Understanding Residents' Support for Tourism Development in the Central Region of Ghana

By: Ercan Sirakaya, Victor Teye, and Sevil Sönmez

*** Note: Figures may be missing from this format of the document

Abstract:
The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to assess the determinants of support for tourism development in two adjacent communities, Cape Coast and Elmina, in the Central Region of Ghana, which stand to benefit the most from tourism development projects; and (2) to create and test a model for its explanatory power of residents' support for tourism. Personal interviews of 465 respondents were conducted in both communities. Factor analysis was used to obtain measures for dependent and independent variables. Two dependent variables— support for the hospitality industry and support for the infrastructure and tourism attraction development— were influenced by a multitude of social-psychological factors such as perceptions toward tourists and tourism's impacts, respondents' employment status, membership in community organizations, and awareness of tourism development projects in the community. Theoretical and practical contributions of the factors are discussed within the frame-work of social exchange theory.

Article:
There has been a proliferation of empirical and theoretical research examining residents' attitudes and their support for tourism since the mid-1970s (i.e., Pizam 1978; Belisle and Hoy 1980; Sheldon and Var 1984; Liu and Var 1986; Um and Crompton 1987; Allen et al. 1988; Canan and Hennessy 1989; Madrigal 1993; Akis, Peristianis, and Warner 1996; Boissevain 1996; Pearce, Moscardo, and Ross 1996; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Huang and Stewart 1996; Kang, Long, and Perdue 1996; Schroeder 1996; Wall 1996a, 1996b; Faulkner and Tideswell 1997; Lindberg and Johnson 1997; Schneider, Lankford, and Oguchi 1997). According to Mason and Cheyne (2000), the majority of research has focused on measuring attitudes of residents in areas where tourism is already a significant contributor to the local economy. Very few studies, however, concentrated on examining resident attitudes of areas that are in the beginning of a "destination lifecycle" (see, for example, Keogh 1990; Hernandez, Cohen, and Garcia 1996), despite recent research findings reporting heterogeneity of community responses and diversity of resident attitudes (Ap and Crompton 1993; Lawson et al. 1998). Longitudinal studies that trace the changes of perceptions of residents toward tourism, the stages of development, and its consequences on local economies are of extreme importance to policymakers and destination developers since such studies would establish a base to which further developments can be compared, and appropriate actions can then be taken to prevent negative impacts (Ap 1992). With plenty of excellent works already in existence, the interest in resident attitudes does not seem to be diminished, primarily for three reasons. First, assessing residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism and tourists is crucial for the development of a successful tourism sector (Ap 1992). Over the years, experience has taught that without the cooperation, support, and participation of residents, it is hard to establish a sustainable tourism industry. Second, resident attitudes vary during various stages of community development. Doxey's irridex index (1975) and Butler's destination life cycle model (1980) suggest a change in resident attitudes and involvement in tourism over time. Third, residents' attitudes toward tourism vary in space. Depending on the location of communities, residents exhibit varying forms of attitudes (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997). Therefore, studying resident attitudes in various communities around the world indeed increases the number of available factors, which could further increase the explanatory power of behavioral models.

To date, the majority of tourism studies on residents' attitudes have been conducted in industrialized countries such as the United States, Canada, Australia, and several European countries. Such studies in developing

countries, particularly those in Africa, are scarce, if not nonexistent. It is, therefore, appropriate to examine an aspect of residents' attitudes to tourism development in a developing African country, where tourism is at its inception stage. The purpose of this article is to explain residents' support for tourism development in the central region of Ghana. It is hoped that additional factors might be uncovered that would contribute to advancing the theoretical foundations of resident attitude studies.

PRESENT DIMENSIONS OF TOURISM IN GHANA

Since the late 1980s, tourism has received considerable attention in the economic development strategy of Ghana. International tourist arrivals in Ghana increased steadily from nearly 114,000 in 1988 to about 348,000 in 1998, an average annual growth rate of about 20%. Tourism receipts grew at an average annual rate of 41.3%, from $55.3 million in 1988 to $285 million in 1998 (Ghana Tourist Board 1999). Both public and private investments in various tourism subsectors have expanded as well. The growth in tourism can also be seen in the expansion of activities in the hotel sector where the number of hotels approved and licensed by the Ghana Tourist Board increased from only 273 in 1989 to 730 in 1998 (Ghana Tourist Board 1999). The number of rooms more than doubled from 4,851 in 1989 to 10,879 in 1998. The government established the Ministry of Tourism in 1993 to underscore its commitment to tourism development and, with assistance from the United Nations Development Pro-gram (UNDP) and the World Tourism Organization (WTO), prepared a 15-year Tourism Development Plan for the period 1996 to 2010. Of the 10 administrative regions in the country, the Central Region is growing to quickly become the leading destination in Ghana due to its diverse tourism resource base and a number of projects initiated in the past 10 years, emphasizing the development of nature-based and cultural tourism.

