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ABSTRACT

Traditionally the relationship between residents and tourists in a community is superficial in nature (Ratz, 2000). Interactions between the parties are not only transitory, unequal and unbalanced, but they are also predicated on financial exchanges (Mason, 2006), and rooted in the dichotomy of ‘self’ versus ‘other’ (Wearing & Wearing, 2001). Within the literature, calls for research have been made to examine a potential deeper emotional relationship between residents and tourists (McIntosh, 1998; Pizam, Uriely & Reichel, 2000; Prentice, Witt, & Wydenbach, 1994; Wearing & Wearing, 2001).

Applying and testing the theory of emotional solidarity (Durkheim (1995[1915])), a sequential exploratory mixed method study was conducted to better understand the emotional relationships residents of Beaufort County, South Carolina have with tourists in their community. In the context of tourism, this theory posits that residents’ interaction with tourists, shared beliefs, and shared behaviors with tourists will influence the emotional solidarity they have with tourists. The research design included three phases: a qualitative component, which involved a series of focus groups with Beaufort County residents using conceptual content analysis to develop items for the four scales of the constructs within the proposed theoretical framework; a scale development component with two pilot tests using EFA, reliabilities and validities to purify each measure; and a survey component using CFA, SEM, and MANOVA to test Durkheim’s model, nested alternative models, and to determine if emotional solidarity dimensional scores differed across resident characteristics and tourist types.
Each dimension of the four scales was confirmed through CFA, and Durkheim’s model was supported through SEM. An amended Durkheim model with four additional antecedents of emotional solidarity did not significantly explain a greater degree of variance in the construct. Few significant differences in the three dimensions of emotional solidarity (i.e., sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, welcoming of visitors) were found across resident characteristics (e.g., resident tourism dependence and recent travel experience). Residents expressed a higher degree of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors with family tourists over any other type of tourist, especially second homeowners.

Theoretical and practical implications are discussed in detail. Suggestions for future research are presented, including testing Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model across numerous contexts, extending the model with additional antecedents and outcomes of emotional solidarity to explain a greater degree of variance in emotional solidarity, and examining the construct from both residents’ and tourists’ perspectives.
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The terms of tourist-host transactions are defined not only by the condition of strangerhood but by the nature of tourism itself. As a tourist, a person is at leisure, which means that he is not bent on shaping the world, only experiencing or toying with it. If the tourist is to pursue peculiarly touristic goals, others must perform more utilitarian functions. To put it more succinctly, others must serve while the tourist plays, rests, cures, or mentally enriches himself. Accordingly, he finds himself separated from those in the touristic infrastructure who serve him by the different, if complementary, nature of the activities specified in the touristic contract.

-Dennison Nash (1989, p.45)

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION
Background

The preceding passage highlights one perspective of the interaction that occurs between tourists or guests and residents or hosts living in a tourist destination. These views have been characterized in a number of ways throughout the literature, all of which focus on the relationship that exists on the surface between members of each group. First and foremost is the perspective that the interactions between residents and tourists are transitory, unequal, and unbalanced (UNESCO, 1976). In this regard, the residents may be thought of as powerless and at the beckoning call of tourists, providing services to the tourists, who are on vacation (Sutton, 1967). The tourist usually stays in the destination for a short time, making it difficult to develop the surface relationship into a more meaningful one (Sutton, 1967). Over time, the once spontaneous hospitality provided by residents turns into commercial activity (de Kadt, 1979; Jafari, 1989), whereby residents ‘act on a front stage’ providing staged authentic experiences to the tourists (Goffman, 1959; MacCannell, 1999). Finally, the obvious relative wealth of tourists often leads to
exploitative behavior on the residents’ side (Nettekoven, 1979). Such a disparity between incomes may allow visitors to look at hosts as inferior.

The resident and tourist relationship has also been examined in terms of financial or monetary transactions that occur between the two groups. Hosts are those that have the product or goods for sale and the guests purchase such products for consumption. Such financial and monetary transactions are at the heart of the social exchange theory, which has been applied by many in the field of tourism to explain the interactions between residents and tourists (see Ap, 1992; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1997; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997; McGehee, Andereck, & Vogt, 2002). This theory explains how we feel about a relationship with another person as depending on our perception of three things: 1) the balance (or give and take ratio), 2) the kind of relationship we deserve, and 3) the chance of having a better relationship with someone else (Wallace & Wolf, 2006).

Another characterization of the relationship between resident and tourist is that of the ‘self versus other’ dichotomy (Kohn, 1997). This dichotomy is not only experienced on the part of the tourists looking at the resident as the “other” (Krippendorf, 1999; MacCannell, 1999; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Smith, 1989; Urry, 1994; Van Den Berghe, 1994) but also on the part of the resident looking at the tourist as the “other” (Laxson, 1991; McNaughton, 2006). According to Wearing and Wearing (2001), “there remains a fundamental assumption that ‘self’ and ‘other’ are separate entities and ‘self’ is at all times prioritized over ‘other’” (p. 148). This sense of “otherness” for both hosts and guests originates in part from the stereotypes each group has of the other and from their different world views (Laxson, 1991). As MacCannell (1984) claims, “relationships
between residents and tourists is a breeding ground for stereotype formation” (p. 388). From a residents’ perspective (especially in developing countries) tourists can be viewed as intrusive, agents of conflict, and agents of change (i.e., demonstration effect or acculturation effect) (Mason, 2006). From a visitors’ perspective (especially from a developed country) residents can be viewed as “poor, carefree, untidy, not so clean, dirty, and unhygienic, lazy, and not so very intelligent” (Krippendorf, 1999, p. 61). In either case, both forms of ‘others’ have been conceived as outsiders as in two works regarding Native American residents and tourists entitled: ‘how “they” see “us”’ (Evans-Pritchard, 1989) and ‘how “we” see “them”’ (Laxson, 1991). Krippendorf (1999) perpetuates this ‘self versus other’ dichotomy by stating,

Tourism leads to a misunderstanding instead of understanding among peoples; at times confrontation instead of meeting. In the worst case mutual contempt instead of esteem: tourists despise the ‘underdeveloped’ natives, and natives in their turn despise the unrestrained foreigners….Tourists and natives come nowhere near a meaningful contact—far from it, in fact (p. 61).

These views of the relationship between residents and tourists fall short for a number of reasons. First, it is assumed that members of each group make up their own homogenous whole. As with tourists, the resident community is heterogeneous not homogenous (Mason, 2006). Residents can be segmented to reflect gradations of economic dependence, length of residence, age, ethnic background, and place of residence (see Doxey, 1975; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002; Madrigal, 1995; Potts & Harrill, 1998). Tourists can also be segmented by motivations of
travel, behavior, and familiarity of destination (see Arimond & Elfessi, 2001; Beiger & Laesser, 2002; Boyd & Butler, 1998; Brey & Lehto, 2007; Cohen, 1972; Dolnicar, 2004; Fuller & Matzler, 2008; MacKay, Andereck, & Vogt, 2002; Pearce & Lee, 2005; Plog, 1974; Sarigollu & Huang, 2005). To claim either party is homogenous in its makeup is to imply that diverse, individual perspectives are not important.

This view of tourism often does not account for commonalities shared between residents and tourists even though such commonality is apparent throughout the tourism literature. For example, many authors have highlighted the shared behavior of both parties in terms of shopping (Snepenger, Reiman, Johnson, & Snepenger, 1998; Snepenger, Murphy, O’Connell, & Gregg, 2003), attending special events together (Derrett, 2003; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002), and multiple other activities throughout the community (Blank, 1989; Kneafsey, 2001).

Residents and tourists also share beliefs. For instance, Laxson (1991) mentions the reverence that both residents and tourists feel for particular Native American ritual dances in the Southeast United States. Sherlock (2001) talks of residents and tourists in northeastern Australia seeking escape and refuge in a seaside tropical retreat near the Great Barrier Reef where both parties peacefully coexist. Cohen (1996) and his work on hill tribes and hunter-gatherer groups in Thailand showcases how both residents and tourists share the belief that living in harmony with nature, escaping developed contemporary society, and getting back to deep cultural roots is important to life.

Positive interactions between residents and tourists have also been examined in the literature. Pizam, Uriely, and Reichel (2000) focus on working tourists in Israel
whose positive interactions with the host community leads to a change from typical negative attitudes and feelings towards their host to more positive attitudes and feelings. Prentice, Witt, and Wydenbach (1994) found in a study of tourists in South Wales that tourists may be endeared to a destination or inhabitants through informal social interactions such as chatting with local residents and participating in everyday social activities with residents. Both Rothman (1978), in a study of residents in two communities in Delaware and Sheldon and Var (1984) in a study examining residents in North Wales, determined that the more frequently residents interacted with tourists, the more intimate the social relations were between the parties.

Deeper degrees of interaction between resident and tourist have been at the center of research in alternative forms of tourism over the last two decades including: ‘green tourism,’ ‘ecotourism,’ ‘sustainable tourism,’ ‘volunteer tourism,’ ‘heritage tourism,’ and the like (Jafari, 1990). These forms of tourism have sought to break down the barrier between residents and tourists in focusing on a greater understanding between the parties, tourists learning about the host communities, and residents’ providing sustainable tourism opportunities resulting in minimal short-term and long-term impacts (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2004; Gunn & Var, 2002; Mason, 2006; Pearce, 1989). However alternative tourism or its conceptualization is not without shortcomings. According to Butler (1990) there are at least four problems with alternative tourism. Those issues include: a lack of ability to determine levels of sustainable development, lack of ability to manage tourism and control the development, lack of appreciation that tourism does cause impacts, is an industry, and can not be easily reversed, and lack of appreciation that tourism is dynamic.
and causes change as well as responds to change (Butler, 1990). Further, alternative
tourism has not fully embraced an affective or emotional component to the relationship
between resident and tourist.

Wearing and Wearing (2001) however do call for an examination of emotions
between resident and tourist by deconstructing the “outdated” ‘self’ versus ‘other’
dichotomy. The authors argue that money has been at the center of the host and guest
relationship, whereby mere “sightseeing, curiosity, objectification, inferiorization and
exploitation” are all performed by tourists visiting resident communities (p. 156).
Examining emotional relationships is one means to transcend views of the relationship
between the two parties which allows for an examination of the feelings or emotions
either party experiences regarding the other (Lupton, 1998).

Wearing and Wearing (2001) claim that the other and self are inextricably
intertwined through emotional connections and interactions that exist and they are not
entirely separate as past literature has stated. Building on the work of Lupton, Craib
(1998) claims that interactions and “experiences contribute to an ‘I’ which organizes the
various ‘me’s’ and which includes a rational, thinking self, but also a ‘flow of feelings
and unconscious processes’” (p. 170). In their work on the emotional self and tourism,
Wearing and Wearing (2001) suggest that,

A conceptualization of the selves of tourists and hosts predicated on a subjective,
cumulative, non-essentialist, but embodied and emotional, ‘I’ which constructs
and reconstructs the tourist experience in interaction with significant others,
significant reference groups and the generalized other in the form of cultural
values may go some way to exploring the complexity of tourist experiences for both tourists and hosts (p. 151-152).

It is implied that since the ‘self’ can be changed and developed through fresh experiences such as travel, there are different gradations of perspectives among both residents and tourists; that not everyone shares the same attitudes or emotions about the ‘other.’

The call for greater examination of emotions between residents and tourists has been echoed by other tourism researchers. Primarily speaking from the perspective of tourists, McIntosh (1998) indicated that examining degrees of emotions or affect is necessary for a more holistic understanding of tourism experience and interactions. McIntosh also claims that mixed methods research may be the most beneficial at measuring emotions. Mixed methods research involves collecting multiple forms of data (i.e., interviews, observations, surveys) and mixing data throughout stages of research within one particular study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006). Pizam et al. (2000) focused on how tourist feelings towards residents were shaped through interaction and found a positive correlation between the two. As the authors noted, future research is needed to examine residents’ feelings towards tourists through their interactions. In examining endearment of residents on the part of tourists through behavior, Prentice et al. (1994) argue that researchers need to concentrate more on the affective dimensions of tourism in explaining the relationship between residents and tourists. The authors claim that research that focuses on tourists in this regard is important, but residents’ degree of affect is also quite important and needs to be examined.
One way to transcend the limitations of previous resident attitude research and embrace this emotional component of the relationships between residents and tourists is by employing the theoretical framework of emotional solidarity. The concept of emotional solidarity, first conceived of in the work by Durkheim (1995[1915]) in his work *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, is the cohesion or solidarity members of a group feel with one another. Hammarstrom (2005) claimed emotional solidarity to be the affective bonds an individual experiences with one another that are characterized by perceived emotional closeness and degree of contact (i.e., help or support). Jacobs and Allen (2005) described the concept as a feeling of solidarity that binds together a group, fostering a sense of “we together,” as opposed to a “me versus you” sentiment. Wallace and Wolf (2006) state that emotional solidarity is feeling a sense of identification with others or identifying with other individuals as a result of a common value system.

Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) theory of emotional solidarity posited as individuals within a particular religion interact with each other, share a belief system, and engage in similar behaviors; individuals experience emotional solidarity with one another. As a structural functionalist in the discipline of sociology, Durkheim viewed religion and other social structures as systems, with intricate parts, each serving a purpose to respond to negative issues in society. In the context of religion, this included the intricacies of rituals, rites, beliefs, practitioners, interactions, etc. To Durkheim, a whole (or system in this case) cannot be defined except in relation to its parts.

Tourism is also a social structure as MacCannell (1999) and Rojek (2000) have pointed out. Tourism can be thought of as a system of interconnected parts including
residents, tourists, travel industry, local economies, local communities, local government, hospitality sector, amenities, etc. (Blank, 1989; Gunn & Var, 2002; Leiper, 1990; Murphy, 1985). Within the context of tourism, some of the most basic systematic components of community include: a local economic system providing a livelihood to local residents, community infrastructure and services such as local businesses, residents who make their home in the community, and tourists who visit the community, utilize services, and contribute to the local economy. Tourism, like religion, has been conceptualized as a response to negative issues in society (Mason & Cheyne, 2000), primarily as an economic development tool.

The theory of emotional solidarity has never been tested or applied in the context of tourism, especially where residents have some form of interaction with tourists that visit their area as well as share similar beliefs and behavior. The theoretical framework of emotional solidarity is utilized and tested in this study to ascertain the degree of solidarity felt between residents and tourists.

Problem Statement

The affective component of relationships between residents and tourists has not been examined within the tourism field and is missing from the tourism literature. Such an examination can provide a new way of explaining the dynamic relationship between parties and move beyond the view of the relationship that is characterized by an imbalance of power, homogeneity of perspectives, financial transactions, and the dichotomy of ‘self’ and ‘other,’ superficial and transitory interactions, and inauthentic experiences.
Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the dynamic, unique relationships between residents and tourists within a particular community using the framework of emotional solidarity. This framework will allow for an in-depth examination of the emotional connection between residents and tourists. Such relationships can be examined from either the perspective of a resident or tourist (or both), but will be focused exclusively from the residents’ perspective in this study. This study focused specifically on residents within a particular region so as to allow for greater manageability in conducting this project.

Site Selection

Beaufort County, South Carolina situated in the southeastern corner of the state was selected as the study site for this project for a few reasons. First, the location was deemed ideal given the wealth of different types of individuals living in the county. A majority of residents (65%) were born outside of Beaufort County, which indicates most individuals relocated to the county (US Census Bureau, 2007). The retiree population has increased nearly 100% over the last decade (Hill & Hill, 2004). Further, 20.3% of the county’s heads of household is African Americans, which is similar to state numbers of 26.6% (US Census Bureau, 2008). Such different people undoubtedly hold varying perspectives of tourists, which would ultimately provide great variance in emotional solidarity. In communicating with officials of the Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Hilton Head-Bluffton Chamber of Commerce, they shared that residents have divergent perspectives of tourists and the accompanying development.
Most notably, those who have lived in the areas the longest would be the least embracing of tourism and tourism development. This is similar to what McCool & Martin (1994) found in studies of regional residents and their perspectives on tourists.

The site was also chosen given that Beaufort County as a whole continues to exhibits signs of tourism support as it one of the fastest growing counties in the state for tourism development (SCPRT, 2006). In fact, as a result of the spillover of tourism and residential development in Hilton Head Island, the town of Bluffton has grown from one square mile in land mass with 1275 residents in 2000 to its current size of approximately 15,000 residents within an area of roughly 54 square miles (Town of Bluffton, 2008). This makes Bluffton one of the fastest growing towns in South Carolina. In addition, tourism is the largest industry in the county ranking third in the state ($958 million) in terms of domestic travel expenditures behind Horry County ($2.9 billion) and Charleston County ($1.5 billion) (SCPRT, 2006).

With having such diverse groups of residents within Beaufort County (i.e., African Americans, retirees, second homeowners, long-time residents, new residents, native-born residents, and tourism dependent residents), the region is ideal to be able to capture the divergent perspectives of residents regarding tourism and determine the extent to which they possess an emotional solidarity with visiting tourists.

Research Phases

Given that research regarding emotions and emotional solidarity is relatively new to the field of tourism, an exploratory sequential mixed methods design was used in this study. This involves an initial exploratory qualitative portion of research which informs a
quantitative portion of research in the latter stages of a project (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006). More specifically, this study included three distinct phases. Phase One of the study consisted of an exploration of the construct emotional solidarity (the dependent variable in data analysis within Phase Three) as well as the constructs interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior among residents and tourists (independent variables used in data analysis within Phase Three). This exploration of the constructs consisted of three focus groups of Beaufort County residents with heterogeneous perspectives of tourists and tourism.

Phase Two of the study included developing and testing four scales (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity) that represent the constructs put forth in Durkheim’s theory of emotional solidarity. Items for each scale were created from qualitative data analysis of focus groups, as well as informed from the literature regarding each construct.

In Phase Three, a survey was conducted and distributed to a representative sample of the county’s residents to test two models: the first being Durkheim’s model and the second being a model with Durkheim’s constructs as well as other potential resident characteristic predictors of emotional solidarity that emerged from the focus group data analysis and a review of the literature. The survey data was also used to determine how emotional solidarity differs across resident types and by the type of tourist that residents interact with most frequently. The survey instrument included the developed emotional solidarity scale, scales of the three constructs used to predict emotional solidarity (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior), as well as other resident characteristic
and demographic items (i.e., retirement status, length of residency, place of birth, tourism dependence, prior vacationing experience in Beaufort County, recent travel experience outside the county, and age).

Research Questions

This study included five research questions. The overarching research question of this work was, “What level of emotional solidarity do residents of Beaufort County have with tourists who visit their area?” The second research question concerned testing Durkheim’s model using the context of tourism. It was stated as, “Do the three variables mentioned throughout the literature and within Durkheim’s theory (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior) significantly predict emotional solidarity of residents with tourists?” A third research question concerned additional resident characteristics added to the three in Durkheim’s model to determine if the amended model explained more variance in emotional solidarity than the original model. It was written, “Do additional resident characteristics (i.e., age, length of residency, income level, and dependence on tourism) explain a greater variance in emotional solidarity than do the initial three constructs in Durkheim’s model?”

The last two research questions related to emotional solidarity differing across multiple resident characteristics and across tourist types residents encounter the most frequently within the community. The fourth research question was stated as, “How does level of emotional solidarity differ across resident characteristics (i.e., retirement status, length of residency, place of birth, tourism dependence, prior vacationing experience in Beaufort County, recent travel experience outside the county, and age)?” The fifth
research question was written as, “How does level of emotional solidarity differ by type of tourist within the community?” These tourist types were ascertained from initial focus group data. Specific hypotheses are presented in Chapter Four for the last four research questions. Objectives for these research questions follow.

Research Objectives

Six objectives existed for this project. The first objective was to identify multiple types of tourists that exist in Beaufort County. This was done within Phase One and was communicated by residents within focus groups as well as through conversations with chamber of commerce officials in the county. The second objective was to generate scale items of emotional solidarity, which was the ultimate dependent variable to be used in Phase Three. Items were generated in Phase One from data analysis of focus groups as well through the literature. A third objective was to generate scale items for interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior, to predict emotional solidarity according to Durkheim (1995[1915]). These items were generated from the Phase One focus groups as well as through the tourism literature. The fourth objective was to generate additional predictor variables of emotional solidarity in the way of resident characteristics. This also occurred during Phase One and was based on focus group data analysis and a review of the tourism literature.

A fifth objective was to develop and test each of the four scales. This objective occurred during Phase Two of the study following a priori steps of constructing scales by Churchill (1979). The sixth and final objective was to conduct a self-administered on-site survey to a representative sample of Beaufort County residents that tested both models as
mentioned above and helped determine emotional solidarity differences across resident characteristics and by tourist types. This objective occurred during Phase Three of the study.

Study Contributions

This study is significant for numerous reasons. First, little research has been conducted examining residents’ emotional solidarity with tourists. This is probably due to the fact that residents and tourists have been viewed historically as having little in common with one another (Krippendorf, 1999; Nash, 1998). This study attempts to understand the level of connectivity between residents and tourists with possible overlapping interests in the same region. This study goes beyond attitudes of residents regarding tourism development that is included in existing research by seeking to determine the degree of emotional solidarity residents feel with tourists. This research aims to reveal how residents’ perspectives can illuminate both the positive and negative socio-cultural impacts that tourists bring to the community. Further, it seeks to highlight on commonalities residents and tourists share beyond financial transactions and being in the same geographic region. This study is also of practical importance. By knowing the degree of emotional solidarity that residents possess with tourists and the significant factors that influence this emotional solidarity, community professionals and tourism planners can develop particular strategies to accommodate resident and tourist needs within the community.
Definition of Terms

Emotional solidarity

The affective bonds individuals feel with one another binding a group together, that are characterized by perceived closeness, degree of contact, and an identification with others in the group (Hammarstrom, 2005; Jacobs & Allen, 2005; Wallace & Wolf, 2006).

Shared beliefs

Common convictions or opinions accepted as truths among individuals (i.e., residents and tourists) regarding a particular phenomenon (primarily the geographic region of Beaufort County as it pertains to this study).

Shared behavior

Collective observable actions or reactions individuals (i.e., residents and tourists) performed in a given location.

Interaction

The process of individuals sharing a physical space, communicating (through informal or formal speech or sight) with each other, and having either a direct or indirect effect upon one another.

Residents (members of host community)

Those individuals who live within Beaufort County, South Carolina as permanent citizens (voting within the county) aged 18 years and older.

Tourists (members of guest community)
Those visitors to Beaufort County, South Carolina who travel outside of their usual environment, for a period not exceeding 12 months for multiple purposes (i.e., vacation/holiday, business, pilgrimages, special events, conferences, visiting friends and relatives) (World Tourism Organization, 1997).

Outline of Dissertation

The remainder of this dissertation includes four chapters, followed by appendices and references. Chapter Two includes a review of the literature pertinent to this study. Five sections are found in Chapter Two: empirical findings dealing with host and guest, rethinking the commonly held views of host and guest, residents’ attitudes towards tourism, residents identifying with tourists, and emotional solidarity.

Chapter Three contains the proposed theoretical framework and conceptual model for the study. Within Chapter Three there are three parts: a discussion of the proposed theoretical model for the study; a discussion of the community components found in a tourist destination, potential segments of residents and tourists who could experience emotional solidarity with one another, and a graphic of the segments; and two conceptual models that were tested in this study.

Chapter Four includes a discussion of the methods used for the study, including: a brief history of the study site, background of mixed methods, the particular mixed methods approach that was used, rationales for using mixed methods, and a graphic representation of data collection and analysis. The remainder of the chapter includes a discussion of scale development procedures, sampling strategies, data collection
techniques, data analysis procedures used for both the qualitative and quantitative portions of the study, and hypotheses.

Chapter Five pertains to results of the study. Three main sections are found within this chapter. Those sections are the results of the qualitative data analysis for the three focus groups, results of the scale development for the four constructs represented in Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model, and results from the analysis of the survey data including testing the two conceptual models from Chapter Three and additional analyses examining the effect of resident characteristics and tourist type on dimensions of emotional solidarity.

Chapter Six is the concluding chapter of the dissertation. This chapter includes a discussion of findings for the focus groups and the survey, implications (both theoretical and practical), limitations, future research, and concluding remarks of the study.

The final portion of this dissertation includes appendices and references. There are 16 appendices listed as Appendix A-Appendix P. References make up the last section of the dissertation.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

The following chapter includes a review of the literature pertaining to five main areas relevant to this study. The sections focus on empirical findings dealing with the host and guest, rethinking the commonly held views of host and guest, residents’ attitudes towards tourism, residents identifying with tourists, and emotional solidarity. A concluding section ends this chapter.

Host and Guest

The idea of a host and guest (or resident and tourist, respectively) has existed for hundreds, if not thousands of years as evidenced in historical accounts of the Sumerians in their travel (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2004), Biblical passages of Joseph and Mary in Bethlehem, and the numerous characters in Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales (Aramberri, 2001). It was the anthropological work of Smith (1989) that made the terms “host” and “guest” popular in the fields of travel and tourism in her work, Hosts and Guests (first written in 1977). Within the work, a series of case studies are presented highlighting the impacts visitors can have on indigenous cultures, which culminates into a theoretical perspective put forth by Nunez (1989) characterizing the interaction between hosts and guests. In the collection of case studies edited by Smith (1989), notions of host and guest are static in nature, not involving any sort of process of either emerging. Simply put, hosts are those who provide services to guests who arrive in unfamiliar lands on vacations and holidays.
Oftentimes in the literature the host and guest are conceptualized as the ‘self’ and the ‘other’ (MacCannell, 1999; McNaughton, 2006; Smith, 1989; Urry, 1990; Wearing & Wearing, 2001). This includes the tourist as ‘self’ gazing upon the ‘other’ or local in a different land or setting out of the ordinary (Urry, 1990). Also, this includes the tourist as ‘self’ in search of an authentic extraordinary experience, much different from the mundane world he/she is planning to leave behind (MacCannell, 1999). This ‘self’ versus ‘other’ is typically examined where the tourist is from the Western Country and the resident or local is from a less developed country (Smith, 1989). This creates somewhat of a social disconnect or social difference between travelers from developed countries and residents of less developed countries. Urry (1990) claims that such “social differences are not as accentuated in northern Europe and North America as tourism creates fewer strains since the mass of ‘hosts’ will themselves be ‘guests’ on other occasions” (p. 58).

Borrowing from the field of anthropology, Nunez (1989) claimed that the interactions between host and guest could best be explained through the theory of acculturation stating that when individuals from different cultural backgrounds are exposed to one another for extended periods of time, they borrow different mannerisms and ways of life. This perspective is echoed by Nash (1996) as he claimed, “the guiding paradigm for examining tourism’s effects on host peoples has been that of acculturation and development” (p. 25). Acculturation in this light is referred to as the socio-cultural change (both negative and positive) resulting from the social contact of host and guest. Williams (1998) noted:
Acculturation theory states that when two cultures come into contact for any length of time, an exchange of ideas and products will take place that through time, produce varying levels of convergence between the cultures; that is they become similar (p. 153).

Even though acculturation theory claims such a process is a “two-way street” between host and guest, Nunez (1989) said however that there is an asymmetry in the way acculturation occurs between hosts and guests—hosts are the ones borrowing more of the time. Mason (2006) said this process of acculturation is not truly balanced as one culture is likely to be stronger or more influential than the other.

This perspective of the host and guest relationship has been accepted for many years, and Aramberri (2001) claims that the true interaction between the host and guest in this modern day era of mass tourism is not one of acculturation as much as it is based on relationships of financial exchange for services between the parties. Aramberri says:

the main tie that binds the contracting parties is the deliverance of services—commodities—on the part of the hosts, and payment in cash for the tab they have been running on behalf of the guests. In fact, the hosts are no longer hosts, just providers of services, while the guests are no longer guests, just customers (p. 750).

These relationships according to Sutton (1967) are superficial where the host serves the guest and the latter party’s wealth leads to an exploitative behavior of host residents (de Kadt, 1979). MacCannell (1999) claimed that what is likely to occur in many tourist destinations is that residents act on a front stage (Goffman, 1959) for visitors (entirely
different from how they would act in their own “backstage” life). This in essence, creates the illusion of authentic traditions, or as Goffman would claim, “a staged authenticity.”

Rethinking the Commonly Held Views of Host and Guest

Kohn (1997) in her work on a remote island off the coast of Scotland says that, “the individual tourist does not just face a world that is completely ‘other’, and people are never completely caught in the dichotomies of hosts vs. guests” (p. 27). The most prevalent conceptualizations of ‘host’ and ‘guest’ relationships within the literature and in everyday life leave little room for residents to feel a sense of identification or solidarity with the tourists with such an emphasis on a contrived form of socialization, financial transactions, power imbalance, and the ‘self’ versus ‘other’ dichotomy. This is especially true if residents consider tourists as outsiders, or the relationship between the two parties as “us” versus “them.” Both Evans-Pritchard (1989) and Laxson (1991) covered this disconnect in their works regarding interactions between Native American residents and tourists. Laxson (1991) claims that both tourists and residents view each other as the ‘other,’ which has originated in part from the stereotypes each group has of the other and from different world views. Unfortunately it is easiest for individuals within society to use heuristics in boiling down individuals into one group or another, but it is more complicated than that.

Resident Segmentation Studies

Residents do not all think and act the same in relation to tourists and tourism. Some view tourists with ambivalence, some with animosity, some with hatred, and still some even with open arms (Jurowski, 1996). Madrigal (1995) specifically clustered
residents into three groups based on perspectives of tourism development within two communities. He found the majority of residents were “realists,” understanding both the positive and negative aspects of tourism development. The next largest group according to Madrigal was the “haters,” who strongly disagreed with the positive aspects associated with tourism development and agree with the negative aspects. Finally, “lovers” make up the smallest percentage of residents, agreeing with the positive aspects of development and strongly disagreeing with the negative aspects.

In a similar study of ten New Zealand communities, Williams and Lawson (2001) segmented residents based on their opinions of tourism. Four groups emerged from the data analysis: “lovers,” who made up 44% of the sample and felt tourism had more positive impacts than negative in the community; “cynics,” who comprised 10% of the sample and feel tourism contributes to demise of community; “taxpayers,” who made up 25% of the sample and do not feel very strongly one way or another about tourism; and “innocents,” who comprised 20% of the sample and are unaware of the potential benefits of tourism in the community. It is apparent from the studies by Madrigal (1995) and Williams and Lawson (2001) that a majority of the residents of a community fall between two extremes (smaller in proportion) of approval and disapproval of tourism development. What both studies lack is an explanation of length of residency and how that may determine residents’ opinions of tourism and how they fit into different resident segments.

Length of residency is ascertained to a greater degree in the work of Davis, Allen, and Cosenza (1988). Davis and colleagues segmented local residents by their attitudes,
interests, and opinions toward tourism and compared native-born status across each segment. Five segments resulted from the work: “haters,” “lovers,” “cautious romantics,” “in-betweeners,” and “love ‘em for a reason.” The researchers found that the highest percentage (40%) of natives existed in the “haters” attitude cluster. Such a percentage is significant given that the lowest portion (16%) of natives were found in the “lovers” cluster (Davis et al., 1988).

The work of Fredline and Faulkner (2000; 2002) involving Australian residents’ attitudes regarding motor sports was inspired from the work of Davis, et al. (1988). Cluster analysis was used to segment residents in each study. In a study concerning the Gold Coast IndyCar Race, Fredline and Faulkner (2000) initially found five clusters to exist including “haters,” “lovers,” “ambivalent supporters,” “realists,” and “concerned for a reason.” Residents in the “lovers” cluster were more likely to fit the demographic profile of a spectator of the event either in the way of attending or watching the event on television (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000).

Fredline and Faulkner (2002) also compared two motor sports events in Australia—the Australian Formula One Grand Prix and the Gold Coast IndyCar Race and clustered residents’ reactions once again. In this study they also found five clusters based largely on positive and negative reactions. Those clusters were: “most negative,” “moderately negative,” “ambivalent,” “moderately positive,” and “most positive.” Similar to the initial study, Fredline and Faulkner (2002) found the “most positive” cluster of residents to have participated in the events the most. This finding from both studies indicates a shared behavior among residents and tourists in attending a tourist
event as well as a degree of positive social interaction between the two parties. However no mention is made within either work as to the degree of emotional solidarity or identification residents felt with tourists.

The commonly held views of the relationship between residents and tourists as highlighted above are problematic for various reasons. It is assumed that members of each group make up their own homogenous whole. As with tourists, the resident community is heterogeneous not homogenous (Mason, 2006). Residents (see Davis et al., 1988; Doxey, 1975; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002; Madrigal, 1995; Potts & Harrill, 1998) as well as tourists (see Bieger & Laesser, 2002; Boyd & Butler, 1998; Brey & Lehto, 2007; Cohen, 1972; MacKay et al., 2002; Pearce & Lee, 2005; Plog, 1974; Sarigollu & Huang, 2005) can be segmented or clustered to reflect the gradations of economic dependence, length of residence, age, ethnic background, place of residence (in terms of residents) and the motivations of travel, behavior, and familiarity of destination (in terms of tourists). To claim either party is homogenous in its makeup is to imply that diverse, individual perspectives are not important.

Tourist Segmentation Studies

Segmenting travelers within the tourism literature is one of the most common methodological techniques undertaken by researchers, primarily within journals embracing marketing (e.g., *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* and *Journal of Travel Research*). In a recent review of articles in the *Journal of Travel Research* from 1990 to present, the author noted that approximately one of every seven empirical articles segmented tourists.
It is beyond the scope of this section to present a review of the entire literature on tourist segmentation studies; instead some of the most recent studies on the topic are discussed. Some of the ways by which tourists have been segmented include motivations, behavior, and benefits sought. In a study examining tourist motivation in the context of the travel career approach, Pearce and Lee (2005) segmented tourists by level of travel experience (i.e., high travel experience and low travel experience). Ultimately what Pearce and Lee (2005) found was that host-site involvement motivations (e.g., experiencing different cultures) were the most important for more experienced travelers, whereas motivations such as stimulation and personal development were the most important for less experienced travelers.

Other researchers have segmented tourists based on behavior. Brey and Lehto (2007) segmented tourists in terms of daily and vacation activities. Three classifications of activity association were found within the data: positive (i.e., where a strong positive correlation exists between daily and vacation activity that are engaged in), nondescript (i.e., where no relationship exists between the two), and negative (i.e., where daily activity predicts non-activity at a destination). Overall, Brey and Lehto (2007) found that the more people are involved in an activity in a daily setting, the more such individuals tend to participate in the same activity while on vacation. MacKay et al. (2002) examined motorist niche markets across two destinations (i.e., the Canadian province Manitoba and the US state Arizona). Four tourist niches emerged from the data: sightseers only, cultural sightseers, outdoor recreation sightseers, and cultural/outdoor recreation sightseers. What the researchers found was that Manitoba had a higher percentage of sightseers only,
whereas Arizona had a much higher percentage of cultural and cultural/outdoor
tourism sightseers (MacKay et al., 2002). MacKay and colleagues also found that the
sightseeing tourists in both locations scored lower on tourist motivation items than did
those in the other three groups with more specialized interests.

Tourists have also been segmented according to their motivations and benefits
they seek. Bieger and Laesser (2002) examined Swiss travelers and their motivations and
found four types of travelers: compulsory travelers, cultural hedonists, family travelers,
and me(e/a)t marketing travelers (i.e. personality marketing in two senses: 1) body, which
is “meat” and 2) verbal communication, which is “meet’). Tourists have also been
segmented on the basis of benefits they seek at the destination. Conducting a study of
visitors to Latin America, Sarigollu and Huang (2005) segmented individuals based on
benefits yielding four groups. Those segments consisted of adventurers, individuals who
are multifarious, travelers seeking fun and relaxation, and the urbane visitor.

Studies segmenting residents and tourist populations exemplify the fact that
neither group is homogenous. This indicates the potential for numerous forms of
relationships, including those predicated on the common ground between parties. Such
areas of common ground include residents and tourists interacting with one another on a
daily basis and possessing similar beliefs and behaviors.

*Interactions, Shared Beliefs, and Shared Behaviors between Residents and Tourists*

Commonalities between residents and tourists are also underrepresented in the
most prevalent views of the resident and tourist relationship. However, such
commonalities are apparent throughout the tourism literature. Interaction between
residents and tourists is one such commonality. In a study of Ghana residents and their attitudes toward tourism, Teye, Sonmez, and Sirakaya (2002) found that interaction (i.e., with items such as “I have developed friendships with tourists,” “I enjoy interacting with tourists,” and “my interactions with tourists are positive and useful”) explained 17.5% of the variance in attitudes among local residents. Similarly in a study of Beaufort County, South Carolina residents, Faulkenberry, Coggeshall, Backman, and Backman (2000) found some residents reported that tourists “become like friends, and that’s fun…the experiences you have just talking to people” (p. 91).

Pizam et al. (2000) focus on working tourists in Israel whose positive interactions with the host community leads to a change from typical negative attitudes and feelings towards their host to more positive attitudes and feelings. Prentice et al. (1994) found in a study of tourists in South Wales that tourists may be endeared to a destination or inhabitants through informal social interactions such as chatting with local residents and participating in everyday social activities with residents.

Sheldon and Var (1984) in a study of residents in North Wales found that residents living in high density areas with large numbers of tourists do not appear to be more negative to tourists, contrary to previous study results. Furthermore, Sheldon and Var (1984) determined that residents felt the more frequent visitors had the least negative impact on their society. Similar findings were found in Rothman’s (1978) work involving residents of two communities in southern Delaware. What Rothman found was that when repeat visitors’ encounters are frequent, intimate social relations exist between residents and tourists.
The importance of interactions between residents and tourists was stressed in the work of Wearing and Wearing (2001) as the authors called for a move beyond the traditional ‘self/other’ view of resident and tourist relationships. The authors emphasize the importance of “interactions—personal, communal, and cultural in the tourist enterprise between residents and tourists and position the selves and identities of each party at the ethical center of tourism” (p.143). Wearing and Wearing call for a focus on tourism to be centered around individuals involved in interactions, as opposed to the common exchange of resources, which will ultimately supersede the prevalent ‘self’ and ‘other’ dichotomy. The authors conclude their work with a call for a greater examination of the role emotions play in the interactions between residents and tourists in everyday life.

Residents and tourists also share similar beliefs within the literature. For instance, Laxson (1991) mentions the reverence that both residents and tourists feel for particular Native American ritual dances in the Southeast United States. Sherlock (2001) talks of residents and tourists in northeastern Australia seeking escape and refuge in a seaside tropical retreat near the Great Barrier Reef where both parties peacefully coexist. Clustering residents in a study surrounding a major motorsport event in Australia, Fredline and Faulkner (2002) found that residents who supported the event held the most similar views of tourists, primarily that they held the highest level of interest in motor racing as a sport. Cohen (1996) and his work on hill tribes and hunter-gatherer groups in Thailand showcased how both residents and tourists share the belief that living in
harmony with nature, escaping developed contemporary society, and getting back to deep cultural roots is important to life.

Participating in similar activities is another area of common ground between residents and tourists. For example, many authors have highlighted on the shared behavior of both parties in terms of shopping (Snepenger et al, 1998; Snepenger et al, 2003), attending special events together (Derrett, 2003; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002), and multiple other activities throughout the community (Blank, 1989; Kneafsey, 2001).

Moving beyond the most common views of the relationship of resident and tourist as characterized by power imbalance, superficiality, inauthenticity, ‘self’ versus ‘other’ and embracing the heterogeneity in both parties, interactions, shared beliefs, and shared behaviors between resident and tourist may help explain the divergent and dynamic relationships between the parties and show how some residents may be better slated to feel a stronger emotional solidarity with tourists. However, no scales for interaction, shared beliefs, or shared behavior have been utilized within the tourism literature in the context of resident and tourist relations.

Residents’ Attitudes toward Tourism

Since both residents and tourists are spatially and temporally confined to a particular geographic location, the former tends to develop particular attitudes about the latter as well as the ensuing development that accompanies tourism (de Kadt, 1979). The fields of travel and tourism are not lacking in research examining such attitudes of residents (see Allen, Hafer, Long, & Perdue, 1993; Allen et al., 1988; Andereck & Vogt,
A number of research studies have examined residents’ attitudes towards tourism or tourists (Andereck et al., 2005; Ap, 1992; Ap & Crompton, 1998; Jurowski, 1998; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997; McGehee, Andereck, & Vogt, 2002; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1990; Perdue, Long, & Allen, 1987). The author, in his own examination of the two leading journals within the tourism field (i.e., *Journal of Travel Research* and *Annals of Tourism Research*), found that approximately 10% of the empirical studies over the last two decades involved an examination of residents’ attitudes towards tourism or tourists. To date the research has largely been focused on the best predictors of attitude (e.g., income, ethnicity, length of residency, age, gender, residential proximity to tourism, and economic dependency) and is largely atheoretical (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Harrill, 2004).

Of the theories that have been used (i.e., social exchange, community attachment, and growth machine), some researchers (Andereck et al., 2005; McGehee & Andereck, 2004) are calling for different theoretical perspectives to be employed in researching the interface between residents and tourists. This is largely due to the facts that many findings are quite mixed regarding attitudes towards tourism (Harrill, 2004) and the belief that the relationship is not fully explained through the existing use of theoretical perspectives (Andereck et al., 2005; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). As Andereck et al. (2005) claims about one particular theoretical framework, “while social exchange theory may be a potentially useful framework, alternatively it may be an incomplete structure for understanding response to tourism phenomena by community residents” (p. 1073).

Three main findings come from this literature on resident attitudes to tourism and tourism development. First, the more a community is economically dependent upon
tourism, the more likely it will be in support of tourism development (Pizam, 1978). Second, those who stand to gain the most financially in a community have the highest support for tourism development (Martin, McGuire, & Allen, 1998). Finally, despite potential negative impacts of increased prices, drug use, vandalism, violence, sexual harassment, environmental degradation, and low wages, communities overall tend to favor tourism development (Allen et al., 1993; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Andressen & Murphy, 1986; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). In fact, many destination area residents continue to seek tourism development (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Wall, 1997), primarily for reaping positive economic impacts within the community (Andressen & Murphy, 1986; Mason, 2006; Smith, 1989).

Research on residents’ attitudes towards tourism and tourism development has been examined extensively in terms of economic dependency, socioeconomic factors, and spatial factors (see Harrill, 2004). Unfortunately to date, findings tend to be mixed and no one clear variable seems to arise as the best predictor of resident attitudes (Andereck et al., 2005; Harrill, 2004; McGehee & Andereck, 2004). The following review of the resident attitudes literature highlights significant findings of numerous predictor variables of attitudes.

**Economic Dependency on Tourism as Predictor of Resident Attitudes**

Economic dependence on tourism is one factor that can influence residents’ attitudes toward tourism development. Social exchange theory has been the primary framework used in such studies given that such dependence is rooted in monetary exchanges (Harrill, 2004). The main finding coming from this line of research is that the
more a person or community depends on tourism dollars, the more positive are attitudes toward tourism development (Pizam, 1978; Smith & Krannich, 1998). This is similar to what Akis, Peristianis, and Warner (1996) and Haukeland (1984) found in their research, claiming that residents who were either currently engaged in traditional industrial jobs (i.e., manufacturing) or lost their once high-paying jobs and are employed in low-paying tourism positions have more negative attitudes toward tourism.

