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Abstract: The limited explanatory research on residents' perceptions of tourism impacts has resulted in an underdeveloped theoretical orientation of research on this subject. This paper presents a social exchange process model as a theoretical basis for some understanding of why residents perceive tourism impacts positively or negatively. The model is based upon the concept of the exchange relation. Propositions are derived from the model to test the relationships between the model's components. These propositions have been developed from inferences based upon the social exchange literature. Keywords: tourism impacts, residents' perceptions, social exchange, exchange process.


INTRODUCTION

During the past two decades, researchers have given increasing attention to the impacts of tourism. The principal reason for this attention is that the perceptions and attitudes of residents toward the impacts of tourism are likely to be an important planning and policy consideration for the successful development, marketing, and operation of existing and future tourism programs and projects. For tourism in a destination area to thrive, its adverse impacts should be minimized and it must be viewed favorably by the host population. Butler observed:
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Unless the often unforeseen and thus unplanned effects of tourism development can be controlled, or at least recognized and predicted, then opposition to the development of tourism, particularly in less developed parts of the world, is likely to increase. Such a situation would be extremely unfortunate and could result in the loss of potentially valuable economic benefits to many areas (1975:89).

Existing research on residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism has provided a knowledge base that is exploratory in nature and primarily descriptive (Allen, Long, Perdue and Kieselbach 1988; Belisle and Hoy 1980; Boissevain 1979; Brougham and Butler 1981; Bystrzarnowski 1989a, 1989b; Liu, Sheldon, and Var 1987; Liu and Var 1986; Milman and Pizam 1988; Murphy 1983; Perdue, Long, and Allen 1987, 1990; Pizam 1978; Rothman 1978; Sethna 1980; Sethna and Richmond 1978; Sheldon and Var 1984; Thomason, Crompton and Kamp 1979; Tyrell and Spaulding 1984; Var, Kendall and Tarakcioglu 1985). The major impacts and variables have been identified, methodological approaches developed, and problems and research needs delineated. A review of this research literature suggests that its theoretical orientation and operational definitions of the central concepts are underdeveloped, and reliability and validity measures typically have not been reported (Ap 1990). These characteristics are typical of exploratory work in new areas of investigation.

Now it is time to focus upon developing a theoretical paradigm that will help explain and interpret these findings. Except for Brougham and Butler (1981) and Perdue, Long and Allen (1990), very little explanatory analysis has been attempted. These two studies used a conceptual model to explain residents' perceptions toward tourism impacts. Brougham and Butler's (1981) model was also used to demonstrate that the impacts are multifaceted. Unfortunately, their model was not discussed in any detail, but the study did empirically verify that residents' attitudes were related to tourist contact, length of residence, age, and language.

Perdue, Long and Allen (1990) developed a model that examined relationships between residents' perceptions of tourism impacts and their support for it. It was discovered that when personal benefits obtained from tourism development were controlled, residents with positive perceptions of tourism impacts supported additional tourism development and specific tourism development policies. The authors recognized the need to develop better measures of perceived impacts of tourism in order to advance knowledge and to relate their model explicitly to a theory.

Currently, there is limited understanding of why residents respond to the impacts of tourism as they do, and under what conditions residents react to these impacts. The lack of explanatory research limits the current literature on understanding residents' behavior toward the impacts of tourism. According to Husbands,

... one persistent problem in this body of work is that the theoretical understanding of residents' perceptions of, or attitude to, tourism is weak. This accounts for the general absence of explanation grounded in the social structure of the destination society. There is, so far, no
theoretical justification of why some people are, or are not, favorably disposed to tourism (1989:239).

A number of theories have been suggested to explain the nature of residents' perceptions toward tourism impacts. Bystrzanowski (1989a) referred to play theory, compensation theory, and conflict theory, but concluded that none of them were able to provide a theoretical perspective that encompassed the phenomenon of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts. Pearce (1989) suggested that attribution theory may be useful, but he did not discuss its application in detail. Preister (1989) has proposed dependency theory, but he recognized that its macro-level orientation may limit its application at the local community level, and that the theory is unable to account for both positive and negative effects. However, Preister did suggest a number of hypotheses to test the application of the dependency framework. Social exchange theory has been considered an appropriate framework to use in developing an understanding of residents' perceptions on tourism (Ap 1990; Nash 1989; Perdue, Long and Allen 1990), and it has been adopted as the framework for development of the model presented in this paper. The advantages of using social exchange theory are that it can accommodate explanation of both positive and negative perceptions, and can examine relationships at the individual or collective level. Therefore, the objectives of this paper are to develop a conceptual model that explains why residents develop positive or negative perceptions toward tourism and to present a set of propositions to test the model.

SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

Social exchange theory was briefly mentioned by Perdue, Long and Allen (1990) as being an appropriate framework for explaining residents' perceptions of tourism impacts. Sutton (1967) recognized exchange as a social characteristic that defines the touring encounter (that is, the social interactions of travel) between hosts and guests. He suggested the encounter is asymmetrical and unbalanced in character. The encounter "may provide either an opportunity for rewarding and satisfying exchanges, or it may stimulate and reinforce impulses to exploitation on the part of the host and, to suspicion and resentment on the part of the visitor" (Sutton 1967:221). The notion of asymmetry as the basis for explaining hosts' negative perceptions of tourists is supported by Pearce: "... that marked asymmetry of frequent, transitory contact with the opportunity for exploitation and interaction difficulties due to large cultural differences are the important elements shaping a negative host reaction to tourists" (1982:85). In addition, Mathieson and Wall (1982:136) also described the tendency for tourist-host relationships to be unequal and unbalanced in character. However, not all asymmetric resident-tourist exchanges favor the tourist. There are occasions when tourists may be taken advantage of due to their inadequate knowledge. Farrell (1982), for example, commented on the commercial "rip off" of "mainlanders" by Hawaiian locals in real estate transactions.
Modern social exchange theory has evolved from the works of Lévi-Strauss (1969), Homans (1961), Blau (1964), and Emerson (1972). It is a general sociological theory concerned with understanding the exchange of resources between individuals and groups in an interaction situation. Interactions are treated as a process in which "actors" supply one another with valued resources. The term "actor" refers to a person, a role-occupant, or a group that acts as a single unit (Emerson 1972). Resources are defined as "any item, concrete or symbolic, which can become the object of exchange among people" (Foa and Foa 1980:78). Thus, resources may be of a material, social, or psychological nature.

