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Abstract

The growth of mass tourism has placed great pressure on British seaside destinations, and has contributed to the social costs experienced by the resident population via symptoms of changing perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism, and the presence of higher crime rates. This thesis examines the social reality experienced by residents, and determines the impacts of tourism-related crime upon two tourist communities which are experiencing high levels of crime. The comparative study of a British seaside resort and a coastal town reveals that tourism communities are influenced by individual resident opinions. Simultaneously these communities influence resident perception and behaviour towards tourism-related crime, and it is through this exchange process, that evidence of destination specific criteria has emerged. The research established that the resort community found commonality through the mutual gaze, whilst the coastal community formed closed perceptions of deviant activities through discord and the local gaze. The study concludes by arguing that a destination offering a hedonistic lifestyle will not necessarily have higher crime rates than other safer destinations. This is due to the widespread implementation of crime prevention methods in the resort, and the lack of deterrents established in the coastal town. Therefore there may be nothing criminogenic about these particular destinations. Instead, collective community perception, digressed through crime talk, has influenced community crime interpretation and individual resident evaluation of the tourism industry.
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1.0 Introduction

‘Communities in many rural, coastal, and urban destinations in Britain are affected somewhat by tourism’ (Brunt and Courtney 1999:493), as the growth of mass tourism has ‘brought great pressure on certain destination areas’ (Murphy 1985:189), especially those that lack a distinctive edge over their competition. These developments are typical within British seaside destinations as ‘people who once thought of “going to the seaside” as the principal form of an extended leisure activity, are now considering this to be barely one of a number of potential kinds of such activity’ (Urry 1988:35). This change is, in part, due to the expansion and availability of other destination choices for consumers, as more and more areas of the world are developed for tourism (Echtner and Ritchie 2003).

The impacts of this evolving tourist market on British seaside destinations, whether economic, physical, or socio-cultural, is thought to be ‘the result of a complex process of interchange among guests, host communities, and destination environment’ (Andriotis 2006:1080) whereby tourism is now ‘regarded as playing a major role in bringing about social change’ (Perez and Nadal 2005:925), as it imposes additional social costs upon the host population. These changes are felt in both a positive and negative manner, and are determined through the conversion of perception, attitudes and the behaviour of local residents towards tourists, and the tourism industry (Milman and Pizam 1988). The effect of these changes encompasses a range of tolerance levels, with hosts experiencing feelings of initial euphoria all the way through to issues of antagonism at different times to one another (Doxey 1975). Therefore, the level of positive and negative reception for each individual is dependent on how
they view the impacts of the tourism industry, and how they consume the social representations formed within the community in which they reside (Zhang, Inbakaran and Jackson 2006). Furthermore, the intrinsic and extrinsic elements of the destination and the host population bears influence upon the social costs and the level of social change experienced by the residents (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997).

Consequently, the diffusion of opinion and behaviour amongst community members occurs as a result of destinations comprising different socio-economic neighbourhoods (Carmichael 2000), thus providing residents with different linkages between their perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards the industry (Carmichael 2000). These linkages are sourced at the same time that residents reflect upon their level of engagement, extent of contact and personal gain with, and from the industry (Andereck, Valentine, Knopf and Vogt 2005). Therefore the associations of perception are determined through different means of attachment to, and consumption of, the tourism industry. However, these feelings and associations can be distorted by the formation of stereotypes (Murphy 1985), as residents can ‘hold perceptions which are almost entirely constructed from our group or cultural stereotypes’ (Goodey 1971:7). Therefore, interaction and encounters with tourists can differ in terms of the level and frequency of contact, depending on demographic characteristics, such as the residents occupational groupings (Krippendorf 1987).

Hence, in response to the nature of the tourism industry and the inevitable contact which occurs between residents and guests, residents play a crucial role in the processes and success of a sustainable tourism-based economy.
(Allen, Long, Perdue and Kieselbach 1988; Zhang et al. 2006). This standing is because residents not only form a reason to travel, they encourage tourism to a destination area, as their communities shape the natural landscapes which many tourists consume (Richards and Hall 2000). Furthermore, hosts are assumed to be willing participants in the industry as a service provider (Allen et al. 1988). This inclination occurs despite the formation of different socio-economic neighbourhoods and the unevenness of interaction and encounter experienced by residents. For that reason, it is imperative to highlight ‘how’ communities in which residents are members can play a significant role in shaping the social identities and patterns of actions of local residents (Crow and Allan 1994), as this action will undoubtedly impact the economic sustainability of the tourism product.

As an outcome of these interactions and encounters, it is evident that the tourism industry can develop a range of welcomed and unwelcomed changes to a location (Brunt and Hambly 1999) and thus have an impact upon the residents’ daily routines, as the ‘presence of large numbers of tourists [can have] obvious implications for the social structure and way of life of the host community’ (Walmsley, Boskovic and Pigram 1983:154). The change experienced by the residents include the benefits associated with improved facilities and infrastructure, as well as detrimental elements of disruption to community life, such as ‘increased noise, vandalism, litter, pollution and crime’ (Brunt and Hambly 1999:26). The extent of this change is highlighted by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997:8), who ‘have identified potential influences of extrinsic and intrinsic variables on resident reactions’. These dimensions are significant in the adaptation process experienced by local residents (Brunt and Hambly 1999),
and encompass the pace of development, the size of the tourism industry and
the importance of tourism to the local economy. In this respect, the ‘negative
impacts of tourism will be accentuated in destinations at a mature stage of
tourism development, and where there is a high tourist ratio, an emphasis on
international tourism and high seasonality’ (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997:8).

Consequently, due to current literature emphasising the ‘decline and attempted
rejuvenation’ of British seaside destinations (Gale 2005:87), many locations
have indeed ‘succumbed to the fate of ongoing economic decline
[and]...become the target of much negative publicity’ (Smith 2004:17). This
decline as a mass market (Gale 2005) has been facilitated by a depleting
market share (Urry 2002), whereby local residents, who are particularly reliant
upon tourism’s ‘one industry’ for their income, experience economic change
(Beatty and Fothergill 2004), and witness the impacts of social exclusion
(Agarwal and Brunt 2006).

In response to this evolving tourist market, the presence of tourism and crime at
British seaside destinations has gained notoriety within the tourism literature
(Brunt and Agarwal 2004; Brunt and Brophy 2004). This bad reputation is due
to the consequences tourism-related crime can have upon a destination’s
economy, as well as the individuals who reside within the area (Ryan 1993).
Destinations that gain notoriety as being ‘criminogenic’ can find it difficult to
retain the tourism industry (Prideaux 1996), whereas individuals experience
added pressure upon their social structures, change their behaviour, and
express a range of perceptions and attitudes towards tourist and the tourism
industry which can encompass antagonism and resentment (Doxey 1975;
Goeldner and Ritchie 2006). Resentment is ‘generated by the apparent gap in economic circumstances, behavioural patterns, appearance, and economic effects’ (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006:300) experienced by each individual, whereas, antagonism, as an externality of tourism development, has become associated with the existing relationships between tourism and crime (Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996).

However, to date, the emphasis of the relationship between tourism and crime has been concerned with ‘tourism development and its effect on crime rates or crimes against tourists’ (Brunt and Brophy 2004:4), as opposed to ‘exploring the possibility of the tourist as the offender or deviant’ (Brunt and Brophy 2004:4). This emphasis is despite evidence suggesting that ‘travel frees the inhibition’ (Ryan and Kinder 1996:26) which highlights the anonymity of being away from home and is a factor involved in influencing a tourist to deviate (Brunt and Brophy 2004). Consequently, there are numerous perceived gaps within the literature based upon local residents as the victim of crime.

For that reason, the aims of this investigation are concerned with the current understanding and the social reality experienced by residents, as potentially being the victims of crime, and the extent to which residents are influenced by the community in which they reside and vice a versa, as tourism displays interesting parallels with deviance which require further classification (Urry 2002). This understanding is imperative, as the nature of the community itself in tourism destinations, and its experience of tourism and tourism-related crime will influence community perceptions, reactions and behaviour towards tourism.
Nevertheless, it is *how* each of these factors relates to the context of British seaside destinations that has informed the direction of this study.

### 1.1. Aims and Objectives

In overview, this thesis will investigate the impacts of tourism and crime upon community perceptions, reactions and behaviour to the tourism industry within the context of a case study of two British seaside destinations.

More specifically, the aims of this study are:

1. To evaluate the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by, individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime; and,

2. To contribute to and develop further knowledge and understanding of the explanations and theory of tourism and crime by investigating the social reality and structure of modern society.

These aims are based upon the objectives of this investigation exploring exactly how a community can affect residents’ perceptions, reactions and responses to tourism and tourism and crime-related impacts. Furthermore, the study aspires to disseminate the study’s implications to practitioners to demonstrate the relevance of this research in addressing practical problems associated with tourism-related crime.
Therefore, the main objectives are:

1. To evaluate residents' perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts in two British seaside destinations
2. To analyse these residents' reactions and responses to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime within their community, by distinguishing between the conditions and attributes of a destination;
3. To assess the role that these communities play in affecting their residents' perceptions of tourism and crime;
4. To analyse the inter-relationships within these two communities, and evaluate the actions of individuals in relation to their perceptions of tourism-related crime; and,
5. To synthesise the findings and appraise the implications on the existing published theoretical arguments of the relationships between tourism and crime.

By addressing these objectives, the thesis will contribute to, and develop further knowledge and understanding to the theory of tourism, crime and the community. This new perspective will be achieved by drawing both theoretical and practical implications from the study to clarify the social reality experienced by local residents.
1.2 The Structure of the Thesis

To address the issues highlighted here, the thesis will be structured in a coherent and logical manner to ensure focus and consistency. This structure will be achieved through the discussion of tourism and crime, resident behaviour and community relationships in the following eight chapters. The first of these, Chapter Two, explores the published academic literature relating to the field of tourism and the community, and tourism-related crime. These topics are explored by describing the nature of tourism communities, ascertaining the behaviour, attitude and perception of resident’s towards the tourism industry, and by addressing the theories and relationships which exist between tourism and crime. The chapter also addresses the nature of the gaze, in order to facilitate understanding of the formation of residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime and the extent to which a community can influence them.

Chapter Three then acts as the building block for the investigation and proposes the conceptual framework. The focus here centres on an examination of the relationship which exists between the theoretical concepts of tourism, crime and the community, alongside the social reality and experience of residents who reside within British seaside destinations. The chapter defines the underpinning concepts and explores the relationships between tourism, crime and community structures. The resulting framework systematically investigates the key concepts and concludes with a collective interpretation of the tourism, crime and community literature. Chapter Four, the methodology, then describes and examines the research methods adopted and implemented in the data collection process. This section outlines the logic and rationale of the
investigation, and offers an insight into the causal puzzle set upon the ontological and epistemological perspectives of the researcher.

This discussion is followed by Chapter Five, which describes the characteristics of the case study destinations in this investigation. This chapter contextualises the social reality experienced by residents, and establishes the nature and size of the tourism industry to illustrate the extent of tourism impacts found within each destination area. Furthermore, it highlights the ‘type’ of locations under investigation so that the factors associated with this study can be deemed destination specific.

Chapter Six then presents the first of two chapters outlining the findings of the investigation from the two case study destinations. The chapter investigates the secondary tourism data consisting primarily of population census and crime data accumulated over a three year period, and interprets the extent and nature of the tourism industry in each location, the socio-demographic profile of residents, and the levels of recorded crime in each area. These findings highlight the changing tastes of tourists and improves awareness of the destination areas at the community level. Thus, the chapter sheds light on the structure of the population, the levels of crime experienced, and the level of tourism present in each location. Chapter Seven represents the second chapter of the findings, and describes, analyses, and interprets the primary qualitative data that were collected. This chapter enables the individual responses to tourism impacts to be addressed alongside the overall community perceptions. The chapter also explores, in greater depth, the understanding and consideration of the term and structure of a ‘community’ in modern society by
highlighting the similarities and contrasts which exist between the two destination areas.

Following these chapters, Chapter Eight discusses how the findings established in Chapters Six and Seven contribute and develop the theoretical concepts of tourism, crime and the community. This section aids the explanation of community relationships, as the chapter reflects upon the extent to which group influences impact resident perceptions of tourism and crime. The final chapter, Chapter Nine, then concludes by presenting the theoretical and practical implications drawn from the investigation. The chapter explains the extent to which a community influences resident perceptions of tourism and crime within two British seaside destinations, and proposes that both the direct and indirect effects of resident consumption and perception can bear influence upon behaviour and collective community perceptions. Further to this discussion, the final chapter illustrates that community characteristics are in fact destination specific, and vary between the two seaside environments studied. As an overview of this thesis, a visual annotation of the structure is displayed in Figure 2.1 below.
Figure 1.1: Structure of thesis
2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by, individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime, as crime is considered as being a by-product of the tourism industry (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Jud 1975; Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996), and an externality which can have serious consequences for both a destination and for the individuals affected (Ryan 1993). This chapter therefore primarily reviews the literature pertinent to understanding the relationship of tourism and crime, and to analyse residents’ reactions and responses to the issues and impacts of tourism. However, to develop a thorough understanding of residents’ perceptions of tourism-related crime, it is imperative to acknowledge the wider body of knowledge surrounding the development and structure of a ‘community’. Therefore, the review will also evaluate residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts. This analysis is necessary, as a community represents both a ‘primary resource upon which tourism depends, and their existence...may be used to justify the development of tourism itself’ (Richards and Hall 2000:1). Consequently, the broader issues relating to tourism and the community need to be considered alongside resident behaviour, attitude and perception towards the tourism industry. This understanding will enable the ‘gaze’ to be established, and for the impacts of tourism and crime upon community perceptions, reactions and behaviour of the tourism industry to be established, by enabling the assessment of the role a community plays in affecting residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime.
There is, at this stage, a need to establish the use and understanding of the terms ‘resident’ and ‘host’ in context to the study at hand. Residents are often referred to as hosts, and inter-related characteristics exist. However, ‘hosts’ are said to interact with the tourism industry on a regular basis and are willing and cooperative participants in the delivery of tourism products (Pizam, Uriely and Reichel 2000; Cole 2006). In contrast, the nature and extent of contact and engagement that ‘residents’ have with the tourism industry is reflected through variables such as economic gain (Krippendorf 1987; Andereck et al. 2005). Therefore, it is proposed here that a distinction is made, as the social reality experienced by today’s society suggests that no ‘real’ contact is made between the two parties. Instead it is suggested that the contact experienced between them is only skin deep and thus the relationship is a mere illusion (Krippendorf 1987), ‘not all people are naturally hospitable, not all want to serve’ (Cole 1997:219). For that reason, the term ‘resident’ will be utilised in this investigation to encompass local residents, community members and ‘hosts’ who interact on a regular basis with the tourism industry. Nevertheless, there is still a need to refer to hosts in respect of the host-guest paradigm (Section 2.3.2) as key literature in this field underpins the social interactions which occur.

In line with the content being reviewed, it is vital to comprehend what influence large numbers of tourists can have on the society they visit (Brown 1998). This understanding is necessary as resident’s attitudes can become reflective of their perceived level of economic benefit, influenced by the nature and extent of contact they have with the industry (Krippendorf 1987), combined with their ability to continue their daily duties without experiencing inconveniences. The
sensitivities and relationships developed here can also determine the residents’ perception of the industry, and influence the way in which their community shapes and responds to the social and environmental change imposed by the tourism industry (Pearce, Moscardo and Ross 1996). Therefore blame can descend upon tourism for some of the disruption of internal family structures (Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996), and conflict can arise through the socio-cultural, economic, and power discrepancies experienced by individuals (Tosun 2002), as residents become more antagonistic towards tourists and tourism as time passes. It is at this stage that issues and relationships between tourism and crime become more apparent (Brunt and Hambly 1999) and the need for understanding such relationships is given emphasis, as destinations which gain notoriety as crime hot spots often experience difficulties in retaining their tourism industry and improving their social situations (Prideaux 1996; Schiebler, Crotts and Hollinger 1996). It is vital therefore to comprehend, from the perception of residents themselves, ‘how’ tourism impacts affect their daily lives, beliefs and actions. After all, tourism relies heavily upon the goodwill and local hospitality of residents (Murphy 1985; Gursoy, Jurowski and Uysal 2002). Indeed, perception needs to be recognised as a complex element upon which behaviour can depend, as it is developed through the formation of images and is based upon time, human relationships, intuitions, and emotions (Goodey 1971).

Consequently, it is important not to appraise the tourism and crime literature in isolation, but to contextualise the impacts that they can have in relation to resident and community issues at a destination level. Respectively, by determining the reactions and responses of a community to tourism and crime,
the different socio-economic neighbourhoods within a destination can be considered, in terms of evaluating the individual residents who reside within them. Therefore, this chapter will evaluate the importance and classification of a community, and the role it plays in shaping the attitude and perception of residents from the same neighbourhood. In addition it attempts to determine resident responses to issues and impacts of tourism-related crime within the community through their interactions and encounters with tourists (as shown in Figure 2.1). This illustration will offer further knowledge and understanding to the theories of tourism and crime, whilst addressing the issues facing the community, the industry, and tourist. However to develop such understandings, a firm evaluation of the term ‘community’ is required as ‘our perceptions of contemporary community life are frequently distorted by misperceptions of patterns of social relationships that made up community life in the past’ (Crow and Allan 1994:22). Therefore, the following section sets out an interpretation of academic literature surrounding the topic of tourism and the community.
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2.2 Tourism and the Community

Tourism literature highlights human consequences as being an integral part of tourism (Burns and Holden 1995), with relationships being framed by the pressures of social relations experienced between people who would not normally meet (Burns and Holden 1995). The interactions are outlined by confrontational aspects of meetings between cultures and ethnic groups (Burns and Holden 1995), whose lifestyle, level of prosperity, language and behaviour may differ. These relationships are comparable to meetings between holiday-makers and local residents, as respectively, these are individuals who may feel released from many of their normal economic and social constraints, or people who reconcile gains and costs of sharing their lives with others (Pizam 1978; Burns and Holden 1995; Lindenberg, Andersson and Dellaert 2001). Either way, both parties are influenced by the social and cultural impacts of their environment, with tourism affecting the values, attitudes, customs and beliefs of each individual, as well as their living patterns and their mode of life (Brown 1998; Goeldner and Ritchie 2006). Therefore, it is inevitable that the presence of large numbers of tourists will have an ‘effect on the societies they visit, and not improbable that they should in turn be affected by these societies’ (Brown 1998:66); So, ‘the issue of how communities shape and respond to social and environmental changes is a driving factor in assessing community responses to tourism’ (Pearce et al. 1996:6).
2.2.1 Understanding ‘Community’

In general, there is a limited understanding surrounding the term ‘community’ as it has developed many meanings evolved around shared aims (Willmott 1989; Crow and Allan 1994; Hoggett 1997), with academics possessing their own notion of what a ‘community’ consists of (Bell and Newby 1971). The literature suggests that a community can range from, and include, a group of people having something in common with one another, which could be identified in a geographical and territorial manner; to being distinguished by means of shared characteristics, other than place, where people are linked through ethnicity, occupation and other interests (Crow and Allan 1994). For these reasons alone, it is vital to acknowledge the variety of definitions that the term carries. This understanding will ensure that a true reflection of the concept is determined, as already different views of community boundaries have been pro-offered that are characterised by varying features, including levels of fluidity, scale and cohesion (Ap and Crompton 1993; Prentice 1993; Evans 1997).

2.2.2 Community Boundaries and Scale

The scale and boundaries of a community ‘can be as small as a couple of streets or as large as a nation (or even a group of them)’ (Willmott 1989:2). Where territorial issues are concerned, social research more commonly uses the smaller scales of boundary. This scale represents the social boundaries of communities as not only do they have an influence upon perception of community life, but opportunities to participate within them are not forthcoming for new arrivals without conscious involvement and a desire to become a
community member (Crow and Allan 1994). This resistance is perhaps because ‘networks are not necessarily open to outsiders’ (Crow and Allan 1994:2).

Symbolic boundaries therefore become more important over time, as illustrated by Crow and Allen (1994) in their review of Cohen’s (1985) work which identified the boundaries of a community as being fluid, and not fixed, and having a more apparent stance to insiders, rather than outsiders (Crow and Allan 1994). This interpretation means that peripheral individuals can become a core member, and effectively integrate into the community despite their geographical location, as long as they are not viewed as being part of a transient population that are un-representational of the area. If this inclusion is the case, then community boundaries can be acknowledged as being more ‘solid’ than first perceived (Evans 1997). They are solid in the form of control and integration, as there is evidence that suggests areas ‘controlled’ by groups and gangs are perceived as being closed to newcomers (Evans 1997).

Nevertheless, spatial boundaries are also important, and are deemed as being fluid, as they have the potential to change over time (Crow and Allan 1994). Therefore individuals can have a personal (symbolic) boundary to their community structure, and at the same time, they can respond differently, and adapt to situations which arise in response to the level of movement (fluidity) that they have in terms of the geographical space, especially when faced with risk and a fear of crime (Evans 1997).
Due to these interchanging variables, both the boundaries and scale of a community need to be set, especially since geographical dispersion can affect the nature of perceptions and human relationships through the fluidity of change and the diversity of reactions within a community, manifested by different behavioural strategies (Ap and Crompton 1993). Therefore ‘how’ a community responds to the opportunities and challenges of tourism can depend to a large extent on the attitude towards the industry itself (Murphy 1985; Andereck and Vogt 2000), as attitude is defined by a variety of personal and complex variables.

2.2.3 Community Cohesion

For the reasons already discussed, the term community can denote a false sense of cohesion, as residents are grouped purely for analytical purposes (Prentice 1993). This grouping encourages community members to develop an homogenous view of what is deemed acceptable, which can differ from their original dissimilar interests (Prentice 1993). Among this theory and conceptual models associated with the examination of resident reactions to tourism, homogenous views are seen to be an unrealistic representation of populations, as residents are individuals who hold heterogeneous views about the development which occurs within their area. Additionally, it does not explain the variations among residents within the same community (Zhang et al. 2006), as the heterogeneity of each community member makes it far more complex to understand the various attitudes towards differing impacts within the community, especially tourism (Zhang et al. 2006).
Even so, it should be recognised that ‘because of the complexities within communities...different residents within a given time period may exhibit the full range’ (Carmichael 2000:603) of perceptions, emotions and anticipation. These intricacies are discussed in more detail in Section 2.3.4, as to address these dilemmas studies should first characterise ‘what’ constitutes a community as perception is ‘an extremely dynamic process’ (Goodey 1971:4) and stereotypes can prove to be extremely influential upon collective community perception (Pi-Sunyer 1989). Consequently there are definitional and measurement problems with concepts of a ‘community’ (Pearce et al. 1996), as that which constitutes a community has not been considered carefully by researchers (Burr 1991, cited in Pearce et al. 1996). For that reason alone, the expression of a community now requires a more precise definition, as the term has been constantly used within the tourism literature, but is rarely defined.

2.2.4 Defining ‘Community’

In a challenge to distinguish a suitable definition of the term ‘community’, Bell and Newby (1971) consulted Hillery’s (1955, cited in Bell and Newby 1971) advanced analysis of ninety-four community understandings and classifications. However, despite the obvious findings that all definitions dealt with people (Bell and Newby 1971), the variety of concepts did not distinguish the true meaning of the term community. Therefore, versatility is required, as not all definitions of a community can be correct, especially since a community cannot exist as a specific area, and not be a specific area at the same time (Bell and Newby 1971). Alternatively, different forms of communities can be fashioned, which implies that a community can take on many roles, including being a part of a
specific geographical area, and/or a group of people who share something in common other than physical proximity (Willmott 1989; Lee & Newby 1983, cited in Crow and Allan 1994), as displayed in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions/Understandings</th>
<th>Territorial/Place</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Shared element which is understood geographically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Social System</td>
<td>Networks structured around common interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community of Attachment</td>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>Relates to the spirit of community expressed in the form of collective actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From an examination of Table 2.1, it is understood that a community can be formed through individuals structuring themselves via their geographical dispersion, common interests or collective actions. Although the broad similarities are striking in Table 2.1 (Crow and Allan 1994), it is important to note that Lee and Newby’s (1983, cited in Crow and Allan 1994) distinction of local social systems as a form of community division, retains geographical elements unlike Willmott’s (1986, cited in Crow and Allan 1994) distinctions of interest community. Even so, a generalised perspective emerges, predicated on an understanding that the requirement for active, positive involvement of people and organisations is required for a community to exist.
These characteristics are required as ‘in short, communities are defined not only by relations between members, among whom there is similarity, but also by the relations between...“insiders” and “outsiders”, who are distinguished by their difference and consequent exclusion’ (Crow and Allan 1994:7). ‘Visitors’ can therefore create additional social relationships which differ from the affiliations amongst the local population (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006), with these relationships having an effect upon local living patterns, mode of life and attitudes of local residents (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006).

Therefore it is essential that the term ‘community’ is seriously assessed, as the term has been constantly used within the tourism literature, but rarely defined. The only useful guidance specified is put forward by Richards and Hall (2000:302) who state that a tourism community is ‘assumed to be equated with the presence of a set of common social characteristics and goals held by a population residing in a local area’. These assumptions can resemble the level of attachment apparent within the community, affecting the nature of perceptions and human relations (Goodey 1971). They also resemble characteristics of local residents and their daily interactions and intellectual perceptions, thus confirming the definitions and understanding cited by Crow and Allen (1994). This explanation connects the spirit of a community to the expression of collective actions, and links them directly to community attachment.

Taking all of these definitions together, a community is best thought of as developing through the dealings of ‘what’ each individual encounters in their normal everyday life, through dealings with others, and the gaze. This insight
formulates the mental perception of others through the gaze (Maoz 2006) and represents the differences found within dissimilar social groups and societies of different historical periods. After all, perception is not just about seeing, rather, it is also about hearing, touching, tasting and smelling the entirety of what is ‘out there’ (Goodey 1971). Hence aspects of the ‘gaze’ can influence the behaviour (Urry 2002) of residents and, in turn, influence their community.

2.2.5 Community Attachment

Community attachment can be ‘conceptually defined as the extent and pattern of social participation and integration into the community, and sentiment or affect toward the community’ (McCool and Martin 1994:29). Consequently, it can affect the nature of perceptions and human relations within a specific destination (Goodey 1971) as research has contemplated the length of residency as a unit for analysis (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974). This research implies that social relationships are strengthened through the length of residency and attachment individuals have with a destination. However, due to the limited responsibility of an individual, as discussed by Kasarda and Janowitz (1974), ‘community attachment may be less about social networks and more a part of what they term “place dependency”’ (Roggenbuck and Watson 1992, cited in Mason and Cheyne 2000:408). This view emphasises the mobility of community members and draws attention to the fact that, in this highly mobile society, ‘people may participate extensively in local institutions and develop community attachments yet be prepared to leave these communities if local conditions fail to satisfy their immediate needs or aspirations’ (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974:329). This level of attachment is of high importance to the
tourism industry as it affects the status of ‘outsiders’ to the resident population and reflects the transient nature of the industry (Hartmann 1986; Peck and Lepie 1989).

In general, the strength of attachment can be measured through the characteristics of local residents by means of length of residency, birth place, heritage, local friendships and network ties, social position, local bonds, local community context, and community sentiments, as well as the stage of an individual within their lifecycle (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974; Um and Crompton 1987; Beggs, Hurlbert and Haines 1996; Andereck et al. 2005). It is understood that residents with stronger levels of attachment have a more informed viewpoint and have stronger views of both the positive and negative impacts of tourism within the community (McCool and Martin 1994, cited in Mason and Cheyne 2000). Hence length of residency can affect an individual’s local bonds and sentiments (Beggs et al. 1996) through the network ties of a community.

The social positions held by residents can also influence the strength of attachment. However, these characteristics are more dependent upon wealth, with the poorer community members being more reliant on stronger ties than wealthier individuals (Beggs et al. 1996).

The strength of attachment is therefore central to community research as it affects the judgement of an individual upon place, and contributes to friendship networks within the community. It is imperative therefore not to underestimate the ‘complex system of friendship and kinship networks and formal and informal associational ties rooted in family life and on-going socialisation processes’ (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974:329) as community attachment is really one
aspect of a larger question. Indeed, the larger enquiry encompasses examining the impacts of tourism development upon the social structure and function of community life, alongside developing an understanding of the commercial temperament of the tourism industry and the influence that it may have over the social structure (McCool and Martin 1994). This attachment can be identified by focussing on the social fabric of a community in a systematic way, by considering local social networks and drawing out those relations that are work-related (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974). The insinuation of these suggestions are founded upon the amount of community attachment that an individual has with their local neighbourhood, and the economic remuneration which are perceptible to individuals (de Kadt 1979). This regard generates limitations in terms of the trade-offs which occur between ‘the benefits and costs perceived by community members’ (Zhang et al. 2006:186). However, the interrelationship between these economic gain and social consequences are complex, and need to be addressed further, as it is one of many limitations which is associated with tourism community studies due to a lack of attention and theory (McCool and Martin 1994). As a result, such limitations shall now be discussed with specific reference to the tourism industry.

2.2.6 Limitations of Community Studies

A major limitation that has been identified when developing community studies is the capability to describe and profile the actual impacts of tourism. Pearce et al. (1996) suggested that only a few researchers have requested residents to rate or assess the importance and level of impacts upon their lives, and even fewer have developed a list from respondents themselves. However since
Pearce et al.'s (1996) paper, inductive, emic and exploratory approaches towards understanding a community have been established by numerous authors (for example McGehee and Meares 1998; Brunt and Courtney 1999; Mason and Cheyne 2000; Gjerald 2005). Therefore, in contrast to Ap and Crompton's (1993) suggestion, the levels of impact have started to be empirically addressed. This progression acknowledges the fact that individuals within a community do respond differently to opportunities and challenges by reconciling their personal traits alongside a variety of personal and complex variables (Goodey 1971; Murphy 1985).

It has therefore been demonstrated that the relationship between communities, the industry and tourists is complex and inter-related, with community residents holding both similar and dissimilar attitudes and aspirations towards tourists and tourism development (Zhang et al. 2006). Such differences are represented within each community, as found by Andereck and Vogt (2000) who state that dissimilarities arise due to the variety of individual residents preference over the development of new and existing tourism products, thus impacting the overall community perspective. As a result, the range of relationships has created community specific differences in opinions (Andereck and Vogt 2000).

Accordingly, the effects of these attitudes influence individual perception, encounters and interactions with the industry, and form the basis of a collective community perception on tourism development, derived through the personal attitudes and perceptions of local residents (Johnson, Snepenger and Akis 1994), albeit diminished or enhanced. This perception is duly emphasised when the tourism industry, as an element of change, modifies the level of
engagement with tourists, sways the economic gain perceived by residents, and
emphasises the socio-economic impacts felt by a community. Depth to these
topics will be unravelled shortly (Section 2.3), but for now emphasis remains
with the need to identify groups of residents by their responses to allow
‘researchers closer to the development of more general theories concerning the
links between perceptions and attitudes and the corresponding stage in tourism
development’ (Perez and Nadal 2005:939). However, as Perez and Nadal
(2005) have emphasised, real progress depends upon a better understanding of
the factors that underline these patterns starting with the individual resident’s
perception, attitude and behaviour towards the tourism industry.

As a result, there are two sides to this discussion to consider. On the one hand,
individual perceptions can influence and dictate the overview of a community’s
ability to comprehend issues of ownership and influence, the benefits from
tourism, and the social impacts which change the nature of the community
(Peck and Lepie 1989). On the other, a community can play a significant role in
shaping social identities and patterns of action of their members (Crow and
Allan 1994). So evidently, community relationships can develop in response to
structural changes in the tourist industry (Mathieson and Wall 1982), and these
can occur differently within each neighbourhood, as the effects of tourism can
be felt through different means, as attitude is considered as being a product of
the personal trait of each and every individual (Goodey 1971). After all, there is
‘no doubt that the communities of which we are members play a significant role
in shaping our social identities and patterns of action’ (Crow and Allan 1994:1).
In the same instance, human communities can ‘represent both a primary resource upon which tourism depends, and their existence in a particular place at a particular time may be used to justify the development of tourism itself’ (Richards and Hall 2000:1). Therefore it is perceived that communities form a reason to travel, and encourage tourism to a destination area, as communities shape the natural landscapes which many tourists consume (Richards and Hall 2000).

This evaluation brings to light a further limitation, as it was deliberated that the term ‘community’ in itself, is too vague, due to the term being comprehended in different ways. This deliberation reflects the lack of theory and progress (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997), as well as the wider inconsistencies and lack of vigour over the definition and use of term ‘community’ has within the social sciences (Richards and Hall 2000). The fragmented framework of existing theories and the level of assertions upon which community research are based upon are also to blame (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997; Zhang et al. 2006). An alternative manner in which the social structure and power can be defined within a specific location is represented in Newby’s (1978, cited in Willmott 1989) work which places the focus upon local groupings, their characteristics and their inter-relationships. This knowledge heightens the representativeness of the social reality within a destination area, in a different way to which the term ‘community’ can (Willmott 1989). As a result, the term ‘community’ will be used within this investigation. However, the term will represent the local groupings, characteristics and the inter-relationships of residents, to encompass the breadth of meaning.
2.2.7 Summary of Tourism and Community

The nature and shape of a community are central to this investigation, as the level of fluidity and change of the spatial boundaries can impede upon scale and cohesion of a group of residents (Ap and Crompton 1993; Prentice 1993; Evans 1997). Symbolic boundaries become more important over time, therefore geographical dispersion, common interests, and collective actions of a community are paramount.

Despite the existence of definitional and measurement problems (Pearce et al. 1996), a community can take on many roles. It is the requirement for active, positive involvement of people and organisations for a community to exist which is of interest, as it considers how the relationships between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ can be established (Crow and Allan 1994). This interpretation represents the ‘social reality’ of residents within a tourism destination.

Nevertheless, it is important to reiterate the limitations of community studies, as a community can denote a false sense of cohesion, as residents are grouped purely for analytical purposes (Prentice 1993). A community should instead be seen as a ‘complex web of social bonds...fashioned by the large scale institution of mass society’ (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974, cited in McCool and Martin 1994:30). For these reasons, a community is assumed as equating to ‘a set of common social characteristics and goals held by a population residing in a local area’ (Richards and Hall 2000:302) for the remainder of this investigation. This definition will aid the setting of boundaries and scale for community analysis.
and not miscalculate the purposes of community cohesion. After all, isolation of these issues could create further limitations.

From this review of the tourism and community literature, there are numerous topics which require further investigation. As with most aspects of academic reviews, there are many sides to the story. Issues of resident attitude and behaviour need careful examination alongside the social representations and exchange of individuals within their community, as this exchange-process influences community perspectives. As a result, aspects of the gaze, interaction and encounters, and the host-guest relationship will also be discussed (Section 2.3) to substantiate the specific determinants which need to been identified (Murphy 1985) in relation to community attitudes. These include the type of contact which has a bearing on residents’ reaction and support for the industry, the relative importance of the industry to an individual or community’s prosperity, and, the economic and tolerance threshold in the residents’ receptiveness (Doxey 1975; Murphy 1985; Madrigal 1995).

This discussion is necessary, as on the whole, there is a requirement to understand the term ‘community’ in context to the study at hand as the exchange of resources is a prominent social activity within a tourist destination. Visitors can create social relationships which differ from the affiliations among the local population (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006), and these can have an effect upon local living patterns, mode of life and attitudes of local residents (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006). Therefore, these relationships shall now be discussed in more detail.
2.3 Resident’s Behaviour, Attitude and Perception

‘Tourism has been regarded as playing a major role in bringing about social change’ (Perez and Nadal 2005:925). Moreover, it is seen as having an effect upon the socio-cultural characteristics of residents’ habits, daily routines, social lives, beliefs and values, which in turn lead to ‘psychological tensions’ within a destination (Andereck et al. 2005). Accordingly, having a good understanding of local reactions and the factors that influence their attitudes is essential. This understanding is particularly important, if successful tourism policies are to be achieved, and the long-term sustainable future of the tourism industry is desired (Lawson, Williams, Young and Cossens 1998; Williams and Lawson 2001; Perez and Nadal 2005).

Theoretical studies suggest that tourism can have a number of serious effects upon social and psychological aspects of the resident population (Pizam 1978) and can have a bearing upon their quality of life (Williams and Lawson 2001). Subsequently, it is the ‘individual’s subjective evaluation of a range of elements’ (Ross 1992:14) which need to be considered. This evaluation includes aspects of the social exchange process and the formation of social representations alongside the relationships and ratios which exist between residents and guests. After all, residents play a crucial role, and must be willing partners, in the processes and success of a sustainable tourism-based economy (Allen et al. 1988). This contribution is due to the frequency of interaction and encounter. Consequently, residents should be willing to serve as gracious hosts if tourism is to be successful (Allen et al. 1988).
2.3.1 Residents' Interface of Exchange

The willingness of residents and their attitudes towards tourists is related directly to the degree of contact and/or the stage of development experienced within the local community (Krippendorf 1987; Allen et al. 1988; Lawson et al. 1998). For example, ‘heavy tourism concentration on a destination area leads to negative resident attitudes towards tourists and tourism’ (Pizam 1978:12), but the residents who are dependent on tourism for their livelihood develop positive perceptions of the tourism industry (King, Pizam and Milman 1993). However, it is noted that some studies suggest that ‘communities have a certain capacity to absorb tourists’ (Allen et al. 1988:17), as they acknowledge tourism is not without its negative impacts. It is therefore due to these inter-related factors, that the most common way of empirically assessing these social impacts have been through addressing resident perceptions’ of tourism (Lawson et al. 1998; Haley, Snaith and Miller 2005). The perceptions of residents are therefore found to be influenced by different factors of contact, capacity, dependency, interaction and exchange (Doxey 1975; Murphy 1985; Madrigal 1995), which are reflective to some extent of Doxey’s (1975) Irridex Index and Butler’s (1980) resort life-cycle.

The Irridex Index contemplates the different levels of perception experienced within a community. Doxey (1975) suggests that perception stems from the impact of encounters between residents and outsiders at a destination which cause irritations to emerge. Irritations can prove to be harmful to the long-term sustainability of a destination as their origins imply that perception is affected through both sheer numbers of outsiders, and by potential threats upon their
existing way of life (Doxey 1975). Over time these irritations will begin to be expressed more overtly, displaying the full range of irritations from euphoric anticipation to antagonist resentment (Doxey 1975).

It is also recognised that ‘different residents within a given time period may exhibit the full range of feelings on Doxey's scale’ (Carmichael 2000:603). However, caution is required as ‘unless local residents are psychologically capable of adjusting to change, irritation levels will continue to rise with long term disastrous effects to the total environment of the tourist area, and to the tourist industry’ (Doxey 1975:198) being established. This caution is required due to the wide spectrum of variables in operation which must be used to arrive at a relevant conclusion, which includes more than just the assumptions of interaction and encounter. It also involves the added diversity of escapism (Ap and Crompton 1993). Subsequently, actions can provide 'a conceptual base for understanding the exchange of resources of any kind, concrete or symbolic, between individuals and groups' (Ap 1992, cited in Andereck and Vogt 2000:29).

Butler (1980), in contrast, offers a destination specific, stage-related destination life cycle model which sees the development of tourist areas through different stages of progression. Butler (1980) encompasses change based upon consumption patterns of tourists, whilst stressing the place specific implications of his model. Essentially, when the number of tourists increase within a destination over time, ‘a general reduction in overall quality and attractiveness’ (Butler 1980:10) can occur, with resident reactions mirroring such growth and change. However, unlike Doxey (1975), Butler (1980:10) states that ‘resident reaction to tourists is not necessarily explained by increasing contact with
visitors or increasing numbers of visitors alone. It is a more complex function, related to the characteristics of both visitors and visited, and the specific arrangements of the area involved’. Therefore, additional implications need to be addressed, beyond the nature of contact and interaction, as it is important to thoroughly understand the theories of impact and influences which are linked to the notions of Butler’s (1980) destination life-cycle and Doxey’s (1975) Irridex Index. A summary of these factors are displayed in Table 2.2 and represent the social impacts of tourism that influence residents’ perceptions.
From an analysis of Table 2.2, it is evident that residents’ perceptions are influenced by many factors, and are ‘known to vary according to a variety of individual and community, or societal, level factors’ (Lawson et al. 1998:247). This understanding suggests that residents’ attitudes toward the social impact of tourism are not ‘consistently related to frequency of tourist contact, length of residence, age, and language’ (Um and Crompton 1987:27). Instead, the social
impacts of tourism involve instantaneous changes in the structure of the community, and are also influenced by any changes in the destination’s economy and the tourism industry (Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996).

For that reason, it is important to develop understandings of the exchange process further. This knowledge can be achieved by evaluating the nature of social contact that occurs between local residents and outsiders/tourists (Pearce 1982) in the form of encounters and interactions. For the individuals involved, the encounter is then usually followed by a mutual change in feelings and attitudes (Pizam et al. 2000), forming a relationship between the resident and the guest. Therefore the exchange system is best understood through the processes of the social exchange theory, as suggested by Ap (1992), along with social representations and the concept of the perceptual model offered by Goodey (1971). All of these models have a bearing upon the relationships which form between residents and guests and the nature of the encounter. This relationship can sequentially have influence upon the perceived social impacts of tourism felt by the resident population. After all, the host-guest relationship illustrates a diverse environment for encounters and interactions to occur between both parties (Pearce 1982; Sharpley 1994; Pizam et al. 2000; Aramberri 2001; Zhang et al. 2006).

2.3.2 Host-guest Relationship

It can be said that the nature of the host-guest relationship varies in response to level of involvement, transitory contact and personal exploration that an individual has with the tourism industry. The outcome of which can be both
positive and negative (Sutton 1967; Pearce 1982; Sharpley 1994; Pizam et al. 2000; Aramberri 2001; Zhang et al. 2006). It is from these interactions that clear understandings can be been formed, not only about the nature of the encounter but the impact it can have upon local residents and their community. However, for characteristics of the host-guest relationship to be warranted there is a need within the literature to assume uniformity within the community. Residents must stand together even though their networks can be destroyed or damaged irretrievably by interaction with outside forces (Aramberri 2001).

Despite this uniformity, individual interaction displays the social processes at work, on the basis that social contact results in interaction (Pearce 1982). This interaction ‘accounts for the perception and behaviour of the people in contact [through the] interpersonal forces and intra-individual forces operating in the encounter’ (Pearce 1982:68). The tourism encounters offered by Pearce’s (1982) analysis refer in some detail to Sutton’s (1967) study, and the combined attribution implies that social contact affects the nature of the encounter. As a result of Pearce’s (1982) study, the social contact and encounters experienced between tourists and residents can be emphasised by four specific characteristics, as shown in Table 2.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3: Specific characteristics which emphasise the nature and type of encounter experienced between hosts and guests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourists’ roles are defined as involving transitory contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status differs between those who have the encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A marked degree of environmental and personal exploration is incurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commoditisation of goods can result in the host-guest contact having both positive and negative outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The characteristics displayed in Table 2.3 are defined through tolerance levels and the desire for gratification from the relationship. Positivity occurs when the parties are tolerant, with the visitors being enthusiastic and the hosts being competent providers of services (Pearce 1982). Meanwhile, negativity is seen as an outcome of the desire for immediate gratification afflicting both the visitor and the host, and ‘when suspicion and mistrust develop from cultural misunderstandings and misplaced attributions about the other group’ (Pearce 1982:70).

What is clear here is that a variety of perceptions and outcomes can be felt through the social contact of an encounter. In some instances, the host-guest encounter can suggest a sense of willingness, equality and harmony between the characters within the equation (Sharpley 1994). However, as Sharpley (1994) has suggested, this structural consensus is not always balanced and equitable. In fact, sometimes it is contradictory to such a conclusion. After all, some ‘encounters between tourists and local people bear more relation to conflict theory than harmonious inter-action’ (Sharpley 1994:185), that is of course unless a meaningful and balanced host-guest encounter occurs in a situation of mutual dependence through local control of tourism development (Sharpley 1994).

In contrast, Aramberri (2001) offers a more sinister approach to the host–guest paradigm, arguing that the literature does not help to explain the nature of current tourism environments. Instead the existing understandings actually obscure the complex interactions between local cultures and their environments,
as they ‘favour a static and exclusionary vision of cultures’ (Aramberri 2001:740). As a result, there are three specific characteristics which Aramberri (2001) believes need to be acknowledged. They include protection, reciprocity and duties to both parties.

Protection is referred to in terms of the extension of hospitality by the host to the guest, where the hosts extend their welcome to outsiders, allowing them to stay for the chosen time, and implying a level of safety for guests. Protection therefore implies a provision of safety for tourists and assumes that for the time the guest chooses to stay, the host allows him to remain (Aramberri 2001). This protection leads to the second element of the host-guest relations, which demands reciprocity. Reciprocity implies a mutual understanding exists between the local residents and the guest, with the guest returning the protection whenever their roles are reversed (Aramberri 2001). This interchange suggests a future protection of the ‘host, his family members, or his associates in the same predicament as the guest at present’ (Aramberri 2001:742). This exchange then results in the third feature of the host-guest affairs, where there are duties for both parties within the interaction and encounter stages, where the host tends to the protection of not only their guests, but to their material well-being, and the guest becomes regarded as a temporary member of the family (Aramberri 2001). Therefore residents are seen as protecting the hosts by respecting their property and being helpful and enduring without complaint whilst they are in their company (Aramberri 2001).

One main limitation of understanding the host-guest relationship though is based upon how the structure of encounter and interaction was devised within
Aramberri’s (2001) study. Initially the literature was developed to ‘understand the relations between tourists from industrialized countries, usually upmarket members, and fragile communities with old traditions’ (Aramberri 2001:756), and it was not to simulate the interaction of international or mass tourism to the developed world. Therefore, the host–guest paradigm, as discussed, can become a ‘theoretical void’ (Aramberri 2001:747). This understanding creates more problems than the theory solves, as hosts and guests are grouped purely for analytical reasons and the generalisations suggest that by purely denouncing a dislike, residents can cope with social change, which is not always the case.

To date the attempts to model host-guest attitudes toward tourism through interaction and encounters are relatively simplistic (Carmichael 2000; Zhang et al. 2006). The fragmented theories have remained at the level of a series of assertions, which cause concern as models such as Doxey’s (1975) Irridex Index cannot explain well the variations among residents due to the need for a degree of homogeneity (Zhang et al. 2006). Furthermore, the models do not indicate the importance of each category presented, or the ‘anticipated direction of change over time’ (Carmichael 2000:604). They do not allow for neutral feelings to be established either. Despite these criticisms, they have been applied. Prentice (1988, cited in Sullivan 2010:24) tested Doxey’s (1975) Irridex Index ‘in the Isle of Man, where the annual Man Tourist Trophy (TT) Motorcycle Races take place’. It was established that each stage of the model’s terminology was ‘not flexible enough to meet the individuality of each case’ (Prentice 1988, cited in Sullivan 2010:24). Furthermore, both Doxey’s (1975) Irridex Index and Butler’s (1980) resort life-cycle have been used to examine
how socio-cultural effects were tilting perceptions of tourism by Teo (1994:126). Despite these applications, among others, these models are still open for criticism, as they do not take into account how residents change their minds in response to the issues being experienced.

For these reasons, the social exchange theory shall now be considered as the model aids the understanding of social processes at work within the host-guest relationship at an interpersonal level (Pi-Sunyer 1989). It also helps to establish a deeper understanding of ‘why’ resident’s attitudes and behaviour differ in relation to tourism impacts (Ap 1992; Perez and Nadal 2005). Therefore the social exchange process can be used to understand the exchange or recourses of any kind, concrete or symbolic, between an individual and/or a group (Ap 1992, cited in Andereck and Vogt 2000) because it also addresses the emotional outcomes associated with change.

2.3.3 Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory has emerged as the most dominant theory to date (Haley et al. 2005). Developed from an economic perspective (Ap 1992; Perez and Nadal 2005; Zhang et al. 2006), the theory ‘accounts for divergent resident evaluations of tourism impacts primarily in terms of experiential or psychological outcomes’ (Waitt 2003:195). Concerned with the exchange of resources between individuals in an interactional situation (Ap 1992), the theory ‘suggests that residents evaluate tourism as either positive or negative in terms of the expected benefits or costs deriving from the services they supply’ (Waitt

When applied to a tourism framework, the social exchange theory predicts that ‘those who are greater beneficiaries of tourism will perceive higher levels of positive impacts’ (Andereck et al. 2005:1071), thus helping to categorise attitudes as a trade-off between the benefits and costs perceived by individuals (Zhang et al. 2006). However, before Ap’s (1992) acknowledgement, it would appear that the social exchange theory had not been applied to the field of tourism. Therefore, based upon Sutton’s (1967) recognition of social exchange, Ap (1992) facilitated the known understandings further, by producing a social exchange process model.

Displayed in Figure 2.2, the model ‘outlines the processes by which residents become involved in tourism exchanges’ (Ap 1992:669) and how residents become involved in these exchanges, continue the interactions, and then become disengaged from the exchanges themselves. This model incorporates a number of basic concepts, including personal needs and satisfaction, exchange relation, the consequences of exchange, and the no-exchange outcome (Ap 1992). At the same time, the model links components associated with the initiation of exchange, the exchange formation, the exchange transaction evaluation and the evaluation of the exchange consequences (Ap 1992).
Within this model, the exchange relation depicts the issues of power and dependency experienced within an exchange. The model also provides the ‘basis for explaining why residents perceive the impact of tourism to be either positive or negative’ (Ap 1992:678) with positivity related to high degrees of influence or control, and negativity connected to the lower levels of power. This impact resembles the anticipated outcomes of the exchange, as Ap (1992) suggests that those with more power and control are more likely to gain a reward or advantage from the situation, unlike those with less power.

However, it is important to note that Figure 2.2 assumes ‘that social relations involve an exchange of resources among social actors, [and these] actors seek mutual benefit from the exchange relationship’ (Ap 1992:659). Moreover, it
assumes that ‘the primary motive for initiation exchange from the residents’ perspective is to improve the community’s social and economic well-being…and [that] residents’ perceptions and attitudes are predictors of their behaviour towards tourism’ (Ap 1992:659). Therefore, because ‘feelings…result from the experiences conveyed “symbolically through the objects exchanged, the functions performed by the exchange, or the meanings attributed to the exchange”’ (Bagozzi 1975:138, cited in Waitt 2003:195), caution is required. After all, it is not simply the existence of an exchange that is important, the nature and value of the exchange that influences attitudes and perceptions are also of relevance (Sirakaya, Teye and Sonmez 2002).

On balance, the social exchange theory can be seen to offer a useful theoretical framework. Yet, it can be viewed by some as an incomplete framework for understanding responses to the tourism phenomena by residents, as it does not take into consideration ‘less quantifiable elements of making decisions such as values and beliefs’ (Andereck et al. 2005:1073). It also fails to address the extent of the nature of engagement between residents and guests, as more engagement ought to result in more perceived benefits from the industry. However, within Andereck’s et al. (2005:1071) study, it is suggested that ‘those who have had objectionable encounters with tourists may actually perceive greater costs than those who have had no, or affirmative, encounters with tourists’. Therefore, the social exchange theory may not be the ‘best framework in which to examine this particular association’ (Andereck et al. 2005:1071).

Due to these limiting factors, it is important to also consider other academic approaches to understanding resident perceptions of tourism’s impact. Thus,
social representations and the human perceptual model shall be discussed in detail. These are important as they address the issues of values and beliefs, and they deal with the supplementary elements of perception being more than about seeing, being about hearing, touching, tasting and smelling the entirety of what is ‘out there’ (Goodey 1971). This discussion shall then be followed by a brief review of academic papers (Section 2.3.6) which have analysed resident perception in different environments to authenticate the theoretical implication of the social world.

2.3.4 Social Representation

Social representation is a notable theoretical approach which considers values in the study of tourism (Zhang et al. 2006) by viewing various aspects of social life as phenomena which can be studied in their own right (Pearce et al. 1996). ‘Residents view the impacts of tourism through the social representations of the industry in the community’ (Zhang et al. 2006:186). The key is being able to identify and distinguish similarities between individual residents within the community, who are influenced by different mechanisms, direct experience, social interaction and the media (Pearce et al. 1996; Zhang et al. 2006). The similarities include values, ideas and practices, which have two key functions. The first is ‘to establish an order which will enable individuals to orientate themselves in their material and social world and to master it; and secondly to enable communication to take place among the members of a community’ (Moscovici 1984, cited in Pearce et al. 1996:38).
As a result, social representations are ‘valuable for explaining social conflict or reactions to salient issues’ (Pearce et al. 1996:39). For example, commonality, in the sense of common views, can spread the feeling of ‘shared understanding’ between individuals and thus very little representation needs to be shared in public. Then again, when individuals are unable to agree, explicit representations can be used to explain conflict (Pearce et al. 1996), as displayed in Figure 2.3.

From viewing Figure 2.3, it is evident that ‘cultures, subcultures, groups and institutions can exert both direct control over actions’ through regulations and ‘indirect control through socialisation and the sharing of social representations’ (Pearce et al. 1996:48). Social representations therefore can aid the search for commonalities and consensus in community responses to tourism development. After all, residents can form their opinions through a number of sources including attachment and consumption, economic reliance and ethnicity (Williams and Lawson 2001). This output results in human relationships
becoming more complex than ideal (Alber, Jannelle, Philbrick and Sommer 1975), with separate aspects of contact and attitude combining to have more specific applications to the understanding of resident attitudes to tourism impacts (Alber et al. 1975).

It is Carmichael’s (2000) linkages between specific impacts and resident perception that helps to affirm the variation in perception, attitudes and behaviour of residents from the same neighbourhood, and assists with the classification of resident attitudes within a given ‘community’. These linkages include elements of personal experience, such as ‘employment in and knowledge of the tourism industry, distance of residence from the attraction and socio-demographic factors’ (Carmichael 2000:603), all of which are likely to influence perceptions of tourism impacts, and behaviour. These connections are shown in Figure 2.4, where the polar viewpoints of positivity and negativity are displayed.
It is therefore assumed likely that attitudes will influence resident behaviour (Carmichael 2000). However, to take into account the variation of resident’s attitude and behaviour within the same area, fluidity is required across the boundaries of each action and attitude. This understanding has led to the reliance upon a four cell matrix to classify individuals within a destination. Illustrated in Figure 2.5, the matrix combines separate aspects of contact and attitude. Whilst having specific application to the understanding of residents’ attitudes towards tourism (Alber et al. 1975), the outcomes transpire to one’s attitude being negative or positive and one’s behaviour being active or passive (Ap and Crompton 1993; Carmichael 2000). These distinctions are important as ‘aggressive cultures attempt to keep others they deal with in a state of passive acceptance, with all the loss of identity and self-respect such a state implies’ (Alber et al. 1975:98). Furthermore, ‘when people react and become
actively negative towards their oppressors, they develop attitudes and aspirations of a positive nature with respect to their own territoriality’ (Alber et al. 1975:98).

Figure 2.5 was developed through the geographical literature of Alber et al. (1975) and takes into account ‘variations of resident attitudes and behaviours within the same area’ (Carmichael 2000:604). These linkages are sourced through different means, which often result in a spread of opinion and an influence upon behaviour (Carmichael 2000), including issues of attachment and consumption. However, one limitation is that the matrix does not indicate the ‘relative importance of the four categories or the anticipated direction of change over time’ (Carmichael 2000:604), and while frequently is ‘referred to in the tourism literature, there has been no empirical verification of this model to date’ (Carmichael 2000:604).
Ap and Crompton (1993) have demonstrated support for the original model through their continuum for responses to tourism impacts. These include behaviours associated with embracement, tolerance, adjustment and withdrawal (Ap and Crompton 1993), which are recognised as being a diversity of reactions, felt by residents at some stage within their encounter with tourism. Not only that, but attitudes can be ‘defined as an enduring predisposition towards a particular aspect of one's environment’ (Carmichael 2000:604), and can be structured along three dimensions. These dimensions include cognitive, affective, and behavioural characteristics which encompass an individual’s beliefs, knowledge, and perceptions, a representation of their likes and dislikes, as well as taking into consideration the action taken or expressed with reference to a particular object or place (Carmichael 2000).

It is important to note here, that the relationships are not based upon the belief that everything, including every human act, is caused by something. Instead, the strength of the relationship can be influenced by a number of factors including ‘situation factors, the manner in which attitudes are formed, and the relevance or importance of an attitude’ (Ajzen & Fishbein 1980, cited in Carmichael 2000). Crucially, attitudes are not considered as being static. Instead, residents can change their interaction and perception of the community and of tourism, by crossing boundaries. Nonetheless, even with this knowledge, there is still ‘a limited understanding of residents’ responses to the impacts of tourism’ (Carmichael 2000:601) due to the diversity in the range of communities in which tourism occurs, and the multiplicity of residents within each specific host community (Carmichael 2000). There is also a lack of segmentation
studies found within the mainstream literature (Perez and Nadal 2005). Nevertheless, based upon the assertions discussed above, there is a clear indication as to how resident's perceptions can influence and be influenced by the community. The influence these perceptions can have upon individual and collective behaviour can be viewed in Figure 2.6, with the direct links being shown through solid lines, and indirect links through dashed line.

