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ABSTRACT

Garfield County Resident Perceptions of the Indirect Effects of the 2002 Winter Olympics

by

Cary M. Deccio

Dr. Seyhmus Baloglu, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Tourism and Marketing
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This study examined rural resident perceptions of a nearby mega-event. Tourism leaders can gauge resident perceptions and thereby plan development in conjunction with the local people, not in spite of them.

It is anticipated that the 2002 Winter Olympics will have some impact on Garfield County, Utah. Using social exchange theory, the study sought to better understand public sentiment regarding the upcoming mega-event. Certain resident values were examined in relation to tourism.

The results show that some residents perceive that the Olympics will bring opportunities, but most residents do not anticipate any impact from the event. Residents who are economically dependent upon tourism and those who participate in outdoor activities support the Olympics. Environmentally conscious residents are opposed to the Olympics. Most residents indicate that they do not support or oppose the event.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study was designed to test Claudia Jurowski's (1994) model regarding resident tourism perceptions in the context of a mega-event's indirect effects on a rural Utah community. A survey was conducted to investigate residents' opinions regarding the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. Based on these responses, relationships were examined to determine the overall public sentiment regarding the Winter Games.

Research Question

How do Garfield County residents perceive that the upcoming 2002 Winter Olympics will affect their community and what is the basis for those perceptions?

Sub-Problems:

a) What is the level of support among residents for the Winter Olympics?

b) What are the perceived indirect benefits and costs of a nearby mega-event upon this community?

c) What kinds of tourism related values are strong in the community- Use of the tourism resource, potential for economic gain, ecocentric attitude,
and/or community attachment. And how do these values affect perception of the indirect effects of the Olympics and subsequent support for the Olympics?

Background and Premise

Garfield County, Utah lies 250 miles south of Salt Lake City and is home to some of the most spectacular scenery in the world. Among its natural wonders are Bryce Canyon National Park, Capital Reef National Park, and the new Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. Traditional industries in this rural community such as logging, ranching, and mining have dwindled, leaving tourism as the major industry. In fact, 65% of Garfield County’s workforce is employed in the travel/tourism sector (Kratz, 1998), and tourism accounts for approximately 40% of the County’s total economic activity (Garfield County Tourism Council [GCTC], 1998, p. 2). In 2002, the Winter Olympic Games will be held in Salt Lake City and vicinity- the biggest event to ever happen in Utah. Because of Garfield County’s extremely high concentration of natural “mega-attractions” (Ritchie, 1987), it is anticipated that the area will receive increased visitation and media exposure around the time of the Winter Olympics. According to recent data (Utah Department of Workforce Services [UDWS], 1998, p. 11) only 4,272 residents were host to the over 1.6 million visitors that came to Bryce Canyon and the county at-large last year (National Park Service [NPS], 1998). The seasonal nature of the tourism industry creates high
unemployment in the winter and nearly zero unemployment in the height of the summer season (UDWS, 1998). This factor, among many others, contributes to strong feelings among community members regarding tourism. In order to provide a high quality of life for residents it is imperative that leaders in both public and private sectors implement planning strategies that are consistent with resident needs. This of course means tourism planning as well. Unplanned, haphazard tourism policy can cause a deterioration in the traditional social structures, tourists being exploited, the environment being destroyed, and the local culture being trivialized, among other things (Hall, 1989; Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Pierce and Napier, 1981; Pizam, 1978; Ross, 1992). Ideally, community input should be fully integrated into every aspect of tourism planning, therefore insuring that the industry is kept stable, balanced, and manageable (Cook, 1982). The purpose of this study was to determine Garfield County residents' perceptions of the indirect effects of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games and determine the motivations and beliefs behind those perceptions. The information can now be disseminated by tourism leaders and others to determine a course of action for community-responsive tourism planning and evaluation.

Goeldner and Long (1987) asserted:

The extent to which any community becomes a successful tourist center depends in large part on its people. The process of tourism development only occurs when the majority of the permanent residents of the community are convinced that attracting visitors is essential for the area's future (p. 128).
Several studies have concluded that the friendliness and hospitality of the host population is one of the highest determinants of a visitor’s desire to return to, and recommend a destination (Gearing, Swart, and Var, 1976; Hoffman and Low, 1981; Var, Beck, and Loftus, 1977). The determinations made in this study were intended to assist the decision-makers in Garfield County in serving the needs of its local folks, who will in turn decide how they will deal with the biggest event to ever assault the state of Utah.

Theoretical Basis and Structural Model

The study used Social Exchange Theory as the framework for understanding support levels for the Olympics and the perceived indirect effects of such a mega-event upon the community. Social Exchange Theory has been found as an appropriate foundation for studying residents’ perceptions of tourism, in that it provides some explanation for relationships found in earlier exploratory studies (Ap, 1992(a), Ap, 1992(b); Bryant and Napier, 1981; Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, Uysal and Williams, 1997; Pierce and Napier, 1981). Social Exchange Theory, as presented by Homans (1961), Blau (1964), Emerson (1972) and others is a theory of social interaction which basically means that individuals are willing to enter into all manner of social exchange with other individuals if they perceive that will receive some sort of benefit from the exchange.

Jurowski’s (1994) model was tested in the context of indirect effects, (as opposed to direct effects felt by the host community) and only one dependent variable was evaluated- support for the Winter Games. The path-analytic model
constructed by Jurowski (1994, pp. 25, 88, 123, 178, 180) was used to study the variables of interest and to evaluate the relationships that were meaningful and the interplay among such variables. Figure 1.1 (p. 6) shows the model used in this research study, and the variables of interest that should have illustrated some relationships between personal tourism values, perceived Winter Olympic indirect impacts and support for the Games.

Literature on mega-events, resident perceptions of tourism and mega-events, social exchange theory, impacts of tourism and mega-events, and community values will be explored further in chapter two.

Contributions

This study was primarily intended to act as a guide and a resource for Garfield County tourism decision-makers to use in planning and evaluating new tourism development and policy, specifically for Winter Olympics preparation. It has already been stated that two of the main purposes for gauging resident perceptions are to:

1. Provide the highest quality of life for residents and,

The conclusions made here could be used in assessing the needs of other rural Utah communities in preparation for the Winter Olympics. The survey
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Figure 1.1: Path Analytic Model for Resident Perceptions of Winter Olympics (Jurowski, 1994)
instrument itself went to a representative sample of the county population, thereby creating a small stirring of awareness about the 2002 Winter Olympics.

This study's conclusions have the potential for providing a foundation for community understanding and communication regarding tourism and the Olympics, hopefully fostering a government and business community establishment that is more responsive to community ideas and needs.

There are also the theoretical contributions that could be made to the body of resident tourism perception literature and mega-event resident perception research. This study's empirical evidence should provide insight into perceptions of nearby mega-events by a rural community's residents.

**Delimitations**

There were several delimitations imposed upon this study. Instead of choosing a sample of counties in Utah, Garfield County was used as the sole experimental area. This means that it is impossible to make direct inferences about other rural Utah areas based on this study's results and conclusions. This was done because of expense and time constraints. Because the survey instrument was almost exclusively taken from Jurowski's (1994) survey instrument, the questions were not extensively pre-tested and analyzed. The purpose of this research was to reveal resident perceptions, not to examine economic predictions for the County. Olympic economic predictions for the County were not researched. If the Winter Games will actually have an effect upon Garfield County is beyond the scope of this paper. This was also one of the assumptions. The impacts and elements discussed in the study were not the
only ones related to community tourism relationships, but were the elements chosen because of previous literature emphasis and research. Many aspects of community life, social interaction, social exchange, political influences and tourism influences were not presented in this study. This was because of the limited nature of the study and the need to remain focused on the practical applications of the work. The project did not deal with tourism in general or Bryce Canyon National Park issues. Those topics could be the subject matter of further research. Ideally, this study should have been part of a longitudinal project, similar to Ritchie and Aitken's (1984) and Mihalik and Simonetta's (1998) Olympic assessment studies that lasted several years before the events, during the events, and after. Once again, expense and time constraints prohibited such an approach.

Limitations

The population set used for drawing out the sample was taken from the County Assessor's property owner list. This meant that renters and other non-property owners were under-represented in the sample. The effects of this limitation may be manifested in the results and subsequent discussion.

One limitation that will be addressed in the literature section is the use of a survey instrument that was intended to measure a different set of elements than the ones being looked at in this study. Jurowski's (1994) dissertation focused on the direct effects of tourism on a community, while this study looks at the indirect effects of a mega-event. The literature review did not turn up a similar study that looked at indirect effects, therefore a better-constructed instrument could not be
obtained. The survey instrument used by Jurowski seemed more than ample for supporting the research objectives. Even though indirect impacts were being studied, the respondents were asked how they thought the Olympics would affect them personally. Thus, the effects would be coming from an event that was not in the community itself, but the indirect effects could theoretically become direct impacts because the residents will be faced with an influx of visitors brought to the County because of the Olympics. The impacts are indirect because of geographic proximity, but are nonetheless, direct impacts felt in the lives of Garfield County residents.

There can be no control over the effects of changing perceptions with time; tomorrow's answers could be different from those offered today. An example of this could be the recent scandal involving the Salt Lake Olympic Organizing Committee, a situation that certainly caused a shift in perceptions of residents in Salt Lake City, and could have done the same in Southern Utah. "Perception" is used in this study instead of "attitude" because it more appropriately conveys the meaning of the information sought from respondents. Perception is a more general word that describes a person's impressions about a subject. Perception is more appropriate for the study than attitude because it cannot be assumed that all respondents have the same amount of knowledge about the tourism issues (Ap, 1992 (b), p. 671). Jurowski (1994) reasoned;

The term perception should not be interpreted as either attitudes or beliefs but rather as a concept that is developed through the analytical processes residents use to develop their understanding of the impact of tourism as it
relates to the specifically defined impacts examined in the research (p. 30).

It should be noted however that the terms “perception” and “attitude” are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature and there appears to be quite a fine line between the two.

Assumptions

This study assumed that there would be some kind of indirect impacts felt in Garfield County from the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. It also assumed that the questionnaire developed by Jurowski (1994, p. 248) provided an adequate survey instrument for assessing resident perceptions of tourism.

Definitions of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment:</th>
<th>The feeling of belonging a resident has toward his/her community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit:</td>
<td>Gain, advantage, reward, preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal(ity):</td>
<td>The implication that one thing leads to another. In science, there is only an implied evidence of causality. No hypothesis is proven to be true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community:</td>
<td>A localized social structure that shares common values and beliefs. The place that individuals identify as their residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost:</td>
<td>Detriment, harm, unacceptable outcome, sacrifice, effort to achieve an end result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County:</td>
<td>Garfield County, Utah. A rural southern Utah county with 4,272 residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements:</td>
<td>Factors, portions, parts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Endogeneous Variables:** Dependent or intervening variables that are possibly explained by exogeneous (independent) variables in a set of equations.

**Exchange:** At least two parties giving each other some kind of good, service, idea or reward. A mutual swap between parties.

**Exogeneous Variables:** Independent variables that may determine the outcome of the endogeneous (dependent) variable.

**"The Games", "Winter Games", "The Winter Olympics", "The Olympics", etc.** The 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City. Any other Olympics mentioned will be specified by its city name and year.

**Impact:** Effect, consequence, cost/benefit, change-inducer, result.

**Indirect Effects:** Effects, impacts, consequences that an event, exhibit, attraction or other major tourism highlight would have on a community that is relatively close but is not the host community.

**Interplay:** Interaction; action, effect or influence on each other or one another (Jurowski, 1994, p. 31).

**Mega-Attraction:** Major attractions, which because of their significance, size or location attract substantial attention to a region, thereby providing a focal point for the enhancement of tourism development (Ritchie, 1987, p. 22).

**Mega-Events:** Major one-time or recurring events of a limited duration, which serve to enhance the awareness, appeal and profitability of a tourism destination in the short and/or long terms. Such events rely for their success on the uniqueness, status, or timely significance to create interest and attract attention (Ritchie, 1987, p. 20).

**Perception:** The ideas and impressions one has about a certain topic, object or event. These perceptions are crafted by experience, knowledge, personal values, social environment, and many more factors (can be altered).
Residents: The people who occupy a specific geographic location.

Social Exchange Theory: A sociological theory that maintains that parties are willing to enter into an exchange if they perceive that they will gain some kind of reward or benefit from the exchange.

Support: The expressed support by individual residents for the 2002 Winter Olympics.

Values: Intangible feelings that serve as the foundation for a person's set of personal beliefs and outlook on life. These deeply held beliefs govern who a person is and what they stand for.

Research Objectives

This project had specific objectives that it hoped to achieve. The results obtained from the research will add to the body of tourism literature, but more importantly it was intended that these revelations would help Garfield County.

1. Test Jurowski's (1994) path-analytic, Social Exchange based model in a different context: Resident perceptions of a mega-event's indirect effects on a rural community.

2. Identify the elements that pose the basis for resident perception of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

3. Discover the relationships between individual values, perceived indirect impacts, and support for a nearby mega-event, the interplay among such elements, and the perceived indirect effects that will result from the event.

4. Provide local community tourism leaders with a "snapshot" of resident perceptions of tourism and the upcoming Winter Olympics so that they can
plan, coordinate, market, and educate the community with an eye towards the
great event.

These research objectives translated into the following specific hypotheses.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: A positive relationship exists between resident perception of
the indirect benefits of the Winter Olympics and support for
the Olympics.

This is the basis for all other hypotheses articulated in this study. It is
founded on the principle that social exchange theory focuses on an individual's
assessment of costs versus benefits (Bryant and Napier, 1981). Those who
perceive benefits will flow from the Olympics to themselves and the community
are more likely to support the event.

Hypothesis 2: A positive relationship exists between a favorable perceived
increase in indirect benefits over indirect costs associated
with the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics.