The application of exchange principles can be found in many common day to day contexts, for example, gift giving (Moschetti 1979), marriage and kinship (Lévi-Strauss 1969), collective bargaining (Lawler and Bacharach 1986), organizational behavior and management (T. Jacobs 1970; D. Jacobs 1974), and marketing (Bagozzi 1975, 1979; Houston and Gassenheimer 1987; Kotler 1972). In the leisure context, only a handful of applications have been reported. They include attitudes to outdoor recreation development (Napier and Bryant 1980), outdoor recreation satisfaction (Bryant and Napier 1981), recreation management decision-making (Searle 1988), ceasing participation in leisure activities (Searle 1991), and museum donation behavior (Bigley 1989). The principles of social exchange theory do not appear to have been applied in the field of tourism. Shamir (1984) discussed exchange theory from a sociological perspective in an analysis of tourist tipping. He dismissed it, however, in favor of a social psychological paradigm. Despite an apparent lack of application of social exchange in the tourism field, transactional approaches have been used in tourism settings (Nash 1989; Villere, O'Connor and Quain 1983; Watchel 1980). Nash (1989) adopts a transactional approach in examining dynamics of host-guest interactions, where he described the relationship between Western industrialized markets and developing destination nations as a form of imperialism. Transactional analysis has been applied by Watchel (1980) and Villere, O'Connor and Quain (1983) in an examination of guest relations and management-employee relations within the hospitality industry. Transactional analysis adopts a psycho-analytical approach in examining interpersonal relationships and focuses upon "resources" of a psychological nature. It differs from social exchange in that it has a much narrower focus.

To sustain tourism in a community, certain exchanges must occur. Participation by a community (residents, civic leaders, and entrepreneurs) in developing and attracting tourism to their area is generally driven by the desire by some members of the community to improve the economic and social conditions of the area. For others in the community, tourism is thrust upon them by certain individual or group advocates. Irrespective of how tourism is introduced and developed in a community, residents are important players who can influence the success or failure of the local tourism industry. Residents may contribute to the well-being of the community through their participation (at varying degrees) in the planning, development, and operation of tourist attractions, and by extending their hospitality to tourists in exchange for the benefits obtained from tourism. On the other hand,
residents may be instrumental in discouraging tourism by opposing it or exhibiting hostile behavior toward tourism advocates and/or tourists. The needs of the visitors have to be satisfied because providing quality experiences for them by the host community will increase the desire for further interaction between hosts and guests (Hudman and Hawkins 1989). The encounter between them may also lead to negative experiences. Knox (1982:77) commented that, "The tourist may have his vacation spoiled or enhanced by the resident. The resident may have his daily life enriched or degraded by the unending flow of tourists."

In developing and attracting tourism to a community, the goal is to achieve outcomes that obtain the best balance of benefits and costs for both residents and tourism actors. The preceding discussion suggests that residents evaluate tourism in terms of social exchange, that is, evaluate it in terms of expected benefits or costs obtained in return for the services they supply. Hence, it is assumed host resident actors seek tourism development for their community in order to satisfy their economic, social, and psychological needs and to improve the community's well-being. Even for those in a community where tourism is forced upon them by others against their wishes, there is still an opportunity for them to evaluate the exchange, since it can be viewed as a dynamic process. In such instances, it is likely that the exchange will be perceived negatively because there is an imbalance of benefits and costs shared between the actors and any stability in the relationship, in terms of motivation and loyalty, is not maintained. However, benefits derived from the exchange may be perceived by residents as outweighing costs. Thus, perceptions may change to a more positive disposition, despite initial opposition stemming from having tourism forced upon the community.

A SOCIAL EXCHANGE PROCESS MODEL

To help facilitate understanding of residents' perceptions of tourism, a model of the social exchange process is presented in Figure 1. The model outlines the processes by which residents become involved in tourism exchanges, continue these exchanges, and become disengaged from the exchanges. It incorporates some of the basic concepts and elements of various frameworks of social exchange theory which have been previously mentioned. The basic components involved in the exchange process are need satisfaction, exchange relation, consequences of exchange, and the no-exchange outcome. Linking the components are a set of processes that are presented as flows shown in Figure 1: (1) initiation of exchange; (2) exchange formation; (3) exchange transaction evaluation; (4) positive evaluation of exchange consequences, that is, reinforcement of behavior; and (2a) and (4a) negative evaluation of exchange consequences resulting in a reduction of exchange behavior or possibly the withdrawal of exchange behavior which results in no-exchange.

In this model it is assumed that social relations involve an exchange of resources among social actors; social actors seek mutual benefit from the exchange relationship; the primary motive for initiating exchange
from the residents' perspective is to improve the community's social and economic well-being; and residents' perceptions and attitudes are predictors of their behavior toward tourism.

Host residents' perceptions are used as predictors of behavior in host resident-tourism exchanges. The use of this assumption is based upon Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) and Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) who found that there is a strong relationship between belief, attitudes, and behavioral intentions under certain conditions. There is debate about the consistency between attitudes and behavior, and that it may not always be the case (Oskamp 1977). Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) addressed concerns raised about the consistency between attitudes and behavior and concluded that certain conditions must be met if the attitude-behavior relationship exists, such as when there is high correspondence between the target and action elements of the attitude and belief entities, and when an attitude scale has been carefully constructed. Reid and Crompton (1991) also noted that consistency between attitudes and behavior may not exist in situations where there is a low level of involvement. Moreover, people sometimes do things they do not necessarily like to do or they may exhibit dissonant or conflicting behavior. In situations such as this, possible explanations would be that correspondence between target and action elements of the attitude and belief entities would be low or non-existent, or that behavior is induced by eternal forces contrary to the true desires of the individual which, over time, is not conducive to maintaining a stable and rewarding relationship between the actors. Although the above explanations are subject to debate and involve the broader issue of conflict between consistent and non-consistent theories of the attitude-behavior relationship (Oskamp 1977), the inability to conclusively explain non-consistent behavior is considered a limitation.
For the purposes of this paper, the term perception is used to describe resident dispositions towards tourism rather than attitude. The terms perception and attitude are sometimes used interchangeably, however, there is a fine distinction in meaning between the terms. Perception represents the meaning that is attributed to an object, whereas attitude represents a person's enduring predisposition or action tendencies to some object (Kurtz and Boone 1984:206). The differences represent varying degrees of attribution toward an object with perceptions referring to a more general application. Nonetheless, perceptions/attitude measurement is indirect, that it, it can only be inferred and cannot be directly ascertained (Oskamp 1977; Parasuraman 1986). In the host resident-tourism context, use of the term perceptions is considered more appropriate. This is because residents may attribute meaning to tourism impacts without necessarily having knowledge or enduring dispositions about them, and because it cannot be assumed that all residents have knowledge and hold beliefs about tourism impacts.