Similar findings have been found in gambling communities and well established resort destinations. Caneday and Zeiger (1991) in a study of the gambling community of Deadwood, South Dakota found that residents who had the lowest paying tourism-dependent jobs were the most likely to identify negative impacts of tourism and have negative attitudes toward the industry. Studying Cape Cod, Massachusetts residents, Pizam (1978) found that the more dependent a person was on tourism, as a means of livelihood, the more positive was his/her overall attitude toward tourism on Cape Cod. Numerous other findings exist however surrounding economic dependency and resident attitudes.

Researchers have also found that those individuals within a community who hold the best social and economic positions to receive benefits of tourism typically have the greatest positive attitudes towards the tourism industry. For example, Martin, et al. (1998) found that business owners and town officials in Hilton Head Island, South Carolina were most favorably disposed to tourism within the community. Similarly, Husbands (1989) in a study of the Victoria Falls area in Zambia found white-collar upper-class workers had a greater support for tourism development than did individuals within a lower blue-collar
managerial class. Both of these studies exemplify the apparent “growth machine” phenomenon that exists around tourist development and offer credence to its use as a theoretical framework in relation to resident attitudes toward tourism development (Harrill, 2004).

It is apparent from the literature that residents view being economically dependent on tourism as not only a blessing but a curse. For instance, Lankford (1994) found in a study of the Columbia Gorge region of the Pacific Northwest, residents agreed tourism creates jobs and contributes positively to the local economy, but that the industry does not raise personal standards of living and provides low paying jobs. This ability to see both the positives and negatives of tourism was seen in the Turkish resort town of Marmaris, where Var, Kendall, and Tarakcioglu (1985) found residents agreed that tourism reduces unemployment, creates jobs and businesses, but also drives up property values of prices of houses. Liu, et al (1987) conducted a study of three tourist destinations (i.e., Hawaii, North Wales, and Istanbul, Turkey) and found that despite the economic benefits of tourism, residents still had a great concern for the resulting environmental impacts of tourism development (e.g., ecological degradation and litter). Examining gambling communities in Colorado and South Dakota, Long (1996) discovered that residents had disparate perspectives of the positive economic and socio-cultural impacts of living in a community dependent on tourism from casinos.

**Socioeconomic Factors as Predictor of Resident Attitudes**

Socioeconomic factors are perhaps the most used variables in predicting attitudes within the tourism literature. Some of the variables used to operationalize socioeconomic
factors include age, gender, ethnicity, income, length of residence, and native-born status (Harrill, 2004). However, many of the socioeconomic variables that have been used either do not explain a great deal of the variance in resident attitudes or even play a contradictory role (Perdue et al., 1990).

Age as a predictor has offered some mixed results within the literature. McGehee and Andereck (2004) in a study concerning residents of 12 communities in Arizona and their attitudes toward tourism found that the older the respondent, the less likely he/she was to agree with statements concerning negative impacts of tourism. Similarly in a study of Australia’s Gold Coast, Tomljenovic and Faulkner (2000) found older residents were generally more favorably inclined toward tourism development than their younger counterparts within the community. Conversely, Cavus and Tanrisevdi (2002) found in study of Turkish residents that older residents had more negative perceptions of tourism than younger residents.

Gender as a predictor of resident attitudes has also produced contradictory findings. In their study of a rural region of New Zealand, Mason and Cheyne (2000) found that women were more opposed to tourism development largely due to a higher degree of perceived negative impacts associated with tourism. Similar results were found in a study involving residents of Charleston, South Carolina (Harrill & Potts, 2003). What the authors found was that more women than men had a negative perception of tourism development. Harrill (2004) suggests that perhaps this was found given women associate increased tourist volumes with decreased neighborhood safety and marginal economic benefits. Sometimes men are more opposed to tourism than women within a community.
Petrelka, Krannich, Brehm, and Trentelman (2005) found that men in the Intermountain Western United States were more opposed than women to potential tourism development options and thought the community in which they live had become a less desirable place to live since the onset of tourism development.

Mixed findings have also come from using ethnicity as a predictor of resident attitudes. In a study of northern Wales, Sheldon and Var (1984) found that native Welsh residents were more sensitive to the negative social and cultural impacts that arise from tourism development. Um and Crompton (1987) in a study of a predominantly German town in Texas found that the more attached a resident was to the community regarding birthplace and heritage, the less positively he/she perceived negative impacts. Particular instances of ethnic groups supporting tourism within a community are also found within the literature. Besculides, Lee, and McCormick (2002) conducted a study of Hispanic and non-Hispanic residents’ perceptions of cultural tourism living along the Los Caminos Antiguos Scenic and Historic byway in southwestern Colorado and found that Hispanic residents felt more strongly that such tourism could provide cultural benefits to residents by helping them to preserve their culture. This is similar to what Faulkenberry et al. (2000) found in their study of Beaufort County, South Carolina residents; that one way to help preserve the rich African American “Gullah” culture of the coast is to market the traditional cultural way of life for public viewing and consumption.

While many socioeconomic predictors of resident attitudes have yielded mixed results, two variables in particular (i.e., length of residency and native-born status) tend to yield consistent findings across studies. Research has shown that residents who have
lived in a community for extended periods of time were more opposed to tourism than those who have not lived in a community that long (McCool & Martin, 1994; Snaith & Haley, 1999; Williams, McDonald, Riden, & Uysal, 1995). Both McCool and Martin (1994) and Williams et al. (1995) found that short-term second homeowner residents had a more favorable perception of tourism than those who had lived in the area for longer terms. In a similar vein, Snaith and Haley (1999), examining the historic area of York, England, found that the shorter the length of residence, the more positive residents’ opinions about tourism were.

Perhaps some of the “incomer” residents (i.e., new residents to an area) as Kneafsey (2001) calls them are themselves not far removed from being visitors to the area, which is why they are not entirely opposed to tourism. In addition, such new residents may still feel a degree of “outsideness” as Kohn (1997) claims, which is why some may embrace visitors as the latter is also considered an “outsider” in a community (Smith, 1989). Overall, new residents within a community are more likely to participate in tourist activities, promote the local area to visitors, and welcome others to their community than other residents who have lived in the community longer (Kneafsey, 2001). Some neo-natives (in the case of Sante Fe, New Mexico) arrive in a particular location, bring with them values and beliefs different from residents (of the location in which they just moved), and shape local culture to meet the demands of the growing travel from other outsiders (Pearce, 1989; Rothman, 1998).

Closely related to years of residence, native-born status has also been linked to residents’ attitudes towards tourism. More specifically, those individuals who are born in
the same place where the tourism occurs tend to have a negative perception of tourism (Canan & Hennessy, 1989; Davis et al., 1988; Um & Crompton, 1987). Davis et al. (1988) actually found that by segmenting Florida residents based on their attitudes, interests, and opinions towards tourism, more “native-born” residents communicated an anti-growth and anti-tourism sentiment and were considered “haters” of tourism. On the opposite end of the spectrum, “lovers” of tourism had the lowest percentage of individuals born in the state of Florida (Davis et al., 1988). Um and Crompton (1987) found in their study of Texas residents that the more attached residents were to the community (in terms of birthplace, heritage, and years of residence), the less positively they perceived the tourism impacts in their community. Similarly, Canan & Hennessy (1989) found that native residents of the Hawaiian island Moloka’i were most in favor of anti-development and anti-tourism (preserving Hawaiian culture and the rural lifestyle) when asked of their perspectives of tourism. According to the authors, tourism to the Moloka’i was viewed as a threat to such a traditional way of life on the island.

*Spatial Factors as Predictor of Resident Attitudes*

Not nearly as much research has been conducted connecting spatial factors to residents’ attitudes of tourism development. The primary way in which this line of research has been operationalized is through determining residents’ attitudes based on the physical distance between resident and tourist (Pizam, 1978; Gursoy & Jurowski, 2002; Harrill & Potts, 2003; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004). Harrill (2004) claims the field has assumed that the closer a resident lives to concentrations of tourism activity, the more
negative his/her perceptions will be of tourism development. Based on this assumption, there are a number of mixed findings regarding distance between residents and tourists.

Some researchers have found that those who live close to attractions are likely to have more positive perceptions of tourism impacts and a more favorable attitude toward tourism development. Investigating residents’ attitudes toward tourism in North Wales, Sheldon and Var (1984) reported that participants living in high-density tourism areas had favorable attitudes of the tourism industry and development. In a study of residents of Bogota, Columbia, Belisle and Hoy (1980) determined that as distance from the tourism zone increased, perceptions of impacts became less favorable. Similarly, Mansfield (1992) found in the Israeli resort town of Eilat that residents living further from tourism areas were more negative about the impacts than those living closer.

Conversely, some researchers have found the opposite to be true, noting residents who live close to attractions have less positive perceptions of impacts and less favorable attitudes toward tourism (Gursoy & Jurowski, 2002; Harrill, 2004; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004). Harrill & Potts (2003) found in Charleston, South Carolina that the neighborhoods closest to the tourism core had the most negative attitudes of tourism. Similarly, Pizam (1978) found that heavy concentration of tourism facilities and services in Cape Cod, Massachusetts led to negative attitudes towards tourism development. Williams and Lawson (2001) in their work with the 10 New Zealand towns found that those living close to attractions saw them less favorably. Similarly, Keogh (1990) found that residents living closest to small-scale development in New Brunswick, Canada had the strongest negative feelings towards tourism in the area. Examining Rhode Island residents, Tyrrell
and Spaulding (1984) established that residents reported an unfavorable attitude toward the location of specific facilities close to home, primarily because of traffic congestion and litter problems.

What is lacking in the works by Harrill and Potts (2003), Pizam (2003), Williams and Lawson (2001), Tyrrell and Spaulding (1984), and Keogh (1990) is an examination of the degree of use of tourism facilities and services by residents. Such negative attitudes may not result if residents themselves participate in the same pursuits as tourists and reap the benefits of tourism amenities (Gursoy & Jurowski, 2002; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; Snepenger, Murphy, O’Connell, & Gregg, 2003). Residents very easily could have moved to a particular area to partake in the tourism opportunities that are available (Florida, 2004) while embracing tourism. Jurowski and Gursoy (2004) speak to this degree of use among residents within a study of community residents living in southwestern Virginia near Mt. Rogers National Recreation Area. What the authors found was that recreation resource users living closest to the attraction that used it more heavily felt more negatively about tourism than did those users living further away.

These attitude studies do not translate into identification or the emotional solidarity a resident feels with a tourist. Harrill and Potts (2003) do call for future research exploring solidarity variables in regards to tourism development, however it is implied that such solidarity be between residents and not necessarily with tourists. Such variables Harrill and Potts (2003) suggest utilizing include: trust, altruism, safety, belonging, leadership, and equity. It is important to understand that residents must have a
positive attitude towards tourism if they are to feel an emotional solidarity with those tourists entering their community.

Residents’ Identification with Tourists

While the literature on residents’ attitudes is extensive, there is little work on residents forming emotional solidarities or identifying with tourists. The research that does exist regarding residents identifying with tourists largely is focused on the negative socio-cultural impacts tourists of developed countries have on less developed residents in the form of the demonstration effect (Crandall, 1987; Duffield & Long, 1981; Pearce, 1989; Tsartas, 1992) and acculturation (MacCannell, 1995; Mason, 1992; Mason, 2006; Nunez, 1989; Smith, 1989). The demonstration effect occurs when residents simply observe tourists, leading to behavioral changes in the resident population (Williams, 1998). Bahamian adolescents wearing American-made Oakley sunglasses after seeing tourists wearing them is an example of the demonstration effect. Mason (2006) claims that for the demonstration effect to occur, there must be visible differences between tourists and hosts as local people note the superior material possessions of the visitors and aspire to these.

Acculturation carries a greater degree of impact on the host community. Acculturation occurs when individuals from different cultural backgrounds are exposed to one another for extended periods of time and they borrow different mannerisms and ways of life from each other (Nunez, 1989). This exchange is typically unbalanced as the residents’ culture is most likely to be altered borrowing more from tourists than tourists do of residents (Mason, 2006; Nunez, 1989). One of the perceived negative effects of
acculturation is the reduction in the diversity of global cultures (Mason, 1992). In fact, acculturation has been dubbed both the “McDonaldization” and “Coca-colaization” of global cultures (Mason, 1992; MacCannell, 1995). In either instance of the demonstration effect or acculturation, it is difficult to imagine residents feeling an emotional solidarity with the tourists who visit as the former are typically viewed as powerless, having superficial encounters with the latter, and being providers of services to the latter (De Kadt, 1979; Sutton, 1967; UNESCO, 1976).

Beyond the demonstration effect and acculturation, what little research that has been conducted regarding identification focuses on the concept from the tourist perspective. For instance, examining working tourists in Israel, Pizam et al. (2000) sought to find out how the relationship between residents and tourists predicted tourists’ feelings towards their host and tourists’ change of attitudes towards their hosts and destination. The ultimate findings from this study are that the higher intensity of the social relationship between the parties leads to more favorable feelings of the tourists towards their hosts and the more positive was the change in attitudes towards the hosts (Pizam et al., 2000). However no mention is made as to whether the tourists felt a sense of emotional solidarity with their hosts, as the reverse was not examined either.

In a similar study involving visitors to South Wales, Prentice et al. (1994) examined the concept of endearing behavior exhibited by tourists to the host community they visited. A large percentage of respondents within this study had local contacts living in the area and were repeat tourists to the resort area of Wales. What was interesting about this work is that in the past, research has focused on the impacts of tourism on host
populations (De Kadt, 1979; Krippendorf, 1999; Mathieson & Wall, 1982), whereas this study examined the effects of tourism on tourists. In the end it was found that tourists may be endeared to a destination or inhabitants through informal social interactions such as chatting with locals and participating in everyday social activities (Prentice et al., 1994).

However endearment can only occur if tourists experience is not perceived as unwelcoming or negative. What Prentice et al. (1994) also found was that contacts are causing tourism and that those that feel endearment most are those that chat with locals, socially interact in local activities, and are repeat visitors. This study highlights that not all tourists are a homogenous group of individuals, each having different perspectives, demands, and behavior. This is similar to what Mason (2006) and Jurowski (1996) argue about the host community—that some residents are more in tune with tourists than others.

While both of the works of Pizam et al. (2000) and Prentice et al. (1994) are from the perspective of the tourist, they do speak to the importance of social interactions, relations between the two parties, and behavior despite the explicit lack of mention of identification. Further, the process of how residents identify with tourists is missing within each work.

Snepenger et al. (2003) conducted a study of a downtown shopping area in Bozeman, Montana that both residents and tourists utilized. As Blank (1989) claimed in his famous book, *The Community Tourism Industry Imperative*, residents as well as tourists enjoy the attractions of the destination. Within the article by Snepenger and colleagues, tourists and residents were segmented into four clusters based on use of the
space: local (light and high use) and tourist (light and high use). The high-use locals were the most comfortable socializing and sharing space with tourists. This indicates they had the most exposure to the tourists in the area. On the contrary, light-use locals spend little time in the downtown space and considered it serving tourists and wealthy too much (Snepenger et al., 2003). According to the authors, this latter group agreed the most with the statement that the “downtown is mainly for tourists.”

Snepenger et al. (2003) claimed that tourists can be looked at as a double-edged sword: they can share cultural values with residents, yet they can become overwhelming to community and social solidarity can be lost in tourism masses. The authors only briefly alluded to how tourists and locals identify with one another (through similar degrees of use). However this only partially explains behavior. It is unclear as to whether residents participate in similar behavior (as at home) when they are on vacation and that could be why they have similar behavior to tourists. This perspective of course, pertains mostly to the high-users from the Snepenger et al. (2003) article.

Another study focusing on residents and tourists sharing a space and interacting with one another is the work by Sherlock (2001) that occurred in Port Douglas, Queensland. The tropical climate of the seaside setting attracts both tourists and residents as each seeks to escape the conditions of their place of origin and to search for a better way of life (Sherlock, 2001). This speaks to both parties sharing the belief system that areas can be an escape and furthermore that Port Douglas offers such an escape. The friendly nature of the area with residents and tourists interacting with one another is a large draw for both visitors and migrants alike in Port Douglas as in other rural areas.
(Tonts & Greive, 2001). Sherlock (2001) claims participants in the study communicated how they enjoyed the friendliness of people in the community and the fact that they enjoyed “walking down the street and having every second person knowing your name” (p. 279). Both tourists and residents consume the shared symbols of paradise and their shared fantasies are acted out in the practice of consumption according to Sherlock (2001). Explicit mention of emotional solidarity between residents and tourists is lacking from this study overall, but potential antecedents of the construct are apparent in forms of interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior.

Machlis and Burge (1983) in an early work pertaining to the relations and interactions in a tourist destination claimed that residents and tourists were strangers to one another. Within this conceptual piece, the authors present their perspectives on cycles of structure (organization in community, participation of tourists in community, and transactions) and myths (symbolization, expectation, and appreciation) culminating in a tourism typology. What Machlis and Burge (1983) claim is that the more rural a destination is, the greater likelihood of interaction between residents and tourists, which is what Smith (1989) had proposed in her work. Machlis and Burge (1983) claim destinations go through a life-cycle of changes similar to what Butler (1980) claimed. As far as tourist participation at the destination is concerned, the wealthy are those that experience a destination first (with little amenities and services offered), then followed by middle-class (as wealthy are pushed out), working class (as middle-class are displaced), and finally mass tourism gives way to overdevelopment of amenities. It is at this last
stage that arguably, relationships between residents and tourists become superficially based on brief interactions and “staged authenticity” as MacCannell (1999) claimed.

What Machlis and Burge (1983) miss in this work are the intimate relationships that hosts and guests participate in while being in remote, resource dependent communities as both Smith (1989) and Nash (1997) focus on in their works. While this article does have its drawbacks, there are some interesting things to ponder. Machlis and Burge (1983) claim that “the routines of dailiness are often all there is to our identity” (p. 688). Each group develops a ritualized pattern of response and standardized social roles with which to make the irregular and unique event routine and normative (Machlis & Burge, 1983). The term “stranger” may be used inappropriately in this work. Given that tourists visit the community and participate in behaviors which can be similar to those of the locals (Derrett, 2003; Kneafsey, 2001; Sherlock, 2001; Snepenger et al., 2003; Snepenger et al., 1998), some may no longer be considered strangers, especially those that might be repeat visitors to remote locations and have adopted some of the native language and customs (Van Den Berghe, 1994). This disputes what Machlis and Burge (1983) claims, that typically in dealing with strangers, our myths permit confidence that our behavior is correct and others are alien.

Though qualitative studies are not as common as quantitative studies in tourism, there were some that focus primarily on host-guest relations and talk peripherally of identification. Using Zanzibar, Tanzania as a study site, Gossling (2002) examined the relationships between hosts and guests and found that interactions between tourists and locals were open and friendly, yet superficial not involving intimate conversations. This
may be due to the fact that each party realizes their role is determined by financial exchanges (Aramberri, 2001) where the host is the server and the guest is served (Mason, 2006). In fact, most tourists to the island convey they feel superior to the host community, indicating some disconnect between host and guest (Gossling, 2002). Despite this, Gossling (2002) claims that young Zanzibari children identify with tourists and their lifestyle by wearing sun glasses and western t-shirts that many tourists wear. This is a prime example of the ‘demonstration effect,’ where the hosts’ behavior is modified in order to imitate tourists (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2004; Pearce, 1989; Tsartas, 1992).

Gossling also commented on the fact that relationships become less personal once a destination embraces mass tourism. Echoing what Stott (1978) found, Gossling (2002) claimed that on the level of interpersonal relations, “tourism tends to loosen solidarities and increase individualization among residents” (p. 549). Such solidarity in this regard however pertains entirely to residents and not necessarily involving tourists. McCabe and Stokoe (2004) used the setting of a UK national park to determine the process through which identity and place are embedded in language. The authors claim that places and behavior in such a place leads to one’s identity. This however is not necessarily identification with one another, but rather the place. However, McCabe and Stokoe (2004) do mention that identity between two individuals can be linked in place. Just as Urry (1994) claimed, identity is increasingly constructed through consumption of leisure goods and services rather than through occupational categories. This would only involve the tourists’ consumption of leisure goods and services however as this study did
not include residents. What was interesting about this work is that the authors claim the term “tourist” is a culturally constructed category with associated negative category-bound activities and predicates. By using such a term, the disconnect between the local and visitor is perpetuated. Overall, McCabe and Stokoe (2004) claim tourism is fundamental to the construction of modern social identities and tourism places play a significant function alongside the domestic scene in contributing to such identity constructions” (p. 618).

Relationships between residents and tourists have also been conceptualized as the exchanges of each party in a rural cultural economy (see Greenwood, 1989; Kneafsey, 2001; MacCannell, 1999). According to Ray (1999) there are four modes of a cultural economy: commoditization of local culture, construction and promotion of a new territorial identity to the outside (through community organizations), a territorial initiative of selling itself internally to the community, and a combination of the first three. Examining social relations and tourism in a rural community, Kneafsey (2001) claims that certain sections of the tourism market are fascinated by the idea of ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ vacations where contact with local inhabitants and their daily life is a primary motivation. This echoes what MacCannell (1999) claims the modern tourist is in search of. In this regard, individuals are buying “commoditized culture” from the locals. Kneafsey (2001), using a term similar to Rothman’s (1998) “neo-natives,” claimed that ‘incomers’ (new residents to a tourist destination) are those individuals who participate more in local tourism endeavors. It is these ‘incomers’ that Kneafsey (2001) claims are commodifying culture and welcoming tourists to the local area. What is lacking from this
paper is discussion of whether such ‘incomers’ feel an emotional solidarity with tourists. The article ends with a call for more qualitative research to record “local voices” and gain a greater understanding of how local people (whether long-standing residents or new arrivals) make sense of local knowledge, commodification, and tourism.

Emotional Solidarity

The concept of emotional solidarity dates back to the writings of Emile Durkheim, most notably his work on religion in *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. While Durkheim (1995[1915]) never explicitly uses the term “emotional solidarity” in his writings, it is implicit in the way he focuses so extensively on integration and solidarity in society within his works (Giddens, 1979). As one of the most well-known structural-functional theorists in sociology, Durkheim conceived of religion as being especially effective in developing common values and in turn a good source of integrating individuals within society (Wallace & Wolf, 2006).

Collins (1975) claims Durkheim “presented a powerful model of the ritual aspects of social behavior as key to emotional solidarity and to our most fundamental conceptions of reality” (p. 43). At the root of Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) *Elementary Forms* is his quote on emotional solidarity in the form of “the church:”

A religion…is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden…which unite into one moral community, called a church, all those who adhere to them” (p. 47).

Durkheim conceived of the concept as being an affective connection that comes about through shared beliefs and rituals of believers in any religion (Barbalet, 1994). To
Durkheim (1995[1915]), a religion is based on this emotional solidarity, not necessarily a god or place of worship. Emotional solidarity can be thought of as being synonymous with a sense of identification an individual feels with the group resulting from a common value system (Wallace & Wolf, 2006). In the context of intergenerational relationships, Hammarstrom (2005) said emotional solidarity is conceptualized as the affective bonds an individual experiences with others, which are characterized by emotional closeness and degree of contact. Emotional solidarity has also been considered the affective component of solidarity that binds individuals together in a group and fosters a sense of “we togetherness” (Jacobs & Allen, 2005).

Despite Durkheim being one of the most respected theorists in classical sociology, some researchers have criticized his work pertaining to emotional solidarity. These criticisms have primarily come from a conflict theorist perspective. Just as Durkheim would claim religion seeks to provide cohesion among a group of individuals and provide social order, others would claim emotional solidarity among individuals actually ostracizes people from becoming part of the group and provide an “arena in which groups fight for power, and the control of conflict simply means that one group is able, temporarily, to suppress its rivals” (Wallace & Wolf, 2006). This is apparent in the workings of Marx and Weber, who would claim that such solidarity comes with a cost—the marginalization of people not in the group.

Another criticism of Durkheim and emotional solidarity is that he only studied a small number of aboriginal groups (Parsons, 1944). This makes it difficult to generalize to modern day social structures like religion. Still the criticism exists that Durkheim was
“too informed” by Judeo-Christian beliefs and his ethnographic experiences with aboriginal groups was not accurate, which translates to his theoretical framework also not being accurate (see Morrison, 2003).

Beyond that Durkheim, never empirically tested his theory of emotional solidarity in working with aboriginal groups (Barbalet, 1994). Further, some claim that the conceptualization of emotional solidarity is not relevant to modern societies, which have subcultures and ethnic groups as Allen, Pickering, and Miller (1998) allude to in their edited work on *The Elementary Forms*.

Even with such criticisms at hand, the last 15-20 years have witnessed a resurgence of interest in Durkheim’s work regarding emotions (Fish, 2002). As the concept of emotional solidarity has existed for nearly a century, its application appears across multiple disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, gerontology, social psychology, and family studies. Unfortunately no evidence can be found of an emotional solidarity scale; only scales of similar constructs (i.e., social distance and affectual solidarity) which are based on attitudinal measures. Further, existing measures of emotional solidarity within studies capture the construct with minimal items.

**Social Distance**

The concept of social distance first appeared in the field of sociology within the work of Bogardus (1925) where he claimed, in the context of immigration and race attitudes, social distance to be the “degrees and grades of understanding and feeling that persons experience regarding each other” (p. 299). It was eight years later that Bogardus (1933) first put forth a scale measuring the construct with seven items. What Bogardus did was
provide a list of 39 ethnic groups (e.g., Armenians, Danes, Italians, Norwegians, Russians, Turks, etc.) to study participants and had them determine their attitudes toward each ethnic group based on seven degrees of “closeness”, (where a number was assigned to each ethnic group) which were:

1. Would admit to close kinship in marriage.
2. Would admit to my club as personal chums.
3. Would admit to my street as a neighbor.
4. Would admit to my occupation in my country.
5. Would admit to citizenship in my country.
6. Would admit as visitors only to my country.
7. Would exclude from my country.

Since that time, the social distance scale has been used primarily within racial and ethnic studies (Owen, Eisner, & McFaul, 1981; Smith & Dempsey, 1983), studies involving attitudes for persons with mental disabilities (Angermeyer & Matschinger, 1997; Hayward & Bright, 1997; Link, Cullen, Frank, & Wozniak, 1987) and studies examining students in school settings (Brewer, Ho, Lee, & Miller, 1987; Langworthy, 1959). The most current scale that is being used to date is a modified scale of Bogardus’ (1933) work put forth by Link et al. (1987) that has seven items in the context of attitudes towards a particular person with a mental disability (e.g., Jim Johnson used within the study) measured on a four point scale with a response format of: 0 = definitely willing, 1 = probably willing, 2 = probably unwilling, and 3 = definitely unwilling. Scores to the following seven social distance items are then added together and divided by seven to
form a composite social distance measure varying from 0 to 3. Link et al. found the internal consistency reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) of the measure to be 0.92. The seven items are:

1. How would you feel about renting a room in your home to someone like Jim Johnson?
2. How about as a worker on the same job as someone like Jim Johnson?
3. How would you feel having someone like Jim Johnson as a neighbor?
4. How about as the caretaker of your children for a couple of hours?
5. How about having your children marry someone like Jim Johnson?
6. How would you feel about introducing Jim Johnson to a young woman you are friendly with?
7. How would you feel about recommending someone like Jim Johnson for a job working for a friend of yours?

What Bogardus’ (1933) and Link et al.’s (1987) scale captures are individuals’ attitudes towards a particular group of people, and not specifically the affect or emotions people feel towards others. In addition, many of the items included in both scales are non-applicable to a tourism setting where resident interact with tourists.

*Affectual Solidarity Scale*

The construct of affectual solidarity has existed within the literature of family and marriage studies for the last half of the 20th Century; however the construct has only become popular in the last two decades. Gronvold (1988) claimed the construct to be “nominally defined as the nature and extent of positive sentiment toward other members

The affectual solidarity scale exists of 10 items made up of five attributed and five self-reported items on a scale of 1 to 6, (where 1 equals “not well” and 6 equals “extremely well”) (Gronvold, 1988). Five attribute items relate to how another individual feels about the respondent and are: “understands you,” “trusts you,” “fair to you,” “respects you,” and “affection for you.” The five self-report items involve how the respondent feels about someone else and are: “you understand him or her,” “you trust him or her,” “you are fair to him or her,” “you respect him or her,” and “your affection for him or her.” Gronvold (1988) claims that the attributed items are often less important to measure than the self-report items, and “the best short-list combination to measure affectual solidarity is the five self-report items, or how the individual feels toward another person” (p. 94).

Limited research (existing only in the fields of family studies and gerontology) has utilized either a “long version” of the affectual solidarity scale with all 10 items (e.g., Essex, 2002; Hinrichson, Adelstein, & McMeniman, 2004; Silverstein & Bengston, 1991) with alpha reliability scores ranging from 0.89 to 0.936 or a “short version” of the scale with the five self-report items (e.g., Feng, Giarrusso, Bengston, & Frye, 1999; Goodman & Silverstein, 2002) with reliabilities ranging from 0.83 to 0.95. In addition, many researchers have examined affectual solidarity as one, two, or three individual measures and not explicitly as a scale. The following review of literature highlights the
lack of utilization of the Gronvold (1988) scale across multiple disciplines including sociology, anthropology, gerontology, social psychology, family studies, and leisure and tourism research and shows why developing a scale of emotional solidarity would be beneficial to fields outside of family studies and gerontology. Such a scale would be primarily beneficial to the field of tourism in the context of interactions between residents and tourists of a particular community.

Emotional Solidarity Studies

One of the first studies to examine Durkheim’s work closer was that done by Swanson (1968). In a series of quantitative tests of 50 aboriginal societies, Swanson (1968) in his book, *The Birth of the Gods*, proposed a number of hypotheses to test whether certain forms of religion existed based on the work of Durkheim (1995[1915]). Dependent variables that were used were not explicitly linked to solidarity, but rather the existence of particular forms of religions: monotheism, polytheism, experiences with ancestral spirits, reincarnation, immanence of the soul, and others. Independent variables that were used in this collection of empirical studies fell under three categories: those that define the sovereignty (or lack thereof) of organizations, variables referring to the complexity, specialization, and wealth of the society, and threats from armed attacks by alien peoples (Swanson, 1968). Even though this work is empirical in nature, it fails to provide measures of emotional solidarity.

Some studies have been quite conceptual in nature involving emotional solidarity. Employing Durkheimian thought, Barbalet (1994) explained emotional solidarity in terms of mourning among members of a group. The work focuses on Barbalet’s (1994) claims
that both positivists and interpretivists have missed one key point from the work of
Durkheim and emotional solidarity. That point is that, “the means of a group attaining
ritual emotion is through socially situated bodily movements and relationships rather than
through merely cognitive or cultural processes” (Barbalet, 1994, p.121). This is not to say
that beliefs or values are not important, but that behavior is a major component to
arriving at a shared state of emotional solidarity among the group (Collins, 1975). Given
that the work of Barbalet (1994) is conceptual, no measures of emotional solidarity are
offered.

One study that aids in operationalizing emotional solidarity more is a work by
Wilson (2006) in which he creates a model to measure social inclusion and cohesion.
Wilson includes such solidarity as a conceptual component of inclusion and cohesion,
claiming emotional solidarity, “can bind groups together through the emotional bonds
such emotional solidarity that is produced by collective activities is particularly benign;
that it does not necessarily lead to negative feelings or resentment as some conflict
theorists would propose, but rather brings individuals together. This is largely due to the
fact that Durkheim spent most of life in writing about social integration and solidarity in
a positive light that acts as a glue to hold society together (Lamanna, 2002). While
Wilson (2006) fails to address how emotional solidarity can be measured in the
concluding section of his paper, he does point to a “solidarity” index with the following
questions and statements to consider in formulating measures:

1. How many communities does the respondent belong to?
2. Which community of interest is the most important to the respondent?

3. How often does the respondent meet with the community of interest or its members?

4. An estimate of the range of contacts established

5. The homogeneity of the community of interest

6. Respondent identification with the community of interest

7. Trust in others in the community of interest

Beyond the work of Wilson (2006), other sociology works do not make use of measures of emotional solidarity per se, but rather group solidarity, social solidarity, or friendship solidarity. Using a population of inmates, Street (1965) examined solidarity among juveniles in custodial institutions (where emphasis is on protecting community by containing inmates) versus those in treatment institutions (where emphasis is put on changing attitudes and psychological conditions of inmates). Given that the former group was more organized voluntaristically around friendship patterns, were given more free reign to associate with other inmates, and appeared a more cohesive group, Street (1965) hypothesized that those inmates in treatment incarceration would display stronger orientations of solidarity with each other than those in custodial incarceration. Solidarity was measured in this study by two questions: “How much of the time do you think most of the boys here really stick together and are loyal to each other?” and “Regardless of how much the boys actually do stick together now, how much do you think they should stick together?” Inmates in the treatment settings were found to be more likely to express a solidarity orientation with one another than those juveniles in custodial institutions.
Two issues are apparent in this study: there are only two measures of solidarity and they are cognitive and behaviorally-oriented.

Rosengren (1959) also examined solidarity in relation to juveniles in institutions. Using nine “acting-out” boys between the ages of eleven and thirteen, the author designed a series of special group activities (i.e., planned cooking sessions) for the participants, with the intent of reducing inappropriate manifestations of the acting-out syndrome. In addition to collecting behavioral and interaction data by examining the participants, Rosengren (1959) also recorded group solidarity. Unfortunately, solidarity was only measured by one item—praise or criticism of others during the cooking session. It was found that 85% of the boys indicated a presence of solidarity with one another as most praised each other in cooking meals together (Rosengren, 1959). This form of solidarity appears to center more around behavior than affect, especially given that data resulted from a quasi-experimental design.

Solidarity was measured in terms of friendship by Suchman (1964) in a study concerning ethnic groups, members’ attitudes toward medical care, knowledge about disease, and behavior during illness. Differences across groups were found using five indexes of social organization (based upon the degree of “in-group” identification): ethnic exclusivity, friendship solidarity, social-group cohesiveness, family tradition and authority orientation, and religious attendance. The friendship solidarity index was comprised of four items (in which respondents were rated as “high” if they agreed with each item): “almost all my friends are people I grew up with,” “most of my close friends are also friends with each other,” most of my friends have the same religion as I do,” and
“most of my friends come from families who know each other well.” What the author found was that “the more socially cohesive the ethnic group is on a community, friendship, or family level, the more likely are its members to display low knowledge about disease, skepticism toward professional medical care, and dependency during illness” (Suchman, 1964, p. 319). Similar to the previously mentioned studies, this study which focused on friendship solidarity does not utilize affectual aspects of solidarity, but rather cognitive and behavioral measures.

Emotional solidarity has been measured empirically in other fields such as family studies, social psychology and gerontology. Examining family support, Lowenstein and Daatland (2006) measured familial solidarity with six different items: affective (i.e., “feeling close to”), consensus (i.e., “share similar views), proximity (i.e., live less than half an hour away”), face-to-face contacts (i.e., “at least weekly contact”), instrumental help provided, and instrumental help received (i.e., “to and from at least one in the form of household chores, house and gardening, shopping, and transport”). Lowenstein and Daatland (2006) found that affective solidarity (or emotional solidarity) had the greatest association with familial solidarity. In this study however only one measure of emotional solidarity was used and it was operationalized as “feeling close to someone.”

Other studies have been conducted in the social sciences regarding family solidarity. Geiger (1955) examined how the Soviet regime affected interpersonal solidarity among refugee families in Germany, Austria, and New York City. Solidarity was measured through two questions. First, respondents had to communicate if they thought the typical Soviet family became more solidary, less solidary, or stayed the same
under the Soviet Regime. Second, based on those three degrees of solidarity, respondents had to describe their own family. What Geiger found was that the typical family was rated as being less solidary by respondents, but that their own family was rated as being more solidary as a result of being under the Soviet regime. This study only examined solidarity based on its magnitude through two questions, which can be argued to not be a very detailed measure of the construct.

Klapp (1959) examined family rituals in relation to family solidarity. More specifically Klapp examined the relationship between family rituals (i.e., “ate Christmas dinner together,” “participated in family reunions,” “participated in family prayer,” “celebrated birthdays with members of family,”) using a 5-point likert scale (with categories from much to undecided) and family solidarity (on a 5-point likert scale with categories of very much to not at all) through correlation tests. Family solidarity was measured using 21 items such as the following: “I feel a part of this group,” “members are close-knit, stick together through thick and thin,” “spend a lot of time together because we prefer each other’s company,” “serious conflicts or antagonisms among members,” “I don’t get along well with some of the members,” “I sometimes feel I am ‘not part’ of this group.” With a coefficient of correlation of 0.39 between ritual items and family solidarity items, Klapp concluded that those who reported the most rituals and felt such rituals were important to their families also tended to perceive a comparatively high degree of family solidarity. While this study does provide more measurement items of solidarity, such items do not specifically relate to resident and tourist relations, nor do they convey feelings or emotional solidarity.
Closely related to family issues, solidarity has also been examined in the context of intergenerational relations (Baranowski & Schilmoeller, 1999; Harwood, 2000; Lin & Harwood, 2003; Mills, Wakeman, & Fea, 2001). In a study concerning grandparents’ roles in the lives of grandchildren with disabilities, Baranowski and Schilmoeller (1999) measured affectional solidarity by one item: “Taking everything into consideration, how close do you feel is the relationship between you and ________?”. In a similar study examining solidarity between grandparents and grandchildren, Lin and Harwood (2003) measured relational solidarity as “the strength, closeness, or satisfaction one feels with another,” treating the construct as the dependent variable. What the authors found was that two of the best predictors of solidarity from this study for both grandparents and grandchildren were perceptions of involvement with the other and contact frequency (Lin & Harwood, 2003). In a similar study, Mills et al. (2001) examined affectual solidarity as the dependent variable in a study concerning grandparents and grandchildren. Within this study Mills et al. (2001) measure such solidarity by six items on a five-point likert scale. Solidarity was measured by the following six items:

1. Taking everything into consideration, how close do you feel is the relationship between you and your [grandparent]?

2. How is communication between yourself and your [grandparent]?

3. How well can you exchange ideas or talk about things that really concern you?

4. How well do you feel your [grandparent] understands you?

5. How well do you feel you understand your [grandparent]?
6. Generally how well do you and your [grandparent] get along?

Mills et al. (2001) found that the grandparent’s kin position (maternal or paternal) was the best predictor of grandchildren’s perceived affectual solidarity with grandparents (Mills et al., 2001). The six affectual solidarity items used within the Mills et al (2001) study as well as those used by Harwood (2000) and Lin and Harwood (2003) were derived from a unidimensional scale put forth by Gronvold (1988) who was first to take an in-depth look at the measurement of the construct. The five items in short-form (in the context of mother and child relationships) scale were:

1. How well do you understand him (or her)?
2. How much do you trust your father (mother)?
3. How fair do you feel you are toward your father (mother)?
4. How much do you respect your father (mother)?
5. How much affection do you feel toward your father (mother)?

Despite the existence of the affectual solidarity scale Gronvold (1988) put forth, few have utilized the unidimensional scale (e.g., Essex, 2002; Feng, Giarrusso, Bengston, & Frye, 1999; Goodman & Silverstein, 2002; Hinrichson, Adelstein, & McMeniman, 2004; Silverstein & Bengston, 1991). Instead, researchers (e.g., Baranowski & Schilmoeller, 1999; Bahr, Mitchell, Li, Walker, & Sucher, 2004; Harwood, 2000; Lin & Harwood, 2003) have used single items indicators from the scale such as “How close do you feel the relationship is between you and someone else?” This is largely due to the fact that Gronvold (1988) conceded the developed scale was exploratory and recommended using single-item measures of affectual solidarity in subsequent studies.
Neither Gronvold (1988) nor Mills et al. (2001) examined shared behavior or activities and interaction between parties involved within a relationship (see Kennedy, 1992). However, Lowenstein (2002) examined interaction however in regards to solidarity. Using qualitative methods, the author sought to explore the issues of solidarity and conflict among Soviet Union extended families living in shared households in Israel (Lowenstein, 2002). What the author found was that seven themes reflecting solidarity and conflict captured the dynamic intergenerational relationship these families have. Chief among those themes was emotional support that comes from living in such close proximity as well as involvement with intimate relations of the other generations, which reflects affectual solidarity according to Lowenstein (2002). This article explains the dynamic nature of interaction and solidarity between parties in a spatially constrained space, much like with tourists and residents at a destination (De Kadt, 1979).

Interaction and solidarity (specifically emotional) were also the focus of a longitudinal study by Bahr et al. (2004) examining grade school and high school students in Middletown (Muncie, IN), USA. More specifically the authors treated interaction as time with parents (measured as interval-level hours spent in last week) to predict emotional solidarity with parents. Bahr et al. (2004) measured solidarity as identification (i.e., “Would you like to be the kind of person your father [or mother] is?”), closeness (i.e., “How close would you say you are (or were) in your feelings toward your father [or mother]?”), and agreement (i.e., “Do you and your father [or mother] agree in your ideas and opinions about things you consider really important to life?”). Time with parents (interaction) was found to be a significant predictor of emotional solidarity, however only
explain 9% of the variance in such solidarity with parents (Bahr et al., 2004). The authors concluded that better indicators of emotional solidarity are needed in future studies. Shared behavior and beliefs may serve to better predict student’s perceived solidarity with parents. It can be argued as well that more measures of emotional solidarity are needed to explain the concept given that only three were used.

Beyond the fields covered above, mention of emotional solidarity or Durkheim’s perspectives on religion is limited in the tourism and leisure literatures. Dean MacCannell, in his famous book, *The Tourist* is one exception. In this work, MacCannell (1999) highlights the parallels of symbolism, beliefs, and ritualistic behavior that are present in Durkheim’s conceptualization of religion to that used at tourist attractions and sites. The references MacCannell (1999) makes in regards to the relationship residents share with tourists are somewhat negative. He claims that modern tourists who are in search of an authentic experience (much like the traditional Protestant followers as MacCannell claims) are actually tricked by residents who provide a “staged authentic” experience (MacCannell, 1999). This speaks to the common view of the relationship between residents and tourists being based on financial exchanges of commoditized services (Aramberri, 2001; Greenwood, 1989). MacCannell (1999) goes on to say that solidarity between residents and tourists occurs only when tourists are allowed a true glimpse of how residents live or are allowed to experience “back regions” as Goffman (1959) referred to them.

Also, the work of Rojek (2000) highlights on Durkheim in discussing modern leisure practices. Within his book, *Leisure and Culture*, Rojek sets out to construct an
anthropological perspective of leisure building off of the works of functionalism, conflict theorists and post-modernists (Bramham, 2002). Rojek compares religion to the modern-day leisure and tourism as both being forms of “other worldly escapes” (Rojek, 2000, p. 2), likening leisure to religion in the way some take pilgrimages to attend sporting events. Rojek however does not fully support Durkheim in his early work of expressing leisure as serving a positive function for society and solidarity. Rather Rojek (2000) adopts a perspective echoed by Veblen (1994) that leisure is about performance that serves the purpose of social display and can be viewed as a “status placing activity” (p. 49).

Conclusion

The time has come to transcend the perspectives of resident and tourist relationships. These perspectives treat the relationship as one based on financial transactions where there is a disparity in power and wealth between resident and tourist, where members of the latter group possess more of each (Mason, 2006; Nettekoven, 1979; UNESCO, 1976). These perspectives perpetuate the superficiality of interactions where neither party invests in getting to know one another (de Kadt, 1979; Jafari, 1989; Krippendorf, 1999; Sutton, 1967). These perspectives also embrace the notion of both parties looking at one another as the ‘other,’ as a spectacle—an outsider in effect (Evans-Pritchard, 1989; Krippendorf, 1999; Laxson, 1991; MacCannell, 1999; McNaughton, 2006; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Smith, 1989; Urry, 1994; Van Den Berghe, 1994; Wearing & Wearing, 2001).