Ghana moved up from its position of 17th (1985) to 8th (1998) among the tourism revenue earning countries in Africa (WTO 1999). This makes tourism Ghana's third-largest earner of foreign exchange currently, ranking behind mineral and cocoa exports. As in the case of most African countries, the rationale for tourism development in Ghana is primarily economic and at two levels: macro or national and micro or local. At the macro level, tourism is expected to promote economic growth by generating foreign exchange and by increasing various forms of government revenue. At the micro level, tourism is expected to facilitate job creation, income and revenue distribution, and a balanced regional development, which ultimately should improve the quality of life of residents. In this context, the Central Region of Ghana lends itself to a study of residents' attitudes toward tourism development. Ghana is one of the few African countries that officially embraced tourism development as a socioeconomic development strategy in the early 1990s. Furthermore, the country took concrete steps to identify specific projects for tourism development. The Central Region emerged as the spatial unit with the most desirable potential attractions. The region has a large inventory of tourism resources including quality beaches, cultural attractions, precolonial European trading posts, three forts and castles on the World Heritage List, and a newly developed national park. Consequently, the Central Region has in the past 5 years emerged as Ghana's leading tourist destination and therefore lends itself to the examination of residents' attitudes toward tourism development.

FACTORS AFFECTING RESIDENTS' SUPPORT FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Tourism scholars have long recognized the importance of gaining local residents' support for the development of a successful tourism industry. A substantial body of literature about tourism development in low- and middle-income countries has emerged during the past three decades (Bryden 1973; De Kadt 1979; Lea 1988; Harrison 1992; Mowforth and Munt 1998). The literature contains many variables that have been shown to influence residents' perceptions and attitudes toward support for tourism development projects. They include type and extent of host-guest (resident-visitor) interaction, importance of the industry to the community, extent of individuals' reliance on the tourism industry, and the over-all level of tourism development in the community (Murphy 1985). Beyond these general factors, the influence of several specific factors on the nature and extent of residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism development have been identified. Some of the specific factors include native-born status in the community (Canan and Hennessy 1989; Um and Crompton 1987), length of residency in the community (Liu and Var 1986; Allen et al. 1988), the extent of tourism concentration in the community (Pizam 1978), economic reliance on the tourism industry (Madrigal 1993), values (Lindberg

and Johnson 1997) and social representations (Pearce, Moscardo, and Ross 1996), and distance of residence from the central tourist zone (Belisle and Hoy 1980). Some of these basic factors have been used in extending studies on residents' attitudes and perceptions to a number of comparative studies within and between countries such as Israel (Mansfeld and Ginosar 1994), New Zealand and the United Kingdom (Ryan, Scotland, and Montgomery 1998), and Wales (Sheldon and Var 1984). The bulk of research on residents' attitudes in the United States is from rural regions "since tourism has a far more visible effect in rural areas than in urban areas and, consequently, a greater effect on rural residents" (Madrigal 1993, p. 337). While rural areas in developed and developing countries may have more in common than urban areas in the two regions, the factors that influence residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism, as well as the nature and the extent of the impact, are likely to be different between developed and developing regions—regard-less of the urban or rural location of the community. One of the few studies on a middle-income country focused on Argentina and indicated that there are issues related to residents' attitudes that are peculiar to developing countries (Schluter and Var 1988).

While a number of theories have been advanced to explain residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism development and its impacts—such as the play, compensation, and conflict theories (Bystrzanowski 1989); attribution theory (Pearce 1989); and dependency theory (Preister 1989)—it is the social exchange theory that has become more acceptable as the appropriate framework for developing an understanding of residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism (Perdue, Long, and Allen 1990). Pearce, Moscardo, and Ross (1996) and more recently Ap and Crompton (1998) provided excellent reviews and evaluations of previous research in this field. In this particular study, the authors used social exchange theory to explain the relationship between individual benefits and perceptions of economic development. As applied to residents' attitudes toward tourism, social exchange theory stipulates that residents seek benefits of tourism in exchange for something estimated to equal the benefits they offer in return, such as resources provided to tourism developers, tour operators, and tourists. Included in the bundle offered by residents are support for appropriate development, host community's hospitality, and tolerance for tourism-caused inconveniences (i.e., queuing for services, pollution, and traffic congestion). The acceptance and emphasis on local participation and community approach to tourism development (Murphy 1985) implies that local residents are often excluded from not only tourism planning but decision making and management of tourism projects as well. The exclusion of residents from decision making is a very common practice in low-income countries with top-down development cultures, but the exclusion is even more pronounced when tourism projects are mostly externally initiated or implemented, as appears to be the case in Ghana's Central Region. Against this back-ground, this study examines residents' support for tourism development in Cape Coast and Elmina. Specifically, the purpose of this study is twofold: (1) to assess the determinants of support for tourism development in the two Ghanaian communities and (2) to create and test a model for its explanatory power of the residents' support for tourism.

The present study differs from others in the same area of study in three general perspectives. First, the study assesses factors influencing resident support in a newly emerging African destination, where tourism is at its inception stage. Second, the study integrates the findings of earlier research on the same issue into one comprehensive study, where the combined effect of all possible variables are measured in one model thereby eliminating the risk of omitting relevant explanatory variables (Gujarati 1988). Third, it not only replicates previous studies in a different setting but also attempts to establish a basis for a longitudinal study that could trace the changes in resident attitudes over time.