Figure 2.6 displays the positioning of an individual within a group environment and demonstrates the influence of man upon group representations through both action and social representation. The model also aids the understanding of the formation of sub-cultures and groups, or institutions, which best resemble the collective opinion and social nature of the individuals within that area. In
addition to these sub cultures which form, there is also a need to understand the individual perception of humans, as offered by Goodey (1971), as they can impact group representation and societal change. These issues shall now be discussed, as human perception can influence and dictate the overview of a community’s ability to comprehend specific issues (Peck and Lepie 1989).

2.3.5 Perceptual Model

Developed from the geographical literature, the perceptual model, as offered by Goodey (1971), can be viewed in a simple diagrammatic form, as shown in Figure 2.7. The model illustrates ‘avenues’ of the personal space, and enables the diversity of perception from person to person overtime to be recognised (Goodey 1971). This diversity is important to comprehend as the study of perception ‘is complex, and the study of man’s perception of the environment is even more so’ (Goodey 1971:1). This complexity is due to ‘image’ upon which behaviour depends being made up of many fluid variables. The movement expressed within the image are formed through the perceptions of time and human relationships, as well as intuitions and emotions (Goodey 1971).
From the personal space domain of the diagram, judgements can occur to form a comparison as to the closest elements of everyday life, with the model inhabiting elements of the home environment and the individual’s immediate neighbourhood (Murphy 1985). The personal space also helps to identify the restrictions individuals are known to place on their spatial behaviour pattern (Murphy 1985). For example, when connecting this concept to the behaviour of local residents, it is possible to attach the mixed attitudes of residents to Goodey’s (1971) model. This connection is possible due to the recreational elements of space and the involvement of individuals in activities such as sport and shopping. Forming such a perception, however, would also imply that people who benefit from tourism have more favourable attitudes towards tourism development (Perdue, Long and Allen 1987), and that is not always the case (Johnson et al. 1994). Therefore, the consequences of these opinions can
vary with respect to the level and type of contact the resident has with the tourism industry overtime. The formation of avenues and personal space can be seen to change continually, as it is from this understanding that perceptual space is understood (Goodey 1971). Consequently, it allows different opinions to be conceptualised from person to person overtime, whilst assisting the deeper understandings of ‘which’ factors have an influence or can discourage the positive and negative elements of perception (Goodey 1971).

Clear implications can also be exposed, as the model is based upon a dominant perceptual process of individuals, leading to organised mass environmental stimuli and impressions accrued over time (Murphy 1985). What is forgotten though, is that ‘tourists and natives are in diametrically opposite situations, as what is freedom and pleasure for the former, means burden and work for the latter’ (Krippendorf 1987:58). Therefore, a number of additional variables need to be considered when placing the action space into a tourism context. The need for additional variables is due to tourism being a highly social business (Pearce et al. 1996), and the fact that socio-cultural attitudes of a person can inform the action of an individual, and shape their views of others (Murphy 1985).

In general, Goodey’s (1971) model offers movement and action whilst showing an insight into places visited and ‘far off’ places. Each of these areas play an important role in the decision-making process and helps to formalise the views and images of others. However, this image can still be distorted by the formation of stereotypes (Murphy 1985), as residents ‘hold perceptions which are almost entirely constructed from our group or cultural stereotypes and from
fragmentary information gained from media perceptions’ (Goodey 1971:7). Therefore, ‘the importance of group stereotypes cannot be overlooked in tourism’ (Murphy 1985:57), as it can affect the way people view far off places and those who inhabit them. Stereotypes can create preconceived notions of tourists by the local residents’ and engage them in a higher level of scepticism before the individual even enters the destination area.

Consequently, it is essential to compare these academic findings with the social reality experienced by residents. Therefore, general reviews of some of the academic papers generated over the years are discussed to ensure the viability of the social exchange theory and the perceptual model. Although the next section is not intended as a complete review of resident perceptions studies, it will act as a guide as to the differing perceptions which have been identified within the literature. This review is necessary as tourism development has been considered as a form of social conflict for different groups and movements (Perez and Nadal 2005). Therefore, thoughts need to be contextualised to benefit specific research agendas as most studies view aspects of the personal space as a measure of dependency upon the tourism industry (Andereck et al. 2005).

2.3.6 General Reviews

To compare the academic findings with the social reality experienced by residents, and to develop the literature further, authors have made numerous primary analysis of resident perceptions, attitudes and behaviour. The academic papers imply that tourism development creates differing levels of
perception amongst the resident population, with them forming two polar perspectives; a positive outlook or a negative standpoint (Liu and Var 1986; Gursoy et al. 2002; Andereck et al. 2005; Haley et al. 2005) in response to tourism development. In addition, residents can formulate contradictory elements of perception (Liu and Var 1986), whilst also varying their perception on a continuous scale between positive and negative (Milman and Pizam 1988).

The extent of which these contradictions are evident depends on a variety of issues, including the level of economic benefits perceived by local residents (Madrigal 1995; Haley et al. 2005), the nature and extent of contact and engagement residents have with the industry (Krippendorf 1987; Andereck et al. 2005), and, the residents’ ability to continue their daily duties without inconveniences being caused. Ambivalence can also impact upon perception (Liu and Var 1986) as well as issues of power, payoffs and trade-offs (Milman and Pizam!88).

In most cases, it is perceived that positive attitudes are associated with residents who have a commercial stake in the industry, and are dependent on tourism for their livelihood (Murphy 1985; King et al. 1993) along with non-participants of recreational activities (Perdue et al. 1987), and those who have more contact and are more knowledgeable about the industry (Andereck et al. 2005). These conditions translate into a more positive perception of tourism’s impact upon life, image and economy, due to the benefits gained from tourism (Perdue, Long and Allen 1990; Andereck et al. 2005). These benefits transcend into a positive attitude for future development, especially by those who are dependent upon tourism for their livelihood (King et al. 1993). Interestingly, it
was found by Haley et al. (2005:662) in a study of an urban area ‘that as income level fell, the residents were more likely to support increased tourism, and those with the lower incomes were more likely to accept their city becoming more of a destination’.

In contrast, negative perceptions have been found among residents who live and work within the centre of a destination (excluding Haley et al.’s (2005) assessment of Bath which shows the opposite), who inhabit a small tourist town, who have little or no direct involvement with the industry, and amongst participants of recreational sports who have to alter their leisure activities to cater for the rise in participants within the season (Murphy 1985; Perdue et al. 1987). These negative issues have been portrayed as a result of various underlying factors. One example of such is the diversification to tourism from other declining industries (Perdue et al. 1987; Johnson et al. 1994). This diversification suggests that expectations of the tourism industry can have an impact upon attitude and behaviour of individuals, with the initial high expectation for tourism development diminishing overtime (Johnson et al. 1994). This breakdown is due to residents being exposed to a complex relationship between the levels of economic development, tourist activity, and socio-economic impacts, and the onset of discouragement felt by residents (Johnson et al. 1994). Thus there are noted differences in overall opinion, with dissimilar opinions being justified by residents adopting known coping mechanisms to avoid confrontation with ‘outsiders’, which changes in response to their attitudes and behaviours, conditions within the environment also change (Perdue et al. 1987).
Evidence of these conflicting beliefs that incorporate the range of positive and negative opinions can be found within the literature. For example, Liu and Var (1986) ascertained a level of ambivalence and uncertainty being felt by residents as they generally agreed that tourism brought many economic and cultural benefits to a destination, but they also recognised environmental impacts. Even so, residents were reluctant to ascribe the environmental costs to the tourism industry (Liu and Var 1986). This disinclination was despite residents stating that the environment needs the uttermost level of protection. However, they perceived that it should not occur at the cost of their livelihoods, which flourish in accordance to the economic expanse of the industry (Liu and Var 1986). This exchange was due to the apparent ‘trade-off’ residents made between the detrimental environmental impacts of tourism in return for their own accepted high standards of living (Liu and Var 1986, cited in Perdue et al. 1990).

In addition, residents’ attitudes and perceptions towards tourism have been seen to vary on a continuous scale between negative and positive (Milman and Pizam 1988; Andereck and Vogt 2000). The division of which has been established through the importance of issues relating to power, payoff and tradeoffs (Peck and Lepie 1989). Where ‘power’ depicts issues of ownership and input, ‘payoffs’ relate to the hosts’ benefits from tourism, and ‘tradeoffs’ resemble the social impacts which change the nature of the community (Peck and Lepie 1989). Furthermore, the wants and desire of residents, in response to tourism development, can also bear influence upon the overall perception of a community (Andereck and Vogt 2000).
Factors such as the stage of the tourism lifecycle, the level of dependence placed upon the industry, and the experience of cultural differences are all considered as being differentiating factors in determining resident perception’s (Andereck and Vogt 2000). These are in addition to the level of a resident’s engagement with the tourism industry, as the extent of contact and the level of personal gain acknowledged reflects issues of consumption and attachment that may be experienced (Andereck et al. 2005). However, in stark contrast to this familiarity, the social reality experienced by today’s society suggests that no ‘real’ contact is made between residents and guests. Instead, it is suggested that the contact experienced between them is only skin deep and thus the relationship is a mere illusion (Krippendorf 1987). Therefore it is important to understand if the relationship does exist, or if indeed the main reason for guests to travel is to get away from things and to ignore other human activity (Krippendorf 1987).

Consequently, differences in resident perceptions arise due to residents having an inconsistent level of sensitivity towards social and environmental impacts created by tourism, with some having a more favourable attitude towards tourism and the additional development of the industry than others (Perdue et al. 1987; Milman and Pizam 1988; Andereck and Vogt 2000). The fact is perception is ‘an extremely dynamic process and one which is very difficult to monitor’ (Goodey 1971:4), as residents quite rightly seek equivalent benefits from tourism, to what they themselves offer in the form of costs (Perez and Nadal 2005). Therefore, a more generalised analysis of resident perceptions has been ascertained by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997).
In synthesis, Faulkner and Tideswell (1997:5) offer ‘two broad dimensions of the tourism development/community interface’ which refer to the characteristic of location as well as that of the residents, alongside the extrinsic and intrinsic dimensions of tourism. The variables associated with these dimensions include elements of development, tourist/resident ratio and the level of involvement and attachment (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997), by combining the academic models of numerous authors (including Doxey 1975; Butler 1980; and Ap 1992).

On the basis of the insights provided by the literature, Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) have identified potential influences of extrinsic and intrinsic variables upon resident reactions, as displayed in Figure 2.8. The factors are not designed to suggest that combinations of these variables at any one given destination would coincide, but instead ‘the figure suggests that negative impacts of tourism will be accentuated in destinations at a mature stage of tourism development, and where there is a high tourist ratio, an emphasis on international tourism and high seasonality’ (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997:9).
It is therefore from Figure 2.8 that the resident perception can be formulated, to incorporate the variations in perception that occur within a destination. These perceptions become reflective of a resident’s level of involvement, residential proximity, and their length of residency in an extrinsic environment (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997). An outcome of the model is that ‘residents whose employment is directly or indirectly dependent on tourism are expected to be more tolerant of its impacts, irrespective of where they live’ (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997:9). This product is consistent with the work of Krippendorf (1987) and Goodey (1971), who consider resident attitudes as being developed through economic importance and the occupational structure of the local population (Krippendorf 1987) and the perceptual model of space and action (Goodey 1971).
As a result, resident perception, attitude and behaviour can be defined by the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions offered in Figure 2.8. This connection is possible as the theoretical implications have been reassured by the primary analysis of resident perception (Murphy 1985; Perdue et al. 1987). Therefore the synthesis offers a conceptual basis for the remainder of this investigation, as it affirms the fluid variables of perception, and emphasises the deliverance of change over time in different destination areas.

### 2.3.7 Summary of Resident’s Behaviour, Attitude and Perception

From this review of the literature surrounding resident’s perception, attitude and behaviour, it has become apparent that tourism can have an effect upon how residents respond to the challenges of tourism. These responses impact the socio-cultural characteristics of residents’ habits, daily routines, social lives, beliefs and values (Andereck et al. 2005).

Residents, defined by their nature of employment, their ability to respond to tourism development, as well as their level of judgement (Ap and Crompton 1993), can illustrate specific factors which contribute to the beliefs, values and representations towards and of their living environments, and their quality of life (Williams and Lawson 2001). In summary, the factors displayed in Table 2.4 are determined as being influential over resident attitude. Therefore social change and social representations can have a major influence over the perceptions of tourism and tourist development, through issues of encounters and interactions of ‘insiders’ with ‘outsiders’. Finally, the extrinsic and intrinsic
dimensions of the environment also bear influence on the reactions of local residents towards tourism impacts (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997).

The social contact includes residents as willing participants in the delivery of the tourism product, with them seeking gratification from the relationship as encounters are followed by a mutual change in feelings and attitudes (Pizam et al. 2000). However, issues of tolerance thresholds can see the manner of some encounters being representative of conflict rather than harmony (Sharpley 1994). Social contact therefore emphasises the importance of the nature and value of exchange (Sirakaya et al. 2002), as human relationships are more complex than ideal (Alber et al. 1975). The social exchange can therefore be influenced by social representations which explain ‘social conflict or reactions to salient issues’ (Pearce et al. 1996:39). The key is being able to identify and distinguish similarities between individual residents within the community who are influenced by the mechanisms of social representations (Pearce et al. 1996; Zhang et al. 2006). However, to take into account the variation of residents attitude and behaviour within the same area, fluidity is required, as attitude is not static. As what is often forgotten in this exchange process is that ‘tourists
and natives are in diametrically opposite situations. What is freedom and pleasure for the former, means burden and work for the latter’ (Krippendorf 1987:58).

However, what must not be forgotten is how these studies acknowledge common limitations. Therefore, caution has to be given to the lack of a cohesive definition and the lack of statistical analysis to support these assumptions. These deficiencies are important to note, as comparisons are changeable. There is no ‘normal’ society to compare against, and societies are not homogenous. Therefore the only constant is change (Murphy 1985), and resident studies require a degree of homogeneity and uniformity (Aramberri 2001; Zhang et al. 2006). Furthermore, there are contradictory elements within the literature to contend with, as individuals weigh up the costs incurred and the benefits gained from the tourism industry, which then influence the viewpoint of that individual, albeit negative or positive.

Due to the complex web of social bonds and the heterogeneity of each community member (McCool and Martin 1994; Zhang et al. 2006), the impacts need to be considered in more detail. Taken as a whole, collective negative impressions can seriously impede tourism activity and sway the behaviour and attitude of individuals towards the industry. However, to better understand the formation of residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime and the extent to which a community can influence them, it is important to consider the implications of stereotypes and preconceived notions in tourism (Murphy 1985). After all, perceptions can become distorted through group or cultural stereotypes (Goodey 1971; Murphy 1985), and through the gaze of each individual.
Therefore, before considering the impacts of tourism and crime in Section 2.5, the review shall now consider the gaze in depth, as it can bear resemblance upon the perception and understanding of residents towards the tourism industry. The gaze reflects how everybody gazes at everyone else (Maoz 2006). Tourists are the subject of the local gaze. Locals are the subject of the tourist gaze, and amid them is the mutual gaze which regulates the behaviour of the other two (Maoz 2006). The gaze is determined by the encounters and interactions of individuals, which in turn is closely associated with their attitudes and behaviour, as the different type of gaze incorporates ‘the ways guests and hosts view, grasp, conceptualise, understand, imagine, and construct each other’ (Maoz 2006:255).

2.4 The Gaze

To better understand the formation of resident perceptions of tourism and crime and the extent to which a community can influence them, it is important to consider the implications of ‘the gaze’ upon an individual’s understanding. The gaze looks with interest and curiosity at what people encounter, and becomes socially organised and systematised over time (Urry 2002). The gaze relies on mental perceptions (Maoz 2006), which develops differently in dissimilar social groups and societies of different historical periods. Thus, aspects of the gaze can influence behaviour, as tourism, holiday-making and travel are significant social phenomena which have interesting parallels with the study of deviance (Urry 2002). Tourism systems are also ‘sustained by the gaze at the individual level’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:378).
From a tourism perspective, the gaze is considered in terms of the tourist and the resident, as each person gazes at everybody (Maoz 2006). Simultaneously, differentiations can transpire when considering how noticeable each subject is of being watched by the other (Maoz 2006). Therefore, it is at this stage where each type of gaze shall be discussed in relation to encounters and interactions. The aim is to offer an overview of the issues of perception which are incorporated in the gaze, as opposed to offering a detailed analysis of consumption.

2.4.1 Tourist Gaze

Tourism is about ‘consuming goods and services which are in some sense unnecessary. They are consumed because they supposedly generate pleasurable experiences which are different from those typically encountered in everyday life’ (Urry 2002:1). Consequently, an integral part of that experience is to gaze upon or view that which is encountered and is considered out of the ordinary, albeit scenes, landscapes or townscapes (Urry 2002). ‘The gaze is the key means for enjoyment which a tourist employs upon arrival at any particular desired destination’ (Lim 2008:377), and is constructed through its difference and ‘relationship to its opposite, to non-tourist forms of social experience and consciousness’ (Urry 2002:1). It is also ‘associated with the power that tourists activate against locals by gazing at them’ (Maoz 2006:226). Therefore, the tourist gaze is a term used to ‘describe the process through which a tourist objectifies and interprets the place that he or she visits’ (Tussyadiah and Fesenmaier 2009:24). Places are ‘chosen to be gazed upon because there is anticipation, especially through...fantasy, of intense pleasure’
(Urry 2002:3) on behalf of the tourist. However, ‘many attractions are only gazed upon once [therefore] the gaze of a tourist can be amazingly fickle’ (Urry 2002:3).

In accordance with this literature, Knudsen, Soper and Metro-Roland (2007:231) state that ‘Urry’s theorisation of tourism overemphasises the role of tourists in tourism. The term ‘gaze’ implies unidirectionality in the meaning of tourist sites/sights that ignores the reflexive and contested nature of all landscapes, tourist landscapes included’. Cheong and Miller (2000:382), however, state that Urry ‘concentrates on what the tourist views and interprets rather than on the techniques and strategies that agents use to instruct tourists to see’, thus failing to examine the power agents can have upon the gaze’. Cheong and Miller (2000:382) believe that such agents ‘not only focus the gaze, they also determine what is not to be seen or experienced’.

It is also perceived that tourists have begun to linger over their gaze, with the emergence of ‘new media’ generating ‘a new set of mediators for tourists’ experiences’ (Tussyadiah and Fesenmaier 2009:24). This modernistic view allows for the gaze to be recaptured and reproduced, with the gaze becoming more and more mediated (Beeton, Bowen and Santos 1996, cited in Tussyadiah and Fesenmaier 2009). This mediation is achieved as individuals become more active and capable of interpreting a tourism experience through another individual’s actual experience, via both personal and non-personal experiences, which now due to ‘new media’, exist not only on site, but also the anticipatory and the reflective stages of tourism consumption (Tussyadiah and Fesenmaier 2009). This over-emphasis on the tourist gaze tends to disregard
additional environmental elements of the tourist experience, including the aroma and smellscape of a destination. Dann and Jacobsen (2003) state that, since the ‘influential work on ‘the tourist gaze’, there has been an unwarranted privileging of imagery and the ocular-centric in tourism’ (Dann and Jacobsen 2003:3).

These social representations vary and enable the gaze to be constructed through social activities, signs and mediations (Urry 2002). These representations act as indirect social control, and can therefore influence tourists whilst travelling in and around a location. Thus the gaze can develop differently within each social group, and within each tourist destination. After all, there is not one single tourist gaze (Urry 2002; Lim 2008), because the nature of the gaze always varies according to changing social and cultural contexts’ (Lim 2008:377). In reality, it is not even necessary to travel to see objects of the tourist gaze. Instead, objects can be ‘seen, noted, compared and contextualised’ (Urry 1988:37) through the aid of these social representations.

Accordingly, the study of signs has an ability to analyse the representations that a tourist would encounter before and during a visit to a particular destination area. Signs could therefore initially influence tourist’s expectations and motivations within a tourist destination (Nelson 2005). For that reason, ‘people have to learn how, when and where to gaze’ (Urry 2002:10). As what makes a tourist gaze depends purely upon what it is contrasted with, from day to day experiences, to tourism experiences. A distinctive gaze is therefore the ‘basic binary division between the ordinary/every day and the extraordinary’ (Urry 2002:12). As a result, the tourist gaze needs to be negotiated to better
understand the tourist experience when the linkages between culture, meaning and value are maintained and transformed through a range of behaviour patterns and attitudes (Black 1996).

However, within Ryan and Kinder’s (1996) study, the norm of tourism research is challenged. Ryan and Kinder (1996:23) suggests that ‘if there is a “tourist gaze”, then it is the “gaze” that reveals deficiencies in “normal” non-touristic traffic’. This gaze highlights the need in tourism studies to take into account the visual experience of tourists through the examination of the ‘tourist gaze’ (Urry 2002, cited in Lim 2008). ‘This consumption of the visual aspects of social worlds is what marks tourist activities as a unique form of social activity’ (Urry 2002, cited in Lim 2008:377).

From this brief review it is evident how ‘Urry’s tourist gaze has provided a starting point for the post-modern theorisation of tourism’ (Knudsen et al. 2007:230). However, equally important to this investigation is the gaze of the residents (Lim 2008), which shall now be considered and be referred to as the local gaze. This understanding is important, as the gaze also ‘aims to uncover the way tourism practitioners and tourists help normalize some activities and behaviour and define others as bizarre or deviant’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:382).

2.4.2 Local Gaze

The local gaze is based upon ‘a more complex, two-sided picture’ (Maoz 2006:222), where locals observe tourists and make ‘inferences about their
aspirations and judgements about their behaviour’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:384). This two-sided image implies that a contrast between residents and guests exists. The contrast of the gaze occurs in relation to its opposite, from what is viewed to the normal forms of social behaviour that has been consumed. As a result ‘tourists are inherently threatening because of these contrasting qualities’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:383). Ironically, the dissimilarity between the two parties enhances the tourist’s visibility, thus stimulating ‘them in a vulnerable position to be managed’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:383). These dissimilarities not only increase their visibility, but it also bears influence on a tourists targetability (Cheong and Miller 2000). This visibility comes in the form of organised tours and processes of registration, making tourists ‘distinguishable from locals’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:383).

The ‘local gaze’ can be considered as a phenomenon in its own right (Gjerald 2005), offering a ‘concept complementary to the well-discussed “tourist gaze” [as] tourists too can become the “mad” behind bars, closely watched by the locals’ (Maoz 2006:222). The primary difference is the purpose of the gaze and the power relations that exist. For example, locals have the ability to behave as a host and demonstrate ‘antagonistic or exhibiting utter indifference to the presence of tourists’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:384). This distinction is why the local gaze is perceived as being a viewpoint which is formed through interaction and encounters and ‘is made up of images and stereotypes about the tourist’ (Maoz 2006:222).

Through these encounters, locals can display their gaze toward tourists in a number of ways; through actions, gestures, insinuations, and communication.
'The force of this gaze is multiplied when locals coalesce' (Cheong and Miller 2000:384). When locals do unite, the power of the gaze can swiftly lead tourists to understand their personal intentions and actions. For example, tourists may encounter an enthusiastic welcome from ‘the local community, but others [may] involving “Tourist Go Home!” attitudes and violence’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:384). Therefore, like positive and negative attitudes of residents, the local gaze can be influenced by different factors of contact, capacity, dependency, interaction and exchange (Doxey 1975; Murphy 1985; Madrigal 1995) to some extent reflective of Doxey’s (1975) Irridex Index and other theoretical models.

The local gaze differs from the tourist gaze in a number of respects. Within a tourism environment, locals feel as though they are constantly being gazed upon. However, due to self-importance, most tourists are unaware of the local gaze, and it is easily dismissed (Maoz 2006). Therefore, tourists rarely feel as though they are being watched, and consequently act out in a perceived free and passive environment (Maoz 2006). ‘Unlike the hosts, they do not try to limit the effect of the all-seeing eye, but many nevertheless unknowingly conform to the locals’ stereotypes’ (Maoz 2006:229). This stereotypes imply that unlike tourists, whose gaze is constructed before an encounter through media sources, the locals ‘construct their gaze upon previous and numerous encounters with tourists’ (Maoz 2006:229). For that reason, the local gaze is viewed as being a closer representation of reality within a destination area. However, it should be highlighted that the behaviour and attitudes of resident’s is reflective of both the tourist and the local gaze. Thus both gazes can influence the host-guest encounter and influence future perceptions and attitudes. In response to these interactions, Maoz’s (2006) study highlights the mutual gaze that exists between
the residents and visitors at a given destination. This gaze has similar qualities to Boissevain’s (1996) host-coping strategies, and include cooperation, open resistance and veiled resistance.

### 2.4.3 Mutual Gaze

The ‘mutual gaze’ has been developed through the understanding of residents seeing and watching tourists as the subject of their gaze (Maoz 2006). It extends ‘Urry’s original concept of “the tourist gaze” to embody a more nuanced interpretation in which the “local gaze” is reflected in tourist behaviour shaping the tourist gaze which, in turn, reshapes the local gaze’ (Jordan and Aitchison 2008:331).

As a continuation of Urry’s analysis of the tourist gaze, Maoz (2006) develops an understanding of residents seeing and watching tourists as the subject of their gaze, stating that ‘the gaze does not belong to the tourists only. Everybody gazes at everybody’ (Maoz 2006:225), thus residents and tourists become the subject of each other’s gaze. ‘The former acts according to the tourist gaze, while the latter acts according to the local gaze and to what is expected of them by the host’ (Maoz 2006:225). The mutual gaze therefore acts as a showcase for the unveiling of residents and guests interactions and assessments of one another, referred to by Maoz (2006) as a puppet show, which regulates behaviour.

Jordan and Aitchison’s (2008:331) ‘focus on the gaze acknowledges this mutual relationship’. The mutual gaze therefore ‘results in mutual avoidance,
remoteness, and negative attitudes and behaviour’ (Maoz 2006:225) and suggests that there are ‘no defined “dominators” and “dominated” as both groups simultaneously undergo and exercise power’ (Maoz 2006:225). ‘Thus, the tourist gaze may be directed towards the locals, but another gaze—that of the local—is directed towards the guest simultaneously’ (Maoz 2006:225). This alternative aspect to the traditional view of tourism studies lends its hand to developing understanding of residents’ motivations, perceptions and behaviour in relation to tourism development as well as detrimental aspects of tourism development.

2.4.4 Summary of the Gaze

In summary, it is understood that all gazes are socially organised and systematised over time (Urry 2002). Relying on mental perceptions (Maoz 2006), the gaze is seen to develop differently throughout different social groups and societies. Nevertheless it is important to appreciate the implications of the gaze upon an individual’s understanding. Gazing is an integral part of what is encountered and is considered out of the ordinary as it is constructed through its difference and relationship to its opposite. Social representations enable the gaze to be constructed through social activities, signs and mediations (Urry 2002), which act as indirect agents of social control upon a population. Accordingly, signs also have the ability to analyse the representations of encounters, before and during contact.

However, the gaze can be ‘a more complex, two-sided picture’ (Maoz 2006:222) which can be influenced by different factors of contact, capacity, dependency,
interaction and exchange (Doxey 1975; Murphy 1985; Madrigal 1995). Locals observe tourists and make ‘inferences about their aspirations and judgements about their behaviour’ (Cheong and Miller 2000:384). These judgements are based upon their ‘previous and numerous encounters with tourists’ (Maoz 2006:229), whereas tourists need not to even travel to see the objects of their gaze (Urry 1988). Instead, the objects of the tourist gaze can be ‘seen, noted, compared and contextualised’ (Urry 1988:37) through the aid of social representations and media sources. Consequently, the primary difference is the purpose and force of the established gaze. Tourism is after all considered as an industry formed of commodities, with every commodity becoming a symbol of power, ‘for all social relations, even those that one might think completely innocent, are socially constructed through power struggles’ (Aramberri 2001:744). Moreover, the force of the gaze is multiplied when people unite and have the same level of understanding (Cheong and Miller 2000).

The dissimilarities highlighted here increase tourists’ visibility and bear influence on tourists’ targetability within a destination (Cheong and Miller 2000). Furthermore, it considers the implications of technology upon an individual’s ability to formulate a ‘suspicious gaze’, as perception can easily become distorted through group or cultural stereotypes (Goodey 1971; Murphy 1985) found within society. Considering ‘it is when we are at our most mobile that we are the subject of and subjected to surveillance’ (Jordan and Aitchison 2008:330), it comes as no surprise that our ‘increasing concerns with security, terrorism and street violence have turned our suspicious gaze’ (Jordan and Aitchison 2008:330) to the actions of individuals. This suspicious gaze has
occurred ‘as a result of the social, cultural, economic and familial changes of the late twentieth century’ (Jordan and Aitchison 2008:329). Thus, the inconsistency of surveillance in society comes into view as ‘the gaze without eyes’ (Koskela 2000, cited in Jordan and Aitchison 2008:330). A cycle of gazing is therefore apparent within the tourism literature, in which ‘the “local gaze” is reflected in tourist behaviour shaping the tourist gaze which, in turn, reshapes the local gaze’ (Jordan and Aitchison 2008:331). Known as the mutual gaze, the process acts as a showcase for the unveiling of residents and guests interactions and assessments of one another, due to everybody gazing at one another (Maoz 2006).

Overall, it is perceived that the gaze is fashioned by the social world. ‘This involves the investigation of bizarre and idiosyncratic social practices’ (Urry 2002:2) linking concepts of the gaze with the study of deviance, as that which happens to be defined as deviant in some societies are not necessarily so in others (Urry 2002). Therefore, the interest of the review shall now focus on the relationships which exist between tourism and crime as deviancy can reveal ‘interesting and significant aspects of “normal societies”’ (Urry 2002:2), and help to better understand why various activities are treated as being deviant. This understanding can then illuminate how different societies operate in a more general sense (Urry 2002).

### 2.5 Tourism and Crime

Tourism and crime has become a well-documented topic of investigation with crime being considered an externality or by-product of the tourism industry
It is believed that tourism ‘like any other industry, contributes to environmental destruction’ of a destination (Walmsley et al. 1983:137), by bringing a range of ‘welcomed’ and ‘unwelcome’ changes to a location (Brunt and Hambly 1999). These changes include social elements of disruption to community life in the form of ‘noise, pollution, litter, vandalism and crime’ (Brunt and Hambly 1999:26), and are dependent on internal and external factors affecting the tourist destination and the nature of tourism activity taking place.

Reflective of these changes, the emphasis of the literature has been concerned with ‘tourism development and its effect on crime rates or crimes against tourists’ (Brunt and Brophy 2004:4) as opposed to ‘exploring the possibility of the tourist as the offender or deviant’ (Brunt and Brophy 2004:4). For that reason, the relationship between tourism and crime is not clear-cut (Brunt 1999), as research over the past 30 years has not been developed in a particularly systematic manner (Brunt 1999; Brunt, Mawby and Hambly 2000). Tourism and crime studies have instead varied in focus in terms of ‘the extent to which they can be replicated, and the sagacity of research methods’ (Brunt et al. 2000:417).

Consequently, a central question remains: is crime simply another negative externality of tourism or are there other explanations for this relationship (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999)?

To thoroughly understand and explain these associations, it is necessary to examine the relationships which exist between tourism and crime. Alongside this analysis, the contributing literature surrounding deviant tourism and behaviour, the criminology of place, the tourism crime-cycle, crime prevention
techniques, and variables of victimisation shall also be discussed. This range of literature is important to acknowledge as ‘the relationship between crime and place is neither uniform nor static’ (Block and Block 1995:1473) and impacts of the relationship can have serious implications upon the resident population in the form of retention and development of the tourism product, as crime can impede image formation and result in a declining tourist market (Pizam 1999). To this extreme, in some cases, crime can totally decimate the tourism industry (Pizam 1999), which can have additional socio-economic impacts upon the local community (Pizam, Tarlow and Bloom 1997).

This decimation is probable as it is thought that ‘every minute of every day a crime or a violent act occurs at a tourist destination somewhere in the world’ (Pizam 1999:5). However, it is the inability to distinguish the difference in victimisation rates between residents and guests which causes concern as crime ‘committed against tourists have a stronger effect on tourism demand than those committed against local residents’ (Pizam 1999). For residents, however, the simple presence of large numbers of tourists can have ‘obvious implications for the social structure and way of life of the…community’ (Walmsley et al. 1983:154). As, although an increase ‘in the number of tourists might lead to general increases in crime throughout the community by contributing to…social change, it is evident that the tourist industry itself is a factor in increasing crime rates’ (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986:185).
2.5.1 The Relationship

Understanding the associations between tourism and crime is not a new phenomenon (Sharpley 1994). The relationship has become complex and inter-related (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986; Ryan 1993) with the relationship ranging from incidental commitment of crimes to deliberate actions of terrorists (Ryan 1993). This notion is emphasised in specific studies conducted since the early 1970s which aid the understanding of the tourism and crime relationship (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Jud 1975; Fujii and Mak 1980; Walmsley et al. 1983; Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986; Ryan 1993; Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt et al. 2000; Brunt and Shepherd 2004).

It is evident that tourists can be seen as ‘easy prey for criminals’ (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006:299). Simultaneously, tourists can also ‘commit crimes or become involved in illegal activities’ (Sharpley 1994:290). Tourists can therefore be considered as being vulnerable to criminal victimisation (Brunt and Hambly 1999), and ‘be seen as the aggressors and not solely the victims of crime’ (Brunt et al. 2000:418) thereby creating costs which are expected to be borne by the resident population (McPheters and Stronge 1974). As a result both tourists and residents within a given destination can be at risk from the possibility of becoming a victim of crime (Fujii and Mak 1980; Prideaux 1996). However, to completely understand these implications, it is necessary to look in more detail at the literature. In general, the studies which have so far been conducted are destination specific. Thus generalisations are said to not be representational nor reflective of other destinations (Pizam 1999). Other externalities also need to be addressed, including aspects of seasonality.
The latter is particularly relevant since McPheters and Strange’s (1974:288) early study in Miami considers the ‘possibility that seasonal tourism generates externalities of a more insidious nature’. The research considers the implications of seasonality upon the increased opportunity for crime to occur and the lower rates of detection within the tourist season (McPheters and Strange 1974). Seasonality was also empirically assessed by Jud (1975) and Fujii and Mak (1980). Jud (1975) measured the correlations of a wider environment in 32 Mexican states, while Fujii and Mak (1980) measured the relationships and growth patterns of tourism and crime in Hawaii.

Together the studies of Jud (1975) and Fujii and Mak (1980) proposed two common characteristics in the relationship of tourism and crime. One was that the relationships can be influenced by seasonal factors, such as the influx of foreign tourists at any given time (McPheters and Strange 1974; Jud 1975). The second was that the growth of tourism can lead to an increase in crime at visitor destinations (Fujii and Mak 1980). These characteristics appear in response to the availability of ‘opportunities for gainful illegal activities’ (Jud 1975:325) within the destination area, and do not encompass many possible causal variables such as the distribution of education and wealth and the likelihood of punishment (Jud 1975). Instead the studies are merely a suggestion of a relationship that remained to be confirmed (Jud 1975).

The studies demonstrate how tourists are seen as lucrative targets, who act in a vulnerable and careless manner whilst on vacation, and who are less likely to report criminal activity if they experience of witness crime (Fujii and Mak 1980).
The studies also address tourist communities, and the environments in which they exist, by acknowledging their modification as a result of catering for a large number of temporary strangers (Fujii and Mak 1980). However, the studies fail to empirically separate the proportion of crime directed at both local residents and tourists (Jud 1975). Instead, it is reasonably assumed that locals, ‘even if they are not affected directly, obtain disutility from the increased crime associated with tourism’ (Jud 1975:330), thus resulting in both locals and tourists becoming the victim of criminal and counterproductive behaviour.

Pizam (1982) also attempted to assess the contributions of tourism to crime, by assessing crime in 50 American states. The study revealed that tourism, as ‘measured by expenditures, does not constitute a meaningful determinant of crime’ (Pizam 1982:10). Instead, tourism expenditure had an insignificant effect on crime, suggesting that tourism is not wholly responsible for the occurrence of crime. Therefore, the study recognises that tourists can potentially become the victims of crime and that protecting them is paramount to the survival of the tourism industry (Pizam 1982).

Further to this study, Walmsley, Boskovic, and Pigram (1983) conduct a spatial and temporal analysis of criminal activity in Australia, recognising property damage and the possession of drugs as the most predominant forms of crime. The study identified how coastal areas shared similarities, between criminal activity and school holidays, with the peaks and troughs of criminal activity coinciding with the holiday season (Walmsley et al. 1983). The research also suggested that tourism development has two main contexts: one of destruction and unwelcome change and the other of positive influence and environmental
enhancement (Walmsley et al. 1983). This research demonstrates how the presence of large numbers of tourists could have obvious implications for the social structure and way of life of the resident community (Walmsley et al. 1983). Once more the study failed to establish the proportions of victimisation between residents and guests. Instead, it compared the susceptibility of tourist and non-tourist destinations to crime.

Chesney-Lind and Lind (1986), in contrast, established that tourists were more frequently the disproportionate victims of crimes than local residents in Hawaii. This finding was realised through the utilisation of existing data to derive independent crime rates for tourists and residents alike (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986). The study states that ‘while increases in the number of tourists might lead to general increases in crime throughout the community by contributing to…social change, it is evident that the tourist industry itself is a factor in increasing crime rates’ (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986:185). Therefore vacation behaviour and a lack of crime control strategies were largely to blame for acts of deviancy and criminal behaviour, all of which have serious consequences for both individuals and tourist destinations (Ryan 1993).

Following on from these specific studies, the classification of tourism and crime has become representational of the range of crime that can be experienced (Ryan 1993). Ryan (1993) analysed the associations between tourism and crime, and proposed a classification identifying the existence of five specific types of tourism and crime relationships, displayed in Table 2.5.
From viewing these relationships, it is evident that the classifications are constrained by the range of Ryan’s (1993) choice of relationship, and exclude additional elements. They also question there existence, as there is no classification to the outcome of each type, and they may not ‘contain an inherent structure which might permit development from one stage to another’ (Ryan 1993:174). The main differences therefore arise through the perception and legality of crime, as what is illegal in one country is not necessarily illegal in another (Ryan 1993). These differences emphasises the definitional issues of crime and deviancy. Crime was simply defined as ‘an action which is contrary to written or case law in either the tourist-generating or tourist-receiving country’ (Ryan 1993:174). It does not therefore realise the freedom to commit certain illegal acts as an element which motivates travel in the first instance.

Ryan (1993) also acknowledges the simultaneous existence of different types of crime alongside the extrinsic factors which help to analytically structure
explanations of the tourism and crime relationship. This understanding has led to the proposal of a crime-tourism matrix, as displayed in Figure 2.9. The matrix consists of four cells constructed by two dimensions: one where the tourist is either the deliberate or incidental victim, and the other where the determinants are intrinsic or extrinsic to tourism (Ryan 1993).
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From the consideration of this matrix, it is evident that each type of relationship can be segmented into an analytical structure. However, type 1 from Table 2.5 has not been included within the matrix of Figure 2.9 as Ryan (1993:181) believes the ‘level of tourism is generally unimportant within the locale’. This exclusion is controversial within the literature.
The tourism and crime relationship has further been refined by Pizam (1999) who produced a comprehensive typology to classify the attributes of crime and violence within tourist destinations. The typology identified ‘five attributes of the criminal/violent act, namely, motive, victim, location, severity, and frequency; three attributes of the effect, namely, magnitude, expanse, and duration; methods for prevention; parties responsible for prevention; methods for recovery; and parties responsible for recovery’ (Pizam 1999:6). Notably this typology has helped to identify the interaction between motives, victims, location, severity and frequency of crime, which all demonstrated an effect upon tourism demand (Pizam 1999).

In view of these investigations, the progression of the tourism and crime literature has enabled the categorisation of broad topics for exploration (Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt et al. 2000; Brunt and Shepherd 2004). These categories represent a balance of defined areas in which crime may occur (Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt et al. 2000; Brunt and Shepherd 2004) and are reflective of Ryan’s (1993) classification of the types of relationships between tourism and crime. The six broad topics identified are listed in Table 2.6.
The classifications in Table 2.6 offer an insight into the relative ‘spread’ of criminal activities within a tourist destination. This classification enables the discussions of the type of offences to become more manageable and definable, when conducting research. Further to these classifications, Brunt and Hambly’s (1999) review identifies pace of development, size of the tourism industry and the importance of tourism to the local economy as significant elements within the relationship (Brunt and Hambly 1999). These characteristics also contribute to distinguishing the before mentioned nature of the host-guest relationship. The characteristics relate to the unwelcome factors of the tourism industry (Brunt and Hambly 1999), as ‘the growth and development of tourism can, for some, be mirrored by an increasingly negative attitude towards tourists from the host community’ (Brunt and Hambly 1999:25). This reciprocity has been more the case of recent studies, as ‘a theme has emerged whereby tourists can be seen as the aggressors and not solely the victims of crime’ (Brunt et al. 2000:418), coinciding with the research of Jud (1975) and Pizam (1999).

From these studies, it has become evident that ‘while some acts of crime and violence are aimed directly at tourists...others are committed against local
residents’ (Pizam 1999:5). This victimisation occurs through individuals involving themselves in risky activities, and deviating from their normal behaviour (Brunt and Hambly 1999). As a result, it can be implied that tourists are not always the victims of crime, but can, in fact, be the perpetrators of criminal activity (Brunt 1999). In this manner, tourists and residents can succumb to the fate of criminal activities by accident, or they can be classified as risk-takers to begin with (Diamanche and Lepetic 1999).

However, it is not a new theme which has emerged (Sharpley 1994), instead, it has become a better understood topic of investigation. Crime is a deviant behaviour traditionally linked to an offender’s motivation to offend, and is representational of the inner structure of social life and family circumstances (Ehrlich 1974) that are subjected to uncertainty. This deviant behaviour might be simply violent or drunken behaviour…but tourists also engage in more serious crimes’ (Sharpley 1994:291). Consequently, the literature surrounding deviant tourism and behaviour needs further exploration as public perception can shape whether an act is seen to be deviant or not (Brunt and Brophy 2004).

2.5.2 Deviant Tourism and Behaviour

‘Much less academic attention has been devoted to exploring the possibility of the tourist as the offender or deviant’ (Brunt and Brophy 2004:4). This lack of attention is in spite of Ryan and Kinder’s (1996:26) statement that ‘travel frees the inhibition’, the coincidence of the peaks and troughs of criminal activity with the holiday season (Walmsley et al. 1983), and the fact that badly behaved
tourists have provided many newspaper column inches (Brunt and Agarwal 2004; Brunt and Brophy 2004).

Limitations exist within the literature, as data restrictions have prevented the development of the tourism and crime literature and deferred the identification of the direct victims of crime (Jud 1975; Fujii and Mak 1980). In essence, crime data is relatively easy to secure. However, proving a causal relationship between tourism and crime within a specific location is much more difficult (Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996). Even if precise measures were available, the outcome may still reflect the impact of the left-out variables (Fujii and Mak 1980) as crime imposes costs on society regardless of a victim’s place of residence (Fujii and Mak 1980).

Despite these restrictions, Brunt and Brophy (2004) have examined the behaviour of deviant tourists within two English seaside locations, highlighting the probability that the nature of the deviant behaviour is related to the type of location. This probability is subjective, in relation to media influences and the portrayed image of the tourist destination (Brunt and Brophy 2004), as well as other reflective and situational elements. As a product of this paper, Brunt and Brophy (2004) have summarised the factors involved in influencing a tourist to deviate and have proposed a typology of tourists’ deviant behaviour. The typology consists of three classifications, and includes the accidental, the situational and the intentional deviant tourist, as displayed in Table 2.7.
Overall from the content of Table 2.7, ‘it is safe to infer that there is a fairly strong link between tourism and deviant behaviour’ (Brunt and Brophy 2004:9). The spectrum of deviant behaviour demonstrates a varying level of intentions and outcomes, on behalf of the offender. This typology directly relates to the level of opportunity apparent as well as the nature of the resort in which criminal activity is taking place.

From an analysis of literature, a common definition of a deviant tourist is provided by Ryan and Kinder (1996). A deviant tourist is someone who engages in behaviour which differs from their normal lifestyle, and someone who aims to conceal that different behaviour from those where they live normally. Furthermore, deviance can be ‘crossing the divide between the legal and the illegal’ (Ryan 1993:178), and be represented by those who break the
‘unwritten rules, in the sense that they do not represent the behaviour of most tourists’ (Brunt et al. 2000:418).

When considering such representations in the context of tourism, there is the ability for the definition of deviancy to be challenged itself (Ryan and Kinder 1996), especially when considering tourism itself as being a deviant act. In effect, if deviancy is simplistically defined as behaviour that differs from normal behaviour patterns, tourism itself can be viewed as being deviant. However, reflective of Ryan (1993), Brunt and Brophy (2004) safeguard such a statement by saying crime and tourism are both deviant behaviours, ‘the difference being that crime is not socially tolerated but tourism is’ (Ryan and Kinder 1996:25), with crime being an accepted feature of tourism in some countries (Sharpley 1994). Therefore a question remains, if deviant behaviour is tolerated, can it be classified as being deviant?

The ‘problem with an argument based upon “deviance” is that it implies there is “one normal” society, and that is obviously not the case’ (Ryan and Kinder 1996:25) as tourism studies have been widely criticised by the lack of a homogenous society (Brunt and Courtney 1999). Ryan and Kinder (1996) also raise issues of scepticism when borrowing concepts of deviancy from studies of crime, as unlike criminal deviants, deviant tourists are not deprived of power. Instead, tourists are seen as being empowered as they hold the power within the stated relationship. As a result, individuals conceal their deviant behaviour from others within their normal place of residence, to then exert them on holiday where acts of deviance become exaggerated. Nevertheless, dependant on the type of deviance, the change in normal behaviour can be reflective of the
legality of activities. The phenomenon is therefore one which, on the whole, is recognised, but which defies definition (Ryan and Kinder 1996; Sparks, Girling and Loader 2001) as deviancy is a process of ‘action and reaction’, a process of individual intent with social implications (Ryan and Kinder 1996).

This evaluation leaves a number of unanswered questions surrounding the tourism and crime literature. After all, deviancy is categorised as a process of action and reaction, of individual intent with social implications for the whole community (Ryan and Kinder 1996). Therefore, there is a need to understand the implications of place upon crime studies as crime activity is not necessarily evenly distributed within a destination, due to the uneven spatial and temporal distribution of people (Felson and Clarke 1998). For these reasons, the attention of the literature will now be with the characteristics of place and the criminology of place.

### 2.5.3 Criminology of Place

‘The relationship between crime and place is neither uniform nor static’ (Block and Block 1995:147) as ‘when people talk about crime they are often also talking about places’ (Sparks et al. 2001:887). This dialogue has produced a need to acknowledge the impact that criminal activity can have upon tourist destinations, as it has been ascertained that ‘destinations which gain notoriety as crime hot spots are likely to experience difficulties in retaining their tourism industry’ (Prideaux 1996:59). These difficulties are experienced in response to the marketing of hedonistic resorts, and the illustration of escapism which attracts pleasure seekers and opportunists to the area (Prideaux 1996).
Therefore, the locations which offer a more ‘hedonistic lifestyle’ are found to have higher crime rates (Brunt et al. 2000) than other ‘safer’ resorts. This classification is somewhat due to the portrayed image of a particular destination, as the most influential factor influencing the behaviour of tourists is image (de Kadt 1979; Prideaux 1996).

Influenced by the characteristics of place, metaphors, meanings and place myths (Eck and Weisburd 1995; Sparks et al. 2001), the criminology of place exposes crime patterns within specific locations and scrutinises the impacts upon the place. It considers the distribution of crime (Felson and Clarke 1998), the characteristics of place (Eck and Weisburd 1995), and identifies routine activity theories and crime pattern theories. Even so, it is important to keep a clear perspective upon these properties, especially in relation to crime talk and place myths as it is recognised that if ‘people have multiple identities then the same point can be made in relation to place’ (Sparks et al. 2001:888), creating a source of richness, conflict, or both (Massey 1994, cited in Sparks et al. 2001).

Crime talk is talk of an event, happening, or story that is divulged between individuals in familiar surroundings, and within media sources through intense and digressive conversation, slipping from topic to topic, yet having specific implications on a particular place (Sparks et al. 2001). The product of these talks are metaphors of meanings and place myths (Sparks et al. 2001), and it is the powerfulness of these metaphors and meanings, when being relayed through the representation of places and the creation of ‘place myths’ (Sparks et al. 2001), that can have an effect upon a destination. This discussion brings to light some of the issues that arise when status and personal identity are
included in, and are influential upon, conversations of place. This manipulation raises further concern over the characteristics that are critical to explaining the emergence of crime in specific communities (Eck and Weisburd 1995).

In the same way, emphasis has grown about concerns of how the ‘characteristics of the urban environment are critical to explaining the emergence of crime in specific communities’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:2). This concern is noteworthy, as a shift has occurred whereby the nature of the problem is becoming better understood, as the study of deviant individuals does not necessarily explain why they commit crimes within certain areas and not others. Instead, it could be influenced by specific characteristics of place as it influences the likelihood of crime occurring due to the ‘distribution of offenders, targets, handlers, guardians, and managers over time and place’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:6). This distribution occurs because criminal behaviour can be characterised by three specific conditions, which must converge in time and space for a crime to occur (Felson and Clarke 1998). The conditions are: (1) the presence of a motivated offender, (2) a suitable target, and (3) the absence of a capable guardian against crime (Sherman, Gartin and Buerger 1989; Eck and Weisburd 1995; Ryan and Kinder 1996; de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999; Brunt and Shepherd 2004). Crime activity is therefore not always necessarily evenly distributed within a location due to the uneven ‘spatial and temporal distribution of people [which] sets the stage for crime to occur at particular times and places’ (Felson and Clarke 1998:22). Therefore, theories of routine activity and crime pattern help to identify why certain destinations do not constantly suffer from criminal activity in every sub--neighbourhood, all the time.
‘Routine activity theory and crime pattern theory are helpful in understanding the concentration of crime opportunities at particular places and times’ (Felson and Clarke 1998:5). The routine activity theory started as an ‘explanation of predatory crimes’ (Felson and Clarke 1998:12) which seeks to ‘explain the occurrence of crime events as the confluence of several circumstances’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:5). Nowadays, it identifies the criminal acts as a custom action ‘for those persons pursuing a criminal lifestyle’ (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999:969), whilst defining the principal motives of criminal behaviour. Evidently, routine theory can help to explain some of the repetitive activities undertaken by offenders within a specific place, as it is believed that, while offenders ‘conduct their normal legitimate activities, they become aware of criminal opportunities’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:6). In the same instance, those areas that are not routinely visited are not exposed as being opportunistic to the general offender. However, most of these studies ‘lack independent measures of the life-styles in question and substitute presumed demographic correlates for them’ (Sherman et al. 1989) which is a major weakness of the reliability of previous research.

Crime pattern theory is also used to support the understanding of crime and place, as it ‘considers how people and things involved in crime move about in space and time’ (Felson and Clarke 1998:14). It therefore ‘combines rational choice and routine activity theory to help explain the distribution of crime across places’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:6). This combination is important as the theory also ‘explores the interactions of offenders with their physical and social environments that influence offenders’ choices of targets’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:6), and it is dependent on attributes as to how particular targets become
apparent to the offenders. ‘Fitting well with the routine activity approach, this theory has three main concepts: nodes, paths, and edges’ (Felson and Clarke 1998:14), as outlined in Table 2.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>Where people travel to and from. Generates possibilities for crime within and around the areas travelled between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Directly related to the trail an individual takes in their daily routine and lives. Related to where people fall victim to crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edges</td>
<td>The boundaries of areas where people live, work, shop or seek entertainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the edges, as described in Table 2.8, a collaboration of different perspectives, attitudes, behaviours and beliefs come together and create tension and criminal activity (Felson and Clarke 1998). These differences emphasise the importance of ‘edges’ as they are emphasised by insiders and outsiders (Felson and Clarke 1998). Insiders tend to commit crimes ‘closer to their own neighbourhoods, while outsiders find it safer to offend at the edges’ (Felson and Clarke 1998) before they retreat home.

When considering place as the central unit of analysis, there are also a number of additional elements to consider. These include the location, facilities and features of a destination which can create crime clusters in a destination. Different facilities can increase or decrease crime in the immediate environment (Eck and Weisburd 1995), as they draw and/or deter individuals to the area. Some of those drawn to the area may be criminal. However, it may just be the
way the facility is managed which influences the crime rate there. Nevertheless, it is understood that the more access people have to a place, the more likely crime is to occur in that place (Eck and Weisburd 1995). In response to this issue of access, the criminology of place has been developed by two specific authors: one in relation to predatory crime (Sherman et al. 1989), and the other prostitution (Ryan and Kinder 1996).

Sherman et al.’s (1989) study of routine activities and the criminology of place raise the issue of spatial distribution, by stating that if ‘crime is concentrated in direct proportion to the concentration of people, then there may be nothing particular criminogenic about those places’ (Sherman et al. 1989:44). As, on balance, it is unknown if ‘places vary in their capacity to help cause crime, or merely in their frequency of hosting crime’ (Sherman et al. 1989:46). Even so, it is known that the level at which crime is measured can influence the meaning and interpretation of the crime data for an area. For example, if crime is measured at the community level, it will have a very different inference at the level of a place (Sherman et al. 1989). This difference is due to crime clusters being unevenly distributed, and the locality of certain facilities being concentrated in certain areas of a destination. Therefore, a boundary of place is required and a place should be defined as a fixed physical environment (Sherman et al. 1989) before analysis takes place. Otherwise, the boundary of a place can create subjectivity, as a boundary can be increased from the community level to a destination level and impact the crime statistics for that area. This finding was evidenced by Taylor and Gottfredson (1986, cited in Sherman et al. 1989), who linked the boundary of place to crime rates, and noted the difference at different sub-neighbourhood levels.
Ryan and Kinder (1996) conversely discover a distinct geographical pattern of activity, which links deviant tourism to the criminogenic place. This pattern was established through the theory of ‘hot spots’. These consist of ‘places where there are lots of bars, nightclubs and strip joints catering to tourists and providing ancillary services’ (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999:970). In response to the formation of these areas, the destination becomes perceived as having safety issues, thus presenting opportunities for deviant tourists to offend. Based upon the red light district in Auckland, Ryan and Kinder (1996) suggest that, within an area of change, a mixed use of space occurs. This mixed use in effect can contribute to the development of safe areas in which crime can still occur, as during transitory times the perception and direction of a location can alter. This pattern once again refers back to the range of criminal activities and the appearance of particular hot spot areas within a destination.

Overall, it is understood that place has a central role in the developing crime literature and theories. The spatial and temporal distribution of crime within a place is subjected to a variety of elements and can be linked to issues of time and place, as well as victimisation (Cohen & Felson 1979, cited in Sherman et al. 1989). However, it should not be forgotten that the crime theories here have been transferred into the field of tourism, and considers the specific impacts of crime. This transfer is possible, as tourist destinations are locations that attract a high level of outsiders and this infiltration underpins the criminology literature. This transference is not new, as Prideaux (1996) investigated the relationship between increase crime and increased levels of tourism, and suggested a tourism crime cycle model.
2.5.4 Tourism Crime Cycle

Identified through highlighting elements which appear to stimulate criminal activity within a specific place, Prideaux's (1996) study considered why specific elements appear to stimulate criminal activity in some beach locations, and not in others. These considerations indicated the existence of an identifiable cause and effect pattern (Prideaux 1996), and resulted in the construction of a four staged model which identifies the transition of trends within a tourist destination, as shown in Figure 2.10. The model demonstrates the different stages in the development of crime (Prideaux 1996), and suggests that destinations alter from ‘local tourism and family value stages with low crime rates, to hedonistic and mass tourism stages with higher crime rates’ (Brunt et al. 2000:417) as tourism expands. The model therefore confirms the aspirations of some criminology studies, as it reinforces the unit of place in research, by concluding that an increase in crime rates occurs in relation to the level of exposure and ‘openness’ experienced by the destination (Eck and Weisburd 1995).

Figure (Text/Chart/Diagram/Image etc.) has been removed due to Copyright restrictions
From viewing Figure 2.10, the trends found within the Australian beach locations are emphasised, significant factors that relate to the image of a destination are named, and the type of promotional marketing that was undertaken is questioned (Prideaux 1996). To form such a cycle, Prideaux (1996) states that tourism, often glamorised and marketed to appeal to the tourists’ sense of adventure, offers an opportunity for self-indulgence. These images not only appeal to tourists, but they also entice the migration of a ‘mobile population’ who are searching for entertainment. This demand subsequently increases the population of the destination, and provides further opportunities for the emergence and expansion of the night-entertainment industry and the drug sub-culture to take place within the destination area (Prideaux 1996).

Figure 2.10 also traces the development of crime through the manner in which the destination is marketed to tourists (Prideaux 1996), and, as a result, ‘two types of destination are postulated, the hedonistic destination and the family values destination’ (Prideaux 1996:70). These types of destinations suggest that more sexual references and elements of escapism are illustrated within the marketing of the hedonistic resort as opposed to the family orientated destination. Consequently, this type of marketing encourages additional pleasure seekers and opportunists to the area, which contributes to the negative aspects of tourism development, and puts both tourists and residents at risk from the possibility of becoming a victim of crime (Prideaux 1996). However, the growth of crime is dependent on both the type of marketing adopted, as well as the level of tourism achieved by the destination (Prideaux
1996), which concurs with elements of the study of place within crime analysis, as the criminogenic nature of the destination can be questioned (Sherman et al. 1989).