Examining the relationship in terms of emotions is one potential route which has been called for in the literature (see McIntosh, 1998; Pizam et al., 2000; Prentice et al.,
It is apparent that residents and tourists share beliefs (Cohen, 1996; Laxson, 1991; Sherlock, 2001), behavior (Blank, 1989; Derrett, 2003; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002; Kneafsey, 2001; Pizam & Sussman, 1995; Snepenger et al., 1998; Snepenger et al., 2003), and positively interact with each other on a regular basis (Pizam et al., 2000; Prentice et al., 1994; Sherlock, 2001; Wearing & Wearing, 2001). These are all precursors to experiencing an emotional solidarity as Durkheim (1995[1915]) claimed. The literature on resident attitudes is one area to derive potential predictors of emotional solidarity in addition to those put forth by Durkheim. Some of those variables include length of residency, age, and economic dependency on tourism.

Unfortunately there has been little research done in the tourism field examining residents identifying with tourists or experiencing an emotional solidarity. What has been done typically carries a negative connotation in the form of the demonstration effect (Crandall, 1987; Duffield & Long, 1981; Pearce, 1989; Tsartas, 1992) or acculturation effect (MacCannell, 1995; Mason, 1992; Mason, 2006; Nunez, 1989; Smith, 1989). In fact, tourists are more cited as identifying with residents than the reverse.

Measures of solidarity are plentiful within fields of sociology, gerontology, family and marriage studies, social psychology, and anthropology. However most only capture the behavioral and cognitive components of solidarity. Those that do speak to the affective component are limited to borrowing single indicators of a rarely used scale of affectual solidarity. What is needed in the tourism field is a deeper examination of the relationship between resident and tourist employing the framework of emotional
solidarity. Furthermore, a scale of emotional solidarity developed from existing items as well as qualitative data in the context of residents and tourists would be ideal.
CHAPTER THREE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND CONCEPTUAL MODEL

This chapter contains three parts. The first is a discussion of the theoretical framework that was utilized in this study. Included in the initial section is a discussion of the constructs within the theory as well as a graphic representation of the theoretical model. The second portion of the chapter contains a discussion of the community components found in a tourist destination, potential segments of residents and tourists who could experience emotional solidarity with one another, and a graphic of the segments. Resident classifications from the model in Figure 2 were used to assess the fourth research question of the study, “How does level of emotional solidarity differ across resident characteristics?” Tourist classifications from the model in Figure 2 were used to address the fifth research question, “How does level of emotional solidarity differ by type of tourist within the community?” The final portion of the chapter includes two conceptual models: one testing Durkheim’s theory of emotional solidarity (which is expressed in the second research question) and the other examining additional resident characteristics as predictors of emotional solidarity. In both models, emotional solidarity is treated as the dependent variable.

Theoretical Framework

While it may prove hasty to utilize a theoretical framework prior to data collection in qualitative studies, a theory can be considered a starting point (Schram, 2006), merely speculating what could be found in the examination of residents experiencing a degree of emotional solidarity with tourists. Given that such solidarity
between two groups would involve some level of interaction, the theory is based in sociological thought.

The theoretical framework used in this study was rooted in the sociological workings of Emile Durkheim. It was James (1984) who first said, “We act, therefore we feel.” Based on this thought process, Durkheim (1995[1915]) developed a theory of emotional solidarity. In its most basic form, the theory states that as individuals interact with one another, possess common beliefs, and share behaviors rooted in rituals they develop an emotional solidarity with others (see Figure 1).
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**Figure 1.** Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) Theoretical Model of Emotional Solidarity

Expanding upon components of his theory, Durkheim (1995[1915]) claimed that, “Religious phenomena fall into two basic categories: beliefs and rites. The first are states of opinion and consist of representations [values and ideals in social life (Lukes, 1972)]; the second are particular modes of action” (p. 34). Collins (1975) says, for Durkheim, “emotional contagion…results from physical copresence…and the coordination of common actions or gestures” (p.58). According to Durkheim, this solidarity was the
collective emotions experienced by members of the church community; or the common affective interests shared by the group (Durkheim, 1995[1915]). This emotional solidarity that one has with the group can be thought of as an identification they feel with the group (Wallace & Wolf, 2006).

An example of Catholics may serve to explain Durkheim’s theory of religious life better. As a Catholic, one attends Mass each week at 11:15 on Sunday, dip hands in the holy water upon entering the church, sits in the same pews each week, stands when appropriate, sits when appropriate, kneels when appropriate, attends baptisms and funerals when necessary, makes the sign of the trinity by crossing oneself, and participates in responsorials when directed. As one church member looks around at another during this procession, each recognizes that such behavior serves to strengthen the bond they have with one another and reaffirms their feelings of belonging to “the church,” and indeed are Catholics.

An example within the context of tourism can highlight such emotional solidarity. In the 1970s, Bill was a graduate student in the intermountain-western region of the United States. On winter weekends, he and his friends would pack up the car and drive 45 minutes to the nearest ski slopes. While in the area, the guys would always stop in an adjacent town to the ski resort to buy supplies, get the ski report, and engage in conversations with locals that involved each party sharing how they loved the area and its wonderful recreational opportunities. Years passed, Bill married, had a family, and returned to take a job as a professor where he received his Ph.D. He now lives in the place where he spent many weekends skiing and falling in love with the area and its
inhabitants. Only now he is the one interacting with local students as they travel to ski, skiing alongside of them, and sharing the belief that no place could be finer!

In the context of tourism, this theoretical framework could be applied to include the collective behavior that residents share with tourists, which contributes to an emotional solidarity, or identification between the two groups. MacCannell (1999) claimed that “tourist attractions are an unplanned typology of structure that provides direct access to the modern consciousness or ‘world view,’…tourist attractions are precisely analogous to the religious symbolism of primitive people” (p. 2).

Tourism appears to be a logical fit given that both organized religion and tourism can be thought of as social structural systems made up of intricate components and the interactions of involved parties (Blank, 1989; Durkheim, 1995[1915]; Gunn & Var, 2002; Holocek, 1982; Leiper, 1990; Murphy, 1985). Further, each part is intricately linked, working together for the good of the system. At the most basic level, three regions exist within a tourism system as Leiper (1990) points out: tourist generating region, the transit route region, and the tourist destination region. In the generating region, individuals plan their vacations utilizing online travel organizations, travel agents, and promotional material prepared by the destination organizing sector. The travel sector provides the tourist with the means to get from home to the destination and back. It is within the destination that relationships between residents and tourists are negotiated, services are exchanged, dining and lodging opportunities are provided, tourism is planned for by CVBs, chambers of commerce, and local/state/federal government agencies, and attractions are visited. Every component is linked.
Implicit in the workings of Durkheim is the idea that societies are held together by two forms of solidarity: mechanical and organic (Durkheim, 1964). Mechanical solidarity can be thought of as the social cohesion that a group has based upon the likeness and similarities among individuals in a society that is largely dependent on common rituals and routines (Wilson, 2006). While organic solidarity integrates society on the basis of interdependence (Chang, 1989). Turner (1967) claims that Durkheim considered mechanical solidarity (mostly in primitive cultures) to be a necessary form for the development and maintenance of organic solidarity (in the more advanced societies). It is the former type of solidarity that Durkheim was focused on in his writings in *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (Turner, 1967), where he formed his theoretical framework. As Pope and Johnson (1983) claim, by this time in Durkheim’s writings he had abandoned the concept of organic solidarity. While the current study intends to examine advanced societies, it is first necessary to determine if such emotional solidarity exists before one can assess the degree to which organic solidarity exists as Durkheim (1933) would claim.

Durkheim’s theoretical perspective and concept of emotional solidarity has been examined across many disciplines including sociology, anthropology, gerontology, and family studies. Unfortunately measures of emotional solidarity are lacking in the work. Perhaps this is due to the fact that Durkheim, himself, never tested his theory on the aboriginal peoples in which he derived his framework (Nisbet, 1974). Regardless of this limitation, his work has informed many researchers and has been accepted by many. The current study applied Durkheim’s theory to the context of tourism in examining
emotional solidarity residents in a particular county experience with tourists to the area. The applied framework posits that as residents interact, possess similar beliefs, and share behavior with tourists, residents will forge an emotional solidarity with said tourists.

Model of Community with Residents and Tourists

Similar to a religion, tourism can also be conceptualized as a social system made up of interdependent, interrelated parts, working together to bring about balance. Within the tourism literature, a community systems approach has been examined (see Blank, 1989; Gunn & Var, 2002; Holoczek, 1982; Murphy, 1985). Some of the most basic systematic components of a tourism community include a local economic system providing a livelihood to local residents, community infrastructure and services such as local businesses, residents who make their home in the community, and tourists who visit the community, utilize services, and contribute to the local economy.

Residents and tourists within a community are two main components in any tourist destination; however they should not be considered two uniform groups (Mason, 2006). Residents can be segmented on their perspectives of tourism and tourism development (Davis et al., 1988; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner, 2002; Jurowski, 1996; Madrigal, 1995) as well as where they live, demographics, socioeconomic status, etc. (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2003). Davis and colleagues (1988) segmented residents in terms of their responses to tourism development, yielding segments of “haters,” “lovers,” “cautious romantics,” “in-betweeners,” and “love ‘em for a reason.” Similarly, Fredline and Faulkner (2000; 2002) segmented residents based on their attitudes of tourism resulting in five groups across a spectrum of “lovers” to
“haters.” Looking at community values in regards to natural resources, Jurowski (1996) segmented a community into three main groups: “attached residents,” “resource users,” and “environmentalists.” Madrigal (1995) found three segments of residents within his study on the role of government in tourism development: “lovers,” “haters,” and “realists.”

Some *a priori* conceptualizations of residents within communities include retirees (Hunt & Ross, 1990; Tomljenovic & Faulkner, 2000), native-born residents (Canan & Hennessy, 1989; Davis et al., 1988; Um & Crompton, 1987), residents who have lived in the area for short periods (Kneafsey, 2001; Rothman, 1998; Tomljenovic & Faulkner, 2000), residents who have lived in the area for longer periods (McCool & Martin, 1994; Snaith & Haley, 1999; Williams et al., 1995), and those residents who derive income from the tourism industry (Andressen & Murphy, 1986; Evans-Pritchard, 1989; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Pizam, 1978; Smith & Krannich, 1998). These resident classifications were used to assess the fourth research question within this study, “How does level of emotional solidarity differ across multiple resident characteristics?”

Tourists cannot be considered one homogenous group either. As with residents, tourist groupings exist that are both emergent from particular data analysis within studies as well as those that are formulated *a priori*. Segmentation studies of tourists are one of the most common types of studies within the tourism literature. In an examination of the *Journal of Travel Research* from since 1990, the author found that approximately 15% of the empirical studies involved some form of segmentation of tourists. The following
discussion of tourist segmentation studies does not begin to capture the sheer volume of studies that have been conducted within the field, but serve to highlight some of the most current work.

Segmenting Swiss travelers by motivation, Bieger and Laesser (2002) found four clusters of travelers that emerged from their study: compulsory travelers, cultural hedonists, family travelers, and me(e/a)t marketing travelers. Brey and Lehto (2007) segmented tourists based on activities participation at home and at destination. Three segments emerged from analysis: positive correlation (i.e., activity at home same as on vacation), nondescript relationship (i.e., no significant relationship between activities at home and on vacation), and negative correlation (i.e., activity at home predicts non-activity at destination). MacKay et al. (2002) also segmented tourists based on activity, examining niche markets. Four niche segments resulted from the work by MacKay et al.: sightseeing only visitors, culture sightseeing visitors, outdoor recreation sightseeing visitors, and culture and outdoor recreation sightseeing visitors. Tourists have also been segmented based on benefits sought in travel. Sarigollu and Huang (2005) identified four segments in their study of Latin American tourists: adventurer, multifarious traveler (i.e., like a bit of everything at destination), fun and relaxation traveler, and urbane traveler.

Emergent tourist types are not the only groupings that exist within the literature. *A priori* classifications also are plentiful within the tourism literature. Smith (1989) identified five types of tourists: ethnic tourists, cultural tourists, historical tourists, environmental tourists, and recreational tourists. Of course other types of tourists exist such as sport tourists, dark tourists, business tourists, culinary tourists, heritage tourists,
ecotourists, agritourists, green tourists, and sex tourists (Cooper, Fletcher, Fyall, Gilbert, & Wanhill, 2005).

Goeldner and Ritchie (2003) formulated a comprehensive classification of travelers involving those individuals staying one or more nights in a location (e.g., family vacationers) and day-trippers (i.e., those individuals remaining in the area for less than a 24-hour period) as Kohn (1997) referred to them on the small island in the Inner Hebrides of Scotland. Both groups of travelers had four distinct primary purposes of travel: business (e.g., consultations, conventions, and inspections), visiting friends or relatives (e.g., socializing and dining in), other personal business (e.g., shopping), and pleasure (e.g., recreation, sight-seeing, and dining out) (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2003). While most studies (Girard & Gartner, 1993; Kaltenborn, 1997; Kohn, 1997; Rothman, 1978) consider second homeowners separate from residents and tourists, they are treated as tourists in the current study given that only permanent residents were considered residents. Some of these tourist classifications were used to address the fifth research question, “How does level of emotional solidarity differ by type of tourist within the community?”

Below is a model of some of the potential relationships of a priori resident groupings experiencing an emotional solidarity with tourists (also a priori classifications) and vice versa in a community (see Figure 2). Such a priori classifications of resident and tourist were utilized in this study for three primary reasons. First, it is less confusing to determine a resident type based on self-reporting demographic information than segmenting the residents based on numerous criteria. Second, residents within Phase One
of this project identified a type of tourist group, many of which were an *a priori* classification based on their experience with such tourists in Beaufort County. Third, each *a priori* classification of both residents and tourists are well established throughout the literature. Each line within the diagram indicates the potential emotional solidarity experienced between the parties.

![Diagram of community classifications of resident and tourist experiencing emotional solidarity.](figure2)

**Figure 2.** Community Classifications of Resident and Tourist Experiencing Emotional Solidarity.
In seeking a representative sample of county residents, multi-stage cluster sampling occurred based on two main factors: race and household income. The resulting sample sought to reflect each of the five types of residents as shown on the left portion of Figure 2. As mentioned earlier, emotional solidarity can be measured from the perspective of the resident, tourist, or both. However within this particular study, the focus was from the residents’ perspective.

Conceptual Models with Operationalizations of Each Variable

Two conceptual models are presented below. The first is based on the four constructs (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity) from Durkheim’s theory (see Figure 3). Figure 3 shows the numerous operationalizations of each construct based on the literature. For this study, each construct was operationalized with numerous scale items through qualitative data analysis and scale development in the first two phases of the research. The first model corresponds with the second research question posed in this study. Scale items for each construct used in this study are presented in Chapter Five.

The second model presented below addresses the third research question of the study and examines additional resident characteristics in addition to Durkheim’s three predictors of emotional solidarity. Corresponding hypotheses for construct relationships in each model are presented at the end of Chapter Four.

Dependent Variable of Model One and Model Two

The ultimate dependent variable in this study was emotional solidarity. The construct has been measured by many using multiple items, but never as a scale.
Emotional solidarity was measured as multiple scale items generated from the initial data analysis of focus group data in Phase One. To aid in the initial operationalization of emotional solidarity, measures of the construct were borrowed from the literature and included: identifying with others in group (Bahr et al., 2004; Wilson, 2006), trust in others (Wilson, 2006), loyalty felt with others (Street, 1965), praise of others (Rosengren, 1959), feeling close to others (Bahr et al., 2004; Lowenstein & Daatland, 2006), feeling part of the group, number of conflicts, and getting along well with the group (Klapp, 1959), how well a person understands others and exchanges ideas with others (Mills et al., 2001), and agreement between parties (Bahr et al., 2004). Emotional solidarity is represented on the right side of the model in Figure 3 and is the dependent variable in both of the following models.

**Independent Variables of Model One**

Following Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model the three main independent variables used to predict emotional solidarity were interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior. Within the tourism literature, interaction between residents and tourists has been operationalized in multiple capacities. Rothman (1978) determined interaction based on asking residents of two communities their degree of interaction with tourists. The categories that Rothman used were: “almost no contact,” “limited to contact in public places,” “know some acquaintances,” “know some on first-name basis,” “know some as friends,” “extended communication (e.g., at Christmas),” “guest in their home,” and “guest in my home.” These items that Rothman used in her study do not capture the frequency with which residents interact with tourists. For example, number of
interactions daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly with tourists will be potential ways to derive a precise estimate of encounters. Teye et al. (2002) determined degree of interaction by asking residents how many days per week they interacted with tourists. Similarly, Akis et al. (1996) asked residents how often they talked with tourists during an average week in the summer. Another way to ascertain degree of interaction between residents and tourists is by asking participants how often they interact with tourists during peak- and off-peak tourist season.

Shared beliefs between residents and tourists have been operationalized to a lesser degree. Some examples include: positive impacts of tourism, negative impacts of tourism (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Lankford & Howard, 1994), motivations for travel (Fredline & Faulkner, 2002), spirituality (Cohen, 1996; Laxson, 1991), political perspectives (Madrigal, 1995), travel destination choice, cost of travel, protection of the environment (Boyd & Butler, 1998; Butler, 1990), etc.

Shared behavior has been slightly less difficult to operationalize within the literature. Measures of this variable include: purchasing local crafts (Laxson, 1991), shopping at local places tourists frequent (Snepenger et al., 1998; Snepenger et al., 2003), visiting local tourist attractions, buying local souvenirs, taking photos of local scenery, and sight-seeing around local area (Pizam & Sussman, 1995), eating at restaurants tourists frequent, visiting local museums, art galleries, historic sites, attending local activities and festivals together (Derrett, 2003), and attending church together.
Figure 3. Model of Emotional Solidarity (based on Durkheim, 1995[1915]) between Residents and Tourists with Hypothesized Operationalizations (Model One).
Independent Variables of Model Two

A second model is presented below with the addition of four predictors of emotional solidarity (see Figure 4). Each of the four constructs from Model One is also included in Model Two along with their operationalizations. Each of the four additional independent variables (appearing on the far left of Figure 4) is operationalized below as based on the literature. Length of residency was one potential predictor of emotional solidarity. The way in which this variable has been typically operationalized is through ascertaining the number of years lived in a particular area (McCool & Martin, 1994; Snaith & Haley, 1999; Teye et al., 2002; Williams et al., 1995). In this case, years lived in Beaufort County is most appropriate.

Beaufort County residents’ recent travel experience outside of the county was another potential predictor variable of emotional solidarity. The way that this variable has been measured is determining the number of trips taken over the last two years (Petrick, 2002). For this study, two measures were used to determine number of overnight trips taken outside of Beaufort County over the last two years as well as number of day trips taken outside of the county over the same time period. At that point a new variable was computed summing raw values for each of those measures, yielding a new variable referred to residents’ recent travel experience.

Residents’ dependency on tourism was another potential predictor of emotional solidarity. Dependency on tourism has been examined throughout the literature on both an individual level and a community level (Andressen & Murphy, 1986; Evans-Pritchard, 1989; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Pizam, 1978;
Smith & Krannich, 1998). Pizam (1978) measured economic dependency using a nominal level question ascertaining whether residents were “tourism employed” or “non-tourism employed.” Rothman (1978) determined residents’ dependency on tourism by asking respondents to indicate what level percent of income directly or indirectly comes from the tourism industry (i.e., none, less than 10%, 10-25%, 25-50%, 50%-75%, or over 75%). Within the current study, economic dependency was determined by using a scale-level variable whereby residents self-reported the percentage of their income derived from visitor spending.

Age was another probable predictor of resident experienced emotional solidarity with tourists. Age has been used as a demographic predictor many researchers have included within their surveys (Allen et al., 1988; Allen et al., 1993; Ap, 1992; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Smith & Krannich, 1998; Um & Crompton, 1987). The most common way of determining age is through asking the participant how old he/she was on their last birthday.
Figure 4. Model of Durkheim’s Constructs and Additional Resident Characteristics with Hypothesized Operationalizations (Model Two).
In order to answer the second and third research questions of this study, the two models were tested. The first model as mentioned contains only those predictor variables laid out in Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) work. In essence this tested Durkheim’s theory in the context of tourism. The second model contained Durkheim’s predictors as well as other resident characteristics that have been examined in numerous resident attitudes studies within the tourism literature. It should be mentioned that operationalizations for constructs and variables in Figure 3 and Figure 4 are merely hypothesized to reflect what previous researchers have utilized. For the current study, each construct and variable was operationalized primarily through qualitative data analysis and scale development in the first two phases of the research and are presented in Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FOUR

METHODS

This chapter includes a discussion of the methods used within this study. More specifically the chapter includes a discussion of the study site, background of mixed methods, the particular mixed methods approach that was used, rationales for using mixed methods, and a graphic representation of data collection and analysis. The remainder of this chapter includes a discussion of scale development procedures, sampling strategies, data collection techniques and data analysis procedures that were used for both qualitative and quantitative portions of the mixed methods study.

Prior to conducting this study, a proposal was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Clemson University. Through an exempt review procedure, approval was granted by IRB. The approval number for this project was #IRB2007-101.

Study Site

Beaufort County, South Carolina, situated in the “Lowcountry” in the southeastern corner of the state, was selected as the study site for this project. The County is bordered by Jasper County to the west and south, Hampton County to the northwest, Colleton County to the north, and Atlantic Ocean to the east (see Figure 5).
The total land mass of Beaufort County is 587 square miles, with approximately 14% being made up of water and stretching 30 miles along the Atlantic Coastline (Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce, 2007). In addition to the major destinations of Beaufort (the county seat in the northern region), Hilton Head Island and Bluffton (in the southern region), the county also boasts approximately 60 major islands including Fripp Island, Hunting Island, Harbor Island, Capers Island, St. Helena Island, Ladys Island, Daufuskie Island, and Daws Island (see Figure 6). Many of the areas are home to not only residents who have been born and raised in the county, but also retirees (in communities such as Sun City in Bluffton and Sea Pines on Hilton Head Island) and second-home owners who vacation in the region.
A Brief History of Beaufort County

Tourism in Beaufort County is steeped rich in the history of its settlers and developers. A number of important events throughout the last five centuries have contributed to make Beaufort County one of the most popular tourist destinations in South Carolina and arguably in the southeastern region of the United States. Roughly 4000 years after Archaic Indians had settled the area, the first recorded visitors to the area were Spanish explorers led by Captain Francisco Gordillo in 1521 (Rowland, Moore, & Rogers, 1996). It was shortly thereafter that a settlement was established on Parris Island named Santa Elena. Over the next 200 years, explorers from France, England, and Scotland would lay claim to land on what is current-day Parris Island and Port Royal.
(Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce, 2007). Each of the settlements that existed throughout the 200 year period were either abandoned or destroyed by attacks from European conquerors or Native Americans (Rowland et al., 1996).

By 1711 the town of Beaufort was founded by the Lords Proprietors of Carolina, but was transferred back to the Crown in 1729 and quickly became one of the “wealthiest, most aristocratic and cultivated towns of its size in America at the time (Beaufort County Library, 2007a).” It was by the end of the 18th Century that wealthy landowners in Beaufort bought slaves and began developing plantations with rice, indigo, and cotton as cash crops (Rowland et al., 1996). During the Revolutionary War British troops occupied Beaufort, but left the town unharmed. As a result some of buildings remain to date.

By the turn of the 19th Century South Carolina was growing strong in agriculture and tourism. The town of Bluffton, which was established in 1852, was used as a stopping point for travelers from Savannah to Charleston. Bluffton also became a refuge for residents fleeing Union occupation of the South Carolina Barrier Islands (Town of Bluffton, 2008). Beaufort despite being occupied by Union troops during the Civil War was left once again untouched; however Bluffton only had two churches and 15 residences left standing after General Sherman’s “March to the Sea” (Beaufort County Library, 2007a). While Beaufort County was quick to recover after the Revolutionary War, the opposite was true during the Reconstruction Period following the Civil War (Rowland et al., 1996). This was compounded by the boll weevil infestation of cotton, the
hurricane of 1893, and the Fire of 1907 that destroyed much of downtown Beaufort (Beaufort County Library, 2007a).

While Beaufort County did receive some visitors throughout the state at the turn of the 20th Century in the way of family and friends traveling to visit each other, it was not until after WWII that the county realized it potential as a tourist destination (Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce, 2007). In 1956 Charles Fraser bought an uninhabited 5,200 acre tract on the southern portion of Hilton Head Island (making up 20% of the total land area of the island) (Martin, 1996). Shortly thereafter Fraser developed Sea Pines Plantation, a gated resort community designed primarily for permanent retirees and vacationers. The community is still thriving today and has expanded almost entirely inward, but has been renamed “Sea Pines Resort.” In 1969, the downtown Beaufort Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register of Historic Places, 2007). Since that time, approximately 75 other islands, historic districts, and buildings have been added to the register in Beaufort County, including Bluffton Historic District and Sea Pines. By the mid-1990s the retiree population continued to grow as Sun City, a gated retiree community located in Okatie was developed.

Tourism Demand and Supply in Beaufort County

The history of settlement and resort development has made Beaufort County what it is today—a prime destination for cultural tourists, family vacationers, and retirees. In Beaufort County, tourism supports approximately 44% of all jobs (Hill & Hill, 2004). In 2005 Beaufort County ranked third in the state for highest domestic travel expenditures
bringing in $899 million (SCPRT, 2006). Currently the number of visitors to Beaufort County each year is approximately 3.0 million (2.2 million of which visited Hilton Head Island). The estimated number of visitor-days (number of tourists multiplied by number of days spent) is 10.5 for Beaufort County (7.5 million of which were on Hilton Head Island) (Hill & Hill, 2004).

A number of tourism amenities in Beaufort County provide justification for the county being one of the fastest growing in the state in terms of tourism and population (Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce, 2007a). The towns of Beaufort and Bluffton offer quaint shops located within their historic districts including art galleries, eateries, boutiques, antique stores, and outfitters. Ninety buildings make up the historic district in Beaufort which is listed on the National Historic Register (Coastal Places, 2006). More than 10 structures are part of the Bluffton Historic District on the National Historic Register, with the Heyward House (one of only 10 antebellum homes left in Bluffton) and St. Luke’s Parish (established in 1767) being in the center of the district. The Penn Center (which is located east of Beaufort in St. Helena Island) is another historic draw being one of the first schools for freed slaves and one of the most significant African American historical and cultural institutions in existence today. One other draw to the area is the famous “Secession Oak” located in Bluffton, where the Bluffton Movement supposedly began with 500 angry South Carolinians meeting under the tree on July 31, 1844 to discuss secession from the United States (Emmett McCracken, personal communication, May 5, 2007). Many credit this as being the event that helped prompt Southern states to leave the Union.
Throughout the county, numerous historic homes, golf courses, museums, local eateries (many of which are located on the water), accommodations (bed-and-breakfasts, inns, hotels, motels, timeshares, resorts, condos, and campgrounds), and an amusement park exist for visitors (Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce, 2007b). Many outdoor recreational opportunities also exist within the county as five rivers flow through the area making it a prime location for kayaking, canoeing, boating, sailing, bird-watching, and fishing.

In addition to the local businesses, a number of festivals and special events exist for visitors and residents alike occurring primarily from February through October. In 2004, these festivals and events brought in $52.5 million in output for Beaufort County (Hill & Hill, 2004). Some of the festivals in Beaufort include the Beaufort Film Festival (February), Gullah Festival (May), Taste of Beaufort (May), Beaufort Water Festival (July), Fall Festival of Houses (October), and Beaufort Shrimp Festival (October). Port Royal hosts the Softshell Crab Festival (April), July 4th Flying Pig Festival, and Oktoberfest. Some of the events Hilton Head Island offers include the Verizon Heritage Golf Tournament (April), Coastal Cajun Festival (April), and the Food Fest (September) (SCIway.net, 2007a; SCIway.net, 2007b). Numerous other festivals and special events exist throughout the year in the county for visitors and residents.

Beaufort County Demographics

According to the 2006 American Community Survey conducted by the US Census Bureau, there are 142,045 residents living in Beaufort County (2008). That is an increase of 64.4% from the 1990 Census of 86,425 residents (Beaufort County Library,
2007b). Of the total population, 74.3% are white (20.3% are African American, compared to the state percentage of 26.6), 29.8% are senior citizens (aged 55 years and older), and 60.8% are born outside of South Carolina (US Census Bureau, 2008). According to Lowcountry Council of Governments Planning Department (2006), since 1990, the population of senior citizens in Beaufort County has increased 96.2%. The median income for residents is $50,522 (US Census Bureau, 2008). As far as housing units are concerned, 15.9% of the total units are used for seasonal, recreational, or occasional use (US Census Bureau, 2007), which is up 45.6% from 1990 (Lowcountry Council of Governments Planning Department, 2006).

**Rationale for Site Selection**

Beaufort County, South Carolina was chosen as the study site for several reasons. First, it is apparent that after speaking with residents in Beaufort County as well as officials of the chambers of commerce within Beaufort County that residents have divergent perspectives of tourists and the accompanying development. Most notably, those who have lived in the areas the longest would be the least embracing of tourism and tourism development. However with that said, Beaufort County as a whole continues to exhibits signs of tourism support as it is the fastest growing county in the state for tourism development. In fact, as a result of the spillover of tourism and residential development in Hilton Head Island, the town of Bluffton has grown from one square mile in land mass with 1275 residents in 2000 to its current size of approximately 15,000 residents within an area of roughly 54 square miles (Town of Bluffton, 2008). This makes
Bluffton one of the fastest growing towns in South Carolina. Also, Beaufort County appears to have a large percentage of new residents who have moved from other states.

Based on the literature, new residents tend to participate in local tourism activities, get along better with incoming tourists, and have positive impressions of tourism development (Kneafsey, 2001; Sherlock, 2001). This indicates that such residents may be suitable candidates for feeling solidarity with tourists who visit their community. With having such diverse groups of residents within Beaufort County (i.e., retirees, second homeowners, long-time residents, new residents, native-born residents, and tourism dependent residents), the region is ideal to be able to capture the divergent perspectives of residents regarding tourism, variance in findings, and determine the extent to which they feel an emotional solidarity with visiting tourists.

Mixed Methods

Mixed methods research involves collecting multiple forms of data (i.e., qualitative, quantitative, or a combination of both) with the intent of mixing data during phases of the research process (i.e., data collection, data analysis, conclusion, discussion, etc.) (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2006), combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in mixed methods provides a better understanding of research problems then either approach alone. For instance, findings are stronger and more valid if multiple methods confirm similar findings, which is referred to as triangulation (Mitra & Lankford; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). This can provide stronger evidence for a conclusion through convergence and

Mixed methods research is relatively a new design, emerging around the 1960s with the closely aligned pragmatic paradigm. This type of design came about because researchers were calling for a more integrated methodology between the two purist extremes. Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998) claim there have been two distinct phases of pragmatic methodology since the 1960s. Between 1960 and 1980, mixed methods design gained momentum (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). This type of design consists of conducting qualitative research initially and following it up with quantitative research, and vice versa. Examples of this type include sequential and dominant-less dominant designs (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998).

By 1990, mixed model design grew in popularity among social and behavioral scientists (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). This design combines quantitative and qualitative approaches within different stages of the research process (Creswell, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). The mixing can occur during the methods, collection, analysis, and reporting stages of research (Brent Igo, personal communication, April 14, 2006). In the literature to date, mixed model design and mixed method design are frequently combined under the categorization of mixed methods research (Creswell, 2003; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). As a result, a number of techniques (and variants of each technique) can be employed within mixed methods such as triangulation...
design, embedded design, explanatory design, and exploratory design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006).

Mixed Method Technique of Choice

An exploratory sequential mixed methods design was used in this study to examine the relationship residents have with tourists in their community using the framework of emotional solidarity. This form of mixed methods design consists of exploring a phenomenon with qualitative methods in order to formulate a testable instrument to measure the phenomenon across either the same or additional populations (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006).

Reasons for Using a Mixed Methods Design

Numerous rationales exist for the utilization of an exploratory sequential design within this study. First, results of the first method (qualitative) can help develop the second method (quantitative) (Greene, Caracelli, & Graham, 1989). This is based on the premise that no specific instrument pertaining directly to emotional solidarity is available to utilize (Creswell, Plano Clark, Guttman, & Mason, 2003). Second, different questions are posed that require multiple forms of data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006). Third, this technique is appropriate to explore a phenomenon in depth and then measure its prevalence and generalize results across different groups (Morse, 1991). Fourth, this research design is beneficial for data triangulation as well as addressing multiple research questions of a qualitative and quantitative nature (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003).
Mixed Methods in Tourism Research

Mixed methods research in the tourism literature is secondary to positivistic, quantitative methods. In a review of four leading journals in the tourism field (*Journal of Travel Research, Annals of Tourism Research, Tourism Management*, and *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*) from their inaugural publications (dating as far back as 1970) through 1996, Riley and Love (2000) concluded that approximately 6.0% of the articles employed qualitative as exploratory, leading to a quantitative examination and only 5.5% of the articles used mixed methods. This is further supported through an examination of methods used in the two leading journals in the field between 1990 and 2006 (*Journal of Travel Research* and *Annals of Tourism Research*) conducted by the researcher. Only 6.2% of the empirical articles used a form of mixed methods.

Despite these low numbers, mixed methods research has numerous benefits for the tourism literature. First, it allows for a more complete examination of the phenomenon being studied by collecting multiple forms of data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006). Using multiple methods allows for more credible and dependable findings (Phillimore & Goodson, 2004). This ultimately leads to a greater likelihood of triangulating the data to test for concurring and confirming data (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). Utilizing mixed methods techniques in research also highlights the growing and evolving scholarship and academic inquiry of the tourism field, transcending the traditional, positivistic inquiry that has been prevalent for many decades.
Mixed Methods Procedural Phases

Three phases of data collection and analysis occurred within this study. In the first phase, a series of focus groups with Beaufort County residents who possessed various perspectives on tourism and tourists was conducted to explore the construct, emotional solidarity. Upon completion of the qualitative data analysis, scale-items of emotional solidarity as well as predictors of the construct were generated. At that point, scales of interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity were developed and pilot-tested on two separate samples of residents (i.e., one coastal North Carolina community and a sub-sample of Beaufort County residents) through an on-site self-administered survey instrument. Finally, a representative sample of Beaufort County permanent residents were contacted at their homes and asked to complete the finalized on-site self-administered survey instrument (with each of the four developed scales and additional resident characteristics) to test the two conceptual models laid out in Chapter Three.

Data collection and analysis procedures for this exploratory sequential mixed methods design are diagrammed below (see Figure 7). A more detailed discussion of data collection and analysis are presented in proceeding sections for each qualitative and quantitative portions of this study. Phase One of the research involved the first three stages listed below. Phase Two will included stage four below. Finally, Phase Three will involved stages five, six, and seven below.
Phase One of Research Design

The initial phase of research in this study was an exploration of the construct emotional solidarity residents experience with tourists in their community. This occurred through a series three focus groups with residents of Beaufort County. The number of focus groups was determined based on data saturation occurring, where no new data or very little new data emerges from subsequent interviewing (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006). Beaufort County was deemed an appropriate study site because the county has divergent enough perspectives of tourism among its residents (both those who strongly support and those who strongly oppose) to formulate an emotional solidarity scale (with
extremes low and high) that is missing from the tourism literature. Further, the scale was
used in the last phase to address the second, third, fourth, and fifth research questions
within the study. Four main objectives existed for this phase of the study: 1) to develop a
list of tourist types, 2) to generate emotional solidarity scale items, 3) to generate scale
items of interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior, and 4) to generate potential
predictors of emotional solidarity.

Advantages of Using Focus Groups

A number of advantages exist in using focus groups as a technique for collecting
qualitative data. First, focus groups have the ability to explore topics and generate
hypotheses (Morgan, 1988). The main topic studied in this project was the relationship
between residents and tourists in terms of emotional solidarity. Codes from the focus
group analysis served to inform hypotheses based on the emerging predictors and scale
items of the construct. A second advantage of using focus groups is that the technique is a
socially oriented research method capturing real-life data in a social environment
(Krueger, 1994). People are social creatures as Krueger points out, and as they interact
with and listen to each other they are informed and can influence one another’s
perspectives. This dynamism can be captured through focus groups, especially if
individuals have moderately divergent perspectives about the topic at hand. A third
advantage of focus groups is that they are flexible in nature (Babbie, 2005). What is
meant by this is that the moderator has the freedom to probe deeper into a topic or
comment that is offered if clarification is needed. This is especially true if the researcher
is using semi-structured interviews and a script is used, but not “set in stone” (Krueger, 1994).

A number of logistical advantages also exist in using focus groups. The technique offers speedy results (Krueger, 1994). Instead of conducting multiple individual interviews, focus groups allow the researcher to have access to numerous people at one time, which saves time in data entry, coding, and analysis. Focus groups are also high in face validity (Babbie, 2005). Krueger (1994) claims that the technique is easily understood and the results appear believable to those viewing the information. Finally, focus groups are relatively inexpensive to conduct when compared with other forms of data collection (Morgan, 1988). Paying for meeting rooms, refreshments, assistant moderator fees, and incentives for participants tends to be much more cost effective than conducting a large-scale mail survey or numerous individual interviews (Krueger, 1994). This is especially true if each focus group is kept to sizes of 8-12 participants (Andreasen, 1983).

Sampling and Potential Interviewees

In order to collect data from focus group interviews, access must be established with a gatekeeper and rapport established and maintained with such individuals (Schram, 2006). According to Creswell (1998), a gatekeeper is a key informant from the study site that has access to information and individuals important to the research project, and who can steer the researcher to contacts. In this study, there were numerous gatekeepers. Such individuals included Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce officials, the Director of the Lowcountry and Resort Islands Tourism Institute, Hilton Head Island Chamber of
Commerce officials, a Senior Extension Agent for Beaufort County (through Clemson University), and professors employed at the University of South Carolina-Beaufort. Each of these individuals were viewed as insiders who have knowledge of the area, its residents, and could potentially gain from this study as it would continue to add to the positive relations between residents and tourists. A list of those gatekeepers can be found in Appendix A. In order to form rapport with this person, Bogdan and Biklen (1992) suggest providing the gatekeeper with answers to the following five questions. Answers to each are provided below (see Table 1).
Table 1. Gatekeeper Rapport Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rapport Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why was the site chosen for the study?</td>
<td>Unique natural resources in area, extensive history of tourism in area, unique recreational opportunities in area, and apparent positive relationship residents have with tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will be done at the site during the study?</td>
<td>Focus group interviews will occur on-site between April 2007 and May 2007. Interviews should last between one and three hours. The only resources required of participants are their narrative experiences of living in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the researcher’s presence be disruptive?</td>
<td>Not intended to. Plan to collect interviews on-site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the results be reported?</td>
<td>Results will be reported in a dissertation manuscript, potentially journal manuscripts for publication, and as reports to the Greater Beaufort Chamber of Commerce and Hilton Head/Bluffton Chamber of Commerce. All names will be changed so as to seek anonymity of interviewees and protect identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will the gatekeeper gain from the study?</td>
<td>Potential information that will explain daily life among locals, perhaps build potential bridges among residents and tourists concerning planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus group participants were recruited using a criterion sampling scheme (once gatekeepers provided names of potential participants) (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Such
sampling consisted of acquiring a list of residents in Beaufort County that met the following criteria: 1) residents who felt strongly (either positively or negatively) about tourism and tourists in Beaufort County, 2) who lived in the County for 12 months of the year, 3) and were 18 years of age. Each focus group had residents of Beaufort County from different socioeconomic backgrounds, age categories, and racial make-ups that possess divergent perspectives regarding tourism and tourists in the area. Anticipating receiving lists from gatekeepers that were not racially diverse, contact was made with the local African Community Center (Penn Center) and well-known and respected African American professors to collect names and addresses of local African American residents to contact.

Once the lists were received from gatekeepers with names, addresses, and phone numbers, individuals were contacted three times as suggested by Krueger (1994). The first contact occurred 10-14 days prior to focus groups via telephone where potential participants were read a recruitment script (Appendix B), told of the project with incentives and their role in the focus groups. Those that agreed to participate in focus groups received a formal written invitation (following a template put forth by Krueger) seven days prior to each focus group with specific information regarding meeting location, time, and other pertinent details (Appendix C). The third contact made with focus group participants included a “dentist” style phone call the day before the focus group as Krueger (1994, p. 90) suggests. This last contact served two purposes: it reinforced the importance of the focus group given that three contacts have been made.
and it reminded those participants that might have forgotten about the session (Krueger, 1994).

Ideally focus groups should have between six and nine participants as any more than nine might limit each person’s opportunity to share insights and observations (Krueger, 1994). Also, group dynamics change when participants want, but are unable, to describe their experiences and have to settle for leaning over to their neighbor to communicate (Babbie, 2005). Andreasen (1983) and Morgan (1988) claim that an appropriate focus group size is between eight and 12 participants. With that said, the three focus groups held in Hilton Head, Bluffton, and Beaufort had 8, 11, and 10 participants respectively.

**Focus Group Coordinators**

Two individuals conducted each focus group: the moderator and assistant moderator. Having an assistant moderator increases both the total accumulation of information as well as the validity of the analysis (Babbie, 2005). The moderator was the author and the assistant was a paid graduate student in Tourism Management within the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management at Clemson University. Each person had different roles as stated in Krueger (1994). For example, the moderator directed the discussion, kept the conversation flowing, and took a few notes (Morgan, 1988). The assistant moderator was responsible for taking comprehensive notes, operating the tape recorder, handling the environmental conditions and logistics (i.e., refreshments, lighting, seating, etc.), responding to unexpected interruptions, and noting body language throughout the discussion (Krueger, 1994).
Data Collection

The source of data for this portion of the study consisted of audio-recorded semi-structured, on-site interviews. Semi-structured interviews consisted of asking each participant within the focus group a series of formulated questions with the intent that the interviewer would ask probing questions if further explanation was needed from the participants’ responses (Merriam, 2001). A semi-structured format also allows for flexibility in the interview to take different directions as the interviewees dictates in his/her responses (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006; Merriam, 2001). Each focus group interview was guided by an interview script (see Appendix D). Questions from the interview script involved the following topics: ice-breakers, antecedents of emotional solidarity, and multiple dimensions of emotional solidarity.

Prior to beginning each focus group, participants received an information letter for their records which includes the study purpose, role of participant in research, benefits, confidentiality, risks, compensation, and contact information (see Appendix E). Focus group interviews occurred on-site at three locations (Hilton Head Island, Bluffton, and Beaufort) that are well known by participants such as the Clemson University Extension office in Beaufort, the USC-Beaufort South Campus in Bluffton, and the Hilton Head Library. Krueger (1994) claims that focus group sites should be neutral, have ample room for participants, have adequate seating, and be in a quiet location (so as to allow for tape-recording). These were criteria the researcher utilized to select an appropriate meeting location for all parties.
Focus groups were held in April and May of 2007 when residents, retirees, and second-home owners were likely to be in Beaufort County. This time of the year was also the off-peak period of the year for tourism in the county, which allowed residents a greater chance to attend the focus groups. The qualitative data collection phase began in early March by receiving names from gatekeepers in Beaufort County to contact for the focus groups (see Appendix F for a Phase One timeline). Focus groups occurred until data saturation occurs as indicated by Krueger (1994).