RESEARCH METHOD
The Study Area
Located about 10 kilometers apart, Cape Coast (the regional capital) and Elmina are the primary community centers of the Central Region as a tourism destination. The three world heritage forts and castles, which are being rehabilitated to serve as various cultural tourism attractions, are located in these two communities. Within a 25-kilometer radius are the newly developed Kakum National Parks and a multiple-land-use beach resort development project at Brenu-Akyenin. Ostensibly, tourism is being developed in the region as a lead sector by the national government with assistance from such international organizations as the UNDP and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). While the existence of tourism resources has enabled the

planning and development of tourism in the region (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/WTO 1996), the objective is to reverse the decline in the regional economy "after losing its role in the colonial spatial organization and the subsequent post-independence restructuring of national transportation systems" (Akyeampong 1996, p. 7). The contemporary socio-economic conditions of Cape Coast, Elmina, and, indeed, the Central Region of Ghana as they relate to the present study are succinctly stated by Akyeampong (1996) as follows:

> The Central Region is therefore the typical ex-colonial, sub-national region with an economic history and spatio-economic structures very similar to other Sub-Saharan coastal regions. As other nations embark on tourism promotion for local or regional development purposes they should have a great deal to learn from the Central Region's approaches and experience. (P. 7)

Sample and Data

Data for this study were gathered in Cape Coast and Elmina between January and April 1998 using the interviewing method. Along with an 82-item scale that measured general residents' attitudes toward tourism development in the two towns, the questionnaire contained 20 questions including a 20-item scale measuring attitudes toward tourists themselves. The study sample consisted of 250 residents from each community using interpreters who speak the local Fanti language, wherever necessary. An overall response rate of 92.8% was obtained (86.0% in Elmina and 99.6% in Cape Coast). Missing data points (~3%) were replaced using a regression imputation technique to increase the statistical power of the analyses and to obtain reliable parameter estimates without distorting the data that would ultimately enhance the overall validity of the data set (Little and Rubin 1987; Roth 1994; Sirakaya 1997).

Operationalization of Independent Variables

Attitudes toward tourism development (82 items) and perceptions of white and black tourists (24 items) were obtained using a varimax-rotated principle component analysis. Seven attitudinal factors toward tourism and four perceptual factors toward tourists were extracted and found to be internally reliable in explaining major portions of the variance in their respective data sets. Tables 1 and 2 display the domains, along with their associated descriptions, factor loadings, eigenvalues, percentage of variance explained, and corresponding alpha reliability. For each factor, a factor score was calculated using the Anderson-Rubin method through SPSS. In the subsequent regression analyses, these factor scores were used as independent variable measures to explain residents' support for the tourism industry.

Remaining variables were operationalized by using several scales at different measurement levels. Variables that contained "yes"- or "no"-type dichotomous variables were coded as dummy independent variables. Table 3 presents the codes and designations of attitudinal, perceptual, as well as the remaining independent variables.

Residents' Support for Tourism Development (Dependent Variables)

A varimax-rotated principal component analysis was used on 13 Likert-type scale items for the sample of 464 residents of the two towns (Elmina and Cape Coast) to extract general groups of attitudes toward illustrating residents' support for tourism development. A cutoff point of 0.4 was used to include items in interpretation of a factor. Only 1 item of the initial 13 items describing various sectors of the tourism industry did not load on any factor, reflecting the homogeneity of items. Accordingly, two factors with eigenvalues equal to or greater than one explained 53.4% of the variance in the original data set. Table 4 displays the domain descriptions, items, factor loadings, eigenvalues, and Cronbach's alpha. The two factors were labeled as follows: (1) support for tourism infrastructure and attractions (factor 1) and (2) support for hospitality industry (factor 2). The two conceptually meaningful domains resulting from factor analysis were then tested for reliability. The reliability of the variables in each factor was assessed by examining the Cronbach's alpha coefficients, which were .86 and .70 for the first and second factors, respectively, indicating that the variables exhibited a strong to moderate correlation with their factor groupings and therefore may be regarded as internally consistent and stable.

TABLE 1
RESULTS OF FACTOR ANALYSIS OF RESIDENT ATTITUDES

Domain	Domain Descriptors	Aggregated Sample (n = 464)	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance Explained
Social interaction with tourists (α = .75)[a]	I have developed friendships with tourists.	.706	5.06	17.45
	My interactions with tourists are positive and useful.	.690		
	I enjoy interacting with tourists.	.603		
	I now enjoy visiting tourist areas.	.568		
	I like learning about tourists' own country and culture.	.542	2.52	8.68
Cultural impacts of tourism (α = .69)	Tourism promotes cultural exchange.	.664		
	The jobs tourism provides are highly desirable.	.622		
	Tourism promotes better understanding between people.	.607		
	Tourism helps to increase local awareness and appreciation of the environment.	.567		
	Tourism helps to preserve and improve our culture and traditions.	.561		
	Because of tourism development, I have a better appreciation of my culture.	.546		
Welfare impacts of tourism (α = .72)	Tourism improves public utilities (water, electricity, telephone, etc.) in our community.	.704	2.38	8.20
	Because of tourism, Cape Coast/Elmina has better roads.	.677		
	The quality of public services (roads, water, sewage, etc.) in Cape coast is better due to more tourism.	.676		
	Cape Coast/Elmina has lost its small-town atmosphere because of tourism.	.609		
	Tourism improves transportation services in our community.	.562		
Negative interference of tourism in daily life (α = .70)	Tourism development in Cape Coast/Elmina has caused me to regret living here.	.697	1.88	6.48
	Because of tourism, I have more difficulty participating in entertainment events.	.685		
	Tourists interfere with my enjoyment of this town.	.667		
	Most people I know don't like tourism.	.629		
	I am against new tourism facilities, which will attract more tourists to Cape Coast/Elmina.	.585		
Economic costs of tourism (α = .65)	Tourism only benefits a few people in Cape Coast/Elmina.	.779	1.58	5.46
	Tourism increases the cost of living.	.622		
	Tourists should pay more than local residents to visit tourist attractions.	.543		
Sexual permissiveness due to tourism (α = .73)	Tourism increases prostitution in Cape Coast/Elmina.	.847	1.21	4.16
	Tourism increases sexual permissiveness in Cape Coast/Elmina.	.838		
Perception of crowding (α = .60)	Tourists cause my town to be crowded with people.	.762	1.04	3.58
	Recreation areas in Cape Coast/Elmina are overcrowded because of tourism.	.697		
	The tourism sector provides a ready market for the product of local farmers.	.616		

Note: Total variance explained by aggregated data = 54.0%, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.806.
a. Cronbach's alpha for domains.

