

RESIDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AND ITS IMPACTS (CASE: MONTENEGRO)

Iva Bulatovic

PhD, Assistant Professor, Higher Colleges of Technology,
Faculty of Business

Residents' attitudes toward tourism development and its impacts (economic, socio-cultural and environmental) in case of Montenegro haven't been analyzed before in a scientific and systematic way. The main aim of this paper is to provide a high-quality base for further research bearing in mind that there is no relevant, scientific research related to this topic. For the purposes of this paper poll survey among residents in Montenegro (total 857) was conducted in 2018. Collected data were processed and analyzed by different statistical methods. Results showed that attitudes of residents depend on their place of residence. There is also a statistically significant relationship between demographic characteristics and positive and negative attitudes toward tourism impacts but the relationship is not strong. New, expanded research regarding the topic is recommended as well as the introduction of destination lifecycle analysis.

Keywords: *residents' attitudes, impacts, tourism, Montenegro.*

INTRODUCTION

Measuring impacts of tourism is a great challenge for decision makers. In most cases, measuring positive economic impacts of tourism is systematic, well organized and implemented by many

© University of the Aegean. Print ISSN: 1790-8418, Online ISSN: 1792-6521



Except where otherwise noted, this work is licensed under
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

official bodies. On the other hand, measuring social, cultural and environmental impacts is not as much frequent and systematic as measuring economic impacts. Usually, all these measurements are based on the exploration of tourists and residents' attitudes toward specially indicated impacts. In the context of Montenegro, small developing, southeast European country, at the Adriatic coast, measuring impacts of tourism is based only on measuring economic impacts. Environmental and social-cultural impacts haven't been explored in detail yet. The purpose of this paper is to explore Montenegrin residents' attitudes toward tourism development and its impacts (economic, socio-cultural and environmental) in order to set the base for decision-makers and for further destination development. Special focus will be on investigation of residents' demographic characteristics on their attitudes in order to compare our analysis with other similar research held worldwide.

Tourism is one of the most important pillars of the Montenegrin economy (Bulatovic et.al.,2018). Montenegro was visited by 2,204,856 tourists in 2018 and they recorded 12,930,334 overnight stays in three different regions: Coastal, Central and North. The most visited region in Montenegro and the most developed in the sense of tourism is Coastal region that usually records more than 95% of total tourist traffic in Montenegro (Monstat, 2019). Economic impacts of tourism in Montenegro are measured by World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC, 2019). Tourism takes 21.6% of total contribution to GDP, 32.7% to employment and more than 89% goes to leisure spending. Montenegro is the most visited during summer season (Jun, July and August). Due to climate change, winter season is changeable, and lack of snow causes fewer occupancy rates. Moreover, tourist infrastructure in the North region is not developed as it is in the case of the Coastal region. As it was stated before, socio-cultural and environmental impacts, as well as

negative economic impacts, have not been measured before. In the next text, we are going to present the literature review, hypothesis, research methodology, sample, our results and discussion.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Market segmentation is a marketing tool that allows the recognition and separation of different consumer target groups using specific and objective criteria. According to Kotler and Armstrong (2005) market segmentation can be defined as the division of a market into distinct groups of buyers who have distinct needs, characteristics, or behavior and who might require separate products or marketing strategies.

An organization, whether tourism destination or business, cannot address effectively the needs of all consumers. Consequently, it has to recognize the most attractive, lucrative and suitable market segments to serve effectively (Kotler, 1991; Kotler et al., 2006; Middleton et al, 2009; Pickton & Broderick, 2005).

Market segmentation and focus on distinctive target markets is a necessity since, as Morrison (2001) suggests, a non targeted approach can prove too costly because it is certain that there are target markets that have no interest in buying specific products and services. According to Lewis et al (2013) a destination may be attractive and fashionable for a specific target market but at the same time have no appeal or be downright avoidable for another. This knowledge is valuable for the marketing departments of tour operators charged with designing and promoting tour packages but also for all relevant stakeholders.