**Conducting Focus Groups**

After weeks of preparatory planning for the focus groups (i.e., securing a meeting place, placing a food order, recruiting potential participants), the actual interview session was over in a matter of two hours. Conducting the focus group was consistent across all three individual sessions, with two individuals (i.e., the moderator and assistant moderator) carrying out their own responsibilities. Conducting each focus group consisted of following a series of steps.

Initially the moderator and assistant moderator arrived at the location of the group meeting 30 minutes to one hour prior to participants. During this time, the room was set up so that tables were in the shape of a rectangle, ensuring everyone could look at each other as they spoke. Also during this time, food was set up at a table on the periphery of the room and information letters and documents were placed at each seat with a name card and the moderator’s business card. An audio recording device was set up in the center of the rectangle for greatest likelihood of capturing everyone’s voice.
As individuals began to arrive at the location, the moderator greeted each at the door, ushered them inside and shared that they could sit anywhere and help themselves to food. In addition, the moderator and assistant moderator told each participant to please fill out the sample survey (for pilot-testing purposes) at their seat, read the information letter, and fill out their name on the name card in front of them prior to beginning.

Once everyone had arrived, had time to fill out the form and eaten, the moderator took a seat in the rectangle and the assistant moderator was seated opposite, however outside of the circle. At this time the assistant moderator began recording the session as the moderator started with introductions of researchers, ground rules, confidentiality statements, and fielded any initial questions.

From that point on, the remainder of the focus group followed a semi-structured question script made up of roughly 10 questions with a specific time allocated for each question. The moderator was responsible for asking each question and keeping the conversation flowing as the assistant moderator took notes. The script moved through a progression beginning with ice-breakers and general questions to facilitate a discussion. Next, more substantive questions were asked getting at potential items for the four constructs. Finally, summary questions involving resident characteristics and travel behavior were asked followed by a call for additional comments and/or questions. The interview questions and responses typically lasted between 100-120 minutes as participants were free to get food and drink throughout.

Once the script was completed and no additional questions were asked by participants, everyone was dismissed and directed to give their completed sample surveys
and payment acknowledgment forms to the assistant moderator. In return the assistant moderator gave participants the promised stipend and a Clemson University t-shirt. Participants were also urged to contact the moderator for a summary of the results in the coming months. Once everyone left, the moderator and assistant moderator reviewed the session, listened briefly to the recording to make sure there were no difficulties, and returned the room back to its original layout.

Data Analysis

Upon completion of each focus group, data were transcribed into a Microsoft Word document and uploaded in the NVivo7 qualitative data software program for coding and analysis. Two basic approaches exist in analyzing focus group data. One is a strictly qualitative or ethnographic summary of the interviews and the other is systematic coding via content analysis (Morgan, 1988). The latter approach was utilized following an eight-step procedure as outlined in Carney (1972) to analyze the transcribed data (see Table 2).
As is mentioned in Busch, DeMaret, and Flynn (2007) and Carney (1972), the first five steps involved determining the level at which analysis would actually occur. Coding procedures were done using the NVivo 7 software program. Six parent nodes were coded from the data. Those parent nodes were: 1) tourist type, 2) emotions/feelings for residents, 3) shared behaviors in Beaufort County between residents and tourists, 4) shared beliefs about Beaufort County between residents and tourists, 5) interaction between residents and tourists, and 6) resident characteristics. Once data were coded, inter-rater reliability tests were conducted by using two coders of the data. The two
coders were the moderator and assistant moderator at the focus groups. The particular inter-rater reliability test that was conducted was the percent-agreement test as put forth by Holsti (1969) using the following equation:

\[
\text{IRR} = \frac{2(A)}{n_1 + n_2},
\]

where \( A \) represents the number of common codes between coders, \( n_1 \) represents the number of codes of the first coder, and \( n_2 \) represents the number of codes of the second coder. Once inter-rater reliability tests were concluded, themes were generated within each of the parent node categories. Scale items for emotional solidarity as well as predictor variables of the construct were developed not only from the themes that emerged from the codes, but also from some of the codes.

**Phase Two of Research Design**

The ultimate goal of conducting the initial qualitative portion of the study was to develop four scales; one each for emotional solidarity, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and interaction. O’Brien (1993) claims using focus groups to construct survey items is key to improving survey questionnaires, especially when the construct has not been examined in great depth or a scale measuring the construct does not exist. Both situations are true in the case of emotional solidarity. These scales were ultimately used in the third phase of research to test the two conceptual models in Chapter Three as well as explain differences in emotional solidarity across different resident types and for multiple tourist types.
Scale Development Procedures

Procedures for developing scales of interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity closely followed the model put forth in the work of Churchill (1979; see Table 3).

Table 3. Scale Development Procedure (as modified from Churchill, 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Technique or coefficient used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Specify domain of construct</td>
<td>Literature search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generate sample of items</td>
<td>Literature search, Focus group, Expert panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td>Pilot test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purify measure</td>
<td>Exploratory factor analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assess reliability</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Collect data</td>
<td>Pilot test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purify measure</td>
<td>Exploratory factor analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assess reliability</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha, Split-half reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Assess validity</td>
<td>Convergent validity, Criterion validity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of qualitative data collection and analysis, items were generated that capture the construct of emotional solidarity, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and interaction in the context of tourism and the relationship between tourists and residents.
Churchill (1979) claims that using qualitative data through individual or group interviews is a viable way in which to generate items in scale development (See Appendix G for Phase Two timeline). The numerous items that were generated were distributed to an expert panel (see Dillman, 2006) to determine overlapping items, potential bad items, and confusing items.

The four scales within the survey instrument were pilot-tested in a North Carolina coastal county similar to the study site using permanent residents during the Fourth of July week in 2007. This first round of pilot-testing was conducted for purposes of data collection, readability, reliability, and item clarification. Surveys (n = 73) were self-administered on-site at multiple locations where residents could be found. Places included grocery stores, food establishments, retail locations, government offices, the beach, and residential neighborhoods. In some instances, surveys were left with participants and picked up later that day as Andereck and Vogt (2000) had done in a similar resident study. Fifty-five surveys were returned to the researcher; however four were not included in the analysis because less than half of the items were completed. In the end, 51 surveys were completed in the first round of pilot-testing the instrument. According to Rea and Parker (1997), a pilot study must have at least 40 participants to insure greater reliability of findings.

In order to purify each measure, a sequence of exploratory factor analysis procedures were conducted using principal axis factoring extraction with an orthogonal varimax rotation to determine which items within each scale were double loading or non-loaders on the emergent factors based on eigenvalues. Following the series of
exploratory factor analyses, Cronbach alphas were assessed as suggested by Peter (1979) to determine the reliability of factors within each construct.

A second pilot test of the scale occurred using a sub-sample of the population of Beaufort County residents that was utilized to test the final instrument. On-site self-administered surveys (n = 75) were again distributed and collected at locations where numerous permanent residents of Beaufort County could be found (e.g., grocery stores, food establishments, retail locations, government offices, the beach, and residential neighborhoods). Similar to the first pilot test, the sample size of the second pilot test was 53 participants. This number is adequate given the minimum required sample size of 40 for pilot-testing analysis as proposed by Rea and Parker (1997).

Surveys from the second pilot test were subjected again to a series of exploratory factor analyses to further refine each scale. Cronbach alpha reliabilities as well as split-half reliability following Peter (1979) were then assessed. Following tests of reliability, construct validity through convergent validity (to determine the extent to which the measure correlates with other measures designed to measure the same thing) as well as criterion validity (to determine whether the measure behaves as expected) were assessed as Churchill (1979) suggests.

Following two rounds of pilot-testing the survey instrument and conducting reliability and validity analysis, the final instrument was beta-tested in one randomly selected block group of a randomly selected census tract within Beaufort County. According to Babbie (2005), the goal of beta-testing is to determine whether the sampling
procedure is appropriate given the selected sample and if data collection procedures need to be altered.

One week prior to administering the final instrument, the survey was distributed to residents in a block group within Beaufort County that was not selected as part of the final study. The block group that was selected was both rural (60%) and urban (40%) in nature to ensure that the data collection method would in fact work across both types of block groups. The surveys were administered on Saturday August 4th, 2007 between approximately 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. the researcher returned to each of the homes where individuals accepted a survey to collect those that were completed. Two waves of return contacts were made.

Overall, 25 of 32 individuals that were contacted agreed to take the survey, which was a 78.13% survey acceptance rate. Of the 25 individuals who agreed to take the survey, 22 completed the survey, which was an 88.0% survey completion rate. Based on these rates, 22 individuals completed surveys out of a potential 32, which yielded an overall response rate of 68.8%. Based on the beta-test, only minor changes were made to the data collection procedures, namely tally sheet reconfiguration (Appendix H), more detailed instructions provided to data collectors (i.e., two individuals would go in groups to collect data, role of each in pairs, how much time spent at each home in recruitment process, returning to homes in order that surveys were dropped off, etc.), and better markings on each map for data collection groups. No major data collection issues arose from beta-testing, which meant the final instrument could be distributed as planned.
Phase Three of Research Design

Four research questions exist for the quantitative aspect of the study. Those research questions are: 1) “Do the three variables mentioned throughout the literature and within Durkheim’s theory (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior) significantly explain variance in emotional solidarity among residents?”; 2) “Do additional resident characteristics (i.e., age, length of residency, income level, dependence on tourism, past vacationing in the area, and level of tourism experience outside of the area) explain a greater variance in emotional solidarity than do the initial three constructs in Durkheim’s model?”; 3) “How does level of emotional solidarity differ across resident characteristics (i.e., retirement status, length of residency, place of birth, tourism dependence, prior vacationing experience in Beaufort County, recent travel experience outside the county, and age)?”; and 4) “How does level of emotional solidarity differ by type of tourist encountered most often within the community?”

In turn, four main hypotheses were tested. The first two hypotheses speak to both conceptual models, while the third and fourth hypotheses address the level of emotional solidarity across multiple resident characteristics and for differing tourist types. As mentioned previously, scales of the four constructs (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity) were developed from the initial qualitative phase of research and through pilot testing at two locations. Emotional solidarity was considered the dependent variable in this portion of the study. Some of the hypotheses that were tested from this instrument are listed in the “hypotheses and data analyses procedures” section below.
Sampling and Data Collection

The population for the quantitative portion of this study were permanent resident heads of households in Beaufort County who were over the age of 18. According to the US Census Bureau, there are a total of 108,137 individuals over the age of 18 residing in 55,981 households in Beaufort County (2008). Participants were selected from households using a multi-stage cluster sampling scheme based on proportionate random sampling (based on percentage of urban versus rural households). This sampling scheme is utilized not only by the U.S. Census Bureau but also by researchers in the field (Andereck & Nickerson, 1997; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; McGehee & Andereck, 2004).

The first stage of cluster sampling included randomly selecting from the 25 geographically identified census tracts (i.e., numbered from 1-12, 21, 22, 101-113; with the exclusion of census tracts 4 and 10 because they are military bases) within Beaufort County (see Figure 8). The 25 census tracts are further broken down into 87 block groups. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, each census tract was formulated based on homogeneity of socio-demographic variables of residents within a particular region. Block groups are smaller than census tracts, and formulated by a further refinement of socio-demographic variables.
Of the 25 census tracts, 19 were urban and six were rural. Ten census tracts were randomly selected initially. Given that the county is made up of 71.7% urban households, seven of the 10 randomly selected census tracts were made up of predominantly urban
households. From the seven randomly selected urban census tracts, there were 31 block
groups (a smaller geographic area within each census tract) and from the three randomly
selected rural census tracts, there were 11 block groups to select from. It should be noted
that to begin with, 87 block groups made up the 25 census tracts. Figure 9 below is a map
highlighting one particular block group within one of the census tracts of Beaufort
County, South Carolina.

![Figure 9. Map of Block Group 1 within Census Tract 1 of Beaufort County, South Carolina (cited from U.S. Census Bureau, March 2007)](image)

The second stage of multi-stage cluster sampling continued to follow a
proportionate random sampling procedure by selecting 15 urban block groups and six
rural block groups. A total of 21 block groups was arrived at given the researchers had 21
sampling sessions to collect the on-site data. Further, each day a different block group could be sampled by the researchers.

As a check to see the selected block groups were representative of the overall county, race of head of household and income were compared to US Census Bureau data. Of the 21 block groups that were selected, 23.4% of the heads of households were African American. This compares to 20.3% throughout Beaufort County (US Census Bureau, 2008). A chi-square goodness-of-fit test was conducted to determine if the percent of African American heads of household were similar between selected block groups and the county overall. The null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference between percentage of African American households in the selected block groups and the county. The equation (as adapted from Sheskin, 2007) that was used to determine chi-square goodness-of-fit was written as,

$$X^2 = \frac{[\text{observed value} – \text{expected value}]^2}{\text{expected value}},$$

Where observed value represents percent of African American heads of household in block groups and expected value represents percent of African American heads of household in county. The observed chi-square value was 0.473. Comparing this value to the chi-square critical value with 1 degree of freedom at the 0.05 alpha level (i.e., 3.841) in Tabachnick & Fidell (2006), it was concluded that the test was not significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted and it was claimed that no significant difference existed between percentage of African American heads of households from the selected block groups and the county overall. This indicates a good fit.
Of the 21 block groups that were selected, 77.2% of the households had an income less than $100,000, compared to the 79.5% of the households throughout the county (US Census Bureau, 2008). A chi-square goodness-of-fit test was conducted to determine if the percent of household incomes greater than $100,000 were similar between selected block groups and the county overall. The null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference in percentage of household incomes greater than $100,000 between block groups selected and the county overall.

The same goodness-of-fit equation (Sheskin, 2007) was used to determine the observed chi-square value to be 0.07. Comparing the observed value to the critical value chi-square value with one degree of freedom (i.e., 3.841), it was concluded that the test was not significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted and it was said that no significant differences existed between percentage of households earning less than $100,000 from the selected block groups and the county overall.

The third stage of selecting the sample included determining the required amount of respondents from both urban block groups as well as rural block groups. Prior to doing that, a sample size was calculated from http://www.surveysampling.com based on three criteria: population size (i.e., number of households in Beaufort County), confidence level, and confidence interval. With 55,981 households in Beaufort County and using a 95% confidence level with a confidence interval of five, a sample size of 382 homes was calculated. Based on that number, 267 individuals from urban block groups and 115 individuals from rural block groups were needed. This stage required randomly selecting
every 3\texttexttt{rd} house within an urban block group and every 5\texttexttt{th} house within a rural block group to administer the on-site survey.

Data collection for the survey portion of the study was conducted by a research team consisting of the author and fellow graduate students from Clemson University during four weekends (both Saturday and Sunday) in August and September of 2007. Prior to collecting data, each student researcher was trained in how to collect data and how to follow a protocol. Additionally, each student completed CITI training as it relates to social and behavioral sciences research.

Data collection included distributing on-site self-administered survey instruments to randomly selected k\texttexttt{th} households within randomly selected block groups in Beaufort County. For urban block groups, researchers visited every 3\texttexttt{rd} household after selecting a random starting point. For rural block groups, researchers visited every 5\texttexttt{th} household after selecting a random starting point. These numbers were arrived at randomly by selecting the first serial number off of a dollar bill in the author’s possession.

Researchers in groups of two were responsible for covering an entire block group per day, driving throughout neighborhoods working as a team. One researcher drove the car and controlled the tally sheet, while the other spoke to each potential participant, dropped off questionnaires, and later picked up completed questionnaires.

Potential participants were contacted at their place of residence (between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.) and read a recruitment script (Appendix I), asked if they were permanent residents, if they were 18, if they were heads of the household or spouses, and given a postcard (Appendix J) with contact and project information prior to completing
the questionnaire. If individuals agreed to participate in the survey, a questionnaire was
given to them, and they were told that a researcher would return later that day (between
4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m) to collect the completed questionnaire. Only one participant per
household was asked to participate. If no one answered the door, the next immediate
house was contacted. If the person who answered the door was not permanent (i.e., did
not vote in Beaufort County), the next immediate house was contacted. If individuals
declined to participate, the next kth house was contacted.

Two return contacts were made to collect completed questionnaires. This method
allows for greater response rate (Andereck & Nickerson, 1997; Andereck & Vogt, 2000;
McGehee & Andereck, 2004). Potential participants were not contacted prior to arriving
at each household, after they declined to participate, or once a completed survey was
collected from a particular address. Each weekend, three pair of researchers were
responsible for covering either five or six block groups.

Distributing on-site self-administered questionnaires were used for three primary
reasons. First, it is likely to increase response rates (Babbie, 2005). Second, it is likely to
increase the inclusion of some minority groups as well as different resident groups within
the county. Third, on-site data collection is efficient and allows for quick data collection
(Dillman, 2006).

Throughout the four week period of data collection, 1229 homes were visited
throughout Beaufort County. At roughly half of those homes (n = 517) there was no
answer. Forty-one of the homes had a head of household that was not a permanent
resident. At the remaining 671 homes, the head of household (or spouse) was contacted
and asked to participate in the study. Of the 671 residents, 117 declined to take the questionnaire, which equates to an 82.6% survey acceptance rate. Of the 554 surveys that were distributed, 455 were completed by residents. That amounts to a survey completion rate of 82.1%. The overall response rate (i.e., 455 completed surveys from the 671 individuals that were contacted) was 67.8%. Table 4 highlights the number of individuals contacted, questionnaires accepted, questionnaires completed and corresponding rates across each of the 21 urban and rural block groups.
Table 4. *Response Rates across all 21 Block Groups within Beaufort County*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tract, Block Group</th>
<th>Urban/Rural</th>
<th>Overall Contact</th>
<th>Quest. Accept</th>
<th>Acceptance Rate Percent</th>
<th>Quest. Complete</th>
<th>Completion Rate Percent</th>
<th>Overall Response Rate Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22,1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113,2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113,1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110,1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104,3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                     | 671         | 554             | 82.6%        | 455                     | 82.1%         | 67.8%                  |

Data collection for Phase Three of the study began in August 2007. Data entry and initial data analysis were conducted through November 2007. See Appendix K for Phase Three timeline.
Hypotheses and Data Analysis Procedures

Below are hypotheses which correspond to the four main research questions of the study (i.e., research questions two, three, four, and five listed within Chapter One). Seven hypotheses correspond to the four research questions. The first four hypotheses correspond to the second research question and Model One. The first hypothesis involves main effects of the model. Hypothesis two, three, and four look at the unique contributions of each of the predictors within Model One. Hypothesis five (which come from the third research question) corresponds to Model Two to determine if the addition of resident demographic variables increases the variance explained within the model. The sixth and seventh hypotheses (which come from research question four and five, respectively) examine differences in emotional solidarity across residents and tourists. Operationalizations for each variable are listed below hypotheses as well as the type of statistical procedure used to test each. Due to the lack of research on emotional solidarity within the tourism literature, each hypothesis is written as non-directional in the null form.

The first hypothesis tests the model of emotional solidarity as put for by Durkheim in Figure 3, and is written as:

\[ H_1: \text{ The three variables in the Durkheimian model (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior) do not significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.} \]
In order to address each construct within the model more specifically, $H_1$ is further broken down into three hypotheses. These hypotheses address the significance of each predictor variable in explaining emotional solidarity.

$H_{1a}$: Interaction does not significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.

$H_{1b}$: Shared beliefs do not significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.

$H_{1c}$: Shared behavior does not significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.

These hypotheses were tested using structural equation modeling techniques. More specifically, structural regression modeling was utilized, which is a hybrid structural equation modeling technique involving specifying a measurement model (through confirmatory factor analysis) and then testing a latent structural model expanded from the measurement model (Kline, 2005). Emotional solidarity was treated as the dependent variable in this structural model, with interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior being three separate independent variables. Significance tests included an examination of observed large sample $z$-values in comparison with a two-tailed critical $z$-value at the 0.05 level. Each of the independent variables and dependent variables were scale-level variables comprised of multiple factors.

The second hypothesis concerned unique effect sizes for each of the three predictor variables in Durkheim’s model. The three hypotheses are:
H₂: Interactions between residents and tourists in Beaufort County will not have a unique effect size greater than that of shared beliefs or shared behavior in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

Semipartial effect sizes from the structural regression modeling techniques were used to examine unique effect size of interaction on emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

H₃: Perceived shared beliefs between residents and tourists in Beaufort County (as reported by residents) will not have a unique effect size greater than that of interaction or shared behavior in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

Again, semi-partial effect sizes from the structural regression modeling techniques were used to examine unique effect size of shared beliefs on emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

H₄: Perceived shared behavior between residents and tourists in Beaufort County (as reported by residents) will not have a unique effect size greater than that of interaction or shared beliefs in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

Once more semi-partial effect sizes from the structural regression modeling techniques were used to examine unique effect size of shared behavior on emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.
A second model with the three constructs as put forth by Durkheim (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior) were tested along with additional resident characteristics to predict emotional solidarity that emerged from focus group data analysis to determine if the model explains a greater variance than Model One. The fifth hypothesis is,

\[ H_5 \: \text{Additional resident characteristics (i.e., length of residency, recent travel experience outside Beaufort County, economic dependency on tourism, and age) along with the predictors from Model One (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior) will not significantly explain a greater degree of variance in emotional solidarity than predictors in Model One.} \]

Again, structural regression modeling was used to test the fifth hypothesis corresponding to Model Two. This hypothesis tested competing, nested models to determine which fits the data better and explains a greater degree of variance in emotional solidarity. Emotional solidarity was considered the dependent variable with multiple scale-level items loadings onto multiple factors. The four demographic predictors within Model Two were ratio-level items. Length of residency was ascertained by asking, “How many years have you live in Beaufort County?” Participants were provided a blank in which to fill their response. Recent travel experience was measured as number of trips taken in the last two years (both overnight trips and daytrips). Participants were provided a blank in which to fill their response. Resident dependence on tourism was operationalized with the question of, “What percent of your overall household income is directly or indirectly attributed to the tourism industry?”
Respondents had a blank to fill in the appropriate percentage. Finally, age of residents was operationalized as the number of years they have been alive. Respondents had a blank to fill in the appropriate number.

The sixth hypothesis of the study was concerned with examining the extent to which dimensions of emotional solidarity differ across resident types. The main hypothesis is written as,

\( H_6: \) Mean scores of emotional solidarity dimensions felt with tourists (DV) will not be significantly different across multiple resident types (IV).

In order to address each dimension (i.e., sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors) more specifically, \( H_6 \) was further broken down into seven sub-hypotheses examining seven resident characteristic variables (i.e., retirement status, length of residency, place of birth, tourism dependence, prior vacation experience in Beaufort County, total trips taken in the last two years, and age).

\( H_{6a}: \) Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors (DV) will not be significantly different across residents’ retirement status (IV).

\( H_{6b}: \) Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors (DV) will not be significantly different across length of residency groupings (IV).

\( H_{6c}: \) Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors (DV) will not be significantly different across residents’ place of birth (IV).
H_{6d}: Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors (DVs) will not be significantly different across levels of resident tourism dependence (IV).

H_{6e}: Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors (DVs) will not be significantly different residents’ prior vacationing experience in Beaufort County (IV).

H_{6f}: Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors (DVs) will not be significantly different across residents’ varying amounts of total trips taken in the last two years (IV).

H_{6g}: Mean scores of sympathetic understanding (DVs) will not be significantly different across resident age categories (IV).

Composite scores for each of the emotional solidarity dimensions was calculated by summing item scores within each dimension and dividing by the number of items within each dimension. Retirement status was comprised of two groups, retirees and non-retirees. Retirees were considered all those individuals who are retired from work, while non-retirees included individuals who were employed full time, employed part-time, homemakers, students, or unemployed. This variable was categorical. Length of residency groupings were comprised of new residents (i.e., permanent residents living in Beaufort County less than 10 years), seasoned residents (i.e., permanent residents living in Beaufort County between 10 and 30 years), and long-time residents (i.e., permanent residents living in Beaufort County more than 30 years). Data for this variable was
collected as continuous, but was recoded into a new categorical variable to reflect the three groupings mentioned above.

Place of birth was made up of two groups, native-born residents and nonnative-born residents. Native-born residents were considered individuals who were born in Beaufort County. Nonnative-born residents were all those born outside of the county. This variable was categorical. Level of tourism dependence was comprised of residence with low dependence on tourism (i.e., residents who claimed less than five percent of their household income was derived directly or indirectly from tourism), moderate dependence (i.e., residents who claimed between five and 25% of their household income was derived directly or indirectly from tourism), and high dependence (i.e., residents who claimed more than 25% of their household income was derived directly or indirectly from tourism). Data for this variable was collected as continuous, but was recoded into a new categorical variable to reflect the three groupings mentioned above.

Prior vacation experience in Beaufort County was made up of two groups, those residents who previously took at least one trip to the county prior to relocating and those residents who had never visited the county before. This variable was categorical. The variable, total trips taken in the last two years, was comprised of three groups: those who had taken less than five trips, those who took between five and 15 trips, and finally those who took more than 15 trips. Data for this variable was collected as continuous, but recoded into a new categorical variable to reflect the three groups. The seventh and final independent variable for this set of hypotheses was age. Four age ranges made up this variable: under 40, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 and above. Separate one-way multiple analyses
of variance (MANOVA) statistical procedures were used to test each of the seven sub-hypotheses above along with univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) and follow-up post hoc tests using the Fisher’s Least Significance Difference (LSD) statistic. LSD was used to control for Type I errors (i.e., rejecting the null hypothesis when it is actually true) across all pair-wise comparisons (Green & Salkind, 2005). Conducting multiple MANOVA models across categorical variables has occurred recently in the works of Andereck et al. (2005) and Andereck and Vogt (2000).

The final hypothesis concerned the effect that tourist type residents encountered most often in the county had on the three dimensions of emotional solidarity (i.e., sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors). The hypothesis was stated as,

\[ H_7: \text{Residents’ mean score of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors} \ (\text{DV}s) \text{ will not be significantly difference across numerous types of tourists that residents encounter most often within the county} \ (\text{IV}). \]

Again, composite scores for each of the emotional solidarity dimensions was calculated by summing item scores within each dimension and dividing by the number of items within each dimension. The independent variable, types of tourists encountered most often in the county, included four groups. Those four groups were family tourists, second homeowners/renters, seasonal tourists, and day-trippers. Family tourists included those individual who vacationed as a family in Beaufort County and those who came to the county to visit family and friends. Second homeowners/renters were comprised of
tourists who owned a second home, owned a timeshare, or rented a home or
condominium while in Beaufort County. Seasonal tourists included those individuals who
traveled to Beaufort County for Spring Break, summer vacationers, and off-season
extended visitors. Finally, day-trippers were made up of individuals visiting Beaufort
County for the day including group tourists, motorcoach travelers, business traveler, and
festival or special event attendees. These types of tourists were placed in the day-tripper
group based on focus group participants communicating that they mostly stay in Beaufort
County for short periods of time.

Data for this variable were collected as categorical. The variable was recoded to
create four overarching groups of tourists. As with H₆, a MANOVA was conducted along
with univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) and follow-up post hoc tests for pair-wise
comparisons using the Fisher’s Least Significance Difference (LSD) statistic.
CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS

This chapter is presented in three main sections (each mirroring one of the three phases of the study). The first section involves results of the qualitative data analysis for the three focus groups. The second section includes the results of the scale development for the four constructs. Finally the last section covers results from the analysis of the survey data. Numerous hypotheses (from Chapter Four) are presented within this final section and are considered separately as the results of statistical analyses conducted to test them are reported.

Phase One: Focus Group Results

During April and May 2007, three focus groups occurred in Hilton Head, Bluffton, and Beaufort involving residents of Beaufort County and their attitudes, feelings, and interactions with visitors to the area. The same moderator and assistant moderator attended each of the group sessions. The Hilton Head interview lasted two hours and included eight residents. The Bluffton interview lasted two hours and included 11 residents. The Beaufort interview lasted one hour and 45 minutes and included 10 residents. The rationale for only having three focus groups was data saturation (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006).

Each focus group was tape-recorded and semi-structured. Focus groups were semi-structured in the sense that a script with specific questions was used to guide the conversations, but as additional questions developed, they were also asked (Merriam, 2001). Six main content areas were included within the script (see Appendix D) including
questions regarding 1) residents understanding of tourism in Beaufort County (e.g., what
types of tourists exist throughout the county), 2) residents’ feelings toward visitors, 3)
shared behavior with visitors, 4) shared beliefs with visitors, 5) interactions with tourists,
and 6) residents’ characteristics (e.g., prior vacationing in the county, travel experiences,
and role in tourism industry).

Focus group interviews were transcribed as three separate documents by the
moderator, resulting in 77 total pages of textual data. Each of the three transcripts was
then uploaded into NVivo7 for coding purposes. Prior to analysis, five coding decisions
were made as suggested by Bush et al. (2007). The first was to code the textual data by
phrase. The second was to code only for six parent nodes (e.g., tourist type,
emotions/feelings for residents, shared behaviors between residents and tourists, shared
beliefs between residents and tourists, interaction between parties, and resident
characteristics). Third, data was to be coded for frequency. Fourth, data would be coded
exactly as they appear (i.e., verbatim from residents’ narratives). Fifth, irrelevant
information not pertaining to the six parent nodes was to be disregarded.

Once those coding decisions were made, the moderator and assistant moderator
coded the data for the six parent nodes using NVivo7 software. The software was
primarily used at this point for sorting each code under appropriate parent node. Each
parent node was coded for separately, however focus group (i.e., Hilton Head, Bluffton,
and Beaufort) data were combined according to parent node. Further, coding was done
separately by each researcher, so as not to alter the integrity of the emerging codes
(Morgan, 1988).
Overall, the moderator formulated 730 separate codes from the three focus groups across all six parent nodes. There were 144 codes for tourist type, 122 codes for emotions/feelings for tourists, 102 codes for shared behaviors between residents and tourists, 53 codes for shared beliefs between residents and tourists, 118 codes for interaction between parties, and 191 codes for resident characteristics.

Coding the same data using identical means, the assistant moderator found 758 unique codes from the three focus groups across all six parent nodes. Coding resulted in 123 codes for tourist type, 135 codes for emotions/feelings for residents, 104 codes for shared behaviors between residents and tourists, 54 codes for shared beliefs between residents and tourists, 108 codes for interaction between parties, and 234 codes for resident characteristics.

Once each researcher concluded coding, a coding comparison report was conducted utilizing NVivo7. This report yielded the common codes between the moderator and assistant moderator. A list of the common codes is found in Appendix L that is based on the coding comparison report. Overall, there were 606 common codes. One hundred and eighteen common codes were found for the first parent node, tourist type. Examples of common codes include: “Beaufort County gets a lot of tourists in the summer, but they are mainly going to Hilton Head because they are looking for the beach.” “For the people—95% of my guests are interested in the history of the Lowcountry and South Carolina.” “Folks that are staying on Harbor Island or on Fripp [Island], the rentals there tend to be more interested in playing golf.”
There were 96 common codes associated with the parent node, emotions/feelings for residents. Both researchers coded the positive and the negative feelings residents felt for visitors, however the former far exceeded the latter in terms of frequency. One resident had a positive impression of visitors stating,

When I walk or exercise in the historic area [of Beaufort], quite often I see primarily senior citizens taking the horse-drawn tour or even taking the walking tour and I personally enjoy seeing them because they are so laid back and relaxed.

Many emotion/feeling codes that highlighted negatives associated with visitors were followed by mention of empathy for the visitors, reflecting residents do understand what it is like to be a tourist. One resident said,

Sure I don’t like the traffic coming on and off the island—coming on the island in the morning and going off the island in the afternoon. But if you are reasonable about it, you just say well, I am not going to go at that particular time. I’m going to go some other time. It is not so bad.

Another resident said something similar, “Everybody was a tourist at one point in time, even if they came with their family or whatever.”

Seventy-four codes for shared behavior were common between the researchers. A number of codes comprised mention of beach activities as well as cultural events throughout the county. One resident said, “Every third Friday they block off Calhoun Street, have vendors, musicians, and performers and it allows people to interact with the local community.” Recreational activities (i.e., fishing and boating) were also commonly mentioned as behavior shared between resident and visitor. Finally, residents claimed
they shared everyday activities (e.g., grocery shopping, boutique shopping, and restaurant dining) with many visitors. One resident claimed,

> Go down to the Salty Dog, which is just a really tourist-focused area, a little outdoor café bar with some outdoor entertainment…I love to go into a place like that, because for that hour or two, it is just like, ‘yeah, I’m on vacation, gotta love it. This is livin.’

The moderator and assistant moderator had only 40 codes in common concerning shared beliefs between residents and visitors. This was the lowest amount of common codes for the researchers across the six parent nodes. Residents communicated that both they and the visitors have a deep appreciation for the area. For instance, one individual said, “I think they [the visitors] do appreciate the history and appreciate the time that people spend in talking to them and trying to share and give them some sort of appreciation of why you live here.” Another said,

> I think a shared belief is that it [Beaufort County] is a special place. That is why they have chosen to visit here or buy a home here or buy a timeshare. And that is why we have chosen to live here as well.

Far more common codes existed for the parent node involving resident and tourist interactions. The researchers had 97 codes in common for interaction. Numerous codes related to frequency and intimacy of interactions and where, when, and with whom interactions occurred. One long-time, native-born resident spoke of intimate relationships with some visitors, “There are relationships that are established, particularly if they are
people that are visiting every year and kind enough to come by the shop every year.”

Similarly a Savannah, Georgia native said,

But I always find it a lot of fun to stop people in the grocery store and say, ‘where are you here from?’ You know and ‘is there anything we can help you with?’ I just love doing that. It is just fun to me. You can watch it in their eyes, they say, ‘I’m not sure I have everything,’ or ‘where do I go from here?’

The most codes the researchers had in common involved the parent node, resident characteristics, where there were 181 codes. Codes were primarily demographic in nature within this parent node such as travel experience, how long individuals had lived in the county, birthplace, and occupation. A retired resident spoke of his length of residency,

I was away for 30 years in the Army and came back in 1989. My mother was a Native. She started an antique business in the early 1950s and when I retired in 1989 we sort of merged in with business.

Many of the residents expressed that they were not born in Beaufort County, but did visit prior to moving. One resident who was an outfitter claimed, “My dad and step-mom lived here. I came here to visit over the years and I moved here 11 years ago.” A retiree had a similar story,

So we came and looked and we thought, ‘oh, my gosh, looks pretty good.’ So we bought a lot and then kept coming back year after year until we were ready to retire, then built a house.

A frequencies table with total codes for each moderator and assistant moderator as well as common codes across all six parent nodes is found below (Table 5).
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Table 5. *Code Count for Researchers across all Six Parent Nodes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Node</th>
<th>Number of Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Type</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions/Feelings for Tourists</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Behavior between Residents and Tourists</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Beliefs between Residents and Tourists</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between Residents and Tourists</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Characteristics</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>730</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After examining the initial code lists for each researcher and the coding comparison report, an inter-rater reliability (IRR) test was conducted as mentioned in Busch et al. (2007). The particular inter-rater reliability test that was utilized was the percent-agreement test as put forth by Holsti (1969) using the following equation:

\[ 2(A) / (n_1 + n_2), \]
where \( A \) represents the number of common codes between coders, \( n_1 \) represents the number of codes of the first coder, and \( n_2 \) represents the number of codes of the second coder. IRR percent-agreement scores for each of the parent nodes as well as overall IRR appear below (Table 6). IRR scores ranged from 72.8% (shared behavior) to 92.9% (interaction between residents and tourists) across the six parent nodes. Ultimately the overall IRR between the researchers’ codes was 84.4%.

Table 6. *Inter-rater Reliability between Coders for each Parent Node*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Node</th>
<th>Common Code Frequency</th>
<th>Inter-rater Reliability Percent Agreement Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Type</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions/Feelings for Tourists</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Behavior between Residents and Tourists</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Beliefs between Residents and Tourists</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between Residents and Tourists</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Characteristics</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though internal validity is not measurable in qualitative research, three primary measures as illustrated by Merriam (2001) were taken to enhance internal validity. First, data triangulation was utilized in the way of using multiple investigators to collect, enter, and code the data. Second, long-term observations (e.g., multiple focus groups and informal field observations) within the study site were conducted concerning residents' feelings toward tourists as well as the behavior, beliefs, and interactions the parties shared. Finally, codes that researchers compiled were subjected to peer examination, which allowed an unbiased perspective to comment on findings as they emerged. According to Babbie (2005) and Merriam (2001) internal validity is high for qualitative research given that data are the actual words spoken by participants. Further, findings in the way of codes and themes actually capture ideas that are in the data.

The final step in qualitative data analysis that was followed per Busch et al. (2007) was generating themes that captured the common codes between researchers. This was done collectively by reading through the 606 common codes and assigning a theme to each. If a consensus was not reached between the coders, or if both coders were unsure at the time of where to assign a particular code, those codes were revisited at the close of the theming session. Some codes were assigned multiple themes if content fit both criteria. Just as with coding, themes were assigned within each parent node. A comprehensive list of derived themes for each parent node along with corresponding codes can be found in Appendix M.

For the first parent node, tourist type, 19 themes emerged. The top themes with corresponding number of codes were: historic sites/cultural heritage (18), special
events/festivals (17), outdoor recreation (16), sports activities (15), and beach activities (6). Historic sites/cultural heritage encompassed codes involving walking tours, carriage tours, and house tours “to see the historic town of Beaufort.” As Beaufort County is known for, special events/festivals included codes highlighting the various festivals in the area (i.e., Water Festival, Shrimp Festival, Gullah Festival, Film and Chef Festival). The theme, outdoor recreation, included mention of fishing, kayaking, and boating. Sports activities included codes focusing on golf, tennis, and miniature golf. Finally beach activities involved the general mention of being at the beach.

For the second parent node, emotions/feelings for tourists, 10 themes were generated. The top themes were: empathetic (23), enjoyment (22), grateful (14), economically appreciative (13), and crowded (11). The idea of empathy was mentioned by many of the residents to indicate that they understood what it was like to be a tourist primarily because they find themselves looking at the scenery as well and many were tourists once themselves. Residents also enjoyed having visitors around the area. One inn owner in Beaufort commented, “The more people that are around, the more vibrant it feels…it sort of gives a critical mass to the city.” Still other residents spoke of the positive economic impacts that are linked with tourists and tourism. One retired resident on Hilton Head Island said, “Look at all the kinds of activities that are available. They are not here to support the permanent residents. They are really here to support tourism and we benefit from it.” A small business owner in Bluffton shared a similar story about how residents appreciate tourists: “I’ve been working with tourists since I was in college and they help put me through college. So, yes we do appreciate them, their presence.” Despite
these comments, some residents felt at times there are too many tourists around. One prominent woman in Beaufort commenting on an historically affluent and exclusive neighborhood said that, “I don’t think people like all that traffic in their neighborhood. If it were up to a majority of the Pointe residents, they would close it [the area] to tourists.

Eleven themes emerged from the 74 common codes within the shared behavior parent node. The top themes were: attending special events/festivals (13), cultural-historic activities (12), beach activities (12), dining out (7), church (7), and grocery/shopping (7). It is interesting to point out that the top themes (e.g., attending special events/festivals, cultural-historic activities, and beach activities) included more recreational pursuits for residents and tourists. However, the secondary themes highlighted sharing behavior in everyday activities (i.e., dining out, church, and grocery/shopping).

Only eight themes were identified from the 40 common codes concerning the shared beliefs parent node. Top themes included: appreciation for history (10), natural beauty of area (10), shared value system (7), beautiful place (6), and respect for nature (5). Residents were quick to point out that they as well as tourists both felt a sense of admiration for the history of the area and for the Deep South. One lifelong retired resident on Hilton Head Island (who now runs a kayaking tour company) said,

I find the common belief in history and preservation of the island. Many of our visitors who take our tour and talking about the past and conservation district that this island once was—you both yearn for half-way back, wishing we could just be
somewhere in-between where we are now and where we were then. There are things we should have saved and we didn’t.

This narrative speaks to the shared value system with tourists some residents mentioned. One Bluffton resident said, “we have a lot in common with them [tourists] whether we forget it or not. We are here for the same reasons they are.” Some would say that reason is for the natural beauty of the area: “I get a particular feeling when I walk up from the [May] river right at dusk-dark and see the moss moving in the breeze and the palmetto fronds cracking against one another. That is very special.”

Based on the 97 common codes for the parent node, interaction between residents and tourists, four main themes emerged. Interaction themes were: where and when interaction occurred (67), level of intimacy associated with interaction (30), frequency of interaction (22), and with whom the interactions occurred (8). Residents interacted with tourists at numerous locations and while engaging in similar behaviors. For example, such places included: on the street, at church, work, special events/festivals, restaurants, grocery stores, golf courses, and even at their home. The most common places were at work and the store. Three different types of intimacy with tourists were communicated by residents. Those were personal, friendship, and superficial. It was far more common for focus group participants to claim their interaction was superficial, involving small talk. One resident said while he waits outside a restaurant to get a table, he will exchange polities with others: “I engage in small talk like, ‘hi where you from?’ or ‘do you live here?’” Residents that mentioned frequency of interaction said they had contact with tourists on a daily basis, occasionally, infrequently, frequently, regularly, and never. Most
residents said their contact occurred infrequently, which is in keeping with the predominating superficial encounters. Types of tourists with which residents interact included second homeowners, tour group participants, family vacationers, and individuals attending military graduations on weekends.

The final parent node concerning resident characteristics had six overarching themes result from the 181 common codes. Those themes were occupation (55), preferred types of vacationing (47), frequency of travel (32), length of residency (27), where they were from (24), and visiting prior to moving (21). The largest percentage of focus group participants were either employed in real estate or education or were retired and a volunteer. The second most-common profession involved the hospitality and tourism industry. Residents claimed visiting family/friends, general vacationing, day trips, weekend trips, and visiting parts of Beaufort County were the preferred forms of vacationing. Most traveled throughout the year to see friends and family. As one local newspaper editor shared, “All my family is still on the West Coast so we gout there for maybe 10 days every year usually over Thanksgiving.” Another said, “I have elderly parents in Connecticut so very often that is the place I end up going.” The frequency with which most residents travel could be thought of as regular (i.e., same time each year). Only a few focus group participants mentioned either traveling frequently (i.e., weekly or monthly trips) or seldom (i.e., not traveling due to being retired or because of work constraints).

Length of residency was another theme that developed within the resident characteristics parent node. As can be imagined given the diversity of residents within
each focus group, individuals had lived anywhere from one year in Beaufort County to all their lives (e.g., 70 years). Primarily, most residents seem to have lived in the County between 10 and 30 years. Just as many of the participants were born in the Northeast region of the US as were from the South. Further, of those from the South, only half were born and raised in Beaufort County. Of those that had relocated from an area outside of Beaufort County, almost everyone had visited the area prior to moving. One woman, originally from the Midwest whose husband was from the area commented, “I am here because of tourism or touring while visiting with my husband’s family in Ridgeland. Vacationing, like I said is what got us here, because we used to come down here at least once a year.”

Top themes (i.e., those with largest frequencies) and even codes were then used to create items for the interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity scales. In the event that themes were too broadly defined, codes were utilized to construct items for each scale. Initially 21 items were formulated for the interaction scale, 18 items the shared beliefs scale, 23 items for the shared behavior scale, and 27 items for the emotional solidarity scale. Each of these 89 items can be found in Appendix N.

Phase Two: Scale Development Results

Once items were developed from the qualitative data analysis, each scale was sent to eight researchers within the field to review for bad items (i.e., redundancy, poor wording, double-barreled questions, etc.). The document that each of the eight researchers received is in Appendix O. Following suggestions from the expert panel, 40 items were reworded, six items removed, and five items were added. This resulted in 88
items overall: twenty-two items within the interaction scale, 18 items within the shared beliefs scale, 26 items within the shared behavior scale, and 22 items within the emotional solidarity scale.