The writings of Homans (1961) explained that individuals will seek out
exchanges where the benefits exceed the costs. Naturally, residents will evaluate
tourism relationships in terms of a cost/benefit analysis. Pierce and Napier
(1981) contended that local people have more at stake when considering tourism
planning in their community, and they tend to approach development more
cautiously. The key proposition that links these two hypotheses, as well as the
others, is this point made by Jurowski in the dissertation;
Since the perceptions of the impact of tourism are founded on the evaluation of the exchange, values become a key variable in the determination of not only how individuals perceive the impact of tourism, but also of the level of support for tourism individuals express. Consequently, we can expect resident perceptions of the benefits to vary with the value they place on that which is affected by tourism such as, the resource base, economic gain, the natural environment, and/or their community (1994, p. 21).

Thus, the following hypotheses arise:

Hypothesis 3: A positive relationship exists between the potential for economic gain from the upcoming Winter Olympic Games, and both the perception of the indirect benefits of the Games and support for the Games.

Hypothesis 4: A positive relationship exists between importance placed on the use of the County’s tourism recreation resources and both the perception of the indirect benefits of the Winter Olympic Games and support for the Games.

Hypothesis 5: A negative relationship exists between the ecocentric attitudes and both the perception of the indirect effects of the Winter Olympic Games and support for the Games.

Hypothesis 6: A negative relationship exists between the degree of community attachment and both the perception of the
indirect effects of the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics.

These suppositions relied upon a model that surmised that there was a causal relationship, shown through path analysis that identified an individual's perceptions through their values, impacts based on those values, and ultimately support for the Olympics.

Hypothesis 7: Use of the County tourism natural resources, expectation of economic gain, ecocentric attitude, and community attachment values interact in the formation of perceptions of the indirect impacts of the Winter Olympic Games and both directly affect support for the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City.

These hypotheses parallel those used in the Jurowski (1994, pp. 19-22) dissertation because similar models were employed.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Relevance of Study

This study has been relevant to the body of tourism literature because it made a case for the need to involve residents in the planning process, particularly, rural residents in the face of mega-event preparation. Terms like "resident-responsive" tourism, "community-centered" tourism, and "sustainable" tourism have been replete in the tourism literature (Arthur and Andrew, 1997; Hall, 1989; Joppe, 1996; Potts, Uysal, Backman & Backman, 1992; Ritchie, 1988; Taylor, 1995). Scholars have been trying to pinpoint just what elements inherent to tourism development affect local residents, how costs can be minimized, and how benefits can be distributed to the greatest number of people (Ap and Crompton, 1993; Liu and Var, 1986; Milman and Pizam, 1987; Murphy, 1983). Tourism issues are complex and numerous. This study sought to understand the perspectives of individuals who are a part of the destination product.

Why is it important to know resident opinions? Who cares if "Small-town Scotty" and "Lucy Local" are not consulted before the local county commission decides to plant an annual winter festival in their backyard? Tourism is a people business. No matter what else enters into the tourism equation, residents and...
tourists will interact. Hall (1989) stated; “Tourism is based on face to face encounters between visitors and residents. If there is opposition or resentment towards tourists, then there could be a lack of community support and subsequent restrictions on development and return visitation” (p. 27). Tourists travel to fulfill the need to recreate, relax, and (or) be adventurous. Residents must deal daily with a transient group of visitors and the consequences of such interaction. To the visitor, the trip will end and they will return home. To the resident, the trip never ends.

In a destination-marketing context, local residents are a key constituency in the tourism exchange model (Jurowski, 1994, p. 16). The major players in a destination tourism model are tourists, businesses, residents, and governmental agencies (ibid.). Sometimes community members become the outsiders in a process where they should be the major change-initiators. Hall (1989) noted that most community involvement in hallmark events (mega-events) seems to be either placation on the part of residents or manipulation by those in power (p. 32). He also went on to say that sometimes those who are going to feel most of the negative impacts have the least amount of participation in the development (ibid.). Cook (1982) studied tourism development in British Columbia Canada and advocated that all tourism planning should be based on community involvement, and further argued that local attractions should be promoted only when that marketing is supported by local residents. This approach is an ideal scenario that may be out of reach for many communities, but if implemented, guarantees a high quality of life for year-round residents, as well as a better
environment for visitors. Quality of life may mean a myriad of things to different people, but in a social exchange theory framework as presented here, it suggests that residents desire tourism that will meet their needs. Huang and Stewart (1996) found that the residents of Fredericksburg, Texas were comfortable with the tourism development in their community because the residents perceived the development as being, "... community-created (verses imposed)" (p. 30). This was a key insight into resident reactions to tourism development. Not only must tourists, businesses, government, non-profit groups, and wealthy citizens be involved in the development process, but input from the local populace is essential for tourism success - after all, residents are part of the destination product. Several studies have shown that residents exhibit different perceptions about tourism than business leaders and community leaders (Lankford, 1994; Murphy, 1983). Just how that participation and consensus occurs is dependent on the community. Ritchie (1988) and Arthur and Andrew (1997) provided examples of community involvement and planning for tourism. Gaining input may mean doing specific surveys regarding tourism (as was done in this research study), or it could involve community-driven committees, public forums, chambers of commerce, or ultimately, general voting when it comes to implementing large tourism decisions.

According to Goeldner and Long (1987), the main purpose for holding mega-events is to improve the host community's quality of life. If a mega-event can possibly impact a nearby community, then community tourism leaders must begin to examine resident perceptions. This thesis was one of the first studies to
test a model for examining nearby community reactions to mega-events. Jeong and Faulkner (1996) advocated the resident perception study as an integral part of the mega-event cost-benefit analysis (p. 4). It can be argued that the host community is not the only community to be affected by a mega-event. Peripheral communities can be impacted by mega-events because of the size and scope of the phenomena. Large-scale events such as the Olympics have been recognized for their role in highlighting the international profile of the host country or region (Jeong and Faulkner, 1996), and for having an impact on long-term tourism to the host country (Kang and Perdue, 1994). The literature is fairly porous when it comes to causal resident-perception studies involving mega-events, and little has been found that examines impacts to non host-community residents. This study is intended to fill in an area that has been neglected by scholars in the past. Many of the impacts of tourism that will be discussed can be applied to mega-event implications as well. Mega-events require the same high level of visitor/host interaction as tourism. Many of the issues are the same, and therefore when tourism impacts and tourism issues are discussed, a parallel should be made to mega-event situations. Mega-events (or hallmark events) have unique qualities of their own that pose special problems and opportunities for host communities and peripheral communities. These points will be discussed later in the literature section. In order for a causal linkage to be revealed it is necessary to provide a theoretical basis for this study.
Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory forms the conceptual, theoretical basis for this study. Exchange theory has been found to be an effective theory to explain resident perceptions of tourism in recent studies (Ap, 1992(a), 1992(b); Bryant and Napier, 1981; Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, Uysal, and Williams, 1997; Long, Perdue, and Allen, 1990; Perdue, Long, and Kang, 1999). Exchange theory is appropriate in the study of resident perceptions of mega-events because it may explain residents' motivations and reasons for entering into an exchange with tourists or their lack of support for such an exchange.

Social exchange theory is, in essence, a "quid pro quo" theory of social interaction. Early pioneers in the formulation of exchange theory, Blau, (1964), Homans (1961, 1967), Emerson (1972, 1976) and Levi-Strauss (1969), advocated the theory as a way to explain individual and group dynamics within society. Basically, an individual or group will be willing to engage in an exchange with another party if the individual or group perceives that there will be some kind of benefit derived from the exchange. Homans (1961) stated, "Social association can be seen as an exchange of activity, tangible or intangible, and more or less rewarding or costly, between at least two persons" (p. 13). Blau (1964) further articulated:

An individual who supplies rewarding services to another obligates him. To discharge this obligation, the second must furnish benefits to the first in turn. Concern here is with extrinsic benefits, not primarily with the rewards intrinsic to the association itself, although the significance of the social
"commodities" exchanged is never perfectly independent of interpersonal relationships between exchange partners" (p. 89).

Behaviorists such as Blau and Homans did not buy into strict utilitarian theory, which explained man as being a creature who is purely economically driven. Peter Blau stated that Social Exchange, "...tends to engender feelings of personal obligation, gratitude, and trust; purely economic exchange does not" (1964, p. 94). Blau (ibid.) further explained that social exchange can involve unspecified obligations, and Levi-Strauss (1969) argued that gifts and goods exchanged represent intangible factors such as power, influence, status, symbols, magic, sentiments, religious values, as well as economics. There is far more to the tourism exchange than money. Time, shifting values, community solidarity, power, traditions, culture, and many other elements contribute to the tourism exchange process.

Social exchange theory was considered appropriate for the explanation of resident perceptions because:

1. Exchange theory can help explain residents' participation in the tourism development process (Bryant and Napier, 1981). The hypotheses presented in this work suggest that individuals will in fact, value perceived rewards, and will enter into exchanges, where those rewards will be obtained and the exchanges will be personally beneficial (Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, Uysal, and Williams, 1997; Skidmore, 1975).

2. The rewards expected from the tourism exchange will be evaluated in relation to perceived rewards from alternative types of development. Residents will
evaluate the exchange based on each individual’s cost verses benefit analysis (Bryant and Napier, 1981; Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, et al., 1997). Tourism exchanges will not occur if the level of costs exceeds the benefits and cause unacceptable social and/or environmental damage to the community.

3. Emerson’s (1972, 1976) power-dependence theory suggests that Social Exchange is a concept that can be applied to all societal relationships and is a part of interaction between “actors”, which can be two or more persons or groups. The concept of the dyad, or the two-person group, can be used to explain larger and more complex social interactions (Jurowski, 1994, p. 49). Gergen (1977) maintained that Social Exchange Theory has accounted for almost all social phenomena (p. 110). Knowing the interpersonal dynamics and interrelationships between tourists and residents can help researchers understand motivations behind resident and visitor reactions.

Emerson (1972, 1976) elaborated on exchange theory, explaining the importance of “power” in the exchange relationships. The power dependence theory advocated by Emerson suggested that one “actor” (person or group) has control over the other actor because of that actor’s dependence on the first actor to achieve his goals. Samuel and Zelditch (1989) explained that this power is a silent power, and is more about the potential to exert power over another person or group. Power enters into the tourism exchange because of its relevance to tourist/resident interaction. If there is a great imbalance, for example tourists feeling “ripped off”, or residents feeling exploited, then there is likely to be some
negative consequences associated with the exchange and one actor may terminate the exchange altogether.

The dyad, or two-person group, as proposed by Emerson is relevant in the context of this research because of the fact that individuals were asked questions regarding tourism and the 2002 Winter Olympics. This concept is important in the resident/tourist context because Emerson said that the exchange between actors could be explained on a one-on-one basis, group-to-group, or any combination in between (1972). Johnson (1977) stated that the dyad links larger groups together as social interactive actors. Armed with this knowledge, it can be theorized that individual residents' opinions (written or verbalized responses based on perceptions) are valid in understanding the community perception of tourism and the Olympics. These responses can be interpreted as individual perceptions of the impacts of tourism on the community, and in totality represent a statistical sample of the entire county population. Thus, individual responses represent an accounting for community perception because dyadic theory suggests that simple one-on-one interactions (like the ones implied by the survey instrument) can be building blocks for explaining more complex societal interactions. It is at the level of the individual that cost-benefit impacts ultimately take place (Jeong and Faulkner, 1997. p. 5).
Support for the Olympics

The Event

The Winter Olympics in 2002 is expected to generate over $1.2 billion to Utah’s economy and attract over 70,000 visitors per day (Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget(a) [UGOPB], 1998a, p. 1). Most of the spending and visitation will occur along the Wasatch Front in northern Utah, but there will be significant promotional opportunities available during the Games for the entire state. For three weeks in February 2002, Utah will have the attention of much of the world. The Garfield County Tourism Council (1998) has articulated its desire to have the state travel council and legislators assist them in efforts to attract media attention. In its marketing plan, the Travel Council (ibid.) identified a golden opportunity to direct major media attention to the states’ National Parks. The fact that Garfield County contains so many natural mega-attractions, or world-renown scenic natural wonders, sets it apart as an area that warrants major visitation and exposure during the Olympics.

According to the UGOPB. (1998a) there is the possibility that such a large event could cause displacement in the tourism sector during the Olympics. Many people could postpone vacations to Utah for fear of crowding, congestion, and high prices. This situation could benefit or harm Garfield County, which is far from the heavily populated region which hosts the Olympics. These are issues that must be addressed, but are the subjects of further research. Garfield County’s greatest opportunity may be in the long-term indirect impacts that could
result from some well-placed advertisements and news stories. The County is located in what is called, "The Grand Circle," which includes such places as Mesa Verde, the Grand Canyon, Lake Powell, Arches, and Capital Reef. It is highly likely that a portion of the 50,000 extra visitors (20,000 visitors normally flock to Utah's ski areas each during the winter) will take the 4-hour drive to southern Utah to see the National Parks. In addition to the visitors and television viewers, statewide communities can look forward to the influx of thousands of employees and their families brought in to work on the Olympics and various support businesses.

Do Garfield residents perceive that they will receive some impact from the Winter Olympics? If so, do they care? What kinds of impacts will occur and how will they affect residents? What is the source of those feelings? The preparation and planning time is right now if the county is going to create some awareness among residents regarding the Winter Olympics and subsequently garner public support.

Rural Resident Support Considerations

Support for the 2002 Winter Olympics in rural communities is dependent upon residents' perceptions that benefits will outweigh costs and that rewards will be obtained from participation in activities and promotions before, during, and after the event. Small towns that are dependent upon tourism are presented with the opportunity to market themselves to a mass audience of millions. Rural support may not be essential to the planners in the Salt Lake area, but tourism
organizers and leaders in the small communities should try to use the mega-event as a marketing opportunity. A key component in any marketing campaign is internal marketing (Kotler, Bowen, and Makens, 1996). In a non-tourism context, rural communities could see promotional attention drawing diverse industries into the community that may be attracted by the descriptions that they see in the media. Garfield County could use the Olympics as a springboard for their own special events that would coincide with the Games and then continue yearly thereafter. Any amount of additional winter visitation would help the seasonal economy. Most of the motels and tourist operations in Garfield County close down in the winter due to low visitation and occupancy.