Segmentation allows the marketing departments of tour operators and travel agencies to have a better understanding of the various markets but also of their competition. Segmentation leads to effective marketing planning because it allows registering the demands of specific target groups (Dibb & Lyndon, 1991).

Of great importance though are the criteria used to achieve an effective market segmentation. Researchers have applied different

variables through time, in order to segment the tourism market, like demographic, economic, geographic, psychographics, benefits sought segmentation, usage, lifestyle, activities, behavioral and/ or product- Exploring residents attitudes toward impacts of tourism and tourism development in general has always been attractive topic among researchers (Sheldon, Var, 1984; Liu, Var, 1986; Perdue et al.,1990; Akis et al.,1996; Mason, Cheyne, 2000; Besculides et al.,2002; Ross, 1992; Snaith, Haley, 1999; Teye et al., 2002; Andereck et al.,2005; Lee et al.,2010; Almeida -Garcia et al., 2015; Liang, Hui, 2016; Hu et al.,2016; Ribeiro et al.,2017; Garau-Vadell, 2018; Joo et al.,2019).

Besides investigation of economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts, researchers have paid great attention to factors which could affect residents attitudes such as demographic characteristics: age (Harrill, 2004; Huh, Vogt, 2008); gender (Nunkoo, Gursoy, 2012); community attachment/ length of residence, education and type of work (Kuvan, Akan, 2005).

For example, Almeida – Garcia et al. (2016) investigated residents' perceptions of tourism development in Spain (Benalmadena). These authors found out that demographic characteristics such as place of birth, community attachment and education of respondents significantly affect their attitudes toward tourism developments.

Furthermore, Kuvan and Akan (2005) in their research held in Belek (Antalya) concluded that residents have mainly positive attitudes toward tourism development in this area, but negative impacts of tourism and negative attitudes by residents were seen as results of less effective government's decisions. These authors declared that family income is the most important factor that affects residents attitudes as well as a source of income (related to tourism or not).

Weawer and Lawton (2001) based on their research held in Australia found out that residents' perceptions about impacts of tourism and tourism development, in general, depend at great scale on age, gender and length of residence.

Kim et al. (2013) investigated how tourism affects the quality of life among residents. Their results showed that socio-demographic characteristics such as income, marital status and general life satisfaction impact their attitudes toward tourism development.

Rivera, Croes and Lee (2016) analyzed the relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism impacts and their level of general satisfaction. They came to an interesting conclusion that incomes do not impact residents' perceptions of tourism impacts as much as social comparison. Bimonte and Faralla (2016) concluded that residents' attitudes toward the impacts of tourism depend mainly on their overall life satisfaction.

Nunkoo and Gursoy (2012) in their research held in Mauritius investigated impacts of residents' demographic characteristics on residents' attitudes toward tourism development and their willingness to support tourism development. They concluded that socio-demographic characteristics affect respondents' attitudes toward tourism development and its impact at a great scale. Another research (Hanafiah et al., 2013) held in Malaysia emphasized the importance of exploring residents' attitudes toward tourism development. These authors stated that if the

community want to prospect residents must be involved in decision making and their attitudes are of crucial importance.

In the context of Montenegro, we couldn't find in ScienceDirect and Google Scholar database any relevant research regarding residents attitudes toward tourism development and its impacts.

Based on the literature review presented above, our hypothesizes are:

H1: Residents attitudes (positive and negative) toward the impacts of tourism in Montenegro depend on the region (place) where residents live.

H2: Residents' attitudes (positive and negative) toward impacts of tourism in Montenegro depend on their demographic

characteristics such as age, gender, education, income, employment status and their work.