First Pilot Test

After modifications were made to the four scales, each scale was piloted-tested through the use of an on-site self-administered instrument to a sample population of 51 residents of Emerald Isle, North Carolina. As indicated in Churchill (1977) after the first round of pilot testing was concluded, scales should be downsized by removing items that do not explain significant variance in the construct. In order to do this, items within each scale were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. Such analysis also aids in determining the number of dimensions underlying the construct (Churchill, 1977). According to Pallant (2005), this involves balancing two conflicting needs: the need to find a simple solution with as few factors as possible and the need to explain as much of the variance in the original data set as possible.

Prior to subjecting each scale to exploratory factor analysis, both the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity were requested. The KMO coefficient for the interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity scales, respectively were 0.790, 0.811, 0.838, and 0.822. Each scale yielded a significant Bartlett test (p < 0.05). According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) a good factor analysis will have a KMO coefficient greater than 0.60 and a significant Bartlett test of sphericity.
Exploratory factor analysis was then conducted for each of the four scales using principal axis factoring extraction with a varimax orthogonal rotation procedure. Dimensions for each construct were determined based on two criteria: eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and a scree plot examination of eigenvalues (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999; Mertler & Vannatta, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Items that double-loaded onto multiple factors (with coefficients greater than 0.40) or items that did not load onto factors very strongly (i.e., coefficients less than 0.40) were removed from each dimension. Forty items meeting these two criteria were removed after the first pilot test exploratory factor analysis. Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) claim only items with loadings of 0.40 or greater should be interpreted. This resulted in 48 items being left across the four scales.

The construct interaction was unidimensional with five items (i.e., during holidays, during peak vacation season, on weekend, during week, and during off-peak vacation season). The shared beliefs construct was made up of two dimensions: “preservation of the area” and “amenities of the area.” “Preservation of the area” was comprised of six items (i.e., respect for nature, preserving local way of life, appreciation for the Lowcountry, too much new home building, unique place, and great place to vacation). “Amenities of the area” was comprised of three items (i.e., variety of dining opportunities, variety of entertainment opportunities, and great place to explore local art).

Shared behavior was comprised of four dimensions: “cultural heritage activities” made up of 10 items (i.e., attending concerts, taking local tours, visiting art exhibits, sightseeing, visiting natural areas, attending theatrical performances, visiting historic
sites, bird watching, visiting lighthouses, and visiting museums), “beach activities” with three items (i.e., relaxing on the beach, taking walk on beach, and swimming in ocean), “outdoor recreation activities” with six items (i.e., offshore fishing, inshore boating, offshore boating, inshore fishing, canoeing/kayaking, and taking bike rides), and “local patronage activities” with three items (i.e., grocery shopping, shopping at local merchant stores, and dining at local restaurants).

Emotional solidarity was comprised of three dimensions: “emotional closeness” with three items (i.e., feel close to some, made friends with some visitors, and feel affection toward some visitors), “sympathetic understanding” with five items (i.e., have a lot in common, can trust visitors, identify with visitors, share ideas with visitors, and understand visitors), and “welcoming of visitors” with four items (i.e., appreciate contribution to economy, proud to have visitors in area, feel community benefits from visitors, and treat visitors fair).

To determine reliability of each scale, Cronbach’s Alpha scores were assessed. Reliabilities for the 10 dimensions within the four constructs ranged from 0.744 to 0.945. According to Nunnally (1978), reliabilities over 0.70 are adequate when assessing new scales (primarily through the use of exploratory factor analysis). This is echoed in the recent work by Lance, Butts, and Michaels (2006), as the authors claim that the 0.70 cutoff for reliabilities is adequate “if one wants to save time and effort in a new area of research” (p. 206). Variance explained in each construct ranged from 47.97% to 68.28%. Constructs, factors, instrument items, loadings, reliabilities, and variance explained in each construct and factor follow (Table 7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factor Groupings</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Percent Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During peak vacation season</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the weekend</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During week</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During off-peak vacation season</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A respect for nature within Beaufort County</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that preserving the local way of life in Beaufort County is important</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appreciation for the Lowcountry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that there is too much new home building in Beaufort County</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that Beaufort County is a unique place</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thought that Beaufort County is a great place to vacation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities of Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that there is a wide variety of dining choices throughout the county</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that there is a wide variety of entertainment choices throughout the county</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that Beaufort County is a great place to explore local art</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Shared Behavior

**Cultural Heritage Activities**  
- Attending concerts: 0.879  
- Taking local tours: 0.829  
- Visiting art exhibits: 0.797  
- Sightseeing: 0.774  
- Visiting natural areas: 0.745  
- Attending theatrical performances: 0.732  
- Visiting historic sites: 0.712  
- Bird watching: 0.686  
- Visiting lighthouses: 0.647  
- Visiting museums: 0.620  

**Outdoor Recreation Activities**  
- Offshore fishing: 0.847  
- Inshore boating: 0.816  
- Offshore boating: 0.794  
- Inshore fishing: 0.744  
- Canoeing/kayaking: 0.569  
- Taking bike rides: 0.484  

**Beach Activities**  
- Relaxing on the beach: 0.811  
- Taking a walk on the beach: 0.785  
- Swimming in the ocean: 0.732  

**Local Patronage Activities**  
- Shopping at grocery stores: 0.622  
- Shopping at local merchants’ stores: 0.621  
- Dining at local restaurants: 0.557  

### Emotional Solidarity

**Sympathetic Understanding**  
- I have a lot in common with Beaufort County visitors: 0.842  
- I can trust visitors to Beaufort County: 0.692  
- I identify with visitors in Beaufort County: 0.643  
- I share ideas with visitors in Beaufort County: 0.597  
- I understand visitors in Beaufort County: 0.551
Welcoming Visitors
I appreciate visitors for the contribution they make to the local economy 0.828
I am proud to have visitors come to Beaufort County 0.812
I feel the community benefits from having visitors in Beaufort County 0.765
I treat visitors fair in Beaufort County 0.481

Emotional Closeness
I feel close to some visitors
   I have met in Beaufort County 0.915
I have made friends with some Visitors in Beaufort County 0.861
I feel affection towards visitors in Beaufort County 0.498

Second Pilot Test

In order to further purify each scale and determine whether similar dimensions would result from additional exploratory factor analysis and reduce items within each scale, a second pilot-test was conducted. The second pilot-test was conducted on a sample of 53 residents from Beaufort County. KMO coefficients for interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity were 0.875, 0.739, 0.752, and 0.807, respectively. Each scale yielded a significant Bartlett test (p < 0.05). Such results indicate a good potential for subjecting data to factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001).

As with the initial pilot study, data were subjected to exploratory factor analysis for each of the four scales using principal axis factoring extraction with a varimax orthogonal rotation procedure. Dimensions for each construct were determined based on
two criteria: eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and a scree plot examination of eigenvalues (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Items that double-loaded onto multiple factors (with coefficients greater than 0.40) or items that did not load onto factors very strongly (i.e., coefficients less than 0.40) were removed from each dimension. Eleven items meeting these two criteria were removed after the second pilot test exploratory factor analysis. Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) claim only items with loadings of 0.40 or greater should be interpreted. At this point, only 37 items remained across the four scales.

The construct interaction was once again unidimensional with the same five items (i.e., during holidays, during peak vacation season, on weekend, during week, and during off-peak vacation season). The construct of shared beliefs was made up of the initial two dimensions from the two rounds of exploratory factor analysis: “preservation of the area” and “amenities of the area.” “Preservation of the area” was comprised of five items (i.e., respect for nature, preserving local way of life, appreciation for the Lowcountry, unique place, and great place to vacation). “Amenities of the area” was comprised of two items (i.e., variety of dining opportunities and variety of entertainment opportunities). One item from each of the dimensions was removed.

Shared behavior was comprised of the same four dimensions as the exploratory factor analyses: “cultural heritage activities” made up of four items (i.e., taking local tours, sightseeing, visiting natural areas, and visiting historic sites), “beach activities” with three items (i.e., relaxing on the beach, taking walk on beach, and swimming in ocean), “outdoor recreation activities” with three items (i.e., inshore boating, offshore
boating, and inshore fishing), and “local patronage activities” with three items (i.e.,
grocery shopping, shopping at local merchant stores, and dining at local restaurants). Six
items were removed from the “cultural heritage activities” dimension and three items
were removed from the “outdoor recreation activities” dimension.

Emotional solidarity was comprised of the same three dimensions from the initial
exploratory factor analyses: “emotional closeness” with three items (i.e., feel close to
some, made friends with some visitors, and feel affection toward some visitors),
“sympathetic understanding” with five items (i.e., have a lot in common, can trust
visitors, identify with visitors, share ideas with visitors, and understand visitors), and
“welcoming of visitors” with four items (i.e., appreciate contribution to economy, proud
to have visitors in area, feel community benefits from visitors, and treat visitors fair). No
items were removed from the three emotional solidarity dimensions.

Cronbach alpha reliabilities were assessed as well as split-half reliabilities as
suggested by Churchill (1977) for the second pilot test data. Cronbach alpha reliabilities
for the 10 dimensions ranged from 0.738 to 0.914. Again, each factor within the four
constructs had a Cronbach reliability score of 0.70 or greater, which is considered an
adequate cut-off point when developing a scale (Lance et al., 2006; Nunnally, 1978).
Spearman-Brown coefficients were assessed for split-half reliabilities. Split-half
reliabilities for the 10 dimensions ranged from 0.796 to 0.955. According to Litwin
(2002), Spearman-Brown reliability coefficients of at least 0.80 are adequate, 0.90 or
higher reflect good reliability, but it is not uncommon to see the coefficient as low as 0.60
for exploratory work. Variance explained in each construct ranged from 59.79% to
70.63%. Constructs, factors, instrument items, loadings, reliabilities, and variance explained in each construct and factor from the second pilot test follow (Table 8).

**Table 8. Second Pilot Test Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Four Constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factor Groupings</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Split-half Rel.</th>
<th>Percent Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During off-peak vacation season</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During peak vacation season</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During week</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During holidays</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On weekend</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation of Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appreciation for the Lowcountry</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A respect for nature within Beaufort County</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that preserving the local way of life in Beaufort County is important</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that Beaufort County is a unique place</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The thought that Beaufort County is a great place to vacation</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities of Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that there is a wide variety of dining choices throughout the county</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that there is a wide variety of entertainment choices throughout the county</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Beach Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing on the beach</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a walk on the beach</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in the ocean</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cultural Heritage Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting historic sites</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking local tours</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting natural areas</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outdoor Recreation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inshore boating</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore boating</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inshore fishing</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Patronage Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping at local merchants’ stores</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping at grocery stores</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining at local restaurants</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emotional Solidarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic Understanding</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>27.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Closeness</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>21.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming Visitors</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>18.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to examining reliabilities of the second pilot test data, construct validities (i.e., convergent and criterion validities) were assessed. The Pearson’s r statistic was examined for convergent validities and both Pearson’s r (for both continuous variables) and the F-value (for one continuous and one categorical variable) were examined for criterion validities. Convergent validity, according to Churchill (1977), tells us the “extent to which a measure correlates highly with other measures designed to measure the same construct” (p. 70). The interaction dimension was correlated with a modified scale of group interaction put forth by Marks and Fraley (2007). The two dimensions of shared beliefs were correlated with Kahle’s (1983) list of values. The four dimensions of shared behavior were correlated with a modified scale of shared activities as put forth by Kennedy (1992). Finally, the three dimensions of emotional solidarity were correlated with the affective solidarity scale developed by Gronvold (1988). Convergent validities for each of the 10 dimensions were significant (p < 0.05) and are listed in Table 9.

Criterion validity tells us whether a measure behaves as expected in relation to other constructs (Churchill, 1977). In other words, does the scale correctly predict some
criterion measure? Sheldon and Var (1984) found in a study of Welsh residents that the more residents interacted with visitors the more they appreciated their contributions to the local economy. This correlation was also found from the second pilot test data. In the context of a major motorsports special event, Fredline and Faulkner (2002) found a significant difference in shared beliefs across residents’ education level. One would expect that same logic to follow in this study; however there were no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in means of either shared belief dimension across education level. In a study examining the rural cultural economy of a tourist destination, Kneafsey (2001) found that the longer residents live in a particular area, the less likely they are to share tourist behaviors with visitors in the area. In the current study, no significant relationships ($p < 0.05$) between shared behavior and length of residency were found across the four dimensions of shared behavior. In the context of residents interacting with tourists in Ghana, Teye et al. (2002) found significant differences in residents feeling close to tourists across educational level. In the current study, only one of the three emotional solidarity dimensions revealed a significant difference (i.e., sympathetic understanding) across education level. All convergent and criterion validities from the second pilot test are found in Table 9.
### Table 9. Construct Validities for Second Pilot Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factor Groupings</th>
<th>Convergent Validities</th>
<th>Criterion Validities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson’s r   p</td>
<td>Pearson’s r or F   p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction(^a)</td>
<td>0.628   0.00</td>
<td>0.337      0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td>Preservation of area(^b)</td>
<td>0.340   0.01</td>
<td>1.767      0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td>Amenities of area(^b)</td>
<td>0.265   0.05</td>
<td>1.164      0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td>Beach activities(^c)</td>
<td>0.770   0.00</td>
<td>-0.134     0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td>Cultural heritage activities(^c)</td>
<td>0.474   0.00</td>
<td>-0.067     0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td>Outdoor recreation activities(^c)</td>
<td>0.399   0.00</td>
<td>-0.060     0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td>Local patronage activities(^c)</td>
<td>0.762   0.00</td>
<td>-0.062     0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Solidarity</td>
<td>Sympathetic understanding(^d)</td>
<td>0.616   0.00</td>
<td>2.330      0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Solidarity</td>
<td>Emotional closeness(^d)</td>
<td>0.625   0.00</td>
<td>1.130      0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Solidarity</td>
<td>Welcoming visitors(^d)</td>
<td>0.465   0.00</td>
<td>0.835      0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Criterion validity tested with appreciating the contribution tourists make to economy
\(^b\) Criterion validity tested with education
\(^c\) Criterion validity tested with length of residency
\(^d\) Criterion validity tested with education

It can be said that the dimensions of each construct are relatively high in convergent validities but low in criterion validities. According to Churchill (1977), criterion validity is one of the most difficult validity tests to obtain high correlations. Snepenger, O’Connell, and Snepenger (2001) experienced this same issue with few scale
dimensions being significant in their study concerning the development and application of the embrace-withdraw continuum scale (in the context of attitudes about tourism development) among residents in Montana.

Despite low criterion validities for most dimensions, the second pilot test was high in face validity based on only two questions not being completed and one note of clarity being written on a completed survey. Even though criterion validities were low, items were generated from the qualitative focus group data which was extremely high in internal validity as Babbie (2005) and Creswell (2004) claim. The reason qualitative data is so high in internal validity is that findings (i.e., codes and themes) are congruent with reality (Merriam, 2001). In other words, participants actually spoke the words and communicated dialogue as they understand their own reality. Upon completion of the two rounds of pilot-testing, each of the four scales were refined and resulted in the final scales of the survey instrument (Appendix P).

One week prior to survey data collection, the instrument was beta-tested within one block group (that was 60% rural and 40% urban). The block group was not one of the 21 block groups that were selected for data collection. Based on the beta-test, only minor changes were made to the data collection procedures, namely tally sheet reconfiguration (Appendix H), more detailed instructions provided to data collectors (i.e., two individuals would go in groups to collect data, role of each in pairs, how much time spent at each home in recruitment process, returning to homes in order that surveys were dropped off, etc.), and better markings on each map for data collection groups. No major data
collection issues arose from beta-testing, which meant the final instrument could be
distributed as planned.

Phase Three: Survey Results

Description of the Sample

The sample consisted of 445 Beaufort County permanent residents. As Table 10
indicates, males made up 48.1% of the sample and females comprised 51.9% of the
sample. The average age of respondents was just below 50 years. Age was recoded into a
categorical variable based on quartile values. The largest number of respondents was
between the ages 40 and 49 (26.3%). This was closely followed by individuals aged 60
and over (25.4%), individuals between 50 and 59 (22.4%), and individuals between 30
and 39 (17.4%). The youngest individuals, between 18 and 29, made up the smallest
group of participants (8.5%).

Most residents either had four years of college degree (30.3%) or some college
(29.9%) education. A modest amount of individuals had either a high school diploma or
GED (17.0%), technical, vocational, or trade school experience (5.2%), or grade school
or some high school (1.1%). Similarly, a small percentage of the sample had advanced
degrees—12.2% had a Masters degree and 4.3% had a Ph.D. or professional degree.

Household income categories with the most residents were: $75,000-99,999
(18.5%), $60,000-74,999 (14.0%), $100,000-124,999 (11.2%), $50,000-59,999 (10.5%),
and $40,000-49,999 (9.1%). These income categories made up 63.3% of the sample.
Household incomes less than $10,000 and $200,000 or more only accounted for 3.5% and
4.9% of the sample, respectively.
A majority (81.1%) of the permanent residents were white. Only 12.3% of the sample was comprised of African Americans residents. The remaining 6.6% were made up of individuals within a different minority group or a combination of two or more races.

Table 10. *Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>M, SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.7, 14.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade school or some high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, vocational, or trade school</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or professional</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were conducted on race and income variables to determine if the sample was significantly different from the population based on census bureau data. According to the US Census Bureau (2008), 20.3% of households are headed by African Americans in Beaufort County. That compares to the 12.3% that was ascertained in the sample. The null hypothesis for the goodness-of-fit test was that there was no significant difference between the sample and the population in regards to percentage of African American heads of household. Following the goodness-of-fit equation in Sheskin (2007), the observed chi-square value was 3.153. Comparing this value to the chi-square critical value with 1 degree of freedom at the 0.05 alpha level (i.e., 3.841) in Tabachnick & Fidell (2006), it was concluded that the test was not significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted and it was claimed that no significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$14,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-$19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$24,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$29,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$59,999</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$74,999</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-$99,999</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$124,999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000-$149,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other minority group</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difference existed between percentage of African American heads of households from the sample and the population. This indicates a good fit.

The same test was conducted across the sample and the population in regards to household incomes under $100,000 in Beaufort County. In the sample, 73.4% of the residents had an income less than $100,000. Within the county, 79.5% of the residents had an income less than $100,000. The null hypothesis was that there was no significant difference between the sample and the population in regards to percentage of households earning less than $100,000 per year. Using the goodness-of-fit equation put forth by Sheskin (2007), the observed chi-square value was 0.468. Comparing this value to the chi-square critical value with 1 degree of freedom at the 0.05 alpha level (i.e., 3.841) in Tabachnick & Fidell (2006), it was concluded that the test was not significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was accepted and it was claimed that no significant difference existed the sample and the population in regards to percentage of households earning less than $100,000 per year. This indicates a good fit between the sample and the population based on this variable.

Situational (socio-demographic) characteristics of the participants are reported in Table 11. The vast majority (83.8%) of residents within the sample were not born within Beaufort County. The number of residents who reported that they were natives of the county was 72 or 16.2% of the sample.

The average length of residency among residents was approximately 21 years. Length of residency was recoded into a categorical variable. Seasoned residents (i.e., residents who have lived in Beaufort County between 10 and 30 years) made up 41.8% of
the sample. New residents (i.e., residents who have lived in Beaufort County less than 10 years) comprised 35.4% of the sample. Long-time residents (i.e., those who have lived in Beaufort County more than 30 years) made up 22.8% of the sample.

The average household in Beaufort County derived 18.1% of their income from tourism and visitor spending. This variable was recoded into a categorical variable. Individuals with a low dependence on tourism (i.e., less than 5.0% of household income attributed to visitor spending) made up 48.1% of the sample. Those with a moderate dependence on tourism (i.e., between five and 25% of income coming from visitor spending) comprised 24.5% of the sample. Residents with a high dependence on tourism (i.e., more than 25% of household income attributed to visitor spending) made up 27.4% of the sample.

A majority (81.1%) of the sample was not retired as residents were employed full-time, employed part-time, students, homemakers, or unemployed. The number of participants that reported they were retired was 83 or 18.9% of the sample.
Table 11. *Situational Characteristics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>M, SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native of Beaufort County</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native of Beaufort County</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.7, 14.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30 years</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 years</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism dependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.1, 26.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5% of income</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between five and 25% of income</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25% of income</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not retired</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Travel experience characteristics of residents within the sample are detailed in Table 12. Of those residents who were not born in Beaufort County, 201 or 53.6% of the sample had vacationed in Beaufort County prior to moving. The remaining 46.4% had vacationed at least one time in Beaufort County before moving there. Of those who had vacationed in Beaufort County previously, the average resident visited just over 10 times.

In the past two years, the average amount of vacations residents had taken outside of Beaufort County was 15. This variable was recoded into three categories of travelers: less than five trips, between five and 15 trips, and more than 15 trips. Those residents who had taken more than 15 trips over the past two years made up the largest portion of the sample (35.9%). The number of participants that reported they took between five and
15 trips during the last two years was 151 or 34.6% of the sample. Residents who took less than five trips comprised the smallest percentage of the sample (29.5%).

The number of residents that claimed they had not traveled outside of the US in the past two years was 287 or 64.6% of the sample. The remaining 35.4% of residents within the sample had taken a vacation outside the US over the last two years.

Table 12. *Travel Experience Characteristics of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>M, SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior vacationing experience in Beaufort County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times vacationed in Beaufort County prior to moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.6, 14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vacations taken outside Beaufort County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7, 13.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in last two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than five trips</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between five and 15 trips</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 trips</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveled outside of US in past two years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked what type of tourist they encountered most often within the county to provide a reference group in order to respond to scale items regarding interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity. The top four types were: summer vacationers (19.8%), family vacationers (19.3%), family and friends travelers (14.9%), and second homeowners (14.3%). Those tourists that residents interacted with least included business travelers (1.4%), spring break travelers (0.2%),
and motorcoach travelers (0.2%). Descriptive data for tourist type encountered most often is reported in Table 13.

Table 13. *Tourist Type Residents Encountered Most Often in Beaufort County*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of tourist resident encounters most often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer vacationer</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family vacationer</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and friends traveler</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second homeowner</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day visitor</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival/special event attendee</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home/condo renter</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tourist</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeshare visitor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-season extended visitor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business traveler</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring break traveler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcoach traveler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For data analysis procedures, this variable was recoded into four variables: family tourists (including family vacationers and family and friends travelers); second homeowner/renter (including second homeowner, timeshare visitor, and home/condo renter); seasonal tourist (including spring break traveler, summer vacationer, and off-season extended visitor); and day-tripper (including day visitors, group tourists, motorcoach traveler, business traveler, and festival/special event attendee). Recoded categories of most encountered resident type are found in Table 14.
Table 14. Recoded Tourist Type Residents Encountered Most Often in Beaufort County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of tourist resident encounters most often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family tourist</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second homeowner/renter</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal tourist</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-tripper</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate Data Screening

Prior to beginning any further data analysis involving hypotheses, H₁-H₇, univariate data screening occurred to clean the data and remove cases that were outliers, causing data to be skewed and non-normally distributed. Variables that were to be used in subsequent hypothesis testing were screened initially by requesting corresponding z-scores. Those variables included the 37 items across the four scales and four demographic variables (i.e., length of residency, age, tourism dependence, and travel experience). Following Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) the value of 3.29 was used as a cutoff to determine whether some cases were problematic (i.e., with z-scores greater than 3.29). Cases with scores over the cutoff were then checked to see whether or not they fell within the data distribution by examining a graph. If not, the original value for that case was considered an outlier. At that point outlying cases were assigned a raw score on the offending variable that was one unit smaller than the next most extreme score in the distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Two waves of univariate screening were conducted. The first wave resulted in 12 recoded scores. The second wave resulted in five recoded scores. No cases were removed at this point.
Multivariate Data Screening

Linear regression analysis was used to test Mahalanobis’ Distance among all 41 variables to be used in hypothesis testing. Statistics were calculated for Mahalanobis’ Distance in the form of chi-square values. Also, those cases that had at least one missing value did not produce a chi-square value. Fifty cases had at least one missing value.

Given that 41 variables were used in linear regression, the degrees of freedom was 41 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). At this point, calculated chi-square values were compared against the critical chi-square value (i.e., 74.745) with 41 degrees of freedom at an alpha level of $p < .001$ (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Four cases (i.e., 422, 242, 211, and 219) were deleted that had extreme chi-square values (e.g., 112.964, 114.116, 115.356, and 130.693).

Remaining cases were then examined across each construct to determine the extent of missing values for construct indicators. If at least 50% of the indicators for a particular construct were missing, the entire case was deleted as suggested in Kline (2005). Six cases (i.e., 92, 254, 262, 330, 370, and 407) were deleted with at least 50% of indicators missing values for constructs. After all stages of univariate and multivariate data screening, the dataset was reduced to 445 cases.

At this point, the dataset was moved into EQS 6.1 for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural regression model (SRM) testing. However, before beginning CFA or SRM analysis, missing values from the dataset had to be addressed. Expectation-maximization (EM) procedures were conducted to impute missing values for 50 cases from Mahalanobis’ Distance screening. This EM procedure involves imputing missing
values by predicting scores in a series of regressions where each missing variable is regressed on remaining variables for a particular case (Kline, 2005). Next, the entire imputed data set was submitted for maximum likelihood estimation until a stable solution was reached. EM is one of the most common and reliable imputation techniques to replace missing values in structural equation modeling (Byrne, 2006). At this point the dataset was ready for CFA.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

The first procedure utilized in conducting CFA was to construct multiple models by adding one factor at a time. This procedure is synonymous with forward stepwise regression in multivariate statistical analyses. The point to doing this is to determine the best-fitting model with all significant parameters (path coefficients and error covariances) even those that were not anticipated from the two initial exploratory factor analyses (EFA) during the scale development stage. Across the four constructs within this study (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, and emotional solidarity), there were nine factors that were subjected to this initial phase of confirmatory factor analysis (excluding the unidimensional measure of interaction).

Within EQS 6.1, each factor was added as a new model by fixing the factor values to 1.0 and co-varying each factor. This procedure is called “unit variance constraints” (Kline, 2005). Each time a model was run, Lagrange Multiplier (LM) tests were selected to indicate parameters not specified in the model that were significant. Univariate increment scores within the LM test were examined to determine which parameters were significant at the 0.05 alpha level. Those significant parameters, whether they were cross-
loadings or error covariances, were added to subsequent models (with newly added factors).

Each of the nine factors was added in subsequent models, and significant parameters were added until no univariate LM were significant. This resulted in 13 models, with the final model being the ideal, best-fitting CFA model (see Figure 10). All in all, 86 parameters that were not specified from the initial EFAs were significant (i.e., 30 cross-loadings and 56 error covariances). The most ideal, best-fitting model for the nine factors within the dataset had a chi-square value of 227.8686, with 342 degrees of freedom and a \( p \)-value of 1.00 (which is appropriate given the hypothesis is that the model implied covariance matrix is equal to the model observed covariance matrix), a Comparative Fit Index (CFI) of 1.00 (which indicates perfect incremental model fit according to Kline, 2005), and a root mean square of approximation (RMSEA) of 0.00 (which indicates perfect absolute model fit, according to Kline, 2005).
At this point, even though an ideal, best-fitting CFA model was specified, it tells us such a model is of little use given so many cross-loadings and error covariances. Another stepwise CFA procedure synonymous with backward stepwise regression was then used called the Wald Test (Byrne, 2006). The purpose of using this stepwise procedure is to start with the most ideal, best-fitting model and work backwards using the Wald Test to determine which of the 86 bad parameters can be eliminated from the model due to their non-significant effects (while not deviating from the ideal model fit index.
scores drastically) to create a parsimonious final CFA (Kline, 2005) before the two structural regression models can be run.

Fixing factors to a value of 1.0 as in the forward stepwise models, 10 separate models were run requesting Wald tests, which indicate what error parameters can be dropped without altering the chi-square per degree of freedom. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), parameters can be dropped from the model if the chi-square change per degree of freedom is less than 3.84 at the 0.05 alpha level, which is indicated by examining the Chi-square critical values table. Kline (2005) claims that with a large sample size (i.e., larger than 200) a critical value cutoff can be considerably larger because “even a trivial change in overall model fit due to dropping a path could be statistically significant” (p. 148). For example in the first backward stepwise model, 70 of the 86 parameters were dropped with a Chi-square change per degree of freedom of 3.82.

The remaining 16 error parameters were removed within the subsequent nine models. Also, three items that cross-loaded onto two factors were also removed (i.e., visiting natural areas, trust the behavior of visitors, and share ideas with visitors). At this point, 34 items remained among the four scales. The final measurement model with no error parameters and all factors included was significant (p = 0.00) with a Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-square statistic of 819.16, with 482 degrees of freedom, a CFI value of .955 (which indicates a near perfect incremental model fit), and an RMSEA value of 0.040 (which indicates a near perfect absolute model fit). According to Hu and Bentler (1999), a rule of thumb for the CFI and other incremental indexes is that values greater than roughly 0.90 may indicate reasonably good fit of the researcher’s model. As for RMSEA,
a rule of thumb is that values less than or equal to 0.05 indicates close approximate fit, values between .05 and .08 suggest reasonable error of approximation, and RMSEA greater than or equal to 0.10 suggests poor fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). The measurement model to be used in the structural regression models is listed in Figure 11.
The same 10 factors identified from EFA were also identified after all forward stepwise models (with LM tests) and backward stepwise models (with Wald tests) were run. The construct interaction was unidimensional with five items (i.e., during week, on
weekend, during peak vacation season, during off-peak vacation season, and during holidays). The construct shared beliefs had two dimensions. The first dimension was “preservation of the area” which included five items (i.e., appreciation for the Lowcountry, respect for nature, preserving local way of life, unique place, and great place to vacation). The second dimension of shared beliefs was “amenities of the area” and had two items (i.e., variety of dining choices throughout county and variety of entertainment choices throughout county).

The construct shared behavior had four dimensions: “beach activities” (i.e., relaxing on the beach, taking a walk on the beach, and swimming in the ocean), “cultural heritage activities” (i.e., sightseeing, visiting historic sites, and taking local tours), “outdoor recreation activities” (i.e., inshore boating, offshore boating, and inshore fishing), and “local patronage” (i.e., shopping at local stores, shopping at grocery stores, and dining at local restaurants). The construct emotional solidarity had three dimensions: “emotional closeness” (i.e., feel close to some visitors and made friends with some visitors), “sympathetic understanding” (i.e., identify with visitors, have a lot in common, feel affection toward visitors, and understand visitors), and “welcoming visitors” (i.e., proud to have visitors, treat visitors fair, appreciate visitors’ contribution to local economy, and feel community benefits from having visitors).

Reliabilities for each of the 10 factors ranged from 0.773 to 0.916 for Cronbach’s alpha and from 0.784 to 0.997 for maximal weighted internal consistency reliability. The latter reliability statistic reflects a weighted alpha score; weighted by factor loadings (Kline, 2005). This weighted reliability statistic is reported given that alpha assumes
equal loadings; however this is never the case in confirmatory factor analysis (Byrne, 2006). According to Nunnally (1978) and Lance et al. (2006), reliabilities of 0.70 are deemed adequate when developing a new scale. Based on the final full measurement model, factor loadings ranged from 0.513 to 0.978 (all but four loadings were between 0.700 and 0.900). According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), factor loadings above 0.700 are ideal. However, Comrey and Lee (1992) claim the range, 0.300 to 0.500 is acceptable for factor loadings. Constructs, factors, instrument items, loadings, and reliabilities follow (Table 15).

Table 15. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for Four Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factor Groupings</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Maximal Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td>On the weekend</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During off-peak vacation season</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During peak vacation season</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During week</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During holidays</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Beliefs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation of Area</strong></td>
<td>An appreciation for the Lowcountry</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A respect for nature within Beaufort County</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The belief that Beaufort County is a unique place</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The thought that Beaufort County is a great place to vacation</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The belief that preserving the local way of life in Beaufort County is important 0.713

**Amenities of Area** 0.783 0.784
The belief that there is a wide variety of dining choices throughout the county 0.848
The belief that there is a wide variety of entertainment choices throughout the county 0.759

**Shared Behavior**

**Beach Activities** 0.916 0.997
Relaxing on the beach 0.978
Taking a walk on the beach 0.921
Swimming in the ocean 0.772

**Cultural Heritage Activities** 0.887 0.918
Sightseeing 0.917
Visiting historic sites 0.875
Taking local tours 0.769

**Outdoor Recreation Activities** 0.860 0.868
Inshore boating 0.834
Offshore boating 0.833
Inshore fishing 0.817

**Local Patronage Activities** 0.773 0.841
Shopping at local merchants’ stores 0.857
Shopping at grocery stores 0.691
Dining at local restaurants 0.657

**Emotional Solidarity**

**Emotional Closeness** 0.878 0.879
I feel close to some visitors I have met in Beaufort County 0.940
I have made friends with some Visitors in Beaufort County 0.832

**Sympathetic Understanding** 0.857 0.906
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I identify with visitors in Beaufort County</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot in common with Beaufort County visitors</td>
<td>0.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel affection towards visitors in Beaufort County</td>
<td>0.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand visitors in Beaufort County</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Welcoming Visitors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to have visitors come to Beaufort County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the community benefits from having visitors in Beaufort County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate visitors for the contribution they make to the local economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I treat visitors fair in Beaufort County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structural Regression Model Analysis Results**

Once the final measurement model was established with near perfect fit, the process of building structural models to tests hypotheses $H_1$ (including $H_{1a}$, $H_{1b}$, and $H_{1c}$), $H_2$, $H_3$, $H_4$, and $H_5$ was started. In this case, two separate structural regression models were created, Model One (testing Durkheim’s model of emotional solidarity) and Model Two (Durkheim’s model with additional predictors of emotional solidarity). According to Kline (2005), a structural regression model analysis is considered a hybrid model including the final full measurement model as well as the full path model. A valid measurement model must be in place before the structural path model can be evaluated (Kline, 2005). This is referred to by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) as two-step modeling.
Model One: Durkheim’s Model

The first four hypotheses applied to Model One which included four constructs (all considered second-order factors except for interaction which was a unidimensional, first-order factor), nine first-order factors, and 34 individual items loading on the 10 total first-order factors. The initial Model One is listed below in Figure 12.

Figure 12. Initial Model One Structural Regression Model

The initial Model One was designed to test the predictive relationship of interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior on emotional solidarity. The Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-square for the initial Model One was significant (p-value = 0.00) with
a value of 938.3564 based on 512 degrees of freedom. Model fit was examined using the CFI and RMSEA as in the measurement model. The CFI statistic for this model was 0.943 and the RMSEA statistic was 0.043, both of which indicate near perfect fit (Kline, 2005). Within this model, interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior explained 14.5% of the variance in emotional solidarity with an $R^2$ value of 0.145.

To determine whether interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior were significant predictors of emotional solidarity, construct equations (i.e., regression equations for each path) were examined. The statistic that is used to determine significance is the robust large sample $z$-test. The observed $z$-value must be greater than the two-tailed critical $z$-value of 1.96 at the 0.05 alpha level to be considered significant (Kline, 2005).

The first-order factor, interaction was a significant predictor of emotional solidarity with a $z$-value of 2.850 at the 0.05 level. The standardized regression coefficient for interaction was 0.201, indicating a positive relationship with emotional solidarity. In other words, for every unit increase in interaction between residents and tourists, residents’ emotional solidarity felt with tourists increased by 0.201 units.

The second-order factor, shared beliefs was a significant predictor of emotional solidarity with a $z$-value of 2.831 at the 0.05 level. The standardized regression coefficient for shared beliefs was 0.237, indicating a positive relationship with emotional solidarity. In other words, for every unit increase in shared beliefs between residents and tourists, residents’ emotional solidarity felt with tourists increased by 0.237 units.
The second-order factor, shared behavior was not a significant predictor of emotional solidarity with a $z$-value of 1.116 at the 0.05 level (indicated by a dashed line in Figure 13). This indicates that the second-order factor (which is the construct, shared behavior) is not an adequate predictor of emotional solidarity, and that shared behavior is too complex of a construct to capture in one latent variable (Byrne, 2006). As a result, a closer examination of the first-order factors within shared behavior was needed to determine how well such factors predict emotional solidarity.

To determine potential first-order independent variable-dependent variable parameters to add to the model, LM tests were requested for all six first-order independent variable factors within shared beliefs and shared behavior (e.g., preservation of area, amenities of area, beach activities, cultural heritage activities, outdoor recreation activities, and local patronage activities) and their parameters with emotional solidarity. The direct path between cultural heritage activities and emotional solidarity had a Chi-square change of 14.324 by adding it to the model, which is significant at the 0.05 level. The direct path between local patronage and emotional solidarity had a Chi-square change of 4.877, which was also significant at the 0.05 level. These were the only two parameters that were significant in the LM tests and both were added to the initial Model One to determine if they were also significant in the model. The modified Model One is listed below in Figure 13.
Figure 13. Modified Model One Structural Regression Model

The Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-square for the modified Model One was significant ($p = 0.00$) with a value of 920.4478 based on 510 degrees of freedom. Model fit was examined using the CFI and RMSEA as in the measurement model. The CFI statistic for this model was 0.946 and the RMSEA statistic was 0.043, both of which indicate near perfect fit (Kline, 2005) and a slight improvement over the initial Model One. Within this model, interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, cultural heritage activities, and local patronage activities explained 22.3% of the variance in emotional...
solidarity with an $R^2$ value of 0.223. This is nearly a 10% increase in explained variance of emotional solidarity over the initial model.

Construct equations from the structural regression output were again interpreted for the modified Model One to determine significance of each predictor. The first-order factor, interaction was still a significant predictor of emotional solidarity with a $z$-value of 3.720 at the 0.05 level. The standardized regression coefficient for interaction was 0.265, indicating a positive relationship with emotional solidarity. In other words, for every unit increase in interaction between residents and tourists, residents’ emotional solidarity felt with tourists increased by 0.265 units.

The second-order factor, shared beliefs was still a significant predictor of emotional solidarity with a $z$-value of 2.802 at the 0.05 level. The standardized regression coefficient for shared beliefs was 0.230, indicating a positive relationship with emotional solidarity. In other words, for every unit increase in shared beliefs between residents and tourists, residents’ emotional solidarity felt with tourists increased by 0.230 units.

The first-order factors of shared behavior, cultural heritage activities and local patronage activities were both significant predictors of emotional solidarity at the 0.05 level. The $z$-value for cultural heritage activities was 4.291. The $z$-value for local patronage activities was 2.014. Both of these values were beyond the two-tail critical $z$ score of 1.96. The standardized regression coefficient for cultural heritage activities was 0.360. For every unit increase in shared cultural heritage activities between residents and tourists, residents’ emotional solidarity felt with tourists increased by 0.360 units. The standardized regression coefficient for local patronage activities was 0.222. For every
unit increase in shared local patronage activities between residents and tourists, residents’ emotional solidarity felt with tourists increased by 0.222 units.

The second-order factor, shared behavior in the modified Model One was a significant predictor of emotional solidarity, but in a negative direction. The $z$-value of shared behavior was $-2.576$, which is beyond the two-tail critical $z$ score of $1.96$. The standardized regression coefficient for shared behavior is $-0.441$. For every unit increase in shared behavior between residents and tourists, residents’ emotional solidarity felt with tourists decreased by 0.441 units.

When a second-order factor has a regression coefficient with an opposite sign of the first-order factors, net suppression or negative suppression is occurring (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). What this means is that shared behavior is acting as the suppressor variable of cultural heritage activities and local patronage activities actually enhancing the effects of the latter first-order factors (Kline, 2005). Further, the sign of one of the independent variables is in the opposite direction of the other independent variables of what is expected on the basis of the correlations with the dependent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). In this case, correlations between cultural heritage activities, local patronage, and shared behavior are all positively correlated with emotional solidarity (i.e., 0.275, 0.252, and 0.194 respectively).

To determine whether $H_1$, $H_{1a}$, $H_{1b}$, and $H_{1c}$ could be rejected or accepted, examination of the $z$ statistic from the modified Model One was performed. Observed $z$ statistics, regression coefficients, and standard errors associated with the first hypothesis are listed in Table 16.
H$_{1a}$ was stated as, “Interaction between residents and tourists does not significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.” The observed $z$-value for interaction in predicting emotional solidarity was 3.720 (well beyond the 1.96 two-tailed critical $z$ value), with a standardized regression coefficient of 0.265. This indicates interaction between residents and tourists is a significant predictor of residents experiencing emotional solidarity with tourists, with a direct positive relationship. H$_{1a}$ was rejected and it can be claimed that interaction does significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.

Table 16. *Construct Equation Results from Modified Model One*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Standardized Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Observed $z$-value ($p &lt; 0.05$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Emotional solidarity</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>3.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared beliefs</td>
<td>Emotional solidarity</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>2.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared behavior</td>
<td>Emotional solidarity</td>
<td>-0.441</td>
<td>-2.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage activities</td>
<td>Emotional solidarity</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>4.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local patronage activities</td>
<td>Emotional solidarity</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>2.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H$_{1b}$ was stated as, “Shared beliefs do not significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.” The observed $z$-value for shared beliefs in predicting emotional solidarity was 2.802 (well beyond the 1.96 two-tailed
critical $z$ value), with a standardized regression coefficient of 0.230. This indicates shared beliefs between residents and tourists are a significant predictor of emotional solidarity residents experience with tourists, with a direct positive relationship. $H_{1b}$ was rejected and it can be claimed that shared beliefs do significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.

$H_{1c}$ was stated as, “Shared behavior does not significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County.” This hypothesis had mixed findings given that the second-order factor of shared behavior acts as a suppressor of the first-order factors, cultural heritage activities and local patronage activities. The observed $z$-value for shared behavior in predicting emotional solidarity was -2.576 (well beyond the 1.96 two-tailed critical $z$-value), with a standardized regression coefficient of -0.441. This indicates shared behavior between residents and tourists is a significant predictor of residents experiencing emotional solidarity with tourists, with an inverse relationship. $H_{1c}$ was rejected and it can be claimed that shared behavior does significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County. Caution is advised in interpreting this hypothesis given the presence of net suppression and first-order factors, cultural heritage activities (observed $z$-value of 4.291 with a standardized regression coefficient of 0.360) and local patronage activities (observed $z$-value of 2.014 with standardized regression coefficient of 0.222) being significant predictors of emotional solidarity.

Overall $H_1$ was stated as, “The three variables in the Durkheimian model (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior) do not significantly predict residents’
emotional solidarity experienced with tourists in Beaufort County. Based on each individual hypothesis test, this global hypothesis can also be rejected to claim that the three variables in the Durkhemian model do significantly predict residents’ emotional solidarity experienced with tourists. Further, these results support Durkheim’s model where interacting with one another, sharing beliefs, and sharing behavior can lead to experiencing an emotional solidarity.

As mentioned above, the total variance explained in emotional solidarity within the modified model was 22.3%, or five predictors (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, shared behavior, cultural heritage activities, and local patronage activities) had an $R^2$ of 0.223. The next set of hypotheses (i.e., $H_2$, $H_3$, and $H_4$) examined the unique effect size of each of the constructs within Durkheim’s model in predicting emotional solidarity. This unique effect size is also known as the $sr^2$ value. Tyler (2002) claims the $sr^2$ or unique effect size represents the amount of variance explained by a particular factor above what can be explained by all other factors within a structural model.