Pierce and Napier (1981) suggested that local people more seriously considered the costs and benefits of planned development. They also said that the potential impact of a proposed change would partially govern resident attitudes (ibid., p. 70). Several studies have examined rural resident tourism issues and complexities (Allen, Hafer, Long, and Perdue, 1993; Huang and Stewart, 1996; Lankford, 1994; Lewis, 1996; Pierce and Napier, 1981; Potts, et al., 1992; Rothman, 1978; Schroeder, 1996). They have each indicated that rural areas have lost most of the traditional land-use industries and are far more sensitive to tourism impact changes than are large cities. One of the distinguishing characteristics of a rural community is its unique culture and identity. Without proper planning, community involvement, and balance between tourist needs and resident needs, the very thing that brings visitors to the area may be lost. Local culture provides visitors with a rich tourism experience. The
character of the people, the overall special local atmosphere, and the physical 
surroundings are key elements in the total destination package. If residents' 
property rights, culture, way of life, traditions, and customs are trampled and 
trivialized in a rush of vulgar commercialism then the destination loses the 
qualities that made it attractive. Residents of Hawaii considered tourism to 
enhance and perpetuate the local culture (Liu and Var, 1986), and residents of 
German descent in a small Texas community found that tourism actually brought 
the community together (Huang and Stewart, 1996). Garfield County's common 
Mormon-pioneer heritage has unified it for generations. Sheep herding, 
ranching, and farming have provided the backdrop for some of the western 
activities and themes that permeate the tourism scene today. The County used 
to be a natural-resource economy driven area, but now logging and mining no 
longer play a role in County economics. Agriculture, tourism, and governmental 
agencies employ a majority of County residents (UGOPB, 1998b; UDW S, 1999). 
Loss of traditional industries, coupled with high unemployment and low paying 
jobs has relegated the County to an economically depressed region.

Small, rural communities are more likely to feel the effects of a tourism 
influx than big cities. Local infrastructures are often inadequate to handle the 
dramatic temporary immigration that occurs during a mega-event or seasonal 
invasion. In a tourism context, residents will associate certain concepts (tourist, 
environment, marketing, government, etc.) with pre-conceived images (ibid.). 
These images affect perception of proposed changes, and ultimately support for 
tourism or the mega-event. An example of community solidarity against events
of this magnitude would be Colorado's rejection of the 1976 Winter Olympics. In fact, host resentment of tourists may be more pronounced in smaller communities where tourists outnumber residents (Mathieson and Wall, 1982). Rural communities are, for the most part, more homogeneous than cities, and therefore carry more of a unified belief system and culture. A feeling of loss of identity, unwanted change, and new ideas that may fragment the community are all factors that contribute to a distrust in tourists and "new-comers".

Unregulated, unplanned tourism development can lead to a state of xenophobia. Mathieson and Wall (1982) wrote that host perceptions of continued expansion of tourism facilities and services may begin to wear on residents. Once the saturation point or carrying capacity of a community has been reached (whether it is environmental, infrastructural, social, or economic) residents will begin to resent tourists and everything they bring into the area. Perdue, Long and Allen (1990) found that after 30% of local retail sales were derived from tourism that residents began to oppose further development. Tourism in Garfield County accounted for 55% of total retail sales in the County in 1998 (UDWS, 1999, p. 16). Perdue, Long, and Allen's analysis would suggest that the threshold for community embrace has been surpassed. Ap and Crompton (1993) categorized residents' reactions to tourism according to a continuum comprised of four strategies; embrace, tolerance, adjustment, and withdrawal. Ap and Crompton (1993) suggested that residents move from one stage to another over time and that these feelings can differ within a community. This study should reveal the level at which residents reside, and could therefore assist tourism
leaders in creating innovative solutions to promote a better tourism policy.

Because of the potential impacts resulting from the Olympics, it is imperative for community tourism leaders to gauge resident perceptions.

Support for Mega-Events

Support for mega-events is dependent upon many factors, just as is tourism in general. Community support will depend on the perceived benefits and costs derived from the event. Colorado's rejection of the 1976 Winter Olympics indicated that residents perceived that the costs of holding such an event outweighed the benefits. Ritchie et al. (1984; 1985; 1990; 1991) in their longitudinal study of the 1988 Winter Olympic Games in Calgary found that residents consistently supported the event because of perceived short and long-term rewards. The people in Calgary seemed to be united in their optimism for what the Olympics could do for the city; including raising global awareness of the area and bringing together residents in support of a common cause. Mihalik and Simonetta (1998) found that support for the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta remained quite high overall throughout the stages of the event, but did decrease a little as the Olympics approached. They theorized that the decline in support could have been a function of Social Exchange Theory because fewer residents indicated involvement with the 1996 Summer Games. Less involvement and planned attendance could have had an effect on support levels. Georgia residents also identified several costs such as traffic and crime that contributed to their negative perception of the Olympics (Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998).
Support is a function of perceived costs being minimized and benefits being maximized for the individuals and organizations involved in the event, which is consistent with the premise of Social Exchange Theory.

At present, there are few research articles that have mentioned mega-events in relation to rural resident support and perceived impacts (Bryant and Napier, 1981; Hall, 1989; Long and Perdue, 1990; Mihalik and Cummings, 1995; Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998). Mihalik and Cummings (1995) and Mihalik and Simonetta (1998) analyzed attitudes of Atlanta residents, as well as residents outside of the metro Atlanta area with regards to the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. They discovered that non-metropolitan area Georgia residents had a higher degree of support for the 1996 Olympics than did the metro-Atlanta residents (ibid., p. 11). Metro Atlanta residents were more aware of potential perceived problems associated with the event. Jurowski (1994) found that most of the residents in the rural study area supported event-based tourism, especially those who were strongly attached to the community. Allen, Hafer, Long and Perdue (1993) discovered that rural residents supported tourism as long as economic activity was high. Resident support for mega-events has mostly been based on economic benefits and long-term awareness derived from the events (Ritchie and Lyons, 1990; Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998; Soutar and McLeod, 1993; Jeong and Faulkner, 1997). One study (Turco, 1998) indicated that a majority of residents received social benefits from a hallmark event and were thus more willing to support public funding of facility development and event promotion. Soutar and McLeod (1989) found that, contrary to initial misgivings,
the America's Cup was perceived by residents to improve the quality of life (p. 101). Potential, perceived impacts of mega-events, and personal values regarding the community are elements that lead to the formulation of support for the event.

Mega-Event Impacts

The appeal of mega-events is that they avoid some of the pitfalls of continuous tourism or seasonal tourism. Mega-events are one-time events that generate a lot of attention to the affected area and bring in a huge influx of money (Getz, 1997; Hall, 1989). Uysal and Gitelson (1994) asserted that mega-events and festivals were part of a new wave of alternative tourism and offered the following assessment of mega-event impacts:

... festivals and special events can minimize negative impacts, contribute to sustainable development, foster better host-guest relations, and help preserve sensitive natural or social and cultural environments (p. 3).

This statement is consistent with the intentions and goals of most parties involved in promoting a mega-event. The whole reason for holding a festival or special event is to improve residents' quality of life.

Jurowski's (1994) model tested tourism's perceived direct impacts on a host community. Direct impacts were evaluated against several different kinds of tourism development. This study used the same model, but indirect impacts were used as intervening variables instead of direct impacts, and the model in this study is only looking at one dependent variable, the support for the 2002
Winter Olympic Games. The three impacts identified here - Economic, Environmental, and Social - have been supported by the literature as impacts that are generally felt by the local residents (Getz, 1997; Huang and Stewart, 1996; Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, et al, 1997; Lankford and Howard, 1993; Lawson, Williams, Young, and Cossens, 1998; Liu, Milman and Pizam, 1987; Long, Perdue, and Allen, 1990; Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Pizam, 1978; Ross, 1992; Sheldon, and Var, 1987). Ritchie (1984) identified six impacts that mega-events would have on a community, but these six areas can be further generalized into the three broad categories of impact reiterated by the literature. Getz (1997) indicated that events are held to foster social, economic, and environmental goals within a community (p. 41). These tourism impacts have been used to determine resident support for a non-host mega-event in this study, even though the event is over 200 miles away. Because of geographic location, the Winter Olympics will indirectly affect the lives of Garfield County residents, but the effects will still lie within the three impacts mentioned. Because it is theorized that the Winter Olympics will have some impact on Garfield County, it is assumed that indirect impacts can be appropriately placed in the model.

Economic Impacts

Most of the work on mega-events and resident perceptions has focused on the economic impacts. Mega-events have been recognized for their economic benefits (Getz, 1997; Hall, 1989; Long and Perdue, 1990; Kang and Perdue, 1994; Murphy and Carmichael, 1991; Ritchie, 1984; Travis and Croize,
Kang and Perdue (1984) concluded that mega-events have an impact on the long-term international tourism to the host country and that the impact is greatest in the year following the event and eventually diminishes over time. They estimated that South Korea has received over $1.3 billion in a 3-year period after hosting the 1988 Summer Olympics (ibid.). This information bodes well for Utah, which stands to receive indirect economic benefits for years after the Winter Olympics. Jeong and Faulkner (1996), in their study of the Taejon Exposition also found that events of such a great magnitude have been recognized for their role in lifting the profile of the host city and host country. Even relatively small-scale special events have been found to generate a considerable amount of awareness for the host region and generate significant tourist revenue (Murphy and Carmichael, 1991). Ritchie (1987) explained that increased economic activity and enhanced international awareness of the region are among the profound long-term effects rendered by a mega-event. Negative impacts created by a major event may include price inflation for the events and mismanagement of public funds by organizers. Long and Perdue (1990) made an interesting discovery; “A significant proportion of the expenditures associated with rural arts and crafts festivals may not accrue to the community, and hence, would not contribute to the local economy” (p. 13). Salt Lake City Olympic organizers have already recognized and accounted for economic leakage associated with the Olympics, but rural communities would not be faced with the same situation. Any extra business derived from the Olympics for the County would be a boon for the economy.
Increased employment opportunities are one of the supposed benefits of holding a mega-event (Hall, 1989, p. 23). The UGOPB (1998a) estimated that the total employment impact of the Olympics would be 22,732 job years, and that the Olympics will represent over 21.4% of the state’s total employment growth in 2001 (p. 6). Indirect employment opportunities in Garfield County may manifest themselves in the services sector, particularly with additional employees needed to work in hotels and restaurants during winter.

Several studies aimed at understanding residents’ responses to mega-events have revealed some information regarding economic impacts. The Taejon International Exposition was perceived by residents to benefit the city of Taejon, South Korea by providing both short and long-term employment opportunities (Jeong and Faulkner, 1997), and the America's Cup was perceived to significantly improve Freemantle, Australia's economic foundations (Soutar and McLeod, 1993). Thirty four percent of Calgary residents perceived that the 1988 Winter Olympics benefited the area by providing more jobs and business, but this was down from 49% of respondents who anticipated financial returns from the 1988 Games before they occurred (Ritchie and Aitken, 1984; Ritchie and Lyons, 1990). One of the major economic concerns to Calgarians before the 1988 Olympics was the high cost of the Games and the tax burden that might be imposed, which was mentioned by about 29% of the respondents (Ritchie and Aitken, 1984). After the event, “recognition for the city of Calgary” was mentioned by 50% of the respondents, and “increased tourism” was perceived as a benefit by about 36% (Ritchie and Lyons, 1990, p. 16). An overwhelming 97% of
respondents stated that the 1988 Winter Games were a success (Ritchie and Lyons, 1990).

Before the 1996 Summer Olympics, Georgia residents consistently rated “increased citizen pride” and “enhancing Georgia’s image” higher than economic benefits, but economic benefits were still deemed important (Mihalik and Cummings, 1995; Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998). The authors noted that future mega-event organizers should examine the results of their study. The findings suggested that economic outcomes were important, but perhaps residents hold community pride and quality of life issues in higher regard. This assessment is consistent with Social Exchange doctrine.

Social Impacts

Jurowski (1994) determined that the perception of social impacts had a stronger influence on support for tourism than did economic impact perception (p. 200). As mentioned previously, residents in Calgary and Georgia both perceived social issues such as community pride and international recognition just as, or more important, than economic benefits (Mihalik and Cummings, 1995; Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998; Ritchie and Aitken, 1984; Ritchie and Aitken, 1985). In addition, mega-events were perceived by residents to improve quality of life (Turco, 1998), and to improve cultural and shopping opportunities (Jeong and Faulkner, 1997).

Similarly, social costs were seriously considered by local residents. Jeong and Faulkner (1997) and Hall (1989) argued that socio-cultural impacts of mega-
events have received relatively little attention up to this point (p. 4). These
effects could be more important in terms of long-term, serious impact to a
community. Hall (ibid.) indicated that a mega-event has the power to strengthen
regional values and traditions and even lead to cultural understanding among
residents and visitors. Tourism has the ability to bring a community together
because of interest in local customs and culture, or tear it apart through
trivialization and degradation. Mihalik and Cummings (1995) uncovered
perceived social liabilities associated with anticipation of the 1996 Atlanta
Summer Olympics, including; traffic congestion (could be an environmental
concern as well), law enforcement strain, and increased crime.

Environmental Impacts

The 1994 Winter Olympics in Lillehammer, Norway were the first, so-
called, "Green Games." With visitor counts similar to those anticipated in Salt
Lake City, local residents looked forward to many negative economic impacts.
Fortunately, because of good planning, apparently those impacts did not
materialize. Chernushenko (1996) explained; "Lillehammer managed not only to
cope with this monumental sports event without noticeably harming the
environment, it did so in a manner which won praise from commentators world­­­wide" (p. 65).