Sample and Methodology

For the purpose of this paper, the poll is used. A special questionnaire was designed based on previous research and available literature (Page, 2015; Inkson, Minnaert, 2018). The questionnaire was composed of two parts: Residents' attitudes and Bio information: In part Residents' attitudes 23 different statements were presented. Statements were referred to as economic (EC), socio-cultural (SC) and environmental impacts (EN) of tourism. For the level of agreement assessment respondents used Likert's scale from 1 - strongly disagree to 6 – strongly agree. Reliability statistics showed that data is relevant - Cronbach's Alpha = 0.904 (Bland, Altman, 1997). Bio information includes information about gender, age, education, employment, income and residence place. Income scale was designed according to the Montenegrin Statistic Bureau (2017). More than 1000 questionnaires were delivered, but 857 were returned fulfilled (83% response rate). The poll was held between January and August 2018. Sample characteristics are presented below (Table 1).

Frequency		Percent
Gender		
Male	307	35.8
female	550	64.2
Total	857	100
Age		
18 - 30	612	71.4
21 - 50	159	18.6
51 - 65	86	10
Total	857	100
Education		
High school	318	37.1
college	131	15.3

bachelor degree	245	28.6
specialization degree	113	13.2
Master degree	34	4
phd	16	1.9

For results' presentation mean values are calculated and grouped by region: Coastal, Central and North. ANOVA and Eta were calculated with the aim to prove if there was a significant difference between attitudes of respondents from different regions. For data reduction, 23 items (different attitudes) were processed by Principal Components Analysis. Moreover, in order to investigate relationship between specific factors / components derived by PCA and demographic characteristics, multiregression analysis is used. Results of our analysis are presented in the next chapter.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of the average value of the degree of agreement of residents with the proposed attitudes (tables) shows that tourism plays an important role in the economy of Montenegro. Residents moderately agree with the view that tourism influenced income improvement, infrastructure development, employment, tax rates, real estate prices, a seasonal increase in prices. The opinion of most respondents is that the positive economic effects of tourism outweigh the negative economic impacts.

Similar findings were also made in the analysis of attitudes related to the socio-cultural effects of tourism. The respondents agreed that tourism improves socio-cultural activities in the region, cultural development, and that tourism has a positive impact on the local population, on the acquisition of new knowledge and skills, as well as on future ambitions of the population to become more involved in the tourism industry. On the other hand, the findings show

that there are minimal negative socio-cultural impacts (terrorist attacks, criminal, diseases).

When it comes to environmental impact, respondents disagreed with the attitude that, because of the tourism development in their region, they are suffering from overcrowding and congestion by tourists. They showed very little agreement with the attitude, that they are unfairly exposed to the lack of electricity and water in the peak season due to tourism, and that tourism has adversely affected the environment and led to an increase in excessive construction. A detailed overview of the total average values is given in the table below (Table 2).

Table 2. Residents attitudes toward impacts of tourism – Mean Values		Total
		M
EC	Tourism has great importance on the regional economy	4.7608
EC	The income of residents in my region has increased due to tourism	3.6336
EC	If there had been no tourism industry, infrastructure and other facilities would not improve in my region	3.9428
EC	The development of tourism in my region provides more opportunities for the employment of residents	4.4411
EC	Real estate prices in my region have grown due to tourism and this is an additional benefit for us	3.7048
EC	Tourist institutions (touristic business entities, hotel industry and catering) should pay more taxes than others	3.6838
EC	Tourism has a negative impact on the growth of prices during the main tourist season in my region	3.4586
EC	The economic benefits of tourism outweigh the negative consequences	4.0583
EN	I suffer from overcrowding and pollution by tourists	2.6896
EN	Due to tourism, We are incorrectly exposed to the lack of electricity and water at the peak of the season	3.1179
EN	The tourism industry in my region has a negative impact on the environment and has led to an increase in excessive construction	3.1529
SC	Tourism encourages social and cultural activities in my region	4.3652
SC	I think that it is necessary to open more quality tourist and catering facilities in order to attract more tourists to my region	5.2042
SC	The residents of my region will not enjoy / will not be happy if my region attracts more tourists	2.5858
SC	I believe that the tourism industry has improved the quality of life	3.2567