It is apparent that Prideaux (1996) considers tourism growth to be directly related to an increasing crime rate. This association is highlighted through the progression of a destination from local tourism levels to international arrivals, and an increase in offence rates. When a destination expands, there is pressure to offer a higher level of infrastructure. There is also the pressure to expand a destinations catchment area and begin to entice additional tourists. This expansion ensures that the destination can retain and sustain the economic growth, by enhancing the facilities and appealing to a wider audience (Prideaux 1996). However, it is through this transition period that migrant job seekers are encouraged to travel to the area, which caters for the local economic boom, but stimulates additional opportunities for criminal activity to take place.

Furthermore, this stage of development is when decisions are made to shape the future promotional material of the resort, to sustain the growth and development of the resort (Prideaux 1996). By this time, the images of self-indulgence are expressed and developed to attract more tourists. Crime rates become interrelated with destination image. Therefore, short of changing a destination’s image and taking the risk of suffering a loss of market share, it appears that those destinations which market ‘a hedonistic image based on glamour, excitement and sex will suffer higher rates of crime than could be
This relationship can have a number of implications upon a destination and the attitudes and behaviour of local residents, as some residents could be more likely to experience crime than others. On the one hand, it would be expected that a higher rate of victimisation would be apparent within a hedonistic resort, with resident’s having to deal with tourists who seek opportunity and a more self-indulgent atmosphere than others on a more regular basis (Brunt and Davis 2006). While on the other hand, residents can become more complacent with criminal activities and begin to develop an alternative behaviour towards tourist and their actions. This behaviour could transpire through residents causing crime against tourists or by becoming the victim of crime from tourist offenders and other residents. This behaviour can also affect the level of fear within a destination, as people who fall victim to crime near their home ‘often feel that there are no safe places and that danger lurks everywhere’ (Sherman et al. 1989:27) and would not therefore directly relate the incidences with the tourism industry. In response to this revelation, the review shall now turn to issues of victimisation as it can have an impact upon tourists future decision making processes (Brunt and Shepherd 2004), as ‘fear features among our most basic emotional or dispositional states’ (Sparks et al. 2001:885).

2.5.5 Victimisation

From a criminology perspective, the analysis of victimisation has been well highlighted (Garofalo and Laub 1978; Garofalo 1979), but within the context of
tourism, only a few studies have addressed the issues of victimisation (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999; Brunt et al. 2000; Harper 2001; Brunt and Shepherd 2004). The few studies which have addressed victimisation, have been ‘aimed at assessing the nature of tourist victimisation and the fear of crime exhibited’ (Brunt et al. 2000:417), as opposed to gauging the level of victimisation within a specific place, or as a comparison between residents and guests within the same destination (Brunt and Shepherd 2004). Nevertheless, these studies do contribute to the growing body of analysis and highlight some specific elements which translate well into this body of research.

de Albuquerque and McElroy’s (1999) study is one paper which, through the general review of tourism and crime literature, compares victimisation rates of both residents and tourists. Based upon a study in Barbados, the authors highlight the shortcomings of previous research, by comparing victimisation rates (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999), and by stating that ‘despite all the publicity given to crime against tourists, there has been little theoretical attempt to understand the relationship between the two’ (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999:969). In response to this statement, de Albuquerque and McElroy (1999) go on to consider the possibility that tourists are more likely to be politely accommodating to hustlers, drug peddlers, and assorted miscreants, thus opening themselves up to possible victimisation (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999). This willingness is in contrast to expectation, as the last thing tourists ‘expect is to be victims of a theft or robbery. They have come for relaxation and entertainment, and issues of personal safety are secondary’ (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999:970). However, ‘holidays typically involve higher than normal amounts of risk-taking behaviour resulting in the tourist being the accidental
victim of opportunistic crimes’ (Brunt and Hambly 1999:7). Meanwhile, locals are found to be ‘more cautious, experienced and knowledgeable’ in avoiding victimisation within familiar surroundings (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999).

In a review of the tourism and crime literature, Brunt and Hambly (1999:6) state that it is ‘not wholly clear whether the tourism industry generates an increase in crime throughout the areas and communities where it operates, or whether it is the victimisation of tourists themselves that account for the observed increases in crime rates in tourist areas’. Even so, it is still alleged that tourists are more vulnerable to criminal victimisation than local residents due to the risk-taking behaviour portrayed by tourists and the incentive of their portable wealth making tourists more lucrative and tempting targets (Pizam et al. 1997; Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt and Shepherd 2004).

Brunt, Mawby and Hambly (2000) focused directly on the nature of victimisation amongst British holidaymakers, finding that tourists are vulnerable to victimisation (Brunt et al. 2000). However, the ‘fact that the average holiday is typically only two weeks in duration means that the likelihood of the experience of crime in any one holiday is very small’ (Brunt et al. 2000:423). Despite this resistance, further research has been conducted and comparative studies have emerged. Harper (2001) compared five international destinations, and their tourist and resident populations revealed that the crime experience of the resident population was only higher than that of the tourists in one destination. Therefore, the ‘crime experience of tourists and non-tourists is not significantly different’ (Harper 2001:1055). This difference is due to crime experiences being reflected upon one another. After all, it is expected that, as ‘crime experience
increases for the host population it also tends to be higher for the guest population’ (Harper 2001:1055), offering support for the notion that tourists destinations can be classified as ‘hot spots’ for certain crime types (Sherman et al. 1989).

Brunt and Shepherd’s (2004) investigation into the effects of victimisation upon tourists decision-making choices revealed that age and gender also have an association with the type of victimisation encountered whilst on holiday. In general, it was found that ‘younger persons tend to be crime victims more frequently than the older population’ (Brunt and Shepherd 2004:324) and that ‘males, in absolute terms, were more susceptible to crime than females’ (Brunt and Shepherd 2004:325). These findings coincide with previous criminology studies (Garofalo and Laub 1978; Garofalo 1979), where it has been identified that males show a higher victimisation rate than females and that females show a higher level of fear than men (Garofalo 1979). This finding is positively associated with age, ‘as age goes up, victimisation rates decrease and the fear of crime increases’ (Garofalo 1979:84). In addition to age and gender, victimisation rates were also compared to the level of interaction and irritations experienced in line with Doxey’s (1975) Iridex Index. After all, ‘conflict or resentment between the tourist and the resident can impact upon the incidents of crimes against tourists (Ryan 1993), due to the intrusive nature of mass tourism (Pearce 1982)’ (Brunt and Shepherd 2004:319).

As a result of these studies, it is considered that victimisation of local residents is associated with the so called problems of society, whilst ‘crime on holiday may be perceived more as a matter of carelessness or bad luck’ (Brunt et al.
Future research should therefore ‘determine if the magnitude of difference between the experience of crime between tourists and non-tourists is significant and to what degree the rate of victimisation for tourists correlates with the local crime rate’ (Harper 2001:1053). In relation to victimisation, it is also noted that ‘crime prevention initiatives may minimise the opportunity for victimisation to occur and minimise the negative consequences of crime where victimisation occurs’ (Brunt et al. 2000:418). Hence, there is a need to acknowledge issues of those who discourage crime (Felson 1995) through reviewing the crime prevention literature as the offender is not the only important factor in explaining crime. Those who interfere with offenders, however inadvertently, also play a central role (Felson 1995). Subsequently, ‘law enforcement agencies and the tourism industry should co-ordinate efforts to implement crime prevention measures’ (George 2003:583) in order to reduce or alleviate visitors’ fear of crime.

2.5.6 Crime Prevention

‘Crime theory can and should assist crime prevention’ (Felson and Clarke 1998:5) as crime prevention initiatives may minimise and even remove the opportunity for victimisation to occur (Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt et al. 2000). Crime prevention also minimises the negative consequences of crime where victimisation does occur (Brunt et al. 2000). Consequently, ‘there have been serious attempts at crime prevention and special activities aimed at protecting tourists’ (Brunt et al. 2000:421), with prevention methods aimed at reducing the level of crime at a tourist destination (Pizam 1999). It is therefore perceived that
crime at tourist destinations can be reduced by employing a number of prevention measures as outlined by Pizam (1999) and displayed in Table 2.9.

Despite the differences in prevention methods displayed in Table 2.9, ‘each seeks to reduce opportunities for crime for particular kinds of targets, places, and classes of victims’ (Felson and Clarke 1998:31). As a response to this issue, a debate has sparked as to who is responsible for such preventative methods. ‘Recently, there is growing recognition that the prevention of violent acts against tourists is the joint responsibility of the tourism industry and the public sector’ (Pizam et al. 1997:24). Meanwhile Pizam (1999:9) identified seven distinct groups who ‘could be conceived as having the responsibility for crime and violence prevention in tourism destinations. These are law enforcement agencies, the local community at large, the tourism industry, tourists, local businesses, governments, and the international community’.
These groups are important to note, as from the perspective of routine activity theory, the offender is not the only important factor in explaining crime, those who interfere with offenders, however inadvertently, play an even more central role in crime and crime prevention (Felson 1995). Hence a capable guardian ‘serves by simple presence to prevent crime, and by absence to make crime more likely’ (Felson 1995:53).

Subsequently issues of crime prevention should address the underpinning notion that for crime to occur there is a need for the absence of a capable guardian against crime (Sherman et al. 1989; Eck and Weisburd 1995; Ryan and Kinder 1996; Brunt and Shepherd 2004). This absence has been addressed by Felson (1995) who identified a two-step version of the control theory which accounted for social controls of offenders by linking the routine activity theory to Hirschi’s (1969, cited in Hirschi 2002) control theory. This theory ‘assumes that delinquent acts result when an individual’s bond to society is weak or broken’ (Hirschi 2002:16). The first step is to attach a ‘handle’ to each individual, and the second is to identify who is actually breaking the rules, which is much more problematic (Felson 1995). This theory enables residents to attach handles to individuals, and create opportunities for these handles to be grasped through informal social controls (Felson 1995), thus helping to reduce crime at certain time and places. Felson’s (1995) work here was developed from Hirschi’s (2002) control theory of delinquency, which suggested a number of elements affect the social bond between individuals and a destination. These elements include attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief (Hirschi 2002), and demonstrate issue of conventionality. In brief, it is perceived that individuals who are conventionally tied to a destination will no doubt participate
in conventional activities within that location (Hirschi 2002). However, those who have weak ties are more open to criminal and delinquent opportunities, thus tourists can easily be identified as the aggressors and not solely the victims of crime (Brunt et al. 2000) within a tourist destination.

Further to this study, Eck (1994, cited in Felson 1995) has identified additional supervisory roles which aid the prevention of crime and the social control of individuals. These are based upon the same premise as the two-step model, whilst enhancing Eck and Weisburd’s (1995) studies on place and crime, and the unit of analysis. In addition to place and offender, Eck (1994, cited in Felson 1995) also identifies the target as a unit for analysis. This progression is achieved through denoting the objects of supervision through the interpretation of the routine activity theory as two triplets, displayed in Table 2.10, which is achieved by integrating Felson’s (1986, cited in Felson 1995) study with his own (Felson 1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision of Target</th>
<th>Offender</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly Supervised by Guardian</td>
<td>Handler</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.10: Depiction of Eck’s triplets

Source: Felson (1995:55)

Although beneficial to this study, there are a number of issues which are raised within Table 2.10, including the definition of place. Felson (1995) encourages the use of amenable place as a term to describe the location of the offence, since a place which has no potential for crime, does not need a place manager. In addition to this concern, there is an element of scepticism overshadowing the
opportunity of crime, as Felson (1995) suggests that crime opportunity is reduced when supervision is apparent. However, the level of supervision varies, and although it is felt that the inference of a supervisor with criminal behaviour can increase the prevention of crime, it does not necessarily occur with the same level of responsibility.

As a result, Felson (1995) highlights the variety of roles and responsibilities that are evident within a destination. The four types of responsibilities can be viewed in Table 2.11, and include personal, assigned, diffused, and general responsibilities of supervisors in the shape of guardians, handlers, and managers who grasp the handles of the target, offender and place. The table offered by Felson (1995) mixes together type of crime with examples of supervision, since the focus of the table is upon the discouragement of crime, rather than the variations in crime type.
From an analysis of this matrix and the twelve cells of proposed crime discouragement, it is possible to make inference as to the level of effect that the forms of supervision have upon crime prevention. This effect is apparent as ‘within each cell a variety of crime discouragement can be subsumed’ (Felson 1995:58). Although these assumptions alter in conjunction with the unit of analysis (target, offender, and place), there is a general type of supervision within each given responsibility. This general depiction of the type of responsibilities and type of discouragement can be viewed in Table 2.12.
Table 2.12 infers that, aside from the examples offered by Felson (1995), the type of responsibility and discouragement differentiates between the level of responsibility, rather than the types of supervisor and objects of supervision under contemplation. The nature of responsibility is a concept investigated further in Section 3.3, the conceptual framework.

In terms of responsibility, there is acceptance in the literature that ‘the tourism industry is receiving preferential treatment in crime protection’ (Pizam et al. 1997:24). This favouritism is largely to do with the pass of responsibility within the industry as they are ‘being too lax in applying well-established strategies for crime prevention’ (Pizam et al. 1997:24). However, ‘no party by itself can effectively prevent crimes and violent acts from occurring at tourist destinations’ (Pizam 1999:10). Therefore, officials ‘need the cooperation of the community at
large and the local tourism industry’ (Pizam 1999:10) and visa a versa. Furthermore, both parties need to ‘enlist the assistance of the tourists themselves in avoiding risky behaviour and increasing security and safety awareness’ (Pizam 1999:10), to have ‘greater success in prevention’ (Tynon and Chavez 2006:307). However, what is clear is that ‘who is responsible for crime prevention and who should be responsible are altogether different’ (Tynon and Chavez 2006:305) within the literature. This indifference is due to a series of limitations which arise. For example, ‘the tourism industry historically has done a poor job in communicating to the police the complexities and motivations of its industry’ (Muehsam and Tarlow 1995:9), and due to this lack in communication, the needs of the tourism industry have not become obvious.

Other apparent limitations include issues over how crime is measured and crime recorded (McPheters and Stronge 1974; de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999; Brunt and Shepherd 2004); the weaknesses of official crime statistics (Jud 1975); how tourism is quantified (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Brunt and Agarwal 2004); and, how deviance is defined. These are all important issues, as deviancy implies that there is one normal society, and that is not always the case (Ryan and Kinder 1996), as tourism studies have been widely criticised by the lack of a homogenous society (Brunt and Courtney 1999). Hence, why studies fail to empirically separate the proportion of crime directed at local residents and tourists (Jud 1975), as ‘the very term “crime” notoriously evades definition, beyond the circularity of saying that it comprises acts prohibited by criminal law’ (Sparks et al. 2001:887). This evasion is partly because what is illegal in one country is not necessarily illegal in another (Ryan 1993).
In summary of the tourism and crime literature, it is evident that crime is simply considered as an externality of the tourism industry (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Jud 1975; Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996; de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999). Crime consists of costs which are expected to be borne by the resident population (McPheters and Stronge 1974), and the apprehension of victimisation for both tourists and locals.

The behaviour of tourists and the lack of crime control strategies are largely to blame for acts of deviancy and criminal behaviour in tourist destinations. Alongside seasonal factors, such as the influx of foreign tourists (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Jud 1975), the location, facilities and features of a destination (Eck and Weisburd 1995) are of importance. So to are the pace of development, the size of the tourism industry and the importance of tourism to the local economy (Brunt and Hambly 1999). The growth of crime is also dependent on both the type of marketing adopted, and the level of tourism achieved by the destination (Prideaux 1996). Image not only appeals to tourists, it entices the migration of a mobile population who are searching for entertainment. This migration increases the population of a destination, and provides additional opportunity for the night-entertainment industry to emerge, contributing to the destinations drug sub-culture (Prideaux 1996).

Consequently, it is said that the relationship between ‘crime and place is neither uniform nor static’ (Block and Block 1995:1473). Especially when the definition of deviancy can be challenged in itself (Ryan and Kinder 1996), and when
tourism is considered as being a deviant act. The difference is ‘crime is not socially tolerated but tourism is’ (Ryan and Kinder 1996:25), and crime becomes an accepted feature of tourism (Sharpley 1994). There is also little evidence to ‘directly link an increase in crime with the development of tourism’ (Sharpley 1994:290). As a result, ‘the study of deviant individuals does not necessarily explain why they commit crimes within certain areas and not others’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:6). Instead, a motivated offender, a desirable target, and the absence of a capable handler is required (Eck and Weisburd 1995; Felson and Clarke 1998). Furthermore, it is recognised that if ‘people have multiple identities then the same point can be made in relation to place’ (Sparks et al. 2001:888), creating a source of richness, conflict or both (Massey 1994, cited in Sparks et al. 2001) with and between residents and guests. Therefore, the characteristics of place, metaphors and meanings, and place myths (Eck and Weisburd 1995; Sparks et al. 2001) can also expose crime patterns within specific locations.

Another causal problem within the literature has been the inability to distinguish the difference in victimisation rates and the type of victimisation encountered for both the residents and guests. Instead, it is alleged that tourists are more vulnerable to criminal victimisation than local residents due to the risk-taking behaviour and the incentive of their portable wealth to criminals. This behaviour makes tourists appear lucrative, and tempting targets (Pizam et al. 1997; Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt and Shepherd 2004). Further to this behaviour, there is a debate over whether or not victimisation rates are influenced by tourist density levels (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999). Moreover, there is no hiding from the fact that crimes against tourists not only hurt the visitor, but also
the community and its economy’ (Muehsam and Tarlow 1995:9) as locals, ‘even if they are not affected directly, obtain disutility from the increased crime associated with tourism’ (Jud 1975:330).

Since ‘fear features among our most basic emotional or dispositional states’ (Sparks et al. 2001:885), and it is positively associated with gender and age (Garofalo 1979; Brunt and Shepherd 2004), the relationships between tourism and crime are not perceived as being clear-cut (Brunt 1999). Instead it is perceived that ‘when people talk about crime they are often also talking about places’ (Sparks et al. 2001:887). Therefore, locations which offer a more hedonistic lifestyle have higher crime rates (Brunt et al. 2000) than other safer resorts. This difference is due to the portrayed image of a particular destination, as the most influential factor influencing the behaviour of tourists is image (de Kadt 1979; Prideaux 1996). Crime rates are also influenced by the type of individuals who consume a destination, residents and/or guests, as it is perceived that individuals who are conventionally tied to a destination will no doubt participate in conventional activities within that location (Hirschi 2002). Conversely, this finding implies that those who have weak ties are more open to criminal and delinquent opportunities, which coincides with the control theory. Thus tourists can be identified as the aggressors and not solely the victims of crime (Brunt et al. 2000) as both parties are at risk from the possibility of becoming a victim of crime (Fujii and Mak 1980; Prideaux 1996).
2.6 Chapter Summary

This review of literature has evaluated the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by, individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime. In doing so, the review has examined a range of literature, so that the impacts of tourism and crime were not studied in isolation. This inclusion has resulted in the classification of the term ‘community’, and the role of a tourist community being established. This classification was achieved by identifying the individual behaviour, attitude and perception of residents from a neighbourhood, and considering them in relation to community responses. Furthermore, the social exchange process and social representations helped to determine the direct and indirect influence of community values upon resident perception, and visa a versa.

The main logic drawn from the review is that local residents are important aspects of the tourism product, and understanding them is imperative to determining how tourism affects their daily lives, beliefs, actions, routines, attitudes and aspirations. Tourism relies heavily upon the goodwill and local hospitality of residents, and this understanding sets the context in which the encounter occurs. Quite frequently residents are assumed as being a fixed entity in the tourism product, and they are not always considered in the development process of tourism. This presumption and exclusion then leads residents to feelings of irritation, as their attitude and perception towards tourism can be a direct response to the opportunities and challenges which exist. These feelings are determined through three determining factors: contact, economic importance, and tolerance thresholds.
Such factors also bear influence upon the relationship of tourism-related crime, and it is at this point in the association where issues become more apparent to local residents. The impacts of tourism and crime are somewhat accentuated here, as destinations which gain notoriety as crime hot spots often experience difficulties in improving their social situations. Therefore, further irritation and dependence may be demonstrated as their quality of life diminishes.

Crime and deviancy is then, at times, seen as an output of behaviour and the destination having inadequate crime control strategies in place. Accompanied by the extrinsic and intrinsic elements of the location, the facilities and features of the destination are then blamed for any rise in crime. The outcome is that a destination develops multiple identities (Sparks et al. 2001) through the gaze of locals and tourists, which when drawn together, and can create a source of richness, conflict or both (Massey 1994, cited in Sparks et al. 2001).

There are a number of disjointed theories and understandings that have been reviewed here. These inconsistencies include the full range of topics under investigation, from definitional and measurement problems, to theoretical models which have not been tested. In response to these issues, the term ‘community’ has been defined as being a group of people who interact, have something in common with one another, and have some form of standing in their social group (Bell and Newby 1971; Crow and Allan 1994). This classification helps to allay some of the issues of inconsistency, and enables the assessment of community boundaries, scale and cohesion to be examined more effectively. More specifically, it allows for residents to be discovered and
for their attitudes reactions and perceptions to tourism-related crime to be established. Inevitably, this process will allow for community influences, to and from the residents to be examined. After all, it has been established that tourism impacts the socio-cultural characteristics of residents’ habits, daily routines, social lives, beliefs and values (Andereck et al. 2005). It is now necessary to interpret the associations into the field of tourism-related crime, as there is little evidence to ‘directly link an increase in crime with the development of tourism’ (Sharpley 1994:290). This lack of evidence is due to the relationship between tourism and crime not being perceived as clear-cut (Brunt 1999).

In response to these findings, the chapter has addressed the nature of the gaze, and developed a clearer understanding to the explanations and theory of tourism and crime, by determining the underlying concepts of the community and resident perception. This evaluation has been completed to aid the evaluation of the extent to which a community may influence resident’s perceptions of tourism and crime. In essence, tourism-related crime can have an impact upon the social structure of a tourism community. This impact is evident through a change in social structure, and through the influence expressed by individuals in the literature over collective perceptions and opinions. However, to connect these theoretical concepts, attention shall now turn to the forthcoming chapter, the conceptual framework, which will systematically investigate the key concepts of tourism, crime, the community, and resident perceptions. The chapter will then conclude with a collective interpretation of the disjointed literature reviewed in this chapter.
3.0 Conceptual Framework

The main aim of this study is to determine the extent to which a community influences and is, influenced by, individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime. Consequently, this chapter presents the rationale for the investigation, and acts as the building blocks for the remainder of this study (Veal 1997). The conceptual framework engages the theoretical concepts of tourism, crime and the community together with the social reality and experience of the residents who reside within two British seaside destinations, to outline possible courses of action to successfully determine resident perceptions. However, to do so, the development of the conceptual framework involved four stages. The first of which logically identified the concepts. The second stage established the definitions of concepts, before the third stage explored the relationships between these notions through visual annotation and mind mapping. The final stage, stage four, then measured the concepts by operationalising them (Veal 1997). These stages were contextualised to the topic under investigation, and were developed into the four steps outlined in Table 3.1, which reflect the broader objectives and functionality of this thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step One</th>
<th>Identify tourism communities and determine specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step Two</td>
<td>Establish residents’ reactions and responses to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime within the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Three</td>
<td>Identify the role a community plays in affecting resident perception of tourism and crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Four</td>
<td>Catalogue the effects of community perceptions of tourism-related crime and evaluate the subsequent actions of individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Conceptual steps in this framework
Accordingly, the framework is realised in a systematic manner, with each aspect of the investigation being considered in turn. The chapter then concludes with a collective interpretation of the literature to combine the theoretical issues with the practical application of tourism research. The conceptual framework therefore structures the disjointed academic literature to offer a comprehensive summary, which relates resident perception of tourism impacts to the behavioural strategies adopted by each individual. This chapter offers an in-depth analysis of the social realities found at tourist destinations. Furthermore, the conceptual framework aims to highlight the complexity of developing an understanding of resident perception to practitioners, to ensure that any future tourism-related crime research is not conducted in isolation, but is developed with the future sustainability of the industry and local community in mind. This inclusivity offers a foundation for the future development of other case study investigations, by establishing a thorough understanding of crime specific areas, the community members who are affected, and by assessing the nature of their gaze upon their home environment.

To emphasise and reiterate the rationale of this investigation, the tourism and crime literature should not be studied in isolation. Instead a range of intrinsic and extrinsic variables that informs perception needs to be taken into consideration. These variables include the extrinsic aspects of the resident/tourist ratio, the stage and pace of tourism development, and the type of tourist who visits. They also include the intrinsic variables of attachment, employment and involvement, as proposed by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997). These distinct dimensions incorporate a range of underpinning theories and models offered within the tourism literature by Doxey (1975), Butler (1980), Ap
and Carmichael (2000), and will be considered in more detail throughout this chapter to represent the social reality and structure of modern society. However, to begin with, the key concepts require recognition.

3.1 Step One
- Identify tourism communities and determine specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts

To identify tourism communities there is a need to determine the levels of community boundary, scale and cohesion. Both the boundaries and scale of a community need to be set, as the geographical dispersion of a community can affect the nature of perceptions and human relationships within that area. This dispersion occurs through the fluidity and the diversity manifested by different behavioural strategies (Ap and Crompton 1993).

Within previous tourism studies, boundaries and scale have been inconsistent, as ‘communities themselves are unequal’ (Richards and Hall 2000:302) and symbolic boundaries have become more influential over time, with the community being identified as fluid, and not fixed (Crow and Allan 1994). As a result, that which constitutes a community has not been considered carefully by researchers (Burr 1991, cited in Pearce et al. 1996), as the term has been constantly used within the tourism literature, but rarely defined by authors. Nevertheless, it is still vital that the term community is thoroughly assessed before use, as tourism studies require deeper consistency in classifying and interpreting tourism communities and the affecting attributes of a destination upon their lives. This assessment is important, as tourism communities have
been noted for their ability to shape and respond to social and environmental changes and now this classification has become a ‘driving factor in assessing community responses to tourism’ (Pearce et al. 1996:6).

Despite this need, there has been little classification to date. The only guidance specified was put forth by Richards and Hall (2000). This clarification followed Richards and Hall’s (2000:302) statement that determines a community as ‘a word which we think we understand, but the imprecise nature of the term makes misunderstanding very easy’. The meanings of community are therefore fought over by different groups (Hoggett 1997). On the one hand, the place-based notion of a community has re-emerged (Richards and Hall 2000), whereas on the other, there are the distinctions of the development of new social groups who embrace the expression even though the traditional sense of a community is waning (Hoggett 1997).

In relation to the tourism industry, ‘the community itself has become an object of tourism consumption...tourists travel partly to consume difference, to see how other societies live. They can also be repulsed from districts regarded as dangerous or hostile because of the nature of the “community” within’ (Richards and Hall 2000:4), thus having an influence upon the long-term sustainability of the tourism industry (Zhang et al. 2006). ‘In particular, “the local community” has become for many the appropriate context level for the development of sustainable tourism’ (Richards and Hall 2000:4).

In view of these limitations, a clear distinction of what constitutes a tourism community needs to be established. Earlier this distinction was recognised as
equating to ‘a set of common social characteristics and goals held by a population residing in a local area’ (Richards and Hall 2000:302) (Section 2.2.7). However, further definition may be required, as the term community is used in a number of different ways, reflecting the lack of theory and progress (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997), alongside the wider inconsistencies and the lack of rigour over the definition and use of term within the social sciences (Richards and Hall 2000). Further definition would therefore address the theoretical issues which exist. At the same time, it would also offer a more practical understanding of a tourism community.

In response, the boundaries and scale of a community can be set through clearly defining and identifying the territorial position of the specific society, by identifying the individuals who live within a localised area. Tourism communities can therefore be identified through the detection of four fundamental characteristics. These characteristics are shown in Table 3.2 and represent a combination of previous disjointed theories (Willmott 1989; Lee & Newby 1983, cited in Crow and Allan 1994) refined by Urry (1995, cited in Richards and Hall 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2: Characteristics defining a community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In addition to Table 3.2, there is a need to recognise issues of fluidity which have influence upon boundaries, and which are controlled by perception, power...
relations, and personal movement. As an ideology, a community often hides ‘the power relations which inevitably underline communities’ (Richards and Hall 2000:2). Therefore ‘the analysis of power relationships is crucial to an understanding of the impact of tourism on the community’ (Richards and Hall 2000:303), as the level of resident’s influence upon decision are rarely equal throughout.

For those reasons, an alternative depiction of a community is made available, in which social structure and power can be defined within a specific location as represented in Newby’s (1978, cited in Willmott 1989) work. This understanding places the focus upon local groupings, their characteristics and their inter-relationships, thus heightening the representativeness of the social reality within a destination area, in a different way to which the term ‘community’ can (Willmott 1989).

This portrayal highlights the different social relationships present, which relate to the length of residency and level of place dependency (Roggenbuck and Watson 1992, cited in Mason and Cheyne 2000). It also epitomises the mobile population found within a community and strength of attachment featured within a community (Prideaux 1996). For example, Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:329) noted that residents ‘may participate extensively in local institutions and develop community attachments yet be prepared to leave these communities if local conditions fail to satisfy their immediate needs or aspirations’. Therefore, to identify tourism communities, there is a requirement to ascertain the strength of social bonds and ties between the individual and the community through length of residency.
Local social systems identify the community to which residents actually belong to, who share similar living conditions, in which they learn, explore, and construct images of others from, thereby developing a sense of self as a local resident. Distinct within these local social systems are ‘communities of practice’, which are everywhere (Home Office 2004). They represent different forms of participation and interaction with others, with members becoming informally bound with what they do together. ‘A community of practice is thus different from a community of interest or a geographical community, neither of which implies a shared practice’ (Home Office 2004:2). Developing around that which matters to the local residents, communities of practice reflect the members' own understanding of what is important (Home Office 2004). Therefore, to determine the social reality within tourist destinations, it is important to remain open to new systems and to the existence of communities of practice. As similar to a community in the more traditional sense, communities of practice can also determine specific resident's perception, attitude and behaviour towards tourism impacts.

As a result, the main characteristics required to determine a tourism community are displayed in Figure 3.1. They incorporate the characteristics refined by Urry (1995, cited in Richards and Hall 2000) and involve the identification of local residents who reside within a specific tourist destination, by discovering the nature of social relations between residents. The characteristics also include the social bond/ties residents have with others through gauging the feelings of familiarity and by determining members' own understandings of what is
important to them, by defining particular local social systems to reveal the power relations present.
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However, to successfully determine specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts, there is a requirement to understand the balance of benefits and costs assembled by the local population, as it can alter the characteristics displayed in Figure 3.1. This change is due to the impact tourism has upon a resident, as tourism can affect a person’s values, attitudes, customs and beliefs, living patterns and mode of life (Brown 1998; Goeldner and Ritchie 2006). Fittingly then, residents attitudes become reflective of the trade-off between the benefits and costs of tourism development (Zhang et al. 2006), and build upon the three criteria of central importance to residents, as suggested by Peck and Lepie (1989): (1) power; (2) payoffs; and, (3) tradeoffs (Milman and Pizam 1988; Peck and Lepie 1989). ‘Power’ depicts issues of ownership and input, ‘payoffs’ relate to the residents’ benefits from tourism and ‘potential changes in social mobility’ (Peck and Lepie 1989:204), and ‘tradeoffs’ resemble the social impacts which change the nature
of the community. As a result of these criteria, resident perception, attitudes and behaviour can become positive or negative in nature and active or passive in practice, depending upon the balance of exchange.

Tourism development can therefore create differing levels of perception among the resident population, with them forming two polar perspectives of either a positive outlook or a negative standpoint (Liu and Var 1986; Gursoy et al. 2002; Andereck et al. 2005). The extent is dependent on issues of economic benefit, the nature and extent of contact and engagement, and residents’ ability to continue life as ‘normal’ (Krippendorf 1987; Madrigal 1995; Andereck et al. 2005). As a result, those who have an unbalanced exchange are less favourable in their perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism development than those who have a positive or more balanced ending (Allen, Hafer, Long and Perdue 1993). The wants and desire of residents also bear a perspective on perception (Andereck and Vogt 2000). Therefore, the nature of what is actually important to local residents, the feelings of familiarity and the nature and strength of social relations can be determined by the outcome of the exchange process, reflective to some extent of Doxey’s (1975) Irredex Index. This outcome is because the irritations felt by residents can damage the long-term future of a tourist destination, as their origins imply that perception is affected through both sheer numbers of outsiders, and by potential threats upon their existing way of life (Doxey 1975).

In spite of this knowledge, there is still ‘a limited understanding of residents’ responses to the impacts of tourism’ (Carmichael 2000:601) due to the diversity in the range of communities in which tourism occurs, and the multiplicity within
each specific resident community. Therefore, specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts are still fragmented and under-developed. As an alternative, they have become associated with the outcome of a number of influencing factors, as shown in Figure 3.2. The factors include the degree of contact, the level of dependency, the level of interaction and the nature of the encounter (Doxey 1975; Krippendorf 1987:46; Allen et al. 1988:16; Lawson et al. 1998:253) thereby incorporating the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions offered by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997).

The outcome of each factor within Figure 3.2 is dependent upon how residents evaluate tourism. They can view the outcomes ‘as either positive or negative in terms of the expected benefits or costs deriving from the services they supply’
Therefore, it can be said that residents seek ‘what they estimate as equal benefits in return for what they themselves offer’ (Perez and Nadal 2005:927).

However, the relationships are somewhat more complex and inter-related (Zhang et al. 2006) than first perceived, especially when considering the extent to which a community can influence residents’ perceptions through issues of social change and stereotypes. Stereotypes can prove to be extremely influential upon collective community perception (Pi-Sunyer 1989), while social change and social representations can have a major influence over the perceptions of tourism and tourist development, through issues of encounters and interactions of ‘insiders’ with ‘outsiders’. This understanding shall be embedded within the framework within a later step, for now the conceptual framework for step one can be viewed in Figure 3.3. This understanding does, however, suggest that to identify a tourism community and to determine specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts, a range of issues need to considered to ensure a true reflection of the social reality within a tourist destination is capture within this investigation.
Figure 3: Conceptual framework of step one
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3.2 Step Two
- Establish resident's reactions and responses to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime within the community

To establish resident's reactions and responses to issues of tourism-related crime, there is a need to understand how communities shape and respond to social and environmental change, as crime is highlighted as being a negative by-product of the tourism industry. There is also the requirement to comprehend the full range of relationships which exist between tourism and crime, as crime studies are not clear-cut. They are instead complex and inter-related and riddled with limitations and inconsistencies (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986; Ryan 1993; Brunt 1999).

Due to limitations of the tourism literature, the application of the criminology literature becomes paramount to tourism and crime studies. Criminology theories help to expand the base of literature, considering place and offender as separate entities, without containing bias within a destination as to who is committing the offence. However, such studies cannot be directly transferred to tourism studies, as classifications need to be made tourism specific. Even so, the aim of this section will be to marry such theories together and emphasise the areas of deficiency. To do so, consideration needs to be given to the two separate entities of place and person. The place is important in order to ensure features and facilities open to opportunity are considered, alongside issues of accessibility and seasonality, while the person will exhibit the indulgence and intent of individuals, as both victims and offenders.
A factor which is prevalent but difficult to assess within the tourism and crime relationship is seasonality, as it can potentially increase the opportunity for crime to occur in a tourist destination (McPheters and Stronge 1974). On the one hand, seasonality can cause ‘short business operating seasons with major periods of closure or a reduced level of operation’ (Baum and Lundtorp 2001:2), which sees minimal supervision and discouragement during off seasons. On the other hand, the heightened density of a tourist area during peak season can provide opportunities for illegal activities to occur (Jud 1975). In both cases there are issues which require acknowledgment, as even seasonal employment rates can influence crime, reflecting the inward and outward migration of strangers into an area. Consequently, the assumed relationship between seasonality and crime can easily become distorted by other external elements (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999), including human judgement. Seasonal factors that influence human decisions provide an outcome for criminal intent through issues of institutional seasonality (Baum and Lundtorp 2001). Resident perception can become influenced, as seasonality can affect the pace of community life (Rothman 1978), and can be held responsible for the varying levels of friction between residents and tourists (Snaith and Haley 1994). This accountability is due to the seasonal migration of temporary visitors to and from a destination which cause residents to curtail certain activities, become more dependent upon tourism, and at the same time contribute towards the deterioration of some parts of community life (Rothman 1978). For example, activities may be limited due to work restrictions and ‘problems relating to the peaking [and] overuse of facilities’ (Butler 2001:5). The level of dependency may stem from both the benefits of additional services being available within a
destination, and cause effects from the more negative implications the season can bring (Rothman 1978). Evidently then, seasonality can bring challenges to the resident population, the destination, and the industry as a whole.

Some of the notable transformations which may occur include the potential change in pace of life for the community, the overall appearance of the community, the heightened tension during the peak seasons, and the increase in crime which takes place within the community (Rothman 1978). These issues are emphasised by the influx of strangers to a destination, being the tourist and temporary residents. A stranger is therefore seen as any individual who comes to a destination to capitalise on its already established ‘wealth and success’ (McNaughton 2006:646). This understanding relates directly back to seasonal issues of employment, in addition to the infiltration of tourists, as both can be seen as uninvited outsiders rather than as guests by fellow residents. The encounter, in turn, can increase the level of antagonism amongst locals, and can create a rise in crime rates (Jarrell and Howsen 1990).

In response to such issues, the resident community are seen to adapt to their changing environment by modifying their behaviour and community structure to suit (Fujii and Mak 1980), thus reacting and responding to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime within the community. However, there is an overall lack of research into the implications of seasonality (Baum and Lundtorp 2001; Butler 2001). Therefore, seasonality remains a problem for the tourism industry, and is at times held responsible for the problems of society, and the pressures upon infrastructures during high season (Sheldon and Var 1984; Liu and Var 1986).
The social and physical characteristics of a place can also alter the opportunities for crime to occur (Eck and Weisburd 1995), and influence the way in which residents react and respond to impacts of tourism-related crime. Therefore, using place as a unit of analysis, the features and facilities of a destination can be analysed and assessed as to the contribution they make towards crime levels. Of particular importance is emphasising how the clustering of specific elements can cause an increase or decrease in crime to occur within the immediate area (Eck and Weisburd 1995). By drawing in or deterring individuals, characteristics of place also assist to explain why crime activity is not necessarily evenly distributed, due to the uneven spatial and temporal distribution of people (Felson and Clarke 1998).

Accessibility plays a key role in defining characteristics of place. On the one hand, accessibility determines the level of criminal activity. On the other, it causes the requirement for more specific types of features, which engage and attract particular types of people, thus increasing the opportunity for crime to occur, and signalling a requirement for certain facilities of place to be established. This openness accommodates the desires of tourists, and the general population, by exploring the interactions of individuals with their physical environment, and determining need. Facilities are after all ‘special-purpose structures operated for specific function’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:8). Therefore, a migration of a mobile population searching for entertainment, provide an opportunity for the night-entertainment industry to emerge (Prideaux 1996), resulting in a higher crime levels (Eck and Weisburd 1995).
From an alternative perspective, accessibility also bears influence upon the level of supervision and guardianship of home dwellings. Linked to an increase in second home ownership (Reed 1997), accessibility draws opportunity upon uninhabited and unsupervised residence during particular months of the year. This opportunity creates an increase in illicit opportunities for offenders, especially when homes are left unattended for long periods of time. Meanwhile, feature depict areas of the environment that either attract potential offenders to go there, or which influence the behaviour of an offender once present (Eck and Weisburd 1995). Therefore accessibility can encourage individuals to migrate to a destination for one specific reason, and present opportunities along the way for deviant activity to take place. This selection is because accessibility influences an offenders' choice of target, depending upon how targets become apparent (Eck and Weisburd 1995) and the ‘distribution of offenders, targets, handlers, guardians, and managers over time and place’ (Eck and Weisburd 1995:6).

Crime pattern theory implies that residents respond and react differently to crime opportunities than to tourists. Insiders ‘commit crimes closer to their own neighbourhoods’, while outsiders find it safer to offend at the edges, and then to retreat to their own areas (Felson and Clarke 1998:14). This behaviour suggests that residents are more likely to commit a crime within their own neighbourhood, and so too are tourists, who find it safer to offend whilst away from home. Therefore, it appears that travel encourages deviance, and that both tourists and residents contribute to the crime rates of a destination.
Crime studies also address transient populations. However, they do not encompass specific issues of tourism. Instead the movement of people is made less specific and the impacts less applicable to tourism studies. In addition to this dissimilarity, generalised research lacks independent measures to assess how tourism and crime lead to problems within society. As a result, the main characteristics used to determine characteristics of place are limited and displayed in Figure 3.4. They involve identifying impacts of seasonality alongside issues of accessibility and key component of facilities and features of a destination.
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However, to successfully determine residents reactions and responses to tourism-related crime, there is the obligation to acknowledge the balance of place and person as a unit of analysis in crime studies. Studies of place do not inform that of people and *visa a versa*. Instead, a balance is required, to encompass community-level variations in crime, which can alter the perception and applicability of the criminology of place. Public perception can after all shape the extent to which an act is considered to be deviant or not, through the
perception of the legality of crime (Ryan 1993). This distinction highlights the perplexing issues of status and the importance of personal distinctiveness upon place identity (Sparks et al. 2001), as place can have multiple identities, which can be a ‘source of richness, or a source of conflict, or both’ (Massey 1994, cited in Sparks et al. 2001:888).

The characteristics of a person within crime studies play an important part as a unit for analysis, albeit the person is an offender or a victim of crime. For example, an individual can act out to conform to their sense of being, and respond to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime presented within their community. A person can respond by either gaining illicit opportunities to commit a crime, or through guardianship of their surroundings to prevent crime from occurring. What is evident here though is that crime imposes costs upon individuals and a destination, regardless of residency (Fujii and Mak 1980). Therefore both residents and tourists can be seen as the aggressor and as the victim of crime. Furthermore, the deviant behaviour and the actions of crime prevention illustrated above are representational of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief, alongside a sense of identity, social bond and patterns of behaviour an individual expresses with their own community (Willmott 1989; Hirschi 2002).

The impacts of these elements can lead to problems within society, affecting social conditions including changes in value systems, behaviour, relationships, lifestyle and organisation, bringing about social change, and affecting the socio-cultural characteristics of residents themselves. These impacts are heightened by the influx of tourists, as their presence can impact the social structure and
way of life of a resident community (Walmsley et al. 1983), creating different social relationships from the affiliations among the local population that affect living patterns, mode of life and attitudes of local residents (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006). A resident’s social bond with a community therefore represents the level of attachment, and strength of view they have upon tourism development and the impacts of tourism-related crime. It is found that residents who have a stronger level of attachment with a destination have a more informed viewpoint and have stronger views of both the positive and negative impacts within the community (McCool and Martin 1994, cited in Mason and Cheyne 2000).

In line with the control theory, social bonds between individuals and a destination are affected by the elements put forward by Felson (1995). All of these may affect local bonds and sentiments through the network ties of a community, as social positions are dependent upon wealth. But then again, the poorer community members may be more reliant on stronger ties than wealthier individuals (Beggs et al. 1996). Such social relationships are strengthened through the length of residency and attachment individuals have with a destination, which can be identified by placing focus upon local groupings, their characteristics and their inter-relationships (Newby 1978, cited in Willmott 1989). However a community is a complex web of social bonds, therefore assessment is not assumed to be straight forward (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974 cited in McCool and Martin 1994).

Within the criminology literature, it is evident that the weaker the bond and ties that an individual has with the community, the more likely they are to commit a
crime. The control theory, for example, ‘assumes that delinquent acts result when an individual’s bond to society is weak or broken’ (Hirschi 2002:16). It is also perceived that individuals who are conventionally tied to a destination will no doubt participate in conventional activities within that location (Hirschi 2002:27). However, those who have weak ties are more open to criminal and delinquent opportunities, thus acting in more a deviant manner. Deviant behaviour therefore represents a cross between the legal and the illegal actions of individuals, signifying the inner structure of social life and family circumstances within a destination (Ehrlich 1974). By breaking the unwritten rules, criminals do not represent the behaviour of the majority. Instead they form a process of action and reaction, a process of individual intent with social implications (Ryan and Kinder 1996).

Interestingly, tourism, holiday-making and travel all have parallels with the study of deviance (Urry 2002). The gaze uncovers the way in which individuals help to normalise certain activities and behaviour, whilst classifying others as being bizarre or deviant (Cheong and Miller 2000). This normalisation is due to deviance being simply defined as behaviour which differs from normal behaviour patterns. Therefore, travel behaviour and a lack of crime control can be blamed for acts of deviance and criminal behaviour. However, the ‘problem with an argument based upon “deviance” is that it implies there is “one normal” society, and that is obviously not the case’ (Ryan and Kinder 1996:25) as tourism studies have been widely criticized by the lack of a homogenous society (Brunt and Courtney 1999). Even so, there is still ‘a fairly strong link between tourism and deviant behaviour’ (Brunt and Brophy 2004:7). It is feasible that the nature of such behaviour, which could be simply violent or drunken behaviour,
is related to the type of location (Brunt and Brophy 2004). This understanding offers a balanced approach towards both the person and place, through site features and facilities.

Nevertheless, crime talk also requires consideration. Crime talk represents the discussion of happenings, which can quickly become a metaphor of meaning. Influenced by stereotypes and social representations, crime talk and crime experience aid the search for commonalities and consensus in community responses to tourism development, exerting both direct and indirect control over actions, socialisation and the sharing of social representations (Pearce et al. 1996). The point being, once crime talk is conveyed between individuals, in familiar surroundings and within media sources, it becomes disproportionate to reality. However, it still influences an intense and digressive conversation (Sparks et al. 2001) that can bear influence over collective perspectives, by creating issues which can have serious consequences for individuals (Ryan 1993). As a result, there is a need to identify people’s perception of crime and of deviant behaviour, alongside issues of place, especially in relation to an individual’s aspirations of the tourism industry. After all, if deviancy is defined as behaviour that differs from normal behaviour patterns, then tourism itself can be viewed as being a deviant act. The difference being ‘crime is not socially tolerated but tourism is’ (Ryan and Kinder 1996:25). Therefore, if behaviour is tolerated by residents as a consequence of tourism development, can it be said to be deviant?

In view of this deviancy, the opposite of deviant behaviour is action by individuals which help to reduce crime and minimise the opportunity for
victimisation to occur. This behaviour emphasises the actuality that the offender is not the only important factor in explaining crime. Those who interfere also play a central role in crime and crime prevention (Felson 1995). Individuals can serve ‘by simple presence to prevent crime, and by absence to make crime more likely’ (Felson 1995:53). Therefore, residents may adapt a series of roles to help guard, manage and supervise the vicinity. Supervisory roles not only help prevent crime, but they also place social constraints upon individuals, denoting different types of responsibility and discouragement, and differentiating between the types of supervisor and objects of supervision. However, to have success in crime prevention, all involved parties need to avoid participating in risky behaviour whilst increasing the awareness of safety and security (Pizam 1999). This behaviour is pertinent within tourist destinations, as tourists escape their known supervisory elements and therefore are in a more adaptable environment where the opportunity to commit crime is higher.

Crime prevention can therefore take on many roles, all of which require individual participation. The supervision of an offender, target and place can happen as a consequence of personal, assigned, diffused and general regulation. The local population are therefore influential in preventing crime, by adopting roles and responsibilities to reflect their personal attitudes, behaviours and beliefs towards the impacts of tourism-related crime. Thus, residents react and respond to local crime rates and their own personal fear of crime. After all, fear is considered a realistic response to high crime rates in tourist areas (Mawby 2000), not just as reflections of anxiety, but of a broader conceptual framework, including expressions of fear across time on a national level.
(Garofalo and Laub 1978). Such fear can be positively associated with community size, gender and location (Hall and Müller 2004), and can assess people’s attitude to crime, such as how they take measures to avoid it. As a result, the characteristics of a person, as displayed in Figure 3.5, can influence the reaction and response of residents to tourism-related crime, assessing aspects of behaviour, social controls and cohesion alongside family ties and values.

Reflective of Figure 3.5, it is necessary to appreciate how certain limitations restrain the development of the tourism and crime literature. Limitations transpire through the lack of rigour in definition in terms of deviance, legality of crime, and the criminology of place. Inconsistencies arise though the use of metaphors of meaning, especially in issues of crime talk and place talk. In addition, there are concerns over deficient literature. For instance, crime victims are at the forefront of numerous investigations, while aspects of crime and place are still growing in notoriety.
As a result, there is limited understanding of residents' responses to the impacts of tourism, and more specifically impacts of tourism-related crime (Carmichael 2000). Such a shortcoming is partly due to inconsistencies in the ability to distinguish the actual victims of crime through analysing crime data, and unless caught, establishing the residence of offenders is also problematic. Therefore investigations have focused primarily on reasonable assumptions of both tourism statistics and the impact that they may have upon crime rates and crime victims, leading to studies which vary in focus and fail to be replicated in a different environment (Brunt et al. 2000). Tourists as victims has therefore become a dominant issue to explore, as crime committed against them can have a stronger effect on tourism demand (Pizam 1999:11). However, it cannot be overlooked that locals ‘obtain disutility from the increased crime associated with tourism’ (Jud 1975), which results in both locals and tourists becoming the victim of criminal and counterproductive behaviour.

In essence, data restrictions also prevent the development of the tourism and crime literature. After all, crime data is relatively easy to secure. However, proving a causal relationship between tourism and crime within a specific location is much more difficult (Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996:506). Therefore, due to these limitations, resident perceptions have been consulted within the academic literature, as residents are considered as being meaningful components of the social world (Mason 2002). Furthermore, they can impact the tourism product, and enable an enhanced understanding to be developed of the factors that underline their actions. As a result, the conceptual steps required to determine residents' reaction and response to tourism-related crime within step two are displayed in Figure 3.6.
From the examination of Figure 3.6, it is evident that resident responses and reactions to tourism-related crime are influenced by characteristics of the self, alongside place. The figure also takes into account the extrinsic and intrinsic elements of the location (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997), including the pace of development, the size of the tourism industry, and the importance of tourism to the local economy (Brunt and Hambly 1999). However, it should not be underestimated how human relationships are more complex than ideal (Alber et al. 1975). Both people and place have multiple identities (Sparks et al. 2001), and can therefore create a source of richness, conflict or both (Massey 1994, cited in Sparks et al. 2001:888) with and between residents and guests.

Therefore, to establish responses and reactions a number of unanswered questions surrounding the tourism and crime literature still requires investigation. For if deviancy is simplistically defined as the behaviour that differs from normal
behaviour patterns, can tourism itself be viewed as being an act of deviance? Or does it make a difference that crime is not socially tolerated but tourism is (Ryan and Kinder 1996:24)? Either way, there is a need to ensure catalogues of questions are posed to enquire further about the environment and person in question.

3.3 Step Three
- Identify the role a community plays in affecting resident perception of tourism and crime

To identify the role that a community plays in affecting resident perception of tourism and crime, there is a need to establish a link between individual and group social representations and actions. After all, they form the basis of a collective perception. Issues of power and the identity of individuals also needs to be ascertained, alongside matters of direct experience, social interaction and the media (Pearce et al. 1996; Zhang et al. 2006). It is necessary to establish such a link as the perceptions of social impacts are influenced by factors of contact, capacity, dependency, interaction and exchange (Doxey 1975; Murphy 1985; Madrigal 1995). However, there is also a need for caution when considering the literature pertaining resident perception, as a diffuse nature of studies have been drawn together over the years under the heading of perception (Goodey 1971) and do not represent a consistently defined topic area.

To highlight matters of perception, it is important to note that residents are regarded as having two discrete perceptions: one as an individual with
attributes of personal space and the other as a member of a group who has a conventional collective viewpoint. These two interpretations ensure that the true perception of space, and the features of the environment, are taken into account as suggested by Goodey (1971). The interpretations also bear in mind the difference of perception and opinion from person to person, whilst acknowledging that ‘many of its struts are derived from the group and culture to which the individual belongs’ (Goodey 1971:4). Crucially, it is also important to note that personal past experience can influence present perception, as ‘methods of upbringing, survival practices and religious interpretations of the unknown, all act as forms in the structuring of individual perception’ (Goodey 1971:4).

Perceptions can therefore be distinguished through the identification of social representations and action of an individual and a group, helping to define their social identity by means of societal portrayal of values, ideas, and practices (Pearce et al. 1996). Social representation systems have two key functions, which can bear influence upon perception: one of orientation in the material and social world in which people live, and another of communication between community members to socially exchange ideas (Moscovici 1984, cited in Pearce et al. 1996). As a result, social representation can explain community issues of shared understanding and social conflicts. On the one hand, commonality can spread the feeling of shared understanding, whereas on the other hand, when a group are unable to agree, explicit representations can be used to explain social conflict and reactions to prominent issues (Pearce et al. 1996), including impacts of tourism and crime.
Imperatively here, social representations demonstrate an understanding of social reality amongst community members, from which they can work. They also help determine perception about specific issues which surround them. They therefore represent the array of perceptions felt by local residents towards tourism development, ranging from positive to negative or ambivalence. However, when dealing with the more negative consequences of tourism development like crime, it is evident that individuals become more extreme in their views. Such a reaction demonstrates why 'people who are most cynical about tourism rate community issues more highly than others' (Williams and Lawson 2001:288), whilst signifying the presence of social conflict and the lack of a common framework for members to work from.

There are, in fact, simplistic representations to these mechanisms that people utilise to understand the objects around them. They include direct experience, social interaction, and media influence (Zhang et al. 2006). In addition to aspects of commonality and consensus, network of links are important, as well as the notion that there is a core of images serving to portray social representations (Pearce et al. 1996). Individuals are therefore, on balance, strongly influenced by community groups, as joining a group denotes an individual's desire to adopt the groups social representations (Pearce et al. 1996). Thus, a community can play a large role in affecting resident perception of specific issues, especially those which are rated highly as impacting the community.

This raises questions over communication and how social representations can cause contradiction within a location. Due to individuals adopting numerous
community groups, contradictory images of specific values, ideas and practices within their social life are formed. This interpretation may be especially true nowadays, as individuals choose to join a number of communities of practice to reflect their interests as well as their geographical dispersion, adopting a number of collective viewpoint of social content and social objects, some of which may be mutually contradictory (Pearce et al. 1996).

Consequently, it is essential to ascertain the variety of community groups in which an individual participates, as the power of each social representation and collective viewpoint can have influence over their individual perception and action. This is imperative, as once created, social representations have an existence independent of individuals, which allows them to be communicated and shared with others. They also have the potential to become a part of the local culture, by being presented to individuals through socialisation and interaction (Pearce et al. 1996) via images and information presented within the mass media. Such representations within mass media sources can lead to misconception of intent when considering the sensationalistic output of tourism and crime. A consumer of the mass media may therefore gain false impressions of the behaviour which is tolerated by local residents. As a result, deviant tourists, who familiarise themselves with images of a hedonistic destination, may enter the vicinity with intentional behaviour, thus pressurising the tolerance thresholds of a community by adhering to opportunistic crime. For tourists, behaviour is instigated by the way in which a destination is marketed and developed (Prideaux 1996).
These impressions occur as a result of social representations telling people how to act in certain situations, having power over our perceptions (Pearce et al. 1996), as they ‘define reality and so greatly influence the way that we perceive and interpret the actions of others’ (Pearce et al. 1996:45). Therefore a community’s collective viewpoint can play an influential role in affecting resident perception on issues of tourism and crime. After all, ‘it is through conversation and participation in social activity that individuals develop, contribute to, and change social representations’ (Pearce et al. 1996:43). It is also through changing social representations where social conflicts are paramount. As social representations transpire, by placing values upon society through direct experience, they can also go beyond personal experience to be adopted by others to inform perception, an exchange which forms a high resistance to change within a group. Therefore, it is the power of social representations which truly influence definition and perception of tourism impacts.

In general, it is believed that ‘individuals differ according to the influence that they have over other group members’ (Moscovici 1981, cited in Pearce et al. 1996:45). Therefore change depends upon the power and influence of individuals within the group structure, thus influencing the way that individuals perceive and interpret the actions of others (Pearce et al. 1996), especially since power is defined in this context as the ‘ability to impose one’s will or advance one’s own interest’ (Reed 1997:567). This understanding demonstrates how power relations can alter the outcome of combined efforts, and how they can even prevent collaborative action (Reed 1997).
By considering these relationships, it is possible to gain a clearer picture of resident opinion (Williams and Lawson 2001), especially since traditional studies have not addressed both the community and individual issues at the same time (Williams and Lawson 2001). Therefore, it enables this investigation to ascertain that individuals can influence group perception and in return, resident perception can influence the community as a whole (Pearce et al. 1996). The influence that these social representations can have upon individual and collective behaviour have been developed by Von Cranach (1992, cited in Pearce et al. 1996). The direct and indirect links highlighted by Von Cranach (1992, cited in Pearce et al. 1996) demonstrate the positioning of an individual within a group environment and demonstrates the influence that an individual can have upon group representations through both action and social representation (see Figure 2.6). These links recognise the formation of subcultures and groups or institutions which best resemble the collective opinion and social nature of individuals within a destination. Importantly, it also signifies that social representations symbolise the diversity of community boundaries and scale by acknowledging their existence and supporting the concept of social representations crossing such boundaries by means of perception.

