Comparing Residents' and Tourists' Emotional Solidarity with One Another: An Extension of Durkheim's Model

Kyle M. Woosnam[1]

Abstract

This study is the first of its kind to examine residents' and tourists' degree of emotional solidarity experienced with one another in a destination—Galveston County, Texas. Two main purposes for this study are (1) to confirm the factor structure of the emotional solidarity scale for both residents and tourists while assessing psychometric properties of reliability and validity and (2) to compare residents' and tourists' emotional solidarity (based on resulting factors from confirmatory factor analysis) with one another. Ultimately, the scale produced the same factors (i.e., welcoming nature, emotional closeness, and sympathetic understanding) as in previous studies while exhibiting sound psychometric properties. Significant differences in mean factor scores were found for the factors welcoming nature and emotional closeness across residents and tourists. Implications, limitations, and future research directions are provided.

Keywords

resident and tourist interaction, self and other, confirmatory factor analysis, Galveston Island

Introduction

Hall and Lew (2009) claim that the relationships between residents and tourists tend to be characterized by four limiting features, the first of which is a transitory aspect. Visiting a location for a couple of days or weeks (as most tourists do) makes it difficult for tourists to establish a sense of commitment and ownership of the destination and its culture as residents can (Mason 2008). Such a limited time spent in the destination can contribute to a greater sense of superficiality as interactions are reduced to polities exchanged among residents and tourists. The relationship is also unequal and unbalanced toward the tourists as residents are typically less affluent, providing services to tourists, and impacted (e.g., socially, culturally, environmentally, and economically) by the behavior of those visiting (Hall and Lew 2009; Nash 2001). "The larger the cultural and economic differences between tourists and local residents, the more obvious and more significant these impacts can be" (Hall and Lew 2009, p. 165).

Lack of spontaneity also characterizes the relationship. In this vein, residents (primarily those as service providers) act on a front stage (MacCannell 1999), responding accordingly to tourists' questions just as tourists assume the roles of shopper or diner visiting established businesses purposely created for them. Finally, resident–tourist relationships are bound by time and space constraints. Given the limited time in a destination, tourists can only engage in so many activities on-site. As a result, Hall and Lew (2009) state that tourists' "ability to know the full range of geographic, social and cultural diversity in a destination is limited" (p. 166). In addition to these features, the relationship between residents and tourists has often been characterized by the exchange of resources between individuals. The most common of these exchanges are goods and services that residents provide in return for money received from tourists while shopping and dining (Timothy 2005). Such relationships can be reduced to financial transactions where residents are encouraged to stage authentic experiences (MacCannell 1999) and commodify cultural and natural resources (Williams 2004) for the benefit of tourists. Unfortunately as Urry (2002) claims, "almost all aspects of social life become commodified" (p. 14).

Embracing these features makes it nearly impossible for either resident or tourist to experience a sense of solidarity with one another. This is counter to what Woosnam and colleagues have alluded to recently indicating emotional solidarity between residents and tourists, which develops from shared beliefs, shared behavior, and interaction as put forth in Durkheim's ([1915] 1995) theoretical framework. Woosnam and Norman (2009) recently developed a scale of emotional

[1]Texas A&M University, College Station

Corresponding Author:
Kyle M. Woosnam, Department of Recreation, Park & Tourism Sciences, Texas A&M University, 2261 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843-2261
Email: woosnam@tamu.edu

solidarity; however, the work only assessed emotional solidarity that residents communicated experiencing with tourists. Therefore, the aim of the current study is to use the scale of emotional solidarity as developed by Woosnam and Norman to compare residents' and tourists' emotional solidarity with one another in the same destination.

Literature Review

Self and Other in Tourism

Notions of the traveler as Self and the local resident as Other have existed as long as people have traveled (Smith 1989). As Reisinger and Turner (2003) purport, tourism in its most basic form puts people in contact with one another who are strangers, likely belonging to different cultures or subcultures, on both an international and domestic scale. As long as difference defines the relationship between resident and tourist, the dichotomy of Self versus Other will play out in everyday interactions.

It was the works of Smith (1989), van den Berghe (1994), and Urry (2002) that helped introduce the idea of the Other in the context of host and guest within the tourism literature. In search of the Other, ethnic tourists, as van den Berghe (1994) refers to them, are in constant search for difference, actively seeking the untouched, pristine, authentic (as tourists perceive it to be) exotic, to collect in a sense, the Other (see Laxson 1991; Smith 1989). Of course, as the tourist pursues authentic encounters, he or she consciously or subconsciously desires a high degree of "otherness" of the Other so that experiences are that much more satisfying and memorable (Galani-Moutafi 2000). van den Berghe (1994) claims,

> The native is not merely a host, a provider of creative comforts, a servant, but becomes, quite literally, the spectacle. The native becomes what I have called the "touree." As an object of curiosity, the touree is on show, whether he wants to be or not; he must make a spectacle of himself. (p. 9).