The $sr^2$ value was ascertained by running five individual models with each model including four different combinations of predictors of emotional solidarity (each model with a different predictor excluded). The $R^2$ value for each model was subtracted from the $R^2$ from the baseline model (i.e., modified Model One) to determine the unique effect size of the removed predictor. For example, to determine the unique effect size for shared beliefs, only shared behavior, cultural heritage activities, local patronage activities, and interaction were included in the model to predict emotional solidarity. The resulting $R^2$ was 0.178, which was then subtracted from the baseline model $R^2$ of 0.223, indicating the
unique effect size (i.e., $sr^2$) of shared beliefs was 0.045. Four additional models were run, each with a different predictor removed from the baseline, modified Model One, yielding unique effect sizes for each predictor (Table 17).

Table 17. Models Run in Determining Unique Effect Sizes from Modified Model One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Specified Predictors in Model</th>
<th>$R^2$ of Model</th>
<th>Unique Effect Size ($sr^2$) of Predictor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>$sr^2_{interaction} = 0.081$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Patronage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>$sr^2_{shared beliefs} = 0.045$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Patronage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>$sr^2_{shared behavior} = 0.060$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Patronage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>$sr^2_{cult hrtg activities} = 0.079$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Patronage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>$sr^2_{local ptrng activities} = 0.036$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine whether to reject or accept $H_2$, $H_3$, and $H_4$, $sr^2$ values were compared among the three main predictor constructs (i.e., interaction, shared beliefs, and
shared behavior) in the modified Model One. H2 was stated as, “Interactions between residents and tourists in Beaufort County will not have a unique effect size greater than that of shared behavior or shared beliefs in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.” With an $sr^2$ value of 0.081, interaction uniquely explained 8.1% of the variance in emotional solidarity. Both shared beliefs ($sr^2$ value of 0.045) and shared behavior ($sr^2$ value of 0.060) uniquely explained a lesser amount of variance in emotional solidarity than did interaction. This indicates that H2 is rejected. Further, it can be said that interaction does indeed have a unique effect size greater than that of shared beliefs and shared behavior in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

H3 was stated as, “Perceived shared beliefs between residents and tourists in Beaufort County (as reported by residents) will not have a unique effect size greater than that of shared behavior or interaction in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.” With an $sr^2$ value of 0.045, shared beliefs uniquely explained 4.5% of the variance in emotional solidarity. Both shared behavior ($sr^2$ value of 0.060) and interaction ($sr^2$ value of 0.081) uniquely explained a greater amount of variance within emotional solidarity than did shared beliefs. This indicates that H3 is accepted. Further, it can be said that shared beliefs between residents and tourists does not have a unique effect size greater than that of shared behavior or interaction in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

H4 was stated as, “Perceived shared behavior between residents and tourists in Beaufort County (as reported by residents) will not have a unique effect size greater than
that of shared beliefs or interaction in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County. With an $sr^2$ value of 0.060, shared behavior uniquely explained 6.0% of the variance in emotional solidarity. Shared beliefs ($sr^2$ value of 0.045) explained less variance than shared behavior in emotional solidarity. However interaction ($sr^2$ value of 0.081) explained more variance than shared behavior in emotional solidarity. This indicates that $H_4$ is partially rejected and it can be claimed that while shared behavior does indeed have a unique effect size greater than that of shared beliefs, the effect size of shared behavior is less than that of interaction in predicting residents’ level of emotional solidarity felt with tourists in Beaufort County.

**Model Two: Durkheim’s Model with Additional Predictors of Emotional Solidarity**

A second model was proposed with additional predictor variables (i.e., length of residency, recent travel experience outside Beaufort County, economic dependency on tourism, and age) to determine if Model Two explained a greater variance in emotional solidarity than the Modified Model One. The corresponding hypothesis (i.e., $H_5$) was written as, “Additional resident characteristics (i.e., length of residency, age, economic dependency on tourism, and recent travel experience outside Beaufort County) along with the predictors from Model One (i.e., shared beliefs, shared behavior, and interaction) will not significantly explain a greater degree of variance in emotional solidarity than predictors in Model One.”

In order to test this hypothesis, two models had to be run, a Baseline Model Two and a Final Model Two. Kline (2005) claims that when comparing two models, one model must be nested within the other. In this circumstance, the Baseline Model Two
(which is in essence the same as the Modified Model One with the four additional predictor variables) is nested within the Final Model Two (with the four additional predictor variables and paths specified to emotional solidarity). Three criteria were examined to determine if the Final Model Two explained a greater degree of variance in emotional solidarity: 1) the change in Chi-square between models (using an omnibus Chi-square difference test), 2) the change in CFI between models, and 3) the change in RMSEA between models.

Baseline Model Two (Figure 14) was significant \( p = 0.00 \) with a Satorra-Bentler Chi-square value of 1187.8918 based on 634 degrees of freedom. The CFI statistic for this model was 0.931 and the RMSEA statistic was 0.044. The Baseline Model Two explained 16.9\% of the variance in emotional solidarity \( (R^2 = 0.169) \).
Figure 14. Baseline Model Two Structural Regression Model

The Final Model Two (Figure 15) was also significant ($p = 0.00$) with a Satorra-Bentler Chi-square value of 1181.5285 based on 630 degrees of freedom. The CFI statistic for this model was 0.931 and the RMSEA statistic was 0.044. The Final Model Two explained 20.8% of the variance in emotional solidarity ($R^2 = 0.208$).
Figure 15. Final Model Two Structural Regression Model

In order to reject $H_5$, Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) claim the difference in the model Chi-squares between Baseline Model Two and Final Model Two must exceed the Chi-square critical value at the 0.05 alpha level with four degrees of freedom (i.e., 9.49). The difference between the observed baseline model Chi-square and the observed final
model Chi-square is 6.36, which is well under the critical Chi-square value, indicating the test is not significant.

Further, neither the CFI nor the RMSEA model fit index improved from the baseline model with the addition of length of residency, recent travel experience outside Beaufort County, economic dependency on tourism, and age as predictors of emotional solidarity. Given the omnibus Chi-square difference test was not significant and neither CFI nor RMSEA improved upon addition of the four predictor variables, H5 must be accepted. In addition, none of the four additional predictors were significant (as indicated by dashed lines in Figure 15). In other words, additional resident characteristics (i.e., length of residency, age, economic dependency on tourism, and recent travel experience outside Beaufort County) along with predictors from the Modified Model One (i.e., shared beliefs, shared behavior, and interaction) do not significantly explain a greater degree of variance in emotional solidarity than predictors in the Modified Model One alone.

Hypotheses Regarding Resident Characteristics and Tourist Types

In order to test hypotheses H6 and H7, composite scores for each emotional solidarity dimension (i.e., sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming visitors) were calculated by summing item scores within dimensions and dividing by the number of items within each dimension. This was appropriate given the results of the CFA indicated emotional solidarity was not a unidimensional construct. Both the mean for sympathetic understanding (M = 4.51, SD = 1.28) and emotional closeness (M = 4.36, SD = 1.58) were lower than the mean for welcoming visitors (M =
5.81, $SD = 1.08$) for the 7-point likert scale (where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree).

**Resident characteristics hypotheses.** The overarching hypothesis (i.e., $H_0$) examining numerous demographic variables across the three dimensions of emotional solidarity was stated as, “Mean scores of emotional solidarity dimensions felt with tourists will not be significantly different across multiple resident types.” Seven sub-hypotheses of this main hypothesis were proposed that include different independent variables: retirement status, length of residency, place of birth, tourism dependence, prior vacation experience in Beaufort County, total trips taken in the last two years, and age. For each of the seven sub-hypotheses, one-way MANOVA tests were conducted with ANOVA follow-up tests. In addition, post hoc analyses using the LSD test was conducted for those independent variables with more than two categories with a significant ANOVA test at the 0.05 alpha level. LSD tests were conducted to control for Type I errors (i.e., rejecting the null hypothesis when it is actually true) across all pairwise comparisons as Green and Salkind (2005) suggest.

In conducting MANOVA tests, two major assumptions must be met: 1) observations on all dependent variables must follow a multivariate normal distribution in each group and 2) the population covariance matrices for the dependent variables in each group must be equal (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). This latter assumption is typically referred to as the homogeneity of covariance matrices assumption (Green & Salkind, 2005). In addressing the first assumption, Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) claim that MANOVA are robust to moderate violations of normality, as long as the violation is due
to skewness and not an outlier. As mentioned in the previous chapter, outliers were removed in both univariate and multivariate screening. Mertler and Vannatta say that “having a large overall sample and only a few dependent variables, a sample size of about 20 in the smallest cell should be sufficient to ensure robustness to violations of univariate and multivariate normality” (p. 124). Green and Salkind claim a less conservative cutoff claiming a sample of 15 is needed for each cell. The smallest sample in any of the cells of the MANOVA tests was 72. This assumption was not violated.

The second assumption concerning the homogeneity of covariance matrices can be tested by examining Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices. This tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups. If the test is significant at the 0.001 level (per Mertler & Vannatta, 2005), “The homogeneity hypothesis is rejected, and we may conclude that there are differences in the matrices” (Green & Salkind, 2005, p. 222). If however the test is significant, it is not likely to prove fatal to an analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices were conducted for each of the seven potential MANOVA tests and the results follow in Table 18. Given that none of the tests were significant, it was determined that population covariance matrices for the dependent variables in each group were equal and this assumption was not violated.
The first sub-hypothesis (i.e., \( H_{6a} \)) was stated as, “Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across retirement status.” Retirement status included two groups, retirees and non-retirees. A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of two types of retirement status (retirees and non-retirees) on the three dependent variables, sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness and welcoming of visitors. No significant differences were found across retirement status on the dependent measures, Wilks’s \( \Lambda = 0.995, F(3,436) = 0.715, p = 0.543 \). The multivariate \( \eta^2 = 0.05 \), which indicates that 5.0% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor.

Table 19 contains the means and the standard deviations on the dependent variables for retirees and non-retirees. Given the MANOVA produced no significant

---

**Table 18. Results of Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices for all MANOVAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable in MANOVAs</th>
<th>Box’s M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Status</td>
<td>9.882</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>128175.8</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residency</td>
<td>27.165</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>549226.0</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92060.7</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Dependence</td>
<td>12.866</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>546481.8</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Vacation Experience in County</td>
<td>6.270</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>953987.3</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trips in Last Two Years</td>
<td>13.682</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>855052.4</td>
<td>0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>26.093</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>641211.0</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
findings, no follow-up tests were conducted. $H_{6a}$ was accepted and it was concluded that there were no significant differences in mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors across retirees and non-retirees.

Table 19. Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for Retirement Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retirement Status</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirees</td>
<td>4.44 (1.46)</td>
<td>4.43 (1.68)</td>
<td>5.69 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-retirees</td>
<td>4.51 (1.23)</td>
<td>4.32 (1.54)</td>
<td>5.82 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second sub-hypothesis (i.e., $H_{6b}$) was written as, “Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across length of residency groupings. These groupings were new residents (i.e., permanent residents living in Beaufort County less than 10 years), seasoned residents (i.e., permanent residents living in Beaufort County between 10 and 30 years), and long-time residents (i.e., permanent residents living in Beaufort County more than 30 years).

A one-way MANOVA was run to find out the effects of three types of residency groups (new, seasoned, and long-time) on the three dependent variables, sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors. No significant differences were found across length of residency groups on the dependent measures, Wilk’s $\Lambda = 0.976$, $F(6,876) = 1.764$, $p = 0.103$. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.012$, which indicates that
1.2% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor.

Means and standard deviations on the three dimensions of emotional solidarity for the three lengths of residence groups are found in Table 20. As was the case with the previous independent variable, no further tests were conducted. $H_{6b}$ was accepted and it was concluded that there were no significant differences in mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors across new, seasoned, and long-time residents of Beaufort County.

Table 20. *Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for Length of Residence Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Residence Group</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasoned</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-time</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third sub-hypothesis (i.e., $H_{6c}$) was written as, “Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across residents’ place of birth.” The independent variable, place of birth was operationalized as native-born residents and nonnative-born residents of Beaufort County. A one-way MANOVA was run to determine the effects of place of birth (native-
born and nonnative-born residents) on the three dependent variables, sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors. No significant differences were found across place of birth on the dependent measures, Wilks’s $\Lambda = 0.987$, $F(3,441) = 1.921$, $p = 0.125$. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.013$, which indicates that 1.3% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor.

Table 21 contains the means and standard deviations of the three dependent variables for native-born residents as well as nonnative-born residents. With no significant findings from the MANOVA test, no further tests were conducted. $H_{6c}$ was accepted and it was concluded that there were no significant differences in mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors across residents born in Beaufort County and those born outside the country.

Table 21. *Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for Place of Birth*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding $M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness $M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors $M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native of Beaufort County</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonnative of Beaufort County</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth sub-hypothesis ($H_{6d}$) pertaining to resident characteristics concerned residents dependence on tourism. $H_{6d}$ was stated as, “Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across levels of resident tourism dependence.” The different levels of tourism...
dependence were operationalized as low dependence (i.e., residents who claimed less than five percent of their household income was derived directly or indirectly from tourism), moderate dependence (i.e., residents who claimed between five and 25% of their household income was derived directly or indirectly from tourism), and high dependence (i.e., residents who claimed more than 25% of their household income was derived directly or indirectly from tourism).

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect the three groups of tourism dependence (low, moderate, and high) would have on the three dimensions of emotional solidarity (sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors). Significant differences were found among the three tourism dependence groups, Wilks’s $\Lambda = 0.966$, $F(6,880) = 2.574$, $p = 0.018$. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.017$, which indicates that 1.7% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor.

ANOVA tests were then conducted on each dependent variable as follow up tests to the MANOVA. Using the LSD method, each ANOVA was tested at the 0.05 level. The ANOVA on sympathetic understanding was non-significant, $F(2,442) = 1.89$, $p = 0.152$, $\eta^2 = 0.008$, while the ANOVA on emotional closeness, $F(2,442) = 2.76$, $p = 0.050$, $\eta^2 = 0.012$ as well as the ANOVA on welcoming of visitors were both significant, $F(2,442) = 6.01$, $p = 0.003$, $\eta^2 = 0.026$.

Post hoc analyses to the univariate ANOVA for emotional closeness scores consisted of conducting pair-wise comparisons using the LSD method to determine which tourism dependence group had the most significant difference in scores of
emotional closeness. Each pair-wise comparison was tested at the 0.05 level. The mean score of emotional closeness was significantly higher for residents who were highly dependent on tourism ($M = 4.62, SD = 1.59$) than for residents who had a low dependence on tourism ($M = 4.20, SD = 1.55$). The moderately dependent resident group was not significantly different from either the low or highly dependent group.

Post hoc analyses were also carried out for the welcoming of visitors dependent variable using the LSD method. The mean score of welcoming of visitors was significantly higher for residents who were highly dependent on tourism ($M = 6.09, SD = 0.94$) than for both moderately dependent residents ($M = 5.74, SD = 1.05$) and residents who had a low dependence on tourism ($M = 5.68, SD = 1.14$). The low and moderately dependent resident groups were not significantly different from one another.

Table 22 contains the means and standard deviations of the three dependent variables for low, moderate, and highly tourism dependent resident groups. $H_{0d}$ was partially rejected and it was concluded that there were significant differences in mean scores emotional closeness and welcoming of visitors but not sympathetic understanding across the three tourism dependent resident groups.
Table 22. Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for Tourism

Dependence Resident Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Dependence Residence Group</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth hypothesis (H₆ₑ) regarding resident characteristics concerned prior vacation experience in Beaufort County. H₆ₑ was stated as, “Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across residents’ prior vacationing experience in Beaufort County.” This variable was operationalized as two groups: residents who previously took at least one trip to the county prior to relocating and those residents who had never visited the county before.

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the two types of prior vacationing experience (visiting at least once and never visited) on the three dimensions of emotional solidarity (sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors). No significant differences were found among the prior vacationing experience groups on the dependent measures, Wilks’s Λ = 0.990, F(3, 371)
= 1.20, \( p = 0.310 \). The multivariate \( \eta^2 = 0.010 \), which indicates that 1.0% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor. However it should be noted that mean scores for each of the dependent variables was higher for those who had vacationed prior to relocating to Beaufort County.

Means and standard deviations of the three dependent variables for residents who had visited Beaufort County at least once before relocating and those who had not visited are found in Table 23. With no significant findings from the MANOVA test, no follow-up tests were conducted. \( H_{6e} \) was accepted and it was concluded that there were no significant differences in mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors across residents who had visited Beaufort County at least once prior to relocating and those who had never visited the county.

Table 23. Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for Prior Vacationing Experience in Beaufort County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Vacationing Experience in Beaufort County</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visited at Least Once</td>
<td>4.56  1.34</td>
<td>4.43  1.63</td>
<td>5.93     1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Visited</td>
<td>4.47  1.21</td>
<td>4.22  1.54</td>
<td>5.76     1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixth hypothesis (\( H_{6f} \)) concerned residents’ recent travel experience. \( H_{6f} \) was stated as, “Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and
welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across residents’ varying amounts of total trips taken in the last two years.” Residents were broken into three groups regarding the amount of trips they had taken in the last two years: those who had taken less than five trips, those who took between five and 15 trips, and finally those who took more than 15 trips.

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to examine the effect that recent travel experience groupings (less than five trips, between five and 15, and more than 15 trips) had on the three dimensions of emotional solidarity. Significant differences were found across the three travel experience groups on the dependent variables, Wilks’s $\Lambda = 0.970$, $F(6, 864) = 2.24$, $p = 0.038$. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.015$, which indicates that 1.5% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor.

Since MANOVA tests revealed significant findings, follow-up ANOVA tests were conducted on each dependent variable. Using the LSD method, each ANOVA was tested at the 0.05 level. Each ANOVA was significant: sympathetic understanding, $F(2, 434) = 3.15$, $p = 0.04$, $\eta^2 = 0.014$; emotional closeness, $F(2, 434) = 3.71$, $p = 0.03$, $\eta^2 = 0.017$; and welcoming of visitors, $F(2, 434) = 5.01$, $p = 0.01$, $\eta^2 = 0.023$.

Post hoc analyses to the univariate ANOVA tests for all three dependent variables consisted of conducting LSD pair-wise comparisons at the 0.05 level. The mean score of sympathetic understanding was significantly higher for residents who had taken more than 15 trips in the last two years ($M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.20$) than those who took between five and 15 trips ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.30$). The group of residents who took less than five trips was not significantly different from either of the other two groups.
The mean score of emotional closeness was significantly higher for residents who had taken more than 15 trips in the last two years \((M = 4.65, SD = 1.50)\) than for both those residents who took between five and 15 trips \((M = 4.21, SD = 1.50)\) and those residents who took less than five trips \((M = 4.24, SD = 1.68)\). No significance differences existed between the group of residents who took less than five trips and the group who took between five and 15 trips.

As with emotional closeness, the mean score of welcoming of visitors was significantly higher for residents who had taken more than 15 trips in the last two years \((M = 6.02, SD = 0.93)\) than for both those residents who took between five and 15 trips \((M = 5.72, SD = 1.13)\) and those residents who took less than five trips \((M = 5.66, SD = 1.10)\). Again, no significance differences existed between the two groups of resident who took the fewest amount of trips over the last two years.

Table 24 contains the means and standard deviations of the three dependent variables for the three groups of residents’ recent travel experience. H_{6f} was rejected and it was concluded that there were significant differences in mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness and welcoming of visitors across the three travel experience resident groups.
Table 24. *Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for Residents’ Recent Travel Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents’ Recent Travel Experience</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Five Trips</td>
<td>M 4.42, SD 1.32</td>
<td>M 4.24, SD 1.68</td>
<td>M 5.66, SD 1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Five and 15 trips</td>
<td>M 4.37, SD 1.30</td>
<td>M 4.21, SD 1.50</td>
<td>M 5.72, SD 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 trips</td>
<td>M 4.71, SD 1.20</td>
<td>M 4.65, SD 1.50</td>
<td>M 6.02, SD 0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final sub-hypothesis (i.e., $H_{6g}$) was stated as, “Mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across resident age categories.” Those age categories included individuals under 40, 40-49, 50-59, and 60 and older. A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effects of the four age groups on the three dependent variables (sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors). No significant differences were found among the age groups on the three dependent variables, Wilks’s $\Lambda = 0.990, F(9,1049) = 0.475, p = 0.892$. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.003$, which indicates that 0.3% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor.

Table 25 has the means and standard deviations for the three dependent variables across the four age groups. $H_{6g}$ was accepted and it was concluded that there were
significant differences in mean scores of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness and welcoming of visitors across the resident age groups. However it should be noted that mean scores for the three dependent variables was highest among the oldest residents.

Table 25. Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables for Resident Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident Age Group</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding $M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness $M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors $M$</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and Over</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The global hypothesis, $H_6$, encompassing the seven sub-hypotheses, was partially rejected. Differences were found only in two of the seven resident characteristics. Those differences included residents’ dependence on tourism and recent travel experience outside Beaufort County. The variables retirement status, length of residency, place of birth, past vacationing in Beaufort County, and age had no effect on the three dimensions of emotional solidarity (i.e., sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors).

Tourist type hypothesis. The final hypothesis of the study pertained to the effect that the type of tourist residents encountered most often had on the three dimensions of
emotional solidarity. $H_7$ was written as, “Residents’ mean score of sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors will not be significantly different across numerous types of tourists that residents encounter most often within the county.” A MANOVA with follow-up ANOVA procedures and LSD tests (for pairwise comparisons) was done for this hypothesis.

However prior to conducting the analysis for $H_7$, two assumptions of MANOVA were addressed. Those assumptions were: 1) observations on all dependent variables must follow a multivariate normal distribution in each group and 2) the population covariance matrices for the dependent variables in each group must be equal (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). As stated above, Mertler and Vannatta say that “having a large overall sample and only a few dependent variables, a sample size of about 20 in the smallest cell should be sufficient to ensure robustness to violations of univariate and multivariate normality” (p. 124). The smallest sample size in any cell for $H_7$ was 84 cases.

To determine whether the second assumption was violated, Box’s test of equality of covariance matrices was conducted for the data. The test was not significant, Box’s $M = 19.855, F(18, 478559) = 1.088, p = 0.356$. It was determined that population covariance matrices for the dependent variables in each of the tourist type groups were equal and this assumption was not violated.

A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine the effect of the four tourist types (i.e., family tourist, second homeowner/renter, seasonal tourist, and day-tripper) on the three dependent variables—sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors. Significant differences were found among the four tourist types on
the dependent measures. Wilks’s $\Lambda = 0.961$, $F(9,1032) = 1.885$, $p = 0.050$. The multivariate $\eta^2 = 0.013$, which indicates that 1.3% of multivariate variance of the dependent variables was associated with the group factor.

ANOVA tests were then conducted on each dependent variable as follow up tests to the MANOVA. Using the LSD method, each ANOVA was tested at the 0.05 level. The ANOVA on sympathetic understanding was significant, $F(3,426) = 2.29$, $p = 0.050$, $\eta^2 = 0.016$, while both the ANOVA on emotional closeness, $F(3,426) = 0.731$, $p = 0.534$, $\eta^2 = 0.005$ as well as the ANOVA on welcoming of visitors were not significant, $F(3,426) = 0.998$, $p = 0.394$, $\eta^2 = 0.007$.

Post hoc analyses to the univariate ANOVA for sympathetic understanding scores consisted of conducting pair-wise comparisons using the LSD method to determine which tourist type had the most significant difference in scores of sympathetic understanding. Each pair-wise comparison was tested at the 0.05 level. The mean score of sympathetic understanding was significantly higher for the family tourist ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.22$) than for the second homeowners/renters ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 1.42$). Neither the seasonal tourist nor day-tripper was significantly different from one another or the other two groups.

Table 26 contains the means and standard deviations of the three dependent variables for family tourists, second homeowners/renters, seasonal tourists, and day-trippers. $H_7$ was partially rejected and it was concluded that there were significant differences in mean scores of sympathetic understanding but not emotional closeness and welcoming of visitors across the four tourist types.
Table 26. *Means and Standard Deviations on the Dependent Variables across Tourist Types*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourist Type</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding $M$</th>
<th>Sympathetic Understanding $SD$</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness $M$</th>
<th>Emotional Closeness $SD$</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors $M$</th>
<th>Welcoming of Visitors $SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Tourists</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Homeowners/Renters</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Tourists</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-tripper</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

This was the first study of its kind employing the framework of Emile Durkheim’s emotional solidarity utilizing an exploratory sequential mixed methods design. Born in the field of sociology, Durkheim (1995[1915]) developed the idea of emotional solidarity to describe the structure and formulation of religion through members’ shared beliefs, shared behaviors, and interaction. This study not only included an exploration of the emotional solidarity phenomenon, but it also involved testing Durkheim’s model in the context of tourism relations between residents and tourists. It was proposed that shared beliefs, shared behavior, and interaction between residents and tourists would significantly predict the emotional solidarity that exists between the two parties. Such a relationship can be examined from the perspective of either a resident or tourist (or both), but was focused exclusively from the residents’ perspective in this study.

This study was undertaken to offer a fresh, new perspective of the relationship existing between residents and tourists in a tourist destination. The relationship to date has been focused on superficial relations based primarily on financial transactions between the parties (de Kadt, 1979; Jafari, 1989; Krippendorf, 1999; Mason, 2006; Nettekoven, 1979; Smith, 1989; Sutton, 1967; UNESCO, 1976). Currently there exists an “us” versus “them” mentality in tourist destinations (Laxson, 1991; Pritchards-Evans, 1989), or what Wearing and Wearing (2001) call, the “dichotomy of self versus other.” The two main tenets of this viewpoint are that the self and the other are diametrically
opposed (two separate entities) and that the self is prioritized over the other in almost
every instance (Wearing & Wearing, 2001).

By employing the framework of emotional solidarity, this study begins to
examine a much deeper and personal, emotional relationship that exists between resident
and tourist in communities for which numerous researchers have requested (McIntosh,
1998; Pizam et al., 2000; Wearing & Wearing, 2001). Further, the results indicate that
relationships between residents and tourists can supersede relationships predicated on
financial transactions between the parties.

Given that research regarding emotions and emotional solidarity is new to the
field of tourism, an exploratory sequential mixed methods design was used in this study.
This entailed an exploratory qualitative portion of research which informed a quantitative
portion of research in latter stages of the project (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006). More
specifically, the study involved three phases. The first of which was an initial exploration
of the construct emotional solidarity involving three focus groups of residents who
possess divergent perspectives of tourists. The second phase included the development of
scales for the four constructs within Durkheim’s model (from the qualitative data analysis
and tourism literature), pilot-testing each scale twice across two samples, and refining
each scale through exploratory factor analysis.

The final phase included conducting an on-site survey of a representative sample
of Beaufort County’s residents. In addition to this, each dimension of the four constructs
were reexamined through confirmatory factor analysis, Durkheim’s model and a
competing model (with additional resident characteristics added) were tested through
structural equation modeling, emerging dimensions of emotional solidarity were examined across numerous resident demographic, socio-demographic, and travel experience variables, and finally each dimension of emotional solidarity was inspected among various tourist types for significant differences.

Discussion

Focus group data analysis (pertaining to the four constructs in Durkheim’s model), scale development, and survey data analysis all yielded results worthy of discussion. Chief among those are the fact that Beaufort County residents who attended the focus groups mentioned a common appreciation for naturalness and a concern for preservation of local culture between themselves and tourists. This is in line with perspectives of sustainable tourism which involves creating low impact on the environment and local culture, while aiding in generating income, jobs, and the conservation of local ecosystems (Boyd & Butler, 1998; Butler, 1990). One likely reason why this was mentioned so much throughout focus groups was that a good portion of Beaufort County is still rural and not yet developed. As Butler (1980) would claim in his work regarding the life-cycle of a destination, much of the area would be considered between the involvement and development stages.

The natural beauty and preservation of cultural life are two large reasons tourists are drawn to the county and why residents remain in the area as focus group participants pointed out. Examples of an appreciation for nature and preservation of local culture are seen throughout the county in areas like historic sites (e.g., Penn Center, Beaufort Artillery Arsenal, Heyward House, and the Secession Oak), historic districts of Bluffton
and Beaufort, special events like Third Friday and various Gullah celebrations, and even through measures taken by some developers to construct visually aesthetic landscapes for residents and tourists alike.

Focus group participants claimed numerous behaviors were common to both residents and tourists. Attending special events and festivals (e.g., Water Festival, Gullah Festival, Shrimp Festival, Spring Art Show, and Third Friday) was one major overlap between the groups. Derrett (2003) claimed that residents and tourists participating in festivals can help a community foster a sense of place. Traditional recreation pursuits were also named as activities that residents and tourists participated in. Such pursuits included beach activities and outdoor recreation activities. Examining endearment behavior among tourists, Prentice et al. (1994) found both residents and tourists shared specific beach and recreation activities with residents in the way of sitting or walking on the beach, swimming, watersports, walking or rambling, riding/pony trekking, sitting or picnicking, and pleasure motoring. However, in the current study, analysis of the survey data showed that neither beach activities nor outdoor recreation activities served as significant predictors of emotional solidarity.

Participating in cultural heritage activities was another common behavior of residents and tourists. Such activities included sightseeing, taking local tours, and visiting historic sites. Previous studies have mentioned this form of shared behavior in the contexts of authentic rituals among indigenous peoples (Laxson, 1991; MacCannell, 1999; Smith, 1989) and sharing a historic district between residents and tourists (Harrill & Potts, 2003). Finally, focus group participants mentioned sharing behavior with tourists
in everyday life activities involving local patronage (e.g., grocery shopping, shopping at boutiques, and eating at restaurants). The shared behavior of shopping has been of great interest within the tourism literature over the last decade (see Snepenger et al., 1998; Snepenger et al., 2001; Snepenger et al., 2003) capturing the common bonds between residents and tourists in destinations. As mentioned above, participating in these two forms of shared behavior (i.e., cultural heritage activities and local patronage) were found to be significant predictors of emotional solidarity.

Focus group participants indicated that they interacted with tourists in just about every setting throughout Beaufort County. Rothman (1978) claimed that in his study of two Delaware resort towns, it was difficult to go anywhere without seeing tourists. The most common places Beaufort County residents claimed seeing tourists were at stores, on streets, and in restaurants. Restaurants seem a likely place for interaction given residents indicated the shared belief of having a wide variety of dining opportunities for both groups.

According to focus groups, most participants said their interactions with tourists were superficial in nature, just as many researchers have indicated (see de Kadt, 1979; Jafari, 1989; Krippendorf, 1999; Sutton, 1967; Wearing & Wearing, 2001). This however contradicts findings from the survey data analysis. The composite score for the factor emotional closeness ($M = 4.36, SD = 1.58$) on a scale from 1 to 7 (where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree), indicates residents on the whole felt interaction with tourists was not entirely superficial. In addition, focus group participants said interaction with tourists occurred infrequently throughout the county. However findings from the
survey data analysis contradict this as well. The composite score for the factor interaction 
\( (M = 3.94, SD = 1.40) \) on a scale of 1 to 7 (where 1 is never and 7 is always), indicates 
residents interacted more with tourists than did the focus group participants.

It was rare for focus group participants to mention negative or hostile feelings for 
tourists in Beaufort County. In fact the opposite was true as all but a few participants 
highlighted on the positive feelings they had towards visitors. This is typically not the 
case as Harrill (2004) found in his review of current resident attitudes’ research in 
tourism. Throughout the world, researchers (i.e., Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Ap, 1992; 
Gursoy & Jurowski, 2002; Harrill & Potts, 2003; Joseph & Kavoori, 2001; Jurowski et 
al., 1997; Lankford, 1994; Liu et al., 1987; McCool & Martin, 1994; Perdue et al., 1990; 
Snaith & Haley, 1999; Tyrrell & Spaulding, 1984) have found some group of individuals 
in nearly every study of residents’ attitudes towards tourists or potential development 
who stand in opposition of tourism. Focus group participants’ feelings towards tourists 
were best captured in three categories (which were also the resulting dimensions of 
emotional solidarity from exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis). Those categories 
are feelings of empathy or understanding, emotional closeness, and embrace or 
welcoming of tourists to the area.

Focus group participants commented on feeling empathy towards tourists 
throughout the county. Examples of this understanding or ‘putting yourself in another’s 
shoes’ was seen best in residents’ stories about tourists being taken aback by the natural 
beauty of the area, contributing to traffic congestion and accidents, and causing longer 
waits in lines at stores and restaurants. In many instances, focus group participants
claimed they understood why people would do such things, because they too have done them either in Beaufort County or in their own travels outside of the county. In addition, participants claimed residents understand what it is like to be a tourist because they themselves were tourists when they first moved to Beaufort County, taking in the novel scenery. Based on the findings from the survey data analysis, residents scored moderately high ($M = 4.51, SD = 1.28$) on the factor sympathetic understanding.

It is well documented within the literature where tourists move towards an understanding of what it might be like to be a resident of a particular destination (Laxson, 1991; Nash, 1996; Smith, 1989), even if such understanding is the result of exposure to cultural experiences that are socially constructed (Greenwood, 1989; Kneafsey, 2001; MacCannell, 1999). These latter experiences are considered “staged authenticity” as MacCannell (1999) coined the term from the work of Goffman (1959), whereby residents act on a front stage for tourists, but never show what life is truly like on the backstage. There has been little mention of residents feeling a sense of empathy or understanding towards tourists.

Feeling an emotional closeness to tourists was another idea focus group participants mentioned. This was conceptualized as feeling close with some tourists and actually making friends with some visitors. Rothman (1978) found this was present in the Delaware resort communities that he studied, citing that “large numbers of residents reported interaction of a social nature [with tourists] and in many cases long-term friendships have developed” (p. 11). The development of friendships was also the result of recurring interactions between working tourists and residents of Israel in the work by
Pizam et al. (1994). In a study conducting in South Wales, Prentice et al. (1994), found that tourists were endeared to inhabitants based on informal social interactions in everyday activities with residents over time. One retiree from Connecticut who moved to Bluffton recently said it best in one focus group, “I mean we have some [friends] that have come back on the Third Friday and sit down and we will finish off a bottle of wine in the shop and get schnockered and these are tourists.” Of the three factors of emotional solidarity, emotional closeness had the lowest mean among Beaufort County residents ($M = 4.36, SD = 1.58$).

Focus group participants also communicated that they embraced tourists and welcomed them to Beaufort County. Residents communicated that they felt a greater sense of pride about the area and that the community benefits socially and economically from tourists being in the county. An inn owner from Beaufort claimed,

The more people that are around, the more vibrant it feels…When you walk down the waterfront park and you see every one of the swings being swung, it just makes you feel good that everyone is enjoying your town.

Typically within the tourism research, residents have communicated their support or approval of tourists and the accompanying development given their dependence on the industry for income. Both Lankford and Howard (1994) and Snaith and Haley (1995) found that those employed in the tourism industry had a more positive impression of tourism. Perdue et al. (1990) found a significant relationship between perceived personal benefits (i.e., employment) from tourism and more positive attitudes of the industry. Beyond the individual level, McGehee and Andereck (2004) found that community
dependence on tourism was a significant predictor of residents’ support of tourism. Within the current study, of the three factors of emotional solidarity, welcoming of visitors had the highest mean among Beaufort County residents ($M = 5.81, SD = 1.08$).

Interesting findings resulted from the development of the four scales as well as from data analysis of the on-site surveys. Upon completing three rounds of factor analysis (two exploratory and one confirmatory) on the four scales within the study, the same 10 dimensions resulted. While an item or two switched dimensions and some were removed with weak loadings or because they were cross-loading, the overall dimensions never changed and the final confirmatory factor analysis model had near perfect fit (i.e., $CFI = 0.96$ and $RMSEA = 0.04$). In addition, Cronbach alphas for the 10 dimensions were all over the accepted 0.70 cutoff (with most over 0.80) for newly developed scales (Lance et al., 2006; Nunnally, 1978), indicating strong reliability.

In a discussion regarding the appropriateness of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, Hurley, Scandura, Schriesheim, Brannick, Seers, Vandenberg, and Williams (1997) claim that if sample size is large enough, many times the statistical outcomes of exploratory and confirmatory factor will not likely be different. In a study examining destination image, Kim and Yoon (2003) developed a second-order model of destination image (as the second-order factor) with affective image and cognitive image (as the first-order factors) using an exploratory factor analysis. What Chen and Hsu found was that through using confirmatory factor analysis, the same model resulted (with identical items loading on first-order factors) with adequate fit indices (i.e., Adjusted goodness-of-fit or $GFI = 0.94$ and $RMSEA = 0.04$).
Similar findings resulted from the work of Chen and Hsu (2001) in their development of a scale of riverboat gaming impact. The authors initially determined that five factors resulted from an exploratory factor analysis. After a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted, Chen and Hsu found that the same five factors resulted with only two items removed from the scale. In addition, the model fit indices showed a good fit of the data (i.e., goodness of fit index or GFI = 0.90 and root mean-square residual or RMR = 0.04).

One interesting fact regarding the sample population of individuals who took the survey was that residents on average experienced a relatively high level of emotional solidarity with tourists in Beaufort County ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.07$). In numerous studies regarding resident attitudes toward tourism, research has shown the support or positive attitudes residents have for tourism despite potential negative impacts (Wall, 1997). Such reported positive attitudes include an improved quality of life (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; McCool & Martin, 1994; Perdue et al., 1990), greater employment opportunities in the community (Ap, 1992; Davis et al., 1988), and improved standard of living (Andereck et al., 2005; Gilbert & Clark, 1997; Johnson, Snepenger, & Akis, 1994). However, none of the studies mentioned measured the feelings residents have towards tourists and the degree of emotional solidarity they feel with such visitors.

The three dimensions of emotional solidarity all had corresponding high mean scores: welcoming of visitors ($M = 5.81$, $SD = 1.08$), sympathetic understanding ($M = 4.51$, $SD = 1.28$), and emotional closeness ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 1.58$). Each dimension has high reliabilities (greater than 0.70) as Nunnally (1977) would argue. From the CFA
measurement model, the maximal weighted alphas for welcoming of visitors, sympathetic understanding, and emotional closeness were 0.846, 0.906, and 0.879, respectively. In addition, factor loadings for each of the three dimensions of emotional solidarity from the confirmatory factor analysis ranged from 0.513 to 0.940. This indicates that items are highly correlated with the factors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). As Fornell and Larcker (1981) claim, a factor loading of at least 0.70 is ideal. However, Comrey and Lee (1992) claim the range, 0.30 to 0.50 is acceptable for factor loadings.

Numerous authors of scale development studies concerning resident attitudes and impacts have reported meeting the criteria as outlined by Comrey and Lee (1992) and Fornell and Larcker (1981). Of interest however is that studies employing an exploratory factor analysis (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Choi & Sirakaya, 2005; Lankford & Howard, 1994) yielded lower factor loadings (most under 0.80) than those employing confirmatory factor analysis (Chen & Hsu, 2001) with most loadings over 0.80. This is similar to what was found in the current study. Further, both exploratory factor analyses yielded lower factor loadings than those from the confirmatory factor analysis. This can be explained by the fact that CFA requires better indicators reflective of dimensions in order to move the model closer to a near-perfect or perfect fit (which is reflected in the fit indices) (Byrne, 2006; Kline, 2005).

The final structural regression model testing Durkheim’s theory of emotional solidarity did in fact have a near perfect fit (CFI = 0.946, RMSEA = 0.043). Many researchers who used structural equation modeling examining resident attitudes have reported models with near-perfect fit. Gursoy, Jurowski, and colleagues have reported
near-perfect model fit in studies concerning nested models of resident attitudes (Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002), distance effects on resident attitudes (Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004), and host community support for tourism (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). Respective CFI scores for the three studies were 0.96, 0.95, and 0.98. RMSEA scores for the three scores were respectively, 0.032, 0.040, and 0.014. Ko and Stewart (2002) reported a lower, yet acceptable model fit (GFI = 0.926, RMSEA = 0.058) in their study examining residents’ attitudes to additional development.

In addition to the excellent fit (CFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.04) for the Durkheim model, each of the three constructs (interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior) were all significant predictors ($p < 0.05$) of emotional solidarity. Each construct had a positive relationship with emotional solidarity, with one caveat. The effect of the second-order factor shared behavior was actually suppressed (given that correlations with emotional solidarity were all positive) by first-order factors, cultural-heritage activities and local patronage, causing the second-order factor to reverse its sign. However the two first-order factors had a significant positive relationship with emotional solidarity. While suppression may be a common occurrence within tourism studies, there has been little mention of its presence within the tourism literature.

Within the Durkheim model, the construct shared beliefs was a significant positive predictor of emotional solidarity. The focus on common beliefs between resident and tourist throughout the tourism literature has been minimal, with almost no mention of the way representatives from each party feels about the other. For instance, Laxson (1991) mentions the reverence that both residents and tourists feel for particular Native
American ritual dances in the Southeast United States. Sherlock (2001) spoke of residents and tourists peacefully coexisting in northeastern Australia where each group sought escape and refuge in a seaside tropical retreat. Fredline and Faulkner (2002) found that residents who supported a major motorsport event in Australia held the most similar views of tourists—primarily that they held the highest level of interest in motor racing as a sport. Cohen (1996) and his work on hill tribes and hunter-gatherer groups in Thailand showcased how both residents and tourists share the belief that living in harmony with nature, escaping developed contemporary society, and getting back to deep cultural roots is important to life.

The construct interaction was also a positive significant predictor of emotional solidarity. Other researchers have found similar results. Prentice et al. (1994) found in a study of tourists in South Wales that tourists may be endeared to a destination or inhabitants through informal social interactions such as chatting with local residents and participating in everyday social activities with residents. Sheldon and Var (1984) determined that residents felt the more frequent visitors had the least negative impact on their society. Similar findings were found in the work by Rothman (1978) that found when repeat visitors’ encounters are frequent, intimate social relations exist between residents and tourists.

Of the four first-order factors of shared behavior (all of which were mentioned frequently by focus group participants), neither beach activities nor outdoor recreation activities were significant predictors of emotional solidarity. However sharing cultural-heritage and local patronage activities with tourists were positive significant predictors
for residents forming a greater degree of emotional solidarity with visitors. Attending
cultural-heritage special event together has sought to strengthen the bond between
residents and tourists (Derrett, 2003; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Fredline & Faulkner,
2002). While engaging in local patronage activities in the way of shopping and dining has
also brought residents and tourists together within tourism destinations.

The variance explained in emotional solidarity within the Durkheim model was
modest at 22.3%. Such explained variance is expected in initial model testing studies
(Byrne, 2006). Other studies with established constructs (i.e., residents’ attitude) have
higher explained variances within their models. Models that Gursoy and Rutherford
(2004) and Gursoy et al. (2002) examined respectively explained 62% and 44% of the
variance in the construct, residents’ support for tourism. Lindberg and Johnson (1997)
found their comparable structural model explained 42% of the variance in residents’
attitudes.

Adding predictor variables (i.e., length of residency, age, economic dependency
on tourism, and recent travel experience outside Beaufort County) to the final Durkheim
model proved to be futile. The model fit was not improved across either incremental (i.e,
CFI) or absolute (i.e., RMSEA) fit indices. Further, none of the four additional variables
were significant predictors of emotional solidarity, and as a result did not explain a
greater variance in emotional solidarity beyond the Durkheim model. Numerous studies
(see Johnson et al., 1994; Lankford, 1994; Liu & Var, 1986; McCool & Martin, 1994;
Perdue et al., 1990; Sirakaya et al., 2002; Tosun, 2002) involving residents’ attitudes
toward tourism have highlighted the lack of consistent relationships between
demographic and socio-demographic variables and tourism attitudes as McGehee and Andereck (2004) pointed out. This finding has been echoed by Harrill (2004) in his article concerning a review of resident attitudes research. Harrill highlights how resident attitudes studies have produced a plethora of mixed findings across variables such as socioeconomic factors, spatial factors, and economic dependency.

