would need to be explored in future studies. It is unclear why Dare respondents would feel as if they wielded less influence than Macon.

If planners are to involve second homeowners in the discussion regarding sustainable tourism this is not an encouraging finding. To expect stakeholders to enter the discussion regarding sustainable tourism, they would need to believe that they can affect the outcome. Certainly additional research into their perceived efficacy would yield benefits to planners and other community leaders.

Table 6 presents the relationship between “degree of political influence” and general tourism attitude. Those with more self-perceived political influence were less likely than those with less influence to say that they wished they lived elsewhere. In other words, as political influence increased, the percent of those answering “Yes” decreased: 27% decreased to 11% in Dare, and 15.9% decreased to 5.4% in Macon. The impact of perceived political influence appeared to be stronger in Dare County.

The relationship between degree of political influence over tourism issues and general tourism attitude

Table 5. Political influence by residential status, Dare and Macon Counties.

Political influence	Full time	Dare County			Macon County		
		Second homeowner	Total	Full time	Second homeowner	Total	
None	152 (33%)	201 (52%)	353	98 (28%)	110 (42%)	208	
Very little	207 (45%)	152 (39%)	359	183 (52%)	130 (49.6%)	313	
Some or very much	98 (21%)	34 (8.9)	132	71 (20%)	22 (8.4%)	93	
Total	457	387	844	352	262	614	

Dare County chi-square¼40.46; p < .005; Cramer's V¼.22.
Macon county chi-square¼13.46; p < .005; Cramer's V¼.15.

for full-time residents and second homeowners is much stronger in Dare County than in Macon County. This relationship, measured by Cramer's V, is noticeably stronger for full-time residents than for second homeowners in both counties. The relationship is statistically significant for full-time residents but not for second homeowners.

Identifying factors related to support for sustainable tourism actions is more difficult than finding factors related to general tourism attitude. None of the following factors were related significantly to support for sustainable tourism actions in Dare or Macon Counties: general tourism attitude, residential status, quality of life scale, and degree of political influence over tourism issues. In Macon County, length of residency was found to be significant, while in Dare it was not.

Discussion and conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore property owners' perceptions about the impact of tourism in their communities, satisfaction with tourism development, and the importance of sustainable tourism development. The perceptions and opinions of full-

time residents and second homeowners were compared in two North Carolina counties, Dare and Macon, with different tourism histories, locales, and amenities. The perceptions and opinions of these homeowners were compared between the two counties as well in order to determine if the differing county situations are related to homeowners' attitudes toward tourism. As is the case in many locales, important cultural differences accompany the variation in natural environment; Dare is a coastal county and Macon a mountain county. While it is beyond the scope of this study to delineate these differences, they would include variations in folkways; natural resource-based occupations (e.g. maritime work on the coast); attitudes toward "outsiders" including tourists; cultural norms and mores (e.g. gender roles); and cultural assets such as types of music, food, traditions, heritage, and recreational pursuits. These differences cannot be ignored in comparing the two counties, and as Johnson and Tyrrell (2005) purported, policy or program changes as a result of this study must be tailored to the context of the community. Table 8 summarizes the differences between the two counties, particularly related to the study.

Homeowners in Dare and Macon differed from each other in their general attitude toward tourism. Differences existed between full-time and second homeowners in both counties as well. Although a siz-

Table 6. General tourism attitude by degree of political influence.

Wish you lived elsewhere	Degree of political influence			Total
	None	Very little	Some or very much	
Dare				
No	256 (73%)	285 (80%)	119 (89%)	660 (78%)
Yes	96 (27%)	73 (20%)	15 (11%)	184 (22%)
Total	352	358	134	844
Macon				
No	84.1%	87.1%	94.6%	533 (87.2%)
Yes	15.9%	12.9%	5.4%	184 (12.8%)
Total	207	311	93	612

Dare County chi-square χ^2 15.5; $p < .005$; Cramer's V χ^2 .14.
Macon County chi-square χ^2 6.4; $p < .05$; Cramer's V χ^2 .10.

able majority in both counties did not think that tourism was such that they wished they lived or owned property elsewhere, in general property owners in Macon County are more accepting of the impacts of tourism than are those in Dare County. A larger per-

cent of Dare County residents than Macon County residents said that tourism was such that they wished they lived or owned property elsewhere. In both counties, full-time resident property owners were more likely to say this than were second homeowners. These findings are consistent with the TALC—tourism has grown more and more quickly in Dare than in Macon. Local leaders and planners should monitor this sentiment by full-time and second homeowners, along with real estate sales trends, to predict the point in which the destination has almost reached the stagnation stage (Butler,

Table 7. Tourism attitude by political influence by resident status, Dare and Macon Counties.