We are fascinated with the work lives of those dissimilar to us, to see how Others negotiate daily routines different from our own. We are dissatisfied with our own lives and look to Others', which somehow possess a reality that is hard to discover in our own experiences (Urry 2002). This is evidenced in the growing desire of individuals tuning in to the latest "reality" television shows—to leave our own life (even momentarily) in a sense. Of course in the context of tourism, these "real lives" can only be found backstage (MacCannell 1999), and "the gaze of the tourist will involve an obvious intrusion into peoples' lives, which would be generally unacceptable" (Urry 2002, p. 9). As Maoz (2006) purports, observing the private lives of the Other without invitation can produce great social stress.

In the contemporary tourism literature, it is far more common for research to focus on the tourist gaze rather than the resident gaze (Evans-Pritchard 1989; McNaughton 2006) or mutual gaze (Maoz 2006). This is not to say that a gaze by anyone other than tourists is trivial or less important. However, the fact that most studies pertain to the tourist gaze may be a function of the emphasis placed on the traveler in resident–tourist relationships as Hall and Lew (2009) alluded.

Recently, research surrounding the Other has become increasingly popular, most notably through a postmodern, postcolonial theoretical lens (see Caton and Santos 2008, 2009; Favero 2007; Galani-Moutafi 2000; Lazaridis and Wickens 1999; Santos and Yan 2008; Wearing and Wearing 2006). Such work has focused on tourism from the perspective of western domination of non-westerners whereby power inequalities exist and hegemonic depictions of the Other are widespread (Buzinde and Santos 2009; Caton and Santos 2009). Studies focused on representations of the Other are some of the most common forms of research currently conducted. Representations of the Other through photographs or promotional material about destinations has served to perpetuate stereotypes of natives that ultimately privilege dominant groups at the cost of Others (Caton and Santos 2008, 2009).

Work surrounding the discourse of Self and Other is not without its criticisms. One criticism is that Self and Other perspectives are almost exclusively rooted in power struggles. Residents can easily be considered the have-nots, subordinate to the dominant haves, who by design are viewed by residents as intrusive and agents of conflict and change (Mason 2008). This portrayal of residents as savages and tourists as dominating the non-Western world is somewhat presumptive of the role and identity of each. Actually, such portrayal only serves to perpetuate the stereotypes of the Other (Caton and Santos 2008, 2009). As Fisher (2004) asserts, it can be patronizing to assume that cultures of host societies are weak and not intelligent, that they need protecting from contact with tourists.

In much of the work, Self and Other are considered static (e.g., tourist as invader and resident as part of an unchanging culture) as Aramberri (2001) and Wearing, Stevenson, and Young (2010) mention. However such a narrow perspective does not capture the dynamic, complex, interactive nature of the relationship between residents and tourists. Instead, the tourist should be considered an engaged traveler interacting with residents of a dynamic and evolving culture (Wearing, Stevenson, and Young 2010). As Wearing, Stevenson, and Young (2010) point out, "Social change, brought about through contact with the West, occurs not only through tourism, but also through communications and information technology such as television, movies, advertising, and the internet" (p. 57). Interaction among residents and tourists can ultimately act as a springboard to cross-cultural interaction and coexistence (Franklin 2003).

Another criticism of the Self and Other work is the idea that little binds individuals but their physical proximity in a

destination and the exchange of polities and resources. This perspective has been championed as of late by much research focusing on the social exchange theory. In a tongue-in-cheek manner, Aramberri (2001) says that "the hosts, no matter their individual generosity, are as eager as the clerks at the Plaza to get their dough" (p. 746). A similar perspective is offered by van den Berghe (1994) when he claims:

> Tourist-host interactions are segmented and instrumental: they are entered into for specific, limited and immediate purposes and they are not expected to have far reaching or long-lasting consequences. When they blossom into friendship, this is considered exceptional and atypical. (p. 19)

Such a perspective is limited, as the likelihood that a deeper (less superficial) relationship exists between residents and tourists. This is especially true if individuals share beliefs and behaviors and interact with one another—ultimately this can serve to reduce commonly held stereotypes of one another (Reisinger and Turner 2003) and even contribute to residents experiencing a degree of emotional solidarity with tourists (Woosnam and Norman 2009).

Emotional Solidarity between Residents and Tourists

One way of transcending the view of residents and tourists reduced to polar opposites with divergent socioeconomic statuses, possessing little in common, whose relationship is predicated on power inequalities and gazing at the Other, is to embrace the potential for emotional solidarity to exist between each. Hammarstrom (2005) conceived of emotional solidarity as the affective bonds individuals experience with one another, characterized by degrees of emotional closeness and contact (i.e., association contributing to help and support). Emotional solidarity serves to bond individuals together in such a way that a we-together sentiment replaces that of the commonly held me-versus-you or us-versus-them mindset (Jacobs and Allen 2005; Wearing and Wearing 2001). In a basic sense, emotional solidarity can be thought of as a feeling of identification a person has with someone else (Wallace and Wolf 2006).

The theory of emotional solidarity is credited to the early workings of Durkheim ([1915] 1995), whereby the classical sociologist posited that the construct emerges from individuals possessing similar beliefs and engaging in collective behavior, which are ultimately brought on through interaction. Despite growing interest in the construct within disciplines and fields such as sociology, social psychology, religious studies, and gerontology, his theory remains largely untested (Fish 2002). It is asserted that Durkheim's framework can be applied in the context of tourism stating that as residents and tourists share beliefs and behavior and interact with one another, some degree of emotional solidarity will be forged between such individuals.