As a result, ‘any examination of locally held ideas respecting tourism and tourists must be sensitive to important contextual changes within which lived experience actually takes place’ (Pi-Sunyer 1989:189). However, what should be looked for ‘are not differences on such variables as age or length of residence on single impact items but rather a number of response patterns which are similar across the full range of items’ (Pearce et al. 1996:62). Therefore, it has been ascertained that to identify the role that a community
plays in affecting resident perception of tourism and crime, it is necessary to consider the characteristics outlined in Figure 3.7.

Following on from this stage, if response patterns are identified and differentiated upon, then the fundamental variables of age and length of residency should be consulted for further insight. Resultantly, there is also the requirement to seek patterns in responses when investigating the role of a community in influencing members, as opposed to socio-demographic or socio-cultural characteristics (Pearce et al. 1996).

3.4 Step Four
- Catalogue the effects of community perceptions of tourism-related crime and evaluate the subsequent actions of individuals

To catalogue the effects of community perceptions of tourism-related crime, it is necessary to ascertain just how residents cope, or fail to cope, with the impacts of tourism development. It is also necessary to understand how perception and opinions can bear influence over personal action and behaviour through social contact and interaction (Pearce 1982). Attitude is proven to influence behaviour
(Carmichael 2000), taking into account the variation of residents actions and the fluidity which is required across the boundaries of different action. However, resident reactions to tourism are a complex function, related to individuals and the location as a whole (Butler 1980).

To an extent, the effects of perception can replicate the capacity of a community to absorb tourists (Allen et al. 1988) and the changes associated with tourism development. This absorption reflects issues of the host-guest relationship and the exchange process, as rising irritations test tolerance thresholds, and emphasise the progressively more overt perception of residents (Doxey 1975). As a result, some encounters can ‘bear more relation to conflict theory than harmonious inter-action’ (Sharpley 1994:185) and is dependent upon an individual’s level of involvement and interaction with the industry. This understanding, however, is also contingent upon a resident’s ability to cope with the demands of tourism and the impacts of tourism development as discussed.

In general, it is noted that attitudes are structured along three dimensions. These dimensions include the aspect of behavioural strategies, which represent the action taken and expressed as an act of reflecting a feeling upon a particular object or place (Carmichael 2000). This behaviour is influenced by the manner in which perceptions are formed, and by raising important issues. In this case, the issue of how important an impact is to a community member can transpire through direct experience and their personal life. It also bears influence on the views and consequent behaviour of each individual, and demonstrates how direct experience can have an effect upon perception, attitudes, opinions and behaviour.
Correspondingly, there are noted differences in overall opinion within the tourism literature. Dissimilar opinions are justified by residents adopting known coping mechanisms to avoid confrontation with outsiders. These changes occur in response to their attitudes and behaviours as well as other conditions of change in the community (Perdue et al. 1987). For example, resident reactions and responses to tourism can be placed on a continual scale, comprising of four strategies: embracement, tolerance, adjustment and withdrawal (Ap and Crompton 1993). These behaviours stem specifically from resident reactions to tourist numbers and tourist behaviours (Ap and Crompton 1993), by recognising the fluidity across borders. Diversity in belongings and action can therefore be demonstrated by gaining a shared understanding of coping strategies, and how they can be adopted simultaneously by the resident community (Ap and Crompton 1993). Retrospectively, a combination of strategies can be present at any one time within a tourist destination. Therefore additional intrinsic and extrinsic elements need consideration alongside those stated. The process of social exchange also requires consideration, as it represents socialisation and interaction through means of needs satisfaction with the exchange relationship, and evaluations of gratification. The social exchange then highlights the level of dependency, alongside the potential for disengagement to occur, within the community.

In relation to tourism-related crime, crime can be seen to create two differing reactions and actions for a community. As described by Hartnagel (1979), the presence of criminal activity can witness a decrease in social interaction and can restrict social activity, through an erosion of social organisation. This
reduction may, in turn, prevent community formation and maintenance (Wilson 1975, cited in Hartnagel 1979), as individuals restrict their spatial behaviour pattern in relation to their awareness and understanding of their personal spaces (Murphy 1985), whereas for other residents' crime may become the common enemy in the community. This interpretation would witness the need for social organisation, as it would bring the community together to unite in action (Hartnagel 1979).

As a result, the effects of community perception to tourism-related crime can be two-fold, causing unity or constraint. The outcome is dependent upon direct experience and social representation, as both create judgement and stereotypes to which members can adhere. As a result, the process of reaction and behaviour requires contextualisation, through means of the local gaze, the adoption of personal space and by gaining an appreciation of social reality. This circumstance can be identified though understanding impacts of power discrepancies experienced by individuals (Tosun 2002) and acknowledging underlying factors of social conflict. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that there is still 'only a limited understanding of resident responses to the impacts of tourism, and under what conditions residents react to those impacts' (Ap 1990, cited in Carmichael 2000:601). Therefore, cataloguing the effects of tourism and evaluating resident behaviour is an innovative approach to understanding perception, synthesising the disjointed literature.

A limiting factor, however, is the inability to anticipate the direction of change in behaviour over time (Carmichael 2000), especially in relation to crossing boundaries and developing scales. Therefore, consideration needs to be given
for the movement of action and reaction in line with Goodey’s (1971) investigation. Acknowledgement also needs to be given to the development of stereotypes, as they can distort reaction, thus implying that community groups can also misrepresent their reactions. In addition to stereotypes, judgements also require recognition, as they are formed to act as a comparison for individuals to associate happenings with the closest elements of everyday life (Goodey 1971). Further questions also need to be asked with regards to the intrinsic variables of attachment, involvement and the socio-cultural characteristics of residents, alongside the extrinsic variables of place that form a part of the conceptual framework as outlined above.

3.5 Chapter Summary

As a collective interpretation of the tourism and crime literature, and as a conceptual background to this investigation, it is important to highlight the system as a whole. In the past, traditional studies of tourism impacts have failed to address both individual and community responses at the same time. Therefore, the aim of this framework, unlike previous studies, was to initially explore the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime. Secondly, the framework was constructed to consider in greater depth, the understandings and consideration of the term ‘community’ in modern society.

Retrospectively, this chapter has engaged the theoretical concepts of tourism, crime and the community with the social reality and experience of the residents who reside within a British seaside destination. This combination has enabled
the disjointed literature to be synthesised, and has outlined the possible courses of action to successfully determine resident perceptions. The framework has also allowed for theoretical insight to be drawn from the pertaining theories and bodies of knowledge. This insight was achieved through the implementation of four specific stages suggested by Veal (1997) and contextualised to the topic under investigation. The four steps therefore established a process to enable analysis, classification and the mapping of residents’ perception, attitudes and behaviour in response to community issues of tourism-related crime. Moreover, they contribute further knowledge and understanding to the explanations and theory of tourism-related crime, which has resulted in the collective summary presented in Figure 3.8.
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The collective interpretation of the literature highlighted in Figure 3.8 combines the theoretical issues with the practical application of tourism research by structuring the disjointed academic literature. This grouping offers an in-depth analysis of the social realities found at British seaside destinations and highlights the complexity of developing an understanding of resident perception to practitioners, as tourism-related crime research should not be conducted in isolation.

Furthermore, the framework offers a foundation for the future development of case study investigations, by establishing a thorough understanding of crime specific areas, the community members who are affected, and assessing the nature of their gaze upon their home environment. For that reason, the conceptual framework will be implemented via two case study locations, and the methods behind the secondary and primary data collection will be presented, alongside the logic and rationale that supports this qualitative investigation.
4.0 Methodology

This chapter reviews and examines the research methods adopted and implemented for data collection. The research methods employed reflect the logic and rationale of the investigation, supporting the ontological and epistemological perspectives of the nature of this enquiry, whilst contributing to the causal puzzle (Mason 2002). The research strategy also enabled the conceptual framework to be fulfilled, by ensuring the methodology was systematically executed to ensure consistency and validity. The methodology gave consideration to both qualitative and quantitative research methods, alongside primary and secondary data collection.

The chapter, as a result, is organised into five sections to effectively assimilate the information presented. The first considers the logic and rationale of the investigation, by illustrating the links between the objectives, methods used and justifications given towards the study’s feasibility (Section 4.1). The chapter then describes the sources of secondary data used within the study, before the argument for a case study method is presented (Sections 4.2 & 4.3). This process identified two case study areas and the boundaries of each to be used in the investigation. Following on from this identification, the fourth section deliberates the methods of primary data collection, to include the quantitative and qualitative methods debate (Section 4.4.1). In particular, primary qualitative research was considered, as the method epitomises the original aim and objectives of this investigation. The aim was to explore the influence a community can have upon resident perceptions of the impacts of tourism-related crime. The section therefore goes on to discuss the specific methods
used for data collection, including the sample structure, the data analysis and the software options identified in Section 4.5.

The methodology resulted in 28 in-depth qualitative interviews being conducted and analysed with local residents in two specific case study destinations, Newquay and Penzance. The interviews all lasted between 45 minutes and 105 minutes, and adopted a theoretical sample as defined by Mason (2002) and Flick (Flick 2002) via a snowballing sample method, and were mindful of other suggested methodologies and procedures adopted by other academic authors. This resulted in a wealth of information being collated, as a total of 38 hours of interview recordings were transcribed.

4.1 Logic and Rationale

The logic and rationale for this study was based upon the initial aim to evaluate the extent to which a community can influence residents’ perception of tourism-related crime. Consequently, the research focused upon the nature of the social reality within British seaside destinations and for the communities who reside within them. Hence, the reasoning and justification for the methodology was based upon the assertion that people (local residents) held actions, reactions and behaviour, which were considered as meaningful components of the social world (Mason 2002). The representations of this social reality were reflected in the ontological position of the research, whilst the epistemological perspective provided the cause for data generation (Mason 2002).
Representational of the research aims, the ontological position proposes that residents’ ‘knowledge, views, understanding, interpretations, experiences, and interactions are meaningful properties of the social reality’ (Mason 2002:63). The ontological position is supported by the epistemological perspective which helps to ‘generate knowledge and explanations about the ontological components of the social world’ (Mason 2002:16). It therefore allowed legitimate and meaningful data to be collected through the knowledge of people and their ability to reconstruct and remember their daily lives. As a result, the research remained ‘ontologically meaningful, and epistemologically explainable’ (Mason 2002:18), to ensure consistency.

Ontology and epistemology are significant to this research as they enabled questions to be asked about the nature of the phenomena being studied, and the evidence that represented the phenomena (Mason 2002; Bryman 2004). Epistemology questions exactly what the researcher counted as evidence and knowledge of the social world, whereas ontology characterised the social reality that was studied. Both of which apply not only here, but to all researchers, including those who have a qualitative or quantitative orientation (Mason 2002).

In view of these questions, the ontological position adopted for this research was one of constructionism, meaning that the social phenomena and their significance were ‘continually being accomplished by social actors’ (Bryman 2004:17), and that the researcher was actively engaged in constructing meaning (Silverman 2006). Furthermore, the meaning of the conversations were mutually constructed between the researcher and the respondent, and the interviews were deemed as being topics in their own right, as the data and the
accounts ‘are not simply representations of the world; they are part of the world they describe’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983:107, cited in Silverman 2006:129). This view was adopted as it is a relativist thought (Hollinshead 2004), and it helped to represent the core aim of this research, to seek the community as a structure in an ever changing organisation. More precisely, it recognised that the community, like culture, does not constrain people but instead allows the reality to evolve incessantly (Bryman 2004). As a result, realities existed in the form of mental constructions that were considered ‘dependent for their form and content on the persons who hold them’ (Hollinshead 2004:76). This understanding allowed interaction to count as evidence of the social world (Hollinshead 2004).

Conversely, the constructionist position of this research was not pushed to the extreme. The position was controlled, due to Becker (1982, cited in Bryman 2004:17) noting that culture, like a community, has a reality that persists and comes before “the participation of people” and shapes their perspectives, but it is not an inert objective reality that only possesses a sense of constraint: it acts as a point of reference but is always in the process of being formed’. The ontological position also suggested that people employ categories to help them understand the social world in which they live, with the meaning being constructed through interaction (Bryman 2004). Therefore it supported the original aims of the investigation, and symbolised the interaction and involvement of residents with their social groups, whilst addressing issues of community scale and boundaries within the same context, but without the need to push the constructionist position to the extreme. This stance was imperative as the geographical dispersion of a destination is not viewed as being the same
by resident populations and tourists. For residents, the boundaries of a community, in the geographical sense, are instead representational of their own ontological position and they therefore become more representative of objectivism, whereby everything begins with themselves, and they value themselves, because ‘reality contains much more than we can consciously conceive’ (Richards and Munsters 2010:46). Therefore the intrinsic qualities were taken into account, which is beyond the capability of constructionism.

As an outcome of these considerations, it was felt critical from the outset to develop an agenda that would successfully assist the key findings of the literature and the conceptual framework. The agenda resulted in data choices being made from the start, in view of the purpose of the research. This strategy was constructed to coincide with Mason’s (2002) suggestions that raised issues of the importance and practicalities associated with justifying the selection of data collection techniques. Therefore Table 4.1 was developed alongside the aims and objectives to ensure the appropriate decisions were made in line with the literature review and the conceptual framework. Table 4.1 illustrated the depth of consideration that was given to the discussion and offers a snapshot of the consistencies used within the early stages of the research process (Mason 2002). These initial considerations helped to develop fundamental choices in the research methods used, and explored the implications of, and selection choices for, sampling methods and sample size (Mason 2002). As a result, two types of data collection were determined, secondary data and primary data respectively. These were chosen to encompass the data sources that already exist, and to gain further, more specific information which did not exist elsewhere or in another form (Brunt 1997). As a result, the remainder of this
chapter focuses upon the specific methods used in a bid to realise the conceptual framework, beginning with the collection of secondary data sources.
1. What are residents' perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts?

- Review of general literature. Review of secondary data relating to the specific case study areas.
- Literature review enabled the key impacts to be identified without bias and without context to a specific area. This enables comparison. Secondary data provided an overview of crime and tourism statistics for a given area, without introducing bias or having to locate a suitable population for investigation. Needed to be aware of limitations and restriction of secondary data.

2. In what context are tourism and crime impacts apparent within a community?

- In-depth Interviews with local residents and members of the community.
- Interviews encompassed and explored local people's feelings, memories and actions, reactions and behaviour/interactions, situations, and social relations/attitudes, beliefs, and views towards tourism and crime impacts. Interview results helped to build a more rounded picture to be established.

3. How do residents act, react and behave towards the impacts of tourism and crime?

- An overview of all methods used within the study. A comparison of all the data collected helped to build a better understanding of the relationships which were evident. This enabled a more rounded picture to be established.

4. Are these reactions representational of the forms of interactions, social relations and situations at play within the community?

5. Are the underlying themes consistent with community attitudes, beliefs, values, which represent their reaction to the impacts of tourism and crime?

Source: Adapted from Mason (2002)
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4.2 Secondary Data

Secondary data were the first stage of data collection in this investigation. The collection of data was focused upon the primary aim of the investigation, to evaluate the extent of community and individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime within tourist destinations. Since secondary data ‘has a rich intellectual tradition in the social sciences’ (Frankfort-Nachtmias and Nachtmias 2002:305), it was deemed appropriate to source official statistics to raise awareness of specific destination areas that might be at risk of tourism-related crime. These data then allowed objective analysis to be conducted, and resulted in identifying specific communities deemed suitable for case study analysis.

As an overview, secondary data is concerned with the analysis of quantitative data collected by previous research agendas, and uses existing sources to help provide interesting points and ideas of comparison for research agendas (Veal 1992). Secondary data also enables the description and explanation of change over time to take place (Frankfort-Nachtmias and Nachtmias 2002). The ability to change was imperative, as the secondary sources obtained for this investigation were used to triangulate the exploration of tourism communities, and enhance the validity of the second phase of data collection, the primary data collection (Frankfort-Nachtmias and Nachtmias 2002). The collection of which enabled the researcher to gain greater scope and depth about the topic area in general.
However, the use and analysis of official statistics has been a very controversial area for many years (Bryman and Bell 2003; Bryman 2004). This dispute exists due to the diverse scale and the nature of control a researcher has over secondary sources in comparison to the cost-effectiveness of realising a research agenda. Due to these issues, several strengths and weaknesses of the method employed are highlighted in Table 4.2. All of these issues were considered before the secondary data was collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost and time</td>
<td>Lack of familiarity with data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Complexity of the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serendipity</td>
<td>Access to data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality data</td>
<td>No control over data quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for longitudinal analysis</td>
<td>Analysis limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgroup analysis</td>
<td>Absence of key variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time for data analysis</td>
<td>Reanalysis may offer new interpretations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for cross-cultural analysis</td>
<td>The wider obligations of the social researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Despite the limitations highlighted in Table 4.2, secondary data were still considered an important source of information for this investigation due to the applicability and cost-effectiveness of using and analysing secondary data, alongside its use to triangulate the research findings. Secondary data were therefore accumulated through three specific sources, as shown in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Data Source</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The population census</td>
<td>To value the demographics of specific geographical tourist communities and resident populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official police recorded crime statistics</td>
<td>To appreciate the level of recorded crime in specific geographical destinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism statistics</td>
<td>To understand the level of tourism activity taking place in specific geographical locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3: Sources of secondary data**

The secondary sources listed in Table 4.3 are displayed alongside the rationale adopted for collating each specific source, to support the epistemological perspective of the research agenda. Official statistics do, after all, reflect the social life and social issues faced by different communities, including issues such as crime (Bryman 2004). These sources of secondary data were collated in a systematic nature, and were evaluated in turn, independent of any primary data collection to confirm their value to the present study. A description of each of the three sources is listed, in turn, starting with the population census. This description is undertaken to act as an overview, illustrating the reasoning and justification of using each data source, whereas the description and analysis of the secondary data are conducted in Chapter 6.
4.2.1 Population Census

The population census is an important source of information about human life (Veal 2006). The census purposely records demographic data to describe a population (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 2002) at a national, regional, and local level. It is the ‘only survey which provides a detailed picture of the entire population and it is unique in that it covers everyone at the same time and asks the same questions everywhere, making it easy to compare different parts of the country’ (Office for National Statistics 2008). The broad topics covered by the census are displayed in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household accommodation</th>
<th>Demographic characteristics</th>
<th>Health/long-term illnesses/provision of care</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Household relationships</th>
<th>Cultural characteristics</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Work place and journey to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The broad topics in Table 4.4 give valuable insight into the lifestyles and demographics of the nationwide population. Once compiled, the statistics are easily accessible to researchers, and can be manipulated into regional and destination specific data sets. As a result, researchers can gain insightful information about specific geographical locations and the people who reside
within each area. This knowledge then allows the researcher to produce a profile of the residents under analysis (Veal 1992).

However, ‘in recent years there has been a debate over the usefulness of the census data, and the reliability of the methodology which underpins it’ (McNeil and Chapman 2005:134). This debate was due to limitations in coverage and content (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 2002). As a result, data were used as an insight into the social and demographic structure of the population, as opposed to the existing statement of affairs. Limitations in the first instance exist as the most recent census was conducted in 2001, and situations have altered since then. In addition to that, the 2001 census was modified in structure and content to resemble the advancement of technology and the way people now live and work (Zhang et al. 2006). These changes were reflected in the questions asked and the way the data were processed and stored. Therefore, the comparability of census data to previous years was limited, especially since the most distinctive change in the 2001 census was in the methodology, adopting a ‘where you live and not where you are’ policy. However, this investigation was not concerned with the comparability of the census over the years. Instead, it required a snap-shot of the demographic population to use as a guideline for further investigation. Therefore, despite these changes and limitations, it was deemed that the wide range of social statistics which the census creates, restricts the damage of these limitations upon the investigation (McNeil and Chapman 2005). After all, the census provides ‘population statistics from a national to neighbourhood level for government, local authorities, business and communities’ (Office for National Statistics 2008) which were considered of high significance to this investigation.
4.2.2 Official Police Recorded Crime Statistics

‘Official police recorded crime statistics provide a good measure of trends in well reported crimes’ (Home Office 2009) as they include all notifiable offences recorded by the police force. The data are also a practical measure of crime rates and a source for analysing local crime-patterns (Home Office 2009). However, these statistics alone do not ‘paint an accurate picture’ (Home Office 2008) as not all crime is recorded (Guneratine 2001; McNeil and Chapman 2005; Home Office 2008; WTO 2009) or included in the official statistics. In fact, ‘almost all the more minor summary offences are excluded’ (Home Office 2009) from the statistics. Therefore, official police crime statistics do cover the most serious crimes (WTO 2009). However, they do not provide a complete measure of the incidence of crime within an area (Guneratine 2001). Instead, they tend to purely represent the ‘police street or beat practices rather than criminal behaviour’ (McNeil and Chapman 2005:141). Therefore, crime rates may greatly underestimate the volume of events which occur and are uncovered in other ways (Fujii and Mak 1980; Echtner and Jamal 1997) by the local population, as incivilities are experienced, they impact the local residents, but are not represented in official crime statistics (WTO 2009). This interpretation leads to and raises questions as to how crime is measured in the UK (Brunt and Shepherd 2004; Agarwal and Brunt 2006).

Normal practice involves three key stages: reporting, recording and detecting crime (Home Office 2009). In the first instance, a crime occurs. Then, depending upon the willingness of the victim, and the conceptual problem of people actually defining an event as being a crime (Echtner and Jamal 1997), a crime is reported. However, the event is only registered as a crime-related
incident when the police force, using their discretion (to some extent), decide to record the reported crime (Bryman 2004). It is only then counted. Official police recorded crime statistics therefore possess a number of methodological issues (Guneratine 2001). For example, crime statistics can fluctuate due to changes in the counting and recording processes, policy implementation and during periods of police crackdown (Bryman and Bell 2003; Agarwal and Brunt 2006; WTO 2009). This fluctuation occurs as a crackdown witnesses a higher police presence and a concentrated effort in detecting and recording crime within a destination. This crackdown causes the number of crimes to fluctuate in specific destination areas, and as a whole for the UK population (Flick 2002), which skews data. In some instances, it is even found that ‘recorded crime may increase irrespective of any changes to actual crime levels’ (Agarwal and Brunt 2006:5) and that other factors, such as variations over time in surveillance and the operation of discretion, are the causes behind these variations (Bryman 2004). Furthermore, in cases of police crackdown, there is evidence that, while police objectives to reduce the visible aspects of crime are achieved, the actual impacts are only superficial and temporary as the outcome is displacement and adaptation rather than prevention (Aitken, Moore, Higgs, Kelsall and Kerger 2002).

These processes substantiate claims that ‘official statistics do not reflect the actual extent of crime’ (Guneratine 2001:577). Instead, they are considered suspect (Brunt and Agarwal 2004; Agarwal and Brunt 2006) and they present the researcher with inadequate data (Brunt and Shepherd 2004). ‘However, this has not prevented the widespread use of crime statistics by researchers’ (Agarwal and Brunt 2006:5). After all, every form of statistic is shaped by the
process that defines it: ‘the procedures which capture it, and the organisation which processes and interprets it’ (Echtner and Jamal 1997:18). Therefore crime statistics have still been subjected to secondary data analysis by numerous authors (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986; de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999; Mawby 2000; Guneratine 2001; Hollinshead 2004). All have tried to validate a common assumption that crime is more of a problem at the height of the tourist season (Agarwal and Brunt 2006). Nonetheless, within such reports, the crime statistics are represented in light of the host population, rather than comparing the data against both the host population and the tourist population that is present, thus further methodological concerns are highlighted (Agarwal and Brunt 2006).

From this description of official police recorded crime statistics, it was evident that these statistics alone would not represent the social reality experience by individuals who reside in a tourist destination. However, they would allow for time-series analysis of crime data to occur within a specific area, allowing for the peaks and troughs of crime to be assessed in conjunction with the fluctuation of the tourist season. Therefore, the data represented great importance to the investigation. More specifically, the data allowed for an appreciation of the level of recorded crime to be assessed in specific tourist destinations. These data therefore acted as a powerful tool when laying claim to any tourism-related issues which arose.

4.2.4 Tourism Statistics

Tourism statistics are fragmented and collated for different levels of investigation, albeit local or international. On an international level, the World
Tourism Organisation (2009) provide information on international tourism, whereas Visit Britain (2009) provide statistics to represent UK tourism trends. These are not therefore ‘responsible for providing detailed statistical information about domestic tourism’ (Visit Britain 2009). Instead, more localised tourism statistics can be found at a regional level through the United Kingdom Tourism Survey (UKTS). Table 4.5 acts as a guide to some of the potential sources of secondary tourism statistics which had potential usage within this investigation to help appreciate the level of tourism activity taking place in specific geographical locations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Tourism Trends</th>
<th>Examples of Tourism Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide</td>
<td>WTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Visit Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office of National Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>UKTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Destination Specific</td>
<td>Regional Tourist Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Tourist Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.5: Tourism statistics*

However, throughout these statistics a major methodological issue exists: that is how the levels of tourism are measured (Agarwal and Brunt 2006). This issues exists as measuring tourism can create difficulties for the researcher, similar to that of crime statistics (Agarwal and Brunt 2006). Tourism statistics are extremely difficult to attain at the local level. This deficiency makes it difficult to accurately predict ‘the size of the tourist and resident population for a given resort at a particular point in time’ (Agarwal and Brunt 2006:5).
It is for these reasons that estimates have been used in tourism research over the years. For example, in tourism-related crime research some authors have utilised the employment figures in eating and drinking establishments (McPheters and Stronge 1974) and bed spaces in hotels motel rooms per capita (Jud 1975) as an indicator of tourism levels. Others measure the number of staying tourists (de Albuquerque and McElroy 1999), data published by visitors bureaus (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986), and the level of tourism in line with the total amount spent by tourists in a single year (Jarrell and Howsen 1990). These alternatives were used because no direct measure of tourism was available (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Jud 1975), and ‘at best, these proxies can only suggest the sign, but not the magnitude of the partial effect of tourism’ (Fujii and Mak 1980:28). More recently however, official visitor arrival statistics have been accrued by researchers to develop an idea of tourist footfall to specific destinations (Johnny and Jordan 2007; Wallace 2009).

It was for these reasons that local and more specific tourism statistics were used (where available) in the research process and in the collection of secondary data. The investigation was, after all, concerned with specific destination areas and the level of tourism activity within them, not national and regional tourism trends. Therefore, tourism statistics were sourced whilst deciding upon coherent case study destinations to aid the overall intent of collating secondary data, and to explore the nature of tourism communities, the level of crime in specific tourist destinations, and the influx of tourists to a destination throughout the season.
4.3 Case Study Method

Case study methods were deemed more useful in the study of human interaction because they were ‘down-to-earth and attention holding’ (Mawby 2007:19). However, there is much deliberation as to the method, implications, and definitions of case study research as ‘in one sense all research is case study’ (Sharma 2005:2). From an academic standpoint, case study methods have been utilised by numerous authors (examples are shown in Table 4.6).

Figure (Text/Chart/Diagram/Image etc.) has been removed due to Copyright restrictions
Table 4.6 illustrates the variety of case study areas that have already been utilised by academics. These studies were evaluated to develop an understanding of previous research, and to acknowledge the variances of each study area. This knowledge enabled the researcher to clarify the feasibility of the proposed research agenda, and to verify the appropriateness. However, it is important to note that Table 4.6 does not act as an exhaustive list when considering case study methods. Therefore, knowledge and understanding should always be developed further when designing a research agenda.

The case study area for this investigation was ‘employed to identify a specific form of inquiry’ (Sharma 2005:2). For the object of this social enquiry, the case study was not an individual or an enterprise: it was instead a bounded system of interest, as defined by Stake (2007). The systems of interest were British seaside destinations, within which data were drawn from a sample of key respondents, shaped by the case study boundaries. These boundaries were focussed, and the knowledge of what was and was not to be considered were emphasised throughout the data collection process. On an individual level, these were challenged through the criteria for selection as previously discussed in Table 4.1.

However, before these criteria were considered in further depth, there was deliberation about the generalizability, analysis, theory and authenticity of using case study methods. This debate was endorsed by Stake (2007), who suggested that despite literature signifying that authors and scientists need to establish generalisations through case study to make investigation worth-while (Fothergill 2006), case studies were not suitable for the basis of generalisation.
However, this investigation is more concerned with the knowledge of the particular, and not the formation of generalisations. Therefore, the transferability of knowledge gained was of more importance than general statements which could be made. The replication of the case study method was also deemed crucial (Fothergill 2006) for this investigation.

Accordingly, the degree of transferability was well thought-out. This consideration illustrated that there was enough similarity between contexts for the purpose of the investigation to commence, showing the suitability of the research agenda (Fothergill 2006). The appropriateness was established as the research techniques encompassed clear descriptions of theoretical stance and methodological procedures to enable the investigation to be replicated (Brydon-Miller, Greenwood and Maguire 2003). Therefore, to endorse the level of transferability and fittingness of this investigation to other case study methods, four specific criteria were set. These were set to ensure the collection and accessibility of secondary data to the case study area was attainable. These principles were imperative as they were concerned with the level of transferability and repeatability of this study. These were considered in relation to gaining knowledge about the particular, to enable any generalisation that may be made to be credible, and to set clear methodological procedures for replication. The results identified two specific case study destinations, from an initial investigation into a range of locations in Cornwall (See Appendix One). The criteria that were applied to the selection of secondary data can be viewed in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7 illustrates the need to be able to collate specific sources to ensure transferability and fittingness of other destinations to the current investigation. This understanding enabled the case studies to transpire, rather than narrow the investigation, leaving the researcher with more information to synthesise and analyse rather than less (Mawby 2007), which is a technique deemed suitable for building theoretical insight (Bryman 1989, cited in Davies 2003). Taken as a whole, case study methods have ‘many positive features, chief among them being their ability to provide an insight into aspects of life that may not be visible during a fleeting contact’ (Bryman 1989, cited in Davies 2003:262). They also offered a degree of transferability and repeatability to other research agendas.

Reflecting on the criteria stated in Table 4.7, two case study areas were identified within the county of Cornwall; Newquay and Penzance. These specific locations were chosen as sufficient crime data were available for each location; in comparison to other Cornish locations (see Appendix One). Each seaside destination also had comparable characteristics, and were undergoing changes (see Chapter 5), yet they offered difference in terms of their honey pot site classification (see Appendix Three). Due to these similarities and differences, alongside the availability of data to confirm with the criteria outlined in Table 4.7, these case studies were selected to collate information about the
impacts of tourism-related crime in British seaside locations. In-depth background information about each case study can be viewed in Chapter 5, before the secondary data that facilitated the identification of each location is described in Chapter 6. The case study boundaries required clarification and formalisation to ensure the dependability of the data.

4.3.1 Case Study Boundaries

To begin the investigation, crime data was collated at a destination level for a range of locations found in Cornwall (see Appendix One). The purpose of this data was to remove bias form the selection process and to ensure two suitable and comparable locations were drawn from the specified county. Even though a number of destinations were deemed as being suitable for investigation based solely upon crime data (see Appendix One), the focus of the research was quickly refined to two Cornish destinations. This refinement was due to the availability of other statistics alongside crime data, such as tourism statistics and census data. Therefore, two Cornish destinations, of Newquay and Penzance, were chosen. This selection led to a closer examination of the Cornish based crime data (see Appendix One), and resulted in the researcher determining the comparative destinations based upon their similarities and contrasting qualities and the additional sources of secondary data that were available. This evaluation led to the selection of both Newquay and Penzance, whose suitability and sources of secondary data are shown in Table 4.8 below.
In addition to the categories displayed in Table 4.8, further characteristics associated with the two case study areas were taken into consideration during the selection process. For example, a classification of the two destinations were conducted in line with Williams and Lawson’s (2001) study, which highlighted nine influencing dimensions about each destination’s attributes. The attributes that were compared are listed in Table 4.9. These attributes included the nature of attractions, the degree of economic dependence on the tourism trade area, the host to guest ratio, the stage in tourism development, the degree of seasonality, the cultural or psychic distance between host and guest populations, the type of tourist present on location, the time of the year when most tourists are present, and, the origin of tourists. Consequently, it was noted that a range of similarities existed between the two destinations, which supported their selection. These destinations were therefore chosen due to their similarities, as the attributes in Table 4.9 eliminated uncertainty.
surrounding the underlying qualities of the tourism industry in each destination. Instead, they embodied similar backgrounds, and therefore it was felt that should associations be drawn, they would not just purely represent the underpinning characteristics listed here.

Further to the characteristics listed in Table 4.9, secondary data sources were also used to draw attention to the destination specifics and to emphasise the parameters in which the investigation took place. This occurred during the selection process to ensure data was available for analysis. Once selected, the data for Newquay and Penzance were compared, as presented in Table 4.10. This data were of importance, as the population, recorded crime and tourism levels for each case study area represented the basis of the criteria for selection in Table 4.7. Table 4.10 also offered a snap-shot of each destination, highlighting again the similarity of each location, and giving support to the
Taken as a whole, the access to, and availability of tourism statistics, population census data and crime statistics enabled two suitable case study areas to be identified. The data, alongside the similar attributes of each destination, and the different classification of each honey pot site (see Appendix Three) led to this decision, and justified the selection of both Newquay and Penzance. Consequently, each case study area was then investigated in further detail, as discussed and evidenced in Chapters 5 and 6. Once the two locations were justified, the nature and suitability of a full range of primary data collection techniques were considered.

4.4 Primary Data

Primary data collection was the second stage of data collection in this investigation. The primary focus of collecting these data was closely related to the initial aim of the investigation: to evaluate the extent to which a community
influences resident perceptions of tourism and crime. Primary data collection was chosen to act as a third point of reference for this investigation, alongside the review of literature and the collection of secondary data.

However, when considering first-hand data collection in the field of tourism research, there was a requirement to acknowledge the considerable discussions that have taken place ‘among tourism scholars concerning methodological issues, research orientations, and the most appropriate approaches to tourism studies’ (Echtner and Jamal 1997:869). As a result, a variety of data collection techniques were analysed before data collection was undertaken, including consideration of the suitability of using quantitative and qualitative data. This debate ensured the chosen research method was able to satisfy the fundamental question under investigation, and support the rationale of this investigation. More specifically, the assessment of both quantitative and qualitative research methods was undertaken to ensure that the epistemological and ontological commitments of the investigation were upheld.

4.4.1 Quantitative Vs. Qualitative Research

Quantitative research involves the quantification and statistical analysis of data (Moser and Kalton 1971), while qualitative research involves richness, depth, nuance, context, multi-dimensionality and complexity (Silverman 2001; Mason 2002). The tourism literature has previously been dominated by quantitative, scientific research (Echtner and Ritchie 2003). However, more recently, qualitative approaches have become ‘more acceptable within the mainstream,
rather than being viewed as an adjunct to quantitative work’ (Phillimore and Goodson 2004:4).

Qualitative approaches are however ‘criticised because of their lack of rigor and credibility’ (Decrop 1999b:158), while quantitative approaches are critiqued in relation to their style and the level of explanation that can be achieved from closed questions and the low response rates which can be achieved (Moser and Kalton 1971). As a result, both methods ‘possess distinct limitations and grave weaknesses, but both have redeeming characteristics’ (Echtner and Ritchie 2003:535). The two techniques hold fundamental differences, which were considered with regard to the primary data collection method, and are listed in Table 4.11. These differences are distinct, and represent the weaknesses of each approach. However, it is important to note that ‘the interconnections between the different features…are not straightforward’ (Burgess 1984:20) and the differences are not clear cut. Therefore, the characteristics listed in Table 4.11 do not act as a basic set of distinctions between each method; instead, they represent the general tendencies of both qualitative and quantitative research methods.
From viewing Table 4.11, it is evident that the ‘distinction between quantitative and qualitative methods is not entirely clear-cut’ (Mason 2002:8) as certain elements listed in Table 4.11 can be applied to both research approaches. For example, qualitative research can be conducted in an unstructured, semi-structured, and structured manner. Therefore, when considering the distinctions listed above, it is important to recall that they are only general tendencies of each approaches research design. The main differences instead
lie in the nature of the data collected, and the way in which the data are analysed (Veal 1997). Consequently, it is significant to emphasise the fact that ‘no proposed research project is without limitations; there is no such thing as a perfectly designed study [as]…limitations derive from the conceptual framework and the study's design’ (Marshall and Rossman 1999:42). Inevitably, the research strategy of either quantitative or qualitative research does not imply that one technique is superior to the other, instead, it implies that each technique is better suited for specific agendas (Veal 1992).

The question of suitability overcomes the qualitative and quantitative divide that was previously discussed by numerous authors (Burgess 1984; Roberts 2002; Davies 2003; NAVCA 2007) as the ‘status of distinction is ambiguous’ (Burgess 1984:19). In contrast, both methods of data collection are perceived as involving a series of trade-offs with one another (Echtner and Ritchie 2003) and involve distinct methodological judgements. For example, a quantitative method involves the discovery of facts and trades-off the ability to comprehend reality in all its complexities. Qualitative methods are ‘free to ask questions which the rigorous researcher cannot easily pursue’ (Echtner and Ritchie 2003:535), because the resulting insights are not always scientifically verifiable. However, the issue of trade-off is a debated topic in itself (Davies 2003) as it depends on what is being researched and how, and not a dispute that is required to be argued here. Instead, it is noted that limitations do exist, and that it is the researcher’s obligation to consider the range of trade-off which may need to be made in any research agenda.
In a tourism context, research methods need to reflect the diverse, high behavioural content of tourism activity. Therefore, both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are appropriate (Echtner and Jamal 1997), as the fundamental differences represent ‘a useful means of classifying different methods of social research [acting as an]…umbrella for a range of issues concerned with the practice of social research’ (Burgess 1984:19). As a result, ‘tourism needs to forcefully articulate, in a general and universal way, that it is a broad and distinct field and that it embraces a variety of appropriate research strategies’ (Echtner and Ritchie 2003:535).

To reflect these issues, the investigation acknowledged the trustworthiness of its data by cross-examining the research via four precise criteria. The criteria was developed in line with Lincoln and Guba’s (1985, cited in Decrop 1999b) study, and the questions asked are displayed in Table 4.12. These questions were asked of the data, and this enabled the researcher to be confident that the limitations and trade-offs associated with the data collection process were lowered. This thought process enabled standards of qualitative research, in light of quantitative techniques, to be established and enhanced the researcher’s rigour and credibility in the discipline debates.
The criteria in Table 4.12 were therefore utilised in the research design to help keep the qualitative methods rigorous (Decrop 1999b). This process of deliberation ensured the validity and reliability of the research, whilst also ensuring its objectivity to the research environment, which resulted in qualitative techniques being employed for primary data collection. This decision was made in response to the desire to explore individual and group attitudes, perceptions, and behaviour towards the impacts of tourism within their society.

4.4.2 Qualitative Research

For the purpose of this investigation, qualitative research methods were employed. This decision was informed, like other methodological decisions, by the rationale for data collection and the decision to gather and analyse residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts (Office for National Statistics 2009). This decision was emphasised by the perspectives of the epistemological and ontological properties that were initially set out. In accordance with these properties, qualitative techniques were used to acquire
legitimate and meaningful data, assembled through the knowledge of people and their ability to reconstruct and remember their daily lives (Mason 2002).

Qualitative techniques were employed as they have ‘an unrivalled capacity to constitute compelling arguments about how things work in particular contexts (Mason 2002:1). They are also appropriate for exploring areas about which little is known (Strauss and Corbin 1998), drawing out the contextual nature of experience and action (Liamputtong and Ezzy 2005). Qualitative research was therefore seen as a broad approach to the study of social phenomena, referring to and exploring peoples’ lives, lived experiences, behaviours and emotion (Strauss and Corbin 1998; Silverman 2001), whilst emphasising the concern of this research with how the social world was ‘interpreted, understood, experienced, produced or constituted’ (Mason 2002:3). Qualitative research were also deemed as being suitable, as the specific data collection methods were known to be flexible and sensitive to the social context in which they are applied (Mason 2002:3). They also enable the researcher to ‘obtain the intricate details about phenomena such as feelings, thought processes, and emotions that are difficult to extract or learn about through more conventional research methods’ (Strauss and Corbin 1998:11).

Overall, there were many valid reasons for conducting qualitative research including the preferences and experience of the researcher, the nature of the research problem (Strauss and Corbin 1998), and the fact that data were not available in another form (Mason 2002). This decision was also due to qualitative research having ‘an unrivalled capacity to constitute compelling arguments about how things work in particular contexts’ (Mason 2002:1).
Further advantages and limitations of qualitative research that were considered throughout this process are displayed in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich information is provided about people, their experiences, motivations,</td>
<td>Difficult to replicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour, their needs and aspirations</td>
<td>Too subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes are encompassed over time</td>
<td>Lack of transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible and sensitive to the social context</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalisations about the population at large cannot be made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned with how the social world is interpreted, understood, experienced,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>produced or constituted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 underpins the justifications used for conducting qualitative research when collecting the primary data. The advantages highlight the ability of gaining full and rounded data, whilst rich information were gathered (Veal 1997), whereas the limitations were based upon the misunderstandings of the logic behind the enquiry, which were ‘failing to see the strategic significance of context’ (Mason 2002:1). Qualitative research was therefore ‘orientated towards analysis of concrete cases in their temporal and local particularity, and starting from people’s expressions and activities in their local contexts’ (Flick 2002:13). This justification also resembled Sonmez’s (2000) claim for more
creativity within qualitative methods to better understand why people behave
the way they do.

The main challenges of conducting qualitative research included the
development of a conceptual framework that was thorough, concise and elegant,
whilst the planned design remained systematic and manageable, yet flexible.
At the same time, it was necessary to integrate additional elements to convince
the proposed readers of necessity (Marshall and Rossman 1999), as there were
a ‘rich variety of qualitative research strategies and techniques’ (Mason 2002:3)
to consider, as shown in Table 4.14. This variety is evident in qualitative
research, as Strauss and Corbin (1998) state that qualitative research is ‘any
type of research that produces findings not arrived at by statistical procedures
or other means of quantification’. As a result, some decisions about the design
and strategy were on-going (Mason 2002). Therefore this section and
subsequent sections do not aim to produce an entire blueprint to the research
methods which were implemented. Instead, they act as a guide and a
consistent point of reference for the methodological tools of this investigation.
From the information displayed in Table 4.14, qualitative in-depth interviews were identified as an appropriate method of data collection for this investigation as they allowed for the experience of residents to be understood. They also allowed reflection to occur, whilst establishing non-verbal behaviour. For those reasons alone, qualitative interviews were developed due to the nature and style of the investigation at hand, which was concerned with community influence upon resident perceptions of tourism-related crime.
4.4.3 Qualitative Interviews

Qualitative interviews were the primary data collection method used in this study, in a bid to realise the social reality experienced by hosts through reflection (Kvale 1996). Qualitative interviews were employed as they were considered as being the most renowned form of qualitative research, characterised by the length, depth and structure of analysis (Cole 1997; Veal 1997; Marshall and Rossman 1999; Mason 2002; Hollinshead 2004; WTO 2009). This methodological decision also supported the ontological and epistemological position of the research by encouraging respondents to generate knowledge and explanations reflective of their social reality and life within a tourist destination. Respondents were encouraged to recall truthful encounters and experiences through statements that were rich with the sense of human encounter, they were encouraged ‘to speak not of underlying attributes…but of perceptions and understanding that come from [their] immersion’ in the community (Mawby 2007:21).

Recollection was achieved by probing more deeply into conversation and by utilising a less structured, informal style of questionnaire with fewer people (Cole 1997; Veal 1997; Mason 2002). Conversation was considered as being ‘a basic mode of human interaction. Human beings talk with each other – they interact, pose questions, and answer questions’ (Kvale 1996:5). Therefore, the technique was deemed suitable for data collection in comparison to the other available research methods. After all, the purpose of the interviews were to obtain ‘descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena’(Kvale 1996:5).
There was also a need for the researcher to explore general topics to uncover the participants' views (Office for National Statistics 2009) on a subject matter, and qualitative interviews allowed this assessment to occur. At the same time, there was room for variation to occur within the technique, as it was believed that ‘the participant’s perspective on the phenomena of interest should unfold as the participant views it, not as the researcher views it’ (Office for National Statistics 2009:108). For that reason, variation occurred within the structure of the interviews, and the atmosphere of the location. Open-ended questions were used to allow a ‘conversation with a purpose’ to occur (Burgess 1984; Mason 2002), and all 28 respondents were interviewed in a convenient, relaxing environment. These factors were of importance, as the focus of the interviews were to encompass the ‘how’ and ‘what’ of people’s lives and traditions (Cole 1997). These considerations were reflective of the causal puzzle, contributing to the reliability of the data and its validity. As a result, numerous advantages and limitations were considered throughout the data collection process, and are displayed in Table 4.15.
The strengths and weaknesses outlined here demonstrate the level of thought which was given to the investigation. These considerations represented the operation of qualitative research, from the perspective that knowledge is situated and contextual (Mason 2002). Even so, qualitative interviews only have the capacity for individuals to construct or reconstruct emotions and
thoughts within the interviews. Therefore, the technique was ‘heavily dependent on people’s capacities to verbalise, interact, conceptualise and remember’ (Mason 2002:64) their experiences.

To establish the correct research strategy for the collection of primary data, it was important to evaluate the values and practical considerations which influenced the construction of this social research. Alongside the epistemological and ontological perspectives, theory played a critical role, in addition to the values and practical considerations. Values established the beliefs of the researcher, while the practical considerations influenced decisions about how research should be carried out (Bryman 2004).

Reflective of these considerations, a semi-structured approach to questioning occurred, as all respondents were asked a similar set of questions about the research topic, which were pre-established (Hollinshead 2004). However, there was still variation in the ordering and the structure of the interview. This form of interview was identified as being the best suited to the research setting and the nature of the investigation as it involved individuals being interviewed at length as suggested by Veal (1997). This conclusion was reached as the investigation was concerned with an individual’s ability to generate knowledge and explanations of their interpretations, experiences, and interactions with the tourism industry, and thus represented the social reality experienced by hosts. Open questions were therefore asked, and were answered on the basis of the knowledge the respondent had at hand (Flick 2002).
The topic structure was taken from the analysis of the literature review and the conceptual framework. The content for conversation was also loosely based upon the findings of the secondary data. The questions asked can be viewed in Appendix Two. Consequently, the aim of the interviews were to explore the extent to which a community influences residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime, by identifying the role a community plays in the social life of residents. As a result, the methodology also aimed to integrate data to provide a more qualitative and developed view of places and crime as suggested by Matlz (cited in Eck and Weisburd 1995). Such integration allowed the researcher to identify the full social, economic and physical characteristics exhibited by crime places.

4.4.4 Sample

Theoretical sampling was adopted for this research agenda. This decision was made based upon a number of factors, as illustrated in Table 4.16. More specifically, theoretical sampling was used due to two restraining factors: one being the need to meet particular criteria set out by the aims and objectives and the conceptual framework, and the other being the boundaries of the unknown. The unknown population, key respondents and the saturation point (Flick 2002).
Theoretical sampling was therefore adopted, but only once alternative sampling strategies were consulted. The alternate approaches that were considered for this investigation included both convenience sampling and judgemental sampling. However, convenience sampling was rejected on the grounds of intellectual credibility and the quality of data that may be gained (Mason 2002), and despite judgemental sampling being the most common sampling technique (Mason 2002; Bryman 2004) the purposeful sampling was rejected on the grounds on the unknown. With judgemental sampling, the researcher actively selects the most productive sample to answer the research question (Mason 2002), however, in the case of this research, the extension of the basic population was not known in advance (Flick 2002:67), and was therefore unable to be defined in advance (see Table 4.16). Hence the rational for implementing theoretical sampling, as despite a judgement sample being able to select a productive sample to answer the research question, and still use a referral process (Strauss and Corbin 1998), it was necessary to respond to the emergent data from each community group, and selecting a new sample to examine and elaborate on these findings, as it emerged.
Furthermore, the samples were considered in terms of constraint, by limiting the theoretically unlimited possibilities of integrating further persons to fulfil the theoretical saturation point. The thought process therefore required early decisions to be made, in terms of the case study boundaries (Section 4.3), but simultaneously the stages were reviewed at certain periods within the data collection process (Mason 2002). This resulted in questions being asked as to when further cases should not be integrated into the data collection process. It was therefore decided that when nothing new emerged, saturation would be reached and data collection would cease. This resulted in a specific sampling techniques being utilised at different points of the investigation. This ensured the aims of the investigation were met, whilst unnecessary cases were not examined (Flick 2002).

Reflective of this, the sampling method was drawn on three levels. Firstly to distinguish the case study locations, secondly to identify key respondents for analysis, and thirdly when sampling the material collected as suggested by Flick (2002). This allowed data collection to be controlled by the emerging theory and the sampling methods that were used (Glaser and Strauss 1967).

To represent the theoretical method presented here, secondary data were used to identify a population and highlight destination specific locations that were suitable for data collection. While key respondents within these destinations were sourced through criteria presented within the conceptual framework (Table 3.2). This resulted in case samples being selected by the analysis of secondary data, as illustrated in the next chapter, whereas individual cases were identified through the use of snowball sampling. Finally, the framework method was used
to provide a ‘versatile means’ for analysis of the primary qualitative data (Brunt 1997). Therefore, each of the ‘steps’ were considered in turn and analysed in depth before data were analysed, this process started with the selection of a suitable sampling procedure.

A range of sampling methods were considered at this point of the investigation, including targeted sampling and respondent-driven sampling methods (Magnani, Sabin, Saidel and Heckathorn 2005) as both have been reviewed for concealed populations such as these. However, as discussed below (Section 4.4.4.1), snowball sampling was used in this investigation. This approach was considered appropriate as the sampling procedure needed to be capable of reaching all members of the population under investigation (Magnani et al. 2005).

Although such a sample can also be drawn from both targeted and respondent-driven sampling, it was felt that snowball sampling was more suitable. This decision was based upon the nature of the alternative approaches which were available. Target sampling would have extended the concept of snowball sampling to include an initial assessment aimed at identifying various networks and subgroups that may exist. However, it was felt that such a method would have led to researcher bias, and encouraged group formation based upon analytical assessment, rather than being defined by the community themselves. In a similar vein, respondent-driven sampling was rejected. This rejection was based upon the probability sampling that is inherent in the recruitment process (Magnani et al. 2005). Therefore respondent-driven sampling also failed to
adhere to the nature of the investigation; to allow the groups to be identified by the community itself.

4.4.4.1 Snowball Sampling

Snowball sampling is a non-random sampling strategy (Oppenheim 1992; Hall and Hall 1996; Berg 2001), that is often used in explanatory research, when it is impossible to identify beforehand all those who might fall into a category of interest (Hall and Hall 1996). Snowball sampling was chosen for this investigation, as it is a ‘method that has been widely used in qualitative social research’ (Biernacki and Waldorf 1981:141) and has been popular when researching issues of deviance, sensitive issues, or difficult to reach populations (Lee 1993 cited in Biernacki and Waldorf 1981; Berg 2001; McNeil and Chapman 2005). Therefore, the sampling method enabled new information-rich cases to be located (Decrop 1999a), and it enabled the researcher to access individuals who may live outside the boundaries of a standard society (Browne 2005).

The basic strategy of snowballing involved interviewing a few key informants, who had the relevant characteristics and attributes associated with the research question at hand, and asking them for the names of other people who either possessed the same attributes as themselves, or were a member of the same organisation (Biernacki and Waldorf 1981; Oppenheim 1992; Berg 2001; Kumar 2005; McNeil and Chapman 2005; Nash 2006). A visual illustration of the sampling method used is displayed in Figure 4.1.
Like Figure 4.1 suggests, the process starts with one or two informants, who then expand the sample through referrals (Babble 1995:287), which results in a larger sample of key respondents being established (Hall and Hall 1996). The sampling process then halts once saturation is reached, defined as being when no new information is forthcoming (Kumar 2005). With this process in mind, it was clear how the a small number of respondents would grow, by adding further people to the sample in stages (McNeil and Chapman 2005). These respondents would then be grouped to obtain structured results (Berg 2001).

In terms of the actual sample which was drawn in this investigation, snowballing was used to locate subjects for analysis who have certain attributes or characteristics necessary to the investigation (Berg 2001). The technique involved selecting a sample by using networks (Kumar 2005; Liamputtong and Ezzy 2005), which yielded a sizeable group of respondents (Oppenheim 1992). Careful consideration was given as to who the initial individual’s would be, as they would fashion the structure of the remaining sample stages (Liamputtong and Ezzy 2005). The selection process was therefore drawn from a set of
criteria, which was introduced to the sampling method to ensure a reflective and non-bias sample were sought. The criteria was drawn from specific characteristics which were acknowledged during the review on literature (Section 2.2) and from the work of Krippendorf (1987), who recognised that the nature and extent of contact residents had with the tourism industry would bear an influence upon their perceptions of others. These criterions, which were used to select the initial respondent, are outlined in Table 4.17.

| A. Someone who was a local resident of the stated destination |
| B. Someone who was involved with a local society within the destination |
| C. Someone who was identifiable to Krippendorf’s (1987) occupational groupings |

Table 4.17: Criteria for snowball sampling

Due to the criteria outlined in Table 4.17, it can be said that a criteria-based snowball sampling method was adopted for this investigation, as suggested by Palmer, Freeman and Zabriskie (2007). This criterion meant that the initial respondent for each case study area were comparable, in that each individual who started the sampling procedure, in each location, was sourced via their standing within each community. More specifically, the initial respondents were selected via their occupational grouping, with their job title acting as an initial indication of suitability. The referral process was then encouraged until saturation was reached.

Due to the nature of the sampling method, the sample size was not established until after the data collection process was completed, as the sample for this investigation recognised the need for community representation within the
research findings, as opposed to any predetermined analysis of representation and validity. This resulted in 28 key respondents being interviewed between May 2008 and July 2008, 16 of whom were from Newquay and 12 from Penzance. Further insight into the sample size and structure is explained in Chapter 7.

In terms of the sampling method adopted here, it is important to also identify the limitations of snowball sampling. These limitations were considered before sampling began, and are somewhat reflected in the need for a criteria based snowball sample as described above. The main limitations of snowball sampling were identified as being the potential of bias (Hall and Hall 1996; Browne 2005; Kumar 2005), the level of accuracy which could be obtained (Oppenheim 1992), and the level of representation which could be established (McNeil and Chapman 2005). These limitations, which were addressed and applied to the methodology, are displayed in Table 4.18.
Consequently, the potential for personal involvement (Browne 2005) was high, and the sampling process was perceived as being somewhat bias from the start, due to the non-random nature of the social networking of community members and the use the referral system (Browne 2005; Nash 2006). In itself, the process meant that the sample became biased towards those who shared similar views to the initial respondent (Nash 2006). It was also anticipated that the accuracy of the findings were questionable, as snowballing had 'little claim to be representative at all' (McNeil and Chapman 2005:50) of the wider population, and its representation of the community at large (Oppenheim 1992). Nevertheless, snowballing was adopted, as the benefits of conducting such a technique were deemed to outweighing these particular limitations. After all, if the sampling method had been designed differently, to interview other
informants outside of the social networks and ties of the initial respondent, the individuals would not have satisfied the sampling criteria as outlined in the conceptual framework (Table 3.2).

Furthermore, because of the structure of friendship networks, and the strength of social ties being an explicit part of this study’s methodology and theory, these limitations stated, were negated (Liamputtong and Ezzy 2005). These limitations were reduced, by the final sample frame in each location representing a more homogeneous, inter-related section of the community. This sample frame also gave an alternative interpretation from other tourism research, which on the whole have been noted to represent a more heterogeneous society (Brunt and Courtney 1999). Therefore, the researcher acknowledge that the investigation itself could overcome certain difficulties in community studies, as they have often established a false sense of cohesion, whereby residents were assembled purely for analytical purposes (Prentice 1993). Whereas, in this investigation, the snowball sample allowed residents to identify with their own social ties and network groups, as they usually referred likeminded individuals, rather than having them generated by an outsider. Therefore, the sample helped to explain the variations among residents within the same community (Zhang et al. 2006), and resulted in two case study samples which were alike, in terms of the initial respondent. This parallel enabled the objectives of the investigation to be realised, in terms of investigating how a community can affect residents’ perceptions, reactions and responses to tourism and tourism and crime-related impacts, and acknowledging if any differences were uncovered.
4.4.5 Ethical Considerations

Qualitative interviews can give rise to ethical issues and concerns (Allmark, Boote, Chambers, Clarke, McDonnell, Thompson and Tod 2009). ‘Ethical issues can arise in the design and conduct of research and in the reporting of results’ (Veal 2006:70), and include issues of informed consent, openness and honesty, and confidentiality. Therefore, thought was given towards establishing ethical principles in the field (Veal 2006), as outlined by Bryman (2004) and Veal (2006), whereby harm to participants were avoided, permission from respondents were approved, privacy was paramount and respondent deception was avoided.

More specifically, ethical approval was requested from the Plymouth Business School at the University of Plymouth in 2007 to cover the period of investigation. This ethical application was submitted, and then granted in late 2007, and ensured the research conformed to each clause of the University of Plymouth’s ethical protocol. Once ethical approval was granted, the initial respondents were contacted, and were provided with as much detailed information as possible about the nature of the research. Once interviewed, to conform to aspects of confidentiality, the anonymity of each respondent was implemented during data transcription and analysis. This anonymity was possible as initials were recorded on transcripts, rather than names, and code was used to identify each respondent in the final report.