TABLE 2
RESULTS OF FACTOR ANALYSIS OF TOURIST PERCEPTIONS BASED ON SAMPLES FROM TWO CITIES

Domain	Domain Descriptor	Black Tourists[a] (n = 464)	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cronbach's Alpha	White Tourists[b] (n = 464)	Eigenvalue	Percentage of Variance	Cronbach's Alpha
Factor 1. General perceptions of tourists	Undesirable/desirable	.811	4.057	33.81	.74	.761	3.355	27.96	.68
	Scary/reassuring	.771				.693			
	Useless/useful	.765				.704			
	Insincere/sincere	.742				.651			
	Boring/exciting	.717				.667			
	Unadventurous/adventurous	.621				.664			
	Terrifying/comforting	−.550				−.415			
Factor 2. Perceptions of social and economic condition of tourists	Dirty/clean	.688	2.312	19.27	.70	.697	2.249	18.74	.64
	Poor/rich	.658				.548			
	Ordinary/successful	.653				.631			
	Unfriendly/friendly	.648				.624			
	Condenseful/respectful	.542				.553			

Note: Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.887.
a. Total variance explained by the pooled data = 53.07%.
b. Total variance explained by the pooled data = 46.96%.

Similar to the procedure described above, for each factor, a factor score was calculated using the Anderson-Rubin method through SPSS. In the subsequent regression analyses, these factor scores were used as dependent variable measures to explain residents' support for the tourism industry.

An examination of Gauss-Markov assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, multicollinearity, and linearity indicated that with the exception of normality, none of the assumptions was violated. Both dependent variable measures (factors 1 and 2) were transformed using a log-linear and square transformation procedures, respectively. After the transformation, a check for the normality assumption indicated that all the variables were reasonably normal in the distribution around their mean. Furthermore, variables containing categories such as "income" and "employment status" were screened for cell numbers to determine if statistical procedures can be performed without any difficulty. It was determined that employment status needed to be collapsed to only two categories containing "employed" and "others" (students, retired, unemployed). In addition, the income variable, which consisted of six categories originally, was reduced to three (less than 600,000 cedis [¢], ¢600,000- 999,999, and more than ¢1,000,000).

TABLE 3
DESCRIPTION OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Code	Description of Independent Variable	Measurement Level
INTERACT	Number of days interacted with tourists per week	Ratio
BENEFITS	Perception of personal benefits gained from tourism activity	Interval (5-point Likert-type scale)
TEMPLOYED	Employed in tourism or related industry	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
FAMEMPLOYED	Member of family employed in tourism	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
PRJAWARE	Awareness of tourism projects in the community	Interval (5-point Likert-type scale)
INVOLVEMENT	Personal involvement in tourism development decision-making process	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
CONSULT	Consultation with residents about tourism development in the community	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
DESIRE	Desire to be involved in decision-making process about tourism development in the community	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
ORGANIZATION	Membership in a community organization	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
BORN	Being born in the same city of residence	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
SEX	Gender	Nominal (dummy coded: male or female)
AGE	Age of the respondents	Ratio
EMPSTATUS	Employment status (employed, unemployed, or others)	Nominal (dummy coded: yes or no)
EDUCATION	Education level	Ratio
RESIDENT	Length of residency	Ratio
INCOME	Annual personal income	Ordinal (less than ¢600,000, ¢600,000-999,999, more than ¢1,000,000)
ATTITUDE1	Perceived social interaction with tourists	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
ATTITUDE2	Perceived cultural impacts of tourism	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
ATTITUDE3	Perceived welfare impacts of tourism	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
ATTITUDE4	Perceived negative interference of tourism in daily life	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
ATTITUDE5	Perceived economic costs of tourism	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
ATTITUDE6	Perceived sexual permissiveness due to tourism	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
ATTITUDE7	Perception of crowding	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
TOURISTSA (2 factors)	General perceptions of black and white tourists	Anderson-Rubin factor scores
TOURISTSB (2 factors)	Perceptions of social and economic condition of black and white tourists	Anderson-Rubin factor scores

Note: ATTITUDE 1 through ATTITUDE 7 along with TOURISTSA(black and white) and TOURISTSB(black and white) were obtained through separate factor analyses, which are displayed in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 4
THE RESULTS OF FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Domain	Item Description	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	Cronbach's Alpha	Variance Explained
Support for tourism infrastructure and attractions	Cultural attractions	.827	4.53	.86	33.69
	Historic restoration	.809			
	Roads/sewage	.732			
	Museums	.683			
	Outdoor recreation facilities	.673			
	Wildlife/forest parks	.654			
	Festivals/special events	.638			
	Public transportation	.594			
Support for the hospitality industry	Guest houses	.817	1.88	.70	19.70
	Restaurants	.795			
	Hotels/motels	.786			
	Bars/nightclubs	.442			

Note: Total variance explained by aggregated data = 53.4%, n = 464.