Examining differences across the three dimensions also proved somewhat futile. Only dependence on tourism and previous travel experience were significant across three dimensions of emotional solidarity. Residents with a high dependence on tourism felt the highest degree of emotional closeness with tourists. In addition, residents with a high dependence on tourism also felt they welcomed tourists most within the community. This finding has been affirmed by the research in resident attitudes towards tourism conducted by Harrill and Potts (2003), Lankford (1994), Long et al. (1990), McGehee and Andereck (2004), Martin et al. (1998), Perdue et al. (1990), Pizam (1978), Rothman (1978), and Tyrrell and Spaulding (1984). What these studies have shown is that those who stand to benefit personally from tourism or those who are dependent on tourism will view tourism in a positive light (Harrill, 2004). However none of the above studies consider how residents who are dependent on tourism as a means of income actually feel about tourist personally.

Differences in sympathetic understanding, emotional closeness, and welcoming of visitors were also found across residents’ travel experience over the past two years. Residents who had taken the most trips over the past two years scored highest on each of the three dimensions of emotional solidarity. This indicates that residents who travel the
most have the greatest sympathetic understanding for tourists, feel the closest to tourists, and welcome tourists the most. Milne, Grekin, and Woodley (1998) found that travel experience generates memories that tourists take back home with them, which will influence not only their own perceptions of place, but also those of friends, relatives, and others” (p. 102). In a sense, residents who have traveled a lot are just more likely to understand and relate to tourists visiting their own community.

Empirically the relationship between residents’ travel experience and their attitudes towards tourists has not been tested. This may be largely a function of the type of studies conducted concerning residents’ attitudes; involving 1st world travelers to rural tourist destinations, many of which are international (see Belisle and Hoy, 1980; Keogh, 1990; King, Pizam, & Milman, 1993; Ko & Stewart, 2002; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Teye et al., 2002). As a result, it may be that fewer rural residents have personally experienced traveling. Of those occurring among residents and tourists in 1st world countries, researchers (e.g., Andereck et al., 2005; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Gursoy et al., 2002; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; Lankford, 1994; Lankford & Howard, 1994; Long et al., 1990; McCool & Martin, 1994; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Perdue et al., 1990; Pizam, 1978; Tyrrell and Spaulding, 1984) have neglected to include travel experience as a predictor variable of residents’ attitudes.

None of the demographic variables (i.e., age) or the remaining socio-demographic (i.e., retirement status, length of residency, and place of birth) and travel experience variables (i.e., prior vacation experience in the county) were significant across the three dimensions. Again, it should be mentioned that demographic and socio-demographic
variables as predictors have led to a plethora of mixed findings and many of which were non-significant in resident attitudes research (see Harrill, 2004; McGehee & Andereck, 2004).

Finally, it appears that residents felt the highest degree of sympathetic understanding with and welcomed family tourists (i.e., those visiting family in Beaufort County or those visiting area with family) the most of any other group of tourist in Beaufort County. In a study examining family tourists and their endearment to residents, Prentice et al. (1994) found that 87.8% of visitors claimed local residents welcomed them to the area. Andereck and Jun (2004) asked residents to rate tourist markets (e.g., RVers, group tourists, sport fishers, business travelers, VFR, snowmobilers, etc.) by the impact these market segments had on residents’ quality of life and economic livelihood. What the authors found was that those tourists visiting friends and relatives garnered consistent positive ratings on both the quality of life and economic impacts of residents.

Far lower mean scores of the two dimensions of emotional solidarity were found for second homeowners. Rothman (1978) found in a study of two Delaware resort communities that permanent residents on the whole felt second homeowners did impact the community negatively, and found themselves avoiding certain areas frequented by second homeowners, altering their behavior (Rothman, 1978). This was exactly what focus group participants mentioned in knowing what places (e.g., Lowe’s, the grocery store, popular restaurants, etc.) to avoid during busy times of the summer (i.e., weekends).
While second homeowners can be economically beneficial to a tourist destination, the disconnect between permanent residents and second homeowners has been well documented not only in the context of physical separation of homes within an area, but also the social separation within the community (Halseth, 1998). Permanent residents have been found to view seasonal homeowners as outsiders because they do not spend the entire year within an area (Jordan, 1980). In addition, seasonal residents are left out of critical local events which can occur during times of the year when they would not be at their second home (Woosnam, 2003). Clandenning (2004) pointed out that in the back of many permanent residents’ minds is the idea that the cultural fabric of the community is in jeopardy with an influx of second homeowners. Despite these points, seasonal residents have been known to develop social ties and create lasting friendships with permanent residents, and the presence of social ties can prompt such seasonal residents to eventually relocate there (McHugh, 1990; McHugh & Mings, 1996).

Implications

Theoretical

This study offers a new theoretical approach to examining the relationships between residents and tourists in destinations. To date the research in this realm has largely been atheoretical or has applied limited theoretical frameworks (e.g., social exchange theory, growth machine theory, and community attachment) as Harrill (2004) claims. Within the current study, Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model is supported in the context of tourism regarding relations between residents and tourists. However the competing nested model with demographic, socio-demographic, and travel experience
variables added did not contribute to any greater variance beyond Durkheim’s model. This line of research will require more model-testing across different settings and communities to determine whether it will produce consistent results or mixed results as the traditionally used theories have (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Harrill, 2004).

Empirical support for the movement beyond the traditional conceptualization of relationships between residents and tourists is also a result of this study. It is apparent that many researchers feel the relationship can be superficial (de Kadt, 1979; Jafari, 1989; Krippendorf, 1999; Sutton, 1967), based on financial transactions where there is a disparity in power and wealth between groups (Mason, 2006; Nettekoven, 1979; UNESCO, 1976), where residents view tourists as the “other” and vice versa (Evans-Pritchard, 1989; Krippendorf, 1999; Laxson, 1991; MacCannell, 1999; McNaughton, 2006; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; Smith, 1989; Urry, 1994; Van Den Berghe, 1994; Wearing & Wearing, 2001). From the study it is evident that some relationships between resident and tourist are quite deep in nature as friendships have evolved and people feel an emotional closeness with some tourists. In essence, residents do not see tourists as the “other” as once suspected. In addition, the disparity in power and wealth between residents and tourists is weakened as members of both groups claimed to participate in activities together throughout the county.

It is apparent from this study that residents and tourists within a particular destination share more than a geographic space with one another. Residents and tourists may have similar beliefs, participate in common behaviors, and interaction with each
other throughout the entire year. These commonalities serve to foster a deeper emotional relationship between each party, which has been alluded to by numerous researchers (e.g., McIntosh, 1998; Pizam et al., 2000; Wearing & Wearing, 2001).

The perspective of a deeper relationship between resident and tourist is far more common in the works of researchers throughout Europe and Australia (see Beeton, 2006; Kohn, 1997; Mowforth & Munt, 1998; Sofield, 2003). It is the hope that this research will be a springboard for researchers in these countries to further examine the relationship between residents and tourists using the framework of emotional solidarity. Further, research conducted within North America needs to transcend the traditional examination of residents’ attitudes of tourism and development (much of which is atheoretical and inconclusive), neglecting the emotional connections between the parties. Emotional solidarity offers an outlet for this to occur.

**Practical**

In addition to theoretical implications, a number of practical implications can be drawn from this study. First and foremost is the importance of educating the numerous destination management organizations (DMOs) of the high degree of emotional solidarity (with corresponding dimensions of the construct) that residents possess with tourists visiting Beaufort County. Such DMOs include Hilton Head Island-Bluffton Chamber of Commerce and Visitor & Convention Bureau as well as the Beaufort Regional Chamber of Commerce. In turn, the marketing divisions within each of the organizations should seek to educate the public (both residents and tourists) about the emotional connection between the parties. One major way this could occur is through posting an abridged
version of this study (e.g., technical report) on the organizations’ website as a .pdf document for viewing. Another form of education could be a marketing campaign by either DMO that highlights the fact residents understand tourists and welcome them to the county. Pigeon Forge, Tennessee has recently implemented a similar campaign in which local residents appear in ads saying, “Come to my Pigeon Forge.” This will undoubtedly create a sense of hospitality that is a part of the local culture.

DMOs need to promote tourism opportunities in the county that can foster a greater emotional solidarity between residents and tourists. Such opportunities should focus on the cultural resources within Beaufort County where residents and tourists can gather, have more time to interact, and learn from one another. Third Friday in Bluffton is one such example to follow. Of course special events and festivals must be promoted to both residents and tourists. Too often tourists are excluded from off-season scheduling or not encouraged to participate (Jordan, 1980). The best way to foster a sense of appreciation for local culture (e.g., Lowcountry and Gullah) and stimulate greater interaction between residents and tourists would be to promote such special events and festivals (Derrett, 2003). Ultimately, deeper relationships will ensue.

Sustainable tourism opportunities also need to be a focus of marketing Beaufort County to visitors and residents alike. Such opportunities would provide jobs for local inhabitants, yet have little negative impact on the social-cultural and environmental fabric of the county. Examples include a greater promotion of history and the arts as well as ecotourism ventures such as guided tours. After all, two major beliefs that residents claimed they shared with tourists were an appreciation for the culture of the Lowcountry
and the natural beauty of Beaufort County. Promoting these opportunities could increase the likelihood that more residents and tourists share such appreciation for culture and the natural beauty in Beaufort County. This in turn would potentially lead to a greater presence of emotional solidarity across residents and tourists.

In the way of planning, DMOs and city and county government bodies should consult with two main types of residents throughout the community to better plan for tourism. These types of residents would be those who have traveled extensively (as people who have the highest emotional solidarity with tourists) and those who are least dependent on tourism (as people who have the lowest emotional solidarity with tourists). It would be important to have these types of individuals in a room with their divergent perspectives discussing the future of tourism in Beaufort County.

Limitations

Findings from this study should be interpreted with some degree of caution. This is due to four main limitations. First, while sample size for each of the two pilot studies was adequate based on Rea and Parker’s (1997) recommendations, others have suggested the need for larger samples. For example, Rummel (1970) suggests an item-response ratio of 1:4. More conservatively, Schwab (1980) recommends a ratio of 1:10.

Second, criterion validity scores across the ten dimensions in the second EFA were low. It should be noted that this is one of the most difficult forms of validity to receive high correlations among measures (Churchill, 1977). It is difficult enough to find external criterion that relates to a measure at hand (Babbie, 2005), let alone find
significant relationships between the variables that would indicate a high degree of criterion validity (Churchill, 1977; Snepenger et al., 2001).

Third, the second-order factor, shared behavior was suppressed by its first-order factors, cultural-heritage activities and local patronage activities. The result of this net suppression, or negative suppression as Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) call it, was that the parameter coefficient from shared behavior to emotional solidarity had a reversed sign and the overall effect size could have been slightly inflated. In order to combat this, additional studies utilizing the model will need to be conducted to see if such suppression recurs.

Finally, a small degree of variance in emotional solidarity was explained in testing Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model. Undoubtedly the nested models of resident attitudes that appear in the works of Gursoy et al. (2002), Gursoy and Rutherford (2004), and Jurowski and Gursoy (2004) explained a greater degree of variance in resident attitudes with subsequent model testing. This is the expectation of model testing for novel constructs in the field of tourism research.

Future Research

Numerous research endeavors can be pursued from this study. Emotional solidarity was examined in this study from the perspective of residents of Beaufort County. Research needs to be conducted that focuses on the construct from the tourists’ perspectives in Beaufort County. It would be interesting to determine if tourists’ reported emotional solidarity with residents is as high as it was for residents in this study. In addition, studies that examine emotional solidarity simultaneously from both the
residents’ and the tourists’ perspectives need to occur. Such research will help determine if emotional solidarity that residents feel with tourists is reported higher or lower than the emotional solidarity that tourists feel with residents.

More research is needed to build this model with additional predictors of emotional solidarity. It was apparent that the demographic, socio-demographic, and travel experience variables considered in this study were not the best at predicting emotional solidarity. Perhaps more social contextual variables pertaining to the community would help explain a greater degree of variance in emotional solidarity. Such variables might include congruency between a particular region residents reside and where tourists are from, congruency between resident and tourist supported political party, congruency between resident and tourist religious affiliation, and perspectives of environmental and social-cultural impacts of tourism (from both residents’ and tourists’ perspectives). Perhaps a greater congruency between residents and tourists would translate to a higher degree of emotional solidarity possessed by both parties.

In addition to future research regarding antecedents of emotional solidarity, studies should be conducted examining potential outcomes of emotional solidarity. This line of research will also extend Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model. One such potential outcome includes the subjective well-being or satisfaction with life (SWL) of both residents and tourists alike. The SWL scale created by Deiner, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) would be an ideal measure. Another potential dependent variable of emotional solidarity could be the degree of community attachment both residents and tourists feel which has been used in numerous studies within the tourism field (see
Gursoy et al., 2002; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Jurowski & Gursoy, 2004; McCool & Martin, 1994). Finally, it would be of interest to examine how well emotional solidarity would predict to what degree residents would embrace or withdraw from tourists in their community (see Snepenger et al. 2001).

Studies should also be conducted that examine emotional solidarity in additional community contexts where tourism is in different developmental stages. Such research should utilize Butler’s (1980) life-cycle which highlights the numerous stages a tourist destination moves through over time. Those stages are: exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation, rejuvenation, and decline. The ultimate goal of this line of research would be to determine if stage influences the degree of emotional solidarity between residents and tourists. With that said, studies across multiple tourist destinations at different points on Butler’s life-cycle curve would provide the most insight.

The current study has considered emotional solidarity within a moderately rural tourist destination (by United States standards) in a developed country involving residents and tourists with similar cultural experiences and perspectives. It would be of great interest to conduct additional studies testing the Durkheim (1995[1915]) model in international settings, namely with residents of developing countries and tourists from developed countries. Such studies should occur where resident and tourist backgrounds (e.g., demographic, socio-demographic, and travel experience) are potentially more disparate.
Conclusion

This study involved examining the phenomenon of emotional solidarity using an exploratory sequential mixed methods design. It was hypothesized through the application of Emile Durkheim’s model of emotional solidarity that the more residents within a particular area share behavior, beliefs, and interact with tourists, the greater the likelihood they will experience a higher degree of emotional solidarity with such visitors. Data from three separate focus groups involving residents of Beaufort County, South Carolina aided in the development of the scales for each of the four constructs within Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model. Two pilot tests were conducted with the scale items along with exploratory factor analysis. Scales indicated high reliability and validity across all dimensions within each construct.

An onsite self-administered questionnaire was distributed to randomly selected households of permanent residents within Beaufort County. Through using structural equation modeling techniques, Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model was supported explaining approximately 25% of the variance in emotional solidarity. While this percentage is low compared to other studies within the field, the study does show support for an emotional relationship that develops between residents and tourists within a tourist destination. It should be noted that this was an initial exploratory study of emotional solidarity; the first of many to come.

Results from this study serve as a jumping off point for more research concerning the emotional solidarity that residents and tourists feel for one another. With continued support for Durkheim’s (1995[1915]) model in various contexts, hopefully critics of the
relationship between parties will begin to understand the overlap or commonalities that exist between residents and tourists. After all, we are all humans capable of seeing beyond ourselves and understanding others.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Gatekeepers Who Provided Names of Individuals to Contact in Beaufort County

Catherine Hipp
Tourism Marketing Manager
Greater Beaufort Chamber of Commerce

Liz Mitchell
Tourism Director
Greater Beaufort Chamber of Commerce

John Salazar, Ph.D.
Associate Professor and Director of Lowcountry & Resort Islands Tourism Institute
University of South Carolina-Beaufort (South Campus)

Bob Guinn
Senior Extension Agent—Beaufort County, SC
Clemson University

Susan Thomas
Vice President
Hilton Head Island-Bluffton Visitor & Convention Bureau

Joy Sharp
Marketing Manager
Hilton Head Island-Bluffton Visitor & Convention Bureau

Brenda Ciapanna
Marketing and Government Coordinator
Hilton Head Island-Bluffton Visitor & Convention Bureau

Sally LaPointe
Director
Penn Center At-Risk Family Initiative Community Outreach; University of South Carolina-Beaufort (North Campus)
Appendix B

Phone Recruitment Script for Potential Focus Group Participants

Ms. _____________, hello! My name is Kyle Woosnam and I am a Doctoral Student at Clemson University conducting my dissertation in Beaufort County. I received your name from ____________ as someone who has expert knowledge of tourists in Beaufort County. My study concerns county residents’ feelings towards tourists in the area. I am conducting a series of focus groups in the county with residents concerning their interactions with tourists and feelings they have for visitors and was wondering if you are available to attend on ____________ (date) at __________ (time) at the _____________ (location). The focus group will consist of 6-9 people and last 1-2 hours. I will pay you $25, provide lunch and refreshments, and have Clemson University t-shirts for everyone. Will you be able to attend?
Appendix C

Recruitment Letter for Potential Focus Group Participants

April 2, 2007

John D. Rockefeller
1002 Azaela Hill Dr.
Beaufort, SC 29906

Dear John D. Rockefeller,

Thank you for accepting our invitation to attend the focus group at ________________
(location) in _________ (town) on _______________ (date). The _______________ (location) is
located on ___________ (road) on the __________ (side) of town. The street address is
_________________. A map is included of the location to help you with directions. We would
like you to be our guest for lunch, which will begin at ____________ (time). The discussion will
follow the meal and will conclude by ________ (time).

Since we are talking to a limited number of people, the success and quality of our discussion is
based on the cooperation of the people who attend. Because you have accepted our invitation,
your attendance at the session is anticipated and will aid in making the research project a success.

The purpose of these focus groups is to solicit your feelings of tourists visiting your community
in Beaufort County. The focus groups will be led by a facilitator and will involve open
discussions among participants. The emphasis of the focus groups will be a discussion of the
interaction you have with tourists, your experience as a tourist (outside Beaufort County), your
participation in local tourism opportunities, and your overall feelings towards tourists in Beaufort
County. Your input will be used to help develop a survey that will be distributed at a later date to
a representative sample of Beaufort County residents to determine their feelings towards tourists
within the county. Your responses will be tape-recorded to help with analysis, however your
participation will remain confidential and your names will not be used in any write-up or
distributed to anyone.

At the conclusion of the session we will be passing out a form for you to fill out your address so
we can mail you a check for $25.00. In addition to this, Clemson University merchandise will be
given to you as well as lunch and refreshments.

If for some reason you find you are not able to attend, please call or email me to let me know as
soon as possible. My phone number is 864.653.0167 and email is woosnam@clemson.edu.

We look forward to seeing you on ____________ (date).

Sincerely,

Kyle M. Woosnam
Doctoral Candidate
Appendix D

Potential Focus Group Interview Questions Script

Opening
Please tell us your name, a little about yourself, and how long you have lived in B. Co.

Introduction
What is tourism to you?
What do tourists do in Beaufort County?
What are they in BC to experience?
What types of tourists are they? (day-trippers, cultural tourists, business traveler, short-term house renter, family vacationers, recreational tourists)

****ES scale distribution****

Emotional Solidarity
How do you feel (both good and bad feelings) when you think of or see tourists in Beaufort County? And why do you feel this way?

Shared Behavior
What sorts of activities, behavior, and other things do you and tourists do together in the County?
For entertainment, pleasure, and enjoyment (shop, eat together, movies, to the beach, festivals, museums, attend church, etc.)

Shared Beliefs
What do you and tourists both value about Beaufort County?
What beliefs do you feel you have in common with tourists?

Interaction
Describe the interactions you have with tourists (positive or negative)? Are they personal or less intimate?
Where do you interact with tourists most?
When (time of year) do you typically interact with tourists?
How long do most interactions with tourist last?
Have you established friendships with tourists over the years? Have they continued?

Resident characteristics
For those who were not born and raised here, do you have any experience visiting BC prior to moving here?
How often do you take vacations? Where do you visit?
Are you employed in a field that is linked to tourism in some way? What field?
Closing

That is all the questions that we have for you. Is there anything we missed or anything you would like to add?
Appendix E

Information Letter for Focus Group Participants

Title of the Study:
Beaufort County residents’ feelings about visitors to the area

Investigator:
This study is being conducted by William Norman, Ph.D. (Principal Investigator) and Kyle Woosnam (co-investigator), doctoral candidate in the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management at Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina. William Norman can be reached at (864) 656-3400. Kyle Woosnam can be reached at (864) 656-1031.

I. Study purpose
• The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between residents and tourists in Beaufort County in terms of emotional solidarity.

II. What will I have to do?
• Participate in an interview, answer questions about your experiences in the community, and tell the interviewer the stories surrounding those experiences.
• The interview will last between one and three hours.
• The interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis.
• You will be contacted to see if you would like to review a summary of the findings.

III. Benefits of this project
• You will be compensated for your time as stated below.
• You will be communicating your stories surrounding your community and tourists to the area.
• Ultimately your knowledge will lead to better tourism planning within Beaufort County and relationships between residents and tourists in the area.
• You will be helping the researcher complete a dissertation for fulfillment of a Doctorate of Philosophy from Clemson University.

IV. Is it private?
• Your name will not be used in the final report of this study or any other written publication, but rather fictitious names so as to protect your identity. Only the researcher and his faculty advisors will have access to the raw data collected.
• The information you share will be considered your stories of the study site and will aid in presenting the researcher with your experiences which explain how
residents feel about tourists and tourism in Beaufort County. Your responses will be reported in the final write up.

V. Risks
- There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study.

VI. Compensation
- You will receive refreshments, a meal, a $25 stipend, and Clemson University merchandise for participating.
- When the project is complete, you may request a summary of the studies’ findings.

VII. Freedom to withdraw
- If at any time you change your mind about participating in this study, you are encouraged to withdraw and cancel your participation. Also, if you are uncomfortable answering any questions, you are encouraged to decline to answer such questions.

VIII. Approval of research
- This research project is under consideration for approval by the Institutional Review Board of Clemson University and by the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management.

IX. Contact information
- Should I have questions about this research I will contact:

  Kyle Woosnam (864) 656-1031 Researcher/Interviewer
  Dr. William Norman (864) 656-3400 Faculty Advisor
Appendix F

Phase One Timeline

Below is the initial timeline set for collection and analysis of data from focus group interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (Week)</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 12-March 4 (Weeks 1-3)</td>
<td>Contact gatekeepers in Beaufort County to inform of study and receive list of potential focus group participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5-April 8 (Weeks 4-8)</td>
<td>Scout out potential meeting places for focus groups; set up meeting dates and times; contact potential assistant moderator for focus groups and confirm his/her participation in focus groups; finalize recruitment letter and return postcard to potential group participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9-April 22 (Weeks 9-10)</td>
<td>Mail recruitment letter and return postcard to potential participants; confirming participation, tying up loose ends with planning focus groups; deadline for participants reserving spot for focus group; send out confirmation letter and directions to focus group to each participant who agreed for Hilton Head Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23 (Week 11)</td>
<td>Conduct on-site focus group (Hilton Head Island—April 28th); send out confirmation letter and directions to focus group for Bluffton participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30 (Week 12)</td>
<td>Conduct on-site focus group (Bluffton—May 5th); send out confirmation letter and directions to focus group for Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7 (Week 13)</td>
<td>Data transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14 (Week 14)</td>
<td>Conduct on-site focus group (Beaufort—May 19th); data transcription and coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21 (Week 15)</td>
<td>Data coding and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 28 (Week 16)</td>
<td>Data coding and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4 (Week 17)</td>
<td>Data analysis and theme formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11 (Week 18)</td>
<td>Inter-rater reliability tests; final theme formulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Phase Two Timeline

Below is an initial timeline for developing a scale of emotional solidarity and pilot-testing the scale. As indicated by dates, weeks 1-18 (as found in Appendix F) involve focus group data collection and analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (Week)</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 18 (Week 19)</td>
<td>Generate scale items for ES and predictors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25-July 8 (Weeks 20 and 21)</td>
<td>Expert panel assess items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9 (Week 22)</td>
<td>Pilot-test scales as instrument (PRTM courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 16 (Week 23)</td>
<td>Reliability tests, validity tests, and norm development of scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23-August 5 (Weeks 24 and 25)</td>
<td>Pilot-test instrument using sub-sample of population; finalize draft of survey; revise questions and format of questions; print questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix H

Tally Sheet used in Onsite Self-administered Survey Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Address and Notes</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>1st return complete</th>
<th>2nd return complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer Not Perm</td>
<td>Decline Distributed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
Appendix I

On-site Survey Verbal Recruitment Script

The following is an example of the potential verbal script that will be used by the co-investigator and graduate students to recruit potential participants for the on-site self-administered survey.

“Hello, I am ___________ (researcher’s name) with Clemson University and we are conducting a study examining Beaufort County residents’ feelings regarding tourists in the area. Your household has been randomly selected for our study. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Participation is entirely voluntary; responses will remain entirely confidential, and will not be linked to individuals in any way. You may stop or withdraw your participation from this survey at any point. Would the person with the most recent birthday over the age of 18 like to participate?”
Appendix J

Postcard Distributed to On-site Survey Participants

The following is an example of the potential postcard to be given to participants prior to completing the on-site survey.

---

**Study of Beaufort County residents’ feelings about visitors to the area**

Hello and thank you for your time. A study is being conducted by Clemson University that seeks to understand the relationships between residents and tourists in Beaufort County. Your input is very valuable to us. Because of this, your responses will remain strictly confidential and your name and address will not be linked to your responses in any way. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study please contact William Norman (Principal Investigator) at 864.656.2060 or wnorman@clemson.edu or Kyle Woosnam (Co-Investigator) at 864.656.1031 or woosnam@clemson.edu. You may also contact the Clemson University Office of Research Compliance at 864.656.6460 if you have questions regarding your rights as research participants. Once again we thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Sincerely,

Kyle Woosnam
Appendix K

Phase Three Timeline

Below is the initial timeline set for collection of data from surveys. As indicated by dates, weeks 19-25 (as found in Appendix G) involve scale development and pilot-testing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (Week)</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 6 (Week 26) <strong>Saturday August 11th</strong></td>
<td>On-site data collection at the coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13 (Week 27) <strong>Saturday August 18th</strong></td>
<td>On-site data collection at the coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 20 (Week 28) <strong>Saturday August 25th</strong></td>
<td>On-site data collection at the coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27 (Week 29)</td>
<td>Labor Day week—off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 3 (Week 30) <strong>Saturday September 8th</strong></td>
<td>On-site data collection at the coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10 (Week 31) <strong>Saturday September 15th</strong></td>
<td>Develop code book and begin entering data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17 (Week 32) <strong>Saturday September 22nd</strong></td>
<td>Data entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24 (Week 33) <strong>Saturday September 29th</strong></td>
<td>Data entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1 (Week 34)</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8 (Week 35)</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15-November 4 (Weeks 36-38)</td>
<td>Data analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

Common Codes between Qualitative Data Coders Based on Coding Comparison Report

Below is a list of common codes between the two qualitative data coders for each of the six parent nodes. Listed next to each heading is the number of shared codes between researchers for that given parent node. Codes displayed are the actual text as they appeared from focus group transcripts.

Tourist Type-Activity common codes (118 codes)

1. They visit art galleries.
2. They love to eat.
3. They go to the beach.
4. History tours.
5. Yeah, history tours, that is what I was going to say.
6. The park.
7. Waterfront park.
8. And they especially appear to like the horse-drawn carriage rides in the Historic area.
9. Military tourist who comes down every weekend for graduation on Parris Island
10. Destination-oriented folks
11. Military graduation visitors.
12. Day-trippers who come up from Hilton Head
13. They are playing golf
14. To see the historic town of Beaufort.
15. Big tour boats
16. Folks that are staying on Harbor Island or on Fripp…the rentals there tend to be more interested
17. They play golf
18. Interested in cultural and heritage end of it.
19. Fishing
20. Swimming
22. Kayaking
23. Restaurants
24. Art gallery
25. Military visitors
26. Historic tour
27. Go out on a boat and catch cobia
28. Day-trippers
29. Water festival
30. Shrimp festival
31. Vacationers
32. Destination travelers.
33. Swimming
34. Fishing
35. Beaufort County gets a lot of tourists in the summer, but they are mainly going to Hilton Head. Because they are looking for the beach
36. They are the ones with families.
37. A couple of families will get together, rent a condo on Hilton Head and spend time at the beach.
38. Think the Spring and the Fall you get older couples with more discretionary income that are coming to
39. Guys will play golf,
40. Women will go shopping
41. For the people—95% of my guests are interested in the history of the Lowcountry and South Carolina
42. Bus tours
43. Buggy tours
44. Bus groups from Arkansas
45. Senior citizens taking the horse-drawn tour
46. Carriage tours
47. Bus tours.
48. Shrimp Festival
49. Water Festival
50. Film and Chefs Festival
51. Gullah Festival.
52. The Blue Angels always come every year
53. Christian Music Festival down there once a year.
54. Second homeowners
55. A lot of people come for the arts too.
56. Arts events and performances you know people take advantage of that too while they are here, such as the Spring Art Show
57. Art walks now during the year.
58. There is a home tour that goes on in the Fall.
59. People go in the Broad River to catch cobia
60. Shopping.
61. Golfing
62. Golfing
63. Boating
64. Fishing
65. The beach
66. A little bit of touring of the historic sites
67. You get people that come here with the second homes and they stay here for a short while, like one of our neighbors
68. Lots of family vacationers
Lots of golfers
They are actually more a history-oriented or quirky art gallery tourist
The majority of folks that come in have a timeshare on the island
In the fall and the spring, we will get an older crowd that is either golf or history-oriented or not bringing children with them
College kids
Spring Breakers
Traditional sporting activities of tennis and golf
Ecotourism, kayaking,
Shopping
Beach activities
Parasailing and boating
Eating
Miniature golf
Third Friday
Golf
Tennis
Fishing
Now I am thinking that the cultural things are becoming more important.
Well we have lots of plays and we have started a tradition of the Gullah Celebration and that brings in people.
Tourists are participating in the arts center’s activities
Outdoor recreation
We have had people less focused on individual activities…recreation-type activities and more focused on education, getting out and learning about the environment, more focus on learning about the culture and history
Orchestra now has five out of 10 of their concerts duplicated in order to have space for non-season ticket holders.
The beach
A resort
Culture thing
People are migrating more and more for the cultural events.
Summertime it is families. Lots and lots of families.
The golfers
And in the Fall you have the golfers.
February you have the people who are coming to get away from the cold, snow areas.
A lot of business travelers
You have lots of visitors who come to stay with family.
Second-homeowners
Timeshare visitors
Folks who are staying in a hotel
People who are renting a home
College symposium here
And we brought in lots, lots of children and adults here through Special Olympics. People who are coming just for spa weekends. Day trips. International tourists. In the Spring we have influx of Canadian visitors. From the late summer visitors—a large part of them come from New Jersey or New York. Giant groups of folks that visit from Ohio. Sports groups. I know lacrosse, tennis during the college spring breaks have hosted tournaments here or actually Beaufort County rents the facilities to them you know at Barker Field and you know there are lacrosse people everywhere during the day. They come and they have timeshares. Tuesday night at ShelterCove with the fireworks. A lot of boating tourists around Christmas time.

Feelings-emotions towards Tourists common codes (96 codes)

1. We need more things to bring people in.
2. Sometimes there are very elderly people walking around which is fine, but I know I am not going to have a very good day, or at least they are not going to give me a whole lot of business that day. In fact, probably none.
3. I think there are bus groups from Arkansas and church groups or whatever this is not...you know they are not going to make a big impact on us.
4. When I walk or exercise in the historic area, quite often I see primarily senior citizens taking the horse-drawn tour or even taking the walking tour and I personally enjoy seeing them because they are so laid back and relaxed.
5. I really enjoy that on the surface interaction with them.
6. I really enjoy seeing them.
7. Some of them tend to be a little bit rambunctious which happens on vacations.
8. I just enjoy seeing them enjoy our area.
9. I enjoy having them here as long as the kids are not too rowdy.
10. It sort of gives a critical mass to the city.
11. The more people that are around, the more vibrant it feels, the more of a resort it feels.
12. When you walk down the waterfront park and you see every one of the swings being swung, it just makes you feel good that everyone is enjoying your town.
13. And with the exception of some of the visitors from the Waterfest, generally they are positive for the city, not a negative.
14. It just sort of gives the place a little more vibrance.
15. Every now and then I’ll be walking on the street or I’ll be out and I’ll see a group of tourists and I’ll move on and I’ll go, “whoa, I live here.” [laughter].
I think most residents are appreciative of the visitors that come.
I don’t think most of us, at least in my observation and exposure, harbor any resentment for the intrusion or anything like that.
I feel crowded.
And so I think there is a sense of when people see tourists, “we need you, we need these guys here.” That is kind of the sense that I get.
I think there is always the thought in the back of peoples minds that if all of the sudden all that [tourism] went away a lot of people would be in tough straights.
But I have heard the rumbling that we have heard for a time regarding tourists on the Pointe.
I don’t think people like all that traffic in their neighborhood.
If it were up to a majority of the Pointe residents, they would close it to tourists.
It is fine when you see them in the grocery stores
But different when they are driving next to you.
We have too many things to look at and so people are rubbernecking and they are looking for certain things.
We have crowded highways
We don’t have enough access, egress, or all of that and we are new.
So the highways are crowded, some people go too slow and some people go too fast.
Everybody was a tourist at one point in time. Even if they came with their family or whatever.
We don’t like the traffic
And so I like these people [tourists].
I hope they have a good time.
I hope they spend lots of money and keep us all employed.
You cannot blame them for rubbernecking because
The nice thing about living here is that the signs can only be a certain height, certain color, and things like that. So it is not that easy to find things until you are here for a while.
I can understand why it is difficult for them to find places at times.
Don’t go to Lowe’s on a Saturday until after like four o’clock. Because Saturday, just like you were talking about [pointing to #4], you learn the times...Saturdays are check-out and check-in...
So if you are going to go to Lowe’s or one store on the side, you are stuck forever coming back out and it is the only way back out.
So you are a tourist sometimes too and you don’t where you are going.
If it wasn’t for tourists, they wouldn’t be here at all. Because there wouldn’t be any development. There would be a few people out on the island I suppose and that is it. So that is what tourists mean to me.
I’ve been working with tourists since I was in college and they help put me through college. So, yes we do appreciate them, their presence.
44. I find that there is almost a lack of appreciation for the area. It is almost like they are here, but they want to make it something else. They say, “why do y’all do this this way, or why is this this way?”
45. I feel like there is kind of a subtle disrespect for…or a lack of appreciation for the area that we share.
46. I appreciate them coming here, living here, the revenue, the growth, and things like that.
47. You cannot blame them in one sense, but in another sense it is a lack of appreciation for the place where they are living. But I don’t think it is just for here.
48. Everything is crowded.
49. I mean it is crowded because of you.
50. Personally I love them.
51. I think they are great.
52. Yeah there are a few that jackasses. There are a whole group of jackasses down here,
53. The tourists that I deal with and I deal with them everyday, I love them.
54. They are nice people and they are from all over the place.
55. They are decent folks.
56. They are good folks—far better than I was dealing with in other parts of the country.
57. The tourists I think are pretty nice people for the most part.
58. I like them.
59. I appreciate the exchange. I appreciate what I learn from them.
60. We appreciate the tourists that come into our shops.
61. They provide us with a livelihood.
62. Tourism is great.
63. You wouldn’t have that without tourists.
64. They [tourists] are people like us.
65. They like what we like.
66. We are here for the same reasons they are.
67. I have never had a bad experience with tourists.
68. I have never had a bad experience with tourists. in fact, I have had some great times
69. I have to on that one with the ladies, but they [tourists] are just absolutely sweethearts.
70. I say at one time before I got into the tour business, [laughter] I drove up to my departure point one day and there had been a warning about hurricanes and we had no one to take us, and you know we said, “tourists are really important here.”
71. We do have the problem with accommodating them on highways or streets and crowded restaurants where you personally go
72. And then you have the side of the economy, which tourists contribute to our economy
So, I feel there has to be a balance and the balance has to be you we have to be able to know how to accommodate visitors and the market.

I’m not as bad as my husband who I told you used to have the chart on his dashboard of his truck every time he was blocked in the circle, kept him from being able to turn off.

Whenever I do feel frustration towards a tourist who may not know where they are going or may not be sure where they are going or whatever…I think back to whenever we first moved here and/or when I am a visitor in another town.

So I am certainly not one of those people yelling or screaming at tourists because they are bad drivers or are not sure where they are going, because I remember when we moved here it was very hard to find street signs.

I think the predominant position of retired people living in gated communities is tourists are a bother. I happen to be in the minority view where I can recognize things that exist for my pleasure and my family’s pleasure on the island because of there are tourists.

Look at all the kinds of activities that are available. They are not here to support the permanent residents. They are really here to support tourism and we benefit from it.

Sure I don’t like the traffic coming on and off the island—coming on the island in the morning and going off the island in the afternoon. But if you are reasonable about it, you just say well I am not going to go at that particular time. I’m going to go some other time. It is not so bad.

In the southern part of the island where a majority of the visitors stay and you do think they leave their brains at home. They have children on bikes…babies in these little laying in these little bicycle baskets with no shield on them and the sun is beating on them. And they are on Pope Avenue riding in these bicycles it is a terrible, terrible street. It is a four-lane busy busy street and they don’t pay any attention. And the parents are riding along and they have a two-year old behind them in a little training-wheel bicycle trying to keep up with them and watching them. You just think people leave their brains at home.

I try to remind people all the time when they start complaining about the tourists, I say, we were all…most of us, were all tourists at one time.

Have a little bit more empathy for people out there

We have some really wonderful things here that people have worked at because the tourists continue to provide revenue into this place and we have a really nice place here.

And we continue to do things to promote that and we all benefit from it.

So we should be very careful about how critical we are of tourists.

So for me when I meet tourists and interact, I like to know where they are from and learn more about their city.

I love that aspect of all the tourists that come here, because it gives me a chance to just learn about where they are from and other area. And that has kind of been…I have accepted tourists my whole life being here because of that fact.
I really think that there is a gross misperception towards timeshare visitors, that it is just a generalization of what people have of that experience.

Tourists and residents are good for each other as long as there is enough infrastructure.

Very appreciative of the tourists because we like the way the roads look and things and the enhancements.

We hug them. We say, “come on down, but don’t spend too much time

And in fact, I subconsciously avoid the traffic issues and certain restaurants that are going to be crowded.

I don’t say bad words about the tourists, but sometimes I long for the days

I have made friends of tourists just because of that, because we have things in common.

We do travel and empathize with those visitors looking for places.

All of these people were tourists at one point and came to live here and so now this is home to them. And so they remember when...That is why we are so willing to accept tourists

Shared Behavior between Residents and Tourists (74 codes)

1. I think most obvious is eating out.
2. Specific events held by various organizations held in the downtown area. I think we draw tourists and locals
3. Both are very important to support events.
4. They have the Christian Music Festival down there once a year.
5. Golf
6. Tennis.
7. We go to Hunting Island. We love it.
8. The lighthouse
9. A lot of local folks also have boats, so they are on the river on a beautiful day with beautiful weather.
10. Now visitors might not be able to do that as readily, but they might be able to get a charter or tour somehow.
11. Probably very few of my guests ask for church except if it is a special Easter, Christmas. If they are here during some special religious event—they will go.
12. The second homeowners will maintain a dual church attendance.
13. I know a lot of people come for the arts too.
14. And if there are arts events and performances you know people take advantage of that too while they are here, such as the Spring Art Show that is sponsored by the Beaufort Art Association and it is a big event.
15. There are three to four art walks now during the year. And that is a big draw for the people that are here for the home tours, they also participate in the art walks.
16. Yeah there is a home tour that goes on in the Fall.
And there are plantations all around the area sometimes and the houses in town [for the home tours] but it is really popular. They sell out the event.

Every third Friday they block off Calhoun Street, have vendors, musicians, and performers and it allows people to interact with the local community.

Going to go to Lowe’s

Shopping

The beach.

Beach activities.

The beach.

Beach.

Beach activities.

Shopping.

The beach

Shopping

Parasailing

Boating

Eating.

Miniature golf.

Shop a lot.

Golfing is great

...some of the public ones are actually quite affordable. They really do make it quite affordable to do the back nine.

A lot of dining.

How about church?...Getting crowded.

Are there tourists that also attend the churches with residents?...Oh yes. Yes.

Well Church of the Cross…it is not entirely related to tourism, but if you go back to...they have three services on Saturday.

They visited that part of Calhoun Street and they are inclined to go to church on Sunday they will often pick that one because it is close and attractive.

How about museums, festivals...do you engage in those things along with tourists?...Yeah.

Third Friday

At museums.

Third Friday.

And we mingle with them at the Theater.

For those people who have ever visited Bluffton will remember is an oyster roast on a cold October/November night.

Well we have lots of plays

We have started a tradition of the Gullah Celebration and that brings in people. People that had not been coming prior to that are now coming regularly.

I have also noticed that tourists are participating in the arts center’s activities...big time large numbers at the arts center whenever they put a special event on.
The orchestra now has five out of 10 of their concerts duplicated in order to have space for non-season ticket holders. We have little difficulty getting 600 or 700 to come to those concerts.

The other thing that I notice is church. It is interesting, every week there are always some people who have no connection with the family of the church...they are tourists and seem to enjoy coming to church.

And at the spa I have noticed that there are people who are coming just for spa weekends.

You know just go to a beautiful place to get pampered and walk on the beach. The last few times I have been there I have seen people like that.

Remey’s is a local pub, bar, restaurant.

We went to Harbortown
Went to the museum
Went on tours
We use them—the bike paths
The restaurants
The arts
A shared behavior would be driving. Not so much an activity, but that is really something we are really sharing with the tourist is our transportation.

Go down to the Salty Dog, which is just a really tourist-focused area, a little outdoor café bar with some outdoor entertainment. I love to go into a place like that, because for that hour or two, it is just like, “yeah, I’m on vacation, gotta love it, this is livin.”

There are places there where you can go and buy shrimp right out of the waters.