Throughout this paper, the term “actor” is used to describe the participants in an exchange. In the host resident-tourism context, an actor may be represented by individuals or groups such as local residents, local workers, local entrepreneurs, town officials, resident action groups, tourists, tourism operators, developers, environmentalists, or investors. The following description of the model provides a discussion of each of the model's elements and examples of their application to the host resident-tourism setting.

Need Satisfaction

Satisfaction of actors' needs provides the rationale for engaging in social exchange. Although need satisfaction is identified as part of the social exchange process, its relationship to the exchange relation is generally assumed. Emerson (1972), for example, in his explanation of the exchange relation makes no attempt to verify the needs and motives of the actors and assumes them as given. Houston and Gassenheimer (1987) indicated that satisfaction of needs provides the starting point for any exchange. Satisfaction of this need motivates the behavior of the actor to engage in an exchange relationship because he/she "believes it is appropriate or desirable to deal with the other party" (Kotler 1984:8) and thus direct behavior toward preferred anticipated consequences.

Unless a need exists, there is no rationale, motivation, or basis upon which the actor can develop a willingness to initiate exchange with another party. Thus, there may be no need to satisfy, especially in situations where tourism development is not wanted. As the driving force behind exchange, it is assumed that the primary motive for a community in attracting and developing tourism to its area is to improve the economic, social, and psychological well-being of its residents. Some key community actors who may encourage tourism are civic officials, local businesses, or even residents, depending upon the circumstances. Besides improving economic and social conditions for host communities, Ankomah and Crompton (1990), in an interna-
tional context, also identified other motives for undertaking tourism development. They included facilitation of international understanding, education of indigenous citizens by exposing them to other people and cultures, conservation of flora and fauna, and restoration of cultural properties.

While attention has been given to the motivations of tourists for pleasure travel in the tourism literature (Crompton 1979; Dann 1977, 1981; Mathieson and Wall 1982; Mercer 1977; Plog 1973), little attention has been given to the motivations of host countries or communities for their involvement in tourism development. This lack of attention may be partly due to problems of defining who the hosts are, an assumption that residents in the host community are aware of the value of tourism, and the difficulty in determining what constitutes a communal host motivation (for example, political policies, economic development policies, aspirations of key community leaders, or resident aspirations). This subject of host motivations provides a fertile area for future tourism research.

The concept of need and motives is not widely subscribed to by exchange theorists who argue that seeking a reward is not the same as need. Thibaut and Kelley also stated "the appeal to a motive to explain any given social phenomenon seems too easy and unparsimonious" (1959:5). This argument appears reasonable within operant behavior frameworks where the consequences of any interaction are stated in terms of rewards received or costs incurred. However, such an approach in explaining behavior is static, tautological, and presumes behavior takes place in a vacuum. With the proposed model of the exchange process, a social psychological approach is adopted and behavior is seen as a dynamic interaction. Therefore, need satisfaction provides a context for the origins of behavior and the basis for explaining it.

Initiation of Exchange

Expression of a need initiates the exchange process (Flow 1). This initiation of exchange linkage connects need satisfaction to the exchange relation. An actor will initiate an exchange relationship when there is a need to satisfy. This need may be internally motivated by either one of the actors, or it may be stimulated by an imposition from an external source. In the latter situation, the imposition places the exchange in a state of imbalance which then needs to be addressed by the disadvantaged actor. For example, the decisions of civic officials or tourist developers may unintentionally harm residents who must evaluate the consequences and determine an appropriate course of action.

Exchange Relation

The Exchange Relation is composed of two subcomponents: antecedents and form of the relation, which determine the nature of an exchange. It is defined by Emerson (1972) as a series of temporally interspersed opportunities, initiations, and transactions. He formu-
lates a psychological basis for social exchange theory, using the basic concepts and principles of operant psychology:

... the emphasis is on the ratio of rewards exchanged among actors and on how this ratio shifts or stabilizes over the course of the exchange relationship. Propositions thus focus on explaining the variables outside the actors in the broader context of the social relationship that might influence the ratio of rewards in a given social relationship. Thus, behavior is no longer the dependent variable in propositions; rather, the exchange relationship becomes the variable to be explained. The goal is to discover laws that help account for particular patterns of exchange relations (Turner 1986:292).

The concept of exchange relation formulated by Emerson (1962, 1972) first, provides a basis for studying the formation and change of social structures as enduring relations among specified actors, with the exchange relation as the structural unit for analysis. His focus on exchange relations resolves the problem of tautology, which has been one of the main criticisms of operant behavior. Second, the concepts of power, dependence, and balance in exchange relations explain the operation of complex social patterns involving an actor (as an individual or collective unit) engaged in multiple exchange relations with sets of other actors. Third, the concept shifts the study of social exchange from individual psychology to social interaction.

Actors are viewed as either individuals or collective units and the same processes in exchange relations apply to both, thus resolving the micro versus macro schism in theory development. At the collective level, there may be subgroups within the collective that do not necessarily share unanimous viewpoints on the same issue. For example, the host community may refer to local businesses, public officials, and residents who are affected by its decisions. Existing research (Murphy 1983; Pizam 1978; Thomason, Crompton and Kamp 1979) shows that perceptions of tourism impacts vary significantly among these groups. Butler and Brougham (1981) also found residents attitudes toward the social impacts of tourism varied according to some locational and personal characteristics. Therefore, a collective may not be homogeneous and it may be necessary to identify the relevant subgroups within the collective.