In terms of developing the ethical principles even further, there was no single ‘trustworthy ethical formula’ (Allmark et al. 2009:12) that could have been applied to the qualitative interviews which took place. Instead, the ethical
protocol, established by the University of Plymouth, was adhered to as the interview practice progressed. This adaptation was due to the nature of the sampling method adopted (Section 4.4.4.1) and the unknown element of the population prior to data collection. Therefore, even though such issues as informed consent were approved prior to each interview, it was impossible to secure such consent before the initial respondent was interviewed. As a result of these limiting factors, the researcher engaged in on-going reflectivity, whilst responding sensitively to each participant’s needs to ensure moral principles were met. Therefore, the interview research was not regarded simply as being ‘low risk’ (Allmark et al. 2009:16). Instead, the researcher was ethically minded about the close relationships which could have formed between themselves and the respondent, as well as taking sides and issues of power as discussed by Allmark et al. (2009:16). Finally, it should be noted, that individuals did withdraw, prior to interview, on a number of occasions within the Penzance sample. This emphasises the need for ethical approval and the on-going need for ethical protocol at all stages of data collection.

4.5 Data Analysis

Once the data were collected, the information was turned into qualitative variables and processed via the Framework Method (Ritchie and Spencer 1994) and NVivo software. This process was organised to overcome key issues of reliability, as data analysis saw ‘the making of arguments…[as] arguments are sets of ideas which are expressed, and how they are constituted, in writing or in other forms, is fundamental’ (Mason 2002:173). With this communication the argument provoked implicit epistemological claims, that people’s recalled
experiences and perception do count as evidence of ontological properties, and that, in turn, acts as a constitute of the social world.

### 4.5.1 The Framework Method

The Framework Method was used for this investigation as it was considered as being a method associated with systematic and disciplined research (Teo 1994) and one which provided a good way to analyse qualitative data (Brunt 1997). The strength of this approach was illustrated through structure, as it enabled the researcher to inductively reconsider and rework ideas (Teo 1994). This contemplation involved the ‘systematic process of sifting, charting and sorting material according to key issues and themes’ (Teo 1994:177) which emerged from the transcribed field notes. In total, there were five interconnected stages to the framework method which were considered, as identified by Ritchie and Spencer (1994) and displayed in Table 4.19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.19: The five steps of the Framework Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Familiarisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Identifying a thematic framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Indexing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Charting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Mapping and interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The stages highlighted in Table 4.19 ensured the richness of data, in scope and nature, were achieved by the researcher (Brunt 1997). This richness was attained by a process of immersion, conceptualisation and judgement, before data were lifted from their initial context and interpreted and defined (Teo 1994).
As a result, the methods validity relied heavily on the creative and conceptual ability of the analyst to ‘determine meaning, salience and connections’ (Teo 1994:177).

To conduct the analysis in a systematic manner, and to ensure data were sifted and charted in a methodical nature without losing context or source, ‘NVivo’ was utilised. This software programme provided the researcher with the appropriate set of tools to assist the analysis of the qualitative data (Bazeley 2007). The software also gave support to the original Framework Method, as the technological advances increased the effectiveness and efficiency of the research (Bazeley 2007). NVivo had the capacity to record, sort, match and link data without ‘losing access to the source data or contexts from which the data have come’ (Bazeley 2007:2). Therefore, the NVivo software was regarded of importance to this investigation, allowing the mapping and interpretation of data to take place without losing individual responses or the community relationships. This connection provided the researcher with ‘a more complete set of data for interpretation than might occur when working manually’ (Bazeley 2007:3).

4.5.2 NVivo

The NVivo software was used as it acted as a tool of interpretation upon the data collected, insofar as the software did not prescribe a method, but rather supported a wide range of methodological approaches (Bazeley 2007). The software, however, raised methodological concerns not dissimilar to the general use of using software in qualitative research. There was concern over the impact of software use on analysis, as programmes can create issues relating
to the contextualisation of the research and closeness of the researcher to the investigation. Nevertheless, it was felt that such issues were counteracted by the advantages of technological advancements and the software now available, as highlighted in Table 4.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inability to see the whole document</td>
<td>Ability to view retrieved segments of text in their original context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports code- and text-retrieve activity</td>
<td>Ability to code data more efficiently and build theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher can recontextualise data through category than document</td>
<td>Distances researchers from their data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear mechanising analysis</td>
<td>Metacognitive awareness ensures researcher remains in control of the process they are engaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconception that computers support only grounded theory</td>
<td>Loss of context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher must integrate their perspective and conceptual framework into their coding choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ultimately, in response to Table 4.20, it was believed that the reliability and trustworthiness of the software was characterised by the researcher’s ability and understanding in both executing and using the software (Bazeley 2007). As a result, one NVivo project was developed during data collection and analysis as suggested by Bazeley (2007). This software enabled the whole sample to be compared and isolated in the same instance, using sources as a
comparative tool upon different destinations, or within the same case study destination. In addition to this NVivo project, a single journal was kept (as suggested by Bazeley (2007)), to record observations and make notes about the data set. This journal ensured that all the insights and ideas that were identified throughout the familiarisation and indexing processes were recorded. This documentation enabled action to be taken, and allowed for the evidence to be drawn together to support the final conclusions offered by the study (Bazeley 2007).

The processes of using NVivo in conjunction with the Framework Method involved five steps. These steps are displayed in Table 4.21 and began with the formation of free nodes (see Appendix Five), which were developed from the data and through the familiarisation and indexing phases of analysis. These free nodes were designed to reflect the conversations with key respondents and the issues which they raised in relation to the questions posed as a result of the conceptual framework. These were then developed further to form tree nodes to reflect specific relationships which emerged from the data once the familiarisation stage was complete and indexing had begun.
As discussed in Table 4.21, the use of the NVivo software and the Framework Method together ensured that the thematic and case themes were identified, and that contextualisation of the data was recognised throughout the analysis process. The method therefore allowed themes and relationships across respondents and case study destinations to be highlighted with ease. This facility was possible as NVivo allowed the connections to remain evident across the research areas, and also allowed the researcher to view retrieved segments of text in their original context (Bazeley 2007). This connection was deemed important due to the nature, depth and scope required by the research question as, although issues of generalisation and transferability were being recognised,
the method allowed respondents to be identified as individuals. This inter-
connection allowed interpretation to be undertaken at three levels, the self, the
community, and the destination area.

4.6 Chapter Summary

From reviewing and examining the research methods that were adopted and
implemented for data collection, it is evident that both quantitative and
 qualitative data were obtained for analysis. These consisted of secondary and
primary data respectively. The secondary data included the collation of
population census data, official crime rates and tourism statistics for both
locations, whilst the primary data witnessed 28 in-depth qualitative interviews
(approximately 38 hours of interview recordings) being conducted and analysed
with key stakeholders between both destinations. The interviews were
established through a snowballing sampling technique in both Newquay and
Penzance, and were informed by the application of case study methods and
boundaries.

As a result of the data collection process, the conceptual framework could be
fully explored, and interpreted through the forthcoming chapters. These
suggestions can be found in the secondary data analysis and qualitative data
analysis Chapters (6 and 7), before being discussed and concluded in Chapters
8 and 9. However, before this discussion occurs, an in-depth background to
each case study area, which were identified in Section 4.3, will be discussed to
set the scene for interpretation and conceptualisation about the impacts of
tourism-related crime in these two British seaside destinations.
Academic literature suggests that many British seaside destinations are ‘complex socioeconomic environments’ (Shaw and Coles 2007:48) that have not only ‘succumbed to the fate of on-going economic decline, but they have also become the target of much negative publicity’ (Smith 2004:17). This insight highlights the degeneration and the rise and fall of some traditional seaside holidays in the UK, as people opt for foreign travel instead of taking a break by the sea in response to the emergence of competition (Beatty and Fothergill 2004; Gale 2005), and as a reply to ‘the growing range of alternative places to visit within Britain itself’ (Gale 2005:89). Furthermore, the decline of British seaside destinations have been attributed by Gale (2005; 2007) to be the outcome of a deterioration in quality and suitability, the loss of tourism function, and the manifestation of a negative place image. All of which are ‘bound up in simple, yet compelling, cause and effect relationships that occupy a surface ontology’ (Gale 2005:90), and represent symptoms of resort decline, external threats and internal problems (Gale 2007).

British seaside destinations ‘potentially share the same economic problems as other “one industry” towns (Beatty and Fothergill 2004:462). However, Smith (2004) noted that the fate of each individual destination is not concurrent with every other. Instead, destinations are epitomised by their stage in development and other specific typologies. Therefore, the impacts of tourism-related crime and the implications of tourism upon community members may differ between different destinations.
The aim of this chapter is therefore to describe the characteristics of the two case study areas to demonstrate the development and impacts of the tourism industry. This understanding is advanced through the identification of tourism to Cornwall (Section 5.1), as the county acts as a significant visitor destination for the United Kingdom (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005b; About Britain 2009). Then, the information will be discussed through the destinations of Newquay, located in the borough of Restormel, and Penzance, located in the borough of Penwith (Section 5.1.1 & 5.1.2 respectively) to inform the discussion of secondary data in Chapter 6.

These descriptions are significant to the investigation as they aid the contextualisation of tourism in each location, and they allow for a preliminary examination of tourism development over time to take place, as they give reasons for the magnitude of tourism impacts to be felt. Furthermore, the type of location bears influence over these developments. Therefore it is important to establish the ‘type’ of destination being reviewed, as British seaside destinations are frequently categorised in terms of the environment and location (Walton 2000; English Tourism Council 2001; Southwest Tourism 2009a). For example, the English Tourism Council (2001) classified seaside destinations in the UK as being (1) picturesque; (2) traditional; (3) family; (4) lively; and, (5) fun. Southwest Tourism (2009a) categorised them by their distinct nature, with the categories consisting of (a) resort; (b) historical town/city; (c) coastal town/village; and, (d) Countryside town/village.

Due to these distinctions and the location of the two destinations, Newquay is categorised as a lively ‘Resort’ for the purposes of this investigation, whilst
Penzance is categorised as a traditional ‘Coastal Town’ as recommended by the regional tourist board (Southwest Tourism 2009a) (see Appendix Three for further examples). The characteristics that have determined these classifications can be viewed in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of the type of destination</th>
<th>Source: Adapted from English Tourism Council (2001), Fothergill (2006), and Southwest Tourism (2009a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

It is therefore the magnitude of economic and social problems experienced by each destination which is imperative to understand here, as the scale of these problems are not concurrent in every destination. Furthermore, the scale of decline, in terms of the destination life-cycle (Butler 1980), can be gauged through the emergence of stereotypical deterrents for potential visitors to visit each destination (Smith 2004). For example, the image of a destination can lead to difficulties in retaining the tourism industry (Prideaux 1996). These difficulties have implications upon the attitude, behaviour and perception of local communities, as residents may be dependent upon tourism for their livelihood. Furthermore, since residents play a vital role in the tourism product, in terms of providing a service and welcomingly accept ‘strangers’ into their environment,
residents need to exhibit a positive appearance, which is not always the case. Therefore the image of a destination can deter potential visitors and consequently create levels of economic and social decline within the destination.

For that reason, a background of each destination’s tourism industry is now presented. This information allows for the historical development of tourism to be established in Newquay and Penzance. However, to contextualise the expansion of each destination, an initial background of tourism development in Cornwall is given.

5.1 Cornwall

The growth of the tourism industry in Cornwall has been significant since the 20th century when Cornwall’s heavy engineering industry slowly declined, giving way for lighter industries and economies (Cornwall County Council 2006). Since then, the transformation of Cornwall as an accessible tourist destination for national and international tourists commenced, starting with the coming of the railways. Trains brought new travellers, and Cornwall responded by providing accommodation and services for them. More recently ‘Cornwall has emerged as one of the world's iconic destinations’ (Allmark et al. 2009), attracting per year, approximately 3 million visitors and bringing more than £1.5 billion in revenue to the County (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005b).

As a result, Cornwall’s economy has become increasingly dependent upon tourism (Lonely Planet 2005), with the attractions of the county being diluted with underlying economic difficulties which follow tourism (Andrew 1997; Beatty
and Fothergill 2004). This dependency has led to problems for Cornwall’s less well-off as the county remains ‘one of the poorest parts of the UK’ (Lonely Planet 2005), coupling low wages with high unemployment rates that typically relate to an essentially rural environment (HLL Humberts Leisure 2005). So whilst Cornwall tries hard to capitalise upon its natural environment (Cornwall Calling 2006), it is continually seeking a solution to the economic problems faced by seaside destinations (Andrew 1997; Beatty and Fothergill 2004; Cornwall County Council 2006).

In terms of tourism flow, it is believed that over 250,000 visitors can be found within the county at any one time in the summer months (About Britain 2009). However, the density of tourism is not uniform, as the most predominant tourist areas within the county are located within the boroughs of Restormel, Penwith and Carrick (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a). These boroughs represent three of the six boroughs located within Cornwall, as displayed in Figure 5.1. These prominent destinations represent tourist arrivals to towns such as Newquay, Truro, Falmouth and Penzance (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a), which alone cater for up to 60% of the volume of tourists to Cornwall within peak season (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a). However, Restormel is the borough which receives the highest volume of visitors within Cornwall (Restormel Borough Council 2007), with Newquay alone attracting approximately 30% of the total visitor base (Shaw and Williams 2004).
Due to this influx of temporary visitors to the county, it is of no surprise that the employment levels within Cornwall are dominated by tourism-related jobs. They account for between 12.5% and 21% of the total base of employment (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005b; Nomis 2007) in comparison to 8.1% nationwide, and Beatty and Fothergill’s (2004) average identification of 10-12% in a typical seaside destination. Therefore Cornwall has a high proportion of jobs attributed directly to the tourist trade. However, these figures are subjective to the classification of tourism-related employment, as services can incorporate a range of employment opportunities. Ranging from services within hotels, camping sites, restaurants, bars, the activities of travel agencies, to those of library archives museums, sporting activities, and other recreational activities (Nomis 2007).
In relation to the distribution and density of tourism to the County, there is also a varied distribution of tourism-related employment within each of Cornwall’s boroughs. Nomis (2007) statistics reveal that the boroughs of Restormel and Penwith exhibit the highest levels of tourism-related employment, hosting 18.1% and 17.3% respectively. These statistics are displayed in Graph 5.1 and are consistent with Restormel and Penwith hosting large settlements that attract tourists.

Tourism-related employment prospects are, however, coupled with additional economic and social concerns. For example, in Cornwall a lower percentage of the population are of working age (58.6%) in comparison to the rest of Great Britain (62.2%), and only 77.63% of the working aged people in Cornwall are economically active (Nomis 2007). Consequently, the transitory employment of strangers is often sought by employers to fulfil the seasonal service-orientated roles. This temporary employment is not a new trend: ‘it has long been known that there is a problem of seasonal unemployment in seaside towns [which is]...attributed to the seasonal nature of the holiday trade’ (Beatty and Fothergill 2004:467). The aftereffect has led to residents within Cornwall earning 22%
less per week than the average UK resident (Nomis 2007). This fact represents
the more general nature of the service industry, as it offers seasonal patterns of
part-time work (Shaw and Coles 2007) and the prospects signify 'low-skill, low-
productivity and low-wage' (Beatty and Fothergill 2004:477) opportunities.

Further to these concerns, Cornwall also contains a high proportion of second
home ownership in comparison to the rest of England (Weaver 2006). By 2006,
5.6% of Cornish homes were used as second homes and/or holiday
accommodation (Weaver 2006), which is considerably higher than other
counties. For example, Cumbria, the county with the second highest proportion
of second homes in England, only attributes 3.4% of its total housing stock to
second home and holiday accommodation (Weaver 2006). This proportion of
second homes has contributed to further economic and social concerns within
the county, as the aspiration of outsiders to acquire a second home in the
county has induced an increase in house price. This displacement has primarily
occurred in the coastal areas, whereby home ownership has become beyond
the means of local residents (Richards and Munsters 2010). Nevertheless, this
case is not an isolated example, as it replicates the experience of other seaside
destinations in the UK that have been investigated by Shaw and Coles (2007).
However, in Cornwall, it has contributed to a desolate environment for some
locals, as small coastal hamlets are left almost empty of residents during the
winter months (Cornwall County Council 2006). Therefore, there are serious
concerns about the impact of tourism development upon Cornish communities.

Two tourist destinations that have notably succumbed to the fate of the tourism
industry and are experiencing the economic and social issues described here
are Newquay and Penzance. These two locations are discussed to illustrate the destination specific development of tourism, to highlight the changes which have occurred in each destination, and to give an overview of the nature and range of communities that exist. The aim being: to inform the researcher’s understanding of each destination, and not to describe the secondary data collected, as this description will occur in Chapter 6.

5.1.1 Newquay

Newquay, a one-time fishing village, is now Cornwall’s most popular and liveliest holiday resort and premier surfing destination (Magnani et al. 2005; Cornwall Online 2007b), and one of the seven large resorts in the UK alongside Blackpool and Brighton (Shaw and Coles 2007). Spurred on by the coming of the railways (iKnow Cornwall 2006), Newquay can look back on 600 years of history and a dramatic change of identity from fortified cliff settlement, tiny port through to premier resort (Cornwall Online 2007a).

Situated in the borough of Restormel, on the North Coast of Cornwall, Newquay accounts for the largest proportion of tourism to Cornwall (Tomal 2010). The proportion is estimated at 30% of all visitors to Cornwall, totalling approximately 1.4 million visits per annum (Shaw and Williams 2004). Newquay is portrayed as being ‘a small town but a relatively large resort’ (HLL Humberts Leisure 2005:4). Moreover it has been described as a town which has ‘been affected by the change in patterns of demand for tourism to the British seaside’ (HLL Humberts Leisure 2005:4) due to the town’s reliance on the more traditional and ‘old’ forms of tourism (Tomal 2010).
In terms of visitors, Newquay ‘attracts a high proportion of domestic staying visitors, who typically fall into the middle to older age brackets’ (Southwest Tourism 2005). These visitors have a tendency to encompass the ‘lower socio-economic groups and are more likely to visit in adult only groups’ (Southwest Tourism 2005). However, in 2002 the segmentation of the market was described by Meethan (2002) as attracting a variety of clientele from ‘the 18-30 year old for surfing and its nightlife, the retired or semi-retired, that is, those aged 60 years and over, and families for the “bucket and spade” holidays’ (Meethan 2002:32). Then, by 2004 it was proposed that ‘almost three quarters of visitors to Newquay…were in “adult only” groups’ (Southwest Tourism 2005), with Newquay promoting ‘fun’ events where individuals could, if they desired, indulge in a particularly hedonistic weekend (Barton and James 2003). This alteration has led to Newquay being promoted online as the ‘surf and sex capital of Cornwall’s tourism industry’ (Bowcott 2002), which relies ‘heavily on the growing reputation of Newquay within the United Kingdom as a “party town”’ (Barton and James 2003). The spill over of these activities has placed pressure on local residents, businesses and the public police, as events like ‘Run To The Sun’ arguably create time frames where local residents ‘see themselves as effectively excluded from their town’ (Barton and James 2003:261).

The hosting of such events, and the visible shifts in visitor profile, epitomises the growth of the night-time economy in Newquay and the adverse impact that it has upon other aspects of attractiveness, ‘discouraging the traditional family holidaymakers to the resort’ (Hibbett 2005:3). Nevertheless, Newquay is still known to have a ‘good base of loyal repeat visitors for whom a leisure/holiday
visit is the main reason for their visit’ (Southwest Tourism 2005), and in comparison to other large resorts, Newquay boasts a ‘significantly high proportion of long-stay holidaymakers’ (Shaw and Williams 2004:107). Therefore, ‘in terms of socio-economic groups, it would appear on the surface that Newquay is still catering for a traditional mass clientele’ (Meethan 2002:32).

However, during this transition process, Newquay has fallen peril to a national array of bad publicity, highlighting a more deviant temperament to the resort. The reported behaviour of some visitors has led to a negative image of the town, reflected both in the media and in residents’ concern for safety (Hibbett 2005). Arguably, this negativity has resulted from a perceived change in market for the destination thereby altering an individual’s organic image of the resort from a family values location to a more hedonistic destination. As Barton and James (2003) suggested, Newquay is geared towards the youth market, and in terms of Tribe’s (2005) analysis encourages rampant tourists that resemble a ‘particular mutation of Wickens’ [2002] species of Ravers’ (Tribe 2005:6). Furthermore, in Tribe’s (2005:6) opinion, the image of Newquay has transformed ‘a long way from the 3 S's of sun, sea and sand’ into ‘Sin “C” and Sound’.

These alterations have occurred through the modification of image formation, by means of induced and modified-induced image-making (Gunn 1988) factors which have implications for human behaviour (Gallarza, Saura and Garcia 2002). These transformations, in terms of developing a form of ‘Runaway Tourism’ (Tribe 2005), has led to Newquay becoming perceived as an unsafe location to visit and to socialise in. This perception is reinforced by official crime
statistics, as Newquay suffers from the highest reported crime rates in the county (Hibbett 2005). Thus, when the visitors are consider in terms of lifestyle groups, a more complicated picture emerges about the town and those who visit (Meethan 2002).

Since this shift in visitor profile, Newquay has become increasingly popular as a Stag and Hen party venue, ‘challenging the previous dominance of Blackpool as the prime Stag and Hen resort in the UK’ (Hibbett 2005:2). This status is due to the issues of accessibility, as provided by Newquay Cornwall Airport in terms of budget airlines (Hibbett 2005; HLL Humberts Leisure 2005) and the introduction of budget accommodation (Hibbett 2005). Representative of this change, by 2005, Newquay housed a total of 500 licensed premises, 9 nightclubs, 4 ‘super pubs’ and 20 town centre bars all catering for the 18-30 age group (Hibbett 2005), to fulfil demand. Therefore, the expansion of the night-time entertainment and the development of youth tourism in Newquay has witnessed ‘the introduction of key markers and signposts, with its...symbols from Australia’s surfing environments’ (Magnani et al. 2005:34). This image has led to an ‘estimated visitor spend of some £26 m per annum or 10% of all visitor spend within the resort’ (Williams 2002, cited in Shaw and Williams 2004:107) in terms of surf tourism, which has been evolving since the 1970s. The preliminary development of the surfing industry within the town has also contributed to the night-time economy (Shaw and Williams 2004).

Due to this great subjectivity of the tourism service offered in Newquay, images have transformed into mixed impressions, not only about the destination but also the residents, retailers and employees who operate within the resort.
Gallarza et al. 2002). In response to these shifts in representation and visitor profile, further inconsistencies in the town’s image and marketing material are found. Therefore, the town is ‘faced with the problem of how to maintain market share within a pre-existing infrastructure and...a pre-existing set of perceptions’ (Tomal 2010:587) conjured up by those who do not visit the region. This image has painted a somewhat negative perception of the destination to those seeking family values whilst on holiday, and has attracted the more deviant, hedonistic tourist (Prideaux 1996; Brunt and Brophy 2004). Newquay is therefore an area that relies heavily on high volume tourism (Meethan 1998), and with such growth comes more hedonistic values (Prideaux 1996). Therefore, it is less concerned with niche marketing, and more anxious in maintaining visitor numbers and existing patterns of tourists (Tomal 2010).

During this time, Newquay has also attracted a lot of interest from developers for new apartments and second homes in the resort (HLL Humberts Leisure 2005). This interest has led to a change in serviced accommodation, with estimates that ‘640 hotel rooms and 1,443 bed spaces have been lost from the resorts hotel stock through closure’ since 2000 (HLL Humberts Leisure 2005:4). However, there is no evidence that visitor numbers have reduced as a result of this loss of serviced accommodation as the town still ‘provides 34,000 bed spaces, [and] numerous camping and caravan sites’ (Hibbett 2005:2). Instead, the closure of serviced accommodation has seen community impacts increase for local residents, with residents being priced out of the housing market. This modification has seen a shift in tourism focus. Furthermore, the resort has seen a demise in community relationships as a result of homes being left empty during the winter months (Cornwall County Council 2006).
Despite this isolation, Newquay still offers a range of communities for local residents to get involved with, including interest, spatial and attachment based communities, as displayed in Table 5.2. Although not a comprehensive list, it implies that local residents can be segmented within an area or an interest group to help understand their reactions more effectively, as specific social ties and interactions can be recognised. These communities represent a snapshot of the social relationships which exist in Newquay and inform the impact assessment of tourism in Newquay in terms of the type and nature of the tourism industry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territorial/Place Community</td>
<td>• Newquay Regeneration Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Neighbour watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Porth Residence Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pentire Residents’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Community</td>
<td>• Newquay Old Cornwall Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newquay Harbour Sports Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newquay Surf Life Saving Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newquay AFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newquay Hornets (Rugby)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RNLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of Attachment</td>
<td>• Newquay Chamber of Commerce &amp; Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Newquay Residents’ Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Friends of Newquay Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Friends of Trenance Gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Communities within Newquay
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From this background information, it is evident that social and economic decline has occurred in Newquay. A shift in the tourism industry’s focus has transpired and a change in visitor type has been observed. It is therefore important to now assess the factors of growth, changing markets and the development of communities in the coastal town of Penzance, to highlight the similarity and disparity between the two destinations.

5.1.2 Penzance

Penzance is a bustling and historic town and harbour (About Britain 2009; Purely Penzance 2009) situated in a strategic location on the northwest corner of Mount's Bay, facing St. Michael's Mount (Cahill and Russell 2003; About Britain 2009). Penzance is acknowledged in terms of its architecture, spirit, diversity and quality, and symbolises the town’s role as a cultural, artistic, entertainment and tourism centre (Cahill and Russell 2003; Cornwall Online 2005). Moreover, Penzance retains Cornwall's only promenade (About Britain 2009) and it is noted for its ‘sub-tropical trees and plants...high quality streetscapes and spectacular views’ (Cahill and Russell 2003:13), all of which attract tourists.

Since Penzance’s prime, in the early 20th century, there has been a marked decline in the town’s fortunes, which have been intensified by its geographical isolation. Due to social and economic circumstances, the town is now frequently associated with deprivation, housing three of the most disadvantaged wards in the borough, and within Cornwall as a whole (Mawby 2007). This deprivation has developed further, with almost 18% of the resident population
living in an area among the most deprived 10% in England, thus resembling the highest proportion of deprivation in any South West location (Office for National Statistics 2009). This level of deprivation is due to Penzance being an urban area in a coastal location within a rural district (NAVCA 2007). Likewise, the deprivation is associated with the town’s low levels of owner occupancy housing, as less than half of the houses are owned by local residents, compared to over 70% being owner occupied nationally (NAVCA 2007). This deficiency has led to the formation of social housing estates that accommodate for one third of Penzance’s dwellings, as well as a very, run down private rented accommodation market (NAVCA 2007).

Despite these social concerns, the location of the destination and its remote nature is strategically important to the county, as Penzance is ‘a port, rail and coach route terminus, and also the major interchange for local rail, road and bus networks’ (Cahill and Russell 2003:13). The town therefore acts as a transport hub for the transient population, and as an accessible tourist destination, with service industries like tourism developing into a major employment sector within the town (Cahill and Russell 2003). This standing has led to Penzance becoming one of the five most visited locations in Cornwall (Mawby 2007) attracting 23.5% of all tourists to Cornwall (Allmark et al. 2009), which includes staying visitors using the town as a thoroughfare for visiting Land’s End and the Lizard Peninsular (Cahill and Russell 2003). Hence why Penzance has one of the largest proportions of employees in service based industries (Office for National Statistics 2009).
Despite this level of tourism, social and economic impacts are still felt within the town, due to the complex nature of tourism. Consequently, there is little in Penzance that is not affected by the economic and social impacts of such an industry (Penwith Borough Council 2005a; Penwith Borough Council 2005b). Even local residents express the over-dependency on the industry (Mawby 2007) as it significantly impedes their ability to go about their everyday business, especially during the peak season (Penwith Borough Council 2005a; Penwith Borough Council 2005b). As a result, tourism is seen to further contribute to the previously noted high levels of deprivation, due to the seasonal nature of tourism. Seasonality has increased the unemployment rates in the closed season, contributed towards the low levels of owner occupancy, which have inevitably transpired to low levels of car ownership (Mawby 2007). Furthermore, due to displacement and the wider economic and social issues faced by the county, Penzance has become a sought-after residential town, putting ‘pressure on housing from both local demand and in-migration’ (Cahill and Russell 2003:14), with second home ownership accounting for 4% of the total dwellings (Office for National Statistics 2009).

Inevitably community impacts and the effects of a changing economy are present within the town. Penzance suffers from high crime rates, which are somewhat contributed to through the influx of tourists, as tourism can generate ‘a new population of potential targets’ (Mawby 2007:39). ‘Tourism is seen as a “generator” of crime and anti-social behaviour’ (Mawby 2007:39) within the town. Furthermore, crime rates are heightened by the large numbers of unemployed workers as there is an apparent wealth division between local residents and affluent tourists as described by Mawby (2009), which generates
a feeling of insecurity in the town. Therefore, in terms of local communities, Penzance offers a more limited range of interest communities, some of which are displayed in Table 5.3. Although the list does not act as a complete overview of the communities found within Penzance, the table illustrates the different levels of resident interest, which ranges from those shared geographically, to those shared by collective action and common interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Community</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Territorial/Place Community</td>
<td> Friends of Penzance Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Penwith Chess Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Mounts Bay Lugger Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Community</td>
<td> Penzance Ladies Football Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Cornish Pirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Penwith Chess Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Mounts Bay Lugger Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community of Attachment</td>
<td> Penzance Rotary Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Penzance Women’s Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> The Breadline Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Penzance and District Tourism Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td> Penzance &amp; District Hotel Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Communities within Penzance


5.2 Chapter Summary

In summary, from the case study backgrounds offered here, it is evident that the tourism industry in both the resort of Newquay and the coastal town of Penzance are experiencing social and economic decline, and share similar
economic problems as one another. These are representational of the wider concerns faced in Cornwall, as well as other seaside destinations in the UK that have been investigated by Shaw and Coles (2007). However, the magnitude of the impacts found within each destination, is not equivalent to one other. Instead, they differ according to the type and nature of the destination, which shall be investigated further through the description and analysis of secondary data in the following chapter.
6.0 Secondary Data Description

This chapter describes and interprets the secondary data findings for the two case study destinations, which acted as the first stage of data collection in this research schedule. The purpose of the secondary sources was to explore the nature of each case study destination, to clarify their suitability and to illustrate the credible, transferable and reliable nature of this investigation. This ensured that the second objective of the investigation was met, as the conditions and attributes of each destination were assessed.

In line with the case study selection criteria referred to in the methodology (Section 4.3), the aim of this chapter is to describe the statistics that were collected over a three year period, between 2006 and 2009. These data, however, represented a broader time frame than the three years when data were collected, as shown in Table 6.1. Therefore, the data offered both timely information and historical data about each destination area, which presented an overview of changing trends and structure experienced by local residents. The data determined a description of the socio-demographic profile of each resident population, an overview of the size and nature of the tourism industry, and an assessment of the official police recorded crime statistics in each area. The descriptions were compiled stage-by-stage, and were summarised through the implications they may have upon the local population. Therefore, the secondary data will be described source by source. The initial focus will be on the tourism statistics that were compiled at the county, borough and resort level. The description will then be followed by the data collated from the population census, and finally the recorded crime statistics will be discussed.
Overall the aim of this chapter was to build insight about each destination, and to communicate the findings of the secondary data that initially facilitated their identification. Importantly, this data collection was conducted prior to the second stage of data collection, to ensure the researcher was familiar with the social reality experienced by local residents before qualitative interviews were undertaken.

6.1 Tourism Statistics

Tourism statistics help provide interesting points and ideas for the comparison of research agendas (Veal 1992). For that reason, data were collated between 2006 and 2009 for this investigation, as the time period reflected the trends of the destination at the point of enquiry. These data provided an overview of the volume and type of tourists who took a trip to Cornwall and more specifically to the boroughs of Restormel and Penwith. This identification allowed the nature and scope of tourism development to be assessed at the County and borough level for both destinations. However, due to issues of accessibility, data were only collated at a destination level for Newquay, as there was no specific data available for Penzance at the time of this investigation (see Table 4.8). Despite this issue of accessibility, the data shall now be described in a systematic
manner, starting with those that represent Cornwall as a whole, before considering the two boroughs, and then finally the destination specific statistics for Newquay.

6.1.1 Cornwall

Through the assessment of tourism statistics and descriptive data for Cornwall, it was evident that the county had experienced a significant change in the type of visit taken by tourists and their length of stay in the region (Roberts 2002). This change had been witnessed through the ‘growth of both short breaks and extra holidays at the expense of the main holiday’ (Roberts 2002), with the average length of stay per visitor fluctuating over the years. This fluctuation occurred through the arrival of both domestic and overseas travel as illustrated in Graph 6.1, where 2007 represented the shortest staying period for domestic tourism since 1992. This variation emphasises the change in tastes and consumer demands in travel to the county, as short breaks and extra holidays made up over 60% of the total trips to Cornwall (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a; AcumeniA 2006). This tendency, towards taking shorter breaks, is evidenced in Cornwall, as in 2005 the average length of stay for trips dropped to less than a week (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a), and depleted further as, by 2007, the average stay of trips to Cornwall was 5.13 nights (Visit Cornwall 2009). Nevertheless, some characteristics have remained unchanged (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a; AcumeniA 2006; Visit Cornwall 2009). For instance, the most predominant form of travel to Cornwall continues to be the car, and the county still attracts a substantial number of repeat tourists.
The length in stay illustrated in Graph 6.1 takes into account all service types of accommodation, including self-catering, touring and static caravans and camping, second home stays and staying with friends and relatives (Southwest Tourism 2009b). Evidently, the data from 2004 are missing, the missing data are due to a methodological change which rendered the data incomparable (Visit Cornwall 2009). Therefore, trends can only be reasonably assumed for this time period. If analysis was based upon the comparison of the data which lays either side, then it could be reasonable assumed that in 2004 there was a slight rise in the length of stay for domestic tourists (from 5.27–5.49), a decline in the length of stay of international tourists (from 8.00 – 7.00), and a rise, overall in combined stays (from 5.37–5.55).
Further to these statistics, the visitors spend for domestic and overseas visitors altered over the same time frame (1992-2007). An overview of these variations are illustrated in Graph 6.2, which shows a steady rise in visitor spend overtime (1995 to 1998; 2000 to 2002) for both domestic and overseas visitors. Furthermore, an extreme decline in spend is evident for 2003, compared to the 2002 data.

Graph 6.2 illustrates a reduction in spend since the peak in 2002, which correlates with a reduction in staying nights by combined visitors in Graph 6.1. Once again, the data are missing for 2004. However, reasonable assumption suggests that in 2004 the average domestic visitor spend would have been £1067.50. The overseas visitor spend would have been £84.50, and the combined spend would have been £1152. These assumptions imply that there
was a decrease in domestic and combined spend, but an increase in overseas spend within Cornwall during 2004, similar to that found in 2003. In general, these variations in spend can be viewed in Graph 6.3, however, the 2004 data was omitted, as these are reasonable assumptions and not factual data.

The data in Graph 6.3 shows how a steady contribution of spend has been made by the overseas visitor, and the more sporadic spend of domestic visitors to Cornwall. Most startling here, is the uncertainty which surround the level of domestic spend on staying in Cornwall from 2002 to 2007, as this time period included both the peak and troughs of spend which dramatically impacted the combined spend of tourists to Cornwall. Reflective of these statistics, it would be realistic to assume that the flow of tourism over this time period could have seriously impacted the county’s economy, and the businesses within the area.
Not forgetting the local residents who potentially depend upon tourism for their livelihood.

From the descriptive data which was also available for Cornwall (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a; AcumeniA 2006; Visit Cornwall 2009), these potential impacts were accentuated, as it was noted that the expenditure of staying visitor supports approximately 40,000 (17%) of actual jobs in the county. Therefore, tourism is of importance to the county, and especially important to those regions which receive high volumes of tourists. Two of the most predominant tourist regions within the county are the boroughs of Restormel and Penwith, both of which receive high volumes of visitors within the tourist season (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a). Therefore, these locations shall now be discussed in-depth, before the data from Newquay is presented.

6.1.2 Restormel and Penwith

The secondary tourism data compiled for the boroughs of Restormel and Penwith illustrate the proportion of staying visitors spend, in comparison to Cornwall as a whole. Table 6.2 illustrates these data, and highlights the relative percentages of each borough, compared to the Cornish totals for tourism. These data illustrates the size and nature of tourism industry in each borough during 2007.
It is evident from Table 6.2 that Restormel receives a larger proportion of tourism, in terms of volume and spend, in comparison to Penwith. This ratio emphasises the level of tourist traffic through the borough, and highlights the level of tourism dependency that may be experienced in each borough, as between 14.2 and 21.7% of jobs are related to tourism. The high concentration of which is found in Restormel, which has 7.5% more jobs related to the industry compared to Penwith. Potentially, this proportion implies that Restormel is more dependent on the tourism industry compared to Penwith. This dependency is reiterated by the additional data presented in Table 6.2, as Restormel receives 8.8% more trips by staying visitors than Penwith, and accrues 6.2% more staying visitor spend. Further comparable data between the two boroughs can be viewed in Graph 6.4, which highlights a variety of key data about the industry.
265

Figure (Text/Chart/Diagram/Image etc.) has been removed due to Copyright restrictions
From viewing Graph 6.4, the differences between Restormel and Penwith remain evident in terms of visitor numbers, bed spaces and the types of accommodation. In fact the only comparative characteristic where Penwith has a greater proportion over Restormel is in the range of accommodation types. Restormel has ample hotel and guesthouse accommodation, whilst Penwith has fewer, but Penwith exhibits a more diverse range in accommodation type. The borough has a higher proportion of Inn, B&B, and Farm bed spaces, along with a higher proportion of self-catering, holiday centres, and second home units than Restormel (Visit Cornwall 2009).

Together the two districts account for over 50% of Cornwall’s hotels (58%) and guesthouses (71%). This statistic shows the concentration of tourist flows to these two boroughs, as there is plentiful supply to meet existing demand. However, it is now necessary to consider the destination level statistics that were available at the time of this investigation. This application allows for a more in-depth understanding to be determined about the size and nature of the tourism industry at the local level. The data presented are for the resort of Newquay, as data was not available for Penzance.

6.1.3 Newquay

During 2004, a visitor survey was completed in Newquay by Southwest Tourism. The survey ascertained the ‘origin, profile, behaviour and opinions of visitors to help improve understanding of tourism within Newquay’ (Southwest Tourism 2005). The survey offered a comparison, where available, with other studies
conducted in 2001 and 2002, and was undertaken to identify emerging trends. From the visitor survey, the most applicable data are listed in Table 6.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Day Visit (Hours)</th>
<th>Average Length of Stay (Nights)</th>
<th>Average Group Size</th>
<th>Proportion of Repeat Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data illustrates a decline in the length of stay for day and staying visits to the resort from 2002 to 2004, as well as a distinct reduction in group size. Interestingly though, the data reveals that the proportion of repeat visitors increased from 2002 to 2004. This level of repeat travel sits alongside the statistics offered by the Cornwall Tourist Board (2005a), which suggest that up to 9 out of 10 visitors are repeat tourists to the county. However, based upon the background of Newquay, established in Section 5.1.1, the data does not suggest that groups were the predominant group travelling to Newquay as on average the group size was only 2-3 people, and declining.

Descriptive data was also emphasised within the visitor survey. This detailed the type of tourist who vacated in the resort and presented an overview of who the average tourist was in 2004. The key points drawn from this data are listed in Table 6.4, and offer a snap-shot of the tourist population in the resort during the summer of 2004.
From reviewing the data, it is evident that Newquay attracted a high proportion of staying visitors in the form of adult only groups during 2004. On the whole, these descriptions follow the portrayal of Newquay established in Section 5.1.1, and also represent the more general picture of tourism to Cornwall and Restormel. However, the age of tourists established in Table 6.4, does not suggest that Newquay still attracts the youth market as described by Barton and James (2003). It is presumed therefore that a change in market has indeed occurred within the resort from the time of Barton and James’s (2003) study and the data from 2004. More specifically, the change in tourist's age that travels to Newquay is represented in Graph 6.5.
The data suggests that the age of visitors to the resort in 2004 increased in the older age range of 45+ years, with the largest proportion (20%) being aged 65+ years. This group was the largest proportion of visitors for 2001 and 2004, whereas in 2002 the highest proportion (22%) was identified as being 15 years old and under (Southwest Tourism 2005). Therefore, this evidence would confirm the changing market in Newquay over this time period, as established in Section 5.1.1, which suggests that Newquay attracts a range of tourists, from ‘the 18-30 year old for surfing and its nightlife; the retired or semi-retired, that is, those aged 60 years and over; and families for the “bucket and spade” holidays’ (Meethan 2002:32).

In terms of tourist expenditure, the average spend per tourist per day was established for 2004. For day visitors, an average of £7.69 on shopping, £5.96 on eating out, £1.63 on entertainment, and £1.52 on travel, was spent in Newquay, which totalled £16.80 per person, per day (Southwest Tourism 2005). For staying visitors, the total spend was much higher, at £40.37 per person, per
night. This total was based upon tourists spending £19.72 per person per night in paid accommodation, £8.92 on shopping, £8.25 on eating out, £2.23 on entertainment, and £1.25 on travel (Southwest Tourism 2005). The actual spend for staying visitors did however depend upon the type of accommodation that had chosen, as staying in a hotel was obviously more expensive than camping costs. The differences in spend, based upon the type of accommodation are displayed in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5 confirms that the largest expenditure of staying tourists is on serviced accommodation in hotels and motels. Beyond this variable, the cost of shopping, entertainment and travel are the highest with those who are staying in
B&B and guesthouse accommodation, whilst eating out is not surprisingly of higher cost to those in self-catering accommodation (Southwest Tourism 2005).

On the whole, these statistics suggest that Newquay attracts a diverse group of holidaymakers, who stay in a wide range of different accommodation within the town. This age, group size, and the length of stay is changing. Therefore, Newquay will undoubtedly be impacted by tourism, and the general change in tastes and consumer demand for tourism through the tourism flow to the resort. However, to understand the impact of tourism further, it is now necessary to develop an understanding of the resident population and the broader socio-economic characteristics of locals in both case study areas; in Newquay and Penzance. This concentration will now be presented through the data from the population census.

### 6.2 Population Census

The population census data were collated to give a demographic description of the resident population in both destinations. This identification permits the consideration of the hosts, without reference to the tourist population, and allows for resident groups to be compared and contrasted. For that purpose, the population census data was obtained from the 2001 census at a Parish level for each destination. An overview of the comparable data obtained can be viewed in Table 6.6.
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From viewing Table 6.6, it is evident that the population census offers a snapshot in time of the diverse range and nature of the resident population. However it does not represent the current picture. The census, instead, experiences a time lapse between each collection point. Furthermore, the census does not represent 100% population, nor does it give data about individuals. Even so, this limited collection of population statistics allows a picture of resident populations and communities to be established and compared.

From a comparison of Newquay and Penzance, it is evident that they hold many similarities within the boundary limitations of each parish. Although Penzance has a larger resident population, and has more dwellings, it is evident that both destinations resemble a similar percentage in relation to the county data. The largest apparent difference is in relation to the level of car ownership, whereby Penzance residents had a lower level of car possession by approximately 11% in comparison to Newquay residents. This low level of ownership highlights certain issues associated with deprivation, as in addition to car ownership, Penzance also has a higher percentage (5.16%) of people who are economically inactive than those present in Newquay. Moreover, Penzance hosts a higher unemployment rate (0.74%) for those who are economically active.

From the data, the issue of population density is considered, as population density impacts human behaviour (Beatty and Fothergill 2004). For example, as population density increases, stress can increase, and in turn it can manifest social disorder in the form of recorded crime rates (Pizam 1982; Beatty and
Fothergill 2004). This relationship exists ‘probably because there is increased proximity of opportunities for crime in such areas’ to occur (Pizam 1982:7). For that reason, inference has been made upon the population density in terms of the size of the population per hectare. Here they have been measured for Newquay and Penzance and can be viewed in Table 6.7. The table highlights the impact of the tourist population upon the overall population density of each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newquay</td>
<td>19225</td>
<td>19423</td>
<td>67500</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.84 (+0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>19950</td>
<td>21168</td>
<td>63450</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>16.40 (+0.95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics highlighted in Table 6.7 are, when tourist populations descend upon each destination, stark in contrast to the resident population. This transformation is due to the dispersion of people being concentrated in the already established boundaries of the area as opposed to seeing a gradual expansion of the parish boundary. During peak season, it is evident that an increase of 48-49 population per hectare can occur in Newquay and Penzance. This increase undoubtedly can impact the behaviour of locals, as population
growth result in higher costs that are borne by the destination (Beatty and Fothergill 2004). Taken together, if such change in populations were to occur overtime, the destination would accordingly expand in area where permitted. Further to establishing the characteristics of each population, and drawing attention to the issue of population density, the attention shall now turn to the recorded crime rates. This emphasis is important as Pizam (1982) noted such issues as population density can impact upon the official police crime statistics.

6.3 Crime Statistics

For the purpose of this investigation, crime statistics have been compiled at a parish level for both destinations. They were collated to enable a description and an explanation of the nature of, and change in crime rates, over time, and for the duration of this research (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 2002). Official recorded crime statistics were collated to allow the evaluation of time series data, which occurred on two levels, annually and monthly. These statistics determined the year-on-year impacts associated with each destination as well as the monthly trends in data. These data were then analysed to assess the seasonal trends in recorded crime, and to assess the location, frequency and severity of crime rates in each case study area. Mindful of the statistics that follow, it is necessary to comment on the specific study areas in comparison to the Devon and Cornwall Constabulary. This statement will reveal just how crime ridden each destination is, compared to others. For that purpose, Table 6.8 has been included, which outlines the crime data from 2004 (Devon and Cornwall Constabulary 2006) alongside the
population statistics from 2001 (Office for National Statistics 2008), and the crime rate per 1000 population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population 2001</th>
<th>Total Crime</th>
<th>Crime Rate per 1000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newquay</td>
<td>19,423</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>21,168</td>
<td>2,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>501,267</td>
<td>37,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall</td>
<td>1,205,760</td>
<td>133,282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.8: Crime rates and population figures within Devon and Cornwall


From these statistics, it is evident that Newquay and Penzance both have a higher crime rate per 1000 population than Cornwall. Furthermore, Newquay has higher rates per 1000 population than the Devon and Cornwall Constabulary. Newquay, however, is the only district under analysis which is characterised by mass tourism (MRS 2004) and Table 6.8 fails to address the transient population. Therefore caution is required. The crime rates per 1000 population are further considered in Section 6.3.1, and contrasted between the two destinations on an annual basis to give further insight into these suggestions.

For the time being, it is important to investigate the crime data on an annual comparative level, as it is believed by Frechtling (2001) that the first data patterns to look for in historical series of data are seasonal patterns. There are many causes to seasonality, all of which impact the nature and cause of data points within the time series. ‘These seasonal patterns occur regularly and
often obscure the underlying trends’ (Frechtling 2001:63) associated with analysis. Therefore consideration needs to be given to climate and social customs in terms of summer vacations and school breaks alongside calendar effects which depict the length of month and number of weekends present in each month (Frechtling 2001). For these reasons, the annual data will now be described, followed by the description of monthly statistics and any seasonal fluctuations.

However, before the data can be described, there is a necessity to identify the methodological changes that are apparent within the data over this time frame. In 2007, the crime areas in which the crimes were recorded were renamed, and amended again in 2008. These changes were noted within the crime area statistics for both Penzance and Newquay, as illustrated in Table 6.9. These changes demonstrate the suspicious nature of official statistics, and identify situations where crime data may not be reliable when comparing.
Nevertheless, the data on this occasion were still compared, as geographically, the areas still represented the case study boundaries identified previously. Furthermore, in terms of the total crime figures, there was a close comparison between these areas in terms of the totals for Newquay area (2874 and 2870 respectively). However this similarity was not evident in the Penzance data, as displayed in Table 6.10, instead, there was a discrepancy of 843 crimes in 2006/07 totals (1910 and 2753 respectively).
6.3.1 Annual Data

Annual recorded crime rates were collated, and covered the time period of 2004 to 2009. These data represent the level of recorded crime for Newquay and Penzance through the annual cycle, starting on the 1st April until the 31st March each year, obtained from the Devon and Cornwall constabulary website (2006; 2007; 2008). In terms of the total annual recorded crime rates, Table 6.11 shows the level of crime within the two British seaside destinations of Newquay and Penzance over a period of five years from the 1st April 2004 until 31st March 2009. Notably the peak of Newquay’s recorded crime levels occurred in 2004-05 and the low more recently in 2008-09, which was evident through the
continual reduction in the official crime rates. In contrast Penzance illustrates a reduction in crime during the period of 2005-06, and a steady rise from then up until 2008-09. These statistics highlight the year-on-year fluctuation of crime within each destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
<th>Newquay Crime Rate</th>
<th>Penzance Crime Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2114</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2951</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>2371</td>
<td>126.3</td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>130.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11: Comparison of annual recorded crime totals
Source: Devon and Cornwall Constabulary (2006; 2007; 2008)

From the analysis of these crime statistics, it is evident that Newquay has a higher crime rate per 1000 population than Penzance, with exception of the year 2008-09. However, Newquay, as previously mentioned, is the only district characterised by mass tourism in Cornwall (MRS 2004), and Table 6.11 does not take this into consideration. Therefore the crime rates should be viewed with caution, as the transient population may account for the rise and extent of crime rates in the resort. Similarly, the transient population is not factored into the Penzance statistics. Therefore it could be suggested that the actual crime rate per 1000 population is not reflective of the situation at each location, as only the permanent populations have been taken into consideration. At this point it is important to consider the location, frequency and severity of act within each case study area. Based upon the annual data, the location, frequency and
severity of criminal activity can impact tourism demand, as well as the perceptions of local residents.

6.3.1.1 Location

In line with Pizam’s (1999) investigation, understanding the location may help depict the magnitude of the impact of the specific acts of crime. Therefore, the annual crime statistics have been considered in terms of total crime within the specific crime areas, as shown in Table 6.12. This data shows how hotspots have developed within each location, and how some areas are less prone to criminal activity than others.
Table 6.12 identifies that during the period of 2004 – 2007, the Gannel area of Newquay suffered from the highest crime rates alongside the Penzance East area of Penzance. After this period, Newquay Town Neighbourhood suffered from the highest crime rates in Newquay together with Penzance Town East Neighbourhood in Penzance. Each of these areas by 2008-09 encompasses
the areas of the highest crime rates from previous years, in terms of geography. For example, the Gannel ward is now incorporated into the Newquay Town Neighbourhood location and encompass areas of deprivation, with low levels of car ownership and high unemployment (MRS 2004; 2005). These crimes have been annotated by other authors through mapping (MRS 2004; Southwest Tourism 2009a). For instance, MRS (2004) conducted a crime audit in the borough of Restormel using the 2002-2004 crime data. The report produced visual guides to the extent and location of the actual criminal activities within the destination. These allow the hotspots of criminal behaviour to be identified at a glance, as shown in Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 which respectively illustrate vehicle crime, violent crime and drug offences around Newquay.
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More specifically they verify the crime area information outlined above, where the Gannel ward and Newquay Town Neighbourhood areas host the highest frequency of crime.

For Penzance, the same level of detail is unavailable. However the Improvement and Development Agency (Southwest Tourism 2009a) for local government have highlighted that Penzance as an area, in contrast to Kerrier and Penwith, does suffer from higher crime rates per 1000 population than other locations.

6.3.1.2 Frequency and Severity

Further to the total recorded crime figures by location, there is a need to consider the type of crime committed in each destination. This identification is important as crime type can impact perceptions when considered in terms of frequency and severity (Pizam 1999). For that reason Table 6.13 has been constructed to illustrate the variance in each case study location over a five year period, based upon the annual total recorded crime rates from the Devon and Cornwall Constabulary (2006; 2007; 2008).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Shop</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offences</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3500</strong></td>
<td><strong>2951</strong></td>
<td><strong>2874</strong></td>
<td><strong>2454</strong></td>
<td><strong>1978</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The crimes stated in Table 6.13 have resonance with Pizam’s (1999) classification of acts of crime and violence at tourism destinations, with the offences stated being classified as crime. The data shows variation in the frequency of specific acts within the destination areas. The most frequent act being ‘other violent assaults’ in Newquay and ‘criminal damage’ in Penzance. This data highlights the nature and severity of acts in line with the frequency, as noted by Pizam (1999). Although there are some marked differences in the data supplied for both Newquay and Penzance, in terms of frequency and severity, there are similarities in the criminal acts. Therefore they have been displayed in terms of overall variance in Figure 6.4, where the frequency axis ranges from high to low and the severity axis alike.
Figure 6.4 highlights that the most severe act of crime which occurred in both destinations was ‘murder (homicide)’ as it results in the loss of life. More frequently, however, the acts of ‘sexual offences’ and ‘other violent assaults’ occurred. Therefore, the severity of these acts in terms of bodily harm can pose a larger impact upon the destination due to the frequency of the act. For example, acts that cause some loss of life will have a more negative impact than those that cause only bodily harm. However, acts that occur in rapid
succession or constantly will have a serious negative effect for as long as they continue' (Pizam 1999:9). Therefore, the more frequent the act the greater the impact it has (Pizam 1999). For example, crimes and violence at tourist destinations that occur at infrequent intervals will have a negative impact for only a short duration. This impact is significant to note as it helps reflect the level and scope of hosts’ perceptions and community relations in terms of the tourism-related crime impacts.

The main difference between Newquay and Penzance in the comparison of Table 6.13 encompasses the frequency of ‘robbery’, ‘theft of vehicle’, and ‘theft from shop’. For instance, in Newquay the frequency of robbery could actually be considered as occurring in rapid succession, so occurring more frequently than it does in Penzance. Theft of vehicle is slightly more occasional in Penzance based upon the crime figures. Theft from shop is also more constant in relation to Penzance and other burglary could be argued as being more rapid. However, these statements consist of discrete differences, as opposed to obvious dissimilarity across the local expanse. What is of importance here is that the severity of the act can affect the magnitude of the impact (Pizam 1999).

In relation to the more specific crime areas within the two resorts, the ones most prone to criminal acts in Newquay and Penzance are the Gannel (Newquay Town Neighbourhood) and Penzance East (Penzance Town East) respectively. As a result, the type of crime on an annual basis was also considered for each area in more detail. The data for both these areas can be viewed in Table 6.14, which highlights that in the Gannel area of Newquay ‘other violent assaults’, ‘other theft’ and ‘criminal damage’ are the most predominant acts of crime, as
they are constantly occurring. These are acts which cause loss of property and bodily harm. Thus, the acts of crime have a more negative impact on the reputation of the destination over the more severe act of homicide. This finding is the same for the Penzance East area in Penzance, both of which illustrate similar patterns to the overall frequency and severity in Newquay and Penzance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Shop</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offences</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Recorded crime rates by type in the highest crime rate areas of Newquay and Penzance

Source: Devon and Cornwall Constabulary (2006; 2007; 2008)
Overall, these statistics offer an insight into the recorded crime rates for each destination and allows the researcher to appreciate the potential impact of crime upon local residents. However, the data displayed in this section does not take into consideration the seasonal trends that may be illustrated throughout the annual cycle, in line with the peaks and troughs of the tourism industry. For that reason, the monthly data were considered.

6.3.2 Monthly Data

For the purpose of collating monthly statistics, officially recorded crime rates were compiled over a 32 month period, between April 2006 and November 2008. This time period encompasses the time during primary data collection to represent the crime levels experienced by hosts whilst being interviewed. After this period, it was not deemed necessary to continue with the collation of monthly statistics due to the inapplicable nature of their findings. In order to assess the seasonal nature of crime within the two destinations, figures were analysed in terms of total recorded crime rates, crime type, and crime rates per 1000 population. This analysis was undertaken to ensure the severity, frequency and location of the acts of crime could again be given some consideration in each case study destination.

For each destination, changes in crime area were found during the 32 month period. This variation was in line with the total crime area changes as noted previously. However, they occurred during the periodic year. To illustrate the change of crime areas, Table 6.15 was produced.
Further to these changes, it should be emphasised that in the month of September for 2006 and 2007, data anomalies raised suspicion surrounding the Penzance data point. This suspicion was due to the crime area altering annually at this point, therefore the data point was considered as an ‘outsider’ (Frechtling 2001). As a result, although it was felt that crime did rise in Penzance during September, the actual data point was deemed excessive. To rectify the data anomalies, correct values were generated and replaced with an
estimate as shown in Table 6.16. This resolve was conducted in line with Frechtling’s (2001) recommendations, where the value is set to represent a value equal to the mean of the data points either side of it in time. As a result, the changes as described in Table 6.16 took place to improve data quality.

As an overview of the total recorded crime rates collated during this period, Graph 6.6 has been constructed. The graph highlights the anomalies suggested in Table 6.16 and illustrates the overall trends in the total recorded crime for both Newquay and Penzance, highlighting the peaks and troughs of criminal activity. As a result, the graph utilises the new data points displayed in Table 6.16 for Penzance and acts as a comparison for each destination over the time period stated.
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Graph 6. Total monthly recorded crime rates for Newquay and Penzance (April 2006 – November 2008)

Source: Devon and Cornwall Constabulary (2006; 2007; 2008)
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From these data, it is evident that both destinations have seasonal peaks in crime data. However they both occur at different points in the season. For Newquay, there is an increase in recorded crime during the months of July and August, whilst Penzance suffers a more sporadic increase during different points in time. Therefore, it can be inferred that Newquay has seasonal peaks and troughs in line with the climate and social customs as described by Frechtling (2001), whereas Penzance appears to have reoccurring trends which lie beyond this explanation. However, due to the changes in crime area, it is considered that the data sets presented here are not reliable, as there is still a distinct change in recorded crime rates when the crime areas changed in Penzance. As a result, no general statements can be made about the crime levels in Penzance. Instead, only inference can be made as to the nature, extent and impact of crime levels.