County	Wished lived elsewhere	
	Full-time residents	Second homeowners
Dare	Chi-square χ^2 23.1; $p < .001$; Cramer's V χ^2 .225	Chi-square χ^2 5.8; $p < .122$; Cramer's V χ^2 .122
Macon	Chi-square χ^2 10.8; $p < .013$; Cramer's V χ^2 .18	Chi-square χ^2 2.14; $p < .34$; Cramer's V χ^2 .09

Table 8. Dare and Macon County characteristics and response comparison.

Characteristics	Dare County	Macon County
Year round population (2008)	34,000	33,200
Peak tourism season population	200,000	51,800
Percent of all homes owned by second homeowners	70%	31%
Length of owning property (mean)	16.9 years	21 years
Length of owning property (median)	13 years	15 years
Age: Percent 55 years or older		
All homeowners	64.8%	72.4%
Full-time residents	60.4%	70.2%
Second homeowners	69.8%	75.6%
Median household Income		
All homeowners	\$95,260	\$79,100
Full-time residents	\$76,200	\$58,360
Second homeowners	\$108,400	\$160,460
Percent who wished they lived or owned somewhere else		
Full-time residents	28.0%	16.0%
Second homeowners	14.5%	8.0%
Degree of political influence		
Little or none, all homeowners	42.0%	34.0%
None, full-time residents	33.0%	28.0%
Some or very much, full-time residents	21.0%	20.0%
None, second homeowners	52.0%	42.0%
Some or very much, second homeowners	8.9%	8.4%
Support for sustainable tourism actions ^a	(Scale 52 maximum)	(Scale 56 maximum)
Full-time residents	25	40.6
Second homeowners	25.2	41

Population sources: Dare County Government (n.d.) and Macon County Economic Development Commission (n.d.).

^aNote: The Macon scales had one additional item regarding water quality, therefore scale values not comparable across counties.

1980). Before homeowners begin to “wish to live elsewhere,” planning measures should be taken to maximize zoning strategies as well as put into place measures for environmental protection. By the time the homeowners have feelings of discontent, the destination may be on the cusp of its physical and psychological carrying capacity (Weaver, 2006).

The length of residency in Macon County is related to the respondents’ desire to live elsewhere, however, only a small difference in general tourism attitude was attributed to length of residency in Dare County. The result in the current study would seem to have mixed agreement, then, with Almeida-García et al. (2016) who found increased residential tenure correlated with negative feelings of tourism. The current study asked about resident perception using a dichotomous choice; however, future studies might extend this question to a Likert scale. It appears that Macon has a larger population of long-term residents; it is quite likely that Dare has a much larger percent of younger property owners, which is in consistence with Girard

and Gartner’s (1993) suggestion that subgroups may exist within the second-homeowner population.

A disappointingly large percent of respondents said that they had little or no influence on tourism-related issues. As might be expected, this percent was larger for second homeowners than for full-time resident homeowners in both counties but was larger in Dare County than in Macon County. If planners and policy makers want to involve property owners (Sharpley, 2000), especially second homeowners, in tourism policy-making, work needs to be done to change this situation.

As popular tourism destinations evolve from the provision of general tourism products and services to become desirable second home destinations, important planning, policy, and management issues must be addressed. Such destinations are typically attractive due to the degree and quality of natural amenities. As Hao et al. (2013: 19) said,

It is important to note that the reasons... local residents chose to live in the study region(s) and the

reasons... second home owners... chose this destination to purchase a second home reflected similar "values" regarding the natural environment, community amenities and the opportunity to pursue their common recreational interests.

Both groups have good reason to protect the area's resources and the highly rated quality of life the region currently provides and should be keenly interested in policies and actions that maintain the area's economic and social well-being (Tosun, 2002). The current study provides response to Sirakaya-Turk et al. (2008) who calls for more research on this topic in natural resource-based destinations.

However, it has been difficult to identify factors related to support for some standard sustainable actions. Variance in support is difficult to explain. Clearly, a significant, although small segment of the population in both counties are concerned about the negative impacts of tourism. It is also clear that a large percent of both residents and second homeowners feel that they have little political influence over tourism issues. These factors do not seem to translate into differences in level of support for a range of sustainable tourism actions.

This study contributes to the sustainable tourism body of knowledge by introducing the perception of second homeowners to the extensive literature on Social Exchange Theory and TALC. Moreover, it provides insight into second homeowner attitudes about sustainability practices at popular seasonal destinations. The practices explored were based on guidelines from STI, and therefore provide a bridge between a practice-based NGO and academic application.