Similarly, the 1992 Albertville, France Winter Olympics did not damage the
ecosystem as much as was anticipated (May, 1995). In fact, the Olympics
caused the government to improve water quality in mountain lakes, take
measures to reduce airborne and water pollutants, and strengthen the mountain infrastructure (ibid.). There was some damage to the ecosystem, but May said it was limited and probably would have happened anyway. Several studies have examined residents’ perceptions of physical impacts of tourism (Dowling, 1993; Hall, 1989; Liu, Sheldon, and Var, 1986; Ritchie, 1984). Krippendorf (1982) warned that economic benefits should not be the only impacts studied and planned for by tourism organizers. If environmental concerns are not addressed, then the destination product will be destroyed and the source of revenue ruined. On the other side, mega-events could be seen as catalysts for bringing attention to environmental concerns, and thus preserving elements of the physical landscape and local heritage that would have otherwise been ignored. The literature regarding mega-event environmental impacts as perceived by residents is relatively sparse. Before the 1988 Calgary Games, residents did not regard environmental damage as a major concern (Ritchie and Aitken, 1984), and Mihalik et al. (1995, 1998) did not identify environmental costs as a concern among Georgia residents.

Garfield County residents were asked in this study if they thought the environment would improve or worsen as a result of the Winter Games. The environmental impacts experienced as a result of the Winter Olympics will probably have more in common with continued seasonal tourism rather than mega-event tourism. Because it is such a small community, Garfield County is dramatically affected by the seasonality of the tourist industry, just as were communities studied by Rothman (1978). The indirect environmental effects felt
by the County will not be caused by such a dramatic visitation influx as will occur in Salt Lake City. The effects will most certainly be felt over time, and will not be as pronounced as they will be in the Salt Lake area. A majority of tourists visit Garfield County in the summer, therefore winter visitation should not cause a great strain on the environment. The County will not have any facilities built by the Olympic Organizing Committee for Olympic venues, and will thus not have any "legacy" to use for future events. Unless local leaders initiate an Olympic-specific marketing plan to coincide with the Games, Garfield County will not receive any additional assistance to clean and revitalize its natural areas.

Values Affecting Perception of Mega-Event Impacts

Ecocentricity

To examine the reasons behind different perceptions regarding tourism impacts within a community, it is necessary to look at the values inherent in the community. Persons who place a great deal of importance on the preservation of the natural environment are considered "ecocentric", or "environmentalist". Others who are "anthropocentric" hold an attitude that humans hold a stewardship over nature (Dunlap, Van Liere, Mertig, Catton, Howell, 1992). The natural environment is such a paradox within the destination tourism context because a balance must be maintained between recreational use and preservation. Krippendorf (1982) stated that part of the new tourism policy would be the native population becoming more assertive and restrictive when it comes to attitudes towards tourism (p. 144). Tourism leaders and resource
managers must consider implementing development that protects the environment, but also enables residents and visitors to enjoy outdoor recreational activities. This is certainly the case in Garfield County, where National Parks and other Federal areas are trying to be all things to all people.

Little research has been done on resident perceptions of environmental impacts from mega-events, and even less has been done on rural resident perceptions of environmental impacts. Resident environmental values should be an integral element when considering mega-events and subsequent development. Jurowski (1994) found that rural residents who hold ecocentric values generally oppose most types of tourism development, and that residents who are more attached to the community generally look at environmental impacts more negatively. Residents in Hawaii agreed that environmental protection was more important than economic benefits, but were unwilling to sacrificing their standard of living (Liu and Var, 1986). Liu and Var (ibid.) also found that Hawaii residents did not place a majority of the blame for environmental destruction on tourists. This conclusion could be a function of many factors, including level of resident interactions with tourists, economic dependency upon tourism, and collective experiences and knowledge about the environment (Liu, Sheldon, and Var, 1986). Dowling (1993) found that tourist and resident perceptions of preserving the environment in Western Australia was strong, but that environmental support was slightly greater among tourists. Dowling (ibid.) indicated that residents expressed concern over losing autonomy regarding environmental issues and did not want outsiders controlling important decisions.
Jurowski, Uysal, Williams, and Noe (1995) determined that those visitors who represented a more ecocentric attitude group supported more protected lands and were concerned about the balance of nature being upset, while the other group was less ecocentric-minded and favored a controlled, planned management approach to the environment. It was anticipated that residents of Garfield County would fit into such a dichotomy.

In the state of Utah, and particularly Garfield County, environmental issues are powder kegs of emotion and debate, especially since President Clinton designated 1.5 million acres as a National Monument in 1996. Most residents in the two affected counties, Garfield and Kane, objected to the designation because no one was consulted or warned about the impending changes (Davidson, 1999; Spangler, 1998; Spangler, 1999). Environmental attitudes run the gamut, but many residents in Garfield County consider extreme environmentalists to be a threat to the sovereignty of the area. Like many rural communities, Garfield County has had to cope with Federal and State government land use issues that impact residents' very existence. The New Ecological Paradigm Scale (NEP) was used in this study to locate ecocentric attitudes among residents, and find out the relationships between those attitudes and the perceived impacts and support for the 2002 Winter Olympics (Dunlap, et al., 1992). It was anticipated that resident reactions to the NEP would be strong and polarized.
Community Attachment

Another value that affects perception of tourism/mega-event impacts and support is community attachment, or how attached and at-home residents feel to the area. It has been theorized that the bond between a person and his/her community is an important determinant in the formation of tourism perception (Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, et al., 1997; Seid, 1994; Um and Crompton, 1987; Williams, McDonald, Riden, and Uysal, 1995).

Um and Crompton (1987) found that residents in New Braunfels, Texas who were highly attached to the community were less positive toward tourism. They used length of residence, birthplace, and German heritage to construct a Guttman type scale to evaluate the attachment level of residents. McCool and Martin (1994) only found a weak correlation between length of residence and attachment. They also learned that strongly attached respondents viewed tourism impacts more positively. McCool and Martin proposed that many of the newcomers were highly attached to the community and viewed tourism positively because they themselves were recently tourists who decided to settle down in the area (1994, p. 33). The new residents may have been attached to the region and land, but not necessarily to the community. Therefore, it was concluded that length of residence may not be an appropriate measure in constructing an attachment scale. Seid (1994) used the same measure of sentiment as McCool and Martin (1994) based on questions developed by Goudy (1982) and Kasarada and Janowitz (1974), and found a small positive correlation between attachment and support for tourism. Williams, et al. (1995) and Jurowski (1994) confirmed
McCool and Martin's (1994) conclusions that length of residence was not the best way to measure attachment. Each of these studies determined that newcomers held more favorable perceptions regarding tourism development than did old-timers.

Mega-event literature has usually only examined exploratory issues relating to perceived impacts and support for the event (Jeong and Faulkner, 1997; Mihalik and Cummings, 1995; Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998; Ritchie, 1984; Ritchie, 1987; Ritchie and Aitken, 1984, 1985; Ritchie and Lyons, 1990; Soutar and McLeod, 1993; Turco, 1998;). In the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area respondents who were highly attached viewed event-based tourism development positively (Jurowski, 1994). Jurowski (ibid.) explained that residents support event-based tourism and other low-impact forms of development because they pose little long-term detriments to the community and can "... validate, develop and express the nature, history and culture of the place" (p. 211).

Use of Outdoor Tourism Resources

One of the valued elements that has contributed to the perception of tourism among community members is utilization of the actual recreation resources. Some community members have been more active in the outdoors than others, and therefore can be anticipated to have stronger feelings about what is done with the resources and facilities. Mega-event based tourism can
bring both positive and negative impacts upon the resources that are routinely utilized by locals.

Tourism literature recognizes that residents perceive that recreational opportunities can be improved in the face of development (Allen, et al., 1993; Bryant and Napier, 1981; Liu and Var, 1986; Murphy, 1983; Rothman, 1978). Allen et al. (1993) found that residents perceived tourism to improve existing facilities and parks and that rural residents generally had positive attitudes toward recreation opportunities and tourism development. Long, et al. (1990) determined that rural residents generally supported taxes and fees as increasing levels of tourism development were reached. Salt Lake City will definitely receive improvements for the community from the Games- new facilities and an improved infrastructure, sometimes called the Olympics “Legacy”. Garfield County and other rural counties cannot look forward to such investment in facilities (of course they also will not have the associated costs).

Lankford and Howard (1993) and O'Leary (1976) however, revealed that residents felt as if they had to compete with tourists for space and recreational facilities. Those who regularly engage in outdoor activities are more likely to experience competition and crowding in those environments. These findings do not support the hypothesis that recreation users in Garfield County will have positive attitudes toward the impacts of, and support for, the Olympics. Jurowski (1994) found that residents who used the resources were more likely to look at tourism impacts positively, but were reluctant to support certain types of tourism that would lead to overcrowding and competition. Jurowski stated that residents
did support event-based and culture-based tourism, but her intervening variables represented direct impacts and hypothetical tourism development. It is more likely that Garfield County residents who utilize the natural resources will look negatively upon the Olympics because of the fact that no money will be injected into the community to improve facilities and programs. Consequently, the indirect impacts of such an event will bring more tourists into the area that will compete for recreational activities on a long-term basis. There is already a strong negative feeling about out-of-state hunters who invade the state each fall.

Once again, mega-event literature falls short when dealing with resource utilization attitudes. Studies on recent mega-events indicated that residents anticipated one of the great benefits to be the lasting facilities created for the event (Ritchie and Aitken, 1984; Ritchie and Lyons, 1990; Mihalik and Cummings, 1995; Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998). These studies also found that resident approval percentages for the benefits of recreational improvement went down over time. The special circumstances of a non-host community such as Garfield County present an interesting test to see how resource users will react to a nearby mega-event.

**Economic Dependency**

Previous studies have confirmed that those who stand to benefit financially from the tourism exchange are most likely to support the development (Allen, et al., 1993; Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, et al., 1997; Hall, 1989; Lindberg and Johnson, 1997; Liu and Var, 1986; Pizam, 1978; Sheldon and Var, 1984). In
line with Social Exchange principles, those participants who perceive that they are receiving an equitable exchange will continue to engage in the exchange and will not look to other sources. Economic gains are seen as the most visible and powerful motivation for desiring tourism in a community (Pizam, 1978).

Non-metro Atlanta residents continued to support the 1996 Summer Olympics throughout the longitudinal study, but support for the Games and agreement about benefits diminished over time (Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998). The authors mentioned that Georgia residents consistently rated non-economic benefits over economic benefits. They surmised that this was because of social exchange theory. This may be the case for Garfield County if many people do not consider the indirect effects that could occur. Other mega-event studies have not given causal analysis regarding motivations behind perceptions of impacts. Jurowski (1994) did find that the rural residents who indicated economic dependency on tourism in the Mount Rogers N.R.A. were positive about the impacts and supported future event-based tourism. This study should have concluded the same findings among Garfield County residents, unless even residents employed in the tourism industry do not perceive any impacts from the Olympics.

As times change, residents begin to suggest that tourism is not always a good thing (Mathieson and Wall, 1982), and therefore tourism leaders must be cognizant of the different attitudes within a community, various tourism impacts, and ways of reaching a consensus. Pierce and Napier (1981) stressed that local people more seriously consider changes and impacts within their community, and
are more concerned than ever about social and environmental changes. Nevertheless, tourism stimulates economic activity and is beneficial to those involved in the services industry.

Summary of Chapter Two

This literature review has linked the elements of Jurowski's (1994) path analytic model together. The primary reason for determining resident perceptions about tourism in general and mega-events specifically is to provide an understanding of resident needs. It was established in the chapter that this study is relevant because resident needs are an important component of the whole destination product. Tourists will not return and recommend a destination if they feel antagonism or hostility. Garfield County is facing an incredible opportunity to market their area for the 2002 Winter Olympics, thus stimulating economic activity and easing tourism seasonality. This study should provide a starting point for the Garfield Travel Council and others to gauge resident perceptions and tailor resident-responsive programs to prepare for the Olympics.

Social Exchange Theory forms the underlying motivation for resident reactions to tourism, support for tourism, and the values that permeate rural communities. In order for residents to enter into tangible and intangible exchanges with tourists, the exchange must be an antecedent to benefits. Evaluations of impacts will be based on individual perceptions of alternatives to the exchange or benefits derived from the exchange. The section on exchange theory showed that complex societal relationships based on the exchange of
goods and services can be better understood and analyzed. Mega-event literature has only mentioned exchange theory, and has not delved into the motivations and values behind resident perceptions of support for the event.

Following the discussion of social exchange theory, the event itself (2002 Winter Olympics) was examined along with determinants of support in a rural community that would only feel indirect effects. Rural communities like Garfield County are especially sensitive to the effects of tourism development and hallmark event visitation. The literature suggested that rural communities would support mega-events if residents perceived that they would have some say in the process and would receive social benefits.

Finally, the chapter explored tourism and mega-event literature regarding perceived impacts and value elements in communities. These values are the reason for the different perceptions and attitudes about tourism in one community. There were no articles or works found that specifically studied non-host community perceptions of a mega-event. This study makes a contribution to resident perception of tourism/mega-events literature because of its focus on rural communities that will be indirectly affected by a nearby mega-event.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

The two previous chapters discussed the relevancy of this study in the context of the tourism literature. They set up a framework and model for understanding Garfield County resident perceptions of the upcoming 2002 Winter Olympic Games. This chapter will describe the way that the data was collected and how it was analyzed. The first section explains the sample selection and collection procedures, then techniques for determining variable constructs will be discussed, next is an analysis of the methods for testing the data, and finally, limitations and assumptions will be presented.

Research Design

The Sample

This study took place in Garfield County, Utah, a large county about 250 miles south of Salt Lake City (See Appendix A). It was chosen because of its location within the state of Utah and its proximity to several world-famous natural wonders and recreational areas. Approval was obtained from the UNLV Institutional Review Board, Social and Behavioral Sciences Committee, prior to the commencement of the study.
The target population of the study was all residents in Garfield County over the age of 18. The sampling frame source was a property owner list obtained from the County Assessor. After deleting out-of-county individuals, duplicates, and businesses, a total of 1,250 useable residences were included as the sample frame. A decent telephone directory was not available for the study area and vehicle registration databases were not available to the researcher.

A random sample of 100 residents was chosen from the sampling frame as a pre-test group. This group received a cover letter explaining the study and asking for their cooperation. They were also given three local merchant coupons as incentives for completing the questionnaire. The pre-test was used to determine an approximate response rate and if there were any problems with the survey instrument. A response rate of 37% was realized and no glaring problems such as item non-response appeared on the returned questionnaires. No problems with the instrument were anticipated because Jurowski (1994) had already extensively tested it. Based on the pre-test results, it was determined that the main mailing of survey instruments would need to reflect about a 30% response rate in order to obtain the desired number of surveys to make the model work.