Antecedents of the Exchange Relation

The antecedents represent the opportunities or situations in an exchange relation. The four antecedents shown in the model (Figure 1) are adapted from Searle (1991) and viewed as opportunities perceived by at least one of the actors before the exchange forms.

Rationality of behavior refers to an actor's behavior being based upon reward seeking. Without rewards, material or psychological, an actor has no motive for engaging in exchange. In this model, rationality is assumed—that the rewards and benefits derived from exchange are valued resources; and actors who derive reward from the exchange relationship will act in a way that will tend to produce these benefits. Moreover, rationality is used in the context of "satisficing"—finding a
course of action that is good enough to satisfy some level of an actor's aspirations (Simons 1957, 1976), rather than maximizing behavior. Therefore, reward seeking may be suboptimal.

Economists, psychologists, and others have debated the rationality of human behavior and its relevance to human activity (Granovetter 1985; Hogarth and Reder 1986). Exchange theorists have recognized limitations in the original assumptions of rational man and have treated the assumptions cautiously. Homans noted the problem and commented "we are out to rehabilitate the economic man" (1961:27). Since such problems exist, rationality in the model is best conceived and used as an heuristic.

Applying the concept of rationality to the tourism setting, residents expect their involvement in tourism to bring rewards of maintenance and improvement of their social and economic well-being. As long as residents perceive these benefits of tourism, there is sufficient reason for them to view it favorably. On the other hand, if tourism has been forced upon residents or is creating costs that impinge adversely upon individual and community well-being, resident support for tourism is likely to decrease, developing negative attitudes or overt opposition to tourism in their community. Some researchers (Pizam 1978; Rothman 1978; and Thomason, Crompton and Kamp 1979) have found that residents employed in the tourist industry have more favorable attitudes toward tourism impacts than those who are not. This suggests that residents' perceptions of tourism impacts vary with the level of rewards obtained from tourism. Therefore:

\[ \text{The greater the perceived rewards from tourism, the more positive are host actors' perceptions of tourism (Proposition 1a).} \]

\[ \text{The greater the perceived costs of tourism, the more negative are host actors' perceptions of tourism (Proposition 1b).} \]

Satisficing of benefits extends the concept of rationality. Satisficing is a term used in the management literature to explain the seeking of rewards or benefits when maximization of benefits does not occur (Simons 1957, 1976). The principle behind satisficing is that actors attempt to obtain a satisfactory, reasonable, or acceptable level of benefits from social exchange relationships. The benefits or the valued resources obtained from social exchange all have psychological and material properties, and the extent to which benefits are maximized is partly an empirical question of degree and partly a problem of definition (Emerson 1981). The use of satisficing benefits in the model enables a range of benefits to be accommodated. A satisficing perspective for tourist decision-making is advocated by Mathieson and Wall who commented "tourists, still acting rationally but on the basis of limited information, seek satisfactory rather than optimal experiences. . . . Impacts of tourism result from behavioral outcomes of the tourist decision making process" (1982:26). Assessment of tourism impacts by host communities would be made in a similar context.

Since ideal maximized benefits are not always possible, a trade-off, or satisficing result is often acceptable, and continued engagement in the exchange relationship is likely to be maintained. Despite the nega-
tive effects of tourism, the benefits (financial, economic, social, or environmental) may be perceived by resident actors to outweigh the costs, and support for tourism is likely to continue and result in the maintenance of positive perceptions of tourism. Support for tourism, despite specific negative impacts, has been demonstrated in a number of research studies (Belisle and Hoy 1980; Bystrzanowski 1989a; Milman and Pizam 1988; Rothman 1978; Thomason, Crompton and Kamp 1979; Tyrell and Spaulding 1984; Var, Kendall and Tarakcioglu 1985). On the other hand, given minimal benefits, the actor is likely to reduce exchange behavior or discontinue the exchange relationship. When perceived benefits appear to reach an unacceptable level, negative perceptions of tourism are likely to emerge. According to Mathieson and Wall,

there is a threshold of tolerance of tourists by hosts which varies both spatially and temporally. As long as the numbers of tourists and their cumulative impacts remain below this critical level, and economic impacts continue to be positive, the presence of tourists in destinations is usually accepted and welcomed by the majority of the host population. Once the threshold has been exceeded, numerous negative symptoms of discontent make their appearance, ranging from mild apathy and irritation to extreme xenophobia, and from grudging courtesy to open exploitation (1982:141).

The preceding discussion suggests that:

A resident actor will assign a positive value or attitude towards tourism if the benefits meet an acceptable level of satisfaction determined by the actor (Proposition 2a).

A resident actor will assign a negative value or attitude towards tourism if the benefits do not meet an acceptable level of satisfaction determined by the actor (Proposition 2b).

The concept of reciprocity is probably regarded as most central to social exchange theory. It is defined by Gouldner as “a mutually gratifying pattern of exchanging goods and services,” with the understanding that “(a) in the long run the mutual exchange of goods and services will balance out; or (b) if people do not aid those who help them certain penalties will be imposed upon them; or (c) those whom they have helped can be expected to help; or (d) some or all of these” (Gouldner 1960:170). Reciprocity suggests that the resources exchanged should be roughly equivalent. When the nature of resources exchanged differs determining equivalence becomes problematic.

Reciprocity in exchange means that each actor will provide benefits to the other equitably and with units of exchange that are important to the actors. Reciprocity is interpreted and used differently by exchange theorists. For Emerson (1962, 1972), the reciprocity of social relations is expressed as a power-dependence relation: the power of actor A over actor B is equal to and based upon the dependence of actor B upon actor A. These transactions are described as “reciprocally reinforcing events which can be initiated from either end of the relation” (Emerson 1972:45).
The role and importance of reciprocity in exchange is highlighted by Cialdini (1988) in his research on the psychology of compliance, especially in the area of sales marketing and in reference to core-periphery relations (Chilcote 1974; Keeble 1967). This concept has been used to explain unequal exchange between different geographical areas and different economic development areas. Such relationships involve unequal exchange of products when a core zone (characterized by a centralized dominating area or society which is advanced and powerful) conditions and subjects the peripheral zone (characterized by a remote, undeveloped, backward, weak, and poorer area or society). The core expropriates surplus from the periphery, thus enabling the core to develop and expand at the expense of the periphery through incorporation of the periphery within the core’s system.