Stakeholder involvement, especially that of property owners, is a vital part of community tourism development and such involvement should be solicited as well in adopting sustainable practices. Given that over 70% of the properties in Dare County are owned by people outside of the county, the second home economy is a major economic driver in Dare County. As noted earlier in this paper, revenue from construction of second homes along with property taxes on second homes is a primary resource for public service provision. In Macon County, tourism is a major economic factor. It appears that many longer term residents in Macon are concerned about the changes tourism has brought. To increase property owners' involvement, scholars, decision makers, and planners will find it useful to identify and evaluate the elements contributing to stakeholders' understanding and evaluation of sustainable tourism development. Such understanding and the assessment of the impact of sustainable tourism actions will in turn help public officials and planners better accommodate specific interests of property

owners when planning and managing tourism with sustainable components.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Aas C, Ladkin A and Fletcher J (2005) Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(1): 28–48.
- Allen RA, Hafer HR, Long P, et al. (1993) Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research* 31(4): 27–33.
- Almeida-García F, Peláez-Fernández MÁ, Balbuena-Vázquez A, et al. (2016) Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management* 54: 259–274.
- Andereck KL, Valentine KM, Knopf RC, et al. (2005) Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(4): 1056–1076.
- Andereck KL and Vogt CA (2000) The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research* 39(1): 27–36.
- Ap J (1992) Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research* 19(4): 665–690.
- Bramwell B and Lane B (1993) Sustainable tourism: an evolving global approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 1(1): 1–5.
- Butler RW (1980) The concept of a tourism area cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer* 24(1): 5–12.
- Butler RW (1994) Introduction. In: Butler R and Pearce D (eds) *Change in Tourism: People, Place, Process*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–11.
- Butler RW (2004) The tourism area life cycle in the twenty-first century. In: Lew A, Hall CM and Williams A (eds) *A Companion to Tourism*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 159–169.
- Butler RW (ed.) (2006a) *The Tourism Area Life Cycle: Application and Modifications*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Butler RW (ed.) (2006b) *The Tourism Area Life Cycle: Conceptual and Theoretical Issues*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Byrd ET (2007) Stakeholders in sustainable tourism development and their roles: Applying stakeholder theory to sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Review* 62(2): 6–13.
- Choi HC and Murray I (2010) Resident toward sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18(4): 575–594.
- Choi HS and Sirakaya E (2005) Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research* 43(4): 380–394.
- Cottrell SP, van der Duim R, Ankersmid P, et al. (2004) Measuring the sustainability of tourism in Manuel Antonio and Texel: A tourist perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 12(5): 409–431.
- Dare County Government (n.d.) About Dare County. Available at: <http://www.darenc.com/general/mainabout.asp> (accessed 28 June 2016).
- Decchio C and Baloglu S (2002) Nonhost community resident reactions to the 2002 winter Olympics: The spillover impacts. *Journal of Travel Research* 41(1): 46–56.