A form of Dillman's (1978) Total Design Method was used to gather data. Simple random sampling was used to determine the sample size that would be needed- which would be about 160 useable questionnaires (20 surveys per variable in the model). As was mentioned, the sample was drawn from a sample frame comprised of all property owners in the County. According to recent
statistical data, (UDWS, 1998, p. 11) the county had 4,272 residents, and a fact sheet on the County put out by the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (1998b) indicated that the County had approximately 2.8 persons per household (p. 1). So the sample frame contained approximately 3,500 persons, which was 772 persons short of the reported total County population. The sample frame failed to take into account renters, seasonal workers, and others who may not own property. Because at least 160 responses were needed, and the pre-test predicted about a 30% response rate, 500 self-administered mail-in questionnaires were sent to randomly selected residents. Only 170 responses were garnered after two weeks, so another batch of questionnaires was sent to non-respondents who returned an additional 19 usable surveys. The main survey instrument mailing (with follow up), yielded a total of 189 usable surveys and an overall response rate of 38%. A data collection timeline is included in Appendix A.

Several steps were taken to ensure an adequate response rate. First, a press release was printed in the local County newspaper announcing the study and encouraging residents to respond (Appendix A). Chosen households were sent a preparatory letter two weeks before they received the actual survey explaining the study and asking for their assistance. Each household received a cover letter with their questionnaire (Appendix A). All households were given three coupons from local merchants as incentives to complete the survey (Appendix A). To make the process as easy as possible, return, postage-paid envelopes were included with every survey (Also in Appendix A).
Non-Response Bias

Twenty-five households that did not return the survey were randomly selected to assess non-response bias. The respondents were asked the demographic questions from the survey instrument, as well as several key questions from the survey that would provide insight into perceptions about the Olympics. An independent T-test indicated that most of the means for non-respondents held a slightly higher level of support for elements drawn from each variable. Non-respondents’ support of the Olympics was a little stronger than was respondents’. The only factor that differed significantly between the non-respondents and respondents was percentage of household income coming from tourism. For some reason non-respondents received more income from tourism than did respondents. This question was part of the “Economic Gain” variable, which was very strongly correlated with all of the dependent variables in the model. It was not anticipated that this situation would have changed the results because it would have only enhanced the strong relationships already evident.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument relied heavily upon Jurowski’s (1994) questionnaire (pp. 248-252) because of this study’s reliance upon the same model. A copy of the survey is in Appendix A. The survey instrument was not extensively tested nor modified, because it was founded upon Jurowski’s successful version. Jurowski’s survey instrument was based on proven research design and literature review, much of which has been reiterated here. Some of the questions
were changed to reflect the purpose of this study. The survey consisted of four pages and four sections. The first part, called, “Your Community” asked respondents about community attachment/sentiment and quality of life in Garfield County. The second part directed respondents to rate tourism impacts, opinions of development, and support for the 2002 Winter Olympics. “Garfield County Recreation” contained the New Ecological Paradigm (Dunlap, et al., 1992) scale and some questions regarding a respondent’s utilization of the County’s recreation resources. The last section asked for demographic information and indicators of economic dependency on tourism. The number of questions was limited because of time and funding constraints, but the main questions were included that would provide constructs for model variables.

Variables

Ultimate Dependent Variable: Support for the 2002 Winter Olympics

The first variable to be measured was the ultimate dependent variable, or support for the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City (designated as “X1” in the model). Question number eight (Appendix A) had four sub-questions that asked the degree of support residents had for the Olympic Games, similar events in Salt Lake, promotion of Garfield County as a tourist destination during the Olympics, and community activities that would coincide with the Olympics. Support was measured on a five point Likert type scale where; 1=strongly oppose, 2=oppose, 3= neither oppose nor support, 4=support, and 5=strongly
support. The questions in this survey avoided leading the respondents by asking them to “Indicate how much you support or oppose...”. The variable was constructed using a mean score of all cases.

Intervening Endogeneous Variables

The intervening variables were the indirect effects expected to impact Garfield County from the Winter Olympics. These indirect effects were described in the literature chapter as economic effects, social effects, and environmental effects. The literature was examined by Jurowski (1994, p. 98) to glean certain impacts which were mentioned by a majority of researchers. This study relied on Jurowski’s assessment of tourism impacts to be used in the mega-event context, and hence, the same questions and scale as found in Jurowski’s questionnaire were implemented to obtain useful data. Respondents were asked to indicate on an anchor scale how much their lives would worsen or improve as a result of Olympic impacts in Garfield County. The scale consisted of five possible answers for each question: 1=worsen, 2=slightly worsen, 3=no change, 4=slightly improve, and 5=improve (See question seven in the survey instrument; Appendix A).

Economic impacts to the County can be viewed as either positive or negative. The two items identified by the literature as positive indirect effects were employment opportunities created by the Olympics and revenues that would be obtained by local governments from tourists as a result of the Olympics. The other two impacts, the price of goods and services and cost of land and...
housing could be either negative or positive (depending on the situation, i.e. sellers would see benefits in high prices).

There were seven items used to measure perceptions of the social indirect effects of the Winter Games. The seven items chosen by Jurowski (1994) and duplicated here were: opportunities for shopping, opportunities for recreation, traffic congestion, crime rate, local services such as police and fire protection, the preservation of the local culture, and the relationship between residents and tourists. Opportunities for shopping and recreation were considered to be benefits, and traffic congestion and crime were considered to be social costs. The other three could have been perceived as either costs or benefits.

Only one item measured respondents' perceptions of the indirect effects that would occur to the physical environment- the quality of the natural environment.¹

Exogeneous Variables

Dunlap, et al. (1992) pointed out five elements of an ecological perspective; the possibility of a future, environmental catastrophe, the fragility of nature's balance, a rejection of anthropocentrism, a rejection of man's existence in an environmental vacuum, and the realization that growth must be controlled. These elements are measured by a scale called the New Ecological Paradigm Scale (NEP) developed by Dunlap, et al. A composite score was obtained from each respondent to discover the propensity to have a more ecocentric attitude. The higher the score, the greater the level of ecocentricity. The NEP scale was
located in question eleven (Appendix A) and measured the level of agreement on 15 statements. The scale ranged from 5=strongly agree, to 1=strongly disagree. The first seven questions were actually reverse scored during data analysis to reflect the strength of environmental sensitivity.

Community Attachment

Several researchers found that length of residence has not been a good indicator of community attachment (Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, et al., 1997; McCool and Martin, 1994). McCool and Martin (ibid.) attributed the weak correlation between attachment and length of residence to the phenomena that many newcomers to the area are essentially tourists that decided to settle where they enjoyed vacationing. The researchers theorized that many old-timers have moved from the tourist areas, and that relatively new residents may have been expressing a strong attachment because they had visited the area for many years. Because of these conclusions, as well as Jurowski's exclusion of length of residence in her attachment variable, the element was not included in the community attachment variable.

The questions used to evaluate community attachment were based on those developed by Goudy (1982) and used in McCool and Martin's (1994) study as an affective scale that measured community sentiment. The three questions (See questions 2,3, and 4 in the survey instrument in Appendix A) asked respondents to provide their level of sentiment for the County based on a five point, Likert-type scale. The first question was; "If you had to move away from
Garfield County how sorry or please would you be to leave?” Answers ranged from “very pleased” to “very sorry”. The second question asked; “Indicate how much you agree with the following statement: ‘I would rather live in Garfield County than anywhere else.”’ The answers ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. The last question asked residents their interest level in knowing what was going on in the County. Possible responses included; “None”, “A little”, “Some”, “A lot”, and “Very much”.

Resource Utilization

Questions 9, 10, and 12 in the survey instrument (See Appendix A) made up the construct of the outdoor recreation resource use variable. As in Jurowski (1994), the respondents were asked the number of times they participated in outdoor activities, the level of knowledge about Garfield County recreation areas, and the expression of feelings regarding place attachment. A total of 8 elements made up the resource utilization variable.

Question 9 was an open-ended question that asked the approximate number of times the respondent had participated in Garfield County outdoor recreational activities over the past year. This open-ended question was later transformed to reflect 5 major categories; 0=nonusers, 1-10=infrequent users, 11-20=moderate users, 21-50=frequent users, and 51 times or more =heavy participants in recreational activities. Question 10 asked for the extent of the knowledge base of the respondent regarding outdoor opportunities. The choices included; “no knowledge”, “A little”, “Some”, “A lot”, and “A great deal”. The items
assigned to question number 12 were used to investigate the respondent’s attachment to place (Jurowski, 1994, p. 101). These questions should have probed for the sense of attachment and affinity for the land and outdoor opportunities afforded to the individuals. The Likert-type scale ranged from, “Strongly disagree”, to “Strongly agree.”

Economic Dependency

Questions 15, 17, and 18 (Appendix A) served as predictors of economic dependency. These questions form the variable that would describe persons who perceive that they have something to gain financially from increased visitation to Garfield County. Question 15 asked for the percentage of income from the person’s employer or business that comes from the tourist industry- the selections ranged from 0 to 100 percent. Question 17 asked what portion of the respondent’s income has come from the visitors to Garfield County, and finally, question 18 asked how likely would it be that the individual’s household income would increase if the number of visitors increased. This question had a scale from “Not at all likely”, to “Extremely Likely.”

Reliability of the Data

According to Churchill (1995) reliability is the similarity of results provided by independent but comparable measures of the same object, trait, or construct (p. 539). Internal reliability analysis is used to assess the reliability and consistency of a multi-item (Malhotra, 1999). Reliability is also the accuracy or
precision of the measuring instrument. Coefficient alpha provides a measure of
the intercorrelations that exist among a set of items (Churchill, 1995). A value of
.69 or less usually indicates unsatisfactory internal reliability and stability. Tables
3.1 through 3.9 provide evidence of the reliability of the constructed variables for
the model with Cronbach's alpha and inter-item correlations.

The total set of impact variables was highly reliable as one variable with
an alpha of .85 (Table 3.1), but the economic impact variable (Table 3.2) was not
considered reliable at .68 and could not be refined by dropping one of the
elements. Indirect social impact variable (Table 3.3) was deemed reliable at
alpha level of .79. The ecological paradigm scale, community attachment scale,
support variables were all consistent and reliable, with alphas over the .70 cut off.
The open-ended question regarding number of times used recreation resources
was refined initially to contain a 1-5 scale that included all of the respondents'
answers. Community attachment (Table 3.7) initially had a low alpha of .69, but
after the variable, "What level of interest do you have about what goes on in
Garfield County" was deleted, the construct was judged to be successful at .84
alpha. The same was true for the economic gain variable (Table 3.9). By
dropping question 18, which asked if the respondent would experience an
"increase in income if the number of tourists increased", the variable merited a
robust .89 alpha. The question may not be a good indicator of economic
dependency because most workers in the hospitality/tourism industry are not
going to receive a pay increase commensurate with an increase in business.
### Table 3.1 Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlations for Impact Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Correlation</th>
<th>Item to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>.4950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Opportunities</td>
<td>.5498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue for local governments</td>
<td>.4075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of goods and services</td>
<td>.6016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of land and housing</td>
<td>.6086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>.6206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local services</td>
<td>.4599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>.4968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with tourists</td>
<td>.5623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>.6562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local culture</td>
<td>.4595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.2 Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlations for Perception of Indirect Economic Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Correlation</th>
<th>Item to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>.4469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue for local governments</td>
<td>.4225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of goods and services</td>
<td>.5253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of land and housing</td>
<td>.4781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
### Table 3.3 Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlation of the Items

**Measuring Perception of Social Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Correlation</th>
<th>Item to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Opportunities</td>
<td>.4303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Opportunities</td>
<td>.5903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>.5961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>.5471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Services</td>
<td>.4601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local culture</td>
<td>.5252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship between residents and tourists</td>
<td>.5529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.4 Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlations for Support Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Correlation</th>
<th>Item to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the Olympics</td>
<td>.7245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support similar events in Salt Lake</td>
<td>.7284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote County during Olympics</td>
<td>.7222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities that coincide with Olympics</td>
<td>.7275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.5 Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlations for Recreation Utilization Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Correlation</th>
<th>Item to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of resources</td>
<td>.3078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite place to be</td>
<td>.7051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.5 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important to me</th>
<th>.7039</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing compares to this place</td>
<td>.7678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place satisfies</td>
<td>.7869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing can substitute this place</td>
<td>.7288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This place defines me</td>
<td>.7321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of time recreated past year*</td>
<td>.2673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refined to fit 5 point scale that takes in raw data ranges.

### Table 3.6 Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlations of the Items Measuring Economic Dependency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha = .8994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of business income that comes from tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of household income that comes from tourists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refined by deleting question 18 : "Will income increase if tourist numbers do".

### Table 3.7 Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlations of the Items Measuring Community Attachment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha = .8411</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If had to move I would be sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather live in County than elsewhere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refined by deleting question 4 ; "Interest in knowing what goes on in County".
Table 3.8  Cronbach's Alpha and Item to Total Correlations of the Items in the New Ecological Paradigm Scale That Measure Ecocentricity

Cronbach's Alpha = .9010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Correlation</th>
<th>Item to Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humans are subject to laws of nature</td>
<td>.1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth is like a spaceship- limited resources</td>
<td>.6334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When humans interfere with nature it is dangerous</td>
<td>.6080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The balance of nature is delicate</td>
<td>.6394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants and animals have as much right to exist as humans do</td>
<td>.4878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans are severely abusing the environment</td>
<td>.7316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching population limit</td>
<td>.7005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are heading for ecological catastrophe</td>
<td>.7256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human ingenuity will insure that we do not destroy earth*</td>
<td>.4351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans have right to modify environment*</td>
<td>.5820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological crisis is exaggerated*</td>
<td>.6985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans can control nature*</td>
<td>.3218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth has plenty of natural resources*</td>
<td>.6176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans meant to rule over nature*</td>
<td>.6289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of nature is strong*</td>
<td>.6839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These items were reverse scored to reflect direction toward ecocentric attitude (the higher the number the greater the propensity to be ecocentric).
Research Framework and Data Analysis

Path analysis was the chosen technique for analyzing relationships among variables. Path analysis was used by Jurowski (1994) to measure significant relationships between variables and to decompose the relationships within the model. Wright (1985) explained path analysis as a method for dealing with a system of interrelated variables and can identify causal relationships (p. 40). This method of analysis combines cause and effect theory with correlations among variables. It should be noted that causal inferences are only theorized, not proven relationships (Kerlinger, 1964). Cohen and Cohen (1983) related that correlation does not imply causation, but causation manifests itself in correlation. This insight allows path analysis to be used as a framework for interpreting relationships within the context of this study. According to Jurowski (1994):

Path analysis is primarily used to separate correlations among variables into causal and noncausal components. It is, therefore, appropriate for confirming the causal relationship of the variables and for examining the extent to which the variables interact (p. 89).