Minimal research peripherally speaking to closeness and more intimate relationships between residents and tourists has been conducted. Rothman (1978) found that the potential for close relationships to occur between residents and tourists increases dramatically as the frequency of social interactions between individuals increases. The higher the intensity of the social relationship between residents and tourists, Pizam, Uriely, and Reichel (2000) found, the more favorable were the feelings tourists had for residents, and the more positive was the change in their attitudes toward locals. Such finding supports Reisinger's (1994) work indicating that contact and interaction between residents and tourists brings individuals closer together, fostering a greater understanding about one another. Prentice, Witt, and Wydenbach (1994) found that tourists in a region were endeared to residents (and the destination) from engaging in polite discourse and everyday activities alongside locals. Much can be said for residents and tourists participating in shared activities together. Referring to visitor participation in a traditional Native American ceremony, Laxson (1991) claimed, "Some of these visitors meet Indian families and develop life-long friendships with them."

The work surrounding emotional solidarity conducted outside of travel and tourism has no shortage of quantitative measures used to assess the construct. Within sociology, single-item measures such as degree of solidarity describing family structure (Geiger 1955), praise or criticism for others (Rosengren 1959), degree of friendship (Suchman 1964), and loyalty to one another (Street 1965) were all initially used to measure emotional solidarity. Citing lack of consistency in measures, Gronvold (1988) constructed the Affectual Solidarity Scale (ASS)—a unidimensional scale of the construct with five items focused on understanding, trust, fairness, respect, and affection that one person feels for another. Few (Feng et al. 1999; Goodman and Silverman 2002; Silverstein and Bengston 1991) have used this scale. Instead, researchers (Bahr et al. 2004; Harwood 2000; Lin and Harwood 2003) are continuing to use single-item measures such as degree of closeness, identification, and agreement to measure emotional solidarity. This is largely a function of Gronvold (1988) encouraging others to use single items, citing ASS was exploratory and individual items may provide comparable results to her scale. This is counter to Churchill's (1979) perspective when he claimed, "No single item is likely to provide a perfect representation of the concept" (p. 68).

In response to lack of consistency in using single items and championed unidimensionality in measuring the construct, Woosnam and Norman (2009) developed the 10-item multidimensional emotional solidarity scale. This work was the first of its kind measuring emotional solidarity among residents and tourists. Three dimensions or factors of emotional solidarity were found by the authors: welcoming nature (e.g., feeling proud to have visitors in destination, feeling community benefits from having visitors, appreciating visitors for contribution to the local economy, and treating area visitors fairly),

emotional closeness (e.g., feeling close to visitors and having made friends with some visitors), and sympathetic understanding (e.g., identifying with visitors, having a lot in common with visitors, feeling affection with visitors, and understanding visitors). Each factor was found to be high in internal consistency and construct validity (i.e., convergent and discriminant validity). While this work is crucial in offering measures of emotional solidarity for the field, Woosnam and Norman did not assess tourists' emotional solidarity experienced with residents, only that of the residents' emotional solidarity with tourists. This could be considered a limitation.

Most research focused on the resident–tourist relationship is examined in an international context. The current study will examine the emotional solidarity between residents and tourists in the context of domestic tourism that, as Wearing, Stevenson, and Young (2010) claim, "Is a rarely considered but extremely important aspect of contemporary tourism" (p. 64). The purpose of this research is twofold: (1) to confirm the factor structure of the emotional solidarity scale for both residents and tourists while assessing psychometric properties of reliability and validity and (2) to compare residents' and tourists' emotional solidarity (based on resulting factors from confirmatory factor analysis) experienced with one another. Three nondirectional null hypotheses are formulated to examine the second purpose given that such work in comparing emotional solidarity between multiple samples is exploratory:

> *Null Hypothesis 1*: Mean scores on the welcoming nature factor (of the emotional solidarity scale) will not be significantly different between residents and tourists.
> *Null Hypothesis 2*: Mean scores on the emotional closeness factor (of the emotional solidarity scale) will not be significantly different between residents and tourists.
> *Null Hypothesis 3*: Mean scores on the sympathetic understanding factor (of the emotional solidarity scale) will not be significantly different between residents and tourists.

Research Method

Study Site

According to Dean Runyan Associates, Galveston County (located 30 minutes southeast of Houston, Texas) ranked 10th in the state (US$764 million) for visitor spending in 2008, making it the most visited coastal county in Texas (Texas Tourism 2010) hosting approximately 5.4 million visitors (Angelou Economics 2009). As far as residents are concerned, in 2008, Galveston County ranked 10th in the state for number of jobs directly created from tourism (9,370), which was the top among all coastal counties in Texas (Texas Tourism 2010). This large number of jobs created indicates the importance of tourism to the area. In fact, 36.2% of residents of Galveston County were born outside of the state and

relocated (U.S. Census Bureau 2010), likely as a result of being a tourist there previously.