- Dolnicar S, Crouch GI and Long P (2008) Environment-friendly tourists: What do we really know about them? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 16(2): 197–210.
- Franklin North Carolina Chamber of Commerce (2013) Franklin and Nantahala Visitor and Relocation Guide. Available at: <http://franklin-chamber.com/images/VG-flip-2013/book.swf> (accessed 12 November 2015).
- Gale T and Botterill D (2005) A realist agenda for tourist studies, or why destination areas really rise and fall in popularity. *Tourist Studies* 5(2): 151–174.
- Girard TC and Gartner WC (1993) Second home second view: Host community perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research* 20(4): 685–700.
- Hao H, Alderman D and Long P (2014) Homeowners' attitudes toward tourism in a mountain resort community: A comparison of seasonal and permanent property owners. *Tourism Geographies* 16(2): 270–287.
- Hao H, Long P and Hoggard W (2013) Comparing property owners' perceptions of sustainable tourism in a coastal resort county. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* 6(1): 31–51.
- Huh C and Vogt CA (2008) Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research* 46(4): 446–455.
- Hunter C (1995) The need to reconceptualize sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Development* 3(3): 155–165.
- Innes JE and Booher DE (2000) Indicators for sustainable communities: A strategy building on complexity theory and distributed intelligence. *Planning Theory and Practice* 1(2): 173–186.
- Johnson RJ and Tyrrell TJ (2005) A dynamic model of sustainable tourism. *Journal of Travel Research* 44: 124–134.
- Kleckley J (2008) *The Outer Banks Economy*. Report prepared for the Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce. Greenville, NC: East Carolina University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Lee F (2008) *Constructing the outer banks: Land use, management, and meaning in the creation of an American Place*. M.A. Thesis, North Carolina State University, U.S. Available at <http://repository.lib.ncsu.edu/ir/> (accessed 15 January 2016).
- Lundberg E (2016) The importance of tourism impacts for different local resident groups: A case study of a Swedish seaside destination. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*. Epub ahead of print. DOI: 10.1016/j.jdmm.2016.02.002.
- Macon County Economic Development Commission (n.d.) Macon County NC Profile. Available at: <http://www.maconedc.com/county-profile.html> (accessed 28 June 2016).
- McCool SF and Martin SR (1994) Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research* 32(3): 29–34.
- McCool SF and Stankey GH (2004) Indicators of sustainability: Challenges and opportunities at the interface of science and policy. *Environmental Management* 33(3): 294–305.
- McGehee NG and Andereck KL (2004) Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research* 43(2): 131–140.
- Manning T (1999) Indicators of tourism sustainability. *Tourism Management* 20(1): 179–181.
- Mason P and Cheyne J (2000) Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(2): 391–411.
- Miller G (2001) The development of indicators for sustainable tourism: Results of a Delphi survey of tourism researchers. *Tourism Management* 22(4): 351–362.
- Müller DK (2002) Reinventing the countryside: German second-home owners in Southern Sweden. *Current Issues in Tourism* 5(5): 426–446.
- Müller DK (2007) Second homes in the Nordic countries: Between common heritage and exclusive commodity. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 7(3): 193–201.
- North Carolina Division of Tourism, Film and Sports Development (2012a) *2008 North Carolina Regional Travel Summary*. Available at: North Carolina Department of Commerce Visitor Profile Reports website: <http://www.nccommerce.com/tourism/research/visitation-research/visitor-profile-reports> (accessed 15 January 2016).
- North Carolina Division of Tourism, Film and Sports Development (2012b) 2011–2012 *Occupancy Tax Collections* report. Available at: North Carolina Department of Commerce Tax Data website: <http://www.nccommerce.com/tourism/research/tax-data> (accessed 15 January 2016).
- North Carolina Division of Tourism, Film and Sports Development (2012c) 2012 *Expenditures by County* report. Available at: North Carolina Department of Commerce Economic Research web-site: <http://www.nccommerce.com/tourism/research/economic-impact/teim> (accessed 15 January 2016).
- 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.
- Sharpley R (2000) Tourism and sustainable development: exploring the theoretical divide. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 8(10): 1–19.
- Sheldon PJ and Abenoja T (2001) Resident attitudes in a mature destination: The case of Waikiki. *Tourism Management* 22(5): 435–443.
- Sheldon PJ and Var T (1984) Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management* 5(1): 40–47.
- Sirakaya-Turk E, Ekincl Y and Kaya AG (2008) An examination of the validity of SUS-TAS in Cross-Cultures. *Journal of Travel Research* 46: 414–421.
- State Climate Office of North Carolina. (n.d.) Normal Daily Maximum and Minimum Temperatures. Available at: <http://www.nc-climate.ncsu.edu/climate/ncclimate.html> (accessed 12 November 2015).
- Sustainable Travel International (n.d.) Available at: <http://sustainabletravel.org> (accessed 12 November 2015).
- Tosun C (2002) Host perceptions of impacts: a comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(1): 231–253.
- Um S and Crompton JL (1987) Measuring residents' attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research* 26(1): 27–29.
- U.S. Census QuickFacts (2012) Available at the *State and County QuickFacts* website: <http://quickfacts.census.gov> (accessed 12 November 2015).
- Weaver DB (2006) The 'plantation' variant of the TALC in the small-island Caribbean. In: Butler RW (ed.) *The Tourism Area Life cycle: Applications and Modifications*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications, pp. 185–197.
- Williams AM and Shaw G (1997) Riding the big dipper: The rise and decline of the British seaside resort in the twentieth century. In: Shaw G and Williams A (eds) *Rise and Fall of British Coastal Resorts: Cultural and Economic Perspectives*. London: Mansell, pp. 1–18.
- Williams TA (1979) Impact of domestic tourism on host population: The evolution of a model. *Tourism Recreation Research* 4(2): 15–21.

Author Biographies

Huili Hao is an Assistant Professor with the Department of Environmental Studies at University of North Carolina Wilmington. Her research interests include sustainability, impact of second home and tourism development, Community sense of place,

and sustainable brownfield redevelopment. Dr. Hao is also interested in applying spatial techniques to her research projects.

Carol Kline is an Associate Professor of Hospitality and Tourism Department of Management. Her research interests focus broadly on tourism planning and development and tourism sustainability but cover a range of topics such as foodie segmentation, craft beverages, agritourism, animal welfare in tourism, tourism entrepreneurship, niche tourism markets, and tourism impacts to communities.

Patrick Long is Professor Emeritus, Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado at Boulder and is the

Founding Director of the Centers for Sustainable Tourism at CU Boulder and East Carolina Universities. His research has focused on tourism planning strategies, sustainable practices in tourism, host community adjustments to tourism development, and impact of climate change on tourism businesses and regional economies.

Gary Rassel is an Emeritus Professor, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, the University of North Carolina, Charlotte. Dr. Rassel's research interests focus on quantitative research methods, public budgeting and finance, annexation, as well as financial analysis for government and nonprofit organizations.