STUDY RESULTS
Descriptive Results
The sociodemographic background of respondents is illustrated in Table 5. The majority of respondents were male (61.4% in Cape Coast and 62.3% in Elmina). While 42.6% indicated that they were born in Cape Coast, 45.6% indicated the same in Elmina. With respect to the number of years respondents lived in the same community, the mean years were 18.49 and 14.80 in Cape Coast and Elmina, respectively. The mean education levels were 11.91 and 12.33 years in Cape Coast and Elmina, respectively. Among the respondents, the majority (36.8%) had annual income levels of less than 1 million cedis (U.S.$1 = ¢2,200). The mean age of respondents was 34.37 and 34.16 with a standard deviation of 9.94 and 10.43 in Cape Coast and Elmina, respectively. Average number of days of interaction with tourists per week was 2.23 and 3.02 in Cape Coast and Elmina, respectively.

Test of Residents' Support for Tourism
To obtain a better understanding of the factors that might explain variations in residents' support for the tourism industry, a forward regression analysis was performed. Although the use of this method can be criticized on several theoretical grounds, this procedure still remains the choice of researchers when there are a large number of independent variables relative to the number of cases. The results of regression analysis are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

For the first factor (residents' support for the tourism infrastructure and attractions), the forward regression analysis produced a seven-variable model. The seven variables that met the criteria and consequently were added to the model in order of importance were general perceptions of tourists (squared) ($TOURISTSA^2_{white}$), perceived economic costs of tourism (ATTITUDE5), employment status (employed, unemployed, or others) (EMPSTATUS), membership in a community organization (ORGANIZATION), perception of personal benefits gained from tourism activity (BENEFITS), negative interference of tourism in daily life (ATTITUDE4), and perception of crowding (ATTITUDE7). The general model explained 23.6% of the variations in residents' support scores.

General perception of tourists ($TOURISTSA^2_{white}$) had a positive relationship with the dependent variable (support for tourism infrastructure and attractions) and was the most important factor in the model ($\beta = .194$). As residents' perceptions of Caucasian tourists visiting their community increased (perceived positively), their level of support for the tourism infrastructure and attractions also increased. On the other hand, as perceived economic costs of tourism increased, the level of residents' support for tourism development decreased ($\beta = -.165$). The analysis indicated that unemployed residents were more supportive of developments in tourism infrastructure and attractions than those employed. Residents who were members of a community organization demonstrated greater levels of support for tourism ($\beta = .144$) compared to those who did not belong to any community organizations. Similarly, residents who believed that they personally gained from tourism activity in their community demonstrated greater levels of support for tourism development, as evidenced by the positive beta value ($\beta = .142$). Conversely, residents who perceived that tourism interferes negatively with their daily life (ATTITUDE4) and those who perceived the community to be crowded due to tourism activities (ATTITUDE7) showed decreased levels of support for tourism development, as evidenced by negative beta coefficients ($\beta = -.145$ and $\beta = -.140$, respectively).

For the second factor (residents' support for the hospitality industry), forward regression analyses produced a three-variable model (presented in Table 7). Three variables that met the criteria and consequently were added to the model in order of importance were awareness of tourism projects in the community as a dummy variable (PRJAWARE), perceived economic costs of tourism (ATTITUDE5), and perceived welfare impacts of tourism (ATTITUDE3). The general model explained 37.4% of the variation in residents' support scores for the hospitality industry.

TABLE 5
DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS FOR SELECTED VARIABLES

City	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Cape Coast		
Female	95	38.2
Male	153	61.4
Elmina		
Female	76	35.3
Male	134	62.3
Personal income		
Cape Coast		
Less than ¢600,000	43	17.3
¢600,000-¢999,999	34	13.7
More than ¢1,000,000	88	35.3
Elmina		
Less than ¢600,000	41	19.1
¢600,000-¢999,999	38	17.7
More than ¢1,000,000	39	18.1
City in which the respondents were born		
Cape Coast		
No	143	57.4
Yes	103	41.4
Elmina		
No	117	54.4
Yes	89	41.4

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cape Coast		
Number of years lived in the community	18.49	10.72
Education level in years	11.91	5.17
Number of days interacted with tourists per week	2.23	1.97
Age of the respondents	34.37	9.94
Elmina		
Number of years lived in the community	14.80	11.37
Education level in years	12.33	4.11
Number of days interacted with tourists per week	3.02	1.68
Age of the respondents	34.16	10.43

Note: N for Cape Coast = 249; N for Elmina = 215.

A further examination of the results of the regression analysis produced an adjusted R^2 of .371, indicating that these three variables explain 37. 1 % of the variation in residents' support scores. In other words, since the difference between the values of adjusted R^2 and multiple R^2 is not significantly large, one can conclude that the independent variables in the model are sufficient to account for significant variations in the model (Gujarati 1988).

Beta coefficients in this case can be interpreted as the percentage change in the dependent variable since this dependent variable (support for the hospitality industry) was transformed using a log-linear transformation method. In other words, beta coefficients measure a percentage change in the dependent variable when an independent variable changes by one unit. Awareness of tourism projects in the community had a negative relationship with the dependent variable (support for hospitality industry) and was the most important factor in the model ($\beta = -.258$). As residents' awareness of tour-ism projects in their community increased, their level of support for the hospitality industry decreased. Perhaps tourism projects are viewed negatively because residents do not like the way the tourism/hospitality industry is developing in their community. Those who were aware of tourism projects in the community tended to decrease their support, everything else being constant. Support for the tourism/hospitality industry increased as the perceived economic costs of tourism (ATTITUDE5) decreased, as evidenced by the negative beta coefficient ($\beta = -.177$). Similarly, the regression coefficients indicated that

perceived welfare impacts of tour-ism (ATTITUDE3) had a positive relationship with residents' support for the hospitality industry and was equally important as the perceived economic costs of tourism in the model (β =. 170). All other variables in the initial model were not significant and were excluded from the forward regression analysis.