In terms of crime type, a detailed account of each destination can be viewed in Appendix Four, where all the collated data is displayed on a monthly basis for each destination. However, for the purpose of this section, only the most frequent types of crime for each month are discussed in relation to their constant succession in both destinations. These types of crime are listed in Table 6.17 (Newquay) and Table 6.18 (Penzance) for comparative purposes.
From viewing Table 6.17, it is evident that the most frequent type of criminal behaviour occurring in Newquay on a monthly basis is loss of property and bodily harm. These types of crime occur constantly in the resort. Moreover, during the peak summer months (July and August) the most frequent act of crime is loss of property through ‘other theft’. This type of crime has been the highest recorded crime in the resort over the summer period for all three years. At the same time, there is also a high frequency of loss of property and bodily harm in Penzance, as shown in Table 6.18. However, in Penzance, during the peak season, the most frequent crime is mainly committed through ‘criminal damage’.
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Reflecting on Table 6.17 and Table 6.18, it is evident that both destinations also suffer constantly with ‘other violent assaults’. This type of crime is prevalent during shoulder months to the main season, and is predominant in both destinations during April and March, with Newquay also suffering in January and Penzance suffering in October.

More generally, it can be seen (see Appendix Four) that the frequencies of these crimes reduce in cases during the winter months. Even so, they still remain constant (several times a month) within both destination areas throughout the annual cycle. Due the severity of bodily harm and the act of ‘other violent assaults’ this type of crime can affect the magnitude of the event (Pizam 1999) in the eyes of the locals and the tourist. This vision is
emphasised by the severity and the frequency going hand-in-hand, as the frequency of the act has a greater impact upon the destination (Pizam 1999).

In relation to the crime rates per 1000 population, that were initially discussed in Section 4.3.1, it is evident that on a monthly basis the two destinations witness a rise in crime rates during the peak seasons, as illustrated in Graph 6.7. This graph represents the rise in crime that may be experienced by the host population in each destination. However, the graph does not account for the increase in the total population over the peaks of the tourism season in either destination. Therefore, the illustration of Graph 6.7 may be misleading, as the crime rates per 1000 population would considerably decrease during these periods if the total population of tourist and residents were factor into the monthly crime statistics. However, due to the way tourism is measured, it is not possible to include such predictions in this dissertation, as the monthly flow of tourists to Newquay, Penzance or even Cornwall is unknown.
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6.4 Chapter Summary

The key areas highlighted through the description of secondary sources reveals that there are changing tastes in travel to Cornwall (Cornwall Tourist Board 2005a; AcumeniA 2006). Not only that, but there is evidence that Newquay and Penzance experience seasonal trends in tourist numbers and suffer high levels of officially recorded crime. Newquay displays seasonal peaks and troughs in crime data in line with the seasonal flows of tourists, which may be emphasised through the rise and fall of the population density during the summer months, whereas Penzance suffers a more sporadic increase and decrease in crime rates during the shoulder months. The variation occurs during different points in the annual cycle, which is not necessarily related to the tourist season. Therefore it is difficult to summarise the impact these factors may have upon the local population.

In terms of the location, frequency and severity of criminal acts, Newquay and Penzance hold similarities. There are frequent acts of bodily harm and loss of property occurring on a continual basis in both locations. These acts take place throughout the case study areas, but are more prone to specific locations in Newquay and Penzance, being the Gannel and Penzance East areas respectively. Such acts are widespread in the summer months, with the most frequently occurring criminal acts including ‘other violent assaults’, ‘other theft’ and ‘criminal damage’. Nevertheless, these acts were not considered as being the most severe acts. Instead, the most severe act of crime which occurred in both destinations was ‘murder (homicide)’ as it resulted in the loss of life.
Overall, there are numerous similarities held by Newquay and Penzance in terms of the boundary limitations of each parish, which makes them comparable to one another in terms of exploring the community impacts of tourism-related crime. As a result, this initial stage of data collection has increased the awareness of the researcher to the destination areas, and has highlighted the key concerns of this project, by identifying the scale of tourism-related crime at a community level. This understanding has allowed the researcher to determine the structure of the population, the levels of crime experienced and the level of tourism present in their everyday lives, which has enabled a more informed, and open perspective to be formed. This formation occurred prior to the analysis of the primary data, which is discussed in Chapter 7. The primary data constitutes the second stage of data collection.
7.0 Qualitative Data Analysis

This chapter describes, analyses, and interprets the primary qualitative data that were collected from the two case study areas of Newquay and Penzance. The analysis interprets the data obtained from 28 key respondents and examines the individuals’ responses to tourism impacts as well as more general community perceptions of tourism-related crime. This information gauges how a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime.

The aim of this chapter is to explore in greater depth the understanding and consideration of the term ‘community’ in modern society, through an analysis of two British seaside destinations. More specifically, the intention of this analysis is to expose the social reality experienced by residents within a British seaside resort (Newquay) and a coastal town (Penzance). To do so, the chapter systematically highlights the emergent themes established through the application of the ‘Framework Method’ (Ritchie and Spencer 1994; Brunt 1997) via the use of the ‘NVivo’ software (Bazeley 2007). Therefore, the process starts with familiarisation, and ends with the mapping and interpretation of data, encompassing the emergent themes formulated through the classification of free nodes and tree nodes (See Appendix Five). This process enables the examination and explanation of the findings to be considered in the context of the relevant academic literature in the discussion chapter (Section 8.0). Furthermore, the results have been described and analysed in a comparable order to the conceptual framework to ensure uniformity and consistency, as shown in Table 7.1. Consequently, the description does not necessarily illustrate the nature of the conversation which took place within each in-depth
interview, or the networks revealed by the snowball sample (other than Section 7.1). Instead the chapter addresses the questions which were deemed most significant in the preliminary stages of the investigation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Conceptual Step</th>
<th>Findings Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To evaluate residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts in two British seaside destinations</td>
<td><strong>Step One:</strong> Identify tourism communities and determine specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts</td>
<td>7.1 - 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To analyse these residents’ reactions and responses to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime within their community, by distinguishing between the conditions and attributes of a destination</td>
<td><strong>Step Two:</strong> Establish residents’ reactions and responses to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime within the community</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To assess the role that these communities play in affecting their residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime;</td>
<td><strong>Step Three:</strong> Identify the role a community plays in affecting resident perception of tourism and crime</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To analyse the inter-relationships within these two communities, and evaluate the actions of individuals in relation to their perceptions of tourism-related crime;</td>
<td><strong>Step Four:</strong> Catalogue the effects of community perceptions of tourism-related crime and evaluate the subsequent actions of individuals</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To synthesise the findings and appraise the implications on the existing published theoretical arguments of the relationships between tourism and crime</td>
<td><em>(See 8.0 Discussion)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.1:** Relationship between the objectives, conceptual framework and findings
Subsequently, the chapter is divided into six key stages. The first stage separates the two case study areas and gives an overview of the community in each destination area, by giving a detailed outline and a snapshot of each community. This section outlines the construction of the sample by stating the type of respondent, the level of interaction they have with the tourism industry, and the nature of the referral process in both Newquay and Penzance. Furthermore, this section gives a brief descriptive summary of the general findings for each case study area from the in-depth interviews.

From the second stage onwards, the two destinations are then considered side-by-side to allow for cross comparison, and at the same time to highlight the similarities and differences in each destination area. As a result, the second stage scrutinises resident understanding of the term community by probing for a definition from community members through conversation. The third stage interprets resident opinions towards tourism impacts and offers an understanding of the formation of social relationships. The fourth stage specifically addresses crime-related impacts, by assessing the characteristics of both place and person. The fifth stage undertakes an assessment of resident roles and their level of influence within the community. Then finally, the sixth stage summarises and catalogues the effects of community perceptions of tourism-related crime by evaluating the actions of individuals, and the community as a whole.

Overall, it is intended that this chapter uncovers the extent of social cohesion and attachment within each destination, by discussing the level of influence that residents have upon community perceptions, and, in return, the influences that
the community has upon its members. However, it is important to recollect throughout this chapter that the findings presented here purely represent the opinions of the community members interviewed, and due to the nature of the sampling method, may represent some bias. Nevertheless, these data are transferrable and the analysis represents the community networks and opinion within the two destination areas. Therefore, these interpretations are pertinent to fulfilling the second aim of this thesis: to contribute to and develop further knowledge and understanding of the explanations and theory of tourism and crime by investigating the social reality and structure of modern society. As, on the whole, the interpretations offer a classification of tourism impacts upon both the individual residents and the perception of the overall tourism community.

7.1 Sample and Respondent Overview

The snowball sampling rationale enabled the community networks and perceptions of the social reality faced by residents at British seaside destinations to be established. For comparative purposes, each respondent was classified by a number to enable cross referencing between community members and case study areas. This classification was determined once data were collected to avoid more purposeful sampling outside of the initial criteria for snowball sampling. The category assigned to each respondent was determined by the level and nature of contact that each respondent had with the tourism industry, and was developed from Krippendorf’s (1987) groupings related to occupational status and the relationship that exists with the tourism industry. The classifications, as outlined in Table 7.2, enabled the research to be categorised independent of community relationships.
These categories are based on the fact that resident opinions reflect the wider population in terms of their relationship to tourists and the tourism industry. It also identifies the range in perceptions that can be found within the original snowball sample, and helps to segment the differing levels of perception found among the resident population. According to Krippendorf (1987), the nature of opinion should reflect the level of engagement experienced by each grouping, with general awareness and associated costs being better understood by those in direct and continual contact with tourists. Therefore, these categories offer an additional insight into understanding why residents may form polar perspectives on specific issues. Consequently, the two subsequent sections have been devised to gain an overview of the data collection in each study area. The first section considers the occupation and opinion of Newquay residents who live within a resort. The second will then consider the social structure and understanding of Penzance residents who inhabit a coastal town.

7.1.1 Newquay

The sample of Newquay residents resulted in 16 community members being interviewed before saturation was met. The respondents were labelled after data collection to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, and at the same time to
distinguish them from one another. This classification resulted in community members being labelled A to P respective of their order of contact, and being assigned a number (from 1 to 4) after data collection to represent their level of contact and economic reliance upon the tourism industry (See Table 7.2). These markers enabled the researcher to analyse respondent opinions, regardless of their personal association to other community members. This determination was possible as the referral processes, associated with snowball sampling, illustrates the connections between each respondent, as shown in Figure 7.1. The process does not highlight the strength of any relationship shared between each respondent.

![Figure 7.1: Newquay snowball sample](attachment:image.png)

From viewing Figure 7.1, it is evident that the sample was dominated (6 respondents) by those who are in continual and/or direct contact with tourists...
(type 1) and are dependent on tourism, because without tourists they would perhaps be unemployed. Moreover, respondent ‘D2’ within Figure 7.1 is represented in a dashed box to signify certain constraints associated with time and conversational dominance during the interview process. These constraints resulted in a limited range of topics being covered, and consequently, respondent, D (a proprietor of a tourism business), did not always give definitive answers when being questioned. Instead, the respondent was repetitive, and focused on specific issues and problems associated with the resort. Therefore, respondent ‘D2’ has been omitted from some of the finding tables, due to the lack of information gathered. However, depth information about some key issues were obtained, and, as a consequence, the respondent was not omitted from the entire analysis.

In line with the categorical groups identified by Krippendorf (1987), the level of host-guest interaction experienced by the selected Newquay residents differed in accordance to type. The level and intensity of interaction ranged from everyday contact with tourists to more infrequent relations. This difference resulted in an array of relationships being established between local residents and tourists, including both causal encounters and personal relationships. The intensity of these interactions is displayed in Table 7.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>(Continual/direct contact with tourists)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yes, every day on the beach” [Newquay, A1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I ask people, where they are from, what they are doing here, and if they are having a good time” [Newquay, B1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>(Proprietors of tourist businesses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Yeah daily...you have a personal relationship with tourists” [Newquay, J2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we all work with tourists on a regular basis, a daily basis pretty much” [Newquay, L2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>(Frequent contact with tourists)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“It depends what I am up to on my days off” [Newquay, C3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“on a daily basis I interact with them and find out what is going on, and what is right and wrong” [Newquay, F3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 4</th>
<th>(Politicians and political lobbyists)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“quite frequently...probably alternate days, I don’t think there is usually a day that goes by that I am not in town” [Newquay, H4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I don’t really interact with the tourists themselves, but I would say I deal an awful lot with the providers and the campsites and things like that” [Newquay, I4]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3: Level of interaction and exposure of Newquay respondents to tourists

These interactions illustrate the level of dependency and the nature of interaction that Newquay residents have upon, and with, the tourism industry. This dependency conforms with Krippendorf’s (1987) suggestions and implies that positive and/or negative opinions will be expressed as they are dependent on issues of economic benefit, the nature and extent of contact and engagement with the tourism industry and a residents’ ability to continue life as normal (Krippendorf 1987; Madrigal 1995; Andereck et al. 2005). Furthermore, in accordance with Krippendorf’s (1987) suggestions, politicians in Newquay (type 4) offered a broader perspective on their interactions and encounters with tourists than other respondents did by supporting the business community. This perspective is mindful of their position in society, as a primary objective of a politician is to ‘raise their fellow countrymen’s living standards’ (Krippendorf 1987:47). This standpoint was demonstrated by the politician’s expression to sustain the tourism industry in Newquay for the benefit of its residents by
focusing on growth, support and development as a whole, rather than concentrating on personal relationships and individual gain.

On the whole, the in-depth interviews with Newquay residents indicated that there was a strong sense of community in the resort. Residents were able and willing to exchange and generate knowledge and explanations about their actions, reactions and behaviour, through their ability to reconstruct and remember aspects of their daily lives which were considered meaningful to the investigation. This comprehension resulted in community perceptions embracing factors of locality and communion, whereby their observations were based upon the physical environment, the spirit of the community and/or their collective actions. These conversations revealed information about their hobbies and activities. Moreover, the interviews brought to light other community groups which exist. These correspond to the individuals who either do not prescribe to a fixed group, or are solely a part of the business community in Newquay. Each of these defined groups played a role in the structuring of the community as a whole, impacting the boundary, scale and cohesion of the group, a topic which is considered in detail in Section 7.2.

In terms of attitude and behaviour, it emerged that Newquay residents were active and passive, as well as positive and negative in their community relations. They generally held a strong social bond with the town, were welcoming, and associated their level of attachment with a positive promotion of the town. Nevertheless, there were exceptions to this trend, as the community residents who were not born locally, recalled barriers of entry when they first arrived in the
resort and how they purely socialised and engaged with people in the same situation as themselves.

Furthermore, it emerged that Newquay residents referred to tourists as an entity, as opposed to the individuals that they came into contact with. They commonly associated the costs of tourism with relevant parties, and they were able to remain non-judgemental on the whole towards tourists. Therefore they took personal control and ownership over the destination, and certain members of the community were able to make trade-offs between the detrimental and the positive effects of tourism development (Section 7.3). This experience provided a balanced understanding of the benefits and costs assembled by the local community and offered an insight into the impacts of a changing tourism market within the resort (Section 7.3). This understanding was expressed in Holden’s (1988, cited in Sharma 2005) self-destruct theory, as being a cylindrical process that occurs by phase. Phase four, in particular, finds that a once tranquil resort sinks under the social and environmental problems caused by tourism, and, as a result, tourists leave. Here, this phase was expressed through the falling cost of going to the seaside, and through the identification of seasonality which were clearly expressed, embraced and shared in a relaxed and informed manner. This is reflective of Holden (1988, cited in Sharma 2005), who suggested that there would be derelict tourism facilities left behind after degradation, whereby local residents are not able to return to their original way of life, so change is inevitable.

Following on from the self-destruct theory, crime was also depicted as being seasonal, with residents perceiving crime to be more of a problem at the height
of the season and less evident in low season. This peak was in response to laying blame with tourists and outsiders for being the offender. In response to these impacts, there was evidence of changing behaviour (avoidance, acceptance, and hyper-reality - see Table 7.20). However, change was not exhibited by all the Newquay respondents. Some, instead, believed that they did not change, and others expressed resistance. After familiarisation with the transcripts, it emerged that residents evidently adapted and responded to crime through discouragement. Therefore, some contradictions were apparent within the resort, which are discussed in Section 7.4. Moreover the majority of the Newquay community were structured around the common good, as only one resident perceived the role of the community as being defined in terms of geographical dispersal (Section 7.5). Therefore, common views and community cohesion were widespread in response to the formation of interest groups within the resort.

To summarise these findings, Table 7.4 is offered. The table illustrates the key outcomes of respondent type and their level of interaction with the tourism industry. These issues will be considered in more depth in Section 7.6 and shall be generated from the Penzance data for comparative purposes at the end of this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td>1, 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of interaction</td>
<td>Daily / Frequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.4:** Key outcomes of respondent type and interaction (Newquay)
7.1.2 Penzance

The sample of Penzance residents resulted in 12 community members being interviewed before saturation was met. Saturation occurred earlier than expected due to the nature of the referral processes, as referrals were only being obtained through personal relationships exhibited at work, rather than through friendship ties. Nevertheless, the respondents were labelled in the same way as Newquay residents, which resulted in community members being labelled A to K respective of their order of contact, and being assigned a number (from 1 to 4) after data collection to represent their occupational grouping, as shown in Figure 7.2. Again, this classification was conducted to enable the researcher to comparatively analyse resident opinions, regardless of their personal association to other community members.

![Figure 7.2: Penzance snowball sample](image)

From viewing Figure 7.2, it is evident that the 12 Penzance residents (A-K) had a more limited range of occupational grouping (1-3) than Newquay residents.
Nevertheless, the most dominant type also emerged from those who are in continual and/or direct contact with tourists (type 1). However, unlike the Newquay sample, Figure 7.2 reveals that no members of the Penzance community who holds a position as a politician or lobbyist were interviewed. Therefore, a narrower point of view were shared within Penzance, as type 4 respondents represent a more subjective overview of the business community than those in direct and frequent contact with tourists (Krippendorf 1987).

In line with the occupational groupings the level of host-guest interaction experienced by the Penzance respondents differed in accordance to type. The level and intensity of interaction ranged from everyday contact with tourists to more sporadic relationships, which resulted in a range of relationships being formed in terms of nature and intensity, as shown below in Table 7.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>“Every day I talk to them, meet new people” [Penzance, A1]</th>
<th>“Well I see them every day, I have to serve them every day” [Penzance, C1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Continual/direct contact with tourists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>“Every day in fact. Well at least when there are people in the hotel” [Penzance, B2]</td>
<td>“daily, as we are open for business 24-7 so we have to be around” [Penzance, D2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proprietors of tourist businesses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>“quite often really, I seem to see them more often that some other folk” [Penzance, E3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequent contact with tourists)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.5:** Level of interaction and exposure of Penzance residents to tourists

These interactions illustrate the level of dependency and the nature of interaction the Penzance sample has upon, and with, the tourism industry. This understanding, again, conforms with Krippendorf’s (1987) suggestions. However it does not equate to the same range in respondents, as ascertained
in the Newquay sample. Instead there is stronger emphasis placed upon regular interaction between residents and tourists through the dominance of type 1, and exclusion of type 4 respondents in the sample. According to the literature, this classification should imply that Penzance residents are more aware of tourism impacts and are able to associate the costs of tourism development with the tourism industry. However, this knowledge and awareness did not emerge in the interviews. Instead, residents were found to attribute costs to the local vicinity and those who reside within it, as opposed to directing their gaze towards outsiders. For example, respondent D2 from Penzance stated that it is locals “who cause the trouble” in Penzance, and that at the time of data collection, there was “a bit going on...with the Islamic community, there is quite a lot of racist graffiti happening in the area”, which in turn has had an impact upon the tourism industry. However, the same respondent stated that “Most of the time they [tourists] wouldn’t come across the locals anyway who cause the trouble, they would just see some of the damage, like the vandalism”. Therefore, the tourism impacts are perceived as being minimal, even though the respondent recognised that it was bad for business.

On the whole, the in-depth interviews with the 12 Penzance residents identified the overall nature and role of community relationships which existed in the coastal town. These were predominantly focused upon work-based networks (Section 7.5) and, as a result, a range of mixed goals and evidence of poor communication were apparent in Penzance. These constraints transcended into a desire, by some community residents, to withdraw from the coastal town (Section 7.2) as the community failed to satisfy their immediate needs. Consequently, residents did not express a level of ownership over the
destination, other than in terms of personal control of their own inputs. Instead residents placed emphasis on building business associates to ensure the economic potential of tourism was met, and associated trade-offs with those who again have a high level of contact and dependence upon tourism (Section 7.3).

Furthermore, there was evidence of ambivalence, resilience and passive negativity towards change in Penzance. These insights were due to there being little evidence to illustrate any change in behaviour in response to the tourism impacts. Neither was there an association of crime with seasonality (Section 7.4). Instead residents blamed the local population for the crime levels experienced within the town, with locals describing the offenders from within. In part, this blame is due to the lack of personal control and ownership taken by residents over the tourism product, as residents remained jaded in their opinions and exhibited little faith in friendship networks in response to the nature of friendship ties. Subsequently, there was little desire expressed by residents to obtain control or influence upon tourism development (Section 7.3).

Even so, key outcomes of respondent type and their level of interaction were evident, and are comparable against the Newquay case study. These can be viewed in Table 7.6, before the more pertinent issues are addressed in detail through the cross comparison of the two destinations in the forthcoming sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of respondent</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of interaction</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.6:** Key outcomes of respondent type and interaction (Penzance)
7.2 Identifying Tourism Communities

To identify tourism communities and to determine specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts, the finding from both destinations are discussed alongside one another to allow for cross comparison. This comparison is maintained throughout the remainder of this chapter to enable the similarities and differences in each destination area to be examined. Furthermore, this evaluation will allow for meaningful interpretations and analysis to be expressed concerning residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts.

7.2.1 Definition of a Community

The meaning and interpretation of each community was determined through gaining an insight into the boundary, scale and cohesion of each group. The views expressed by the local residents revealed that their understanding of a community were similar by type in both destinations. They have also developed meanings based around shared aims as suggested by Willmott (1989), Crow and Allen (1994) and Hoggett (1997). Some of the opinions expressed by residents are illustrated in Table 7.7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>“We are just friends” [Newquay, G1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Continual/direct contact with tourists)</td>
<td>“Community? You mean my friends?” [Penzance, C1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>“You are part of it and you know people. If not most people, you know people from sight, you have seen them before” [Newquay, J2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Proprietors of tourist businesses)</td>
<td>“A community is a group of people who know each other, help each other out and not a group of people who choose to ignore one another” [Penzance, B2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>“It is coming together to do what you have got to do, and um, to raise what you have got to raise, say whatever you have got to say together” [Newquay, C3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Frequent contact with tourists)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>“I am definitely now a part of the business community here” [Newquay, I4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Politicians and political lobbyists)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.7: Definitions of community**

These understandings range from, and include, a group of people having something in common with one another, to being distinguished by means of shared characteristics (Crow and Allan 1994). They demonstrate that the community is bound by shared practices and friendship ties (Kasarda and Janowitz 1974) in relation to all types of respondents, and represents the formation of communities in British seaside destinations. The nature of symbolic boundaries were also emphasised in the data. A politician (type 4) from Newquay perceived themself as a member of the community: be it the business community, despite them living in another locality.

“I am certainly a part of the business community, and that is a big part of my world... I think there is a difference to specify between the business community and the local residents as there are different perspectives at the forefront on the agenda” [Newquay, I4]
Respondent ‘Newquay, I4’, has therefore become a core member of the community, and has effectively integrated into community life as suggested by Crow and Allen (1994), despite living in the town’s periphery. This example illustrates the different communities which present themselves to local residents in such destinations. It highlights the fluidity of the business community, and draws deliberation over the different boundaries which may exist between the business community and the resident community. For example, the politician highlights the fluid boundaries of these communities, whereas a resident outside the business community may perceive them as being solid, as it is controlled by a group of individuals (business men) and not open to outsiders (Evans 1997).

As a result, symbolic boundaries appear to have become important within the two destinations, with certain community groups having a more apparent stance to insiders rather than outsiders (Crow and Allan 1994). This position has been established through social ties and networks, and defined through personal interpretation of social class and individual association.

Social class  
“There is a lot of class distinction in Newquay. We notice that from doing a door to door as well. We can see the little pocket of classes, middle class, and so on. You can just see the pockets of communities and so on” [Newquay, F3]

Individual association  
“some people think they know us...but they haven’t got a clue about me or my friends” [Penance, F1]

Even so, there are insiders who wish not to prescribe to any community groups. Instead, they choose to remain wide-ranging in their associations, and choose not to socialise with other community members.
“mainly I am a loner. I don't prescribe to any groups. I just keep general, I am a part of Newquay and nothing else” [Newquay, F3]

Furthermore, individual respondents had different perceptions of the scale of their community, which can be seen to range from a small neighbourhood (a street) to a larger region (a destination).

**Small scale**

“those on the street, we have known one another for some time now and we all get together, communicate, care and support each other, we all know the principles of a good community” [Penzance, B2]

“We are all friends with one another. Some more than…My best friend lives across the street, so I pop over there in my spare time and catch up on the world” [Penzance, A1]

“I have a lot of friends and groups I attend all over Cornwall, only some of them are here in Newquay” [Newquay, A1]

“Yeah, there are lots of different groups I belong to. I have different friends from different areas” [Newquay, J2]

“I am the chairman of the boxing club... Pentire Residents Association… I was in the Lions club and very involved” [Newquay, H4]

Willmott (1989) suggests that these opinions can influence an individual’s perception of community life, as these views restrict the opportunity for others to participate within them. This restriction implies that entry for a new local resident would not be forthcoming, not without their conscious involvement and a desire to become a community member.

These findings highlight the range of communities which exist in these destinations, and emphasises the formation of a community, based upon
shared practice, whereby individuals structure themselves via common interests and/or collective actions, rather than just their geographical dispersion. These communities are defined as being communities of practice, and differ from the locality offered by Lee and Newby (1983, cited in Crow and Allan 1994). A community of practice is instead one of shared practice characterised by what residents do with other residents, expressing the spirit of the community through collective actions. Therefore, these communities are seen to represent a level of community attachment as suggested by Willmott (1986, 1989, cited in Crow and Allan 1994).

7.2.2 Level of Attachment

Community attachment reflects the extent and pattern of an individual's social participation and integration into a community as suggested by McCool and Martin (1994). These findings convey that a strong level of attachment exists within Newquay and Penzance. This attachment is evident as the majority of respondents conveyed strong social bonds with their destination, by stating their length of residency and their experience of acceptance into the community. These statements ranged from those who were born locally to those who had moved to each destination at a specific point in their lifecycle. This affection resulted in all 28 respondents stating a long, full length of residency in each location.
“I am 32 now, so it will be nearly 30 years” [Newquay, J2]
“I came down here in ’76 and I stayed” [Newquay, N1]
“lived and worked in ‘South End’ and ‘London’ and those areas for about 8 years before I came back... It was 34 years ago no.” [Newquay, E1]

“We moved here about 15 years ago and we have never looked back” [Penzance, B2]

“Feels like a lifetime [laughs], but we have lived here for about 17 years” [Penzance, D2]

In terms of acceptance, there was a general consensus that the community in both Newquay and Penzance were welcoming to new members. This welcome included those who were born locally and those who had moved to the area, as well as two examples of resident’s re-entering the community after a period of absence.

“I have my own circle of friends and family I have known all my life” [Newquay, A1]
“I live here, I know the place, I ain’t no stranger” [Penzance, C1]

“I know I felt at home and I had a great circle of friends” [Newquay, B1]

“When I came back it was like I had never been away” [Newquay, J2]
“when we first moved back here we found it to be home straight away” [Penzance, B2]

However, there are exceptions to these suggestions. For example, two Newquay residents expressed a dissimilar experience to the rest of the community in terms of acceptance. These residents emphasised rejection. However, they did so in light of their age and social objective at the time of their move, which did not represent a conscious desire to integrate.
“Not really, it took a few years. Only because I came down as a young man and I did the town scene, and then as I matured I looked for more stability and took more interest in other things to occupy my mind” [Newquay, F3]
“Um, I think when I first came I just bonded with the people from the North really” [Newquay, G1]

Furthermore, in Penzance, residents expressed low levels of attachment to the destination. For example, one respondent noted their intent to leave the community as soon as possible. This intent was expressed as the community failed to satisfy the respondent’s immediate needs.

“We have been speaking about it and to be honest I think we may try and find ourselves a little rural retreat and have a much quieter life then we do now. We don’t want to stay in the middle of it all that is one certain. Um, we are definitely staying in Cornwall, there is no question about that, but we may find ourselves a nice little quite village and live a life in the unknown, not hearing all the happenings of Penzance and all that.” [Penzance, D2]

Reflective of these findings, it is agreed that residents with stronger levels of attachment have a more informed viewpoint and have stronger views of both the positive and negative impacts of tourism within the community (McCool and Martin 1994, cited in Mason and Cheyne 2000). This knowledge was evident in Newquay, as those who were attached to the resort also expressed positive promotion of the destination.
“It is nice to be able to walk down the street and say hello to people, or to bump into people you haven’t seen in ages...” [Newquay, A1]
“...it is nice that people still care enough to ask about me and the family” [Newquay, B1]
“I am big advocate of Newquay” [Newquay, E1]
“When I walk down the road you know...I like the fact that I see people I have known for a long, long time and they say hello you know and things like that” [Newquay, G1]
“There has always been this fantastic community spirit” [Newquay K1]
“It is not a sleepy laid back town; it is a fairly up market, vibrant society” [Newquay, H4]

This finding confirms that length of residency can affect an individual’s local bonds and sentiments (Beggs et al. 1996). However, this finding may not be the case in all communities, as illustrated here by those respondents who aired alternative opinions. Instead, these individuals may express their level of attachment through place dependency, rather than their social bond with society, as explored by Roggenbuck and Watson (1992, cited in Mason and Cheyne 2000:408). The level of such place dependency is high for a number of these respondents, as expressed in Section 7.1 and Section 7.5.

Either way, it can be stated that, in general, there is no clear definition of what constitutes a community in either destination. This inconsistency is somewhat due to the varied length of residency and the strength of social ties that exist in each location, as well as the formation of communities of practice. It may also be attributed to the formation and use of stereotypes within each destination. The terms which emerged from conversations were offered as a form of pigeon holing groups of individuals into categories. For example, Penzance residents offered terms to categorise tourist and segment ‘real’ local residents from others.
In contrast, Newquay residents used stereotypes to describe the collective behaviour of tourists. Newquay residents referred to all tourists, as opposed to the few that they may make contact with. Talk of tourists in Newquay was therefore transmitted in terms of ‘them’ and ‘us’.

*It is not them that have to live with a ruined building for the next 8 months or so is it, or their council tax which pays for the town’s upkeep*” [Newquay, N1]

“They go out looking for trouble, they get drunk and smoke the wacky backy” [Newquay, M3]

Such collective interpretation has proven to be influential over community perception, especially in Penzance, as residents are recorded as also referring to tourists as ‘them’. Consequently, stereotypes can influence resident perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts and are discussed in Section 7.3 to determine specific residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts.

Taken as a whole, these findings illustrate the similarities experienced by both destinations in terms of the community formation, level of attachment, and social characteristics held by local residents. The findings also highlight a range of community types that exist in each location, and express the different formation of each type within each destination. These key features are displayed in Table 7.8 for comparative purposes, and at the end of his Chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of community</td>
<td>Interest based</td>
<td>Interest based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of attachment</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of practice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place community</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common social characteristics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.8: Key outcomes of identifying tourism communities*

7.3 Resident Perceptions, Attitudes and Behaviour towards Tourism Impacts

To establish resident perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts within the two communities, there is a need to understand the balance of benefits and costs perceived by the local population. This understanding is necessary as the impact of tourism can have different effects upon a resident. As highlighted by Milman and Pizam (1988), attitudes are found to be representative of a series of trade-offs between the benefits and costs of tourism development. The division of such has been established through the importance of issues related to power, payoff and trade-offs, as shown in Table 7.9. Furthermore, these expressions illustrate the range of opinions which can be associated with the grouping of residents in Section 7.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power (issues of ownership and input)</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“My heart is for Newquay and I, there, I know I am genuinely interested in where the town is going” [Newquay, G1]</td>
<td>“We just look after our own and hope for the best” [Penzance, K2] “I live here, I know the place… I have been here for my life” [Penzance, L1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payoff (residents’ benefit from tourism)</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“We now have this development phase everything is looking fantastically rosy in the picture…the plans are absolutely fantastic; this place is going to be unrecognisable in a few years” [Newquay, E1]</td>
<td>“I have the benefit of being employed. It brings more money to the town and allows for the town to be recognised as a destination rather than the end of world [chuckles]” [Penzance, A1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade-offs (social impacts that change the nature of the community)</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I resent the bad planning of the town… You know the infrastructure of the town perhaps cracks in summer time” [Newquay, F3] “You see they are taking all the green land we have got away and building on it” [Newquay, C3] “The town has changed immensely. It’s um, perhaps, one hopes is the start of a renaissance” [Newquay, D2]</td>
<td>“I personally think a lot of the issues we have are with the locals…mainly because they don’t have the money to keep themselves occupied and off the streets” [Penzance, F1] “Where are the high street stores, where are the shops we all want, not just tourists, locals too” [Penzance, D2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.9: Power, payoff and trade-offs

It is evident therefore that power in both communities is held by those who have a high level of contact and dependence upon tourism (type 1 & 2), whereas payoff is emphasised through residents who are highly reliant on the tourism industry (type 1). Differences are only evident through the depiction of trade-offs, as both case studies exhibit alternative degrees of exchange. For example,
in Newquay, trade-offs are evident in the opinions and expressions of residents who own a tourism business or have frequent contact with tourists (type 2 & 3), whereas in Penzance the trade-offs are more strongly associated with those who have a high level of contact and dependence upon tourism (type 1 & 2).

This finding demonstrates that Newquay residents take more ownership over their destination through recognising issues of power and payoffs. They associate development in a positive manner, and they associate the detrimental costs with appropriate bodies. This association is dissimilar to the resident perspectives found in Penzance. The respondents there expressed a more passive level of ownership over the destination, and they only took ownership of their own personal inputs. Therefore, they focus on the economic benefits of tourism, and related costs to the local population as opposed to attributing them to the development of tourism.

Included within these benefits and costs, there are additional opinions that have been expressed by the residents of each community. To explore these perceptions, the impact and effect of visitor levels on the physical and socio-cultural environment are discussed to ascertain the level and scope of individual opinions towards tourism impacts in relation to the wider population.

7.3.1 Resident Opinion Statements

To determine resident opinions, a comparison of individual statements about the socio-cultural impacts of tourism were undertaken to compare against an independent community attitude survey conducted in 2006 (Southwest Tourism
and an academic paper (Williams and Lawson 2001). This process allowed for a comparison to be undertaken between the respondents of this investigation and the findings of the other two specific studies. Consequently, respondents were asked to react to a range of positive and negative questions based upon the development of tourism in their area. The specific questions posed are listed in Table 7.10 (reflective of Appendix Two).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Visitors make where I live more lively and fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Visitors are interested in meeting local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visitors intrude on my privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I enjoy meeting visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to these questions, respondents agreed or disagreed on a five point scale to ascertain a sense of each respondent’s awareness of the tourism industry alongside their level of interaction with the industry. The questions focused upon personal values (and related constructs) and not on demographic factors, as recommended by Williams and Lawson (2001). Resultantly, each respondent’s answers to these questions are displayed separately for each case study in Table 7.11 (Newquay) and Table 7.12 (Penzance) before being collectively evaluated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Visitors make where I live more lively and fun</td>
<td>Visitors are interested in meeting local people</td>
<td>Visitors intrude on my privacy</td>
<td>I enjoy meeting visitors</td>
<td>I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors</td>
<td>I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town</td>
<td>My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit</td>
<td>I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists</td>
<td>Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.11: Respondent reactions to general tourism statements (Newquay)
Visitors make where I live more lively and fun
Visitors are interested in meeting local people
Visitors intrude on my privacy
I enjoy meeting visitors
I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors
I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town
My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit
I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists
Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K2</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agre</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.12:** Respondent reactions to general tourism statements (Penzance)
From viewing the personal values expressed by the respondents, it is evident that both Newquay and Penzance respondents have a range of mixed perceptions towards tourism in their destinations. These findings are supportive of previous studies (Williams and Lawson 2001; Southwest Tourism 2009a), as residents have formed polar perspectives on key issues. For example when Newquay residents were questioned about the level of tourists’ interest in meeting local people, they stated a range of perspectives to the statement.

“in certain situations...I don’t think they come here to make friends with local people, they come for a break. However, the repeat visitors do. They come to our hotel because we have actually developed a rapport with them over the years” [Newquay J2]

“I think they are always looking to see you because I think they all think you are Cornish with big red cheeks” [Newquay, G1]

“no, definitely not. They just want to make sure they have access to all the facilities they can, for as cheap as they can and then they are happy” [Newquay, A1]

The difference of opinion to this question (statement 2) were evident both within the same occupational grouping (type 1) and across the sample, emphasising mixed perceptions. Furthermore, when Newquay residents were asked if they actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors, opposing opinions were again identified.

“Agreement...I get involved” [Newquay C3]

“I used to [laughs as though thinking of old memories] now I have settled down, there is no need to!” [Newquay, F1]

“No, I don’t have time” [Newquay, B1]

“Disagreement...they [tourists] are not ‘important’ to me. All they do is cause nuisance for us” [Newquay, K1]
However, this time mixed perceptions were found across, and not within occupational type, as those who have more frequent contact with tourists (type 1) expressed stronger disagreement to the statement than those who have infrequent contact with tourists (type 3). Therefore, the statements contextualised the variety and difference of opinions towards tourists in Newquay. More specifically, the mean score and standard deviation for each occupation type can be seen in response to each statement. The results demonstrate the average opinion by resident type (1 to 4) and the spread of opinion from the mean, as displayed for Newquay Residents in Table 7.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement (Where 1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree)</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Visitors make where I live more lively and fun</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Visitors are interested in meeting local people</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Visitors intrude on my privacy</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I enjoy meeting visitors</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.13: Newquay community mean scores per occupational grouping
On the whole, all the types identified in Newquay have a similar response to the statements outlined here in terms of sharing agreement, uncertainty or in their expressions of disagreement with the statements. However, there is some dissimilarity evident with type 3 (in frequent contact with tourists) and type 4 respondents (politicians and political lobbyists). In general, type 3 residents were neutral in their opinions, residents did express agreement (2.00 = agree) with unfamiliar feelings in the resort which differed from the collective opinion of the community (ranging from 4.8 to 5.0 = strong disagreement). However, a distinct difference was apparent with type 4 in response to statement 5. The politicians advocated that they actively seek out opportunities to socialise with tourists (1.5 = agreement), unlike the general feelings offered from the other groupings (ranging between 3.67 and 4.34 = disagreement).

Considering the Penzance resident responses to the same statements, it is also evident that type distinctions exist, as displayed in Table 7.14. Overall dispassionate responses towards the tourism statements are shared throughout. Nevertheless there is evidence of mixed perceptions in response to statements 4 and 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement (Where 1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree)</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Stand. Dev</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Stand. Dev</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Stand. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Visitors make where I live more lively and fun</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Visitors are interested in meeting local people</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Visitors intrude on my privacy</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I enjoy meeting visitors</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.14: Penzance community mean scores per occupational grouping**

It is evident that from these responses that those who are in direct and frequent contact with tourists (type 3) share little agreement (4.25=disagree) with the other types (1 & 2) in the processes of socialisation with and greeting of tourists (statement 4). Furthermore, there is widespread disagreement in responses to statement 6. Type 3 respondents are more critical and disagree (4.33=disagree) with the concept of increasing the number of tourists to the town, whereas type 1 remains in agreement but aired on the neutral side (2.60=neutral) and type 2 strongly agreed (1.00=strongly agree). These findings clearly represent the nature of economic dependency that the respondents in Penzance have upon the tourism industry, as type 1 are more reliant on tourism and would perhaps be unemployed without it, while type 3 derive only part of their income from tourism (Krippendorf 1987).
When comparing Table 7.13 (Newquay) and Table 7.14 (Penzance) in terms of type, it is evident that there are some stark contrasts in opinions and perceptions of each destinations atmospherics between community members. For example, when referring to statement 7: ‘My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit’, types 1 & 2 in Newquay shared agreement (1.29 and 1.67 respectively), whereas in Penzance they shared disagreement (4.20 and 3.67 respectively).

**Newquay**

“I guess it would, it would definitely give me less to whine” [Newquay, A1]

“Yes, most definitely, I would have to agree 100% with that. Especially in the winter, it would be terrible, even if only at the weekends, they really liven the town” [Newquay, O2]

**Penzance**

“Nah, no way. Disagree; we know how to have fun here.” [Penzance, C1]

“no it wouldn’t be dull, but it may be” [Penzance, B2]

Furthermore, in terms of statement 9: ‘Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town’, the greatest difference in opinions exists with type 3 respondents. Newquay respondents who have frequent contact with tourists (type 3) share a neutral opinion (2.00) while Penzance residents aired a more negative viewpoint (4.67). This dissimilarity was also the case with statement 6; Newquay residents were in agreement (2.00) and Penzance residents were in disagreement (4.33). However, beyond the polar perspectives and the individual opinions given by the respondents, it was determined that the overall community outlook towards tourism development is relatively positive in both destinations. This positivity was ascertained through the mean scores and standard deviation of the total overall sample frame, as shown in Table 7.15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement (Where 1 = Strongly Agree, 5 = Strongly Disagree)</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Stand. Dev</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
<th>Stand. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Visitors make where I live more lively and fun</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Visitors are interested in meeting local people</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Visitors intrude on my privacy</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I enjoy meeting visitors</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.15: Community mean scores towards general tourism statements

These scores act as evidence of community opinions, and shows that the communities in Newquay and Penzance are in general agreement with the positive statements (1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 8), and disagreement with the negative statements (3, 7 and 9) about tourism impacts. These community findings signify the wider population of resorts and coastal towns, as highlighted in the ‘Community Attitude Survey’ (Southwest Tourism 2009a), whereby residents based within a resort, such as Newquay, agree that tourists are fun and lively, and disagree that tourists intrude on their privacy. Meanwhile, residents within a coastal town, such as Penzance, concur that visitors are interested in meeting local people.

However, there was dissimilarity noted in these figures, whereby the strength of opinion was different for each community. For example, in Newquay, the
community placed high emphasis and agreement (1.67 = agree) upon the contribution of tourists to the atmosphere of the environment, whereas Penzance residents disagreed (3.00 = disagree) with the statement (statement 1). Furthermore, Penzance residents were most predominantly in agreement with tourists need for social-exchange (2.17 = agree), as shown in terms of individual opinions, which was of similar importance to Newquay residents (2.27 = agree). However this answer was not the most positive response given, as stated previously.

As a result of these findings, a stronger overall sense of agreement was found within Newquay, as opposed to Penzance. This strength of opinion was expressed via the average score of residents’ attitude towards each statement, and represents the repetition of neutral reactions expressed in Penzance as well as the few strongly agree/disagree reactions. Furthermore, when depicted by specific type of respondent, there were key outcomes to note. Those with the most positive agreement in both destinations, and respondents with the largest presence in each destination come from those who are in continual/direct contact with tourists (type 1). This finding is also evident in terms of residents’ expressing their feelings of disagreement. Despite the range in responses given to the same statement within the two communities, both sets of residents disagreed overall with feeling like a stranger in their town (4.23 for Newquay and 4.42 for Penzance). This finding was due to them being dominated by those who either own a tourist business or have direct contact with tourists (type 1 & 2), as they have continual contact and direct gain with/from the tourism industry.
“Completely disagree with that. I have lived here all my life so people know me and I know them. We always have and always will, there is no doubt about that” [Newquay, N1]

“No because I have grown up with it, it is just how, how my town is and I have never felt like a stranger in my own town” [Newquay, J2]

“Completely disagree...I don’t think from the day I stepped foot in here I have ever felt like a stranger” [Newquay, B1]

“No, definitely not. I would have to strongly disagree as I have lived here now for quite some time, so I know people, the locals. So no, I never feel like a stranger” [Penzance, A1]

“No, not at all, my, we have been here a while now and as I said my wife was born here, so we have a lot of friends. We would never feel like strangers” [Penzance, B2]

“Nah I disagree, I live here, I know the place, I ain’t no stranger. They are the strangers to this town, not me. I have been here for my life, they haven’t” [Penzance, C1]

Mixed views were, however, shared in terms of destination marketing, particularly within Newquay. A large group of respondents (47%) remained neutral in their views, which basically represented members of the community who were unsure and unaware of the image which was being portrayed. Further to this naivety, the remaining respondents opinions were spread, encompassing all occupational type (1, 2, 3 & 4), but were still dominant by those in direct contact with tourists.
“I am a firm believer that there is no such thing as bad publicity” [Newquay, E1]
“It is ironic that the people complaining about the bad image of Newquay have gone very public about it and actually made it worse by misquoting and not actually getting their facts straight” [Newquay, I4]
“I have never come here as a tourist, I don’t really know how it is portrayed” [Newquay, A1]
“Sometimes I won’t agree with, especially about what they say about the town, I say ‘well it’s not true’. They always make out Newquay to be worse” [Newquay, G1]
“In this book, ‘Newquay, the place of sand sea sex and beer’ and all this and it was really not a good write up for us” [Newquay, N1]
“The tourist in Newquay is driven by the media, but when they actually come here… they say that this town has no trouble and no fighting or nothing, so again it is down pretty much to the media, and it is being wrongly received. They are just glorifying stories” [Newquay, F1]

Beyond the classification of type, it is evident that Newquay residents represent the Lovers and Cynics towards tourism development with respect to Williams and Lawson’s (2001) study. This classification typifies the mixed perceptions of the community and the cynical perspective of certain individuals towards the portrayed image of the town to tourists. Therefore, the community in Newquay is not always community orientated, even though they are in favour of tourism development. Instead they give low importance ratings to community issues like traffic congestion, litter and noise. This finding contradicts other considerations, as found by Liu and Var (1986). However, it demonstrates that the values and concerns of local resident lie with the more pressing issues.

“we have not had any trouble since last summer other than the littering which happens, but that only takes moments to fix” [Newquay, B1]
“It could have happened anywhere so I don’t see crime as being a problem” [Newquay, J2]
For example, when questioned about the image of the town, Newquay residents were concerned. They disagreed with any cynical statements pertaining to crime rates, and highlighted how the community pulls together to protect their livelihood in times of need.

“you could point the finger and say to the press ‘you are frightening people unnecessarily, you are making them think that this is a bad place, when it isn’t’” [Newquay, E1]
“I do get upset when I read things and I get furious about them. I think ‘NO!’” [Newquay, G1]

This example represents the Cynics (Williams and Lawson 2001) who least approve of tourism and are community orientated, especially when it comes to maintaining control over their community. The community in Penzance differed to this example. They represented the Taxpayers on issues of increased tourism levels, the Cynics in terms of the town atmospherics, the Innocents in terms of the portrayed image, and the Lovers in terms of attachment to the town. This classification represents lower levels of community cohesion and highlights the ambivalent opinions of residents. For example, the Taxpayers in Penzance were neutral in their opinions and offered little strength in opinion towards matters that represent Taxpayer type issues. As a result, the opinions of Penzance residents did not represent or express any signs of strength in attitude.

“tourists come here, they just use us and leave, they don’t care who I am where I am from or what I need, they are just like, um, you know, going again” [Penzance, C1]
“I just stay away and um, you know just do my own thing. Ain’t much for me to do here anyway, so why bother stressing myself out and coming to town on my days off. Can’t be bothered” [Penzance, L1]
7.3.2. Nature of opinion

Further to these statements, the nature of resident opinions continued to display a range of perceptions towards tourism development, varying their perception between positive and negative (Milman and Pizam 1988), and recognising the social, economic and environmental attributes of tourism (Liu and Var 1986). The key findings are displayed in Table 7.16 (Newquay) and Table 7.17 (Penzance). These tables highlight some issues of over-dependency and seasonality, as the economic dependency of both communities on tourism for their livelihood was high. Furthermore they act as evidence of the self-destruct theory, which was only evident in Newquay and described by one resident. Resident ‘Newquay, E1’ described the self-destruct theory in response to issues of tourism-related crime and a perceived change in market to the resort, whereby they had highlighted that the reduced cost of going to the seaside had attracted a different type of tourist.

“In we have had a bad week, I can usually identify why we have had a bad week. And when I say a bad week, I mean the police are saying we’ve had so much trouble it is untrue. I go and ask a couple of questions. One of which is ‘oh, what are you doing here’ to a group of people. ‘Oh we are down here on a £10 Sun holiday’” [Newquay, E1]

Further to this individual opinion, a range of opinions were established in each community, and coincided with previous research. For example, positive attitudes were expressed by Newquay residents who have a commercial stake in the industry, and those who were dependent on tourism for their livelihood (type 1&2) (Murphy 1985; King et al. 1993), as well as those are more knowledgeable about the industry (type 4) (Andereck et al. 2005).
Table 7.16: Newquay residents’ opinion of tourism

Penzance residents, on the other hand, established conflicting beliefs and expressed the full range of positive and negative opinions towards tourism as found within Liu and Var’s (1986) study. Residents expressed ambivalence and uncertainty, as they generally agreed that tourism brought many economic and cultural benefits to Penzance. However, they were reluctant to ascribe social and environmental costs to the tourism industry itself (Liu and Var 1986).
### Economic

“In the summer I can earn a little more than usual, but I have to work for it” [Penzance, F1]

“Now we are lucky to have a handful of guests in at a time” [Penzance, D2]

“There just isn’t much money to be made here all year round, that is a problem for me” [Penzance, L1]

“We don’t have any other source of income. We just work here and put all our effort into the one basket” [Penzance, B2]

### Environmental

“I have to admit, they can be a nuisance sometimes when you can’t get into the centre as quickly as you like” [Penzance, K2]

“Who wouldn’t want that view either, you can see Mounts Bay from here, it is glorious” [Penzance, D2]

### Social

“You always get one or two unwanted guests. I shouldn’t say unwanted, but less desired guests” [Penzance, B2]

“I am so over it …. I have served them and catered for their every need for 17 years now, so forgive me if I don’t enjoy it as much anymore” [Penzance, D2]

**Table 7.17:** Penzance residents’ opinion of tourism

Furthermore, negative opinions were established about the unwelcome changes drawn from tourism development. For instance, in Newquay, residents stated a range of negative tourism impacts that included traffic congestion, the night-time entertainment and other aspects of development and media interpretation, as illustrated in Table 7.18.
Traffic

“There is a big influx of people, and the infrastructure of Newquay cannot cope with the amount of traffic which is here” [Newquay, C3]

Night-time entertainment

“Because the influx in holiday makers is huge, and the majority of those are drinking, drink has its effect and it has got to be monitored” [Newquay, H4]

Development

“There are lots of problems I could list. The town looks like an eyesore and the only answer to it is to build more properties and encourage more people here” [Newquay, A1]

Visitor type

“The town is dominated with 18-30s, and it is not working anymore. And we have an imbalance in gender as well” [Newquay, F3]

Locals

“I think the residents who live in the centre of town are impacted, and you feel for them because they live in the centre of a vibrant place and in the summer, they literally are in the centre of a large tourist centre” [Newquay, I4]

Media interpretation

“Things like Newquay nights on TV...I think they set the town back 10 maybe 5-10 years possibly” [Newquay, J2]

Table 7.18: Negative tourism impacts in Newquay

These perceptions, expressed by the respondents, symbolise the level of sensitivity experienced within the community to issues of economic, social and environmental impacts. They also illustrate the impact that tourism can have upon individual residents and support the findings of Faulkner and Tideswell (1997:9), whereby ‘residents whose employment is directly or indirectly dependent on tourism are expected to be more tolerant of its impacts, irrespective of where they live’.

An insight into the nature and level of control was also established from the data. This insight uncovered the influence of residents in the decision-making process associated with tourism development in each destination. In Newquay, residents expressed a range of views and feeling about their personal control over the industry, as shown in Table 7.19. They showed desire to control and...
increase their personal level of influence over tourism development, in response to their current situation whereby they felt they have insufficient opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td>“I am actually very passionate about this town and people in general, but unfortunately, it is not the way of life anymore” [Newquay, M3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“you are one man against many. So it doesn’t matter if you have got views or not. I personally had to back down from my views; because I was going nowhere, I would never go anywhere and it was overloading” [Newquay, F3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middling</td>
<td>“for me it is right because I don’t do anything about it really” [Newquay, A1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I make my own way [laughs out loud]. I have all the telephone numbers and email addresses of all the councillors, so, if I need to get in contact I can” [Newquay, C3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong-minded</td>
<td>“I would love it if everybody was into town politics, if everyone was interested in local authorities” [Newquay, E1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I think you can always have an influence upon a decision if you really want to” [Newquay, B1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I would, um, like to have influence, and be involved more with the DMO” [Newquay, I4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I even stood as a councillor to object about the pissours...the thing is now; a lot of people are not willing to give their opinion, because they know no one is listening, so something needs to change” [Newquay, F3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.19: Control and power opinions

Furthermore, Newquay residents actively engaged in presenting the opinions of ‘others’ in the community, especially those that opposed their positivity. This forthright opinion demonstrates self-assurance on behalf of the resident being interviewed, as respondent ‘Newquay, E1’ expressed their own interpretation of passive activity and criticised those who were not passionate about tourism development. As a result, the local gaze was apparent, but was directed at other locals as opposed to the tourist population.
“They don’t care [emphasises care] about an awful lot of things. Other than, blue rinse and their particular environment” [Newquay, E1]

In Penzance, however, residents remained lack-lustre in their opinions, and showed no desire to control or have influence over tourism development. This resistance coincided with their level of support for tourism, as support should lessen when local control reduces (Lawson et al. 1998).

“Nah, well I would if I had a business of my own, I’d want them to come and shop with me, then and that, you know, but what difference would it make to me now?” [Penzance, C1]

Taken as a whole, the balance of benefits and costs assembled by each community established that the positive benefits of tourism outweighed the negative costs. Therefore attitudes are seen to represent a series of trade-offs between the benefits and costs of tourism development as highlighted by Milman and Pizam (1988).

“Yeah, there are obviously traffic problems, social problems, um, but it is just for such a short period it is what comes with a holiday resort, and that is a part of living here. If you don’t like it, go and live somewhere else” [Newquay, F3]

“Managing change is really hard, and people don’t like change” [Newquay, I4]

“It all depends on what you want in life and the importance of things to you” [Newquay, A1]

Newquay

“Nah, they don’t cause it don’t solve anything does it. Just adds to it, and makes life more stressful cause there extra people here” [Penzance, C1]

“Yes, for me they do. Most definitely…I am not sure if it is the same for everyone, but for me it is” [Penzance, K2]

Penzance
Furthermore, these findings illustrate the attributes that underpin the nature of resident opinions, and represent the experience of the respondents in each destination. These attributes are illustrated in Table 7.20, and suggest that there are destination specific attributes that need to be taken into consideration when discussing tourism impacts in more general terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of location</th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident type</td>
<td>Lovers / Cynics</td>
<td>Lovers / Cynics / Taxpayers &amp; Innocents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relationships</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of economic dependence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of opinion</td>
<td>Full range</td>
<td>Full range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Opinion</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.20: Key tourism communities and resident perceptions of tourism

7.4 Resident Reactions and Responses to Impacts of Tourism-related Crime

To establish residents’ reactions and responses to the issues and impacts of tourism-related crime, there is a need to understand how communities shape and respond to social and environmental change. Consequently, the full range of relationships which exist between tourism and crime needs to be understood, and the crime literature interpreted, which requires the analysis of the conditions and attributes of a destination. This analysis involves understanding the characteristics of both the person and place, by means of understanding personal behaviour, social cohesion and social structure, separately to the criminology of place. For example, the person exhibits the indulgence and intent of individuals, as both victims and offenders, whereas the place ensures
that the features and facilities open to opportunity are considered, alongside issues of accessibility and seasonality, which will be presented first.

7.4.1 Seasonal Distinctions

Seasonality increases the opportunity for crime to occur in a tourist destination (McPheters and Stronge 1974), by altering the pace and appearance of community life and increasing tension during the peak seasons (Rothman 1978). These findings indicate that both destinations see an influx of tourists during the peak season (Section 6.1), and that they adapt their behaviour to accommodate for the change in seasons (winter to summer). However, the impact of these changes is not uniform between the two destinations.