Residents seek benefits of tourism in exchange for something considered approximately equal to the benefits they in turn give. The resources they may offer to tourism actors (tourists, operators, developers) include supporting appropriate development, extending friendliness, courtesy, and hospitality to tourists (Inskeep 1991; Kaul 1985), and tolerating inconveniences caused by tourism, such as queuing for goods and services, sharing local facilities, overcrowding, and traffic congestion (Pizam 1978; Rothman 1978). Assume that reciprocal obligations exist and, if one actor ignores, coerces, or overrides the other, the disadvantaged actor will feel unfairly treated and exploited. For example, should residents not equitably reward tourists, tourists will tend to express anger and complain about the lack of hospitality of local residents and service providers. This anger may result in dissatisfied tourists spreading negative word-of-mouth communication about the destination and avoiding repeat visitation to the area. Likewise, should residents not comparably reward tourism businesses, an operator is likely to consider taking the business operation elsewhere or selling it. Accordingly,

*When the exchange of resources between resident and tourism actors is reciprocated (i.e., balanced), the effects of tourism are perceived positively by the respective actors (Proposition 3a).*

*When the exchange of resources between resident and tourism actors is not reciprocated (i.e., unbalanced), the effects of tourism are perceived negatively by the respective actors (Proposition 3b).*

Following from the notion of reciprocity is the justice principle; Searle (1991) has suggested that in each exchange a norm of fairness should govern exchange behavior. In other words, the exchange must be viewed as fair in the context of each actor’s social environment. Blau (1964) noted that deprivations arising from violating norms of fair exchange can lead to conflict and retaliation against violators. When the norms of reciprocity and justice are violated, the disadvantaged actor may feel (or be) exploited, yet may continue in the relationship, because of dependence upon the power advantaged actor. Thus, without the justice principle governing behavior such as when tourism is forced upon certain members of the community, an unbalanced exchange relationship may result. When one actor has a power advantage
over the other, he/she may ignore, coerce, or override the other, because of dependence upon the former. This creates tension and conflict, and hinders cordial and amicable relationships between the actors.

Host residents want to ensure that they receive reasonably fair and equitable returns for their participation in or their support of tourism. If the exchange is seen as fair, the exchange will continue and residents are likely to foster positive attitudes toward tourism. However, if the tourism industry is not perceived to be reciprocating fairly—for example, through exploitation of local workers and interference with native lifestyles (Brougham and Butler 1981; Krippendorf 1987; Schneider 1976; Rothman 1978; World Tourism Organization 1981)—residents are likely to express dissatisfaction and anger. Rivers' (1973) reported that residents become angry or even express violence at the unfairness of the distribution of benefits and costs. Resident anger and irritation toward the tourist or tourism industry may be manifested through such behaviors as overcharging, rudeness, indifference, poor service (Krippendorf 1987; Pearce 1989), criminal behavior (Belisle and Hoy 1980; Perdue, Long and Allen 1987; Pearce 1989; Rothman 1978; Sheldon and Var 1984), and hostility (Farrell 1982; Murphy 1985). Hence,

When the value of resources exchanged between the host resident and tourism actors is approximately equal, the exchange transaction is likely to be perceived as fair (Proposition 4a).

When the value of resources exchanged between the host and guest actors is greater for one than for the other, the exchange transaction is likely to be perceived as unfair by the disadvantaged actor (Proposition 4b).

When the value of resources exchanged between the host and guest actors is perceived as fair, the host actor is likely to have positive perceptions of tourism (Proposition 4c).

When the value of resources exchanged between the host and guest actors is perceived as unfair by the host actor, the latter is likely to have negative perceptions of tourism (Proposition 4d).

Exchange Formation

Meeting the antecedent conditions creates an environment conducive to forming an exchange relationship (Flow 2). The antecedents (i.e., opportunities) must be perceived by an actor to be rewarding and able to be consummated as a mutually reinforcing transaction. Exchange Formation involves a two-way directional linking of the antecedents to the forms of exchange relation. Alternatively, if either actor anticipates or perceives that the consequences of exchange will be unworthwhile or unrewarding, then withdrawal of exchange behavior will result and no exchange between the actors will occur (Flow 2a).

Further, it should be noted that a transaction is not a meaningful unit outside the exchange relation because of its temporal nature and the unique interactions involved with the given opportunities and initiations associated with it. That is, exchange relations are unique tempo-
ral relations as each transaction is linked to a history and future for specified actors, emphasizing a more or less durable social relation between two actors which is modifiable across time (Emerson 1972: 46). Therefore,

*The antecedents of the exchange relation should be met favorably in order for the exchange relation to form (Proposition 5a).*

*Where one or more of the antecedents of the exchange relation are abused, the exchange relation will not form (Proposition 5b).*

**Form of Exchange Relation**

Exchange formation, based on Emerson's (1972) power-dependence relations framework, leads to the development of exchange relations. The form of exchange relation is measured in terms of power or dependence of the actors involved and provides the basis for explaining why residents perceive the impacts of tourism to be either positive or negative. It is suggested that assuming the relationship between the host and guest actors is cohesive, positive perceptions of tourism impacts are related to high power levels: There is a high degree of influence or control of resources between the actors, because they both get something of value out of the exchange. This exchange relation is described as balanced; both actors have similar levels of power. Prediction of an outcome for a balanced relation is made when it is compared to actors with low levels of power. Therefore, when comparing the nature of the exchange relation between two sets of actors, one with high levels of power and the other with low, the former is seen to be advantaged and the latter disadvantaged. Negative perceptions are related to low levels of power between the actors, since neither actor gains much from the exchange. In a power relationship that is unbalanced and remains in that state, the disadvantaged actor, will likely develop negative perceptions, because one or more of the antecedent conditions are abused.