TABLE 6
FORWARD REGRESSION MODEL FOR THE SUPPORT OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND TOURISM ATTRACTIONS

Step	Variables	Forward Regression Summary		
		R^2	F Value	Significance
1	General perceptions of tourists (squared) (TOURISTS A)	.069	13.533	< .000
2	Perceived economic costs of tourism (ATTITUDE5)	.116	11.918	.000
3	Employment status (employed, unemployed, or others) (EMPSTATUS)	.149	10.565	.000
4	Membership in a community organization (ORGANIZATION)	.175	9.548	.000
5	Perception of personal benefits gained from tourism activity (BENEFITS)	.197	8.804	.000
6	Perceived negative interference of tourism in daily life (ATTITUDE4)	.217	8.210	.000
7	Perception of crowding (ATTITUDE7)	.236	7.807	.000

Step	Variables	Coefficients				
		Standard Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t Value	Significance	Colinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	General perceptions of tourists (squared) (TOURISTS A)	.005	.194	2.824	.005	.916
2	Perceived economic costs of tourism (ATTITUDE5)	.064	−.165	−2.450	.015	.932
3	Employment status (employed, unemployed, or others) (EMPSTATUS)	.179	−.155	−2.360	.019	.955
4	Membership in a community organization (ORGANIZATION)	.144	.142	2.156	.032	.990
5	Perception of personal benefits gained from tourism activity (BENEFITS)	.050	.142	2.090	.038	.938
6	Perceived negative interference of tourism in daily life (ATTITUDE4)	.062	−.145	−2.157	.032	.960
7	Perception of crowding (ATTITUDE7)	.057	−.140	−2.107	.037	.989

Note: Dependent variable: support for infrastructure and tourism attractions.

An examination of the regression results suggests that the model that was generated did not violate any of the assumptions of the ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. There was no indication of serious multicollinearity as evidenced by low correlation coefficients between the independent variables. The obtained t values and the tolerance levels for the regression estimates were quite high. Accordingly, these data were free of OLS violations, and thus the obtained parameters can be regarded as best, linear, unbiased, and efficient (BLUE) (Gujarati 1988).

TABLE 7
FORWARD REGRESSION MODEL FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

Step	Variables	Forward Regression Summary		
		R^2	F Value	Significance
1	Awareness of tourism projects in the community (PRJAWARE)	.283	15.945	< .000
2	Perceived economic costs of tourism (ATTITUDE5)	.332	11.310	.000
3	Perceived welfare impacts of tourism (ATTITUDE3)	.374	9.828	.000

Step	Variables	Coefficients				
		Standardized Coefficients Beta	Standard Error	t Value	Significance	Colinearity Statistics Tolerance
1	Awareness of tourism projects in the community (PRJAWARE)	−.259	.078	−3.614	< .000	.925
2	Perceived economic costs of tourism (ATTITUDE5)	−.180	.072	−2.529	.012	.938
3	Perceived welfare impacts of tourism (ATTITUDE3)	−.180	.068	2.493	.014	.986

Note: Dependent variable: support for the hospitality industry.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, it was to ascertain the determinants of support for tourism development in two communities in the Central Region of Ghana that stand to benefit the most from a number of ongoing tourism development projects. Second, it was to develop and test a model to explain residents' support for tourism in the early stage of overall tourism development in the region. The study integrated the findings of previous research on residents' attitudes toward tourism development and determined factors that affect residents' support for the tourism industry in the two Ghanaian communities of Cape Coast and Elmina. The regression results of the two models reveal that predicting support for infrastructure/tourism attraction development and the support for the hospitality industry resulted in two parsimonious models by explaining 23.4% and 37.4% of the variation in the respective models (Tables 6 and 7). Support for tourism development as defined by the support of two distinct areas was influenced by a number of sociopsychological factors such as perceptions of tourists, tourism impacts, respondents' employment status, membership in community organizations, and awareness of tourism development projects in the community. The study has theoretical as well as practical implications.

Theoretical Implications

In general, the study provided further support to the social exchange theory. In particular, in the case of model 1 (support for the infrastructure and tourism attraction development), perceived benefits and costs seemed to play an important role in determining a positive response to tourism development. For model 2 (support for the hospitality industry), the same conclusion can be reached. Variables responsible for explaining variations in the model, although less in number than in the first model, were related to factors that can be described as social exchange variables (ATTITUDE3 and ATTITUDE5). Awareness of tourism projects within the community seemed to increase support by residents.

In general, the findings of this study support the outcome of studies done in industrialized countries as well as in more developed tourist destinations. Specifically, residents' sup-port for particular tourism development projects depends on their perceptions of their benefits and costs, as implied by the social exchange theory. The main theoretical contribution of this study lies in the fact that these findings are from a developing African country and in communities where tourism is at the inception stage of tourism development. The social exchange theory appears to be rather robust when put to test in a variety of conditions and countries, including this study's emphasis, Ghana.