The four values: Resource Utilization, Economic Gain, Community Attachment, and Ecocentric Attitude are the exogeneous, or independent variables, that should imply causation of the perceptions of indirect Olympic impacts and Olympic support. The three indirect impacts; Social, Environmental, and Economic are the intervening endogeneous variables that can be perceived to affect the support variable or can be the result of closely held values. The
Support for the Olympics is the ultimate endogeneous dependent variable, which is the effect of all other variables in the model.

The path model shows a logical flow of elements that impact the dependent variables. Straight lines with arrows indicate the direction of causal relationships. In this study, a model was taken from a previous study (Jurowski, 1994) and manipulated to explain the support for a mega-event (See Figure 3.1). Each path was examined using regression analysis to obtain a significance level and beta coefficient that described the correlation between proposed, causal variables (Wright, 1985). Path coefficients are essentially the same as beta coefficients when used to link direct relationships. The benefits of path analysis lie within the decompositions of the paths and the indirect effects that are brought out (Keane, 1994). Indirect effects were measured by “multiplying the path coefficient leading from an exogeneous variable to an intervening variable by the path coefficient that leads from the same intervening variable to its dependent variable” (Jurowski, 1994, p. 113). The total correlation of the variable was measured by summing the simple (direct effect) and compound (indirect) path coefficients. This technique will be illustrated in the following chapters.

A relationship was established between elements of this study if the significance level was at .05 or better, and following the scale used by Jurowski, the following beta/path coefficients were used to imply strength of correlation:

0.0 – 0.05 = Weak
0.051 – 0.30 = Moderate
Figure 3.1: Path Analytic Model for Resident Perceptions of Winter Olympics (Jurovski, 1994)
A path that did not reach the .05 significance level would have been disregarded.

This study was trying to discover the relationship between several variables that would explain resident attitudes regarding tourism and a nearby mega-event. The hypotheses were given to provide a guide for the formulation of probable causal relationships between the important variables that may impinge upon a resident's support for the Olympics. The following questions were trying to be answered through data analysis:

How do Garfield County residents perceive that the upcoming 2002 Winter Olympics will affect their community and what is the basis for those perceptions?

**Sub Problems:**

a) What is the level of support among residents for the Winter Olympics?

b) What are the perceived indirect benefits and costs of a nearby mega-event upon this community?

c) What kinds of tourism related values are strong in the community- use of the tourism resource, potential for economic gain, ecocentric attitude, and/or community attachment, and how do these values affect perception of the indirect effects of the Olympics and subsequent support for the Olympics?

Based on these questions, the following hypotheses were put forth:
Hypothesis 1: A positive relationship exists between resident perception of the indirect benefits of the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics.

Hypothesis 2: A positive relationship exists between a favorable perceived increase in indirect benefits over indirect costs associated with the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics.

Hypothesis 3: A positive relationship exists between the potential for economic gain from the upcoming Winter Olympic Games, and both the perception of the indirect benefits of the Games and support for the Games.

Hypothesis 4: A positive relationship exists between importance placed on the use of the County’s tourism recreation resources and both the perception of the indirect benefits of the Winter Olympic Games and support for the Games.

Hypothesis 5: A negative relationship exists between the ecocentric attitudes and both the perception of the indirect effects of the Winter Olympic Games and support for the Games.

Hypothesis 6: A negative relationship exists between the degree of community attachment and both the perception of the indirect effects of the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics.

Hypothesis 7: Use of the County tourism natural resources, expectation of economic gain, ecocentric attitude, and community attachment values interact in the formation of perceptions of the indirect impacts of the Winter Olympic Games and both directly affect support for the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City.

The results obtained from the data analysis will be reported in the next chapter. The results that were obtained will be evaluated in chapter five in light
of the hypotheses. Figure 3.1 was the path model that has been tested to evaluate resident perceptions and test the hypotheses.

---

1 The author now regrets not asking a few additional questions regarding environmental impacts so that a better construct could be tested. One variable is not good enough to assess perceived environmental impacts.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Profile of Respondents

The average length of residence in Garfield County was about 31 years. Most of the folks in the study have been born and raised in the County. Only 25% of respondents have lived in Garfield County 10 years or less, and over 23% have lived in the area for over 50 years. The average age of respondents' was 55 years old and 54.4% of the sample was female. Because of the sample frame – property owners list- younger people that probably rent (Ages 18-21) were underrepresented. Others who rent or do not own may also be underrepresented as well. This was judged to be a limitation, but should not have significantly affected the quality of the sample obtained. There are only a few rental properties in the County, and no apartment complexes exist in the area to the knowledge of the researcher. It was already noted that based on government data, only about 700 individuals were probably not included in the sample frame.

The majority of respondents had a yearly income between $20,001 and $45,000, with about 30% that made over $45,000 last year. About 21% of the
sample made $20,000 or less. With a mean of 2.89 and a median of 2.80 in the NEP, it appears that most respondents were not ecocentric.

**Exploratory Analysis and Assumption Testing**

The intention of this study was to determine the level of support among residents for the Olympics, as well as what factors led to that support. The study was also intended to test Jurowski’s (1994) model under a more specific premise—express support of a non-host community for a nearby mega-event. A path analytic model was used to assess relationships between community values, perceived Olympic impacts, and support for the 2002 Winter Olympics. Path analysis uses ordinary least squares regression analysis to evaluate direct relationships.

Because of the multi-collinearity among the three original impact variables, Principal Component Analysis was employed for the elements of the three indirect effect perceptions (Table 4.1). It was already noted that the selections for perception of economic impacts did not develop a satisfactory Cronbach’s alpha level. The construct was then scrutinized through Rotated Principal Component Analysis to see if the correct elements went together to form the social and economic variables (environmental impact was only one question and was therefore not expected to stand out on its own in component analysis).
Table 4.1 Varimax Rotated Principal Component Analysis for Elements of Intervening Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
<th>56.65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rotated Eigenvectors</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INITIAL VARIABLES  
CONCERN COMPONENTS  
OPPORTUNITY  
COMPONENTS

| Traffic congestion | .824 |
| Crime Rate | .789 |
| Natural environment | .764 |
| Cost of land & housing | .684 |
| Price of goods & services | .683 |
| Preservation of culture | .661 |
| Relationship with tourists | .611 |
| Employment opportunities | .837 |
| Shopping opportunities | .787 |
| Revenue for local government | .743 |
| Recreational opportunities | .731 |

*The question regarding "local services" was deleted because it was not determined to be a significant factor to residents.

Apparently, residents did not evaluate impacts based on the three general categories identified by scholars. In this study, Principal Component analysis identified a different intervening variable construct. Two new components manifested themselves in the analysis. These new variables were called; "Perceived Indirect Olympic Opportunities", and "Perceived Indirect Olympic Concerns". Elements of the new "Opportunities" construct included:

Employment opportunities, shopping opportunities, recreation opportunities, and
revenue for local government. Elements of the new “Concerns” (impacts that are of concern to local residents) construct included: Traffic congestion, crime rate, natural environment, cost of land and housing, cost of goods and services, preservation of the local culture, and the relationship between tourists and locals.

The revised version of the path analytic model will be presented later in the chapter, and the new variables’ coefficient alphas are displayed in tables 4.2 and 4.3. The evolution of the intervening impact variables here is very similar to the work that Lankford and Howard (1993) conducted when they purified their scale. The factors in their research were labeled “concern for local tourism development” and “personal and community benefits.” They too found that residents perceive tourism as either a personal benefit or else they express concerns about tourism’s impacts and see the need for planning and wise judgement.

Table 4.2 Coefficient alpha for perceived Olympic opportunities variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha = .8013</th>
<th>Item to Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>.6519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Opportunities</td>
<td>.6471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Opportunities</td>
<td>.6333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue for Local Governments</td>
<td>.5391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3  Coefficient alpha for perceived Olympic Concerns Variable

Cronbach's alpha = .8585

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item to Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of goods and services</td>
<td>.6071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of land and housing</td>
<td>.5928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>.7292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime rate</td>
<td>.6501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impacts</td>
<td>.7040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of local culture</td>
<td>.5460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with tourists</td>
<td>.5885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the components analysis, weak Cronbach’s alpha of economic impact, and questions regarding multicolinearity, the model has been changed to reflect new intervening variables.

Exploratory analysis and assumptions for conducting multiple regression analysis were done before the variables could be examined extensively. The only variable that was skewed was the attachment variable at -1.05, which was not judged to be a level of skewness that could cause great harm to the model (a variable is considered skewed if it is over 1.0). It is important that assumptions are met, however, Cohen and Cohen asserted; “Fortunately, the available evidence suggests that even fairly substantial departure from the assumptions will frequently result in little error of inference when the data are treated as if the assumptions are valid” (p. 48). Each dependent variable and its group of independent variables were tested to make sure that regression assumptions were not violated. Based on Studentized Deleted Residual analysis it has been
concluded that each endogeneous variable in the model was normally distributed and no heterogeneity was evident. The endogeneous variables (studentized deleted residuals) were analyzed through normal probability plots, Q-Q plots, histograms, boxplots, and stem and leaf plots to check for normality. The studentized deleted residuals were also plotted against predicted values in a scatterplot. There did not appear to be any apparent pattern, hence the constant variance was confirmed. Finally, multi-collinearity was not found to be a problem in any of the regression models. All Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) were well under 2.0, and tolerance levels were well above .3, thus indicating that independent variables were not intercorrelated. The only variables that seemed to have a problem were the social and economic indirect impact variables that were already changed. These variables had VIFs approaching 3, and social impact variable was very close to .3.

Refinement of Variables

As mentioned previously, the question about interest level was taken out of the attachment variable because it created an unfavorable reliability. Length of residence was not included in the variable based on the findings of Jurowski (1994) and McCool and Martin (1994). Economic gain variable was also refined in the same manner. The alpha level with the “increase income” question was barely over the .70 standard, but with the item deleted it reached a much better .90 coefficient alpha. Only 20% of respondents indicated that they would see an increase in their income if tourism increased. This was evaluated to not be a
good judge of economic gain because many people who are dependent upon
tourism dollars will not necessarily receive any immediate increase in pay
(Validity is questionable). The main group to benefit from increased profits would
be business owners. Consequently, only “percent of business income” and
“percent of household income” were included in the economic dependency
variable. The number of times a person used the resources was categorized into
5 sections for a better scale to compare against the other ordinal 5 point scales in
the resource use variable. Table 4.4 provides a summary of the model variables
with the measures of central tendency for the main variables and their elements.

The most important question posed to respondents was question number
8 in the survey instrument, which asked residents to rate their level of support for
the 2002 Winter Olympics. Only 32% said that they supported or strongly
supported the Olympics, and 32% opposed the Olympics. An astounding 46% of
respondents reported that they neither support nor oppose the Olympics. When
asked if they would support promotion of the County during the Olympics as a
tourist destination, 59% supported the idea, and 50% would support community
activities that would coincide with the event.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Support</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events in S.L.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote County</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Events</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues for local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Land</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of goods</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime rate</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tourists</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.8078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Culture</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Gain</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>34.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.4 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from tourism</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>23.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employer receives</td>
<td>from tourism</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Utilization</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used*</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective scale</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How sorry or pleased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to move</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather live here than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anywhere else</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecocentric Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This variable was transformed into 5 categories of usage.*
Data Analysis

Path coefficients that had a significance level of .05 or better were judged to be significant. A path correlation was considered weak if it was between 0 and .05, moderate between the range of .051 and .30, and strong between .301 and 1.0. Appendix B contains the actual regression models with relevant statistics.

Figure 4.1 shows the revised path analytic model with the following variable symbols.

- \( X_1 \) = Support for the Olympics
- \( X_2 \) = Perceived Opportunities
- \( X_3 \) = Perceived Concerns
- \( X_4 \) = Economic gain
- \( X_5 \) = Use of the resource
- \( X_6 \) = Ecocentric Attitude
- \( X_7 \) = Community Attachment

The path model explained some of the relationships among the variables. Economic dependency positively influenced perceived indirect opportunities that will come along with the Winter Olympics, as well as the concerns that will inevitably come. Individuals who had an economic stake in tourism also supported the Olympics. All relationships were significant and moderately strong. Resource use was positively related to the Olympic opportunities, but negatively related to the perceived concerns about indirect impacts. There was a significant relationship between resource use and the support variable.
Figure 4.1 Revised Path Analytic Model
Community attachment had a weak, positive relationship to opportunities that was not significant, and a weak negative association to the support of the Winter Games. Those who are attached to the community must perceive some benefits in the challenges that lie ahead during the Winter Olympics. A moderate relationship (.19) was found between attachment and perceived concerns.

Individuals with an ecocentric attitude did not generally support the Olympic Games, nor did they look forward to the changes brought by the mega-event. The relationship to concerns was negative, but weak. The path coefficient to opportunities was positive, but weak and insignificant.

Even though the intervening variables were changed, the same hypotheses could be used to determine valuable information about the model. Table 4.5 shows the path coefficients from the two impact variables to the support variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>.407*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes significance at the .05 level

The first hypothesis was partially supported by the data. There was a very strong relationship between perceived opportunities with the coming Olympics and support for the Olympics. Perceived concerns about the Olympics are
positively related to support, but are not significant in this model. This means that residents' do not perceive the Olympics will affect certain factors, such as the cost of housing.