Galveston County was selected as the study site specifically because it was believed to be the best setting to study emotional solidarity in the state of Texas. Few places offer as many attractions for visitors and jobs for local residents where opportunities for interaction are greatly increased for each party throughout the entire year. Such interaction, as Durkheim ([1915] 1995) claimed, is necessary for emotional solidarity to exist. In addition, no one is certain how residents and tourists feel about one another within the county. Now more than ever it is important to assess the relationship as Galveston County rebuilds from Hurricane Ike (which made landfall in October 2008), realizes the history and importance of having visitors in the area, and encourages individuals to return. Having a sense of how residents and tourists of Galveston County feel about one another can aid in appropriate planning for tourism in the area.

Sampling and Data Collection

The current study included collecting data from two samples—permanent resident heads of households (or their spouses) and tourists to Galveston County, Texas—both of which were at least 18 years of age. During five weekends in October and November 2009, an onsite self-administered survey instrument was distributed door-to-door throughout the county to residents using a multistage cluster sampling scheme (Babbie 2010). Initially, Galveston County was reduced to census tracts formulated by the U.S. Census Bureau to comprise homogenous clusters of residents based on similar sociodemographic variables. Census tracts were then selected using a random numbers table. For each of the selected census tracts, block groups (a further geographic refinement) were selected using another random numbers table. Beginning in randomly selected locations within the block groups, every second household was contacted to participate. To allow for a greater response rate, two return contacts were made to each household later the same day to collect completed questionnaires (McGehee and Andereck 2004).

Overall, 1,364 households were visited. At approximately 49.5% of those homes (*n* = 675), there was no answer. An additional 66 homes had a head of household who was not a permanent resident. To alleviate nonresponse bias for no-answer and nonpermanent-resident households, researchers went to the next immediate household to distribute the survey instrument. At the remaining 623 homes, the head of household (or spouse) was contacted and asked to participate, of whom 94 declined (an 84.9% acceptance rate). Of the 529 surveys that were distributed, 446 were completed by residents (an 84.3% completion rate). The overall response rate (i.e., 446 completed surveys from the 623 individuals that were contacted) was 71.6%.

The second sample consisted of summer tourists to the county during July and August 2009. Data were collected from tourists at five of the most visited locations throughout the

county: Stewart Beach (Galveston), the Strand (Galveston), Moody Gardens (Galveston), the Seawall (Galveston), and Kemah Boardwalk (Kemah). On five weekends throughout the summer, researchers approached potential participants, informed individuals of the study, asked if they were visitors to the county, and asked if they were willing to complete an on-site self-administered survey instrument. A systematic sampling procedure with a random starting point (Babbie 2010) was used to collect data, whereby members of the research team approached every fifth tourist they located on the beach, public street, sidewalk, or parking lot.

Overall, 660 individuals were contacted and asked to participate, with 61 people claiming to be residents. Of the 599 visitors approached, 142 declined to accept a survey instrument, indicating that 457 accepted (76.3% acceptance rate). From those 457, a total of 447 completed the instrument (97.8% completion rate), yielding an overall response rate of 74.6%.

Instruments and Data Analysis

Residents and tourists were asked about their level of agreement (on a 7-point Likert-type scale where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*) with the 10-item emotional solidarity scale developed by Woosnam and Norman (2009). The wording of each item was modified so as to reflect the appropriate sample. In addition, residents and tourists were asked about their level of interaction, shared beliefs, and shared behavior with one another. Residents were asked about length of residency, place of birth, travel history, and attitudes about tourism development, while tourists were asked about travel behavior, history, and origin. Sociodemographic variables (e.g., gender, age, education, race/ethnicity, and income) were asked of each.

To address the first purpose of the article, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was conducted using EQS 6.1 statistical software package. The second purpose of the article with corresponding hypotheses was addressed through conducting MANOVAs in SPSS 17.0. However, before beginning any analysis, each data set was screened for outliers (e.g., examining *z* scores and Mahalanobis's distance) per Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) suggestions. In addition, missing data were imputed through expectation-maximization (EM) procedures by predicting scores in a series of regressions where each missing variable is regressed on remaining variables for a particular case (Kline 2005).

Results

Each sample was composed of slightly more females than males. On average, residents ($M = 48.1$) were moderately older than tourists ($M = 39.5$). Each sample was well educated (i.e., 75.7% of residents and 79.1% of tourists had at least some college), Caucasian, and had an annual household income of at least $60,000. Most residents (74.6%) have lived in Galveston County for at least 10 years, while a preponderance of tourists

(74.9%) had visited the county on a previous trip. A descriptive summary of participants in each sample can be found in Table 1.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Emotional Solidarity Construct among Residents

To confirm the structure of the emotional solidarity scale developed by Woosnam and Norman (2009), CFA was conducted for the resident and tourist samples. With knowledge that three factors comprise the emotional solidarity scale, one factor at a time with its corresponding items was added to the model as LaGrange Multiplier (LM) tests were requested (Kline 2005). In so doing, factors were allowed to covary with one another (Byrne 2006). This procedure is similar to conducting a forward stepwise regression analysis as each factor is added sequentially to eventually formulate an "ideal model" (i.e., absolute and incremental fit indices are perfect). Ultimately, once the ideal model is formulated, all error parameters (i.e., error covariances and cross-loading items) are specified in the model. In a sense, the ideal model is not fully interpretable; however, it provides us with each error parameter that must be addressed in turn (Kaplan 2009). Seven parameters (i.e., three error covariances and four cross-loading items) were identified as problematic.