Practical Implications

The study has a number of relevant practical implications, given some of the community issues that are already obvious with respect to tourism development in Ghana. There is considerable evidence that support for tourism development in both Cape Coast and Elmina varies to a large extent. This ranges from strong support to resentment and outright opposition to tourism development. Some of the reasons for the lack of community support for tourism development projects have been discussed elsewhere. Briefly, however, there are three broad areas of concern. First, there are indications that residents of both Cape Coast and Elmina are unaware of the nature of tourism development projects, either through the government's deliberate attempts to exclude residents or through withholding of information from them. Bruner (1996) stated that the council of chief of Elmina has accused the regional planning agency—the Central Region Development Commission—of "not informing them of its plans for tourism development, even though that development is taking place in their area of jurisdiction" (p. 297). On those rare occasions when attempts are made to solicit community input into tourism plans or projects, the public event is ill planned and rushed, invitations are extended mostly to the educated and professional segments of the community, and the proceedings are conducted in English, thereby excluding the vast majority of the population who speak the local Fanti language. For example, invited participants to the public forum in 1997 on the 15-year tourism development plan for the Central Region (Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/WTO 1996) for the period 1996 to 2010 (in which one of the authors participated) mostly represented academics, government officials, and local entrepreneurs and was conducted entirely in English.

The second reason for the limited support from sections of the two communities for tourism development could be traced to the external nature of the funding and implementation of the tourism projects. The donor organizations and implementation agencies include USAID, UNDP, Shell (Ghana), Inter-national Council of Museum and Sites (ICOMOS-U.S. Chapter), the Smithsonian Institution, Conservation International, and the Midwest Universities Consortium of International Activities of the United States. It has been observed that "the people of Elmina are restricted from entering the castle and that the project has been given over to a blue rib-bon list of international aid agencies and is controlled by their staff and hired consultants" (Bruner 1996, p. 298). These observations are applicable to Cape Coast as well since it is covered by the same project, donor organizations, and implementation agencies.

Third, even support for tourism development by some with vested interests in the tourism industry may not be strong since the high expectations promised at the beginning of the tourism projects have not materialized to the residents' level of expectation. Most tourists arrive in Cape Coast and Elmina on organized tours operated by tour companies based in Accra for the day and return to Accra or continue on to other regions. The limited length of stay can be attributed to the fact that the castles and the Kakum National Park can be toured in 1 or 2 days at most, and the towns have very little else in the form of tourism products to offer visitors. As a result, the industry is very seasonal, occupancy rates tend to be rather low, and there is significant leakage from the region to the tour operators in Accra.

The findings of this study indicate that factors that affect or even determine residents' support for tourism development are, in general, similar. However, each destination has a set of peculiar conditions that are critical to increasing residents' support for tourism development. In the case of the Central Region, these conditions include the following: (1) tourism as a service industry catering to international visitors is a new concept. Indeed, the words *tourist* and *tourism* have no equivalencies in local Ghanaian languages. Most residents are able to identify tourism infrastructure or attractions but have only vague ideas initially about its overall benefit to the community. This underscores the need for concerted effort to raise residents' awareness of tourism as an industry and the specific developments projects, as well as how they will affect the community, both positively and negatively. (2) With regard to the two communities, the external origins and implementation agencies of the projects, as well as the intended foreign consumers of the tourism product that is being developed—given the colonial history of the two com-munities, the visible reminders of the role of the forts and castles in the slave trade, and the return of both African American tourists (descendents of Ghanaians sold into slavery) and white tourists (representatives of European slave masters)—it is not surprising that there is resentment and outright opposition to tourism development by sections of the two communities. This is a highly sensitive issue that requires the involvement of chiefs and traditional elders in every stage of tourism planning, development, and management of the attractions. This should be in addition to the important role of community organizations— which, as this study has shown, play in residents' support for tourism development. What happens in the Central Region with respect to community support for tourism development has relevance to other communities in Ghana and other African countries that are embarking on new tourism development initiatives. Longitudinal studies are recommended to monitor the changes in residents' attitudes in both cities, especially since the tourism industry can only be expected to be successful and sustainable if destination developers and marketers develop policies that would be sensitive to the needs of the local residents.

REFERENCES
Akis, S., N. Peristianis, and J. Warner (1996). "Residents' Attitudes to Tour-ism Development: The Case of Cyprus." *Tourism Management*, 17 (7): 481-94.
Akyeampong, O. A. (1996). *Tourism and Regional Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Case Study of Ghana's Central Region*. Stockholm, Sweden: University of Stockholm, Department of Human Geography.
Allen, L. R., P. T. Long, R. R. Perdue, and S. Kieselbach (1988). "The Impact of Tourism Development on Residents' Perception of Community Life." *Journal of Travel Research*, 27 (1): 16-21.
Ap, J. (1992). "Residents' Perceptions on Tourism Impact." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19: 665-90.

Ap, J., and J. L. Crompton (1993). "Residents' Strategies for Responding to Tourism Impacts." *Journal of Travel Research*, 32 (1): 47-50.

- (1998). "Developing and Testing a Tourism Impact Scale." *Journal of Travel Research*, 37 (2): 120-30.

Belisle, F. J., and D. R. Hoy (1980). "The Perceived Impact of Tourism by Residents." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7 (1): 83-101.

Boissevain, J., ed. (1996). *Coping with Tourists: European Reactions to Mass Tourism*. Providence, RI: Bergahn.

Bruner, E. M. (1996). "Tourism in Ghana: The Representation of Slavery and the Return of the Black Diaspora." *American Anthropologist*, 98 (2): 290-304.