The original impact variables (economic, social, environmental) held costs and benefits within their parameters. For example, someone who enjoys the environment might see tourism as a way to improve facilities and draw attention to the plight of endangered areas. Another individual may see to impact as negative because of the harmful effects of human intervention in nature. The new variables are similar in that they can be positive or negatively perceived by residents. The mean scores provide the level of negativity or positive sentiment toward opportunities or improvements. For example, if concerns are positive, it could mean that residents perceive that things such as the preservation of the local culture are going to be enhanced by the Olympic experience and are not a concern to them. If an opportunity is perceived favorably, then the resident recognizes that shopping opportunities will improve as a result of the Olympics.

Relationships were examined through the decomposition of the correlations between the exogeneous variables and the ultimate dependent variable- support. Through path analysis the costs verses benefits can be evaluated and examined. Direct correlations were made through regression analysis, but path analysis revealed hidden information about the variables. All other paths (that are not direct) had to go through another variable before they reached the support variable. Support for the Olympics was both directly and indirectly caused by the values (ecocentric attitude, resource utilization, etc.).
Alwin and Hauser (1978) indicated that indirect effects are a part of a variable's total effect on the dependent variable. The path passes through the intervening variables, which transmit the effects to the ultimate dependent variable. Indirect effects are calculated by multiplying the exogeneous variable's path by the intervening variable's path (Jurowski, et al., 1997). By adding the direct path with the indirect, a total effect can be calculated (ibid.). Jurowski, et al. also explained, "The components yielded through this decomposition may be interpreted as a percentage of total association" (p. 10). Table 4.6 shows the path decompositions.
Table 4.6: Decomposition of the Correlations Between Variables and Support for the 2002 Winter Olympics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>(AxB)</th>
<th>Percentage of Economic Gain on Impact Support</th>
<th>Total Effect of Economic Gain on Impact Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Gain</td>
<td>.217*</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>.249*</td>
<td>.407*</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Indirect Effects    | .123 |       |       |                                               |                                               |
| Total Effects             | .340 | 100  |       |                                               |                                               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>(AxB)</th>
<th>Percentage of Resource Use on Impact Support</th>
<th>Total Effect of Resource Use on Impact Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Resource</td>
<td>.156*</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.407*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Indirect Effects
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Table 4.6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>(AxB)</th>
<th>Percentage of Effect of Effect of Variable Indirect Effect Total Effect of Ecocentricism on Support Variable on Impact Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecocentric Att.</td>
<td>-.188*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.407*</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effects</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(direct+indirect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>(AxB)</th>
<th>Percentage of Effect of Effect of Variable Indirect Effect Total Effect of Attachment on Support Variable on Impact Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.407*</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Effects</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coefficient is significant at the .05 or better probability level.
Figure 4.2: Revised Path Analytic Model With Significant Relationships at .05 Probability Level.
Decomposition revealed some interesting insights. The direct effect of economic gain contributed to 64% of the total effects of the variable upon support. A significant portion (30%) of the total effects of economic gain upon support came from the perceived Olympic opportunities. A high 83% of Resource Utilization effect on support was attributed to the direct effects, while 18% of the total effect came from perceived Olympic opportunities. The totality of a conservationist’s negative attitude about the Olympics comes directly from his/her values and belief system. There were no indirect effects that contributed to the total effect. The community attachment group did not support the Olympics, but if they would have had a significant probability then they would have viewed the Olympics negatively. The direct effects explain the entire total effect. None of the exogeneous variables were changed by an indirect effect into an opposite relationship. More on the decomposition of indirect effects will be discussed in the next chapter. Important relationships are summarized in Exhibit 4.1, and a new, revised model with significant relationships is presented in Figure 4.2.

The results of data analysis have indicated that Garfield County residents are somewhat in favor of the Olympics and recognize the positive impacts that will result. The next chapter will delineate the results and explain the findings in light of the hypotheses.
Exhibit 4.1 Summary of Significant Relationships

Significant Relationships with Perceived Olympic Opportunities:

Potential for economic gain is the only value that has a significant, strong effect on the perception of the favorable distribution of "opportunity" benefits over the "opportunity" costs associated with certain indirect impacts (employment, shopping, recreation, revenue for government).

Significant Relationships with Perceived Olympic Concerns:

Economic gain and community attachment positively affect the favorable distribution of benefits over costs for the Olympic "concerns."
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

This study made some inroads into understanding rural resident perceptions of a nearby mega-event. Some of the main discoveries that have been made include: Perceived opportunities presented by mega-events are important, positive determinants in the support for the 2002 Winter Olympics, People who use the same outdoor recreational resources as the tourists support the Olympics; and those with strong feelings for the environment oppose the Olympic Games. Only about 31% of respondents indicated that they supported or strongly supported the Olympics, while 46% responded that they did not support or oppose the event. This is a truly alarming statistic. In contrast, non-metro Atlanta residents had an 89% support level for the 1996 Summer Olympics three years before the event (Mihalik and Simonetta, 1998, p. 11). The mean value for the support variable is 3.35, which indicates that a lot of residents are ambivalent regarding the success of the event. Many of the modes and means of the impact items also hovered around 3.0, which indicates that many residents do not perceive any kind of impact from the Olympics. The local travel council and other tourism leaders in the County need to prepare residents for the Olympic period or the ambivalence may become self-fulfilled prophecy. There is
still a great opportunity to create a specific marketing plan for the Winter Olympics and include all of the major tourism players, including residents. It is obvious that one of the implications of this study is that awareness of the Winter Games needs to be stimulated.

Interpretation of Findings

Hypothesis One

The results show that residents of Garfield County who perceive that they will receive benefits through additional opportunities brought by the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City strongly support the games. This partially supports hypothesis one, which states: A positive relationship exists between resident perception of the indirect benefits of the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics. Within the “opportunities” variable are several factors that could be beneficial to the community. A positive relationship between intervening variables and support for the Winter Olympics means that residents who perceive that indirect benefits will flow from the Olympics support the Olympics. The concerns brought out by the Olympics, which could be positive or negative, are positively correlated to support, but the path is insignificant in the relationship. Residents are willing to enter into exchanges with tourists if they perceive that benefits will be gained and costs minimized.
Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis two was confirmed, which states that a positive relationship exists between a favorable perceived increase in indirect benefits over indirect costs associated with the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics. Each of the intervening variables has positive and negative elements, but if the path coefficient is positive then respondents indicated that they perceived that the construct elements were positive and beneficial overall.

One of the benefits of path analysis is that it allows for evaluation of the entire effects of a correlation. Exogeneous variables affect the dependent support variable directly and through the intervening variables. The direct effect is found through regression analysis and then indirect effects are found through examining the intervening variables. The product of the direct effect on the intervening variables (impacts) from the extrogenous variable produces an indirect effect coefficient. The indirect effects are then added together to obtain the total indirect effects in the relationship, and then the total indirect effect is added to the extrogenous variable's direct affect on the ultimate dependent variable. Direct and indirect effects summed create the total effect. The measure of the total effect gives the researcher an idea of what kind of influence the intervening variables had on the different types of respondents. For example, in Table 4.6 (p.83) the total indirect effects for the economic gain variable were created by multiplying economic gain's effect on each of the intervening impacts (opportunities and concerns) by the intervening variables' direct effects on the dependent variable (support). The indirect effect of concerns on economic gain
was .022, and the effect opportunities had on economic gain was .101. These numbers were added to get .123, which was added to economic gain’s direct effect on support. .217, to obtain a total effect coefficient of .340. The total effects were greater than the direct effect, so individuals who are dependent upon tourism’s economic benefits perceive a favorable distribution of benefits over costs and have an even greater level of support for the Games.

Those who utilize the tourism resources also perceive a greater benefit in supporting the Olympics after evaluating indirect effects. Community attachment did not pose a significant probability level when regressed against the support variable. If significance level would have been evident, then the relationship would have been negative. Those who have a strong bond to the community seem to oppose the Olympics, but when indirect effects through the intervening variables are examined, the opposition is slightly relaxed and residents perceive some beneficial impacts that affect their perception of the event. The decomposition of the ecocentric paths reveals that the magnitude of opposition for the Olympics is lessened after evaluation of the opportunities and concerns. It makes sense that environmentalists would oppose the Winter Olympics because of the fear that accompanies such an extravaganza. Carrying capacity may be exceeded and natural areas exploited and developed.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis three declares that a positive relationship exists between the potential for economic gain from the upcoming Winter Olympic Games, and both
the perception of the indirect benefits of the Games and support for the Games. This hypothesis is confirmed by the direct correlations between economic gain and each of the endogeneous variables. Economic gain had a significant, strong correlation with Olympic opportunities, Olympic concerns, and with support for the upcoming Winter Games.

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis four expected a positive relationship to exist between importance placed on the use of the County's tourism recreation resources and both the perception of the indirect benefits of the Winter Olympic Games and support for the Games. This hypothesis was partially confirmed. Resource users were in support of the Olympics, but failed to significantly acknowledge the indirect Olympic impacts. Support of a mega-event by resources users is important because it indicates that they do not mind sharing the natural areas that they cherish. The fact that they are ambivalent about the Olympics having an impact in their lives indicates that perhaps they do not think that the hype and tourism impacts will extend to Southern Utah.

**Hypothesis 5**

The fifth hypothesis was also partially confirmed, which says that a negative relationship exists between the ecocentric attitudes and both the perception of the indirect effects of the Winter Olympic Games and support for the Games. Those who value the natural environment directly oppose the Winter
Olympics, but fail to think that the impacts will seriously affect themselves. Once again, this seems to point to a pattern among resident sentiment that the Games would not bring noticeable change to Garfield County.

Hypothesis 6

The evidence did not substantiate hypothesis six. The hypothesis is that a negative relationship exists between the degree of community attachment and both the perception of the indirect effects of the Winter Olympics and support for the Olympics. Respondents with strong community ties do not seem to think that they will be affected by the Olympics at all, and do not even care to express support or opposition for the games. If the direct path coefficient to support had a significance level better than the acceptable .05 level, then the results would indicate that residents mildly oppose the Olympics. However, this hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 7

Use of the County tourism natural resources and expectation of economic gain, ecocentric attitude, and community attachment values interact in the formation of perceptions of the indirect impacts of the Winter Olympic Games and directly affect support for the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City. Use of the resources and economic dependency derive a percentage of their total effect on support from compound paths. Use of resources had 17% of its total effects derived from the indirect effects from the intervening impact variables (See Table...
4.6, p.83) and economic gain received 36% of its total effect upon support from indirect effects. The other two values interacted with the intervening variables, but the direct effects were actually decreased by indirect paths. These results lead to the conclusion that in this particular community, the impacts from the Olympics are not perceived as affecting the area. The interplay among variables is not as pronounced as it was in Jurowski’s (1994) study.

Research Objectives

The following research objectives were established in the first chapter:

1. Test Jurowski’s (1994) path-analytic, social-exchange based model in a different context: Resident perceptions of a mega-event’s indirect effects on a rural community.

2. Identify the elements that pose the basis for resident perception of the 2002 Winter Olympic Games.

3. Discover the relationships between individual values, perceived indirect impacts, and support for a nearby mega-event, the interplay among such elements, and the perceived indirect effects that will result from the event.

4. Provide local community tourism leaders with a “snapshot” of resident perceptions of tourism and the upcoming Winter Olympics so that they can plan, coordinate, market, and educate the community with an eye towards the great event.
Jurowski's model was quite useful in evaluating resident perceptions in Garfield County. Her work in social exchange theory was a great step in tourism research. The survey instrument she used was also judged to be an outstanding tool for assessing resident perceptions. Future resident perception studies should take a serious look at the model and determinations proffered by Jurowski. The model was somewhat problematic in that it did not address the tourism impacts in light of residents' perceptions. A factor analysis or principal component analysis could help further shed light on the way that the impacts should be constructed. The only change in the model in this study was the intervening variables, but the revision could have just been a function of the geographic area. Impacts, good or bad, are still the basis for the intervening variables.

The study also achieved its objective of finding out more about resident perceptions of the Olympic Games in Salt Lake, and what potentially determines those perceptions. This study should provide tourism leaders with an excellent resource to use when conducting a marketing plan for the upcoming Olympics. The data here can be used to cater educational programs and community responsive outreach when entertaining ideas in anticipation of the Olympics. Resident reactions to tourism in the County would probably be correlated to the Olympic reaction study- but that is the subject for a different project.
Discussion of Findings in Light of Previous Studies

Support for the Olympics can be linked to the economic dependency one has on tourism. Economic gain directly and positively affects support for the 2002 Winter Olympics and also positively affects perceptions of Olympic impacts. This conclusion is confirmed by earlier studies (Ap, 1992a; Davis, Allen and Cosenza, 1988; Jurowski, 1994; Jurowski, et al., 1997; Lankford and Howard, 1993; Liu and Var, 1986; Liu, Sheldon and Var, 1987; Long, Perdue and Allen, 1990; Milman and Pizam, 1988; Pizam, 1978; and Rothman, 1978).

The finding in this study that resource users support the Olympics is contradictory to that of Lankford and Howard (1993), who found that residents in Washington/Oregon who used the resources felt threatened by tourists. Several studies have indicated that resource users generally feel positive about sharing their recreational areas with tourists (Pizam, 1978; Rothman, 1978). Jurowski's study (1994) found that resource users were neutral toward tourism development, but also perceived benefits would come from development. This study found resource users to be unconcerned with Olympic impacts. Nothing in the mega-event literature was found that substantiated these analyses.

Perceptions of tourism's impacts have been well documented in the literature, but mega-event research has been scanty at best. Jeong and Faulkner (1997), Mihalik and Cummings (1995), Mihalik and Simonetta (1998), Ritchie and Lyons (1990), Soutar and McLeod (1993), and Turco (1998) evaluated resident perceptions of the impacts of mega-events. The longitudinal study of the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta by Mihalik, et al. tried to discover
correlations between support for the 1996 games and demographic variables. None of these articles examined social exchange theory or linked perceptions of impacts and support to different values within the community. The premise that residents will support tourism if it benefits them socially was established by Turco (1998) and Soutar and McCleod (1993).