SC	I think that tourism has improved the culture, knowledge and skills of the local population	4.2940
SC	The cultural advantages of tourism outweigh the negative social impacts	4.1680
SC	Tourists have positively influenced our culture	4.2684
SC	Ordinary residents (non-tourism residents) can not benefit from the tourism industry	3.3722
SC	I note that tourism leads to increased crime and vandalism in my region	2.6593
SC	Some health problems have increased in the main tourist season in my region	2.6791
SC	Residents have become more ambitious in terms of money due to the tourism industry	3.9953
SC	My region has become a target destination for terrorists and gangs	2.5193

Source: SPSS Output

Note: EC:Economic; SC: socio-cultural; EN: environmental

Our analysis showed that there a statistically significant difference between respondents' from different region, $p < 0.05$ (Table 3). Only in assessing 8 attitudes there was no significant difference between regions ($p > 0.05$). These attitudes are bold in the following table (Table 3)

Table 3. ANOVA and Eta Square Analysis /factor: region							
		Sum of Square s	df	Mean Square	F	p	Eta Square
Tourism is of great importance for the regional economy	Between Groups	15.933	2	7.967	3.787	.023	0.094
	Within Groups	1794.492	853	2.104			
	Total	1810.425	855				
Tourism encourages social and cultural activities in my region	Between Groups	11.947	2	5.973	2.778	.063	0.080
	Within Groups	1834.061	853	2.150			
	Total	1846.008	855				

The income of my region's population has increased due to tourism	Between Groups	109.429	2	54.714	18.262	.000	0.203
	Within Groups	2555.654	853	2.996			
	Total	2665.083	855				
I think that it is necessary to open more high quality tourist and catering facilities in order to attract more tourists to my region	Between Groups	.066	2	.033	.022	.978	.007
	Within Groups	1289.157	853	1.511			
	Total	1289.223	855				
The residents of my region will not enjoy / will not be happy if my region attracts more tourists	Between Groups	25.389	2	12.694	3.633	.027	0.092
	Within Groups	2980.722	853	3.494			
	Total	3006.111	855				
If there had been no tourism industry, infrastructure and other facilities would not improve in my region	Between Groups	36.234	2	18.117	6.868	.001	0.126
	Within Groups	2249.961	853	2.638			
	Total	2286.195	855				
The development of tourism in my region provides more opportunities for the employment of residents	Between Groups	36.950	2	18.475	7.130	.001	0.128
	Within Groups	2210.130	853	2.591			
	Total	2247.079	855				
I believe that the tourism industry has improved the quality of life	Between Groups	32.912	2	16.456	6.461	.002	0.122
	Within Groups	2172.546	853	2.547			

and increased the trade in my region	Total	2205.458	855				
The economic benefits of tourism outweigh the negative consequences	Between Groups	2.099	2	1.049	.432	.650	0.032
	Within Groups	2074.096	853	2.432			
	Total	2076.195	855				
I think that tourism has improved the culture, knowledge and skills of the local population	Between Groups	5.869	2	2.934	1.294	.275	0.055
	Within Groups	1933.945	853	2.267			
	Total	1939.813	855				
The cultural advantages of tourism outweigh the negative social impacts	Between Groups	2.153	2	1.077	.452	.637	0.033
	Within Groups	2032.958	853	2.383			
	Total	2035.111	855				
Tourists have positively influenced our culture	Between Groups	1.039	2	.520	.232	.793	.023
	Within Groups	1911.162	853	2.241			
	Total	1912.201	855				
Real estate prices in my city have grown due to tourism and this is an additional benefit for us	Between Groups	14.344	2	7.172	2.518	.081	0.077
	Within Groups	2429.469	853	2.848			
	Total	2443.813	855				
Tourist institutions (business entities from	Between Groups	2.092	2	1.046	.355	.701	0.029
	Within Groups	2513.478	853	2.947			