The major variables in the exchange relation are power, cohesion, and power imbalance. Power, the central variable of exchange, provides the basis for determining the form of the exchange relation. Power \((P_{ab})\) is defined where "the power of actor A over actor B is the amount of resistance on the part of B which can be potentially overcome by A" (Emerson 1962:32). The notion of power as a means of understanding residents' perceptions of tourism impacts was addressed by Krippendorf who noted that in the host population/tourism situation "the motto of the deal is 'The guy who pays gives the orders!'" (1987:49). This does not necessarily imply that the host resident is always disadvantaged, since the situation may be reversed and there are circumstances when the host may be advantaged. Furthermore, according to Emerson,

balance does not neutralize power, for each party may continue to exert profound control over the other . . . Rather than canceling out considerations of power, reciprocal power provides the basis for studying three more features of power relations: first, a power advan-
tage can be defined as $P_{ab}$ minus $P_{ba}$, which can be either positive or negative (a power disadvantage); second, the cohesion of a relationship can be defined as the average of $D_{ab}$ and $D_{ba}$ (or $P_{ab}$ and $P_{ba}$) . . . and finally, it opens the door to the study of balancing operations as structural changes in power-dependence relations which tend to reduce power advantage (1962:34).

Even though the relations between two actors are cohesive, by definition it may be asymmetrical because a perfect balance of power or dependence between actors seldom occurs. Thus, cohesion does not necessarily mean that the exchange relationship is balanced. It may mean that the relationship between the actors is unbalanced, but the relationship is cohesive and tends toward balance (Emerson 1962).

The role of power, as conceived by Emerson, suggests that the relative dependence between two actors determines their relative power. That is,

social relations entail ties of mutual dependence between the actors. A depends upon B if he aspires to goals or gratifications whose achievement is facilitated by appropriate actions on B's part. By virtue of mutual dependency, it is more or less imperative to each party that he be able to control or influence the other's conduct. . . . The power to control or influence the other resides in control over the things he values, all the way from oil resources to ego-support, depending upon the relation in question. In short, power resides implicitly in the other's dependency (1962:32).

Thus, Emerson's concept of power is used interchangeably with dependence.

Power in the social exchange setting, or social power, has generally been defined as the ability of one actor to influence the outcome of another actor's behavior or experience (Lippit, Polansky and Rosen, 1952; French and Raven 1959; Wrong 1979). In being defined as influence, power is viewed as the capacity to attain ends, usually to produce intended and foreseen effects on others. When thought of as a capacity to influence another, it is a dispositional concept—meaning that influence has latent effects which may not be observable (for example, changing attitudes), and that influence is not necessarily confined to producing a particular act on other actors (Wrong 1979). It must also be recognized that power is not being used in the context of authoritarian rule or power, but in terms of persuasion and mutual benefit.

Power is derived from having and controlling resources that another actor needs and values. A common approach to power is to enumerate the resources that make it possible to exercise power (Wrong 1979: 124). An actor brings various resources to an exchange. An actor with power is one who has an array of valued resources available to exchange with the other actor. This power or influence is derived from having and controlling resources that the other needs. The resource-dependence model developed by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978), in their analysis of organizations, adopted this approach. The model suggests that organizations are influenced by and respond to demands of other
organizations that control critical resources. Thus, the greater the resources of an actor, the greater the power possessed by the actor, because a variety of resources can be used to negotiate the exchange. Therefore, power is vested in the number and availability of valued resources that may be used as concessions to influence another actor.

Another attribute related to power in the exchange relation is cohesion (Emerson 1962, 1972). Cohesion is defined as the average of two actors' power or dependence on each other. It represents a variable state of the exchange relationship (for example, unchanged, undergoing change, or extinguishing) and provides a measure of the nature of interdependence between the actors. Cohesion "comes into play whenever one or both actors in the relation encounter value conflict. In the absence of conflict at a given time, it is an assessment of the level of potential conflict which the relation can survive or absorb" (Emerson 1972:63). Thus, by definition, power and cohesion are directly related. Therefore, it is implicitly assumed that greater cohesion is related to greater satisfaction with the consequences of exchange (that is, perceptions of tourism impacts).

With power as a dimension of exchange between two actors, four outcomes (depending upon the level of each actor's power) are possible. A comparison of an individual actor's outcome from a disadvantaged or advantaged position provides the basis for determining an actor's perception of the exchange. This is shown by the matrix presented in Figure 2. Balanced exchange representing high and low levels of power held by the actors are found in quadrants 1 and 4, respectively. These two quadrants provide a basis for comparing actors' outcomes as either positive or negative. When power levels are high for both actors, exchange is mutually beneficial when compared to actors with low power levels, because the former find exchange rewarding. When the actors have an array of resources to exchange, there is a greater likelihood for exchange occurring as the actors can obtain at least one of a number of valued resources from the relationship and derive some benefit from it.

It is also possible for both actors to possess low levels of power (quadrant 4). This occurs when following an exchange, the consequences do not produce its expected benefits. The resources that have been made available and are used in the exchange have little or limited value. This outcome is described as unrewarding, since both actors derive little benefit from it. The prediction of an outcome for a balanced exchange relation is dependent upon comparison between the two possible states (that is, in terms of high or low levels of power).

Quadrants 2 and 3 of the matrix represent unbalanced exchange where power levels between the actors in the dyad are different. Depending upon the power position of the actor in relation to the other, exchange may be either advantageous or disadvantageous. It is advantageous for the actor with greater power, as the actor is able to obtain an additional valued resource(s) at the expense of the other actor who did not obtain the valued resource that was expected. While for the disadvantaged actor, who has a lower level of power, the exchange is seen as unfair and the actor is placed at a disadvantage.

The power-dependence relation framework proposed by Emerson
Figure 2. Exchange Outcome Matrix
Adapted with permission from Influence Without Authority (p. 195) by A. R. Cohen and D. L. Bradford, 1990, New York: John Wiley. Copyright 1990 by the authors.