The perception of environmentally conscious individuals in a community is another area that has been relatively invisible in the mega-event literature. The finding that ecocentric resident attitudes lead to opposition of the Olympics has commonalities with Jurowski’s (1994) findings regarding environmental attitudes.

Community attachment determinations by earlier studies indicated mixed results (McCoy and Martin, 1984; Um and Crompton, 1987). Jurowski’s (1994) research found that attached residents generally support tourism development and perceive that tourism brings benefits to the community. This study concluded that residents are neutral toward the impacts and support for the Olympics.

Overall, it appears that this study makes a contribution to the literature because of its specific nature. Mega-event literature is still in its infancy, but is gaining in strength and importance. It is anticipated that this study will assist in evaluating different mega-event scenarios, and hopefully providing a basis for better understanding among all constituents.

Validity

The results and conclusions presented in this paper are localized to the Garfield County area. The conclusions may not be generalized for all rural
communities in the state of Utah, or anywhere else. Because the results were very similar to Jurowski's (1994) there is an implied validity to the relationships, but other scholarly conclusions are needed to corroborate.

A large enough sample was obtained that it is unlikely that non-response bias played a role in the determinations, but there is the possibility that the more affluent of the community were underrepresented. The nature of the sample frame- property owner list- also implicates that a segment of the population that is younger and of a lower economic status was not represented. Individuals in the County who rent or otherwise do not own property were underrepresented. It is unlikely that this factor threatened the validity of the results because of the large sample size obtained in relation to the total population of the County (21% of total population).

Directions for Future Research

A form of this study should be conducted in other areas of the country to evaluate resident reactions to mega-events. More causal studies are needed in the mega event research arena. Projects similar to this one can be done in rural non-host areas, or urban areas that are ground zero for the mega-event. Finding out motivations and valued elements among a population are important for producing a quality product that enhances the lives of both visitor and host.

Additional research needs to be done in Garfield County. The Garfield County Travel Council should obtain some statistics on economic effects of the Winter Olympics on rural counties in Utah, and then disseminate this information.
to the rest of the County. Only a small minority of residents support the
Olympics, but 60% said that they would support the promotion of Garfield County
as a tourist destination during the Games, and 50% favor community activities in
conjunction with the event. Residents seem to favor Garfield County's
participation in the festivities if they thought there would be an associated impact.

Also, more research needs to be conducted in relation to tourism in
general, and in relation to Bryce Canyon National Park. Bryce is the sole reason
that 1.6 million people visit the County each year. One thing was established by
this study; Garfield County residents want their opinions heard and want to be a
part of the development process and not just bystanders. This conclusion was
based on the response rate received, the answers given, and the comments that
were scrawled on many of the questionnaires. More research must be done in
the County to gauge resident reactions and perceptions. By talking with many
residents, the researcher found that people were actually surprised to have
anyone inquire about their opinions.

A very important point that must be re-emphasized here is the nature of
the study—measuring indirect effects on a community that is not the host
community for the mega-event. There are no studies that have specifically
looked at indirect effects of a hallmark event on a nearby community. The
indirect effects anticipated to affect Garfield County are, in the short run, minimal
at best, and should be more pronounced over the long run. Respondents
answered the questions according to their perceptions of impacts by an event
that is over 250 miles away. The perception of what will happen during and after
an event such as the 2002 Winter Olympics may be vague to many residents. This fact could be the reason for the low level of support for the Games. Most people may not care because they do not see the event impacting their lives. One study conducted in Turkey (Korca, 1996) concluded that the closer to the tourism area a resident lives, the more likely he/she will have negative attitudes about tourism. Pizam's (1978) study found that negativity toward tourism will be more apparent in heavily tourism concentrated areas. Perhaps someone needs to do a study on the perceptions of mega-event impacts in relation to the proximity of the event location.

Conclusion

Resident responsive tourism is not just a fad or a buzzword in tourism research circles- it is survival for many destination communities. Residents must be involved in the process so that they will buy in to the decisions made in their own communities and support tourism objectives. Garfield County residents will not be able to make any decisions about the 2002 Winter Olympics in Salt Lake City, but they should be able to decide what, if anything, will occur in their County. Resident involvement is critical to the success of marketing campaigns aimed at directing visitors to destination areas. For residents to feel like they are part of their own community, and not just outsiders watching developers and the government control their destiny, it is important for tourism leaders to conduct studies like this one and employ other methods of community planning.
The research shows that Garfield County residents have a low level of support for the 2002 Winter Olympics. Residents who are financially dependent upon tourism tend to support the Olympics and perceive the impacts to be mostly positive. Recreation enthusiasts also support the Games, but those who hold an ecocentric attitude oppose the 2002 Olympics. Most residents do not believe that the event will have any impact upon themselves or the community. Residents do however, favor community activities that would coincide with the Olympics, and 60% of residents support the promotion of Garfield County during the Olympics as a tourism destination. Tourism leaders need to obtain accurate, reliable information about possible visitation numbers and economic impacts that may arise out of the Olympic movement. Once the public has been educated about realistic projections then a study similar to this one should be conducted again. Knowledge is power. More effort needs to be put into community tourism education, discussion forums, and more. Overall, there appears to be a feeling of ambivalence about the Olympics, in fact, it is conceivable that even some of the local governmental officials and tourism leaders do not anticipate an influx of visitors as a result of the Olympics. This study is only a step in the right direction.
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Garfield County
Tourism In Garfield County
A Survey of Community Residents

Your Opinions Do Count!

William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Your Community

1. How long have you lived in Garfield County?

_________ Years and ________ Months

2. If you had to move away from Garfield County how sorry or pleased would you be to leave? Circle one.

Very pleased Pleased No difference Sorry Very sorry

3. Indicate how much you agree with the following statement: "I would rather live in Garfield County than anywhere else." Circle one.

Strongly disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree

4. Are you interested in knowing what goes on in Garfield County? Circle one.

None A little Some A Lot Very Much

5. How would you rate the quality of life in Garfield County? Circle one.

Very Poor Poor Fair Good Excellent No Opinion

Tourism Development

6. Which of the following best describes your feelings about tourism development in Garfield County? Check only one.

______ Tourism development is not needed in Garfield County.

______ Tourism development is needed, but should not be the main industry in the county.

______ Tourism development should take priority over other concerns.
7. If the number of tourists coming to Garfield County as a result of the **2002 Winter Olympics** increases, do you believe the following will improve or worsen for you? Circle the number that best describes your feelings about each.

**Will these improve or worsen for you as a result of 2002 Winter Olympics?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Worsen</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from Tourists for local governments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The price of goods &amp; services</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of land &amp; housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The crime rate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local services such as police, fire protection, utilities, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of the natural environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preservation of the local culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relationship between residents &amp; tourists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of life in Garfield County</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please indicate how much you oppose or support the following types of tourism development in Garfield County & Utah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly oppose</th>
<th>Neither support nor oppose</th>
<th>Strongly support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 2002 Winter Olympic Games in Salt Lake City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar major events in Salt Lake City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of Garfield County as a tourist destination during the 2002 Winter Olympics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community activities that would coincide with the 2002 Winter Olympics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Garfield County Recreation**

9. How many times **approximately** have you participated in outdoor recreation activities in Garfield County in the last 12 months? ________________

10. How much do you know about recreational opportunities in Garfield County? **Circle one.**

   Nothing  A little  Some  A lot  A great deal
11. Listed below are statements about the relationship between humans and the environment. 
*For each one, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with it.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human ingenuity will insure that we DO NOT make the earth uninhabitable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans have the right to modify the natural environment to suit their needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The so-called &quot;ecological crisis&quot; facing human-kind has been greatly exaggerated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans will eventually learn enough about how nature works to be able to control it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The earth has plenty of natural resources if we just learn how to develop them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The balance of nature is strong enough to cope with the impacts of modern industrial nations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans were meant to rule over the rest of nature.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite our special abilities, humans are still subject to the laws of nature.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The earth is like a spaceship with very limited room and resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When humans interfere with nature it often produces disastrous consequences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The balance of nature is very delicate and easily upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants &amp; animals have as much right as humans to exist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans are severely abusing the environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are approaching the limit of the number of people the earth can support.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If things continue on their present course, we will soon experience a major ecological catastrophe.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Please indicate the extent to which each statement below describes your general feelings about Garfield County outdoor recreational areas. *Circle the number that best describes how you feel about each statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is my favorite place to go during my free time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of my lifestyle, this place is important to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other place can compare to this area in terms of what I like to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coming here is one of the most satisfying things I do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn't substitute any other area for doing the type of thing I do here</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use this place to help define and express who I am inside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Little Information About You  *(Note: this information is for segmentation purposes only)*

13. Year of birth *(please fill in the blank)*: 19___

14. Gender: ______ Male ______ Female

15. How much of the income of the company you work for (or business you own) approximately comes from the tourist trade? *Circle one.*

- 0%        10%        20%        30%        40%        50%        60%        70%        80%        90%        100%

16. What is your approximate yearly household income before taxes? *Check one.*

- ____ $10,000 or less
- ____ $10,001-$20,000
- ____ $20,001-$45,000
- ____ $45,001 or more

17. What part of your current household income approximately comes from the money spent by the visitors to Garfield County? *Circle one.*

- 0%        10%        20%        30%        40%        50%        60%        70%        80%        90%        100%

18. How likely is it that your current household income will increase if the number of visitors to Garfield County increases? *Circle one.*

- Not at all likely
- Extremely likely

Thank you for your time and careful consideration. The information gathered from these surveys will help in the further development and planning of tourism in Garfield County.
September 15, 1999

Dear Resident:

This survey is part of an important tourism research study and is being sent out to a select group of Garfield County residents. Your answers are important and vital to the success of this study. Your participation is entirely voluntary and your responses will be kept completely confidential. The survey is being conducted by myself in conjunction with the Harrah College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The aggregate results of the study will be made public, but individual respondents’ identities will not be revealed.

The purpose of this study is to find out Garfield County residents’ perceptions of tourism and the upcoming 2002 Winter Olympic games in Salt Lake City. Knowing how residents feel about tourism and what drives those attitudes is important for community planning and tourism development. Government agencies and other groups should consider your opinions about tourism when deciding to implement tourism policies and to encourage development.

This questionnaire is easy to complete and takes approximately 10 minutes of your time. Most of the questions can be answered by simply checking a box or circling a number. Your time, thoughts and opinions are greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, feel free to contact professor Seyhmust Baloglu at (702) 895-3720. It is very important for either a member of the household over 18 or one of the persons listed on the mailing label to complete the questionnaire. When you have completed the survey, please return it in the enclosed, postage-paid envelope. It is critical that the survey is returned by Oct. 4, 1999.

As a token of our appreciation, please enjoy some coupons from some local, Garfield County merchants. Once again, thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Cary M. Deccio
Graduate Student

Seyhmust Baloglu
Professor, Harrah College of Hotel Management

William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration
Department of Tourism & Convention Administration
4505 Maryland Parkway Box 456023 Las Vegas, NV 89154-6023
(702) 895-3930 FAX (702) 895-4870
http://www.nscce.edu/unlv/Tourism

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Red Canyon
Dry cleaning, Laundry, & Courier Service

This Coupon is good for 20% off Dry Cleaning
One (1) Item (expires 12/31/1999)
551 East Center, Panguitch, UT (next to the C-stop)
(435) 676-8969

Grandma Tina's
523 North Main St.

1 FREE MEAL WITH PURCHASE OF REGULAR PRICED MEAL

Panguitch Drug
95 E CENTER • PANGUITCH, UT 84759 • 435-676-2212
Local Residents To Take Part In UNLV Survey

Cary Deccio, Bryce, a student at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas is conducting a significant university-sponsored survey over the next few weeks to assess some important opinions from Garfield County residents.

Within the next few weeks, a questionnaire will be mailed to some Garfield County residents directly from UNLV. The study will assess resident attitudes regarding tourism and the upcoming 2002 Winter Olympic Games. It is also expected to reveal some important information about the opinions of Garfield County residents on tourism impacts in the county.

Assistance in the project is important and residents are asked to complete the questionnaire and return it to UNLV. The survey is short and will take only a few minutes to complete, Deccio said.

Deccio is a son-in-law of Blaine and Shauna Anderson of Bryce.
Timeline of Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 31, 1999</td>
<td>Pretest questionnaires mailed to 100 randomly selected Garfield County residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 1999</td>
<td>Cutoff date for receipt of pre-test. 37% response rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>Main survey mailing sent to 500 residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>Cut-off date for receipt of main survey- 34% response rate (170 received).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>Follow up survey sent to 300 residents who had not responded yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>Cut-off date for receipt of follow up questionnaires- 29 additional surveys received for response rate of 38%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>Non-response survey of 25 residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Model 1: Regression model for ultimate endogeneous dependent variable: Support for the 2002 Winter Olympics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>63.358</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.560</td>
<td>17.107</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>106.787</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170.145</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Use</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>2.030</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>1.630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-4.99E-02</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.636</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. Gain</td>
<td>5.81E-03</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>3.422</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecocentric</td>
<td>-.239</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-3.055</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>5.942</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Model 2: Regression model for endogeneous variable -

Perceptions of Indirect Olympic Opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Adjusted R</td>
<td>Std. Error of Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.6519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>7.237</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.809</td>
<td>4.258</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>74.362</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.599</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.781</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.8382</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Use</td>
<td>9.06E-02</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>-3.45E-02</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.541</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. Gain</td>
<td>4.62E-03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecocentric</td>
<td>8.44E-02</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Model 3: **Regression model for endogeneous variable -**

**Perceptions of Indirect Olympic Concerns.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5.226</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>2.999</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>76.678</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81.904</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>6.344</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. Use</td>
<td>-1.82E-02</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>2.061</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ. Gain</td>
<td>3.27E-03</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>2.377</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecocentric</td>
<td>-5.42E-02</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-0.837</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These calculations were done on SPSS.*
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