To address each error parameter, Wald tests (synonymous with backward stepwise regression) were used to trim the model and remove each error term in such a way that the integrity of the model was not compromised and $\Delta\chi^2$/degree of freedom was less than the 3.84 critical value as indicated by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). To this end, each of the seven error parameters was safely removed, yielding a final measurement model composed of the 10 items across the three factors specified in Woosnam and Norman (2009): Satorra-Bentler scaled $\chi^2(32, N = 446) = 43.49$, $p < .001$, comparative fit index (CFI) = .99, normed fit index (NFI) = .96, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .03. Incremental model fit indices (e.g., CFI, NFI, GFI) with values greater than .90 indicate reasonably good fit of the model to the data (Hu and Bentler 1999). Kaplan (2009) claims a more conservative rule of thumb to be .95 for a good fit to exist. For absolute model fit indices (e.g., RMSEA), values less than or equal to .05 indicate a close approximate fit (Browne and Cudeck 1993; Browne and Mels 1990).

Table 2 shows the resulting factor structure of the emotional solidarity scale for residents. A nearly identical structure (i.e., same items loading onto same factors) to that of Woosnam and Norman (2009) was found. Standardized factor loadings for items ranged from .65 to .98. Factor loadings greater than .70 are ideal (Fornell and Larcker 1981); however, those greater than .50 are acceptable (Comrey and Lee 1992).

Reliability and validity. Statistics from the final measurement model assisted in examining psychometric properties of reliability and validity. For each factor, maximal weighted reliabilities were at least .86 and composite reliabilities were at least .85 (Table 2). The former statistic was requested given

Table 1. Descriptive Summary of Participants

Sociodemographic Variable	Residents (%)	Tourists (%)
Gender ($n_{residents}$ = 445, $n_{tourists}$ = 445)		
Female	51.9	53.7
Male	48.1	46.3
Age ($n_{residents}$ = 440[a], $n_{tourists}$ = 444[b])		
18-29	14.1	22.5
30-39	19.5	29.5
40-49	18.9	26.1
50-59	23.9	14.6
≥60	23.6	7.3
Education ($n_{residents}$ = 445, $n_{tourists}$ = 445)		
Grade school or some high school	2.9	2.0
High school diploma or GED	12.8	12.1
Technical, vocational or trade school	8.5	5.6
Some college	32.6	27.1
Four-year college	29.0	36.6
Graduate degree	14.1	16.4
Race/ethnicity ($n_{residents}$ = 443, $n_{tourists}$ = 446)		
American Indian/Alaska native alone	1.4	0.2
Asian alone	2.7	0.9
Black or African American alone	13.4	11.2
Latino or Hispanic	15.4	11.2
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander alone	0.7	0.2
White alone	62.4	71.3
Some other race alone	0.9	0.6
Two or more races	3.2	4.3
Annual household income ($n_{residents}$ = 435, $n_{tourists}$ = 430)		
<$20,000	8.0	5.6
$20,000-59,999	37.9	26.5
$60,000-99,999	30.6	36.0
≥$100,000	23.4	31.9
Length of residency ($n_{residents}$ = 445)[c]		
<10 years	25.4	
10-30 years	38.0	
>30 years	36.6	
First trip to Galveston County ($n_{tourists}$ = 447)		
No		74.9
Yes		25.1

a. M = 48.1 years of age, SD = 15.9.
b. M = 39.5 years of age, SD = 12.8.
c. M = 24.9 years, SD = 20.7.

that Cronbach alpha scores assume equal loadings onto factors; however, this is never the case in CFA (Byrne 2006). Instead, alphas are weighted by factor loadings, which provide a more robust estimate of internal consistency (Kline 2005). Each composite reliability score exceeded the critical value of .60 suggested by Bagozzi and Yi (1988). Ultimately each factor displayed strong internal consistency as corresponding items were highly correlated with one another.

To examine construct validity, both convergent and discriminant validity were assessed per Churchill (1979), following the work of Li and Petrick (2008). All t values associated with each loading on corresponding factors were significant ($p < .001$) as they exceeded the critical value of 3.29 (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007), indicating convergent validity for each factor was established. Discriminant validity was determined by comparing factor intercorrelations with the square root of the average variance (i.e., variance extracted estimate) for each factor (Li and Petrick 2008; Sirakaya-Turk, Ekinci, and Kaya 2008). With the variance extracted estimate for each factor being greater than .50 (i.e., at least 50% of the variance is captured by the factor and the remaining because of measurement error) and greater than any intercorrelations of the factors suggest that each factor possesses discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker 1981) (see Table 3).