In terms of adjustment, there was evidence of embracement, adaptation and satisfaction in Newquay based along Ap and Crompton’s (1993) continuum for responses to tourism impacts. In Penzance, there was evidence of resilience, resentment and passive negativity felt towards the change in seasons, as expressed by the level of contact and attitude towards tourism.
“I actually look forward to the summer and enjoy the winter because it [Newquay] is at its best” [Newquay, J2]
“I actually have to work harder in the winter as a hotel manager; trying to make us busy. Whereas in the main season, I don’t work any less, but probably the stress of my job is more covered by reception” [Newquay, L2]
“Oh, I seem to have 2 lives – a winter life and a summer life” [Newquay, F3]

Newquay
“I actually look forward to the two seasons. In the winter it is all like laid back and it is really quite and you wonder if you can afford things. Then the summer comes and you get all that vibrancy, you want to get into town and have a few drinks” [Newquay, M3]
“you see we are a 10 week season and we are a weekend resort and Britain is generally that. But with the regeneration of the town, we may go to a 10 month season a year” [Newquay, P3]

“It is always difficult in the summer to get things done” [Penzance, A1]
“in the summer they are everywhere. Walking about like they own the place, doing what they do and just getting in the way as usual” [Penzance, C1]
“The tourists come and take over in the summer and once they’re [tourists] gone we still left with nothing” [Penzance, L1]
“Way it works really, we all have to work hard in the sunshine, and then get to relax in the winter” [Penzance, I1]

This generalised depiction of adjustment was supported by the majority of residents in each community. However, there was one exception recorded by one resident in Newquay. Respondent ‘Newquay, A1’ showed caution towards the start of the tourist season, by anticipating tourism-related crime, despite their overall support for tourism development.

“I am really not looking forward to the season this year, I can feel it in my bones that there are going to be some issues…I know I am not coming across as much of a fan of the town, but I am really, that is why I still work and live here. It is my life, it always will be and I understand that for Newquay to be the place it is, we need tourist to come here and spend their money” [Newquay, A1]
Further to this adjustment, seasonal and temporary employment was also evident in both communities.

“I work in a small cafe and I only do it in the summer” [Penzance, C1]
“I drive a Taxi in the summers” [Newquay, E1]
“my job you know it probably alters by season” [Newquay, J2]
“I have been a landlord, a taxi driver, a councillor” [Newquay, F3]

However, residents did not associate these seasonal positions with the wider impacts of seasonality as expressed by Baum and Lundtop (2001). There was little consideration therefore given to the consequences of seasonality and the out of season short business operating hours. This ignorance was particularly evident in Penzance, as many businesses were open all year round.

“We have an open door policy, if we are here we are open. If we have people in, we are here” [Penzance, B2]
“We are open for business 24-7” [Penzance, K2]

Due to the time of data collection, residents were instead thankful and focused on the season ahead, as opposed to raising concern and uncertainty about the post-summer period, where uncertainty and unemployment could be looming. Residents were conscious of the season, and were awaiting the arrival of tourists at the point of contact. This anticipation was particularly evident in Newquay, as residents were aware of the seasonal infiltration of tourists, and were able to describe the rise in population density during the peak season, which in effect they blamed for higher crime rates in the resort.
“The population probably quadruples” [Newquay, J2]
“I think we go from 36,000 population up to 300,000” [Newquay, C3]
“We go from 16,000 populations to 3 million, so consequently, percentage wise we are going to get a greater percentage of crime” [Newquay, F3]
“You have to consider the transient population and the density of people here, its higher in the summer” [Newquay, O2]

These findings depict the nature of seasonality found within each resort, and they develop an understanding of opportunities which may exist for criminal activity to occur. For instance, seasonal operations lead to minimal supervision and minimal discouragement of crime during the off-peak season (Baum and Lundtorp 2001). Consequently, the presence and absence of people can result in fluctuation in crime rates at each destination.

7.4.2 Changes in Behaviour

This presence and absence of tourists can have an effect on society (Brown 1998). This influence has been established through the changing pace of each community, and the depiction of irritations directed at tourists and the transient population in response to tourism-related crime.

Both destinations express a similar perception and opinion towards tourists, and both communities judge the transient population as a whole, rather than as individuals. Furthermore, residents curtail certain activities during the tourist season by altering their leisure activities to cater for the rise in participants within the season (Murphy 1985; Perdue et al. 1987) and to overcome obstacles which prevent them from carrying out daily activities with ease. This
understanding is a response to the perception of space as described by Goodey (1971) and the social representations that build up over time about tourists.

**Newquay**

“I don’t bother going in the summer because it is crammed with tourists, I just stop training for a month or so and carry on again in September” [Newquay, A1]

“I probably walk a lot more in the summer” [Newquay, J2]

“You have to walk in the road if you want to get anywhere fast. You see it is a slow town, and in the holiday season you can’t do anything quickly” [Newquay, C3]

“The last thing you need it to queue for ages for one, so instead we just have a drink at home” [Newquay, P3]

“It seems busier in the summer than normal” [Penzance, A1]

“I try and get as much time to myself as possible and let the staff do the bulk of the work” [Penzance, D2]

“I just keep clear” [Penzance, C1]

“Before people used to stop and take time out to get to know Penzance and enquire about our history, but not anymore, things have changed” [Penzance, K2]

This change in pace and restriction of actions represents the basic response and reaction residents have to the impacts faced within their community to salient issues (Pearce *et al.* 1996), which, in this case, represents the tourism-related crime impacts. Residents adapt and change their behaviour to cope with the changing environment. For example, in Newquay, residents respond to change by displaying characteristics of avoidance and acceptance as outlined by Alber *et al.* (1975), alongside features of hyper-reality and changes associated with safety and privacy. This finding represents the respondents likes and dislikes and accounts for action taken or expressed towards tourists (Carmichael 2000), as shown in Table 7.21.
| Avoidance | “I also tend to avoid certain places just so I don’t have to socialise day and night with them” [Newquay, A1]  
“you avoid the dodgy areas” [Newquay, J2]  
“Traffic, in the summer it is difficult to move around, but, um, you know where the traffic is, you know where it builds up, so you can avoid it” [Newquay, C3]  
“you know when the tourists are going to be there emptying shelves. It is the time to avoid it” [Newquay, P3]  
“I don’t want to go out in town anymore, there is nowhere for me to go” [Newquay, E1]  
“There are times of night where there are no go areas” [Newquay, M3] |
| Acceptance | “you learn to live with it, work around it the best way you can” [Newquay, F3]  
“I live here, I accept I live here, I like living here, and I like the lifestyle, so it is a part of my life” [Newquay, M3]  
“I deal with it. It is my daily life at the airport. People come and go” [Newquay, B1]  
“We are used to things down here, because it is a way of life” [Newquay, P3] |
| Hyperreality | “The life I lead here is normal to me, but it does change throughout the year, I just expect it to every year because that is ‘normal’ to me” [Newquay, K1]  
“I suppose my lifestyle does change throughout the year, but that to me is normal…we are used to changing” [Newquay, A1] |
| Work-related | “It has provoked me to change my career from a coach driver, into what I am doing with the police and the CCTV” [Newquay, C3] |
| Safety and Privacy | “It has affected me; in the fact that of the masses that come here, I am probably not safe it town after a certain time at night, but my children are” [Newquay, F3]  
“I never used to lock the doors and windows, but I do now...doesn’t park the car out the front anymore” [Newquay, G1]  
“We have actually built a high wall out the back now, but that is for our own privacy as opposed to anything else” [Newquay, N1] |

Table 7.21: Newquay residents changes in behaviour

However, not all Newquay residents believed that they changed their behaviour. Instead residents describe themselves as creatures of habit, which get on with their lives. Alternatively, residents developed an opinion about how fellow community members are resilient to change.
No Change

“I don’t do anything differently” [Newquay, L2]
“I never change my plans or behaviour” [Newquay, O2]
“No, no, I am a creature of habit” [Newquay, D2]
“I don’t let it interfere with my normal day to day life” [Newquay, P3]

Resists change

“you get the old and bold brigade, and I don’t class myself as them, they have been here 99 years and they don’t want things to change” [Newquay, H4]

Then there are residents who state that they do not change their behaviour, even though they adapt to incidents and take active and positive step towards crime discouragement in the community. For example, respondent ‘Newquay, C3’ takes a personal management approach, as described by Felson (1995), to combat crime.

“No. If it gets too bad, I usually grab a handful of councillors, get those reflective jackets and go and stand on the streets, and let them see what is going on. Let them know that they have got to address the issue” [Newquay, C3]

In Penzance, there is less evidence to suggest that residents change their behaviour as a response to tourism-related crime. However, there are still signs of avoidance and acceptance to represent their likes and dislikes (Alber et al. 1975; Carmichael 2000), as displayed in Table 7.22.
If there was a fight I would walk away from it…especially here in town when people are drinking on the weekends and that…I keep out of it myself, I don’t have to prove anything to anyone” [Penzance, C1]

“I just get on with life and try not to get involved in nothing specific” [Penzance, D2]

“the promenade it full some nights with youths, they are drinking and shouting and trying to draw people in to them, and I don’t like it, so I tend to not go past there anymore if I don’t really have to” [Penzance, A1]

“Do I take their alcohol off of them…or ask them to move on…No, definitely not. I just bypass the area at certain times of days that I know it would be worse. Like on a weekend night and, or something like that” [Penzance, I1]

Table 7.22: Penzance residents changes in behaviour

These findings confirm that residents in Newquay and Penzance frequently change their behaviour in response to their attitude and behaviour towards the tourism industry. Nevertheless, this finding does not explain why residents respond to impacts of tourism-related crime. Therefore, further analysis is required in relation to the characteristics of place, by determining the perceptions of crime which exist in each location.

7.4.3 Perceptions of Crime

In response to the seasonal distinctions in each location and the evident changes in behaviour expressed by residents, it is perceived that crime perceptions differ between Newquay residents and those in Penzance. For
instance, in Newquay, when residents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement “Crime is more of a problem at the height of the tourist season and less evident in low season”, there was wide-spread agreement from twelve of the sixteen respondents. This level of conformity was drawn from coherent and logical thought processes. The respondents demonstrated a higher awareness of cause and effect, and were capable of weighting up the costs and benefits of tourism. However, not all respondents agreed, four community members stated that crime was not more evident in the summer months.

“yes, the more people in one place, the more trouble” [Newquay, A1]
“I probably agree with that statement but for reasons which we discussed, not because of tourist.” [Newquay, J2]
“because of the masses of people, yeah, because you have gone from a sleepy old 16,000 to 3 million people” [Newquay, F3]

Agree

“Oh yeah, I think that has to be a link, has to be a link. I think it is a numbers game really” [Newquay, H4]
“Yes, definitely. But you have to look at our footfall. Our population goes from 20/21,000 to at least 120,000. You can’t expect that not to affect the town” [Newquay, I4]

“No... It’s all year round” [Newquay, C3]
“I would disagree because of, in terms of population, because on a percentage wise, I don’t think it is any greater. It is similar all year round” [Newquay, P3]

In Penzance, however, residents were in two minds about the peaks and troughs of criminal activity being associated with the holiday season (Walmsley et al. 1983). There was acknowledgement of seasonal trends, but these were not classified as being representational of crime.

“we definitely get a lot more complaints in the summer season, but I wouldn’t necessarily consider those complaints a crime” [Penzance, A1]
As a result, there is a distinct difference in residents’ perception of crime, and this difference extends beyond the general perceptions of crime. Difference is also apparent in terms of resident perceptions of who offends, the features which induce criminal behaviour, the level of resident supervision over the destination’s resources, and crime prevention strategies. This difference is due to the nature of the gaze expressed in each destination by its community members. These dissimilarities are now discussed in turn through Sections 7.4.3.1 – 7.4.3.5.

7.4.3.1 Offender Identification

Data restrictions prevent the identification of the direct victims of crime (Jud 1975; Fujii and Mak 1980). However, from the resident perceptions of tourism-related crime, the perceived offenders in each community have been established. In Newquay, residents identify tourists and outsiders as the offender in criminal activities, whereas Penzance residents blame the local population for committing crime and contributing to the crime statistics.

“*I just think it is scallys who are down here, who come down here and think like that*” [Newquay, G1]

“*There are so many different types of people who come here, you have to expect it*” [Newquay, A1]

“*Not because of tourists. It is volume and again you have got to look at it in pro rata to the volume of people*” [Newquay, J2]

“*I don’t think tourists have any intention of coming here and causing a problem. It is as I said most probably the unemployed, and those on the estates*” [Penzance, K2]

Further to this identification, the actual type of individual who causes the majority of the crime within the each area was ascertained. In Newquay, a
specific type of tourist was described as being the one who commits crime, rather than laying blame with the entire tourist population. Also in Penzance, a certain type of person was identified as the offender, which were local residents who were unemployed and living on the estates.

“you might have a higher incident of crime in Newquay, where you have got that core of younger people, whereas the rest of Cornwall probably attracts a different type of individual” [Newquay, O2]

“Well I assume most of it happens on the housing estates” [Penzance, B2]

“There are certain estates where certain types of people get together and they just don’t lead a productive life, they, um, how should I put it...rely on others. They are not in employment, they don’t do anything constructive, and really they just cause a nuisance for others who try hard to keep their family afloat…” [Penzance, K2]

“Especially up Heamoor and around that way, there are quite often groups of young people hanging out around there and causing problems for the other residents” [Penzance, G3]

7.4.3.2 Characteristics of Crime Place

The characteristics of a place help to determine elements that stimulate criminal activity within a specific destination (Prideaux 1996), and sets an induced image of a destination (Richards and Munsters 2010) that draws a certain type of individual to the area. Within each destination, the main facilities and features that are perceived as contributing to criminal activity have been determined.

In terms of place facilities, in Newquay it emerged that the main characteristic was the extensive night-time entertainment, as it was felt that it contributes to the hedonistic nature and drug-sub culture of the destination (Prideaux 1996).
The night-life was also highlighted in Penzance. However, here there was emphasis on a lack of facilities as opposed to an extensive nature of these facilities, as was found in Newquay. Therefore, differences in opinions were evident.

“*If you have so many bars and clubs, surfer lodges and cheap accommodation what do you expect*” [Newquay, K1]

“*there is a general consensus I am sure about there being too many pubs and clubs*” [Newquay, B1]

“The whole thing is spread out all over the town and people can cause trouble all over the place. I suppose you could argue that there should be less bars in a more concentrated area to limit the stress” [Newquay, N1]

“There are 5 strip joints…5 licences in Newquay, and then on the other hand you have flats being built at (£) 1.5 million. I can’t see how the cross over is going to go. They have missed the target market somewhere” [Newquay, F3]

“What will it bring? More and more crime as the next thing they will bring is a casino to Newquay the minute our population is great enough to carry one, they will bring it” [Newquay, P3]

“There are quite a few bars, and naff shops here, so there isn’t really that much for people to do other than drink and hang out or not even bother coming into the town centre” [Penzance, A1]

“Businesses for sure, the pubs and stuff, they don’t help” [Penzance C1]

“When the kids are off school and can’t afford to do anything around here. Most of them don’t use the facilities, as they are overcrowded with tourists, but they don’t choose to go to the beach or anything instead. *They just hang out and cause trouble*” [Penzance, K2]

In terms of place features, respondents in both destinations positively addressed the natural environment in which they were situated. However, they failed to link these features to criminal opportunities and crime rates.
“Newquay is Newquay, it is where it is, it is fixed in its geography and we are lucky to have the surroundings we do” [Newquay, J2]
“The unique things about Newquay are the coastline” [Newquay, E1]
“You will always have families because of the beaches” [Newquay, I4]
“We have nice beaches; it is just a shame, because if they could get it right it could be [long pause]...” [Newquay, F3]
“I am not really sure how the natural feature could increase crime” [Penzance, F1]
“Doubt anyone does anything because of the landscape [laughs]” [Penzance, J3]

A Newquay resident did however identify the most predominant area for crime to occur. Respondent ‘Newquay, J2’ stated that a “quarter of a square mile from say the epicentre of the town in terms of night life… is quite a condensed area for trouble”.

### 7.4.3.3 Crime Discouragement and Supervision

For crime to occur, a motivated offender, a desirable target, and the absence of a supervisor is required (Eck and Weisburd 1995; Felson and Clarke 1998). Crime levels can therefore be influenced by the level of supervision found in each destination by either creating opportunities to offend, or reducing them. This supervision involves the protection of both personal and more general artefacts and premises.

Supervision in Newquay included that of uninhabited premises and facilities, and residents believed they were accountable for the full range of responsibilities highlighted by Felson (1995). However, in Penzance, there was only evidence of personal responsibility, whereby residents demonstrated
informal and inadvertent protection by personal acquaintances with others (Felson 1995).

“I mean I look after my home and make it secure. I watch out for my neighbour’s house too because they live in Sheffield and they are never here... I just collect their post from the doorway and things like that so it doesn’t obviously look empty most of the year” [Newquay, B1]

“I am member of the shop watch, and the pub watch scheme” [Newquay, C3]

“We have spent £3500 on a CCTV system, the digital CCTV system, covering the four entries into the hotel and the bar” [Newquay, J2]

“You know you put your hotel proprietor’s disclaimer on the wall and that covers most things” [Newquay, O2]

“I purely take responsibility for my own actions, and those of the family. I don’t really have anything to do with others” [Penzance, A1]

“No, I just keep clear, I don’t get involved, it is too much hassle and I ain’t got the time for it all” [Penzance, C1]

7.4.3.4 Crime Prevention

Crime prevention initiatives minimise the opportunity for victimisation to occur (Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt et al. 2000), and there is evidence of dissimilar levels of crime prevention in each destination. In Newquay, emphasis was placed on the action of the police force to help reduce crime and official measure to prevent incidents, as recommended by George (2003). With the police force as the main supervisor at the destination level, ‘serious attempts at crime prevention and special activities aimed at protecting tourists’ (Brunt et al. 2000:421) have been undertaken. This deterrence has resulted in the official initiatives being the most influential control over crime in the resort.
“I think that the police have got a very good handle on it. Um, we are lucky you know, there, there is the issue that we don’t have enough police” [Newquay, E1]

“what the police are doing is hand on heart they are asking what is the problem? They go through this in all the meetings…they go through a list by asking those questions; what do you perceive as being the worst problem? Is there any problem in the patch, or in your patch? And they will put it on the board, they will analyse them and out them on the board and we will go through the top few” [Newquay, H4]

“I am not going to take the lead and head into town and put things right. It is a thing for the police to sort, not average Joe” [Newquay, A1]

“a brilliant CCTV system” [Newquay, N1]

“we have this street safe bus” [Newquay, I4]

Beyond these official initiatives, local residents also expressed a level of guardianship over their personal property and their own actions. This responsibility illustrates the personal gain associated with specific actions of crime prevention.

“I have just helped create a neighbourhood watch scheme… there is an insurance incentive if you are within a Neighbourhood Watch Scheme. You can get you house insurance cheaper!” [Newquay, H4]

“I have always made it my um policy… to tell my staff that if they do not like the look of the customer, then don’t let him in… we never import problems is you know what I mean?” [Newquay, D2]

In Penzance, there was little articulation or recollection of crime prevention initiatives, other than the Neighbourhood Watch Scheme. Therefore, little inference can be drawn from the respondents about how they act to minimise opportunities for criminal activity in the locality. Nevertheless, personal crime prevention methods can be supposed, as the respondents did describe a level of personal responsibility through the scheme.
7.4.3.5 Crime Talk

There is also evidence of intense and digressive conversation (crime talk), within the Newquay community. Local residents initially discuss criminal incidents, but then find themselves slipping from topic to topic as they convey criminal stories to others. This digression can have specific implications on a particular place, as the product of these talks are metaphors of meanings and ‘place myths’ (Sparks et al. 2001). This understanding helps build an interpretation of what is socially tolerated and what are the disproportionate examples of crime in Newquay. This knowledge leads to a deeper understanding of what is acceptable behaviour.

“I suppose it depends on what I class as crime really. You know, I mean, when you read the paper, you read about horrific crime” [Newquay, G1]

In Penzance there is less evidence of crime talk, and more suggestion towards personal experience. There is a clear indication that some individuals expect crime talk to be gossip.

“It is all just gossip really and personal opinion. It is never really anything substantial or anything which warrants interest. Usually it is the kids playing around down the promenade, or on the estates, not tourist” [Penzance, A1]

To summarise, the differences and similarities which emerged from the in-depth interviews can be viewed in Table 7.23. These represent resident reactions and responses to tourism impacts associated with crime. Evidently, some dissimilarity is presented, with Newquay residents adopting alternative crime
prevention methods to Penzance residents, alongside altering perceptions of crime and criminal offenders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant behaviour</td>
<td>Active / Passive</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in pace</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of crime levels</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime is considered seasonal</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention</td>
<td>Personal / Assigned / Diffuse / General</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime discouragement</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime talk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of gaze</td>
<td>Mutual</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main supervisor</td>
<td>Police force</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.23: Key reactions and responses to impacts of tourism-related crime

7.5 The Role of the Community

To identify the role that a community plays in affecting residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime, there is a need to make further judgements about tourism impacts in relation to the individual and the collective opinions of residents. This judgement requires additional discussion about community attachment, to link individual and social representations and actions to collective interpretations as outlined by Von Cranach (1992, cited in Pearce et al. 1996:48). This understanding will then determine the positioning of an individual within their group environment, and demonstrates the influence of residents upon group representations.
As already established (Section 7.2.2), the residents interviewed consider themselves to be part of the local community, by determining the meaning and nature of a community. However, through the interpretation of the data, distinct differences have surfaced between the role of residents in Newquay and in Penzance. The community in Newquay was found to be structured around resident interests, which represents their direct experiences, social interaction and media consumption. Communities of practice have formed in the resort, and are representational of social change as socialisation has occurred. Individual action restricts some aspects of group relations, as geographically solid boundaries were perceived. Therefore, there is still an element of place distinction within the community, which divides the town into two distinct areas.

“I have never worked at the Great Western side of town, so I could never imagine being involved over that side of the town. I have always been Pentire or town; I have never lived or worked the other side. So I don’t know what it is like. I have always been this end and I love this end. I am not big on that end” [Newquay, G1]

Nevertheless, community members share common views with one another. This commonality spreads a feeling of shared understanding between residents in Newquay. Therefore very little representation is needed to be shared in public, which emphasises the sub-cultures and groups that exist, and resembles the collective opinion and social nature of the individuals within that area.
“We are all friends because we have similar understandings, not because we live near one another” [Newquay, A1]
“I think my age group and my, the people I socialise with all consider themselves as Newquay boys or Newquay girls, and what goes…well we um, yeah I would say they are of the same opinion as me” [Newquay, J2]
“We work together to manage other initiatives and to control and oversee the safe promotion of different activities within the town” [Newquay, I4]
“I just hung about with all my friends and my sister’s friends and made new friends from there, I always felt a part of things, but then I suppose I would as I was young and willing” [Newquay, B1]

It is only when residents are unable to agree in Newquay that representations of the community were used to explain conflict, as suggested by respondent ‘Newquay, H4’, who turned on a group of individuals that did not hold the same viewpoint about development of the town’s council building as them self.

“You get the old and bold brigade, and I don’t class myself as them, they have been here 99 years and they don’t want things to change… A lot of people are trying to save it and I don’t see what for… Now a lot of them are saying, councillors and officers are saying let’s save it, others are saying why bother. Personally I am saying why bother” [Newquay, H4]

The same findings were not found in Penzance. The only community group identified in Penzance was based upon work relations. There were no geographical classifications, or concepts relating to the spirit of the community which could have been expressed in the form of collective actions. Furthermore, one community member expressed the mixed goals and poor communication that represents the community in the coastal town.

“There is a strong sense of community here when we have common goals, but that is not always the case, quite often we have opposing views and we end up not working together or communicating together properly. There are just a few individuals which ruin it for everyone else, especially within the business community, they just want to pull all the strings in their favour and expect for everyone else to support their views. When it gets like that I just pull back” [Penzance, D2]
This example singles out how a sub-group controlled by business orientated individuals exists in the town, and emphasises the power relationships which are at work. The role of the community in Penzance, consequently, has different dimensions of socialisation and they respond differently to social change. For example, withdrawal was discussed together with power struggles and dissatisfaction. This identification was taken further by respondent ‘Penzance, K2’, who suggested that even the networks may not be real, as they place low value on friendship.

“really we are just colleagues trying to make a quick buck. We are not really friends, not in the true sense of the word. I wouldn’t invite half of them over for tea... well really it ruins it really as we don’t have one unless you consider the business community” [Penzance, K2]

Consequently, it was found that emphasis was expressed through the economic potential of tourism and focused on building business associates rather than friendships. This perception was alleged as weakening the community, as there were no specific individual actions influencing a consensus of opinion. As a result, the community has developed through the dealings of what each individual encounters in their normal everyday life, through their daily dealings with others and through their local gaze. This finding proposes that Penzance residents are grouped purely for analytical purposes as described by Prentice (1993), which is distinctly different to Newquay residents, who share common views and show community cohesion.

The level of community attachment also differs in each destination (Section 7.2.2), relating to the pattern and extent of social interaction, as well as the level of personal integration into the community. Interestingly, both Newquay and
Penzance residents expressed a connection to their community. However, in Penzance, participation in the community was not mandatory, as residents only integrated into general groupings without explicit purpose, so adaptation and socialisation was minimal. Therefore, the direct associations between the role of a community and the individual were reduced.

This level of attachment has also impacted the nature of resident perceptions in each location. In Newquay, the strong direct and indirect links associated with Von Cranach’s (1992, cited in Pearce et al. 1996:48) model have been emphasised, and, as a result, has pooled a unified view of tourism development. In Penzance, however, there was little unison in resident opinion as common goals were not widespread. In its place, blame, withdrawal and power struggles were expressed within and between community members. This classification can somewhat be explained by the sampling method used during data collection, as the nature of the referral process resulted in only certain types of residents being interviewed (see Figure 7.1 and Figure 7.2).

Yet, these collective interpretations do not resemble the length of residency experienced by residents, as they all articulated a lengthy association with their destination. Consequently, it is inferred that the level of community attachment in Penzance differs from that found in Newquay. Attachment appears not to be related to the social networks and length of residency experienced by residents. Instead, Penzance residents show signs of place dependency. This aversion emphasises the mobility of this community and their members, and the different roles that a community plays in each destination. People in Penzance are therefore seen to participate in local institutes yet they are not tied to them, as
they are prepared to leave those communities if certain conditions fail to satisfy their immediate needs. Despite these suggestions, at the time of data collection, agreement was established within each community about the nature of community benefits of tourism.

Overall, it has been found that the role of a community is destination specific. This finding is expressed through a series of dissimilarities experienced by residents, alongside some similarities reviewed in Table 7.24. These findings recognise the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions, through the nature and extent of socialisation and integration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dominant community</td>
<td>Communities of practice (CoP)</td>
<td>Work-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of local community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared views</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cohesion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of residency</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place dependent</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of community attachment</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community benefits</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7.24: Key community roles*
7.6 Chapter Summary

Some of the key findings in this chapter show that coping strategies were apparent in the data (Section 7.4.2). Therefore, community perceptions of tourism-related crime have been catalogued. Newquay residents adjusted and developed tolerance to cope with tourism development (Table 7.21). By avoiding areas of the resort, residents minimised their risk of being faced with crime incidents, and adapted their behaviour to suit, whereas Penzance residents avoided confrontation and aimed to stay away from the coastal town for non-essential items. This avoidance resulted in negligible changes in behaviour being highlighted (Table 7.22), and typifies the structure of these communities to be destination specific.

This evaluation of the actions of individuals in line with their perceptions of tourism-related crime has enabled the findings to be summarised in Table 7.25. From this table, it is evident that there are similarities and disparities between the resort of Newquay and the coastal town of Penzance. These findings provide the basis for further discussion in Chapter 8. Chapter 8 therefore presents the final (fifth) stage of the Framework Method. The discussion maps and interprets the findings, to contribute to, and develop knowledge about tourism communities and crime, by addressing the extent to which group influences impact resident perception. This interpretation is done in a bid to make the study’s implications applicable to practitioners to demonstrate the relevance of this research in addressing practical problems associated with tourism-related crime.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newquay / Resort</th>
<th>Penzance / Coastal</th>
<th>Newquay / Resort</th>
<th>Penzance / Coastal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Respondent</td>
<td>1, 2, 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>Tourist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of interaction</td>
<td>Daily / Frequent</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Crime prevention</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of community</td>
<td>Interest based</td>
<td>Interest based</td>
<td>Crime discouragement</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Attachment</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Crime talk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities of practice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Nature of gaze</td>
<td>Mutual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place community</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Main supervisor</td>
<td>Police force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Dominant community</td>
<td>CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work-related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common social characteristics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Part of local community</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident type</td>
<td>Lovers / Cynics</td>
<td>All types</td>
<td>Shared views</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relationships</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Community cohesion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of economic dependence</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of opinion</td>
<td>Full range</td>
<td>Full range</td>
<td>Length of residency</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of Opinion</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Place dependent</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant behaviour</td>
<td>Active / Passive</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Level of community attachment</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in pace</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Community benefits</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of crime levels</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 7.25: Overview of Key Findings**
8.0 Discussion

This chapter discusses in more detail the key findings of the study (Chapters 6 and 7), and draws on the relevant theory from Chapter 2 to provide an explanation and theoretical link between this investigation and others. The examination of these findings reveals the impacts of tourism and crime upon community perceptions, reactions and behaviour to the tourism industry, within the context of two British seaside destinations.

The aim of this chapter is to contribute to, and develop further knowledge and understanding of how the social reality and structure of these societies can add to the understanding of tourism and crime. This understanding is achieved through a synthesis of the findings and an appraisal of their impacts on existing published academic arguments relating to tourism and crime. However, the tourism and crime literature was not studied in isolation. Instead, the impacts were contextualised in relation to resident and community issues at a destination level. Therefore, the discussions incorporate the three key areas under investigation, and are linked to the objectives of the investigation as shown in Table 8.1.
When the findings are taken as a whole, it is evident from the primary and secondary data collection, that community perceptions, reactions and behaviour towards tourism are influenced by resident opinions. The extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by, an individual resident's perception is dependent on the nature of the location in which the resident encounters tourism. The encounter, as emphasised by Mathieson and Wall (1982), is of significance here, as the extent of community influence can range from active to inactive, high to low. These varying degrees of community influence and control are represented by a number of similarities and disparities found within and between the resort of Newquay and the coastal town of Penzance, and represent both extrinsic and intrinsic elements associated with each destination. These fundamentals suggest that community responses towards tourism are somewhat contingent upon place characteristics.

The nature of these locations is distinct. They are either seen to promote hedonistic opportunities or they uphold family values (Prideaux 1996). In this
case, based upon the secondary data in Chapter 6, Newquay can be perceived as endorsing hedonistic opportunities, while Penzance promotes family values. This classification partially differentiates between the characteristics of each of the British seaside environments, within which distinct community relationships have been fashioned. Similarities are present through social representations and dissimilarities exist in relation to the level and nature of community cohesion, attachment and shared social interaction experienced by each community. However, it should not be forgotten that such a statement may only form part of the differentiation, as there are a number of other elements which need to be taken into consideration, including the ratio of local residents to tourism, and the level of seasonality experienced within each destination, as put forward by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) in Figure 2.8. Due to this array of characteristics which exist, and may bear influence upon the community, a further aim of this chapter is to reveal the similarities and differences found in each location, by comparing them to published, academic research. This comparison will begin with the community based findings, and move on to developing a deeper understanding of resident attitudes and the impacts of tourism-related crime.

8.1 Tourism and the Community

From the review of literature, it is evident that the ways in which a community shapes and responds to social and environmental change is a driving force in assessing community responses to tourism (Pearce et al. 1996). Therefore, in this investigation, it was important to define the term community, and determine the nature of human relationships within each community, via elements of
attachment, engagement and length of residency. This meaning would then determine how community groups are formed within the two case study areas, and evaluate the extent to which a community can influence, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions. After all, it is perceived that tourism and the community can result in a range of outcomes, in terms of the scale and understanding of the term community, the level and nature of attachment expressed by residents, as well as the level of engagement the residents have with the community.

There is a range of literature, in relation to tourism and the community, which has been considered throughout this investigation (Section 2.2), and is summarised in Table 8.2. The table represents the level of community existence, understanding, as well as the consequences of their engagement with tourism, in terms of attachment and commitment. The literature in Table 8.2 is displayed alongside the findings of this investigation, to convey an initial agreement or disagreement between this study’s findings and the findings published in the key literature. Importantly, it is noted here that the study has considered what exactly constitutes a community in both Newquay and Penzance, which addresses Burr’s (1991, cited in Pearce et al. 1996) criticism of previous tourism studies that researchers do not consider such aspects. Therefore, the findings overcome a number of limitations previously highlighted within the literature (Section 2.2.6), by considering the definition and the formation of community groups, as well as the structure and boundaries of the community groups.
The findings stated in Table 8.2 highlight a number of similarities and disparities that can be found between the present study and the key academic material, as well as differentiation that exists between the two case study areas under investigation. For example, agreement was expressed by both groups of local residents in relation to determining the meaning and scale of a community, while differences were established in Newquay and Penzance in terms of understanding the principle of community studies, and community attachment. Surprisingly, there was no evidence of residents from Newquay and Penzance...
mutually expressing disagreement with the literature highlighted in Table 8.2. This consistency implies that although the parameters and the actual locations of this investigation differ to those posed within the academic material, the findings may actually be representative of the broader themes and issues faced by tourism communities, as they correspond to one another. These similarities and differences are now discussed in more detail, by determining the meaning of the community and evaluating the nature of community attachment and engagement in each case study area.

Based on the findings from previous research, a community in modern society can be formed through shared characteristics, other than place, as stated by Crow and Allan (1994) in their assessment of community life. The nature of these shared characteristics, were also established in the findings of this investigation. From the analysis of the primary data, it is evident that on the surface, community relationships in Newquay and Penzance were more likely to be structured through social groups, rather than place characteristics. However, when communities were contrasted with one another, it was found that Newquay residents placed emphasis on the friendship groups which formed, while Penzance residents gave more prominence to work-related groupings.

This slight difference bears a wider implication upon community attachment, as Beggs et al. (1996) state that friendship networks affect the strength of attachment felt within a community. This knowledge underpins a series of other subtle differences that are noted in this chapter. For example, the findings suggest that, in Penzance, work-related communities are formed and not so much friendship networks, which imply that the strength of attachment in the
community is weaker than that found in Newquay. This vulnerability signifies that community members may be more moveable than others, and suggests why a resident expressed an intention to leave the coastal town, as the conditions failed to satisfy their immediate needs (Section 7.2.2). Therefore, the residents in Penzance shared some similar characteristics to mass society, as they expressed certain qualities which resembled Kasarda and Janowitz (1974) sample of Great Britain. Furthermore, Kasarda and Janowitz (1974:338) suggested that ‘community sentiments are compatible with a desire to avoid the negative features of local community life’ which were also noted in the primary data collected from Penzance (Section 7.3.2). Consequently, it can be alleged that the reaction of Penzance residents is linked to issues of employment, as the community members who were interviewed were related through employment and not necessarily authentic friendship ties. This distinction separates out the two case study areas, as the type of networks and communities which have surfaced are underpinned by these differences, in terms of the level of understanding and interpretation of community structure, expressed in each destination. However, this distinction does not imply that similar characteristics were not presented in Newquay and Penzance. Instead it reveals an explanation as to why subtle differences exist in their comparison. For instance, communities of practice have formed in both destinations, but the scale and nature of these communities vary.

Communities of practice do exist in both Newquay and Penzance, and within each destination, there are a range of sporting communities and business orientated groupings that bring individuals together; who share an interest, or profession. However, distinct differences in opinions have transpired from the
primary data, resulting in Newquay residents adapting a more homogenous view towards their community and tourism development, while Penzance residents formed heterogeneous views about their community.

More specifically, the resort-based community of Newquay displayed a sense of belonging and attachment to their community, similar to that established by McCool and Martin (1994) in a study carried out in Montana; a large, rural state with a small population. The authors there found that residents living in a community with high levels of tourism development had a strong sense of community attachment; this was also true of Newquay residents. However, McCool and Martin (1994) found that those residents living in these communities had a short length of residency, which was not the case in this study (see Section 7.2.2). Rather, Newquay residents had a longer length of residency in the town. Therefore, it is believed that the sense of belonging and the level of attachment were formed through common goals and the active, positive involvement of people and organisations within the destination, as opposed to the newness of residents to the community. Reflective of this active involvement, the residents in Newquay identify a range of communities that exist in the resort. These ranged from grouping of individuals who regularly participated in interest centred activities, to those who interacted infrequently in destination specific activities as illustrated in Figure 8.1.
Figure 8.1 highlights the assortment of communities of practice that exist in Newquay. These findings sit in agreement with the statement made by Richards and Hall (2000:302), that a community equates to ‘a set of common social characteristics and goals held by a population residing in a local area’. However unlike Richard and Hall’s (2000) depiction of sustainable tourism communities, the residents interviewed in Newquay illustrated a wider reaching interpretation of their community. It was established from the findings that community members do not necessarily need to reside within Newquay to formally be a part of a community. For example, one respondent who lived in Truro, but worked in Newquay, was still considered to be a part of the formal business community. Accordingly, some reservations are made about this tentative agreement with Richard and Hall (2000), as the business community
established in Newquay does not define their community through the location of inhabitants. Rather, they depict the business community through participation and business networks. This interpretation means that individuals on the fringe of the community can become a core member, and effectively integrate into the community despite their geographical location. That is, as long as the individual is not viewed as being part of a transient population that are un-representational of the area.

Discreet differences were also apparent in the Penzance data. Respondents in the coastal town were all inhabitants. However, they did not necessarily hold common social characteristics, as they failed to articulate commonality, and instead they expressed individual association within the town. Nevertheless, the communities identified in Penzance were similar to those already identified in Newquay, as shown in Figure 8.2. However, the range of these communities was limited and they did not reflect the same nature and scale of those established in Newquay. This restriction is partly due to Penzance residents, as aforementioned, being reliant on employment-related networks, which implies that they socialise with work colleagues. Hence the limited range of personal interest communities illustrated in Figure 8.2. This finding is dissimilar to Newquay, as they were deemed more likely to socialise with friends, due to the authentic friendship ties which were articulated.
The limited scale and range of communities that were highlighted in Penzance has transpired from residents having mixed goals, and expressing elements of social change in Penzance. This combination resulted in fewer communities of practice being formed. Social change was also emphasised through the formation of a sub-group, orientated around business networks. These groups created different dimensions of socialisation within the town, as the members of the sub-group are seen to respond differently to social change (Section 7.5), and it is for these reasons, that further disparities are anticipated via the authenticity and legitimacy of their community.

One significant difference did surface in relation to the authenticity of community relationships. In Penzance, as an outcome of communities not being formed
through genuine friendship ties, there was ambiguity surrounding the legitimacy of its networks and communities (Section 7.5). This uncertainty was characterised by mistrust, which manifested and resulted in a suspicious gaze forming between community members (Section 7.5). Therefore, it is suggested that, in this coastal town, a community can imply a false cohesion of local views, as residents may act individually in their groups. This issue of legitimacy was also established in the literature by Prentice (1993), who questioned the notions of a single community of interest underpinning a community-driven tourism initiative in the UK. Although a single community was not all that was found in the study of Penzance, there are some comparisons which can be made between these findings and the findings presented by Prentice (1993). For example, both community studies developed a heterogeneous view of what was deemed acceptable to the community, and the community's both challenge resident interests, in terms of their authentic groupings. However, Newquay resident views were found to be more homogenous on key tourism impacts, which have the potential to affect their livelihood.

Such distinctions set apart the two destinations under investigation, as from the primary data, it is evident that the coastal-based community signified their attachment in line with the discussions of Williams, Patterson, Roggenbuck and Watson (1992, cited in Mason and Cheyne 2000), whereby attachment was less about friendship networks, and more about place dependency. This place dependency reflected the limited accountability of an individual to a destination, as well as the increased mobility and withdrawal of respondents from the community. This retreat gives reason again, for the mobile nature of the coastal-based community (Section 7.2.2), and differs to the findings established
in the resort-based community. In Newquay, friendship networks were recognised, and the level of place dependency was less evident. This distinction is important to acknowledge, as place dependency can affect the status of ‘outsiders’ to the resident population, as stated by Crow and Allan (1994).

The research also revealed that residents in Newquay were aware of the costs and benefits of tourism development. They had a strong level of attachment to their community, and they expressed verbal ownership and authority within the locality (Section 7.3). Even so, they were not always found to be homogenous in their views about tourism impacts, and they were not always community orientated. Instead, they could be classified as ‘Lovers’ and ‘Cynics’ in relation to the New Zealand based study of Williams and Lawson (2001). Williams and Lawson (2001:288) found that people who are ‘most cynical about tourism rate community issues more highly than others (and more importantly)...people who are most positive toward tourism rate community issues lowest’. Therefore, some similarities exist between the two studies, as when Newquay residents were confronted with more pressing issues (like image) pertaining to tourism, they became cynical, as the costs outweighed the benefits at this point, and, as a result, the broader community impacts were paramount. However, when confronted with issues of traffic congestion, litter and noise pollution, they were positive about tourism development, this positivity could possibly be explained by the fact that they had adapted to tolerate these impacts, and as a result expressed a low level of concern about these specific community impacts.
In terms of the Penzance residents, there were similarities to the whole range of resident types identified by Williams and Lawson (2001). They were comparable to ‘Taxpayers’ on issues of increased tourism levels, ‘Cynics’ on issues of town atmospherics, ‘Innocents’ in response to the portrayed image, and ‘Lovers’ in response to their attachment to the town. However they failed to conform to the consistency amongst resident perceptions as found within Williams and Lawson’s (2001) study. This inconsistency may partly be due to the low level of community cohesion that was felt amongst residents, as well as the ambivalent opinions of residents towards the value statements set out in Section 7.3.1. Consequently, it is not possible to draw direct comparisons from the community findings of Penzance with the case studies presented by Williams and Lawson (2001). Even so, a contrast between the two case studies is given in Table 8.3, for comparative purposes. Table 8.3 highlights the dissimilarities between the two areas, and shows the range of community responses given by the respondents in light of key issues and impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Newquay</th>
<th>Penzance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased tourism levels</td>
<td>Lovers</td>
<td>Taxpayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town atmospherics</td>
<td>Lovers</td>
<td>Cynics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrayed image</td>
<td>Cynics</td>
<td>Innocents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to the town</td>
<td>Lovers</td>
<td>Lovers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion of community cohesion allows for the level of engagement of local residents to their community to be addressed. Using the social exchange theory as a model of assessment, Andereck et al. (2005) found that in Arizona, the level of a resident’s engagement with their community affects resident
perception of community tourism impacts. Similar to Andereck et al.’s (2005) study, it was evident that Newquay residents were well informed about the many ways in which tourism could benefit their community. However, where Andereck et al. (2005) expressed concern about salient issues of traffic, crowding and congestion, the Newquay sample interviewed for this investigation, found such issues to be insignificant. Nevertheless, despite this finding in comparison with Andereck et al.’s (2005) study, there appears to be a positive association between Newquay residents support for tourism as an economic development tool, and their positive perceptions of tourism impacts on the community, which are consistent with the social exchange theory (discussed in more detail in Section 8.2). Furthermore, similarities exist in terms of Andereck et al.’s (2005) final conclusion, which contradicts Ap (1992).

Drawn from the social exchange theory, Ap (1992) states that those who perceive benefits from tourism also perceive lower levels of negative impacts from tourism. However, this exchange-process was not the case in Andereck et al.’s (2005) study, nor was it found to be consistent with the primary data collected by this investigation. Instead, these findings conformed with those lasting remarks of Andereck et al. (2005), that education and awareness to increase understanding are important, as they can create additional support and positivity towards tourism impacts and the community. As for the community in Penzance, there was marked agreement with these comparisons of Andereck et al. (2005) and the Newquay sample. However, the level of engagement differed as a result of the respondents articulation of their mobility, and the level of awareness and education they had of the tourism industry was inconsistent with one another. This difference was due to the standard deviation presented
in Section 7.3.1. Therefore, the outcomes from Penzance were not as comparable with Andereck et al.’s (2005) study, as those found in Newquay were.

Some of the disparities relating to community cohesion found between the two case studies of Newquay and Penzance may be explained through the development of perceptions, from person to person, over time. This understanding is related to the image formation of individuals, and may be explained through understanding the personal space domain of Goodey’s (1971) model, where judgements can be formed to shape a comparison to elements of everyday life. Two aspects which bear an influence upon this personal space are the workplace and friendship interactions. Therefore, due to the uneven interaction of each group of residents interviewed in Newquay and Penzance, it is not surprising that different judgements have been formed about community issues. On balance, the nature and strength of community attachment are found to be affected by perception and human relations within each location. This finding is similar to the geographical literature and findings stated independently by Goodey (1971). Furthermore, personal experience can be distorted by stereotypes, as suggested by Murphy (1985). This outcome was representational of the residents in Penzance, as they held perceptions constructed through cultural stereotypes and media representations (Section 7.2.2). This stereotypical outlook resulted in a higher level of preconceived notions being found in Penzance over the Newquay sample. However, this gaze in Penzance was not directed towards tourists, instead, residents engaged in a high level of scepticism towards fellow residents, as their gaze was found to represent their mental perception of others, as stated by Maoz (2006).
These distinctions help to establish an understanding of why resident’s attitudes differ in relation to specific tourism impacts, and bear influence upon the more generalised community perceptions of tourism impacts. Taken as a whole, these suggestions relate back to an underlying element of economic reliance on tourism in each destination, depicted by the occupational groupings of each individual. As within both case study areas, economic dependency was referred to in terms of the nature of an individual’s contact and employment opportunities as defined by Krippendorf (1987). The nature of employment therefore emphasises the networks which surfaced, the nature of resident’s engagement, and the range of encounters that occurred, not only within the community, but also with the tourism industry as a whole. As a result, different connotations of the scale and cohesion of a group of individuals exist between Newquay and Penzance residents. However, what is also evident is that visitors can create social relationships which differ from the affiliations made among the local population. Therefore, the encounters and opinions of local residents shall now be considered in more detail through the social exchange theory and through social representations.

8.2 Resident Behaviour, Attitude and Perception

From the review of literature, it was evident that tourism has been regarded as playing a ‘major role in bringing about social change’ (Perez and Nadal 2005:925), and that it has the potential to affect the socio-cultural characteristics of residents’ habits, daily routines, social lives, beliefs and values. Therefore, in this investigation, it was important to address the ‘psychological tensions’
experienced by residents, which result from their encounter with tourism, as described by Andereck et al. (2005). These elements of anxiety and pressure were addressed via aspects of the social exchange theory and the understanding of social representations, as it was deemed possible to uncover the full range of resident attitudes and perceptions from such theories. The theories expose a number of intrinsic qualities found within a community, which bear influence over resident perceptions, as outlined in the conceptual framework (Chapter 3). As a result, the key literature which was considered throughout this thesis, in relation to resident behaviour, attitude and perception, can be viewed in Table 8.4, which is highlighted alongside the main findings of this investigation, to convey an initial agreement or disagreement between the study findings and the published literature. The table therefore represents the breadth of published academic research, and includes the concepts of social exchange and social representations, alongside the level of commonality expressed by the local populations. Therefore, the literature within the table helps to explain the ways in which tourism can have an effect upon how residents respond to the challenges of tourism.
Residents evaluate tourism in terms of a social exchange (Ap 1992). The initial high expectation for tourism development diminishes overtime (Johnson et al. 1994). Residents become more critical and less enthusiastic over time (Lawson et al. 1998). Support for tourism diminishes as local control diminishes (Lawson et al. 1998). Attitudes are found to be representative of a series of trade-offs between the benefits and costs of tourism development (Milman and Pizam 1988). The impacts of tourism are viewed through social representations (Zhang et al. 2006). Commonality spreads the feeling of shared understanding between individuals (Pearce et al. 1996). Perceptions vary on a continuous scale between negative and positive (Milman and Pizam 1988). Positive perceptions are held by residents who are financially dependent on tourism for their livelihood (King et al. 1993; Williams and Lawson 2001). Positive perceptions are held by residents who are more knowledgeable (Andereck et al. 2005). Mixed perceptions can be explained by an adoption of coping mechanisms to avoid confrontation with outsiders (Perdue et al. 1987). Responses to tourism impacts include embracement, tolerance, adjustment and withdrawal (Ap and Crompton 1993).

Table 8.4: Resident behaviour, attitude and perception findings and key literature
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The findings stated in Table 8.4 highlight a number of similarities and disparities that can be found between the present study and the key published research, as well as differentiation that exist between the case study areas under investigation. For example, agreement was expressed over the evaluation of social exchange and social representations, while differences were established in the outcomes of such theories through perception and expectation. Surprisingly, again, there was no evidence of both case studies in this investigation expressing disagreement with other studies that contribute to the key literature highlighted in Table 8.4. Therefore, the findings may again be representative of the broader literature and issues faced by residents’ independent behaviour, attitudes and opinions. To conclude, if this stability is the case, the discussion will now examine the similarities and differences in more detail, by determining the outcomes of the social exchange process and the impact of social representations.

8.2.1 Social Exchange

Academic research, such as Pizam (1978) and Williams and Lawson (1998), suggest that tourism can have a number of serious effects upon social and psychological aspects of the resident population and can have a bearing upon their quality of life. Subsequently, according to Ross’s (1992:14) study of residents in Cairns, it is the ‘individual’s subjective evaluation of a range of elements’ which has also been considered by this investigation. These elements include aspects of the social exchange process, which recognises the exchange of goods, either through physical, real, artefacts or symbolic operations found within the tourism industry. The theory itself ‘suggests that
residents evaluate tourism as either positive or negative in terms of the expected benefits or costs deriving from the services they supply’ (Waitt 2003:195).

From the findings of this investigation, it is evident that the social exchange experienced by residents incorporates encounters with both fellow inhabitants as well as the transient, tourist population. These findings include a number of basic concepts of exchange, including personal needs and satisfaction, the exchange relationship, the consequences of exchange, and the outcome of no exchange or future exchange. The exchange is established through the nature of residents evaluation of the process, as formulated by Ap’s (1992) investigation into resident perception. More specifically, the findings demonstrate that Newquay residents are able to effectively attribute the benefits and costs of tourism development through expressing power, payoffs and trade-offs as a result of their social exchange with others (Table 7.9). These are termed to reflect the findings of Peck and Lepie’s (1989) study of tourism development in three North Carolina coastal towns, where ‘power’ depicted issues of ownership and input, ‘payoffs’ related to the hosts’ benefits from tourism, and ‘trade-offs’ resembled the social impacts which change the nature of the community.

These descriptions were evident in both communities of Newquay and Penzance. Interestingly here, it was possible to segment the residents who held these opinions through their occupational group (Section 7.1). This segmentation allowed for the opinions to represent the outcomes of the exchange transaction, rather than the community groupings. Furthermore,
when considering the elements of power and payoff, residents were comparable across the case study areas, as well as being compared within each destination. However, differences did exist between the case studies when the issues of trade-offs were being established (Table 7.9). Therefore, the social impacts that change the nature of the community are considered to be destination specific, rather than being established through the level of economic dependency.

The findings also established that attitudes are related to the level of support for development, despite the nature of the relationship between local residents being different in each community. This outcome is similar to the findings put forward by Andereck and Vogt’s (2000) study of community groups in Arizona, as the residents in Newquay and Penzance, who were aware of the potential negative impacts of tourism, were still supportive of development, which was partly down to their overall general agreement with tourism development as a community strategy. However, once more, these findings were destination specific, as the extent of this agreement reflected the level of awareness and understanding established by each local resident. For example, the resort-based community expressed a range of opinions representative of Milman and Pizam’s (1988) continuous scale of feelings, between negative and positive, which were derived through the personal attitudes and perceptions of each resident (Section 7.3.2). Whilst this range of perception was evidenced, the coastal-based community became more critical and less enthusiastic over time, towards tourism development (Section 7.3.2). This difference represented similar findings to Lawson et al.’s (1998) comparative study of resident
perceptions in New Zealand, as differences were identified with every type of social impact.

Further to these destination specific examples, residents in Newquay expressed a diminished expectation, overtime, of personal gain from the tourism industry (Section 7.3). These findings are representative of Johnson et al.’s (1994) study, which explored the economic transition of a rural community into tourism, which could, in part, be explained by issues of control, as put forward again by Lawson et al. (1998). Lawson et al. (1998) stated that residents support for tourism diminishes as the level of their local control lessens, a factor expressed in the Newquay sample. Newquay residents associated positivity with a high degree of influence and control over tourism, and they believed they were more likely to gain a reward or an advantage from the situation. However this positivity was not the case in the coastal-based community.

The coastal-based community instead expressed a lacklustre and ambivalent approach towards tourism development (Section 7.3.1). This indecision was due to the residents’ desire for immediate gratification, and them seeking equal benefits in return for the services they supplied. This understanding transpired through the lack of community cohesion and the failure of residents to develop any strength in their opinion towards community issues (Section 7.3.1). The coastal-based community therefore placed emphasis on the tangible economic exchange process. They asserted their position within the community by expressing personal motivation, and, at the same time, they showed no desire to control or have influence over tourism development (Section 7.3.2). Extraordinarily, these findings still support the social exchange theory, as put
forward by Ap (1992), as the negativity expressed by these residents was connected to the lower levels of power in the stated relationship (Section 7.5). Furthermore, these residents took personal ownership of their own input, by disregarding the wider implications of tourism development, which consequently placed an emphasis on the nature and value of exchange.

Reflective of the occupational groupings of the residents interviewed for this investigation, it is evident that Newquay residents, exhibit the ‘capacity to absorb tourists’ (Allen *et al.* 1988:14). Residents were able to absorb, in the sense that they adapted their behaviour to accommodate the changes that are associated with the tourism season (Section 7.4.2). One change saw residents curtailing certain activities during the tourist season, by altering their leisure activities to cater for the increase in participants. This behaviour is similar to that stated by Perdue *et al.*’s (1987) study of five tourism dependent Colorado communities, whereby a resident’s inability to participate in their normal routines witnessed a significant decrease in their support for the industry. However, this decreased support for tourism was not found in Newquay.

Taken as a whole, the social exchange theory is only one aspect of a larger question, there is also the need to understand the ‘individual’s subjective evaluation of a range of elements’ as put forward by Ross (1992:14). This understanding is significant as the willingness of residents to comply with the functions of the tourism industry is found to be directly related to the degree of contact and the stage of development of tourism (Krippendorf 1987; Allen *et al.* 1988; Lawson *et al.* 1998). Therefore, it is important to also consider social representation in more detail, as they deal with values and beliefs, and the
concept that perception is about more than just seeing, it is about hearing, touching, tasting and smelling the entirety of what is out there (Goodey 1971).

8.2.2 Social Representations

According to Pearce et al. (1996:39), social relationships are ‘valuable for explaining social conflict or reactions to salient issues’. For instance, commonality can spread the feeling of shared understanding between residents. So much so, that commonality can be used to explain conflict when individuals are unable to agree, as found by Williams and Lawson (2001).

Commonality, however, was not evident in both case study locations, only in Newquay. This difference was demonstrated by the structure of explicit images, formed through avenues of socialisation, which modified individual and group representations of the resort (Section 7.3.1). Newquay residents also expressed direct control over decision-making. Residents showed a desire to control and increase their personal level of influence over tourism development, in response to their existing situation, whereby they felt they have insufficient opportunities. This scenario was not apparent in the Penzance community, which in part can be explained by issues of attachment and consumption, economic reliance and traditions, as explored by Williams and Lawson (2000) and presented in Section 7.3.2.

Social representations were further explained by the classification of residents’ attitude and behaviour towards tourism. Using Carmichael’s (2000) theory, both communities can be seen to exhibit passive and active behaviour in response to their positive and negative views of tourism. However, there were significant
differences between the two types of community in terms of their personal experience, and other socio-demographic factors. This difference is explained through the variations of resident attitudes and behaviours that were articulated in this investigation, and the type of tourism residents encountered. These differences were, however, found to be similar to that discussed by Carmichael (2000), whose investigation focused upon the linkages between resident perception and the impacts of tourism via specific types of resident behaviour. For instance, it was found that in this investigation, like in Carmichael's (1993) study, that many residents had strong opinions about tourism development, but they failed to act upon them. Such strong opinions were more evident in Newquay, over Penzance. However, both communities failed, to some extent, to act upon their disagreements with the industry. This failure is despite some of the Newquay residents being active in their behaviour, as shown through the crime prevention methods adopted in Section 7.4.3.4.

These social representations were also explained by the behaviours associated with tourism development, as suggested by Ap and Crompton (1980, cited in Carmichael 2000). The resort-based community showed a level of acceptance, tolerance and adjustment to tourism in Newquay (Section 7.4.1), whereas the coastal-based community showed symptoms of withdrawal. For Penzance, this withdrawal was embedded through elements of ambivalence, resilience, passive negativity and resentment towards the industry. Despite these differences, the strength of action for both communities was represented by the situational factors that faced residents, and resembled the formation of each attitude within the community, as expressed by Ajzen and Fishbein (1992, cited in Pearce et al. 1996:48) in their study of social behaviour. The strength of
action was represented by the indirect links formed between individual and

group representations and actions, as illustrated by Von Cranach’s (1992, cited

in Pearce et al. 1996:48) model that links individual and social representations

and actions together (Figure 2.6). Von Cranach’s (1993) model highlights the

possibility for sub-cultures and groups, that resemble the collective opinion and

social nature of the individuals within that area, to be influential over individual

opinion. This sway was evident in the Newquay case study, as the processes

of socialisation and social change witnessed the formation of sub-groups and

sub-cultures in the form of communities of practice. Yet, it may be explained by

the lack of socialisation, and the community’s inability to adapt to change, that

the coastal community saw fewer formations of sub-group.

In response to these formations, the attitudes of residents within each

community were not entirely supported by previous academic research. The

Newquay community exhibited a generally positive outlook towards tourism
development. This positivity conformed with the separate findings of King et al.