At the grocery stores
Golf course
Beach
In the grocery stores
Go boating

Shared Beliefs among Residents and Tourists about Beaufort County (40 codes)

1. We are that interesting of a place
2. I really believe Beaufort may be one of the hidden treasures of South Carolina.
3. It is pretty.
4. It is pretty.
5. Appreciation for the Deep South
6. Appreciation for the history of the area.
7. Natural beauty too.
8. Just the old cites and the ruins that people can visit where all of these things happened.
9. Well I keep mentioning the arts because that is what my visitors are after. They cannot believe how many artists are represented by the galleries. There are over 500 artists.
10. And quite often they share their lives as we share our lives.
11. First time I was amazed again with the historical area
12. I just love the historical area
13. I really really appreciate the historical area
14. It is a really unique little spot, especially being centered amongst the natural beauty that is around here
15. A lot of dining. Dining opportunities you wouldn’t have. If you think of how many restaurants there are within a ten-square mile area. A lot of variety too.
16. We have a lot in common with them [tourists] whether we forgot it or not. We are here for the same reasons they are.
17. Well that is what makes this place just so beautiful.
18. It is gorgeous
19. A beautiful sight to me…to me nothing is more beautiful than crossing over the Mackay Creek bridge and seeing that huge flat of oysters out there. To me that is really…that says it all for this area right here I believe.
20. It is beautiful.
21. It really is beautiful.
22. Yeah, the beauty.
23. They marvel at the beauty of it, especially where I work at the visitors’ center—they stare out at the marsh.
24. They are starring out at it and just saying, “aaahhh.” They cannot believe that it is so pristine. They are just shocked by it and are able to enjoy it as much as possible. And I think most of them are respectful of the environment.
25. Do you think tourists appreciate this natural beauty the way you do?...Oh, absolutely.
26. I get a particular feeling when I walk up from the river right at dusk-dark and see the moss moving in the breeze and the palmetto fronds cracking against one another. That is very special.
27. I would say they appreciate it, although it would slightly different. I mean for them it might be, “oh that is pretty.”
28. But I think they do appreciate the history and appreciate the time that people spend in talking to them and trying to share and give them some sort of appreciation of why you live here
29. We have very much the same thoughts as tourists who like to come down
30. I strongly believe the more I can educate people about what we have here surrounding us—the waterways, the wildlife, the history and the culture of the
area—the more I can educate them, the more they can value it and the better off everyone is going to be.

31. I find the common belief in the history and preservation of the island. Many of our visitors who take our tour and talking about the past and conservation district that this island once was—you both yearn for half-way back, wishing we could just be somewhere in-between where we are now and where we were then. There are things we should have saved and we didn’t.

32. History is very important to many of our tourists. It is important to us.

33. We all share the belief of safety for our children. We want to take care of our kids

34. But we do share that safety for our children or our grandchildren

35. You appeal to the safety of their children and their grandchildren. That is something we all share.

36. And the understanding and being educated about the nature around us, I think might also include a respect for that nature and the different creatures we have around here—the sea turtles, the alligators, the snakes. I think education is very important.

37. I would argue that is something we don’t necessarily share with the visitors is the respect. And that is a big part of our process is educating them to share that respect.

38. I try to share, “there are snakes in those bushes and alligators.”

39. I think a shared belief that it is a special place. That is why they have chosen to visit here or buy a home here or buy a timeshare. And that is why we have chosen to live here as well.

40. And don’t you think that people that own their second homes here and aren’t here all the time—they really think they are local. They have the same beliefs we do. They say, “Oh we cannot come down in June, July, and August—it is too busy. We cannot get to our favorite restaurants.”

Interaction between Residents and Tourists (97 codes)

1. I am exposed to a lot of second-homeowners and vacationers who are buying real estate.

2. And of course I deal with tourists on a daily basis.

3. My familiarity with…having being a tourist here initially and occasionally meeting tourists, that that is my exposure to them from a visitors’ point of view.

4. We deal with tourists every day and we love them.

5. I’ll be walking on the street or I’ll be out and I’ll see a group of tourists

6. I have met visitors in church rarely, but I have on probably maybe two times per year I will shake hands with a visitor to town. It happens, but it doesn’t seem to be a regular occasion.

7. Mine are pretty personal because I deal with peoples’ finances and buying houses and so I get pretty involved in their lives for a few weeks, more than they
probably want me to. So yeah it is pretty hands on into what their financial
matters are. Sometimes that makes people back off and sometimes they say, “oh,
you already know about me. I’m coming back.”
8. Certainly my business requires or permits us to get to know our guests pretty well.
And quite often they share their lives as we share our lives.
9. It becomes a friendship of sorts. Some get deeper than others.
10. But certainly our interaction with tourists is personal and upfront…upfront and
personal.
11. People that I see very regularly and they become almost like friends.
12. I feel pretty close to some of them.
13. Most folks are in and out and you don’t even know where they are from. I try to
ask almost everybody where they are from to get some sense of where people are
starting from and why they are here and all of that. So those conversations go on,
they are a little bit superficial, but then there are that small percentage where you
really get to know people pretty well.
14. The lady emailed me earlier this week wanting to know if they could do the three
hour tour
15. You know those folks I met last year they probably spent 45 minutes with me and
this year we are going to spend three hours together.
16. I’m sure we are going to talk about Chicago and what it is like there now. So
there is going to be some interaction.
17. Some folks just breeze through in 30 minutes.
18. At work.
19. I never actually have any personal interaction with them, unless someone stops
me on the street and asks me where to go eat.
20. But so in some ways I am interacting with them all the time. I am a little removed
from them though.
21. But we get correspondence a fair amount from people that are here out of town.
They will say, “oh I picked up Lowcountry Weekly and read this or that.”
22. I’ll tell you where I meet the most tourists—Blackstone’s and Nippy’s
[restaurants in the area].
23. Other places I speak with people who are visiting from out of town are right on
Bay Street. I am great for standing outside of a store while my wife is inside
shopping [laughter].
24. And I will stand outside because I normally have to hold the dog and so you know
I engage in small talk like, “hi where you from?” do you live here?”
25. Those are my three primary places for meeting people from outside of town, I
would say: Nippy’s, Blackstone’s, and Bay Street.
26. One of the neat things if you go out to eat in Beaufort on Friday night a lot of the
military visitors a lot of time will be waiting in line and I will ask them where
they are from when they graduate and where are they going to go next.
27. So primarily as a homeowner and not a business owner that is about the only
interaction that we have with tourists—is when we go out to eat on Friday night
and wait in a long line of military graduation.
28. At Publix all the time as they are heading out to Hunting Island and Fripp and Harbor. And I have been asked a number of times at the stores, “do you live here?” And then of course, the door is open.

29. I don’t get out much but people come in to the gallery and sometimes they become friends.

30. We are getting a lot of tourists now interesting enough...we ask them when they come into the shop—we are an antique shop like #6’s, “where are you from, what are you doing here?” We all love to talk. We are very gregarious.

31. Now because I work all week and I get in my yard on Saturday and Sunday and have interaction with tourists that way.

32. Every third Friday they block off Calhoun Street, have vendors, musicians, and performers and it allows people to interact with the local community.

33. I’ve been working with tourists since I was in college and they help put me through college.

34. But yes, we mingle with them at Third Friday

35. At museums.

36. And we mingle with them at the Theater.

37. Post office.

38. Businesses.


40. Businesses.

41. Businesses for sure.

42. So two ladies came into the shop the other day

43. working in my front yard and talking to people, mostly on Sunday,

44. In front of the library

45. I mean we have some that have come back on the Third Friday and sit down and we will finish off a bottle of wine in the shop and get shnockered and these are tourists.

46. We get people walking into the visitors’ center

47. In like the Barnes and Noble

48. The grocery stores

49. People will just start talking to you, which is a natural thing for me anyhow.

50. I’ve been friends with some of these people for 20 years.

51. We have had one family that turns out they are from Pennsylvania, so we had some things in common, but we have kept in touch with. They are here every summer

52. Every time they are here, we go eat together and go out together.

53. But we have had some casual people that will come back to our shows every year, chit-chat about, “oh, how are doing, look how big Susie is getting.” That kind of thing.

54. Our little antique shop for the first 35 years used to be in my mother’s house and a lot of people would come...a lot of people that shop with us now, remember having shopped there.

55. You do establish personal relationships with tourists.
There are relationships that are established, particularly if they are people that are visiting every year and kind enough to come by the shop every year.

And we have a plumbing business here on the island so we do have some interaction with visitors.

I have had an extensive relationship with tourists on the island for quite awhile.

I interact with tourists a lot.

I am also a developer working on some development of some of the old island communities and I interact with tourists there, you know, just wanting information about the projects and about the island in general.

I have had an extensive relationship with tourists on the island for quite awhile.

I interact with tourists a lot.

I am also a developer working on some development of some of the old island communities and I interact with tourists there, you know, just wanting information about the projects and about the island in general.

I am a member of the Presbyterian church and for about 25 years we have been running a college symposium here that has to do with ethics and it is referred to as an ethics college symposium. So we brought about 20 colleges in here for a long weekend and it is pretty much supported by people within the church. And we break them into small groups and talk about ethical issues that are probably completely separate from what they are getting in college.

Another place you run into tourists and is important to their coming are the restaurants—places to eat.

So for me when I meet tourists and interact, I like to know where they are from and learn more about their city.

I find that I enjoy them and I have made friends of tourists just because of that, because we have things in common.

When you run into each other at the cash register.

Personally it is in our business.

That is where I interact with them and talk about where they are from.

That and we talk the whole time during our two-hour tour about questions regarding the island and questions about history.

Sometimes at the grocery stores.

You run into each other at the cash register.

If you go anywhere you are going to run into a tourist—anywhere.

Golf course,

Beach

Stop lights.

We interact with them everywhere, constantly

And that is through the business.

In the grocery stores

But I always find it a lot of fun to stop people in the grocery store and say, “Where are you here from?” You know and is there anything we can help you with. I just love doing that. It is just fun to me. You can watch it in their eyes, they say, “I’m not sure I have everything, or where do I go from here?”

Church I often encounter tourists

Visitors at the toll booth.

Hanging out at a toll booth

Hang out at one of the county boat ramps.

Boat ramp
84. Business-wise everyday
85. I spend about six hours with tourists every week because of our business
86. on a weekly basis maybe once
87. Twice in the grocery store
88. My personal interaction is not much really.
89. I would say during April, June, July, and August I spend about every waking hour
90. As a retiree in a gated community I would say, not very much.
91. If it is contact it is because you see them on bike paths
92. In restaurants.
93. And in terms of contact, I don’t really think of any except church.
94. I mean they are here and we see them every time. They come to our house and eat
95. There is a friendship that develops and when people have been visiting and seeing you for 3, 4, or 5 years you know they see you out
96. I interact with hundreds of tourists every year.
97. And a lot of those relationships start out as a business relationship and crosses that line

**Resident Characteristics (181 codes)**

1. I have lived in Beaufort County for 27-28 years
2. I came from Hartford, Connecticut.
3. I work for the Adventure Radio group.
4. I’ve lived in Beaufort County all of my life except for a couple of years where I moved away and came back
5. I am a real estate paralegal
6. I am exposed to a lot of second-homeowners and vacationers who are buying real estate.
7. I own Art and Soul Gallery downtown in the Old Bay Marketplace.
8. I had the gallery for seven and a half years.
9. I have lived here in Beaufort County a little over nine years.
10. I moved to Beaufort County in June of 1992 so I am coming up on 15 years.
11. I moved to Hilton Head for about 6 years.
13. I publish Lowcountry Weekly—the arts and entertainment alternative paper and Homes on the Market, which is a real estate publication.
14. I have lived in Beaufort approximately five years.
15. I am a teacher.
16. I am an educator.
17. I’ve lived here in Beaufort for about 26 years now.
18. I am originally from Tennessee
19. my primary job is Clemson Extension
20. I’ve lived here in Beaufort for three years. I bought a piece of property here about seven years ago but have lived here the last three years.
21. I am originally from New Jersey
22. Currently I am retired.
23. I sold my business up North, which prompted us to move here to Beaufort
24. I’ve been in Beaufort for a year and a half.
25. We own the Cuthbert House Inn.
27. I am currently curator of the Lowcountry Estuarium.
28. He is an artist too
29. I’ve lived here 25 years.
30. And I am a Math Professor at the University of South Carolina—Beaufort.
31. When my wife and I came down here. We had come to visit Charleston and then visit Savannah. Beaufort was a side trip for us as we were going to spend two days and two nights here. It was Charleston that brought us to Beaufort and we just fell in with it. We fell in love with Beaufort
32. One of the main reasons that I moved down here was because of a church that I am now a member of. I grew up in the Upstate, but when I drove down here the first time I was amazed again with the historical area, the big oak trees
33. I had not vacationed here per se, but I had visited some friends
34. I was drawn by the Big Chill [movie filmed in historic district]. And we first came because of the movie. That was probably in the mid-to late-1980s.
35. We had come south, with the intention of buying property and we were very disappointed with Charleston. We had an appointment down here to meet with a developer and look at some land and the second day in Beaufort we bought property here.
36. But did I have any knowledge of Beaufort County? I really had no knowledge. I had never been here before.
37. I am originally from Connecticut too.
38. And actually I was working for a company that transferred me to Atlanta. And that first summer we were in Atlanta we came to Hilton Head because we had heard about it and we just came for a long weekend
39. And I was doing human resources, which I definitely didn’t want to do anymore and I wanted to do something in the arts and I opened up an art gallery.
40. And we had done some research about Beaufort…we knew what we were getting into when we got here, but had never been here before…
41. Certainly back to Connecticut because there is family there.
42. And my husband has family in Arizona
43. We like to the Caribbean you know.
44. How often do you travel?...A couple times a year really.
45. I mean we travel locally
46. We like to go to Saint Simons for a long weekend
47. I don’t travel much due to work constraints
48. I do like to take long weekends and visit other small towns by car.
I don’t get out much.

I have elderly parents in Connecticut so very often that is the place I end up going.

Occasionally I go to Jacksonville to visit friends.

I moved here from San Francisco. All my family is still on the West Coast so we go out there for maybe 10 days every year usually over Thanksgiving.

We still have friends in the city.

I really don’t take vacations,

Since I consider myself a newcomer here I like to do leisure activities here in Beaufort to get to know the area better.

So I vacation here in Beaufort.

For a number of years as a family we were trying to visit all the National Parks in the country.

We did all of our traveling before we got to Beaufort.

It has been hectic but this year we definitely going to go to the Biltmore and we are definitely going down to Jekyll Island.

But usually we take a big vacation which is usually Europe or British Isles every two years. And then on the odd year we take a vacation in the states from San Francisco to Phoenix or something interesting here.

we still like to Hunting Island and camp. I mean to us it is like a vacation out there. We love it.

I’ve lived in Beaufort County roughly three years.

I am retired.

I am what you call a second homeowner.

I have two homes.

We have one down here in Bluffton, which we have been camped out in since we got here. And we have another one up in Connecticut where the rest of our family is.

Eventually when my wife decides to retire, we will split our time for awhile between the two locations, because it gets hotter than hell down here in the South.

I have been here for three and a half years. I have retired from a job before, but I am ready to give it up.

I work for National Bank of South Carolina.

We have been here four and a half…it will be five years in November from Pennsylvania.

This was an area we have never explored before and we just kind of happened upon it and one thing lead to another.

I am also the assistant in some of his [GM’s] shows, so I come into contact with tourists that way.

I am also a teacher’s assistant at Bluffton Elementary.

I am a clinical psychologist.
We have been living here a year and I am actually not working now—I am on sabbatical since we have moved here so I can stay at home and be a full-time mom for my three year old.

And we moved here in conjunction with my parents, who retired and they live out on the island [HHI] so that I could also help out with my dad who has Parkinson’s. So between him and my daughter, that is my full-time job right now.

I moved over here in 1974 and been here ever since.

I have a small floor covering business in Bluffton.

I am a Native of Bluffton

I was away for 30 years in the Army and came back in 1989. My mother was a Native. She started an antique business in the early 1950s and when I retired in 1989 we sort of merged in with business.

I got tangled up in local politics for about 12 years. I was on County Council for 6 years, Chairman for 2 years, and Mayor of Bluffton for 2 years and on County Council for another four and then found there were better ways to spend your time. And since December of 2004 I am no longer tangled up in that.

We spend time at the shop almost full-time

I moved here in 1979

I have always been in marketing in either real estate resort and timeshare

I am actually born and raised in the Low Country,

And I work here at the University.

Other than two years in College, I have always lived in the Low Country.

I have been here for 2 years

I work here at the University as well teaching hospitality, travel, and tourism

I also work at the visitor center on the island

I am one of the members of the Merchant’s Association down in the Old Town Bluffton, where I have a shop along with some very nice old ladies.

I work on the island and that is where is most of marketing is

I work for Sea Pines.

I work in admissions

I am in the real estate business

Sure. We used to skip school and come over here and go to the beach and go surfing.

I’m on vacation everyday.

I am retired

Up to North Carolina, over to Columbia

New England,

We typically take our vacations when it is either spring break or fall break from school,

Sometimes we go back to Pennsylvania

We do the Disney thing

We always went to the beach.

We always went to Jersey and Maryland

Charleston is a nice short trip
We have only been here a year.

We don’t need to go on a vacation.

Before when we went on vacation it was pretty much to visit family—so it was either up to Virginia or Atlanta.

Because I have a small business, I take a lot of little trips but you know mostly around the South.

If I had…special trips—I go to the Bahamas where I fit right in.

Our trips lately have been a function of where our grandchildren or our children.

I try to go to one place every year that I have never been before.

I like to go every year to a place I’ve never been.

But I do a lot weekend-type things also.

But we were typical tourists in the last couple of years.

I would like to be but it is hard with jobs and things.

My vacationing—Christmas—I go where family is usually around Philadelphia.

I do have a spot in Asheville and I am looking forward to making a lot of long weekend trips during the hot summer.

I am most certainly a tourist at heart.

I am here because of tourism or touring while visiting with my husband’s family in Ridgeland.

Vacationing, like I said, is what got us here, because we used to come down here at least once a year.

We went cross country on a bus trip…not with Lorraine’s, but folks out of Savannah—Excursion Unlimited.

I don’t vacation nearly enough.

I’m usually working and when I am not working I am too tired to go anywhere.

My brother lives in Columbia so on weekends I go there.

I went to New Orleans right before Katrina—it was a school trip, so that was work. Disneyworld many times and just parts of Florida.

I rarely go to the beach, just because I have lived here forever.

And I don’t know if it is indicative of Southerners but we do spend an awful lot of time visiting with family and relatives. Family is very important to us.

A lot of our vacationing and being tourists, is actually going somewhere where we know somebody.

Like to tell people I came in utero. I was not born on the island, but my parents grew up coming here as young people and so I followed suite.

I have been here myself, living here for about 30 some years.

And I have a business in home health care…“companions, nurses, and nannies—health services 2000.”

I’ve lived here 20 years.

I came from Delaware where I worked for Dupont for a good career.

I have served with B on town planning commission, the community foundation, the orchestra board, and besides that we are good friends.

My husband and I moved here about 19 years ago.
We have a plumbing business here on the island so we do have some interaction with visitors—I do on the phone mostly he does in-person.

Thirty years with IBM and I came down here to play golf.

I volunteer in the school.

I find it very rewarding to be volunteering in the schools and I have been doing that now for about 10 years.

I coordinate a mentoring program of about 45 people that meets with the kids about one hour a week and we always have openings.

I really enjoy that I got really involved with the chamber of commerce because I attended one of their leadership programs.

I have served three years on the board of regents through the chamber and I am currently on one of their other committees which is a business education relationship board that is trying to do to make sure businesses understand the needs of education and that education is communicating with the business community. Ten years and I totally enjoy it down here.

I am also a Delaware transplant. I see another Delaware person here. I began visiting HHI in 1980.

My dad and step-mom lived here. I came here to visit over the years and I moved here 11 years ago.

I worked almost the entirety of the 11 years with a major outdoor outfitter.

Over the past year I have established my own company providing boat-based nature tours. I have had an extensive relationship with tourists on the island for quite awhile.

I am a native of Hilton Head, born and raised.

And here I have been involved in the community as a local realtor. And I interact with tourists a lot.

I am also a developer working on some development of some of the old island communities and I interact with tourists there.

My husband and I moved here 30 years ago.

I am a mortgage banker so I end up seeing tourists when they end up buying something here.

I am born and raised here on the island.

I used to work at one time at the Penn Center, and accommodated tourists there. Now I operate a tour business here.

I am also a chamber director.

When I moved here, I just moved here. I didn’t come visit first.

And basically we just picked up and moved here.

I’ve lived here longer than I have lived anywhere in my life.

We were looking for a place to retire.

So we came and looked and we thought, “Oh, my gosh, looks pretty good.” So we bought a lot and then kept coming back year after until we were ready to retire. Then built a house…

So for me my entire life I’ve been here and you know was spent here, so I love this place even though I am from Savannah.
164. I never intended to come down here.
165. We had never visited before and with both of us being with IBM we had moved all over the country, but nothing here.
166. My wife and I, we go out of town a lot.
167. We were at Miami-South Beach last week.
168. We have a place in Jacksonville we like to go a lot
169. We travel a lot.
170. In 20 years of being here other than visiting family and going to family reunions and ball games—we have seen probably every ball field in North and South Carolina and a few major league ones
171. Twice a year we visit families.
172. We spend the summer on the Chesapeake Bay.
173. Once a year, Karen guarantees we travel out of the country.
174. So for us personally as long as our health is good, I am going to make sure we travel some place that later on if our health wasn’t as good we wouldn’t be able to see. So it is to a foreign country every year the last 10 years.
175. We do the same thing. But if we are going to plan a vacation, we like to go to a beach in the winter time.
176. I travel probably four out of five weekends on a year-round basis.
177. I play with a band, so a lot of that I will be traveling.
178. And I also travel to see music
179. Music is my most important reason to travel.
180. Every year I take a vacation to Hilton Head.
181. But I personally travel three or four times a year all over.
## Appendix M

Derived Themes from Common Codes within each Parent Node

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Node</th>
<th>Theme (with frequency)</th>
<th>Common Code (associated number from Appendix L)</th>
<th>Focus Group where Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourist Type/ Activity</strong></td>
<td>Historic sites/cultural heritage (18)</td>
<td>4,5,8,14,18,26,41,43,45,46,58</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66,70,72</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86,90,94,95</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special events/festivals (17)</td>
<td>29,30,48,49,50,51,52,53,56,57</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87,91,106,107,115,117</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,20,21,22,27,33,34,59</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63,64,76,79</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,89,90,118</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports activities (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,17,39</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,62,69,72,75,81,83</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84,97,98,114,115</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacationers (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,31,32,36,38</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68,73,74</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96,98,108,110,111,112</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach activities (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,35,37</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78,92</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tour (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,42,44,47</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art galleries (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,24,55</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat at restaurants (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military sites (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,11,25</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second homeowner (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeshare visitors</td>
<td>60,77</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-tripper</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort/hotel</td>
<td>12,28</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House rental</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit natural sites</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family visitor</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emotions/Feelings For Tourists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>27,29,31,36,37,38,39,41,65,66,67</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grateful</td>
<td>10,11,12,14,17</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically appreciative</td>
<td>1,13,20,21</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowded</td>
<td>19,22,23,24</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothered</td>
<td>76,78,81,95</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offended</td>
<td>44,45,47,49</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically unimportant</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>15,16</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Behavior</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent (2)</td>
<td>18, 25</td>
<td>Beaufort, Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending special events/festivals (13)</td>
<td>2,3,4,14,15,16,17</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,41,42,44,46</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-historic (12)</td>
<td>8,16,17</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41,43,45</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,48,50,61,62,63</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach activities (12)</td>
<td>21,22,23,24,25,27</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,54,55,59,70,73</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining out (7)</td>
<td>1, 31,36, 58,60,65,69</td>
<td>Beaufort, Bluffton, Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation activities (7)</td>
<td>7,9,10</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29,30</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64,75</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (7)</td>
<td>11,12</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37,38,39,40</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/shopping (7)</td>
<td>19,20,26,28,33</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71,74</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports (5)</td>
<td>5,6, 34,35</td>
<td>Beaufort, Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,66</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving (1)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini golf (1)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spa (1)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpark (1)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging out at pool (1)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Beliefs</td>
<td>Appreciation for history (10)</td>
<td>5,6,8,11,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,33,34</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural beauty (10)</td>
<td>7,14</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18,19,20,24,25,26,27</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared value system (7)</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful place (6)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for nature (5)</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniqueness of place (3)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great place for art (1)</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food varieties (1)</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Where and when interact (67)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At store (13)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,31,39,40,41,42,43,48,55,57</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68,73</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work (12)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,18</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58,64,69,71,81,91,92,96,105</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On street (7)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,19,24,26</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In restaurant (7)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,26,27,28</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65,100</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At grocery store (6)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In public services facility (5)</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,45,47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At church (4)</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89,90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64,86,101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At festivals/events (3)</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33,35,46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At house (3)</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32,44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural facilities (2)</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36,37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Code(s)</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anywhere</td>
<td>74,78</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At golf course</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At beach</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On bike paths</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>13,16,17,19,25,27,29</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,34,50,54,55</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62,66,70,85,105</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superficial</td>
<td>7,8,10,12,13,15</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship</td>
<td>9,11</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,51</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67,103</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>6,15,19,21,28</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequently</td>
<td>30,52,54</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93,94</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95,97</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily basis</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With whom</td>
<td>14,15</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family tourist</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military visitor</td>
<td>27,28</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-homeowner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>15,16,19,28,31</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77,91,94,99</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>89,97,98,100</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157,158</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,71,102,103</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142,146</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Code Numbers</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer (7)</td>
<td>143,147,148,149,150,151,163</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality/tourism (5)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154,155,162</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art (4)</td>
<td>7,8,29,40</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiques (3)</td>
<td>85,87,96</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (2)</td>
<td>3,13</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial business (2)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home maintenance (2)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (2)</td>
<td>79,80</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment (1)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling (1)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public office (1)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care (1)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred types of vacationing (47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General (18)</td>
<td>44,60,62</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63,104,105,108,109,110,118,120,130</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134,176,182,183,184,190</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit family/friends (16)</td>
<td>42,43,51,52,54,55</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70,107,114,119,125,128</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133,136,137,180</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend trips (4)</td>
<td>47,49</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122,126</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Beaufort Co. (4)</td>
<td>58,59</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special travel (2)</td>
<td>187,188</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day trips (2)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vacationing (1)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of traveling (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular (18)</td>
<td>45,54,60</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63,64,106,120,121,123,127</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently (7)</td>
<td>134,180,181,182,183,184,189,190</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175,177,178,179,185,186</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom (7)</td>
<td>48,50,61</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113,124,131</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residency (27)</td>
<td>1,4,9,10,11,12,14,17,20,25,30</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65,71,73,79,81,88,92,93,112</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139,141,144,159,168,179</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where from (24)</td>
<td>South (12)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,18,27,33</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84,90,92,114</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135,156,161,172</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast (11)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,21,23,38,42,51</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West (1)</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting prior to moving (21)</td>
<td>32,33,34,35,36,37,39,41</td>
<td>Beaufort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75,101,128,129</td>
<td>Bluffton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138,152,153,166,167,170,171,173,174</td>
<td>Hilton Head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

Items Developed for each Scale Based on Qualitative Data

Interaction

1. Interact with visitors while driving
2. Interact with visitors at work
3. Interact with visitors at church
4. Interact with visitors at festivals
5. Interact with visitors at special events
6. Interact with visitors while at restaurants
7. Interact with visitors at the grocery store
8. Interact with visitors at museums
9. Interact with visitors at the beach
10. Interact with visitors in your neighborhood
11. Interact with visitors while shopping at boutiques
12. Interact with visitors while out walking
13. Interact with visitors during the week
14. Interact with visitors on the weekend
15. Interact with visitors during peak vacation season
16. Interact with visitors during off-peak vacation season
17. Interact with visitors during holidays
18. Interactions with visitors friendly
19. Interactions with visitors more of a personal nature
20. Interactions with visitors less of a personal nature
21. Interactions with visitors overall

Shared Beliefs

1. Appreciation for the Deep South
2. Appreciation for the history of Beaufort County
3. Belief that Beaufort County is a unique place
4. Belief that Beaufort County is a great place to explore local art
5. Appreciation for the natural beauty throughout Beaufort County
6. Respect for nature within Beaufort County
7. Feeling that Beaufort County is a great place to vacation
8. Belief in preserving the local way of life in Beaufort County
9. Belief that Beaufort County is a beautiful place
10. Thought that roads are sometimes crowded in Beaufort County
11. Interest in learning more about Beaufort County
12. Belief that there is a wide variety of dining opportunities within the county
13. Feeling that there is a wide variety of entertainment opportunities within the county
14. Belief that Beaufort County is a great place to live
15. Belief that there is not enough public beach access in Beaufort County
16. Belief that there is too much residential development in Beaufort County
17. Feeling that there are not enough roads to travel within Beaufort County
18. Belief that residents and tourists have a similar value system

Shared Behavior

1. Dine at local restaurants
2. Swim in the ocean
3. Shop at boutiques
4. Attend festivals
5. Attend special events
6. Shop at grocery store
7. Go boating
8. Go fishing
9. Go to historic sites
10. Play golf
11. Sightsee
12. Attend concerts
13. Attend theatrical performances
14. Go to museums
15. Go to art exhibits
16. Go to amusement parks
17. Participate in tour
18. Go to natural areas
19. Visit lighthouses
20. Take a bike ride
21. Play tennis
22. Take a walk on the beach
23. Relax on the beach

Emotional Solidarity

1. Identify with tourists in my community
2. Trust tourists in my community
3. Praise tourists in my community
4. Criticize tourists in my community
5. Have made friends with some tourists in my community
6. Feel close to some tourists in my community
7. Feel I do not get along well with tourists in my community
8. Prefer the company of tourists in my community
9. Feel I exchange ideas well with tourists in my community
10. Feel I understand tourists well in my community
11. Feel I agree with tourists about things that I feel are important to life
12. Feel I treat tourists fair in my community
13. Feel I respect tourists in my community
14. Feel affection towards tourists in my community
15. Feel I appreciate tourists for the economic contribution they make to the local economy
16. Feel proud to have tourists visit Beaufort County
17. Enjoy tourists coming to visit Beaufort County
18. Feel crowded because of tourists in Beaufort County
19. Feel empathy towards tourists visiting in my community
20. Feel offended by tourists in my community
21. Feel happy when I see people visiting Beaufort County
22. Feel tourists make Beaufort County more vibrant
23. Feel most tourists are a pleasure to be around
24. Feel I have a lot in common with tourists in Beaufort County
25. Feel we benefit from having tourists in Beaufort County
26. Overall feel I get along well with tourists in my community
27. Overall feel I have a close relationship with tourists in my community
Appendix O

Scales with Items Distributed to each Expert Panel Reviewer

Can each of you review the following scale items for each of the four constructs? Please provide feedback as to which items are redundant, poorly worded, or double-barreled and the wording of each opening question/instructions, etc. I would like to have your feedback by Monday June 25th so that I may finalize the pilot instrument and send it to the printer by the middle of that week. Thank you very much for taking the time to review this work.

Kyle

**SHARED BELIEFS scale**

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding beliefs you share with tourists about Beaufort County. The scale ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). **Please circle one number for each statement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors an appreciation for the Deep South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors an appreciation for the history of Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the belief that Beaufort County is a unique place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors that Beaufort County is a great place to explore local art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the appreciation for the natural beauty throughout Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the respect for nature within Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the feeling that Beaufort County is a great place to vacation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the belief in preserving the local way of life in Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the belief that Beaufort County is a beautiful place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the thought that roads are sometimes crowded in Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors an interest in learning more about Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the belief that there is a wide variety of dining opportunities within the county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share with visitors the feeling that there is a wide variety of entertainment opportunities within the county</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHARED BEHAVIOR scale

Please indicate how often you participate in the following tourist activities throughout the year in Beaufort County? The scale ranges from 1 (none of the time) to 7 (all of the time). Please circle one number for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>None of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Pretty often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dine at local restaurants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swim in the ocean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop at boutiques</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend festivals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend special events</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop at grocery store</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go boating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to historic sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play golf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightsee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend concerts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend theatrical performances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to museums</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to art exhibits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to amusement parks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in tour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to natural areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit lighthouses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a bike ride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play tennis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a walk on the beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relax on the beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERACTION scale

Please answer the following questions regarding your interaction with Beaufort County visitors during the past year. The scale ranges from 1 (none of the time) to 7 (all of the time). Please circle one number for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you interact with visitors while driving?</th>
<th>None of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Pretty often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors at work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently do you interact with visitors at church?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors at festivals?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors at special events?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors while at restaurants?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors at the grocery store?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently do you interact with visitors at museums?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors at the beach?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors while shopping at boutiques?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors while out walking?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors during the week?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors on the weekend?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently do you interact with visitors during peak vacation season?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How frequently do you interact with visitors during off-peak vacation season?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you interact with visitors during holidays?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are interactions with visitors friendly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are interactions with visitors more of a personal nature?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often are interactions with visitors less of a personal nature?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how often do you interact with visitors overall?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EMOTIONAL SOLIDARITY scale

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding your feelings towards tourists in Beaufort County. The scale ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Please circle one number for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I identify with tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I can trust tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I praise tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I criticize tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I have made friends with some tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to some tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I do not get along well with tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the company of tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I exchange ideas well with tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I understand tourists well in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I agree with tourists about things that I feel are important to life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I treat tourists fair in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I respect tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel affection towards tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I appreciate tourists for the economic contribution they make to the local economy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel proud to have tourists visit Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy tourists coming to visit Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel crowded because of tourists in Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel empathy towards tourists visiting in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel offended by tourists in my community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel happy when I see people visiting Beaufort County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel tourists make Beaufort County more vibrant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel most tourists are a pleasure to be around</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P

Onsite Self-administered Survey Instrument Distributed to Permanent Residents of Beaufort County

Beaufort County Residents’ Feelings Toward Visitors
Beaufort County Resident Survey

SECTION 1: Your Beaufort County resident status.

1. How many years have you been a permanent resident of Beaufort County? (Please write in number)

2. Do you rent or own your home? (Please check one)
   □ Rent
   □ Own
   □ Other (Please specify)______________________________________________________

3. Were you born in Beaufort County? (Please check one)
   □ Yes → if “yes”, please skip to Section 2, Question #1
   □ No

4. Had you vacationed in Beaufort County before moving here? (Please check one)
   □ Yes
   □ No → if “no”, please skip to Section 2, Question #1

5. How many times had you vacationed in Beaufort County before moving here? (Please write in number)

   __________________________

SECTION 2: Your interactions with Beaufort County visitors.

1. What type of visitor do you encounter MOST OFTEN in Beaufort County? (Please check ONE)
   □ Day visitor
   □ Timeshare visitor
   □ Home/condo renter
   □ Summer vacationer
   □ Second homeowner
   □ Group tourist
   □ Business traveler
   □ Family and friends traveler
   □ Motorcoach traveler
   □ Family vacationer
   □ Spring break traveler
   □ Festival/special event attendee
   □ Off-season extended visitor
   □ Other (Please specify)______________________________________________________
2. Please answer the following questions regarding your interactions with Beaufort County visitors you encounter most often. The scale ranges from 1 = “Never” to 7 = “All of the time.” (Please circle one number per question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you interact with Beaufort County visitors…</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Slightly More than Half the Time</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>All of the Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>during the week?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the weekend?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during peak vacation season?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during off-peak vacation season?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during holidays?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Overall, how frequently do you interact with the type of visitor to Beaufort County you encounter most often? (Please = check one)
- Never
- Rarely
- Occasionally
- Some of the time
- Often
- Very often
- All of the time

SECTION 3: Beliefs you share with Beaufort County visitors.

1. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding beliefs you share with Beaufort County visitors you encounter most often? The scale ranges from 1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree.” (Please circle one number per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I share with Beaufort County visitors…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Moderate Agreement</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the belief that preserving the local way of life in Beaufort County is important.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the belief that there is a wide variety of dining choices throughout the county.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the belief that there is a wide variety of entertainment choices throughout the county.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the belief that Beaufort County is a unique place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a respect for nature within Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the thought that Beaufort County is a great place to vacation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an appreciation for the Lowcountry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. How much do you agree with the following statement: “Residents and visitors share the belief that protecting Beaufort County’s local culture is important.” (Please check one)

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Moderately disagree
☐ Slightly disagree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Slightly agree
☐ Moderately agree
☐ Strongly agree

3. How much do you agree with the following statement: “Residents and visitors share the belief that Beaufort County has many things to offer both residents and visitors.” (Please check one)

☐ Strongly disagree
☐ Moderately disagree
☐ Slightly disagree
☐ Neither agree nor disagree
☐ Slightly agree
☐ Moderately agree
☐ Strongly agree

SECTION 4: Behavior you share with Beaufort County visitors.

1. Please indicate how often you participate in the following activities alongside Beaufort County visitors you encounter MOST OFTEN. The scale ranges from 1 = “Never” to 7 = “All of the time.” (Please circle one number per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you participate in the following activities alongside Beaufort County visitors?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Some of the Time</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>All of the Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dining at local restaurants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming in the ocean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping at local merchants’ stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping at grocery stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inshore boating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore boating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inshore fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting historic sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking local tours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting natural areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking a walk on the beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing on the beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How often do you participate in local cultural and historical activities alongside Beaufort County visitors? *(Please check one)*
   □ Never
   □ Rarely
   □ Occasionally
   □ Some of the time
   □ Often
   □ Very often
   □ All of the time

3. How often do you participate in outdoor recreation activities alongside Beaufort County visitors? *(Please check one)*
   □ Never
   □ Rarely
   □ Occasionally
   □ Some of the time
   □ Often
   □ Very often
   □ All of the time

4. How often do you participate in beach activities alongside Beaufort County visitors? *(Please check one)*
   □ Never
   □ Rarely
   □ Occasionally
   □ Some of the time
   □ Often
   □ Very often
   □ All of the time

5. How often do you buy local goods and services alongside Beaufort County visitors? *(Please check one)*
   □ Never
   □ Rarely
   □ Occasionally
   □ Some of the time
   □ Often
   □ Very often
   □ All of the time
SECTION 5: Feelings and attitudes you have toward Beaufort County visitors.

1. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding your feelings toward Beaufort County visitors you encounter MOST OFTEN? The scale ranges from 1 = "Strongly disagree" and 7 = "Strongly agree." (Please circle one number per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your feelings toward Beaufort County visitors:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate visitors for the contribution they make to the local economy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can trust the behavior of visitors in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have made friends with some visitors in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel close to some visitors I have met in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share ideas with visitors in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand visitors in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I treat visitors fair in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel affection towards visitors in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I identify with visitors in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to have visitors come to Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a lot in common with Beaufort County visitors.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the community benefits from having visitors in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How much do you agree with the following statement: "I understand what it is like to be a Beaufort County visitor." (Please √ check one)
- √ Strongly disagree
- √ Moderately disagree
- √ Slightly disagree
- √ Neither agree nor disagree
- √ Slightly agree
- √ Moderately agree
- √ Strongly agree

3. How much do you agree with the following statement: "I welcome Beaufort County visitors." (Please √ check one)
- √ Strongly disagree
- √ Moderately disagree
- √ Slightly disagree
- √ Neither agree nor disagree
- √ Slightly agree
- √ Moderately agree
- √ Strongly agree
4. How much do you agree with the following statement: “I feel an emotional connection with some Beaufort County visitors.” (Please check one)
   - □ Strongly disagree
   - □ Moderately disagree
   - □ Slightly disagree
   - □ Neither agree nor disagree
   - □ Slightly agree
   - □ Moderately agree
   - □ Strongly agree

5. Which diagram best represents how close you feel to Beaufort County visitors? (Please circle one letter)

![Diagrams]

6. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding your attitudes toward Beaufort County visitors in general? The scale ranges from 1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree.” (Please circle one number per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your attitudes toward Beaufort County visitors in general:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I could, I would leave Beaufort County because area visitation has negatively impacted the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that visitor spending is an important part of Beaufort County’s economy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I reschedule activities in Beaufort County to avoid crowds of visitors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area visitors cause congestion in Beaufort County.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to avoid areas frequented by visitors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy having Beaufort County visitors in the area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 6: Attitudes you have about Beaufort County tourism development.

1. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding your attitudes about Beaufort County tourism development strategies? The scale ranges from 1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree.” (Please circle one number per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your attitudes about Beaufort County tourism development strategies:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism in Beaufort County should be developed by outside investors/developers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism in Beaufort County should be developed through a public/private partnership.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism in Beaufort County should be developed by the Beaufort County government</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism in Beaufort County should be developed by local businesses.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort County government should support private business development in tourism.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort County government should support local businesses serving visitors.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort County government should support festivals/special events.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 7: Your personal satisfaction with life.

1. How much do you agree with the following statements regarding your satisfaction with life? The scale ranges from 1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree.” (Please circle one number per statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your satisfaction with life:</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In most ways my life is close to my ideal.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conditions of my life are excellent.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 8: Living in Beaufort County.

1. In general, would you say you ‘feel at home’ in Beaufort County? (Please check one)
   - Yes, definitely
   - Yes, somewhat
   - No, not much
   - No, definitely not

2. Suppose for some reason you had to move away from Beaufort County, how sorry or pleased would you be to leave? (Please check one)
   - Very sorry to leave
   - Somewhat sorry to leave
   - Wouldn’t make any difference one way or the other
   - Somewhat pleased to leave
   - Very pleased to leave

3. Some people care a lot about feeling part of the community they live in. For others, the community is not so important. How important is it to you to feel part of the community? (Please check one)
   - Very important
   - Somewhat important
   - Little or no importance

SECTION 9: Your travel history.

1. In the past two years, how many vacations have you taken outside of Beaufort County? (Please write in number)
   - ______ overnight trips
   - ______ day trips

2. In the past two years, how many different destinations have you visited outside of Beaufort County? (Please write in number)
   - ______

3. In the past two years, did you travel outside of the United States? (Please check one)
   - Yes
   - No → if “no”, please skip to Section 10, Question #1

4. How many different destinations outside of the United States did you visit over the past two years? (Please write in number)
   - ______
SECTION 10: Background Information: This information is completely confidential and will be used to determine if we have satisfactorily represented residents of Beaufort County.

1. What is your gender? (Please check one)
   □ Male
   □ Female

2. What is your age? (Please write in number)

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed so far? (Please check one)
   □ Grade school or some high school
   □ High school diploma or GED
   □ Technical, vocational or trade school
   □ Some college (includes junior college)
   □ Four-year college (B.A., B.S., B.F.A.)
   □ Masters Degree (M.A., M.S., M.F.A., M.Arch., M.B.A.)
   □ Ph.D./Professional (M.D., J.D., D.V.M., D.D.M.)

4. What is your current marital status? (Please check one)
   □ Single
   □ Married
   □ Divorced or separated
   □ Widowed
   □ Other (Please specify ____________________________)

5. What is your race? (Please check one)
   □ White alone
   □ Black or African American alone
   □ American Indian and Alaska Native alone
   □ Asian alone
   □ Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone
   □ Some other race alone
   □ Two or more races

6. What is your current employment status? (Please check one)
   □ Employed full-time
   □ Employed part-time
   □ Retired if "retired," skip to question #8
   □ Homemaker if a "homemaker," skip to question #8
   □ Student if "student," skip to question #8
   □ Unemployed if "unemployed," skip to question #8

7. In what line of work are you currently employed? (Please check one)
   □ Real estate
   □ Education
   □ Food service
   □ Construction/maintenance
   □ Health care
   □ Government
   □ Media/advertising
   □ Financial/business services
   □ Art/design
   □ Hospitality/tourism
   □ Sales/marketing
   □ Clerical
   □ Other (Please specify ____________________________)
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8. What percent of your household income would you say is derived either directly or indirectly from Beaufort County visitor spending? (Please write in percentage)

6. What is your approximate annual household income? (Please check one)

- Less than $10,000
- $10,000-14,999
- $15,000-19,999
- $20,000-24,999
- $25,000-29,999
- $30,000-39,999
- $40,000-49,999
- $50,000-59,999
- $60,000-74,999
- $75,000-99,999
- $100,000-124,999
- $125,000-149,999
- $150,000-199,999
- $200,000 or more

Thank you for completing the survey!
We appreciate your time and willingness to share your opinions.
A RESEARCHER WILL BE BY TO COLLECT THE SURVEY LATER TODAY.
REFERENCES