(1962, 1972) suggests that such relations involve a balancing process in the unbalanced relation so that relations tend toward balance (that is, if one has power—he uses it; if he uses it—he loses it). This notion of balanced relations is also supported by Cialdini (1988). It is important to remember that the exchange relation is the unit of analysis, not the “actors” or their characteristics, and that the focus is upon the processes involved in exchange. Furthermore, the least powerful actor is generally the initiator in the power/exchange relationship between actors A and B.

The relevance of the notion of power from the host perspective can be illustrated by the attention given in recent years to community tourism development. This attention has come from two directions: one originates from a concern that negative consequences of tourism development should be minimized and controlled. It recommends a “bottom up” people-oriented approach where consideration of community needs and concerns come first and foremost (Murphy 1985). The other direction comes from an economic perspective where tourism is used as a means of diversifying or revitalizing the economy, especially in rural areas (Blank 1989; USTTA 1989). The economic rationale for community tourism development is based on the premise that tourism enables the community to “join in the general progress and participate in the blessings of prosperity” (Krippendorf 1987:49). This premise
suggests economic expectations are first and foremost, but it has been viewed with skepticism. For example, Young (1973) and Turner and Ash (1975) raised concerns about the mixed blessings of tourism. However, the economic benefits cannot be ignored as Krippendorf (1987:49) reported on the comments of a Sri Lankan politician who said “We don’t need tourists, we need tourism,” obviously implying it is the money from tourism his country needs, not the tourists. Another criticism of the economic perspective is that it sacrifices community needs and concerns as the “locals are given to understand that they have to conform to the market—i.e., produce what sells” (Krippendorf 1987:50).

Regardless of the direction that leads to interest in community tourism development, the concept of power-dependence relations is equally applicable. Communities that experience declining agricultural or manufacturing economies often turn to tourism as a means of diversifying their economic base and generating income. Such communities are in a state of dependency and community leaders generally embark upon a vigorous program to initiate action to attract investors, developers, and operators to establish tourism facilities and services in their community. According to Mathieson and Wall, “it reflects widespread belief among agency personnel that tourism can yield rapid and considerable returns on investments and be a positive force in remedying economic problems” (1982:35). This pursuit of tourism is sometimes made regardless of the attractiveness of the area to tourists.

As the community opens its arms to the tourism actors, they are placed in a power-advantage position. According to Krippendorf, “Since many areas are eager to develop tourism, it must accept any price offered by the bidder” (1987:50). In signaling to the tourism actor that they are welcomed in the community (vis-a-vis special treatment, tax incentives, subsidies, relaxation of planning code requirements, or meeting any demands of the tourism actors), tourism actors are given relative freedom to establish and develop the product, and be in a position of control. As the benefits of tourism accrue to the community, the tourism actors lose some of their advantage. When the local economy improves, the original tourism actors play a lesser economic role. As tourism grows and the actors face increasing competition, they begin to depend more upon the host actors. For example, greater reliance may be placed upon the community as a source of labor and for residents to maintain their hospitality towards tourists in order promote this attribute, and as a means for tourism operators to maintain market share. This illustration represents a balanced exchange between the actors (as both share in the benefits and costs) and it is likely that tourism will be viewed positively by the residents. Peck and Lepie (1989) also noted that in the acculturation process that occurs between host and guest, where the acculturating groups have roughly equal power, a minimum of community disruption and disintegration will occur.

It is equally possible that the host residents do not obtain the expected benefits. Instead, “once tourism has taken hold of the area and the locals realize what they have let themselves in for, disillusionment and more realistic attitudes replace the initial euphoria. But then it
can be too late, because they have lost control over their own destiny . . . [consequently] the majority of the local population has to put up with the disadvantages brought on by the loss of control over their own communities” (Krippendorf 1987:45,55). In this situation, the exchange relationship is unbalanced, residents feel exploited, and it is likely they will develop negative attitudes.

If a community is an existing popular holiday destination area with strong planning (e.g., zoning regulations and design standards) and management control measures, it is in a power-advantage position, because a tourism operator is placed in a position of dependency. A tourism operator who proposes to enter the area with a product or service must comply with these controls in order to proceed with the project. Assuming the project proceeds and generates income for the new tourism operator and the community, the operator establishes credibility and a reputation within the community. When this occurs, the dependence of the tourism operator decreases as resident actors accept the presence of the operator in the community and share in the benefits.

Should a tourism operator consider the planning and management controls to be onerous but still proceed with the project, the company is likely to feel some loss of control over its destiny and a sense of being taken advantage of by the community; thus, an unbalanced exchange relationship exists. In this situation, the tourism operator is likely to develop negative attitudes about the arrangement. If the controls are considered unreasonable and are perceived to affect the project’s feasibility, the tourism operator could withdraw the project and look elsewhere. Hence, no exchange takes place. This discussions suggests that:

\[\text{If the host and tourism actors are in a balanced relation, initiation of the exchange relationship by either actor is equally probable (Proposition 6a).}\]

\[\text{If the host and tourism actors are in an unbalanced relation, the more dependent of the actors will be the more frequent initiator (Proposition 6b).}\]

\[\text{When the form of the exchange relation is cohesive and the level of power for both actors is high, host actors' perceptions toward tourism will be positive (Proposition 6c).}\]

\[\text{When the form of the exchange relation is cohesive and the level of power for both actors is low, host actors' perceptions toward tourism will be negative (Proposition 6d).}\]

\[\text{When the form of the relation involves an imbalance and is asymmetrical, the advantaged host actors' perceptions toward tourism will be positive (Proposition 6e).}\]

\[\text{When the form of the relation involves an imbalance and is asymmetrical, the disadvantaged host actors' perceptions toward tourism will be negative (Proposition 6f).}\]

Exchange Transaction Evaluation

The development of an exchange relation results in an exchange transaction taking place between the actors (Flow 3). Exchange transaction evaluation links the exchange relation and consequences of ex-
change. It involves assessment of the actual transfer of resources between actors who have entered an exchange relationship. Once an exchange relation has emerged and the transfer of resources between actors occurs, its consequences are evaluated.