tourism, hotel industry and catering) should pay more taxes than others	Total	2515.570	855				
Ordinary residents (non-tourism residents) can not benefit from the tourism industry	Between Groups	57.647	2	28.824	8.755	.000	0.142
	Within Groups	2808.217	853	3.292			
	Total	2865.864	855				
I suffer from overcrowding and congestion by tourists	Between Groups	39.034	2	19.517	5.958	.003	0.117
	Within Groups	2794.307	853	3.276			
	Total	2833.341	855				
I note that tourism leads to increased crime and vandalism in my city	Between Groups	34.136	2	17.068	5.449	.004	0.112
	Within Groups	2671.937	853	3.132			
	Total	2706.074	855				
Some health problems have increased in the main tourist season in my region	Between Groups	30.084	2	15.042	4.738	.009	0.105
	Within Groups	2708.210	853	3.175			
	Total	2738.294	855				
Residents have become more ambitious in terms of money due to the tourism industry	Between Groups	56.421	2	28.211	10.950	.000	0.158
	Within Groups	2197.574	853	2.576			
	Total	2253.995	855				
My region has become a target	Between Groups	32.042	2	16.021	4.871	.008	0.106

destination for terrorists and gangs	Within Groups	2805.6 21	853	3.289			
	Total	2837.6 62	855				
Due to tourism, we are incorrectly exposed to the lack of electricity and water at the peak of the season	Between Groups	87.267	2	43.634	12.79 1	.000	0.171
	Within Groups	2909.8 16	853	3.411			
	Total	2997.0 83	855				
The tourism industry in my region has a negative impact on the environment and has led to an increase in excessive construction	Between Groups	97.485	2	48.743	15.18 8	.000	0.185
	Within Groups	2737.4 67	853	3.209			
	Total	2834.9 52	855				
Tourism has a negative impact on the growth of prices during the main tourist season in my region	Between Groups	49.586	2	24.793	7.423	.001	0.131
	Within Groups	2848.9 83	853	3.340			
	Total	2898.5 69	855				

Source: SPSS Output

On the other side, Eta square was calculated to define the strength of different groups' impact on residents' attitudes. If Eta Square = 0.01 it means small impact of groups on attitudes; if Eta square = 0.06 – medium impact; Eta square = 0.16 – high impact (Cohen, 2013).

The statistically significant differences in attitudes between the three different regions are evident as well as the magnitude of the impact that varies from medium to extremely high. Such findings are not surprising if we consider the economic and tourist development of certain regions of Montenegro that we discussed in the introduction. It is clear that the inhabitants of the central coastline region feel the impact of tourism considerably in comparison with the inhabitants of the northern region. We conclude that our first hypothesis is: "H1: Resident attitudes (positive and negative) towards the impact of tourism in Montenegro depend on the region (place) where residents live" confirmed.

In order to examine the second hypothesis, i.e. The effects of demographic factors on the positive and negative residents' attitudes on the impacts of tourism, we performed Principal Component Analysis. An insight into the correlation matrix revealed many coefficients of 0.3 and more. The value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin is 0.932, which is significantly above the recommended value of 0.6 (Kaiser, 1970, 1974). Bartlett's (1954) sphericity test is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) which will say that PCA is statistically justified and relevant (Table 4).

Three components with values over 1 have been singled out by PCA, which explain 32.698%, 16.035% and 4.508% (total 53.240%). Insight into the scree plot a clear fracture point behind the second component was identified, so it was decided to keep only two components (Cattell, 1966). These two components describe 48.732% of the variance, which is a solid result. There is a weak correlation between these two components (see table). The attitudes that belong to Components 1 and 2 are bolded in the next table.

Table 4. Principal Component Analysis - RESULTS	
KMO and Bartlett's Test	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.932
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square 8850.731

	df		253	
	Sig.		0.000	
	Pattern Matrix ^a		Structure Matrix	
	Component		Component	
	1	2	1	2
Positive attitudes - COMPONENT 1 I think that tourism has improved the culture, knowledge and skills of the local population	.759	-0.024	.766	-0.239
I believe that the tourism industry has improved the quality of life and increased the trade in my region	.742	-0.072	.763	-0.283
Tourism encourages social and cultural activities in my region	.715	.030	.707	-0.174
The development of tourism in my region provides more opportunities for the employment of residents	.709	.057	.693	-0.145
Tourists have positively influenced our culture	.690	.033	.681	-0.163
The cultural advantages of tourism outweigh the negative social impacts	.672	-0.040	.683	-0.231
Tourism is of great importance for the regional economy	.645	.149	.603	-0.035
Had there been no tourism industry, infrastructure and other facilities would not improve in my region	.637	-0.162	.683	-0.343
The income of my region's residents has increased due to tourism	.629	-0.138	.669	-0.317
The economic benefits of tourism outweigh the negative consequences	.623	-0.070	.643	-0.247
Real estate prices in my city have grown due to tourism and this is an additional benefit for us	.527	-0.287	.608	-0.437
I think that it is necessary to open more quality tourist and catering facilities in order to attract more tourists to my city	.523	.177	.473	.028
Residents have become more ambitious in terms of money due to tourism industry	.490	-0.301	.576	-0.440

Negative attitudes – COMPONENT 2	-0.076	-0.859	.169	-0.838
I note that tourism leads to increased crime and vandalism in my region				
I suffer from overcrowding and congestion by tourists	-0.038	-0.823	.196	-0.812
My region has become a target destination for terrorists and gangs	-0.022	-0.813	.210	-0.807
Some health problems such as AIDS have increased in the main tourist season in my region.	-0.010	-0.808	.220	-0.805
The tourism industry in my region has a negative impact on the environment and has led to an increase in excessive construction	-0.006	-0.746	.206	-0.745
Due to tourism, we are incorrectly exposed to the lack of electricity and water in the peak of the season	.047	-0.717	.250	-0.730
The residents of my region will not enjoy / will not be happy if my region attracts more tourists	.013	-0.643	.195	-0.647
Tourism has a negative impact on growth of prices during main tourist season in my region	.089	-0.615	.264	-0.641
Ordinary residents (non-tourism residents) can not benefit from the tourism industry	-0.048	-0.615	.127	-0.602
Tourist institutions (business entities from tourism, hotel industry and catering) should pay more taxes than others	.107	-0.499	.249	-0.530
Component Correlation Matrix				
Component	1		2	
1	1.000		-.284	
2	-.284		1.000	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.				

We note that the PCA has distinguished the positive and negative residents' attitudes on the impacts of tourism on the destination.

Furthermore, starting from the assumption that demographic characteristics influence the isolated components 1 and 2 and in trying to prove hypothesis 2, we examined two regression models:

- Model 1: Positive attitudes toward the impact of tourism on the destination depend on gender, age, status, education, resident's income, and whether they are engaged in tourism or not.

- Model 2: Negative attitudes toward the impacts of tourism on the destination depend on gender, age, status, education, resident's income, and whether they are engaged in tourism or not.

The results of the analysis are presented in the Table 5. Both models are statistically significant $p < 0.05$, however correlation coefficients show a poor correlation between attitudes and demographic characteristics of residents. On the other hand, the value of R^2 (0.061 and 0.046) means that 6.1% variance and 4.6% variance (10.7% in total) are explained to these models, which is not a good result.

Table 5. Regression Models - Results

Model Summary^b						
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate		
1	.246 ^a	.061	.053	.97317089		
2	.214 ^a	.046	.038	.98078859		
ANOVA^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
1	Regression	51.892	7	7.413	7.827	.000 ^b
	Residual	803.108	848	.947		
	Total	855.000	855			
2	Regression	39.270	7	5.610	5.832	.000 ^b
	Residual	815.730	848	.962		
	Total	855.000	855			
Coefficients						

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.732	.298		2.457	.014
	Gender	.174	.071	.084	2.458	.014
	Age	.043	.069	.028	.617	.538
	Education	-.071	.026	-.093	- 2.732	.006
	Status	-.065	.052	-.058	- 1.234	.218
	Income	.086	.034	.088	2.498	.013
	Are you engaged in tourism?	-.406	.079	-.174	- 5.153	.000
	(Constant)	-1.042	.300		- 3.472	.001
2	Gender	.121	.071	.058	1.696	.090
	Age	.233	.070	.154	3.350	.001
	Education	-.018	.026	-.023	-.679	.497
	Status	.023	.053	.020	.432	.666
	Income	-.063	.035	-.064	- 1.808	.071
	Are you engaged in tourism?	.279	.079	.120	3.523	.000
	(Constant)					

Source: SPSS Output

Analyzing the coefficients individually, it is noticed that all the proposed coefficients are statistically significant. In the first model, statistically significant coefficients are gender, education, income, whether are you engaged in tourism or not. In the second model, statistically significant coefficients are only age and whether are you engaged in tourism or not ($p < 0.05$).

From the complete analysis, we conclude that the attitudes of the residents toward the impacts of tourism cannot be brought in conjunction with all their demographic characteristics. The tested

models, although statistically significant, do not explain more than 50% of the variance, so we cannot confirm them as relevant. Our hypothesis that "Residents' attitudes (positive and negative) towards the impact of tourism in Montenegro depend on their demographic characteristics such as age, gender, education, income, employment status and their work." is rejected.

The findings of our analysis correlate with previous research (Almeida - Garcia et al., 2016; Ribeiro, 2017). This means that the attitudes of the residents, in general, do not depend on gender and age but depend on the place of residence (region). Furthermore, our analysis did not lead to the conclusion that older respondents have a more positive attitude compared to young people (Huh, Vogt, 2008; Almeida-Garcia et.al, 2016). In contrast, in the case of Montenegro, negative attitudes toward the impact of tourism are more present among the older population (51-65 years). Our results show that the positive attitudes of residents toward the impacts of tourism depend on income, but the size of the impact is low. This finding is partially correlated with the findings of Kuvan and Akan (2005) and Kim et al. (2013). Similar are the findings regarding the effects of occupation on the attitudes of residents previously made by Kuvan and Akan (2005). Likewise, the views of the residents do not depend largely on their education, as it is the case in the research carried out by Almeida-Garcia et al. (2016).

CONCLUSION

The impacts of tourism are extremely difficult to measure, especially socio-cultural and environmental. The examination of the attitudes of the residents is the starting point for future planning and measuring the effects of tourism, for making strategic decisions and for the tourism development plans implementation plans (Almeida-Garcia et al, 2015, 2016, Hanafiah et al., 2013). The main conclusion of our research is that the residents of Montenegro are light to

moderate satisfied with the current development of tourism, and that their attitudes (positive and negative) toward the impacts of tourism on the destination do not depend largely on gender, age, education, status, income, whether they are engaged in tourism or not. Findings have confirmed the existence of the impact of demographic characteristics on the residents' attitudes, but these links are not as significant as in previous similar researches.

This paper presents the starting point for future research. If we consider that this is the first relevant scientific study that examines the residents' attitudes toward the impacts of tourism, there is enough space for future research and upgrades. Our recommendation for future research is to expand the sample, to conduct the survey by cities, not by regions, to improve the questionnaire in order to that all positive and negative impacts of tourism are covered. The research can be expanded in order to examine the attitudes of the residents toward current destination management, as Kuvan and Akan did (2005), but also to incorporate a couple of psychological questions in order to determine the level of personal life satisfaction and examine its impacts on the attitudes of residents toward impacts of tourism (Rivera, Croes, Lee 2016; Bimonte, Faralla, 2016). The degree of life satisfaction can essentially influence the findings of the research, so this factor should be included. These are also the main limitations of this research. These findings can also be used to measure the destination life cycle using the Butler's or Irridex model, which we have not done in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Akis, S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus. *Tourism management*, 17(7), 481-494.
- Almeida - García, F., Vázquez, A. B., & Macías, R. C. (2015). Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13, 33-40.

- Almeida-García, F., Peláez-Fernández, M. Á., Balbuena-Vazquez, A., & Cortes-Macias, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54, 259-274.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of tourism research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Bartlett, M. S. (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various χ^2 approximations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 296-298.
- Besculides, A., Lee, M. E., & McCormick, P. J. (2002). Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 29(2), 303-319.
- Bimonte, S., & Faralla, V. (2016). Does residents' perceived life satisfaction vary with tourist season? A two-step survey in a Mediterranean destination. *Tourism Management*, 55, 199-208.
- Bland, J. M., & Altman, D. G. (1997). Statistics notes: Cronbach's alpha. *Bmj*, 314(7080), 572.
- Bulatović, I., Stranjančević, A., Đurašević, S., & Vlahović, S. (2018). Determinants Of Tourist Competitiveness In The Case Of Montenegro: Experts'assessment. *Tourism and hospitality management*, 24(2), 271-286.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate behavioral research*, 1(2), 245-276.
- Cohen, J. (2013). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge.
- Garau-Vadell, J. B., Gutierrez-Taño, D., & Diaz-Armas, R. (2018). Economic crisis and residents' perception of the impacts of tourism in mass tourism destinations. *Journal of destination marketing & management*, 7, 68-75.
- Hanafiah, M. H., Jamaluddin, M. R., & Zulkifly, M. I. (2013). Local community attitude and support towards tourism development in Tioman Island, Malaysia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 105, 792-800.
- Harrill, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of planning literature*, 18(3), 251-266.

- Huh, C., & Vogt, C. A. (2008). Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 446-455.
- Inkson, C., & Minnaert, L. (2018). *Tourism management: an introduction*. Sage, London.
- Joo, D., Cho, H., & Woosnam, K. M. (2019). Exploring tourists' perceptions of tourism impacts. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 31, 231-235.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1970). A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika*, 35(4), 401-415.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31-36.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents?. *Tourism management*, 36, 527-540.
- Kuvan, Y., & Akan, P. (2005). Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: the case of Belek, Antalya. *Tourism management*, 26(5), 691-706.
- Lee, C. K., Kang, S. K., Long, P., & Reisinger, Y. (2010). Residents' perceptions of casino impacts: A comparative study. *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 189-201.
- Liang, Z. X., & Hui, T. K. (2016). Residents' quality of life and attitudes toward tourism development in China. *Tourism Management*, 57, 56-67.
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of tourism research*, 13(2), 193-214.
- Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of tourism research*, 27(2), 391-411.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268.
- Page, S. (2015). *Tourism Management*, 5th Ed. Routledge, London.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599.
- Ribeiro, M. A., Pinto, P., Silva, J. A., & Woosnam, K. M. (2017). Residents' attitudes and the adoption of pro-tourism behaviours: The case of developing island countries. *Tourism Management*, 61, 523-537.
- Rivera, M., Croes, R., & Lee, S. H. (2016). Tourism development and happiness: A residents' perspective. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 5(1), 5-15.

- Ross, G. F. (1992). Resident perceptions of the impact of tourism on an Australian city. *Journal of travel research*, 30(3), 13-17.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40-47.
- Snaith, T., & Haley, A. (1999). Residents' opinions of tourism development in the historic city of York, England. *Tourism management*, 20(5), 595-603.
- Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Sönmez, S. F. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of tourism research*, 29(3), 668-688.
- Weaver, D. B., & Lawton, L. J. (2001). Resident perceptions in the urban-rural fringe. *Annals of tourism research*, 28(2), 439-458.
- Xu, S., Barbieri, C., Anderson, D., Leung, Y. F., & Rozier-Rich, S. (2016). Residents' perceptions of wine tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 55, 276-286.
- <https://www.monstat.org/cg/>
- WTTC, Montenegro: 2019 Annual Research: Key Highlights, 2019.

Iva Bulatovic (ibulatovic@hct.ac.ae) PhD, Assistant Professor, Higher Colleges of Technology, Faculty of Business.