CFA of Emotional Solidarity Construct among Tourists

An identical CFA procedure was conducted to examine emotional solidarity items for tourists as was done with the resident sample. Ultimately 14 error parameters (i.e., 9 covariances and 5 cross-loading items) were identified after adding each factor and requesting LM tests. Each of the 14 error parameters were removed successfully by trimming the model and using Wald tests without violating the rule of thumb of 3.84 critical value for $\Delta\chi^2$/degree of freedom per Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). The resulting factor structure for tourists was identical to that of the residents, with each of the 10 items loading onto the appropriate three factors: Satorra-Bentler scaled $\chi^2(32, N = 447) = 87.08, p < .001$, CFI = .97, NFI = .96, RMSEA = .06. While the RMSEA fit index for tourists is slightly higher than for residents, Browne and Cudeck (1993) claim that values between .05 and .08 are indicative of fair fit.

The resulting factor structure of the emotional solidarity scale for visitors is presented in Table 4. As indicated, the structure is identical to that found for residents, which ultimately mirrors the factor structure Woosnam and Norman (2009) found. Standardized factor loadings were slightly higher for tourists ranging from .76 to .96.

Reliability and validity. As with the resident sample, the same measures of reliability and validity were examined. Maximal weighted and composite reliabilities were high, ranging from .87 to .99 for the former and .88 to .92 for the latter (Table 4). According to Lance, Butts, and Michels (2006), factor reliabilities greater than .80 are good, and those above .90 are excellent. Like the resident sample, the tourist sample indicated strong internal consistency for each factor with corresponding items.

Each factor within the emotional solidarity scale indicated construct validity through convergent and discriminant validities. For convergent validity, each of the t values corresponding to each loading on appropriate factor were significant ($p < .001$)

Table 2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Emotional Solidarity Items (residents)

Factor and Corresponding Item	Standardized Factor Loading (t value[a])	Reliabilities	
		Maximal Weighted	Composite
Welcoming nature		.86	.85
I am proud to have visitors come to Galveston Co.	.837 (14.36)		
I feel the community benefits from having visitors in Galveston Co.	.766 (10.65)		
I appreciate visitors for the contribution they make to the local economy	.757 (9.64)		
I treat visitors fair in Galveston Co.	.721 (8.31)		
Emotional closeness		.99	.93
I feel close to some visitors I have met in Galveston Co.	.982 (27.99)		
I have made friends with some visitors in Galveston Co.	.886 (26.35)		
Sympathetic understanding		.87	.85
I identify with visitors in Galveston Co.	.849 (17.14)		
I have a lot in common with Galveston Co. visitors	.816 (18.54)		
I feel affection towards visitors in Galveston Co.	.732 (14.94)		
I understand visitors in Galveston Co.	.652 (11.30)		

a. all *t* tests were significant at $p < .001$.

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Analysis from Emotional Solidarity Confirmatory Factor Analysis (residents)

Factors	1	2	3
1. Welcoming nature	.60[a]		
2. Emotional closeness	.29[b]	.88	
3. Sympathetic understanding	.54	.44	.59

a. The bold diagonal elements are the square root of the variance shared between the factors and their measures (average variance extracted).
b. Off-diagonal elements are the correlations between factors. For discriminant validity, the diagonal elements should be larger than any other corresponding row or column entry.

and surpassed the critical value of 3.29 (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). From Table 5, one can see that discriminant validity was established as the average variances extracted (diagonal elements) were larger than any correlation between factors (off-diagonal elements) in corresponding rows or columns (Churchill 1979).

Emotional Solidarity Factors across Residents and Tourists

Composite means were calculated for each factor based on CFA results, across each sample. To examine whether factor means were significantly different for residents and tourists, a MANOVA with Wilks's Λ was conducted. Such a test was deemed appropriate given factors were correlated (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007) as should be expected provided resulting psychometric properties from CFA with good fit indices. Significant differences were found among residents and tourists on the three emotional solidarity factors, Wilks's Λ = .84,

$F(3, 889) = 58.16$, $p < .001$. The multivariate η^2 based on Wilks's Λ was modest, .16, indicating that 16% of the multivariate variance of the three factors is associated with being a resident or tourist. Analyses of variances (ANOVAs) on each factor (as the dependent variable) were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA. Using the Bonferroni method (to control for Type I errors), each ANOVA was tested at the .017 level (i.e., .05 divided by the number of dependent variables) (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007). The ANOVA on the welcoming nature factor was significant, $F(1, 891) = 107.65$, $p < .001$, thus rejecting the first null hypothesis. In addition, the second null hypothesis was also rejected as the ANOVA on the emotional closeness factor was also significant, $F(1, 891) = 11.80$, $p = .001$. However, the ANOVA on sympathetic understanding was not significant, $F(1, 891) = 0.33$, $p = .56$, indicating that the final hypothesis could not be rejected. Table 6 conveys means, standard deviations, and ANOVA results for each factor among residents and tourists.

Discussion and Conclusions

This study marks the first time that emotional solidarity of residents and tourists with one another has been measured and compared. Previous work has only examined degrees of solidarity among residents (Woosnam and Norman 2009) or intimacy levels among residents or tourists, but not between either group (Trauer and Ryan 2005). Ultimately the current works provides greater credence to Durkheim's ([1915] 1995) model and its use within the context of resident–tourist exchanges and relationships.