Bryden, J. (1973). *Tourism and Development: A Case of the Commonwealth Caribbean*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Butler, R. W. (1980). "The Concept of a Tourist Area Cycle of Evolution: Implications for Management of Resources." *Canadian Geographer*, 24 (1): 5-12.

Bystrzanowski, J. (1989). *Tourism as a Factor of Change: A Socio-Cultural Study*. Vienna, Austria: European Coordination Center for Research and Documentation in Social Sciences.

Canan, P., and M. Hennessy (1989). "The Growth Machine, Tourism and the Selling of Culture." *Sociological Perspectives*, 32: 227-43.

De Kadt, E., ed. (1979). *Tourism: Passport to Development?* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Doxey, G. V. (1975). "A Causation Theory of Visitor-Resident Irritants, Methodology and Research Inferences." In *Conference Proceedings*: Sixth Annual Conference of Travel Research Association, San Diego, pp. 195-98.

Faulkner, B., and C. Tideswell (1997). "A Framework for Monitoring Community Impacts of Tourism." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5 (1): 3- 28.

Ghana Tourist Board (1999). *International Tourism Statistics for the Period 1990-1998*. Accra: Ghana Tourist Board, Research Department.

Gujarati, N. D. (1988). *Basic Econometrics*. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Haralambopoulos, N., and A. Pizam (1996). "Perceived Impacts of Tourism: The Case of Samos."*Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (3): 503-26. Harrison, D. (1992). *Tourism in Less Developed Countries*. London: Belhaven.

Hernandez, S. A., J. Cohen, and H. L. Garcia (1996). "Residents' Attitudes towards an Instant Resort Enclave." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (4): 755-79.

Huang, Y.-H., and W. P. Stewart (1996). "Rural Tourism Development: Shifting Basis of Community Solidarity." *Journal of Travel Research*, 34 (4): 26-31.

Kang, Y. S., P. T. Long, and R. R. Perdue (1996). "Resident Attitudes toward Legal Gambling." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (1): 71-85. Keogh, B. (1990). "Public Participation in Community Tourism Planning." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17 (3): 449-65.

Lawson, R. W., J. Williams, T. Young, and J. Cossens (1998). "A Comparison of Residents' Attitudes towards Tourism in 10 New Zealand Destinations." *Tourism Management*, 19 (3): 247-56.

Lea, J. (1988). *Tourism and Development in the Third World*. London: Routledge.

Lindberg, K., and R. L. Johnson (1997). "Modeling Resident Attitudes toward Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (2): 402-24.

Little, R. J., and D. B. Rubin (1987). *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. New York: John Wiley.

Liu, J. C., and T. Var (1986). "Residents Attitude toward Tourism Impacts in Hawaii." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13 (2): 193-214.

Madrigal, R. (1993). "A Tale of Tourism in Two Cities." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20 (2): 336-53.

Mansfeld, Y., and O. Ginosar (1994). "Determinants of Locals' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Tourism Development in their Locality." *Geoforum*, 25 (2): 227-48.

Mason, P., and J. Cheyne (2000). "Residents' Attitudes to Proposed Tourism Development." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27 (2): 391-411.

Ministry of Tourism/UNDP/WTO (1996). *Tourism Development Plan for the Central Region: Accra: Ministry of Tourism*. Integrated Tourism Development Program.

Mowforth, M., and I. Munt (1998). *Tourism and Sustainability: New Tourism in the Third World*. London: Routledge.

Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*. New York: Routledge.

Pearce, D. (1989). "Social Impacts of Tourism." In *The Social, Cultural and Environmental Impacts of Tourism*. Sydney: New South Wales Tourism Commission.

Pearce, P. L., G. Moscardo, and G. Ross (1996). *Tourism Community Relationships*. Tunbridge Wells, UK: Pergamon.

Perdue, R. R., P.T. Long, and L. Allen (1990). "Resident Support for Tourism Development." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17 (4): 586-99.

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.

Preister, K. (1989). "The Theory and Management of Tourism Impacts." *Tourism Recreation Research*, 14 (1): 15-22.

Roth, P. L. (1994). "Missing Data: A Conceptual Review for Applied Psychologists." *Personnel Psychology*, 47 (3): 537-60.

Ryan, C., A. Scotland, and D. Montgomery (1998). "Resident Attitudes to Tourism Development—A Comparative Study between the Rangitikei, New Zealand and Bakewell, United Kingdom." *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4 (2): 115-30.

Schluter, R., and T. Var (1988). "Resident Attitudes toward Tourism in Argentina." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15 (3): 442-45.

Schneider, I. E., S. Lankford, and T. Oguchi (1997). "The Cross-Cultural Equivalence of the TIAS: Summary Results." *Annals of Tourism Re-search*, 24 (4): 994-98.

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 T. Var (1984). "Resident Attitudes to Tourism in North Wales." *Tourism Management*, 5 (1): 40-47.

Sirakaya, E. (1997). "Attitudinal Compliance with Ecotourism Guidelines." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (4): 919-50.

Um, S., and J. L. Crompton (1987). "Measuring Resident's Attachment Levels in a Host Community." *Journal of Travel Research*, 25 (3): 27- 29.

Wall, G. (1996a). "Perspectives on Tourism in Selected Balinese Villages." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23 (1): 123-37.

~~~ (1996b). "Rethinking Impacts of Tourism." *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2 (3): 207-15.

World Tourism Organization (1999). *Tourism Market Trends: Africa 1988- 1999*. WTO Commission for Africa. Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization.