

ASERS

# Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism

Quarterly

Volume XII

Issue 1(49)

Spring 2021

ISSN 2068 – 7729

Journal DOI

<https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt>

ASERS  
Publishing



Editor in Chief

**Ramona PÎRVU**

University of Craiova, Romania

Editorial Advisory Board

**Omran Abdelnaser**

University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

**Huong Ha**

University of Newcastle, Singapore,  
Australia

**Harjeet Kaur**

HELP University College, Malaysia

**Janusz Grabara**

Czestochowa University of Technology,  
Poland

**Vicky Katsoni**

Techonological Educational Institute of  
Athens, Greece

**Sebastian Kot**

Czestochowa University of Technology,  
The Institute of Logistics and International  
Management, Poland

**Nodar Lekishvili**

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

**Andreea Marin-Pantelescu**

Academy of Economic Studies Bucharest,  
Romania

**Piotr Misztal**

The Jan Kochanowski University in  
Kielce, Faculty of Management and  
Administration, Poland

**Agnieszka Mrozik**

Faculty of Biology and Environmental  
protection, University of Silesia, Katowice,  
Poland

**Chuen-Chee Pek**

Nottingham University Business School,  
Malaysia

**Roberta De Santis**

LUISS University, Italy

**Fabio Gaetano Santeramo**

University of Foggia, Italy

**Dan Selişteanu**

University of Craiova, Romania

**Laura Ungureanu**

Spiru Haret University, Romania

ASERS Publishing

<http://www.asers.eu/asers-publishing>

ISSN 2068 – 7729

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt>

## Table of Contents:

1	<b>Model of Circular Economy in Environmental Management. Case Study</b> Anastasia SALNIKOVA, Kovalev ANDREY, Valery IOSIFOV, Nairuhi ALMASTYAN	5
2	<b>The Role of Non-financial Reporting in Modern Ecological Problems Updating and Solving</b> Hanna MYSAKA, Ivan DERUN, Iryna SKLIARUK	18
3	<b>Analysis of Water Quality in Batujai Reservoir Due to Community and Business Activities in Central Lombok Regency</b> SUPARDIONO, Wayan ARTHANA, Wayan Sandi ADNYANA, Wayan Budiarsa SUYASA, Nyoman SUDIPA	30
4	<b>Reputation Management in the Healthcare System and Its Impact for Sustainable Development</b> Sabit TASZHARGANOV, Dametken TUREKULOVA, Anar NUKESHEVA, Berik BEISENGALIYEV, Gulmira ERKULOVA	43
5	<b>Sustainable Development of Rural Areas: Assessment of the Investment Appeal of the Region</b> Daniyar KALDIYAROV, Aibarshyn KASENOVA, Stefan DYRKA, Roman BISKUPSKI, Assel BEDELBAJEVA	56
6	<b>Agro-Industrial Complex Competitiveness Management: Based on Sustainable Development</b> Arailym NURMANBETOVA, Berik BEISENGALIYEV, Gaukhar SAIMAGAMBETOVA, Anar NUKESHEVA, Bakytgul AINAKANOVA	64
7	<b>Predicting the Intention to Purchase Electric Vehicles in South Africa</b> Olawale FATOKI	81
8	<b>Job Discipline, Competency, Environmental Instability, and Work Effectiveness in Gorontalo Province on Employee Quality in Tourism Industry</b> Yurni RAHMAN, Irmawati D. ISHAK, Ikhfan HARIS, B. Elnath ALDI, Ayi Srie YUNIAWATI	97
9	<b>Hotel Guests' Perceptions of Environmentally Friendly Practices in Jordan</b> Akram Atef RAWASHDEH, Mukhles Mansour AL-ABABNEH	107
10	<b>The Perceptions of Residents and Businesses towards the Sustainable Development of Tourism</b> Merita Begolli DAUTI, Rron DAUTI, Musa KRASNIQI, Dukagjin NISHIQI	121
11	<b>Evaluation of Touristic Risks While Visiting Ukraine and the Risk Perception by Travelers</b> Kateryna HORIACHKO	134
12	<b>The Impact of Tourism on the Economic Development of Kosovo</b> Idriz KOVAČI, Petrit HASANAJ, Avni KRASNIQI, Alberta TAHIRI	146

Editor in Chief

**Ramona PÎRVU**

University of Craiova, Romania

Editorial Advisory Board

**Omran Abdelnaser**

University Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

**Huong Ha**

University of Newcastle, Singapore,  
Australia

**Harjeet Kaur**

HELP University College, Malaysia

**Janusz Grabara**

Czestochowa University of Technology,  
Poland

**Vicky Katsoni**

Technological Educational Institute of  
Athens, Greece

**Sebastian Kot**

Czestochowa University of Technology,  
The Institute of Logistics and International  
Management, Poland

**Nodar Lekishvili**

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

**Andreea Marin-Pantelescu**

Academy of Economic Studies Bucharest,  
Romania

**Piotr Misztal**

The Jan Kochanowski University in  
Kielce, Faculty of Management and  
Administration, Poland

**Agnieszka Mrozik**

Faculty of Biology and Environmental  
protection, University of Silesia, Katowice,  
Poland

**Chuen-Chee Pek**

Nottingham University Business School,  
Malaysia

**Roberta De Santis**

LUISS University, Italy

**Fabio Gaetano Santeramo**

University of Foggia, Italy

**Dan Selişteanu**

University of Craiova, Romania

**Laura Ungureanu**

Spiru Haret University, Romania

ASERS Publishing

<http://www.asers.eu/asers-publishing>

ISSN 2068 – 7729

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt>

13	<b>Strategies for Developing a Remote Destination: The Sharing Economy in Local Communities</b> DJUMRIANTI, OSSEO-ASARE	154
14	<b>The Status Quo of Sustainable Tourism Development in Phuket. A Qualitative Assessment</b> Kevin FUCHS, Kris SINCHAROENKUL	167
15	<b>Volunteering in the Tourism Industry of the Republic of Kazakhstan</b> Assel BAIMBETOVA, Lyailya MUTALIYEVA, Zhaxat KENZHIN, Darken SEIDUALIN, Saltanat TLEUBERDIYEVA, Kamshat MUSSINA	173
16	<b>Simulation of Behavior of Hotel and Restaurant Business Staff in the Conditions of COVID-19 Viral Pandemic</b> Liudmila BOVSH, Larysa HOPKALO, Inna LEVYTSKA, Igor KOMARNITSKYI, Alla RASULOVA	186
17	<b>Technologies Supporting Pandemic Restrictions in the Hospitality Industry, Hitherto Experiences and Outlook</b> Wieslaw URBAN, Krzysztof ŁUKASZEWICZ	196
18	<b>Risk Management in the System of Tourist Business Control</b> Olga A. TSAPOVA, Valeriia P. KADOCHNIKOVA, Yevgeniy I. KENDYUKH, Lyudmila A. GORKOVENKO, Ruslan M. SHARIPOV, Nefas SAULIUS	211
19	<b>Assessment of Overtourism Manifestations by Visitors of Russian Destinations. The Case from Sochi</b> Alexander Mikhailovich VETITNEV, Dmitriy Valerievich CHIGAREV	218
20	<b>The Influences of Travel Expenses on the Indicator Factors of Sustainability in GMS Member Countries</b> Chaturaporn SIHABUTR, Sakkarin NONTHAPOT	233
21	<b>Cultural Heritage: A Tourism Product of Egypt under Risk</b> Mairna H. MUSTAFA	243
22	<b>Food Culture Integration in Menu Plan for a Sustainable Homestay Business</b> Arif Kamisan PUSIRAN, Yuzainy JANIN, Kamarul Mizal MARZUKI, Watsida BOONYANMETHAPORN	258
23	<b>The Marketing Efficiency Development to Create Value-Added for Product and Service of Community-Based Tourism. Study Case for Phatthalung Province, Thailand</b> Ratirath NA SONGKHLA, Wit WANVIJIT, Pawintana CHAROENBOON, Panida NINAROON	266
24	<b>Evolution of Hotel Classification System in Russian Federation</b> Dmitry Aleksandrovich KOZLOV	277
25	<b>Post-Tourism in Booming Indonesian Rural Tourism Industry: A Social Representation Theory Approach</b> Tri Wahyu NUGROHO, Nuhfil HANANI, Hery TOIBA, SUJARWO, Mangku PURNOMO	288
26	<b>On the Problems of Amending the Terms of the Contract on the Provision of Tourism Services during the Covid-19 Pandemic</b> Nataliia SEROHINA, Olena PIKHURETS, Roman SUKHATSKYI, Elvira YEVLAKHOVA, Stepan LYTVYN, Ivan MIROSHNYKOV	302

# Call for Papers Summer Issues 2021 Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism

**Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism** is an interdisciplinary research journal, aimed to publish articles and original research papers that should contribute to the development of both experimental and theoretical nature in the field of Environmental Management and Tourism Sciences.

Journal will publish original research and seeks to cover a wide range of topics regarding environmental management and engineering, environmental management and health, environmental chemistry, environmental protection technologies (water, air, soil), pollution reduction at source and waste minimization, energy and environment, modeling, simulation and optimization for environmental protection; environmental biotechnology, environmental education and sustainable development, environmental strategies and policies, etc. This topic may include the fields indicated above, but are not limited to these.

Authors are encouraged to submit high quality, original works that discuss the latest developments in environmental management research and application with the certain scope to share experiences and research findings and to stimulate more ideas and useful insights regarding current best-practices and future directions in environmental management.

*Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism* is indexed in SCOPUS, RePEC, CEEOL, ProQuest, EBSCO and Cabell Directory databases.

All the papers will be first considered by the Editors for general relevance, originality and significance. If accepted for review, papers will then be subject to double blind peer review.

<b>Deadline for submission:</b>	28 <sup>th</sup> May 2021
<b>Expected publication date:</b>	June 2021
<b>Website:</b>	<a href="https://journals.aserspublishing.eu/jemt">https://journals.aserspublishing.eu/jemt</a>
<b>E-mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:jemt@aserspublishing.eu">jemt@aserspublishing.eu</a>

To prepare your paper for submission, please see full author guidelines in the following file: [JEMT\\_Full\\_Paper\\_Template.docx](#), then send it via email at [jemt@aserspublishing.eu](mailto:jemt@aserspublishing.eu).



DOI : [https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v12.1\(49\).10](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v12.1(49).10)

## The Perceptions of Residents and Businesses towards the Sustainable Development of Tourism

Merita Begolli DAUTI  
University "Haxhi Zeka", Kosovo  
[merita.begolli@unhz.eu](mailto:merita.begolli@unhz.eu)

Rron DAUTI  
University "Haxhi Zeka", Kosovo  
[rron\\_dauti@hotmail.com](mailto:rron_dauti@hotmail.com)

Musa KRASNIQI  
University "Hasan Prishtina", Kosovo  
[musa-krasniqi@hotmail.com](mailto:musa-krasniqi@hotmail.com)

Dukagjin NISHIQI  
University "Haxhi Zeka", Kosovo  
[dukagjin.nishiqi@gmail.com](mailto:dukagjin.nishiqi@gmail.com)

### Suggested Citation:

Dauti, M.B., Dauti, R., Krasniqi, M., Nishiqi, D. (2021). The Perceptions of Residents and Businesses towards the Sustainable Development of Tourism. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*, (Volume XII, Spring), 1(49): 121 - 133. DOI:[10.14505/jemt.v12.1\(49\).10](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v12.1(49).10)

### Article's History:

Received 14<sup>th</sup> of November 2020; Received in revised form 24<sup>th</sup> of November 2020; Accepted 19<sup>th</sup> of December 2020; Published 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2021. Copyright © 2021 by ASERS® Publishing. All rights reserved.

### Abstract:

Among the economic benefits of tourism development, the negative environmental and socio-cultural impacts caused during tourism activities should be taken into account and carefully managed. In achieving sustainability in the development of tourism, residents, and businesses - tourism service providers should have the right to identify and express concerns and determine the pace and degree of development. The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the importance of negative and positive economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts of tourism, based on the perceptions of residents and businesses on the scale of importance, which is a possible action to boost tourism development sustainably. This quantitative study, based on a random sample, was conducted in Kosovo's territory, using a questionnaire addressed to 338 residents and 221 businesses. The questionnaire results were analysed using the RII test - Relative importance index and the Mann-Whitney test. This study intended to bridge the gap by measuring residents and businesses' perceptions on sustainable tourism development and their suggestions to promote it.

**Keywords:** perceptions; residents; tourist service providers; positive and negative impacts; sustainable tourism development.

**JEL Classification:** Z30; Z32.

### Introduction

Preserving nature and its values remains one of the most significant challenges of the future. Kosovo, located in the Balkan Peninsula center, has not been excluded from these influences. With its rare natural wonders, natural and aesthetic values, and the biological diversity of plant and animal species, Kosovo's territory is one of the most special in the Balkan Peninsula and beyond (MESP 2005). Likewise, Kosovo's cultural heritage is an expression and creativity of life realities developed for over eight thousand years, from the following prehistory to the present day. This inherited wealth with unique artistic, aesthetic, historical values and traditional characteristics illustrated by the rich diversity of architectural, archaeological, movable, and spiritual heritage, as well as the rich cultural

landscape (MCYS 2016). According to the World Tourism Organization, Europe accounts for 41% of total international tourism revenues, as Southeast Europe is one of the fastest-growing regions. In developing countries, tourism ranks sixth as a source of exchange in international trade. Kosovo's tourism industry is still an emerging industry at a very early development stage compared to other Southeast European countries. According to the Statistics Agency, during 2017-2109, 4,962,335 foreign tourists visited Kosovo (KAS 2019). Countries in the early stages of tourism development, such as Kosovo, can benefit from tourism, significantly reducing poverty and increasing economic development (DFD 2016). Tourism will affect the economy and citizens' lives by trying to be a savior for many destinations in Kosovo. Like any economic activity, tourism can have negative impacts; these should be minimized and measured compared to the benefits of tourism, for instance, the intensive and largely spontaneous and uncontrolled development of post-war hotels associated with unbalanced consequences for the environment and the territory. Such consequences are detrimental to the interests of the two groups: residents and the respective tour operators. For the first group, these consequences accompanied by an irreversible use of public goods and difficulty returning to the previous state.

As for the second, the same threat hinders the future efficiency of investments in those countries, locations, etc. Therefore, quality spatial planning is an essential precondition for long-term and sustainable tourism development in Kosovo (MESP 2014). Although Kosovo is a small country, it has a favorable position. Kosovo located in Eastern Europe; it is characterized by its central position in the Balkan Peninsula. In border to: Albania (112 km length of the border), Macedonia (161 km), Serbia (352 km), and Montenegro, 77 km. Kosovo's area is 10,908 km (UNDP 2002) of where live around 1,820,631 inhabitants. Kosovo is surrounded by high mountains, with some mountain peaks exceeding 2,000m above sea level, the highest peak Gjeravica 2,656m (Çavolli 1997).

## 1. Literature Review

Tourism is a dynamic industry, which has an impact on the economic and cultural development of European countries due to its long cultural history and unique natural environment. The tourism industry is in the transformation phase, which derives from the theory of sustainable tourism (Maxim, C. 2016). The World Tourism Organization (2005) describes sustainable tourism as tourism fully considers current, future economic, social and environmental impacts, meeting the needs of visitors, industry, environment and host communities (WTO 2015). Although not explicitly targeted at tourism development, the concept of sustainable development has undoubtedly had a significant impact on the tourism sector. Sustainable development aims to ensure and provide a sustainable and secure living, which minimizes the exploitation and depletion of natural resources, environmental degradation, cultural disruptions, and social instability (Hall 1998). The history of Sustainable Tourism and its Concept by (1998) began in 1968 continuing with the Paris Conference on the Biosphere and the International Conference on Ecological Aspects of Development in Washington and the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972. However, Tosun points out that, 1987 was when the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) introduced the concept of sustainability and sustainable development (Tosun, C. 1998). Since 1980, the use of the term "sustainable development" has spread within planning circles, and there has been debate about this concept. From this time on, the notion of "sustainable tourism" has grown and became widely known during the 1990s, the "sustainable development" became a common theme for tourism research (Pigram 1995). Tourism today is a crucial component of government debates on environmental, economic, and social issues. Tourism plays a primary role in preserving and improving the natural and cultural heritage of different countries and regions (Hunter 1995). Moreover, Middleton and Hawkins (1998) have argued that sustainable tourism means achieving a unique combination of the number and types of visitors, the effect of tourism activities on a given destination along with the actions of operators where it can continue in the future without compromising the quality of the environment on which the activities are based. Also, Inskip (1991) argues that sustainable tourism meets the needs of tourism in the regions by protecting and increasing the opportunity for the future. Being a dependent natural resource, especially in terms of the local environment, tourism has an inseparable legacy, self-motivation for maintaining the quality of the environment, as well as the well-being of participants (McKercher 1993). An agreement is seen among tourism scholars about community participation in the tourism development process (Tosun 2000). Tourism has become a key strategy to generate economic, social, and environmental benefits for communities, foster community development, and alleviate poverty (Binns and Nel 2002). Local residents' participation is a criterion that is often understood as an essential condition for the development and sustainability of any form of tourism (Lekaota 2015).

The community is still treated as an object of observation rather than as a partner in this process. The debate today does not focus on whether the community will be involved in the tourism development process but

how and when it should be involved. The critical question is whether community involvement will increase management control and benefits from the development of tourism in their localities (Woodley 1993). According to some authors, the host community is in itself a part of the tourist product. Residents of these communities need to be adequately cooperated with because their attitudes and behaviors make hospitality a valuable source of a tourist destination (Smith 2009). If citizens do not receive any benefits from tourism, they will be indifferent towards tourists and visitors of the tourist destination, and consequently, none of the tourists would like to visit a place where they are not welcome (Liu, Z. 2003). It is worth noting that residents who agree with the goals and objectives defined for the tourist destination where they are resident are more likely to be satisfied with the results achieved and the possibility of choosing sustainable development as a development factor, which will contribute to growth significantly (Leslie and Logan 2000). Inside the tourist destinations, operate a large number of enterprises which offer tourism products and services. Their enterprises are owned by local residents and are small and medium enterprises (Huybers and Bennett 2002).

Enterprises that offer sustainable tourism products are expected to develop long-term economic relationships, ensure that economic benefits are distributed legally, provide sustainable employment opportunities, and contribute to poverty reduction in local communities (Morrison 2002). The tourism industry's challenge is to provide benefits and control the negative impacts of people, destinations, and countries (Okech 2006). In this regard, Edgell (2006) states that "Sustainable tourism, properly managed, can become a key tool for realizing the lofty aspirations of humanity in pursuit of economic progress, while maintaining social, cultural and environmental integrity." If tourism is poorly planned, then it can lead to negative consequences, weakening the entire industry and negatively affecting residents in destinations (Jaafar *et al.* 2017). In order to achieve a consensual policy in tourism, it is vital to assess the perception and preferences of each group living and operating within the tourism community (Fun, Chiun, Songan and Nair 2014).

### 1.1 Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tourism

Economic and environmental protection are often elements at the core of sustainability and are the most common areas found in the analysis and studies of tourism sustainability. Economic development has been a central point of economic policy for a long time, but in recent decades sustainable development has come to the forefront of the economic debate and it has created considerable importance (Younis *et al.* 2017). Understanding and assessing tourism impacts on local communities is vital to maintain the tourism industry's sustainability and long-term success (Diedrich and Garcí'a-Buades 2008). In recent years, several studies have examined residents' perceptions of the social, environmental, and economic impacts of the tourism industry on the community: (Pizam 1978; Ritchie 1993; Brown and Giles 1994; Andereck *et al.* 2005; Richards and Hall 2000; Ko and Stewart 2002). A significant reason for many studies is that tourism can have both positive and negative impacts on local communities (Lankford and Howard 1994). Available studies conducted by scholars (McIntosh and Goeldner 1984; Dincer and Ertugral 2003; Harrill 2004; Lee 2013; Niccolo and Fernanda 2018; Hateftabar and Chapuis 2020) focus on the tourism industry's economic impacts. The major economic impacts of tourism are related to foreign exchange earnings, the contribution to government revenues, the generation of employment and income, and regional development promotion. Tourism has boosted employment and investment attraction, modified land use and economic structure, and has made a positive contribution to the balance of payments. Therefore, local communities turn to tourism to increase income and increase employment and living standards (Akis *et al.* 1996). On the contrary, residents seem to perceive an increase in the prices of goods and services, thus increasing the cost of living and unequal distribution of economic benefits (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Andriotis 2005).

Economic sustainability, therefore, requires that decisions be made in the most equitable and possible, taking into account other aspects of sustainability (Zhai and Chang 2019). The future of economically focused tourism can only continue to be sustainable if economically successful (Vesenjak 1996). Sustainable tourism could contribute not only to the well-being of the population and tourists but also to the recovery of local economies. In other words, communities can find sustainable tourism an economic boost and improve the living standards (Bouguessa 1996). The environment continues to be an important topic of debate when global politics targets environmental problems such as pollution, depletion of natural resources, and deforestation (Kuvan and Akan 2005). Given this, the potential of tourism activities in achieving environmental conservation objectives has been extensively studied by (Jurowski and Gursoy 2004; Andereck *et al.* 2005). Such studies show that residents favor tourism promotion because it initiates more parks and recreation areas, improves the quality of roads and public spaces, and stimulates awareness of environmental protection. However, tourism can cause significant environmental damage because it often occurs in areas with attractive facilities. Tourism also causes traffic jams, parking problems, disturbance and destruction of flora and fauna, illegal construction of buildings, air, water

pollution, and waste (Andereck and McGehee 2008). Regarding environmental protection in the context of achieving successful tourism development, tourism must be environmentally sustainable in order to be economically acceptable (McIntyre, Hetherington and Inskeep 1993). Tourism development must find solutions to these conflicts and overcome individual interests to achieve a high level of sustainability (Thibal 1996). Hunter (1995) believes that in the long-term interest of decision-makers, *i.e.*, local communities and those involved in the tourism industry need to find principles, policies, and management tools that allow tourism development as an engine of economic growth and preservation of environmental resources. For sustainable tourism, social, economic and environmental sustainability are important criteria for assessing tourism sustainability (Bramwell 2015).

## 1.2 Social and Cultural Impacts of Tourism

Social and cultural elements and issues related to sustainability are often missing from debates on tourism issues, and that it is precisely these elements that need closer attention. Tourism has often been associated with contacts between cultures, behaviors, values, and traditions. Tourism also requires host communities to be more responsible and educated to provide quality services to tourists. Also, interactions between locals and tourists generate new ideas, values, and motives for social and economic progress (Bersales 2005). The socio-cultural dimension of sustainable tourism should benefit the local community and the local tangible and intangible culture. The effects of careful monitoring of cultural tourism using these indicators may signal potential threats to the host community's cultural identity, cultural heritage, and local population's well-being (Kim *et al.* 2013). According to the scholars (Mathieson and Wall 1982), social influences can be based on "lifestyle changes of people living as a community in a destination related to tourism activity" related to moralization and creative expressions. Cultural impacts can be thought of as changes in art, traditional ceremonies, customs and rituals, and tourist infrastructure.

According to Jackson and Morpeth (2000), it is more important than tourism sustainability issues to ensure the preservation of different lifestyles, local social structures, and local communities' sustainability. Although supporting the need for social issues to be addressed, Richards and Hall (2000) emphasize that communities' ability to achieve economic sustainability is paramount to social aspects. Scholars (Pizam and Milman 1984) define the social and cultural impacts of tourism as "how tourism will contribute with changes of individual behavior, family relationships, collective living, moral behavior, traditional ceremonies, and community organization." The cultural benefits of tourism may include an increased standard of living of residents due to the economic benefits of tourism and the provision of a wide range of employment opportunities, especially for women and young people. Tourism can also promote infrastructure development and provide goods and services to which residents have access (Jackson 2006).

## 2. Research Methodology

In this research methods oriented towards exploration and findings were employed. A clearer picture was presented by analyzing the importance of positive and negative (economic, social-cultural, and environmental) impacts, where previous studies have suggested that it is impossible to support tourism in a destination that is not supported by local residents (Woodley 1993; Leslie and Logan 2000; Tosun 2000), and Businesses - Tourism service providers that utilize natural resources and tourism capacity in Kosovo for business purposes. It includes hotel tourism entities such as hotels, motels, restaurants, and hostels. Businesses that offer sustainable tourism products expected to develop long-term economic relationships, ensure that economic benefits distributed legally, provide sustainable employment opportunities, and contribute to poverty reduction in local communities (Morrison 2002; Okech 2006). A questionnaire was designed to identify residents and businesses' perceptions regarding the importance of positive and negative (economic, socio-cultural and environmental) impacts. In most questions, the answers were graded according to Likert scales, with a five-point rating, with the lowest rating representing strong disagreement and the highest rating (5) representing strong agreement (Likert 1932). The questionnaire was conceptualized as such containing positive and negative (economic, socio-cultural, and environmental), impacts addressed to 338 residents, and 221 businesses in Kosovo; The questionnaires' results were derived using the RII test - Relative importance index, which enables the ranking of the most important factors based on the respondents' answers and the Mann-Whitney test, a technique used to test the difference between two independent groups. The Man-Whitney U test was applied to compare the medians of groups, which changes the values of continuous variables in the ordinal form within the two groups. In this way, it assessed whether there is a difference between the two groups' rankings.



## 2.1 Data Analysis and Findings

In data analysis and presentation of findings, we have tried to provide an overview of residents and businesses' general attitudes concerning the research. This paper was mainly focused on the qualitative approach, the questionnaire' responses were essential and necessary to help us as researchers and also the potential readers of this paper to decide in the context of negative/positive economic, socio-cultural, and tourism environment impacts, based on the perceptions of residents and businesses on the scale of importance, which is a possible action to raise the level of tourism development and improve the quality of tourism offer and services sustainably. The following tables show the results of responses received from the samples who participated in the surveys.

Table 1. Positive Economic Impact

Positive Economic Impact	RESIDENTS		BUSINESSES		RANK DIFFERENCE
	RII	RANK	RII	RANK	
Contributes to income and standard of living	0.88	6	0.94	7	1
Improves the local economy	0.96	2		4	2
Increases employment opportunities	0.90	5	0.96	6	1
Improves investment, development and infrastructure	0.82	8	0.86	9	1
Increases tax revenues	0.94	3	0.96	5	2
Improves public service infrastructure	0.80	10	0.84	10	-
Improves transport infrastructure	0.82	9	0.92	8	1
Increases purchasing opportunities	0.92	4	0.98	3	1
Tourism creates a new market ready for our local products	0.98	1	0.98	2	1
Generates new business opportunities	0.84	7	1.00	1	6

Source: Calculation of authors

The respondents' answers showing the ranking of Positive Economic Impacts of residents and businesses are given in Table 1, where ten factors were listed as: 1-Highly insignificant, 2-Insignificant, 3 –Neither/Neutral, 4-Significant and 5-highly significant. Table 1 identifies the differences in the ranking of Positive Economic Impacts listed by residents and businesses based on their importance. The results show the differences in the perceptions of Positive Economic Impacts: In the factor (Creates new business opportunities), there are significant differences between residents and businesses perceptions with a difference in the ranking for six positions, which clearly shows the perceptions of businesses ranked as the most essential Positive Economic Factors. Also (Improves the local economy) with a difference in ranking for two positions, this factor was assessed with the most significant positive economic significance by the perceptions of businesses where they consider the contribution of tourism to the economic prosperity of the host country which is related to the inclusion of the share of visitor expenses held locally. Then (Increases tax revenues) by two positions in the ranking, this factor was assessed with the most significant positive economic impact by businesses' perceptions. These tourism businesses generally depend on their economic survival on the products they produce and offer to tourists and the local community. Whereas for other Positive Economic Impacts, there were differences but not significant ones in the ranking.

Table 2. Mann-Whitney test (Positive Economic Impact)

Positive Economic Impact	P-value	Remark*
Contributes to income and standard of living	.000	Reject $H_0$
Improves the local economy	.001	Reject $H_0$
Increases employment opportunities	.000	Reject $H_0$
Improves investment, development and infrastructure	.003	Reject $H_0$
Increases tax revenues	.025	Reject $H_0$
Improves public service infrastructure	.004	Reject $H_0$
Improves transport infrastructure	.000	Reject $H_0$
Increases purchasing opportunities	.000	Reject $H_0$
Tourism creates a new market ready for our local products	.452	Accept $H_0$
Generates new business opportunities	.000	Reject $H_0$

\*  $H_0$  = there is no significant difference between the perceptions of residents and businesses

Source: Calculation of authors

In Table 2, are shown the Mann-Whitney statistical test results. Zero hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) shows that there was no significant difference between residents and businesses' perceptions. If the P-value of any factors resulting

from the test were less than, or equal to, 0.05, then the null hypothesis would be rejected. In other words, the perceptions between the two groups of respondents were significantly different.

Table 3. Negative Economic Impact

Negative Economic Impact	RESIDENTS		BUSINESSES		RANK DIFFERENCE
	RII	RANK	RII	RANK	
Increases the price of goods and services	0.94	3	0.84	4	1
Increases the price of land and housing	0.90	5	0.92	1	4
Increases the cost of living	0.96	2	0.90	2	-
Increases the potential for imported/nonlocal employees	0.92	4	0.84	5	1
Cost for additional infrastructure (water, sewerage, electricity, fuel, medical)	0.80	7	0.82	7	-
Increases the costs of maintenance and road transport systems	0.74	8	0.84	6	2
Seasonal tourism creates issues of high unemployment risk	0.64	9	0.56	8	1
Competition for (higher value) economic land	0.86	6	0.90	3	3
Work in the tourism sectors is paid less.	0.96	1	0.56	9	8

Source: Calculation of authors

In Table 3, the respondents' results show the ranking of nine Negative Economic Impacts as perceived by residents and businesses: 1-Highly insignificant, 2-Insignificant, 3 –Neither/Neutral, 4-Significant, and 5-Highly significant. Table 3 identifies the differences in the ranking of Negative Economic Impacts listed by residents and businesses. From the test performed, the results showed the differences in the perceptions of Negative Economic Impacts: In the factor (Work in the tourism sector is paid less) there are significant differences between residents and businesses perceptions with a difference in the ranking for eight positions, which clearly shows the factor rated as the most significant negative economic impact assessed by the perceptions of residents, based on the fact that employment in tourism is in most cases seasonal affects the fluctuations of employee salaries in a place that welcomes and accommodates tourists, at all levels and respectively at national, local, and country level. Also (Increases the price of land and housing) with a difference in ranking for four positions where it was ranked as the most significant Negative Economic impact by the perceptions of residents, given the fact that tourism development functions as crucial in newly created tourist regions, always owning more space for buildings, with higher prices as well as shifting in many cases the traditional land use. Then (Competition for land (with a higher economic value) with three positions in the ranking, where it is clear that businesses' perceptions evaluate the factor as the most significant among the Negative Economic impacts. The problem of competition in the tourist activity is very noticeable, as the way of investing in tourist activity in the form of hotel systems, tourist villages, buying hotels, restaurants progressively have higher values. Then (Increases the costs of maintenance and road transport systems) with two positions in the ranking, where it is clear that the factor assessed with the most significant Negative Economic importance was evaluated by the perceptions of businesses—starting from the fact that Infrastructure, although not the fundamental element of the final tourist product, which can attract tourists, is the primary goal for the operation of the tourist activity in a host country. While for other negative economic impacts, there were differences but not significant differences in ranking. For other Positive Economic Impacts, there were differences but not significant ones in the ranking.

Table 4. Mann-Whitney (Negative Economic Impact)

Negative Economic Impact	P-value	Remark*
Increases the price of goods and services	.000	Reject $H_0$
Increases the price of land and housing	.058	Accept $H_0$
Increases the cost of living	.000	Reject $H_0$
Increases the potential for imported/nonlocal employees	.000	Reject $H_0$
Cost for additional infrastructure (water, sewerage, electricity, fuel, medical)	.179	Accept $H_0$
Increases the costs of maintenance and road transport systems	.000	Reject $H_0$
Seasonal tourism creates issues of high unemployment risk	.000	Reject $H_0$
Competition for higher economic value land	.003	Reject $H_0$
Work in the tourism sectors is paid less.	.000	Reject $H_0$

\*  $H_0$  = there is no significant difference between the perceptions of residents and businesses

Source: Calculation of authors

In Table 4, the Mann-Whitney statistical test results were presented. Zero hypothesis (H<sub>0</sub>) shows that there was no significant difference between residents and businesses' perceptions. If the P-value of any factors resulting from the test was less than, or equal to, 0.05, the null hypothesis would be rejected. In other words, the perceptions between the two groups of respondents were significantly different.

Table 5. Positive Socio-Cultural Impact

Positive Socio-Cultural Impact	RESIDENTS		BUSINESSES		RANK DIFFERENCE
	RII	RANK	RII	RANK	
Tourism has provided an impetus for the restoration of historic and traditional buildings	0.58	9	0.62	9	-
Residents' pride in the natural and historical-cultural heritage of their country has increased due to tourism	0.86	7	0.92	1	6
The image of the place in the eyes of others has grown.	0.92	3	0.90	2	1
Tourism promotes better development and maintenance of public spaces	0.66	8	0.72	8	-
Tourism has improved security in the area	0.96	2	0.86	5	3
Tourism has renewed the local culture	0.90	5	0.84	6	1
Tourism is preserving the cultural heritage.	0.88	6	0.82	7	1
There are more educational opportunities for locals because of tourism	0.98	1	0.88	4	3
Tourism development reduces the depopulation of sub-urban tourist areas	0.92	4	0.90	3	1

Source: Calculation of authors

The respondents' results showing the ranking of Positive Socio-Cultural Impacts of residents and businesses were presented in Table 5, nine impacts were perceived by their importance: 1-Highly insignificant 2-Insignificant, 3-Neither/Neutral, 4-Significant and 5-Highly significant. Table 5 identifies the differences in the ranking of Positive Socio-Cultural Impacts listed based on their importance by residents and businesses'. The results showed the differences in Positive Socio-Cultural Impacts: In the factor (Residents' pride in the natural and historical-cultural heritage of their country has increased due to tourism) there are significant differences between residents and businesses perceptions with a difference in ranking for six positions, which clearly shows the most important factor the perceptions of businesses rank Socio-Cultural Positive, then economic operators and the community should use all available competencies to protect cultural heritage and environmental assets that turn the country into an attractive destination. Also (Tourism has improved security in the area) for three positions where it is clear that the factor with the greatest Positive Socio-Cultural impact was ranked by the perceptions of residents, then (There are more educational opportunities for locals due to tourism) with three positions in the ranking, the factor evaluated with the greatest importance by residents' perceptions. While for other Positive Socio-Cultural impacts, there were differences but not significant ones in the ranking.

Table 6. Positive Socio-Cultural Impact

Positive Socio-Cultural Impact	P-value	Remark*
Tourism has provided an impetus for the restoration of historic and traditional buildings	.000	Reject H <sub>0</sub>
Residents' pride in the natural and historical-cultural heritage of their country has increased due to tourism	.000	Reject H <sub>0</sub>
The image of the place in the eyes of others has grown.	.055	Accept H <sub>0</sub>
Tourism promotes better development and maintenance of public spaces	.000	Reject H <sub>0</sub>
Tourism has improved security in the area	.000	Reject H <sub>0</sub>
Tourism has renewed the local culture	.000	Reject H <sub>0</sub>
Tourism is preserving the cultural heritage.	.000	Reject H <sub>0</sub>
There are more educational opportunities for locals because of tourism	.000	Reject H <sub>0</sub>
Tourism development reduces the depopulation of sub-urban tourist areas	.099	Accept H <sub>0</sub>

\* H<sub>0</sub> = there is no significant difference between the perceptions of residents and businesses

Source: Calculation of authors

Table 7. Negative Socio-Cultural Impact

Negative Socio-Cultural Impact	RESIDENTS		BUSINESSES		RANK DIFFERENCE
	RII	RANK	RII	RANK	
Tourism has increased social problems such as crime, drug use, prostitution, alcoholism in the community.	0.98	1	0.86	3	2
Tourism denies local people access to tourist sites.	0.58	7	0.60	7	-
The growth of tourism in summer increases traffic accidents	0.98	2	0.96	1	1
Tourism leads to rising local prices of some goods and services including property/land	0.96	4	0.76	6	2
Tourism has stimulated the migration of residents for jobs and opportunities related to tourism	0.94	5	0.78	5	-
Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behavior, lifestyle of tourists	0.82	6	0.86	4	2
Tourism has led to the loss of objectivity of local traditions	0.98	3	0.96	2	1

Source: Calculation of authors

The respondents' results showing the ranking of Negative Socio-Cultural impacts of residents and businesses were given in Table 7, where seven factors were listed as perceived based on their importance: 1-Highly insignificant 2-Insignificant, 3-Neither, 4-Significant and 5-Highly significant. Table 7 identifies the differences in the ranking of Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts listed by importance. The perceptions of businesses, based on the results, show the differences in Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts: For factors (Tourism has increased social problems in the community such as crime, drug use, prostitution, alcoholism) there are significant differences between residents and businesses perceptions with a difference in ranking for two positions, where it is seen as the Socio-Cultural Negative factor with the most significant importance by the perceptions of residents. It should be considered that this problem caused by the sudden presence of many tourists, which contributes to the development and distribution of behavioral prototypes that, in most cases, do not match those of residents. Also (Tourism leads to an increase in local prices of some goods and services including land/real estate) for two positions, where it is clear that the two Socio-Cultural Negative factors ranked with the most significant importance by residents' perceptions. Due to tourists' ever-increasing demand for goods or essential services, it often causes price increases, negatively affecting residents. Then (Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behavior, lifestyle of tourists) with two positions in the ranking, where it is clear that businesses' perceptions rated that factor as the most significant among the Negative Socio-Cultural impacts. While for other Socio-Cultural Negative impacts, there were differences but not significant ones in the ranking.

Table 8. Negative Socio-Cultural Impact

Negative Socio-Cultural Impact	P-value	Remark*
Tourism has increased social problems such as crime, drug use, prostitution, alcoholism in the community.	.000	Reject $H_0$
Tourism denies local people access to tourist sites.	.016	Reject $H_0$
The growth of tourism in summer increases traffic accidents	.004	Reject $H_0$
Tourism leads to rising local prices of some goods and services including property/land	.000	Reject $H_0$
Tourism has stimulated the migration of residents for jobs and opportunities related to tourism	.000	Reject $H_0$
Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behavior, lifestyle of tourists	.009	Reject $H_0$
Tourism has led to the loss of objectivity of local traditions	.005	Reject $H_0$

\*  $H_0$  = there is no significant difference between the perceptions of residents and businesses

Source: Calculation of authors

In Table 8, the Mann-Whitney statistical test results were presented. Zero Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ); there was no significant difference between residents' and businesses' perceptions. If the P-value of any factors resulting from the test was less than, or equal to, 0.05, then the null hypothesis would be rejected. In other words, the perceptions between the two groups of respondents were significantly different.

The respondents' results show the ranking of Positive Environmental Impacts of residents and businesses as presented in Table 9, six impacts listed as perceived by their importance: 1-Highly insignificant, 2-Insignificant, 3-Neither/Neutral, 4-Significant and 5-Highly significant. Table 9 identifies the differences in the ranking of Positive Environmental Impacts listed by the importance.

Table 9. Positive Environmental Impacts

Positive Environmental Impacts	RESIDENTS		BUSINESSES		RANK DIFFERENCE
	RII	RANK	RII	RANK	
Tourism preserves the environment and improves nature	0.54	5	0.68	5	-
Protection of natural environments or further prevention of ecological damage.	0.42	6	0.50	6	-
Preservation of historic buildings and monuments	0.86	3	0.90	2	1
Improving the appearance of the destination (visual and aesthetic)	0.92	2	0.84	3	1
Tourism helps to raise environmental awareness and appreciation.	0.80	4	0.82	4	-
Tourism provides an incentive for the protection and conservation of natural resources	0.94	1	0.98	1	-

Source: Calculation of authors

The results also showed the differences in Positive Environmental Impacts: In the factor (Preservation of buildings and historical monuments), there are significant differences between residents and businesses perceptions with a difference in the ranking for one position, which clearly shows that the most significant Positive Socio-Cultural importance was ranked by the perceptions of businesses. Also (Improving the destination (visual and aesthetic) for one position, it is clear that the Socio-Cultural Positive factor was ranked with the most significant importance by the residents' perceptions. Whereas for other Positive Environmental impacts, there were differences but not significant ones in the rankings.

Table 10. Positive Environmental Impacts

Positive Environmental Impacts	P-value	Remark*
Tourism preserves the environment and improves nature	.000	Reject $H_0$
Protection of natural environments or further prevention of ecological damage	.000	Reject $H_0$
Preservation of historic buildings and monuments	.001	Reject $H_0$
Improving the appearance of the destination (visual and aesthetic)	.000	Reject $H_0$
Tourism helps to raise environmental awareness and appreciation.	.169	Accept $H_0$
Tourism provides an incentive for the protection and conservation of natural resources	.000	Reject $H_0$

\*  $H_0$  = there is no significant difference between the perceptions of residents and businesses

Source: Calculation of authors

Table 10 shows the Mann-Whitney test results. Zero hypothesis ( $H_0$ ); there was no significant difference between residents and businesses' perceptions. If the P-value of any of the factors resulting from the test were less than or equal to 0.05, then the null hypothesis would be rejected. In other words, the perceptions between the two groups of respondents were significantly different.

Table 11. Negative Environmental Impacts

Negative Environmental Impacts	RESIDENTS		BUSINESSES		RANK DIFFERENCE
	RII	RANK	RII	RANK	
Informal and inappropriate construction of tourist facilities is destroying the natural environment.	0.98	3	0.68	7	4
The noise level in tourist areas has been increased by tourism.	1.00	1	0.86	4	3
Tourism increases traffic in tourist seasons.	0.96	5	0.90	2	3
Loss of natural landscape and agricultural soils to tourism development	1.00	2	0.84	6	4
Destruction of flora and fauna	0.98	4	0.86	5	1
Degradation of landscape, historical sites and monuments	0.90	7	0.88	3	4
Lack of water and electricity during the tourist seasons.	0.94	6	0.98	1	5

Source: Calculation of authors

The respondents' results show the ranking of Negative Environmental Impacts of residents and businesses given in Table 11. Seven impacts were listed as: 1-Highly insignificant, 2-Insignificant, 3 – Neither/Neutral, 4-Significant and 5-Highly significant. Table 11 identifies the differences in the ranking of Negative Environmental Impacts listed by residents and businesses' importance. From the test performed, the results showed the differences in Negative Environmental Impacts: In the factor (Lack of water, electricity during the tourist seasons.) There are significant differences between residents and businesses' perceptions with a difference in ranking for five positions, which clearly shows the factors rated. Businesses ranked with the most significant importance the following Negative Socio-Cultural factors: (Degradation of landscape, historical sites, and monuments), (Loss of natural landscape and agricultural lands to the development of tourism), (Informal and inappropriate construction of tourist facilities are destroying the natural environment) with a difference in ranking for four positions, ranked as the most significant Negative Socio-Cultural factors by the perceptions of residents. Whereas for other Negative Environmental impacts, there were differences but not significant ones in the ranking.

Table 12. Negative Environmental Impacts

Negative Environmental Impacts	P-value	Remark*
Informal and inappropriate construction of tourist facilities is destroying the natural environment.	.000	Reject $H_0$
The noise level in tourist areas has been increased by tourism.	.000	Reject $H_0$
Tourism increases traffic in tourist seasons.	.000	Reject $H_0$
Loss of natural landscape and agricultural soils due to tourism development	.000	Reject $H_0$
Destruction of flora and fauna	.000	Reject $H_0$
Degradation of landscape, historical sites and monuments	.076	Accept $H_0$
Lack of water and electricity during the tourist seasons.	.000	Reject $H_0$

\*  $H_0$  = there is no significant difference between the perceptions of residents and businesses

Source: Calculation of authors

In Table 12, the results of Mann-Whitney statistical test were presented. Zero hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) resulted that there was no significant difference between residents and businesses' perceptions. If the P-value of any of the factors resulting from the test were less than or equal to 0.05, then the null hypothesis would be rejected. In other words, the perceptions between the two groups of respondents were significantly different.

### Conclusion

The research findings proved different perceptions of tourism development in Kosovo between residents and businesses - tourism service providers due to different interests and ideas. The success of sustainable tourism development in a country can be achieved when both parties' goals and expectations are balanced. The results show that the factors evaluated with the most significant importance for the Positive Economic Impact were: "Creates new business opportunities," "Improves the local economy," and "Increases tax revenues." All three factors turn out to be more significant for both businesses and residents, but businesses reflect with a higher degree of difference in importance than residents. The results in the perceptions of Negative Economic Impact on the factors: "Work in the tourism sector is paid less"; "Increases the price of land/real estate and housing" it was considered more significant by residents, while the factors: "Competition for (higher value) economic land"; "Increases the costs of maintenance and road transport systems" turned out to have a higher degree of importance to businesses than to residents. Therefore, out of all effects and impacts that tourism conveys, economic impacts are the most significant for a country's overall development. To that end, local communities turn to tourism to increase income, employment, and living standard (Akis *et al.* 1996).

On the contrary, on the negative side, the residents seem to perceive an increase in the prices of goods and services, thus increasing the cost of living and unequal distribution of economic benefits (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Andriotis 2005). In the respondents' results that show the ranking of Positive Socio-Cultural Impacts, differences were identified in the ranking listed by importance: "Residents' pride in their country's natural and historical-cultural heritage has increased due to tourism" a higher scale of importance to businesses than to residents. The other factors, "Tourism has improved security in the area"; "There are more educational opportunities for locals due to tourism, "were ranked as highly significant by residents. While the results of respondents showing the ranking of Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts identified differences in the following factors: "Tourism has increased social problems such as crime, drug use, prostitution, alcoholism in the community"; "Tourism leads to an increase in local prices of some goods and services, including land," these factors were

ranked with greater importance by the perceptions of residents. Whereas, the factor “Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behavior, the lifestyle of tourists” was ranked higher by business perceptions.

The socio-cultural dimension of sustainable tourism should benefit the local community and the local tangible and intangible culture. The effects of careful monitoring of cultural tourism using these indicators may signal potential threats to the host community’s cultural identity, cultural heritage, and the local population’s well-being (Kim 2013). From the results of the respondents that show the ranking of Positive Environmental Impacts: the “Preservation of historic buildings and monuments” factor was evaluated by the perceptions of businesses as the most important, while; “Improving the appearance of the destination (visual and aesthetic)” was rated with the most significant importance from the perceptions of residents. The results of respondents showing the ranking of Negative Environmental Impacts: “Lack of water, electricity during the tourist season” factor was rated with higher importance by businesses, while the “Degradation of landscape, historical sites and monuments”; and, “Loss of natural landscape factors and agricultural lands to the development of tourism”; “Informal and inappropriate construction of tourist facilities is destroying the natural environment” were rated more significant by residents. Regarding the protection of the environment in achieving successful tourism development, tourism must be environmentally sustainable to be economically acceptable (McIntyre, Hetherington and Inskeep 1993). The awareness of the tourism industry in Kosovo towards tourism sustainability is relatively high. The development of sustainable tourism is the model of Kosovo’s future as a tourist destination. Nevertheless, developing this model requires collaboration between businesses and the community, based on a shared vision of sustainable development.

Therefore, “Sustainable tourism, properly managed, can become a key tool for fulfilling the high aspirations of humanity in pursuit of economic progress, while maintaining social, cultural and environmental integrity” (Edgell 2006).

## Reference

- [1] Akis, S., Peristianis, N. and Warner, J. 1996. Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 17(7): 481-494.
- [2] Andereck, K.L. and McGehee, N. 2008. *The Attitudes of community residents towards tourism*. Tourism, Recreation and Sustainability, CAB International, 236 -259.
- [3] Andereck, K.L., Valentine, K.M., Knopf, R.C. and Vogt, C.A. 2005. Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (4): 1056–1076.
- [4] Andriotis, K. 2005. Community groups perceptions and preferences to tourism development: Evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 29 (1): 67 -90.
- [5] Bersales, J. 2005. “Contested Space: Tourism, Power and Social Relations” in *Sustainable Tourism, Challenges for the Philippines*.
- [6] Binns, T. and Nel, E. 2002. Tourism as a local development strategy in South Africa. *The geographical journal*, 168(3): 235-247.
- [7] Bouguessa, H. 1996. *The council of Europe's activities: Conciliation of economic, cultural, social, scientific and environmental interests*. Maribor, Slovenia.
- [8] Bramwell, B. 2015. Theoretical activity in sustainable tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 54: 204-218.
- [9] Brown, G. and Giles, R. 1994. *Resident responses to the social impact of tourism*. Chichester: Wiley.
- [10] Comerio, N. and Strozzi, F. 2018. Tourism and its economic impact: A literature review using bibliometric tools. *Tourism Economics* 25(1): 109–131.
- [11] Diedrich, A. and Garcí'a-Buades, E. 2008. Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management*, 1-10.
- [12] Dincer, F. I. and Ertugral, S. M. 2003. Economic Impact of Heritage Tourism Hotels in Istanbul. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 14 (2): 34-57.
- [13] Edgell, D. 2006. Managing sustainable tourism: A legacy for the future.
- [14] Hateftabar, F. and Chapuis, J.M. 2020. How resident perception of economic crisis influences their perception of tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 43: 157–168.

- [15] Fun, F., Chiun, M., Songan, P. and Nair, V. 2014. The Impact of Local Communities' Involvement and Relationship Quality on Sustainable Rural Tourism in Rural Area, Sarawak. The Moderating Impact of Self-efficacy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144: 60-65.
- [16] Hall, C. M. 1998. Historical antecedents of sustainable development and ecotourism: new labels on old bottles. In C. M. Hall & A. Lew (Eds.), *Sustainable tourism. A geographical perspective* (pp. 13-24). Essex, UK: Addison Wesley Longman Ltd.
- [17] Haralambopoulos, N. and Pizam, A. 1996. Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23: 503–526.
- [18] Harrill, R. 2004. Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implication for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 18 (3): 251–266.
- [19] Hunter, C. 1995. Conclusions. In C. Hunter & H. Green (Eds.), *Tourism and the environment: A sustainable relationship?* (pp. 169-182). London: Routledge.
- [20] Hunter, C. 1995. On the need to re-conceptualise sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 3(3): 155-166.
- [21] Huybers, T. and Bennett, J. 2002. *Environmental Management and the Competitiveness of Nature - Based Tourism Destinations*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham, UK.
- [22] Inkeep, E. 1991. *Tourism planning: An integrated and sustainable development approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- [23] Jaafar, M., Rasoolimanesh, S. M. and Safura, I. 2017. Perceived sociocultural impacts of tourism and community participation: A case study of Langkawi Island. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17(2): 123–134.
- [24] Jackson, G. and Morpeth, N. 2000. *Local Agenda 21: Reclaiming community ownership or stalled process?* In G. Richards and D. Hall edited *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*. 119-134, London: Routledge.
- [25] Jackson, L.A. 2006. Ameliorating the negative impacts of tourism: a Caribbean Perspective. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18(7): 574-582.
- [26] Jurowski, C. and Gursoy, D. 2004. Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (2): 296 -304.
- [27] Kim, K., Uysal, M. and Sirgy, J. 2013. How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 36: 527-540.
- [28] Ko, D.-W. and Stewart, W. P. 2002. A structural equation model of resident's attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 23(5): 521-530.
- [29] Kuvan, Y. and Akan, P. 2005. Residents attitudes toward general and forest -related impacts of tourism: The case of Belek, Antalya. *Tourism Management*, 26 (5): 691 – 706.
- [30] Lankford, S. V. and Howard, D. R. 1994. Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1): 121-139.
- [31] Lee, T.H. 2013. Influence Analysis of Community Resident Support for Sustainable Tourism Development. *Tourism Management*, 34: 37–46.
- [32] Lekaota, L. 2015. The importance of rural communities participation in the management of tourism management: A case study from Lesotho. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 7(5): 453-462.
- [33] Leslie, D., Harrison, T. and Logan, D. M. 2000. The community and tourism development: A case of a community based tourist attraction. *Environment Paper Series*, 3(3): 74-89.
- [34] Likert, R. 1932. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22 140, 55.
- [35] Liu, Z. 2003. Sustainable tourism development: a critique. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 11 (6): 459-475.
- [36] Mathieson, A. and Wall, G. 1982. *Tourism: economic, physical and social impacts*. Longman: Harlow, UK.
- [37] Maxim, C. 2016. Sustainable tourism implementation in urban areas: a case study of London. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(7): 971-989.
- [38] McIntyre, G., Hetherington, A. and Inskip, E. 1993. *Sustainable tourism development: Guide for local planners*. Madrid, Spain: World Tourism Organization.



- [39] McKercher, B. 1993. Some fundamental truths about tourism: Understanding tourism's social and environmental impacts. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 1 (1): 6-16
- [40] McIntosh, R. and Goeldner, C.R. 1984. *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*. 4th ed. Grid, Columbus.
- [41] Melanie K. S. 2009. *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. Routledge
- [42] Middleton, V.T.C. and Hawkins, R. 1998. *Sustainable Tourism: A Marketing Perspective*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth Heinemann.
- [43] Morrison, A. 2002. Small Hospitality Businesses: Enduring or Endangered? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 9(1): 1- 11.
- [44] Okech, R. 2006. The Role of Local Communities in the Management of Cultural Landscapes. Paper presented at the ATLAS Africa 2006 Conference, Kenya.
- [45] Pigram, J .P. 1995. Resource Constraints on Tourism: Water Resources and Sustainability. In R. W. Butler and D. Pearce (eds) *Change in Tourism: People, Places, Processes*. London: Roudedge
- [46] Pizam, A. 1978. Tourism impacts: the social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents *Journal of Travel Research*, 16: 8-12.
- [47] Pizam, A. and Milman, A. 1984. Social Impacts of Tourism. *UNEP Industry and Environment*, 7(1): 11-14.
- [48] Richards, G. and Hall, D. 2000. *Tourism and sustainable community development*. London: Routledge.
- [49] Ritchie, J. 1993. Crafting a destination vision: putting the concept of resident-responsive tourism into practice. *Tourism Management*, 14(5): 379–389.
- [50] Riza I. Çavolli 1997. *Regional Geography of Kosovo*. Pg.319.
- [51] Thibal, S. 1996. *Introduction: The concept of sustainable development applied to tourism*. Paper presented at the Colloquy organised by the Council of Europe (Directorate of Environment and Local Authorities) and the Slovenian Ministry of the Environment and Physical Planning. Sustainable tourism development: conciliation of economic, cultural, social, scientific and environmental interests., Maribor, Slovenia
- [52] Tosun, C. 2000. Limits to Community Participation in the Tourism Development Process in Developing Countries. *Tourism Management*, 21: 613-633.
- [53] Tosun, C. 1998. Roots of unsustainable tourism development at the local level: the case of Urgup in Turkey. *Tourism Management*, 19(6): 595-610.
- [54] Vesenjajk, P. (1996, 12-14 September). *The development of sustainable tourism in Slovenia*. Paper presented at the Colloquy organised by the Council of Europe (Directorate of Environment and Local Authorities) and the Slovenian Ministry of the Environment and Physical Planning. Sustainable tourism development: Conciliation of economic, cultural, social, scientific and environmental interests: proceedings, Maribor, Slovenia.
- [55] Woodley A. 1993. „Tourism and Sustainable Development: The Community Perspective" In *Tourism and Sustainable Development: Monitoring, Planning, Managing*. Edited by Nelson J., Butler R., and Wall G., Heritage Resources Centre, University of Waterloo.
- [56] Younis, F. and Chaudhary, M. A. 2017. Sustainable Development: Economic, Social, and Environmental Sustainability in Asian Economies. *Forman Journal of Economic Studies*, 15(2019): 87-114.
- [57] Zhai, T. T. and Chang, Y. C. 2019. Standing of environmental public-interest litigants in China: Evolution, obstacles and solutions. *Journal of Environmental Law*, 30: 369–397. DOI:10.1093/jel/eqy011
- [58] Democracy for Development Institute. "Zhvillimi i turizmit përmes politikave dhe legjislacionit efikas". No. 10. Prishtina, 2017 .
- [59] Kosovo Agency of Statistics (KAS). Publication of the results of Hotel Statistics 2019. Prishina. 2019.
- [60] Ministry of Culture, Youth & Sport (MCYS), "National Strategy for Cultural Heritage, 2017-2027", Prishtina, 2016.
- [61] Ministry of environment and spatial planning (MESP) "Tourism development and tourism spatial planning program". Prishtina, 2014.
- [62] Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (MESP) and Kosovo Institute for Nature Protection "Values of Nature Legacy of Kosovo", Prishtina, 2005.
- [63] World Tourism Organization (WTO) "Making tourism more sustainable", 2005.

# ASERS



The logo for ASERS Publishing, featuring the word "ASERS" in a bold, orange, sans-serif font with a stylized fan-like graphic to the left, and the word "Publishing" in a smaller, orange, sans-serif font below it.

Web: [www.aserspublishing.eu](http://www.aserspublishing.eu)

URL: <http://www.journals.aserspublishing.eu/jemt>

E-mail: [jemt@aserspublishing.eu](mailto:jemt@aserspublishing.eu)

ISSN 2068 – 7729

Journal DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt>

Journal's Issue DOI: [https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v12.1\(49\).00](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v12.1(49).00)