In using scales that are relatively novel within any discipline, it can prove to be somewhat time-consuming and

Table 4. Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Emotional Solidarity Items (tourists)

Factor and Corresponding Item	Standardized Factor Loading (*t* value[a])	Reliabilities Maximal Weighted	Composite
Welcoming nature		.87	.88
I treat Galveston Co. residents fair	.847 (18.28)		
I feel Galveston Co. residents appreciate the benefits associated with me (a visitor) coming to the community	.832 (16.21)		
I feel Galveston Co. residents appreciate visitors for the contribution we (as visitors) make to the local economy	.781 (14.75)		
I am proud to be welcomed as a visitor to Galveston Co.	.760 (16.50)		
Emotional closeness		.99	.92
I feel close to some residents I have met in Galveston Co.	.955 (28.55)		
I have made friends with some Galveston Co. residents	.884 (22.12)		
Sympathetic understanding		.94	.92
I identify with Galveston Co. residents	.936 (26.84)		
I feel affection towards Galveston Co. residents	.847 (20.42)		
I understand Galveston Co. residents	.843 (22.56)		
I have a lot in common with Galveston Co. residents	.837 (21.08)		

a. All *t* tests were significant at $p < .001$.

Table 5. Discriminant Validity Analysis from Emotional Solidarity Confirmatory Factor Analysis (Tourists)

Factors	1	2	3
1. Welcoming nature	.65[a]		
2. Emotional closeness	.48[b]	.85	
3. Sympathetic understanding	.52	.61	.75

a. The bold diagonal elements are the square root of the variance shared between the factors and their measures (average variance extracted).
b. Off-diagonal elements are the correlations between factors. For discriminant validity, the diagonal elements should be larger than any other corresponding row or column entry.

cumbersome in showing such a measure is both reliable and valid (Netemeyer, Bearden, and Sharma 2003). However, such a task is crucial if the measure is not only used in a new context to examine a particular phenomenon but also among a new population sample (DeVellis 2003), especially if the goal is to further a particular line of research that is relatively new. A large focus of the current study was set up to do just that, focusing on the novelty of emotional solidarity and its existing use solely among resident populations. Results of the current study indicate that the emotional solidarity scale among residents possesses strong internal consistency as it did within previous studies (see Woosnam and Norman 2009). Furthermore, the scale demonstrated comparable internal consistency among tourists, which was the first time the measure had been assessed using a sample not composed of destination residents. To this regard in assessing psychometric properties of constructs, Churchill (1979) claims, such reliability is only one half of the equation—validity is the other; a more vital test of the measure. For each sample, the scale exhibited strong construct validity by demonstrating both convergent and

discriminant validities. In essence, this conveys that the emotional solidarity scale measured what it intended to measure (Babbie 2010).

Factor structure of the scale for each sample was nearly identical to that of Woosnam and Norman (2009). Each of the 10 items loaded onto the correct factors and the standardized factor loadings were actually higher than what Woosnam and Norman found. The only minor difference in factor structure between residents and tourists was that item loadings within factors were not identical. Given the samples were independent of one another and some variation exists in the way participants respond to scales, minor deviation in item loadings are expected across samples (Kline 2005).

In a general sense, residents and tourists indicated a positive degree of emotional solidarity with one another. Albeit, members of each party neither agreed nor disagreed with items comprising the emotional closeness factor ($M_{residents} = 3.79$, $M_{tourists} = 4.17$); however, residents and tourists agreed with items comprising the welcoming nature factor ($M_{residents} = 6.23$, $M_{tourists} = 5.59$) and slightly agreed with items comprising the sympathetic understanding factor ($M_{residents} = 4.78$, $M_{tourists} = 4.73$). Residents reported experiencing a significantly higher degree of welcoming others than did tourists. One likely explanation for this is that residents are on their "home turf" and it is a more accepted role for locals to host others (Smith 1989), even though Aramberri (2001) disputes this. Another explanation for residents scoring higher on the welcoming nature factor is that they may be more cognizant of the positive impacts or benefits (i.e., social and economic) associated with having tourists in their community as opposed to the other way around. Residents' awareness of such benefits has been well documented most recently by Wang and Pfister (2008) and others (see Harrill 2004; Lawson et al. 1998).