**Consequences of Exchange**

Upon completion of the exchange process, an evaluation of its consequences takes place. When evaluation of the consequences of an exchange transaction are viewed as being rewarding and positive (Flow 4), the actor's needs are satisfied and it reinforces the behavior of the actor such that the latter is likely to continue engaging in future exchanges. Perdue, Long and Allen (1990) found that support for additional tourism development was related to perceived positive impacts of tourism and negatively related to perceived negative impacts, thus suggesting that behavioral intentions were related to residents' perceptions.

Alternatively, if the consequences of the exchange have been evaluated as being unrewarding and negative, then exchange behavior is likely to be withdrawn with no exchange likely to occur between the actors in the future (Flow 4a). Nash (1989:46) recognized the possibility of exchange not being as beneficial as expected: "Of course, calculations may go awry, and what may have appeared to be a profitable venture may turn out in the end to be extremely costly. . . . they [entrepreneurial hosts] may begin to have second thoughts about the wisdom of their initial calculations." A reduction or withdrawal of behavior may also occur at the antecedents stage of the process (Flow 2a) where the actor assesses that engaging in exchange would result in some or all of the antecedent conditions not being met (for example, reciprocity is unequal, injustice, or benefits do not attain an acceptable level). Withdrawal as a response in the host-guest relationship was found by Rothman (1978) who reported that residents tend to avoid areas frequented by seasonal visitors. Furthermore, Doğan (1989) noted one of the responses used by host residents in coping with the changes wrought by tourism was the avoidance of contact with tourists, which was described as a form of "retreatism." At times, one actor may impose upon another and there is no opportunity for a choice of behavior upon the imposed actor, because the matter is a fait accompli. This occurs when mutual benefit from exchange may not be the objective of the coercer. Nonetheless, the disadvantaged actor still has the opportunity to evaluate the consequences and it is likely to be evaluated negatively.

The consequences of the exchange transaction depend upon what resources are valued and exchanged by the respective actors. These consequences may be positive or negative, and may also be evaluated in terms of outputs, actions, and/or outcomes. In this model, residents' perceptions of the consequences of tourism impacts are primarily considered experiential or psychological outcomes. The recognition of varying consequences of exchange was noted by Bagozzi (1979). However, his description of the categories is not consistent with social psychological interpretations of the consequences of social behavior. Accordingly, the categories have been adapted and revised into categories
of outputs, actions, and outcomes. When exchange transactions between actors are evaluated, the consequences may be viewed in the following sequence: examining outputs from exchange; determining the actions of the actor in response to the outputs obtained; and evaluating the psychological outcomes of the consequences.

Outputs refer to the physical, social, or symbolic objects or events that are valued and accrue to the actors. An example of outputs resulting from a profitable exchange between a host community and tourists would be the accrual of income and economic benefits to the host. Actions refer to the behavior, or outward manifestations, in which the actors engage. The extension of hospitality, courtesy, and friendliness toward tourists, or opposition to newly proposed tourism development are actions that residents may exhibit as a result of favorable and unfavorable encounters with tourists and the industry, respectively. Outcomes refer to what the actors feel and are described as psychological states which result from being involved in an exchange relationship. Outcomes have been described by Bagozzi as experiences “conveyed symbolically through the objects exchanged, the functions performed by the exchange, or the meanings attributed to the exchange” (1979: 138). Outcomes resulting from these experiences in a profitable exchange may be feelings of financial security, contentment with the host’s quality of life, and favorable attitudes toward the tourism industry generally. As such,

A host actor will perceive tourism positively when the consequences of exchange provide a reinforcing exchange experience (Proposition 7a).

A host actor will perceive tourism negatively when the consequences of exchange provide an unrewarding or unfavorable exchange experience (Proposition 7b).

CONCLUSIONS

The lack of explicit linkage to a theory is a major limitation in advancing understanding of residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts. It is proposed that a social exchange paradigm offers a useful theoretical framework, which can account for both the positive and negative impacts of tourism as perceived by the host population. Social exchange theory is a logically and intuitively appealing one that may be used to explain why residents develop positive or negative perceptions of tourism impacts. It suggests that when exchange of resources (expressed in terms of power) between residents and tourism is high and balanced, or high for the host actor in an unbalanced relation, tourism impacts are viewed positively by residents. When exchange of resources is low in either the balanced or unbalanced exchange relation, the impacts are viewed negatively. The model provides a basis for explaining the process involved in social exchange and the propositions outlined in this paper provide a basis for testing the model.

It is acknowledged that support by previous tourism research for the propositions presented in this paper is lacking. While this may be a valid concern, it poses a “chicken-egg” relationship dilemma. The main purpose for developing the model (and its accompanying propositions) is to provide a framework for developing a research program on the subject. As noted earlier, one of the main problems identified with
existing research is an underdeveloped theoretical orientation. It might be argued that some existing research could be reworked in terms of social exchange theory. A review of existing research in the context of exchange theory was made, but it does not appear plausible since it is fraught with problems. First, it is questionable to attribute the findings of previous research into an exchange framework when the objectives of such research served a specific and different purpose. The establishment of a relationship between the findings of previous research and suggested propositions may be tenuous and overly simplistic. Second, the variables used and measured in previous research are not comparable with those used in an exchange framework. Third, there is difficulty in suggesting and making assertions about a relationship without adequate support.

Some of the propositions, especially those pertaining to the antecedents of the exchange relation and evaluation of exchange consequences, appear tautological. This is an inherent attribute of the proposition when terminology is borrowed and used from operant behavior and it may, therefore, be considered a limitation. However, it is important to recognize the contextual setting for each proposition and remember that it is applied in a dynamic situation and that each proposition represents one aspect of a process. Furthermore, Emerson's (1972, 1981) exchange framework, upon which the model is based, focuses on the form of the exchange relation as the unit of analysis which, as discussed in this paper, resolves the criticism of tautology.

The proposed model seeks to extend existing knowledge through developing a theoretical orientation toward understanding and predicting residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism; and providing a basis for identification and definition of the central concepts involved in measuring residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism. In addition, this paper indicates application of social exchange theory can be used in a tourism setting. In developing and proposing this theoretical orientation for future research on residents' perceptions of tourism, it is hoped that further theoretical development and understanding of this subject will be stimulated.  
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