(2001) and Williams and Lawson (1990), as these opinions here were held by

residents who were financially dependent on tourism for their livelihood.

Furthermore, the resident population in Newquay were knowledgeable about

the tourism industry, as previously mentioned, so positivity transpired. However,

dissimilarities are also evident, as the findings here oppose the suggestions of

Perdue et al. (1993), as residents were still positive, despite respondents living

close to the town centre, and that they had to alter their recreational activity to

cater for the rise in participation within the tourist season.
In Penzance, the community exhibited an unclear outlook upon tourism. This uncertainty was despite residents being dependent on tourism for their livelihood, which should imply, according to King et al.’s (2001) and Williams and Lawson’s (Ross 1992:14) investigations, that positivity towards the industry exists. However that was not the case. This dissimilarity is partly explained by residents being nonspecific about tourism impacts, which resulted in certain elements such as town atmospherics and destination image not being clarified within the study (Table 7.12). This hesitation was the outcome of residents not expressing a full range of coping mechanisms (Section 7.4.2) as a response to tourism impacts. Nevertheless, they still showed signs of avoidance and acceptance to represent their likes and dislikes, which are explained somewhat by the mutual gaze. The mutual gaze and the local gaze were also evident, in terms of Maoz (2006) explanations. Maoz (2006) states that the gaze can result in avoidance and negativity towards tourism development, which was evident in Penzance, but does not explain the acceptance felt within the community. For that reason, contradictory elements were apparent within and between the two case study locations.

These distinctions, however, help to establish an understanding of why residents’ attitudes differ in light of the social exchange process and social representations. Evidently, residents play a crucial role in the tourism exchange. However, certain elements remain destination specific, as some residents were seen to be more willing partners than others, which was more obvious in Newquay over those questioned in Penzance. In terms of the overall aims and objectives of this investigation, it is now important to focus on the relationships that exist between tourism and crime. Deviancy can disrupt community life.
Since visitors create social relationships which differ from the affiliations made among the local population, deviancy may bear an influence upon community perceptions and the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions.

8.3 Tourism and Crime

From the review of literature, it is evident that crime is considered an externality of the tourism industry (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Jud 1975; Haralambopoulous and Pizam 1996), bringing a range of welcome and unwelcome changes to a location (Brunt and Hambly 1999). These changes include elements of disruption to community life in the form of ‘noise, pollution, litter, vandalism and crime’ (Brunt and Hambly 1999:26), and are dependent on internal and external factors affecting the tourist destination and the nature of tourism activity taking place. Therefore, it was important to establish residents’ perception of tourism-related crime, and to assess the impacts of crime upon community relationships in this investigation. The elements of deviancy and criminal behaviour were addressed via aspects associated with seasonality, the identification of an offender, place characteristics and crime prevention, as it allowed the investigation to determine the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime. Therefore, this section aims to address connections with the key literature relating to the field of tourism and crime, as displayed in Table 8.5. For that reason, the literature is highlighted alongside the main findings of this investigation, to convey an initial agreement or disagreement between the study’s findings and other published research findings.
The literature presented in Table 8.5 represents the breadth of academic research in the field of tourism and crime, and aims to synthesise the key findings. Tourism and crime is not clear-cut, it is instead characterised by a range of relationships and proposed theories.
Tourism growth is directly related to an increasing crime rate (Walmsley et al. 1983). Disagree

Property damage and the possession of drugs are the most predominant forms of crime (McPheters and Stronge 1974; Jud 1975). Disagree Agree

The relationship between tourism and crime is influenced by seasonal factors (McPheters and Stronge 1974). Agree Agree

Seasonality is associated with an increased opportunity for crime to occur (Walmsley et al. 1983). Agree Disagree

The peaks and troughs of criminal activity coincided with the holiday season (Chesney-Lind and Lind 1986). Agree Disagree

An increase in the number of tourists can lead to general increases in crime (Pizam 1999). Agree Disagree

Tourists are easy prey/lucrative targets (Brunt et al. 2000). Disagree Disagree

Tourists are the aggressors and not solely the victims of crime (Pizam 1982). Agree Disagree

Protecting tourists is paramount to the survival of the tourism industry (Eck and Weisburd 1995). Agree Disagree

Place features and facilities can increase or decrease crime (Felson and Clarke 1998). Disagree Disagree

Crime activity is not evenly distributed (Prideaux 1996). Agree Agree

Locations that offer a hedonistic lifestyle are found to have high crime rates (Brunt and Hambly 1999). Disagree

The lack of crime control strategies are largely to blame for acts of deviancy (Brunt and Hambly 1999). Agree Agree
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From Table 8.5, it is evident that a series of similarities and differences are apparent between the data. These distinctions exist when the two case study areas under investigation are compared to one another, and when compared to other academic material. For example, agreement was expressed through seasonal trends in crime data, while differences were established with more specific explanations of crime, in terms of seasonality and crime type (Section 7.4.1). What is interesting here, in comparison to previous sections, is that there are incidents where both the case study data, from Newquay and Penzance, disagree with the academic material. Therefore, caution is required when considering these topic areas, as the data presented here, may not be representative of the broader literature relating to tourism and crime. Furthermore, some of this disagreement relates to the more specific crime literature, as opposed to the tourism studies that identify criminal activity, so further caution is required. As a result, the discussion will now examine the similarities and differences in more detail, beginning with determining the seasonal influences of tourism-related crime.

### 8.3.1 Seasonal Influences

In terms of tourism-related crime, the Newquay residents associated seasonality with an increased opportunity for crime to occur, conforming to McPheters and Stronge’s (1983) findings from an assessment of crime in Miami. Newquay residents perceived the seasonal fluctuations of crime in line with the peak and troughs of the tourism season, as establish by both Walmsley et al. (1982) in selected tourism resorts in Australia, and Mathieson and Wall (1982) in a more general assessment of tourism impacts. These perceptions were
somewhat confirmed by the seasonal trends noted in the officially recorded crime data, as displayed in Chapter 6 (Section 6.3). The crime trends therefore followed with the climate and social customs described by Frechtling (1986), which include summer/winter vacations and school holidays. Interestingly, the resort residents felt that a direct factor in the high recorded crime rates was explained through the increase in visitor numbers and the rise in population density (Section 7.4.1). However, this rise was unsubstantiated in the crime data, which is a similar issue that was faced by Chesney-Lind and Lind (1986) in their study of victimisation data from two of Hawai’i’s four counties. Chesney-Lind and Lind (1986) found that inconclusive data was unable to determine if an increase in tourism related to the general increase in crime throughout the community. However, the authors stated that logically, a residual effect is possible, which was also believed to be possible in Newquay, via resident opinions and the seasonal trends in crime data.

Further to these initial distinctions, the Newquay residents verbally emphasised the type of tourist present in the destination, some of the specific place distinctions, and the type of offender who they believed was present in the resort, all of which are relevant to the field of tourism-related crime. This awareness of the consequences of tourism produced a complex gaze in Newquay, a termed coined from Maoz (2006) as being a local gaze, whereby locals and tourists exist, and locals determine what they expect of tourists. Maoz (2006) states that this local gaze then feeds the tourist gaze, which results in the formation of a mutual gaze, whereby locals observe tourists, but are also aware of being gazed upon. This mutual gaze was established in Newquay, by residents who interacted with tourists, and by individuals who
asserted power, to express their agreement or disagreement with tourist behaviour. This depiction of power is relevant to the gaze, and was established as being so by Cheong and Miller (2000) in their study of the power relationships found in tourism. Cheong and Miller (2000) state that power can be expressed through seeing, therefore locals can establish power, by becoming visual in the tourist experience, and by illustrating their preferred behaviour, to tourists. This visibility allows, in the case of Newquay, for locals to normalise the behaviour of tourists by projecting their own aspirations and judgements onto tourists, and hoping that this will then lead to tourists understanding exactly what is deemed as being socially tolerable behaviour and what is not. This standing was evidenced in Section 7.4.2, as residents spoke of their action and change in behaviour to show others what the issues and impacts are in the town, and to be visible to the tourist population.

Even so, there was evidence articulated by Newquay residents to suggest that the mutual gaze was not apparent in its totality, as there was little confirmation of avoidance or remoteness. However, there were some negative attitudes expressed. Therefore, the mutual gaze, as defined by Maoz (2006) was over shadowed by the local gaze, which may be easily explained by the focus of this investigation into resident perceptions. As a consequence of this focus, and the views which were articulated, the study does not suggest that Newquay residents and tourists simultaneously exercise power. Instead, from the residents' perception, the power and ownership in the resort remains with the community.
The seasonal trends in crime data in Penzance were not, however, as easily attributed to the tourism industry, as the peaks and troughs of criminal activity did not coincide with the holiday season (Graph 6.6). Instead, local residents in Penzance perceived the most predominant offender as being other local residents. Consequently, the respondents were unable to attribute the consequences of deviant behaviour to anyone other than the local population. This communication can somewhat be explained through the weaker social ties exhibited by the resident population, in terms of their commitment and involvement with their local community, as well as their stated power relationship in the town.

Unlike the before mentioned resort, the coastal community placed emphasis on gazing at other local residents, by viewing and creating impressions of fellow inhabitants (Section 7.4.3.1). This focus created a suspicious gaze, as termed by Jordon and Aitchison (2008) in their analysis of links between power and surveillance. Although Jordon and Aitchison (2008) study is based upon the sexualisation of the gaze, there are elements which can be discussed in the context of this investigation. For example, Jordon and Aitchison (2008) state that stereotypes can mediate and influence a gaze, and that social freedom has exposed society to broader forms of surveillance as people have become more mobile. These are all elements which were also found in this study of Penzance, the suspicious gaze was distorted through group stereotypes (Section 7.3), and Penzance residents were deemed as being a more mobile society (Section 7.2.2). This depiction was somewhat due to the residents increasing concerns with safety, by turning their suspicious gaze to the actions of specific individuals. All of which may be attributed to the changing crime
trends which lay beyond the explanation of seasonality (Graph 6.6), as the
destination suffered sporadic increases and decreases in crime rates, at
dissimilar points in the annual cycle. This instability is despite the location
welcoming a seasonal influx of tourists.

As an outcome of these suggestions, Newquay residents claimed that the
relationships which exists in the resort, between tourism and crime, were
representational of Ryan’s (1993) type 2 relationship. Thus, Newquay is seen
by its residents as a venue used by criminals caused by the nature of the
location. However they did not articulate the victims as specifically being
tourists or residents, and crime was not deemed as being an inherent part of the
touristic values (Section 7.4.3.1). Therefore, inconsistencies are apparent
between this investigation and the location types established by Ryan (1993).
Instead offenders were described as being incidental and situational, if
segmented by the deviant tourist typology offered by Brunt and Brophy (2004).
Therefore, Newquay residents believed that offenders only became aware of
criminal opportunities by undertaking routine activities. Such routine activities
are described by Eck and Weisburd (1995), and conclude that it is while an
offender is conducting their normal, lawful, activities that they become aware of
opportunities to commit crime.

In opposition to these statements, Penzance residents suggested that the
relationships between tourism and crime are representational of a type 1
location in Ryan’s (1993) classification. Respondents therefore suggested that
the level of crime was independent of the nature of the tourist destination, and
tourists were only accidental victims of opportunistic crimes in Penzance
(Section 7.4.3.1). This classification was apparent as locals were found to be more cautious, experienced and knowledgeable about avoiding victimisation within their home environment (Table 7.22) and they did not contribute criminal activity to the fact that they lived in a tourist destination.

Further to these two specific links between the data and Ryan’s (1993) classification of the relationship between crime and tourism, the other three types were not evident in either the resort or the coastal town. Therefore, there were no cases articulated in either location that criminals are attracted to the area because tourists are easy prey, that criminal activity had become organised, or that particular groups were committing violent acts against tourists and tourist facilities. Due to this level of consistency underpinning the nature of each tourist location in relation to the levels of crime, it is important to consider in more detail, the perceived offenders and victims of crime. This evidence is important, as not only is the relationship between tourism and crime influenced by seasonal factors, the characteristics of a person can exhibit the indulgence and intent of individuals, as both a victim and an offender.

**8.3.2 Offenders and Victims of Crime**

Data restrictions prevent the true identification of an offender to be established in a tourist destination. Nevertheless, residents’ perception of who they perceive the offender and victim of criminal behaviour to be are established in this investigation. These findings have resulted in differing opinions emerging from the two case study areas, as to who the predominant offender may be. Furthermore, it has considered how the crime experience of tourists and non-
tourists may differ, to reflect upon Harper’s (2001) research note that focused on comparing victimisation rates in five international locations.

The study’s findings here suggest that there is a distinct difference in crime experience for the local residents and tourists, who live and vacate in Newquay or Penzance. Their experience of crime reflects the level of crime and the gaze of the resident group in each location. In Penzance, it was perceived that local residents were the victim of crime, and therefore, followed the example in Harper’s (2001) study of Miami. Remarkably though, in Newquay, it was explicitly expressed that as the crime rate increased for residents, it also tended to be higher for tourists. Therefore, no single group of individuals were deemed as being the predominant victim of crime. Instead it was evenly distributed. Some of these differences may be explained by the nature and direction of the gaze expressed within each location. After all, residents in Penzance perceived locals being both the victim and aggressor of crime. Furthermore, the attributes of crime pattern theory, which combines rational choice with routine activity theory, as considered by Eck and Weisburd (1995) were represented in Penzance. These findings are controversial, as Ryan (1993) suggested that type 1 locations, which Penzance has already been established as being, are locations where the level of tourism is generally unimportant, and that is not the case in Penzance (Section 5.1.2). Conversely, Penzance exhibits a high level of economic dependency on the tourist season (Section 5.1.2). Therefore Ryan’s (1993) patterns are not reflective of the type of tourism and the nature of tourist behaviour found within Penzance. Instead, the type 1 classification here represents Penzance’s status as a disadvantaged part of the county.
In Newquay, however, residents perceived tourists as being the predominant offender. This observation was articulated in terms of them believing tourists advocated deviant behaviour through violent or drunken activities in the resort. However, tourists were also alleged in more serious crimes (Section 7.3.4.1), and some tourists were described as being those who break the unwritten rules (Brunt et al. 2000). This accusation is similar to that highlighted by Brunt et al. (2000) in their study of British holidaymakers, whereby deviant tourists do not represent the behaviour of most tourists, but nevertheless, they still exist. Crime was therefore seen as being a somewhat accepted feature of the tourism industry in Newquay, as the resort promoted ‘fun’ events where individuals can indulge in hedonistic activities, as found by Barton and James (2003) in their study of Newquay.

This specific understanding of crime epitomises the on-going growth of the night-time economy in Newquay and the adverse impact it has upon other aspects of the resorts attractiveness, as with such a reputation the resort discourages the traditional family holidaymakers, as established in Section 5.1.1. Interestingly through, there is little evidence that supports the findings of Barton and James (2003), who investigated issues of contested space in the resort. Barton and James (2003:269) found that there were aspects of profit-seeking and ‘positive risk-taking behaviour that generate negative externalities for a local resident group that needs some form of public police intervention’, a finding that was not substantiated in this investigation.

Further to these findings, the identification of individuals who may commit crime is required to understand the implications of place upon crime. This connection
was stated by Felson and Clarke (1998), in that crime activity is not necessarily evenly distributed within a locality due to the uneven spatial and temporal distribution of people. The attention of this discussion will therefore now turn to identifying the characteristics of place, as they may shed light on why crime occurs in certain places, at certain times, rather than being evenly distributed throughout the destinations. After all, this connection may bear an influence over why these respondents perceive certain individuals as being the offender or victim of crime.

### 8.3.3 Characteristics of Place

To gauge the extent to which the characteristics of place may impact upon crime statistics, it is necessary, as outlined in the conceptual framework (Chapter 3), to consider both the features and facilities of a destination. In general terms, it has been established from secondary data sources (Section 6.2) that both Newquay and Penzance hold many similarities in terms of place characteristics, as the boundary limitations of each parish (Table 6.7) are comparable, via the fixed physical environment and the permanent resident population. Both communities also have associated features of the destination to clusters of crime (Section 7.4.3.2), and some areas of each destination are evidently more prone to criminal activity than others, as illustrated by the MRS (2004) audit of crime and disorder in Cornwall (Section 6.3.1).

From the findings of this investigation, it is evident that both communities associate features of their destination with clusters of crime. Interestingly, the specific features differ for each location. In Newquay, there is evidence to
support Prideaux’s (1996) depiction of an hedonistic resort, whereby the tourist image is glamorised and marketed to appeal to the tourists’ sense of adventure, which then offers an opportunity for self-indulgence. Consequently, Prideaux (1996) states that demand then provides further opportunities for the expansion of the night-entertainment industry and the drug sub-culture, which is one of the main features established by this investigation based in Newquay. To some extent, this classification can explain why the respondents in Newquay perceived a clustering of elements in specific areas of the resort. Residents were able to link the different types of facilities to an increase or decrease in crime, which were found within a quarter of a square mile from the epicentre of the town in terms of night life (Section 7.4.3.2). However, due to residents perceiving crime levels as a representation of the ratio of tourists to local residents, certain inconsistencies can be noted from Prideaux’s (1996) theory. After all, if crime rates are perceived in direct proportion to the concentration of people, as noted by Sherman et al. (1989) in the study of routine activities and the criminology of place, it can be said that there may be nothing particularly criminogenic about Newquay. Instead, what is apparent, from both the primary and secondary data, is that there is a distinct geographical pattern of criminal activity within the resort, known as hot spots (Schiebler et al. 1996).

In Penzance, there was evidence to support Prideaux’s (1996) depiction of a ‘family values’ location, based upon the type of tourists who visit the destination. However, unlike Newquay’s conformity to the model, the primary and secondary data did not suggest that Penzance received local tourism levels and low crime rates. Therefore, disparities do exist, whereby tourism growth is not directly related to an increasing crime rate. Furthermore, Prideaux’s (1996) tourism
crime cycle is deemed as being a less suitable tool for comparative purposes to
the study of Penzance, even though the nature of tourism activity represents the
classifications of the family values market. Fundamentally, this discovery
implies that if the level of tourism was the sole factor in this analysis, then
Penzance, as a destination which attracts high levels of tourism development
(Section 6.1), could be termed as being hedonistic. However, this classification
was unsupported by the findings, and purely remains as speculation in this
investigation.

Further to these findings, it was apparent from the secondary data that
Penzance suffered from distinct geographical patterns of criminal activity.
Therefore, the movement of individuals (locals and tourists) may indeed play a
crucial role in understanding crime place within both destinations, as it denotes
crime pattern theory which ‘combines rational choice and routine activity theory
to help explain the distribution of crime across places’ (Eck and Weisburd
1995:6). Adapted from the theory of Felson and Clarke (1998), Figure 8.3 is
offered, as a visual annotation of crime pattern theory. Figure 8.3 reflects the
findings of this investigation, found both in Newquay and Penzance.
The figure highlights the edges to each individual’s personal space, and illustrates the area where there is a higher probability for crime to occur. The figure takes into account the tourist locality, as well as the local resident’s personal space when referencing Goodey’s (1971) work. However, what must be noted is that crime is neither uniform nor static in each destination area. Instead, the growth of crime may be noted by the large influx of tourists to a destination, as found in Newquay, and issues of social deprivation, as found in Penzance. These differences can be emphasised in the edges of the figure, as according to Felson and Clarke (1998), locals commit crime close to their own neighbourhoods, while outsiders (tourists) find it safer to offend at the edges, before retreating to their own area. This interpretation would imply that tourism and crime are intrinsically linked. However, there is no empirical evidence to support these findings. Instead, there are some theoretical criminology concepts to imply that this interpretation is possible. Consequently, some
aspects of the tourism and crime relationship may not be representative of the characteristics of a person in a place. As an alternative, crime opportunities may present themselves through crime talk and place myths.

Crime talk is talk of an event, happening, or story that is divulged between individuals in familiar surroundings, and crime talk often occurs within media sources through intense and digressive conversation, slipping from topic to topic, yet having specific implications on a particular place, as found by Sparks et al. (2001). The product of these talks are metaphors of meanings and place myths, and it is the powerfulness of these metaphors and meanings, when being relayed through the representation of places and the creation of place myths, that can have an effect upon a destination. Interestingly, the level of crime talk established in each destination was dissimilar.

In Newquay, crime talk was seen to encourage a level of fluidity and open-mindedness to transpire from respondents in relation to accepting crime. However, this lenience was not always deemed acceptable by the local residents, as they understood that the image of their destination was an influential factor affecting the behaviour of tourists. Therefore, the power relationships were exhibited via cynicism towards the issues of media representation of the resort, especially in response to glamorised marketing which was undertaken to appeal to the tourists’ sense of adventure (Section 7.3.1). As a result, the power exhibited by residents was increased, with respect to their gaze. In contrast to these findings, the residents in Penzance formed closed perceptions of deviant activities. These closed perceptions inhibited the population from being fluid in their opinions, and was a
consequence of the strength of community ties in the town as well as the local
gaze established amongst the resident population.

In terms of tourism demand, the relationship between tourism and crime has
further been refined by Pizam (1999) who produced a comprehensive typology
to classify the attributes of crime and violence within a tourist destination. The
typology identified that the severity and frequency of crime can impact tourism
demand. In both destinations, the frequency and severity of acts of crime have
been identified (Section 6.3.1). The most severe act of crime which occurred in
both destinations was murder. More frequently, however, the acts of ‘sexual
offences’ and ‘other violent assaults’ occurred. Therefore, the severity of these
acts, in terms of bodily harm, can pose a larger impact upon the destination due
to the severity of the act and the media portrayal of crime. This understanding
conforms with the findings of Pizam (1999), as acts that cause loss of life will
have a more negative impact than those that cause only bodily harm. In the
same way, acts ‘that cause only loss of property might have only a minimal or
negligent impact’ (Pizam 1999:9). However, the frequency of any act of crime
can also have a detrimental impact upon image. For example, ‘acts that occur
in rapid succession or constantly will have a serious negative effect for as long
as they continue’ (Pizam 1999:9). Therefore, not only do both destinations in
this investigation have to address issues of loss of life, they also have to
address sexual and violent offences too.

In general, Newquay residents were well informed about the impacts of tourism
and crime upon their livelihood and the overall tourism industry. Respondents
understood that they would have difficulty in retaining their tourism industry if
the resort gained notoriety as a crime hot spot, and they knew that badly behaved tourists were the focus of media attention, and that crime can impose costs on their society. Therefore, a general consensus was met, with the description of the resort in Chapter 5. This realisation has witnessed the rise in crime prevention methods found within the resort, as stated in the findings (Section 7.4.3.4), and which shall now be explored. Importantly, it is noted that these characteristics were not established in the Penzance sample. Therefore, no inference can be established in the same way it has for the Newquay sample. This difference is also noted within the crime prevention initiatives discussed now.

8.3.4 Crime Prevention

From a review of literature, it is noted that crime prevention initiatives may minimise and even remove the opportunity for victimisation to occur (Brunt and Hambly 1999; Brunt et al. 2000), and it can minimise the negative consequences of crime when victimisation does occur (Brunt et al. 2000). Interestingly then, the two case studies adopt different initiatives. In Newquay, there is evidence that serious attempts at community crime prevention initiatives have reduced the opportunity for victimisation to occur, and special activities aimed at protecting tourists have been introduced (Section 7.4.3.4).

The aim articulated by the local residents was to reduce crime at the resort level, by employing a number of prevention measures, which fit neatly into Pizam’s (1999) list of prevention methods that are proven to reduce crime and violence at tourist destinations. These include the strict enforcement of existing laws, the
installation of security devices, and the education of tourists. As a result, the findings show that the community in Newquay, as well as the local enforcement organisations, have taken a multi-agency response to crime prevention. This multi-agency response was also found by Tribe (2005) in a comparative study between Newquay and Faliraki, developed in response to rampant tourists. Tribe (2005:11) found that partnerships were built and aimed at reducing ‘the impact and fear of crime and disorder, in order to improve the quality of life for people who live in, work in and visit the area’, which was also evidenced by this investigation. However, in Penzance, there was little recognition of any crime prevention measures in place and being adopted by the local community (Section 7.4.3.4), other than the increased security awareness adapted through the Neighbourhood Watch scheme. It was not therefore deemed necessary by the respondents for residents to do more than to take-up personal crime prevention initiatives. There were, as a result, no community wide schemes articulated by local residents other than the Neighbourhood Watch scheme.

These findings reflect the dissimilar opinions held by each community about who should be responsible for crime prevention methods. In Newquay, the responsibility for initiative and supervision was primarily assigned through guardianship, and the handling and managing of responsibilities, expected from the Police force (Section 7.4.3.4). This expectation was developed through deliberate discouragement and formal protection, similar to the methods outlined by Felson (1995). In Penzance, the emphasis was placed on the personal guardianship, handling and management, delivered by the self, in terms of inadvertent protection by personal acquaintances and personal responsibility, which were also characterised by Felson’s (1995) study. These
differences were the result of the spatial awareness of crime found in each
destination, as well as the acknowledged need for additional crime
discouragement in Newquay as a result on the high influx of strangers to the
destination (Section 7.4.3.4). This accumulation highlights the issues of
preferential treatment in Newquay, as it was stated that the tourism industry
received favouritism over other community issues (Section 7.4.3.4).

Taken as a whole, it can be said that both destinations represented distinct
groupings, as highlighted by Pizam (1982), whereby the offender is not the only
important factor in explaining crime. Those who interfere with offenders,
however inadvertently, also are found to play a central role in crime and crime
prevention. In Newquay, these intentions were apparent, as local residents
tried to protect tourists, by adopting crime prevention methods (Section 7.4.3.4)
to reduce the level of crime in their neighbourhood. This protection then
allowed the community to adapt and learn to cope with tourism-related crime, as
they built tolerance to the impacts of tourism, and residents avoided crime
hotspots. In Penzance, however, this safeguard was not apparent, as residents
only stated how they avoided confrontation, and were ignorant to the issues
faced by the town.

8.4 Chapter Summary

From discussing the primary and secondary data collection, in relation to the
academic literature, it is evident that community perceptions, reactions and
behaviour towards tourism are influenced by resident opinions. Further, the
community can influence resident perceptions, reactions and responses
towards tourism and tourism-related crime. At the same time, a resident can influence the collective opinion of the community, due to the term ‘community’ having more than one meaning in both destination areas.

However, the nature of the opinion is dependent on the characteristics of the tourism environment, as similarities were visible through social representations, but depth analysis revealed dissimilarities in the level of community relationships. Therefore, a varying degree of community influence and control were found between the British seaside resort and the coastal town. These differences were apparent in relation to a series of extrinsic and intrinsic elements associated with each destination, which were established through the synthesis and understandings of tourism and the community, the attitudes, perceptions and behaviour of local residents, and the relationship between tourism and crime. Consequently, these findings contribute knowledge and understanding to the explanations and theories of tourism impacts, community studies and the field of tourism-related crime. Furthermore, there are a number of theoretical and practical contributions which can be drawn from this investigation, which will be discussed in the next chapter. These conclusions will propose avenues for future research, and disseminate the findings of this study.
9.0 Conclusion

The primary purpose of this thesis was to explore the nature of community responses to tourism impacts, by assessing the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime. This aim was suggested in a bid to construct a more viable understanding of residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime, by combining the existing, disjointed models and theories relating to tourism communities and community responses to crime together, to clarify the social reality experienced by local residents. This clarification was proposed, as there were notable inconsistencies in some theories of tourism and crime, which ranged from contrasting views and perceptions, as questioned by de Albuquerque and McElroy (1999), to the inability of the literature to distinguish the true victims of crime.

The thesis has therefore considered the limitations of previous research, and has investigated how community perceptions, reactions and behaviour to the tourism industry can influence the relationship between tourism and crime within the context of two British seaside destinations. This focus has been developed by addressing both individual and community responses to tourism impacts, which has resulted in further knowledge and understanding being established about the explanations and theories of tourism communities and the impacts of crime. These conclusions are discussed in this chapter, especially in terms of the study’s key findings, the theoretical and practical contributions of the study, the future avenues for research, and the limitations that were encountered. This discussion will contribute to, and develop further knowledge and understanding of the explanations and theory of tourism and crime, and at the
same time it will demonstrate the study’s relevance to practitioners. This dissemination is suggested, as there is concern aired by Haley et al. (2005:664) that ‘tourism professionals might all too often be basing their planning decisions on generalisations and explanations grounded in underdeveloped areas of understanding’.

9.1 Key Findings

The study has resulted in a number of key conclusions, which have been drawn from the data. Through this analysis of residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts, the extent to which a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime, has been determined. This inter-relationship was acknowledged within the two British seaside destinations, where the social reality and structure of modern society, as experienced by the local residents, was investigated. Consequently, the key findings stated here highlight the original contribution of this thesis, and denote the objectives of the investigation (Section 1.1).

From the evaluation of tourism communities and community responses to tourism and crime, residents’ perceptions, attitudes and behaviour towards tourism impacts have been evaluated (Objective One). From the perspective of the two Cornish case study destinations, it was found that residents hold mixed reactions to tourism impacts. These findings confirm previous assumptions drawn from the literature, and allude towards the evaluation process of local resident perceptions. The original contribution of this study was the depiction of exactly how local residents evaluate tourism, in terms of the expected benefits
and the costs associated with the industry. This study discovered that the trade-off process, and the acknowledgement of tourism impacts by local residents, goes beyond the nature of economic reliance. Actually, local residents refer to their network ties, friendships, social positions and their level (and extent) of engagement with the community to appraise the impacts of tourism. By evaluating their personal gains and shortfalls, residents are able to estimate the overall impact of the tourism industry on their own lives.

More specifically, by distinguishing between the conditions and attributes of each destination, the investigation was also able to analyse the nature of residents’ reactions and responses towards tourism-related crime (Objective Two). This analysis revealed that seasonality is indeed a significant element and influence upon each individual’s attitude towards the tourism industry. However, what this study actually discovered was that the nature and extent of this influence is destination specific, as similar characteristics (such as those noted in Table 4.9) does not imply that crime rates will be alike. Instead, these similarities may result in different conclusions for each destination. This comprehension contributes a unique insight into the structure of both a resort and a coastal town. Likewise, the investigation reveals that the relationship between tourism-related impacts of crime and seasonality depends upon the conditions and attributes of each destination. These features play a part in the formation of a residents understanding, as dissimilar responses were articulated by local residents in each destination, even though similarities do exist.

Further to these key findings, the study also assessed the role that the communities played in affecting their residents’ perceptions of tourism and
crime (Objective Three). This understanding revealed that an influential function exists. An active individual will contribute to the development of an active community, which will hold power within the decision-making process. This active nature will then transfer to the peripheral residents, as the benefits of the social exchange process will be emphasised and acknowledged, and commonality will be established. In contrast to the formation of these shared aims of residents, a passive individual is found to fail to influence the structure of their community. The community then fails to grasp control, and are left in conflict, as the costs of tourism become more pronounced. This understanding progresses the existing literature, as involvement is not purely associated with new arrivals (Crow and Allan 1994). Instead, participation is continually required if residents wish to be a recognised member of a community.

As a result of these key findings, the structure of a community was also found to differ and be destination specific. This structure was established through the analysis of the community structure (Objective Four), as it was evident that modern communities, characterised by those established in Newquay and Penzance, are representative of both physical and symbolic boundaries. The community structure is also not considered as being confined to the locality, instead the structure develops through shared practice and is characterised by what residents do with ‘others’. This output of the investigation communicates the spirit of a community, and determines it as being developed through collective actions. The extent to which this spirit is expressed is, however, destination specific and dependent upon the actions of individuals. This outlook becomes more apparent when assessing the actions of an individual in relation to their perception of tourism-related crime, as an active individual, and an
active community encourages a multi-agency approach to crime prevention. This detailed understanding of community structure and individual actions develops further knowledge and understanding to the explanations and theory of tourism and crime, as inactivity within a community will not lead to such a desire.

Finally, in response to the fifth objective of this investigation (Section 1.1), the findings have been evaluated and appraised in response to the existing published theoretical arguments of the relationships between tourism and crime. The outcome is found within the forthcoming sections (Section 9.2 & 9.3) in the form of theoretical and practical contributions, which are aimed towards academics and practitioners respectively. These contributions acknowledge the originality of the research, and emphasise its bearing upon the existing academic literature associated with tourism and crime. The contributions also help determine the social reality and structure of modern society, specifically in relation to the two British seaside destinations of Newquay and Penzance.

9.2 Theoretical Contribution

The study has illustrated that community characteristics are destination specific (see Table 7.25), and that they can vary between a coastal town and resort location. If indeed, as the results of this investigation suggest, communities can influence the reaction and responses of residents, then alternative views of the tourism industry can be developed in different destination areas, and even between those that exhibit similar levels of crime. This finding is based upon the
output of the ‘gaze’ that was determined in each location, as the nature of the gaze interpreted who the perceived offender was, along with other community specific characteristics. The offender was specified through the local gaze, which inferred local residents, and the mutual gaze, which deduced the ‘other’ as being the offender.

Through the processes of socialisation and personal experience, it was determined that a community can influence a resident’s perception, reaction and response towards tourism impacts and tourism-related crime. The level of influence reflects the nature of sub-groups (and sub-cultures) which form, with high levels of socialisation resulting in additional sub-groups materialising, and having a higher influence over perception. Simultaneously, it is possible for a resident to influence the collective opinions of the community, due to the term ‘community’ having more than one meaning. Therefore, the role that a community plays in affecting residents’ perceptions of tourism and crime is extremely influential and the nature of the social reality faced by residents is dependent upon the actual location, as varying degrees of community influence and control were found within each specific environment. Further to this understanding, the study has established that resident attitudes reflect the perceived level of economic benefit and the nature and extent of social contact they have with the tourism industry. It was therefore determined that residents who have greater social contact with the tourism industry are more aware, educated and capable of evaluating the true costs of tourism. This attitude is somewhat dependent on the occupational groupings of local residents, as the findings agree with Krippendorf (1987), who stated that the general awareness and associated costs are better understood by those in direct and continual
contact with tourists. Therefore, economic interests dominate in both destinations.

Evidently, there are a number of theoretical contributions which can be drawn from this investigation, as shown in Figure 9.1, which is developed from the findings of pre-existing models (Alber et al. 1975; Ap and Crompton 1993; Carmichael 2000), and additional interpretation drawn from the primary data. The findings have therefore led to the development of an alternative framework for viewing community responses to tourism and crime. Since the implications relate to the community, the findings also have important theoretical value to understanding the mechanics of tourism communities.
Figure 9: Theoretical implications of the investigation
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Figure 9.1 emphasises the direct and indirect effects of resident conception and perception upon behaviour, as well as the collective community perceptions that can be established. The product of the community interactions has two potential outcomes; commonality or discord. Both outcomes imply that the nature of the gaze, adopted by local residents, has a bearing upon attitude. In Newquay, the flow of direct experience and socialisation resulted in residents forming attitudes that influenced collective community perceptions, as residents actively formed communities of practice, sub-groups and sub-cultures. This categorisation resulted in the community forming a mutual gaze with tourists, whereby commonality was formed, and residents expressed their power over tourism, and actively involved themselves in crime prevention methods. This outcome differed to that established in Penzance. Penzance residents expressed their attitudes in a more passive way, which resulted in the community perceptions being viewed through the local gaze and forming discord. These events represent the nature of change experienced in the two destinations, as the figure permits residents within the same location to form alternative perspectives on matters affecting their destination.

Resident behaviour is therefore deemed as being active or passive, positive or negative, and dependent on the type of location in which they live. Communities formed in a coastal town respond differently to tourism impacts than a community formed in a resort. The response is due to the extrinsic dimensions of seasonality and population density found at each location, as illustrated by Faulkner and Tideswell (1997). Intrinsically, community members are also influenced by their lifestyle choices and involvement in the tourism industry. For instance, the coastal-based community of Penzance was largely
established through employment networks, with a high level of place dependency (see Section 8.1 for a discussion). This dependency led to residents socialising with work colleagues, and expressing a higher need for immediate gratification from the tourism industry, as they were otherwise ‘mobile’, and willing to leave the community. The nature of this relationship is somewhat explained by the range of occupational groupings noted in Chapter 7 (Section 7.1), as the Penzance sample was mainly established through the opinions of those who were in continual/direct contact with tourists (type 1) and those who owned a tourism business (type 2). These individuals share similar characteristics to one another: they are dependent on tourism, their attitude is determined by a simple desire to earn money, and tourism is seen as a commercial matter (Krippendorf 1987). Therefore, they are less attached to the destination, despite their length of residency. This attachment results in community members searching for personal gain from the industry, and detaches them from the broader community. The passive behaviour and suspicious, local gaze then leads to contradictory community perceptions, and inconsistency. Inevitably, this detachment results in personal opinions and attitudes being formed, which results in discord, and not commonality.

The resort-based community was also largely established through these two occupational groupings (type 1 and 2). However, they were attached to their community, unlike the Penzance study. This attachment can be partially explained through the active behaviour of residents, as they did not express place dependency; instead they stated their connection to the resort through genuine friendship networks, together with work-related contacts. These networks allowed residents to develop a broader understanding of their
community, which was not necessarily based upon the simple desire to earn money. Residents also described themselves as being active within the community, which enabled them to retain power, and take charge, by collectively responding to and adapting to tourism impacts. Therefore, they were able to mutually gaze at both tourists and fellow residents, and seek unity on issues that impacted the community as a whole.

However, it is important to note that the socio-cultural characteristics of a resident’s daily routine, social life, belief and value, are also induced by the development of tourism, alongside the nature, and size of the tourism industry, as outlined in Chapter 6 (Section 6.1). Theoretically speaking, these differences appear to be related to the underlying characteristics of a community, and how they are equipped to deal with tourism impacts. In terms of practicality, these differences do not disseminate the findings to practitioners. Therefore, the practical implications of Figure 9.1 still need to be acknowledged and discussed.

9.3 Practical Contribution

In addition to the theoretical contributions described above, this study also has a number of practical implications, which have been developed with community interests and the future sustainability of the industry in mind. The aim here is to demonstrate the relevance of the research to practitioners by addressing practical problems associated with understanding tourism-related crime. This explanation offers a foundation for future case study investigations, as practitioners will be able to establish a thorough understanding of crime specific
areas by not studying them in isolation. Instead, practitioners will be able to identify a range of communities which exist in a destination, and be able to assess the nature of their gaze upon their home environment before addressing the impacts of tourism-related crime.

This knowledge may also go some way towards understanding the inter-relationship between community perceptions and the declining market share of British seaside resorts. Tourism impacts are, after all ‘the result of a complex process of interchange among guests, host communities, and destination environment’ (Andriotis 2006:1080). Impacts are important to establish, as it allows for the ‘social reality’ experienced by residents to be explored in more detail. Furthermore, it clarifies the consequences of a changing tourism market, as ‘people who once thought of “going to the seaside”...are now considering this to be barely one of a number of potential kinds of such activity’ (Urry 1988:35). As a result, local residents, who may be reliant upon tourism for their income, are experiencing economic change. Therefore, it is paramount for practitioners to take a broader view of tourism impacts, and understand some of the underlying trends, as they all may have a bearing on the interpretations of tourism-related crime.

Consequently, a series of practical implications have been drawn from this investigation, and are listed below. The aim of these statements is to purely disseminate the study's implications to practitioners, they are not meant as generalisations that may be applied to other destination areas.
A tourist destination can develop a range of communities, yet the organisation of each community is unique. A community of practice is more apparent in modern society than a community grounded by interests or a geographical boundary. These types of communities differ from traditional definitions as they imply shared practice, and they develop around that which matters to the local resident. Therefore, practitioners should be aware that the term 'community' has more than one meaning, and that to assess exactly what constitutes a community within the boundaries of an investigation, they need to allow for the community to emerge, and not for them to be grouped together by the researcher.

The length of residency is of little importance to community studies. Instead, network ties, friendships, social positions, and the local bonds established between community residents, are more relevant to understanding a community group. Tourism can have an impact upon the scale and cohesion of a group of residents, by affecting their local living patterns, mode of life and attitudes of local residents, via socialisation and personal experience. Therefore, the level of community attachment needs to be comprehensively considered. After all, a resident's level of place dependency and economic reliance upon tourism may influence their level of attachment to a community, and in effect influence their perception of tourism.

The structure of a modern community is destination specific. Both the physical and symbolic structure of a community should be considered by practitioners, as those involved within a modern community do not necessarily need to reside in a specific locality to be included within that social grouping.
This detachment is found to be true of the business community, as they may reside in a neighbouring locality but at the same time be considered as being a part of the commercial tourism community. Therefore, the level of association that occurs within a community should also be considered by practitioners, as community members are not defined by inhabitancy. Instead, they are acknowledged via their level of involvement within the community.

Local residents evaluate tourism in terms of their expected benefits or costs from the industry. From a social exchange that occurs between two or more individuals, it is evident that each person is capable of evaluating the outcome of their meeting. People are therefore able to weigh up the costs and benefits of development with reference to this personal experience and through socialisation. Therefore, it is beneficial to segment residents and to gauge the outcome of such an exchange. This segmentation can be done through grouping residents according to their occupation, independent of their community connections.

Occupational groupings are of importance, because they connect the range of economic dependency, to the level of contact each individual has with the tourism industry. This subdivision allows for the opinion of the residents to represent the outcomes of the exchange process, rather than their community networks. It also enables the practitioner to consider the economic reliance of each individual upon tourism, as a source of income, which allows commonality to emerge.

This segmentation, however, should only occur once the community has indeed emerged, and residents should not be sourced through such a classification (as identified in the initial practical contribution).
The level of a resident's engagement with their community can affect resident perception of tourism impacts. There appears to be a positive association between resident support for tourism, as an economic development tool, and their positive perception of tourism impacts on the community. This exchange-process is consistent with the social exchange theory. Therefore, practitioners should assess the level of active behaviour in a community at a given time, as it may lead to a deeper understanding as to why residents respond differently to tourism impacts. Similarly, the passive behaviour also requires consideration, as this exchange-process may be linked to negativity and discord.

The level of engagement is therefore significant in terms of policy development, as an active community is preferable, and the spirit of a community can be encouraged through enhanced control and participation, in local projects and the decision-making processes. Education and involvement of community members stimulates power and understanding within the community. Residents who are educated about the potential impacts of tourism are more likely to respond in a positive manner to negative impacts, and be supportive of future development. This positivity is due to residents being able to see tourism development as a community strategy, and their ability to assess the benefits and costs of tourism. Power in such a situation resides with the local residents, as they are able to influence and control community development. Therefore, practitioners need to assess the level of understanding and knowledge of community members about the tourism industry, as this understanding would cultivate insight into the power relations that exist at a community level.
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Seasonality can influence the nature of a resident's reaction and response to tourism-related crime. The social impacts of tourism are seen to increase as the level of seasonality increases within a destination. However, the type of social impact that seasonality may have upon a locality is destination specific. A resort may witness a direct relationship between the rise in tourism numbers and the crime level. Other areas, such as a coastal town, may not, due to the irregular peaks and troughs in criminal activity that can be experienced throughout the annual cycle.

In response to these perceptions, a resort resident may actively discourage crime, while the coastal town resident would not. Therefore, practitioners should also consider additional extrinsic elements associated to each destination, including the stage of development and the resident/tourist ratio, as these contribute to the social impacts of tourism.

The role a community plays in affecting residents' perceptions of tourism and crime is extremely influential, and destination specific. Depending upon the characteristics of a destination, the size of the tourism industry, and the importance of tourism to the local economy, some residents will be seen to be more willing partners than others to participate in a modern community. A community that is seen to be active and hold power within tourism will be more influential than a passive community which relinquishes their power to others.

Therefore, practitioners need to identify an individual's personal role in the community to develop an understanding towards tourism and crime. This information can inform the broader understanding of community structure, and acknowledge the common social characteristics and goals of that community. Likewise, practitioners can start to connect the spirit of a community to the expression of collective actions, and make direct links to resident perceptions.
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The level and nature of community adjustment is destination specific. A resort community, through commonality and attachment, develops community boundaries through the formation of a mutual gaze and communities of practice. A coastal community on the other hand, tied through employment, develops a local gaze, discord, and issues of poor communication, which raises issues of uncertainty about the 'reality' of social networks in a coastal community. Therefore, it is recommended that practitioners comprehend change over time to track adaptation and acknowledge the changing social relationships that exist. These social relationships can be monitored by revisiting the community, and by building partnerships with the community members.

Crime clusters are destination specific. This implication implies that there may be nothing particularly criminogenic about a resort which has a high level of recorded crime, as the rise in crime is seen in direct proportion to the population density. However, a coastal town may offer criminals with the opportunity to commit opportunistic crime. Therefore, a destination offering a more 'hedonistic' lifestyle will not necessarily have higher crime rates than other 'safer' resorts, due to the widespread employment of crime prevention methods in the resort, and the lack of such deterrents in the coastal community. Therefore, practitioners should be cautious of classifying a destination to purely conform to established theories and an induced image. Crime prevention methods require a multi-agency approach. This knowledge is substantiated in a resort environment, which has been successful in managing the impacts of tourism-related crime. Therefore, if practitioners are
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9.4 Limitations

Inevitably, as with all research agendas, there are both practical and methodological limitations inherent in this study that should be reflected upon to illustrate the complexity and composition of the investigation. Over the course of this investigation, a number of limitations were ‘derive from the conceptual framework and the study’s design’ (Marshall and Rossman 1999:42). These limitations are discussed throughout the investigation (specifically in Chapter 3 and 4). Nevertheless, there is the need to summarise the key points again, to offer insight to other academics.

One practical limitation that should be deliberated stems from the conceptual framework, as a clear distinction of what constitutes a tourism community needed to be established. However, there is no ‘normal’ society to which a community study can be compare against (Murphy 1985). Therefore, the suggestions made by this investigation acts only as a snap-shot of community trends in each destination during 2008. Generalisations are not possible, as the findings are destination specific and represent the community grouping of residents at a specific period of time. Therefore, it is not possible to state how universal the theoretical and practical implications of this study are to other British seaside destinations, as the comparison only distinguished between a resort and coastal town environment within Cornwall. The study did not
consider other destinations outside of Cornwall, or those that may be classified as a honeypot, country or historic environment. Therefore, caution when adapting this framework will be required.

Further to these restrictions, a number of methodological limitations, as noted in Chapter 4, exist. These limitations relate to both the secondary and primary data. Secondary data limitations related to content and coverage of data, as certain restrictions and the time frame impeded analysis. The limitations of the primary data stemmed from the study’s design. Selecting qualitative methods over quantitative methods was justified in Chapter 4. However, limitations existed (see Table 4.13). This limitation was denoted by the sampling method adopted by the investigation, as the snowball method resulted in a referred number of respondents being interviewed in each location. Therefore, the investigation was conscious of bias caused through recommendation, and, as a consequence of these methodological limitations, there is a large group of locals who were not interviewed for this investigation. Therefore, the research cannot, and does not try to represent the whole population. A consideration which needs to be well thought out before similar and future research is conducted.

9.5 Future Research

From this analysis of community perceptions, resident reaction and behaviour to tourism and crime, there appears to be an abundance of literature to explain the relationships that exists. Even so, there are still a number of future research avenues which could be explored to address the issues and impacts highlighted within this investigation. Forthcoming investigations could therefore extend the
knowledge and understanding of this investigation, and determine the social reality and structure of modern society in other tourist destinations.

One recommendation for future research would be to test the theoretical model presented by the findings of the investigation (Figure 9.1) in other locations. Although the model brings together disjointed material, and offers an in-depth analysis of the social realities found at two British seaside destinations, the model's new contributions have not been verified more widely. Such an investigation could verify the processes involved in understanding how a community influences, and is influenced by individual resident perceptions of tourism-related crime. Following on from this verification, the model could then potentially be used as a foundation for future case study investigations.

A further recommendation would be to return to the two communities established in Newquay and Penzance, and assess how opinions may have changed over time, for both the individuals involved, and the community as a whole. Returning to the destinations is recommended as visitors can create social relationships which differ from the affiliations formed among the local population, and these can have an effect upon local living patterns, mode of life and attitudes of local residents (Goeldner and Ritchie 2006) as they encounter tourism.

A third recommendation involves the classification of resident attitudes towards tourism. Although in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.7), it was identified that a range of factors influenced resident attitudes towards tourism (Table 2.4), there is still the need to address age and ethnicity further. Section 6.2 goes some way to
identify the mean age of each population, and the number of white ethnic households in each destination. However, this basic insight does not allow for a depth analysis to be obtained. After all, such evidence may influence resident attitude towards tourism, and influence the future development of the theoretical model.

Finally, future research should aim to encompass all types of local residents, including those who have no contact with tourism. Although a range of occupational groupings were consulted for this investigation, residents who have no contact with tourists or see them only in passing were not contacted. This recommendation implies that a group of residents, who according to Krippendorf (1987), express common feelings of indifference towards tourism development, were not taken into consideration. To include them in future studies would ensure the full range of resident types was represented by the outcome of any future research.
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11.0 Appendices
Appendix One - Cornish based Crime Data
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Appendix Two        - Community Perceptions Questionnaire

Interview Details
Name:
Location:
Date & Time:
Occupation:
Employment Status:

Welcome - confirm occupation, employment status (part-time full time)
Hand the rating scale and explain it is for use in conjunction with some of the questions

1. Tourism Impacts/Attitudes

Do you interact with tourists on a regular basis? How would you describe the relationship you have with them?

Do you or anyone else in your household work in a job where you come into contact with tourists or work for a company that derives benefits from the tourism sector?

- What sector/area is that in and for how long? Accommodation; Food and Drink; Retail; Transport?

How would you rank the importance of the tourism industry to your daily life? – Refer to Scale

In your opinion, what are the benefits and problems created by the tourism industry?
How would you rate and/or assess the level of significance these can have upon your normal life? – Refer to Scale

Do you think that the benefits of tourism outweigh the negative consequences?

Do you think that tourism can cause you to change your behaviour and/or lifestyle?

Do you believe that tourism contributes to the loss of open space and natural resources within the area?

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements; – Refer to Scale

- visitors make where I live more lively and fun;
- visitors are interested in meeting local people;
- visitors intrude on my privacy;
- I enjoy meeting visitors;
- I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors
- I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town
- My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit
- I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists
- Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town

Are you aware how much money the tourism industry generates for the local economy?

- Do you think that the by increasing the number of tourists improves the local economy?
- Do you consider tourism ‘important’ to your local economy and the community? – Refer to Scale

Do you feel as though you can lead a ‘normal’ life all year round?

- If not, within which seasons do you perceive this as being more of a problem?

Do you feel that you have sufficient opportunity to express your views about tourism, in your area?
• And thinking about any views you do express, how much influence do you feel these have on tourism in your local area?
• Thinking about the level of influence you have on tourism in your area, is this: Less than you would like; more than you would like; about right?

In what ways would you like to have more influence on tourism in your area?

• Local residents should be asked more about development and put forward suggestions
• Introduce a tourism tax to cover the expenditure of such things as policing and rubbish collection
• Consider the impacts of tourism upon the local community more
• Improve the quality of what is on offer
• Listen more to local resident than to the businesses
• Respond to the problems caused by tourists
• Produce more questionnaires to assess residents perceptions
• Address policing issues
2. Tourism & Crime Impacts/Attitudes

Would you say that you are actively involved with community efforts to help reduce crime?

- Do you adopt a role or have a responsible within your community to help overcome crime?
- Do you see you’re self as a guardian or a supervisor within your community when considering crime prevention techniques?

In relation to your experience of your community, which specific factors/impacts annoy you the most?

- With respect to these annoyances, do you use other means to overcome the congestion and social discomfort caused by those impacts?

Do you perceive the level of crime in your community to be high?

- Does this level of crime affect your daily behaviour/lifestyle?
- Who, in your opinion, causes you to alter your behaviour?

Do you think any of the features and facilities of your town actually contribute to the level of criminal activity?

- Features – beaches, landscape, natural environment
- Facilities – provision of businesses, infrastructure

The characteristics of a place can influence crime levels. Which, if any, characteristics do you think contribute to the crime levels within your community?

Do you perceive this as a specific problem in conjunction with the tourist season?

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: “Crime is more of a problem at the height of the tourist season and less evident in low season” – Refer to Scale

- Do fear becoming a victim of crime within your neighbourhood?
- Do you feel as though you change your behaviour to accommodate for your fear of crime?
Do you ever act to discourage crime?

- Are you aware of any Police Community Schemes within your community to help prevent crime?
- Are you aware of any preventative plans to reduce crime within your community?
- Would you be willing to participate in preventative plans to help reduce the impacts of tourism and crime if they were available?

3. Community Issues/Impacts

Were you born locally, or did you move to the area?

- So, how many years have you actually lived within the town?
- Before you moved to this destination, did you use to visit as a tourist?
- Do you live far away from the centre of the town?

Do you consider yourself a part of the ‘community’?

Would you say you have a strong social bond with your community?

Which community (s) do you belong to?

How long have you been a part of the community?

How would you define your community, through your mutual interests or by spatial distribution?

Do you share the same views as the other community members?

Are there any members of your community that you feel I should also contact with regards to my investigation?

Would you say that any recent changes in your community have affected your attitude and behaviour towards the destination?

- What are these changes?
- In your opinion, are there any specific issues apparent within your community?
What have been prominent past impacts/issues of the community? Have they been resolved? How, when etc.

What does the term ‘community’ mean to you?

- Do you place a strong value upon friendship?

What, for you personally, has direct community benefits?

Are there any direct community problems you would like to highlight?

Do you perceive tourism as impacting your community? How?

- Do you believe that tourism improves your local identity as a community?
- Do you believe that social problems are made worse by tourism activity? Or are they due to other influences such as rising affluence, television and changing attitudes?
- Do you feel as though you ‘cope’ with tourists as and when necessary?
- How would you rank your tolerance threshold to tourism and tourist at different points of the year?

Which of the following media sources do you consume on a regular basis? TV, Radio, National Newspapers, Local Newspapers

Are there any other issues you wish to raise today in relation to tourism, crime or the community?

Thank you.
Appendix Three - Honeypot areas
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Appendix Four – Crime Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Shop</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offenses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Shop</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Shop</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>171</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Shop</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Type</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Shop</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (Text/Chart/Diagram/Image etc.) has been removed due to Copyright restrictions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder (Homicide)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Violent Assaults</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Burglary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Burglary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Vehicle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from Vehicle</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Cycle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of Shop</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Theft</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling (Stolen Goods)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery &amp; Fraud Offences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Offences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>216</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix Table 6: Penzance Crime Type 2008-09

Figure (Text/Chart/Diagram/Image etc.) has been removed due to Copyright restrictions.
Appendix Five – Free Nodes and Tree Notes

Active Behaviour When respondents recall active behaviour in a positive or negative manner
Birth Place Was the respondent born locally?
Changes in Respondents note that tourism changes their behaviour
Behaviour
Community Are the respondents groups developed through spatial distribution of through mutual interests?
Community Feelings towards being a part of the local community
Feelings
Community Groups Types of community groups respondent believes they belong to
Community Issues Changes and thoughts about the community as a whole and in passing
Community Problems Highlights the problems respondents may have with the community
Coping Strategies Respondents statements towards 'coping' with tourists and tourism
Crime Experience Respondents examples of how they have been a victim of crime
Crime is Seasonal Response to Statement: "Crime is more of a problem in the tourist season and less evident in low season"
Crime Levels How the respondent perceives the level of crime in the community to be
Crime Reduction Actively involved with community efforts to help reduce crime
Daily Involvement Involvement level with tourists on a regular basis
Definition of How the respondent defines a community
Community Development Thoughts about development within the town
Discourage Crime Does the respondent act to discourage crime? Act as a guardian?
Employment Type of Employment the respondent is in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express Views</td>
<td>Does the respondent have sufficient opportunity to express views?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime</td>
<td>Does the respondent fear becoming a victim of crime?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Statements</td>
<td>Examples of free statements made about tourists to express their own opinions about them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts of Tourism</td>
<td>Positive and negative Impacts of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Tourism</td>
<td>How important tourism is to daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Involvement</td>
<td>Time respondent has been involved with tourist and tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Residency</td>
<td>How long has the respondent lived in the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Influence</td>
<td>Does the respondent have a good enough level of influence should they want it within their community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Opinions about the scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders</td>
<td>Who the respondent thinks causes crime in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Behaviour</td>
<td>Where respondent active passively in a positive of negative manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Distinctions</td>
<td>Talk about features and facilities of the community and destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to CBD</td>
<td>How far the respondent live from the town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Groups</td>
<td>Is the respondent a member of any resident groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>Comments about seasonal distinctions noted within the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Bond</td>
<td>Strength of social bond with the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>Response to following statement: Visitors make where you live a more lively and fun place to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>Respondents answer to statement: Visitors are interested in meeting local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>Response to statement: Visitor’s intrude on your privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>Response to statement: I enjoy meeting visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 5</td>
<td>Response to statement: I actively seek out opportunities to socialise with visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Response to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I would like to see an increase in the number of tourists to my town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My town would be a dull place if tourists did not visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I like the image of my town that is portrayed to tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Because of tourism, I sometimes feel like a stranger in my own town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tourism Impacts the Community**
Feelings towards the implications of tourism having an impact against their community

**Tourist Behaviour**
Respondents opinions about how tourists behave

**Weight of Impacts**
Whether or not respondents feel as though the positives outweigh the negatives