Table 6. Emotional Solidarity Factor Differences between Residents and Tourists[a]

Emotional Solidarity Factor	M^b (SD)		ANOVA Results	
	Residents	Tourists	F	p
Welcoming nature	6.23 (0.83)	5.59 (1.01)	107.65	.000
Emotional closeness	3.79 (1.72)	4.17 (1.61)	11.80	.001
Sympathetic understanding	4.78 (1.17)	4.73 (1.37)	0.33	.564

a. MANOVA model: Wilks's $\Lambda = 0.84$, $F(3, 889) = 58.16$, $p < .001$.
b. Measurement scale: 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Residents and tourists reported a modest level of agreement with items comprising the emotional closeness factor, with the latter claiming a significantly higher degree of the construct with the former. Such a finding may be explained by tourists' interest in the local culture as Urry (2002) claims and the receptivity such visitors have toward befriending residents. In addition, this could be a function of the friendly nature of residents and the corresponding ease with which tourists can get to know locals (Wearing, Stevenson, & Young 2010). While a significant difference in level of sympathetic understanding between residents and tourists was not found, such a finding should be regarded in a positive manner. Provided mean scores for the factor, residents and tourists indicated they felt a positive degree of sympathetic understanding with one another, which stands counter to most of the self-versus-other discourse as alluded to in Favero (2007). Such a finding may be explained by the fact that Galveston residents are likely used to having tourists experience the numerous amenities throughout the county. In addition, since a majority of the sample of tourists (74.9%) had been to the county before, they have likely encountered and interacted with residents. As Reisinger (1994) suggests, the more individuals interact, the greater likelihood they will begin to understand one another, especially if they previously had limited or no interaction.

Implications

Theoretical and practical implications can be derived from this work. This research supports the notion that emotional solidarity is indeed composed of three dimensions as Woosnam and Woosnam (2009) initially purported. While it may prove more efficient (i.e., potentially reducing the burden of time for respondents in completing a survey) to use single measures of the construct as others have (Bahr et al. 2004; Harwood 2000; Lin and Harwood 2003), such practice is cautioned. As Churchill (1979) echoed, complex constructs are not accurately captured by single items. It goes without saying that it would be nearly impossible to measure emotional solidarity with a single item that encompasses welcoming nature, emotional closeness, and sympathetic understanding. In fact, quite the opposite is encouraged, so that multiple items may continue to be used that accurately measure the construct and its corresponding factors. Furthermore, additional measures of

solidarity (e.g., trust, altruism, safety, and belonging) as put forth by Harrill (2004) may serve to complement the existing complex nature of emotional solidarity.

Such high levels of emotional solidarity (as evidenced by factor means) shared between residents and tourists for one another stands in contention with the work of the self-versus-other dichotomy. In essence, this showcases the fact that representatives from each party do not conceive of themselves as entirely separate from one another (Prentice, Witt, and Wydenbach 1994) or that the relationship is rooted in otherness as van den Berghe (1994) contends. One only needs to look at the way in which residents and tourists responded to the items within the sympathetic understanding factor (e.g., identify, have a lot in common, and understand) to ascertain that 'otherness' does not always define the relationship between locals and those visiting. A sense of common ground can serve to be just as revealing of the relationship (Hernandez, Cohen, and Garcia 1996; Sherlock 2001). Of course it should be noted that alternative explanations may exist as to why the idea of otherness was not clearly apparent in explaining the relationship between residents of and tourists to Galveston County. For instance, tourists to Galveston County may predominantly be from the United States, which would indicate that they share a similar cultural background with residents (even though regions of the United States are distinguished by differing beliefs, attitudes, and values). Also, residents of and tourists to Galveston County may be quite familiar with one another. This explanation is offered given nearly 75% of tourists surveyed had visited the county previously and the fact that Galveston County is the most visited coastal county in Texas.

Implications exist for the practitioner as well. Relationships between residents and tourists are often overlooked in destinations. Frequently, it is only when hostility, talk of proposed development, or some other threat to the community fabric surfaces that destination marketing organizations (DMOs) react to the relationship (Gunn and Var 2002). It would be in the best interest of residents, visitors, and DMOs to assess relationships in a proactive manner using measures such as the emotional solidarity scale, with regular updates. Hall and Lew (2009) suggest that a successful DMO should encourage ongoing dialogue from residents concerning how they feel toward tourists and their attitudes to tourism and development, even if the relationship between locals and tourists is perceived to

be positive. Ultimately, if residents and tourists do not exist peacefully in a destination, residents will grow to resent tourists and everything about tourism, and of course, tourists will sense such resentment, choosing not to return. Such a response could have a profound impact on the local economy. Planners and managers are then charged with ensuring that tourists do return to not only positively affect the local economy but also be part of a cultural exchange with local residents, whereby representatives of each party learn from one another in the destination.

While it may initially appear difficult for tourism managers and planners to foster emotional solidarity, steps can be taken to help ensure residents and tourists feel a greater sense of welcoming nature, emotional closeness, and sympathetic understanding with one another. First and foremost, tourism managers and planners need to initially assess emotional solidarity between locals and visitors, potentially finding gaps in levels of the three factors of emotional solidarity. This will serve as an indicator of the relationship. If the relationship is positive, local managers should continue to monitor how residents and tourists feel toward one another. In addition, promotional material (e.g., website, vacation guides, and local signage) published and maintained by local DMOs should highlight the existing rapport between residents and tourists. For instance, Wilson County, Tennessee (approximately 30 minutes from Nashville), has launched a promotional campaign using local residents to communicate their new slogan, "Wilson County: The Place To Be" to potential tourists. Using such a promotional campaign helps communicate to tourists the welcoming nature of residents.

If, however, the relationship is negative, local managers and planners should take action to improve the way residents and tourists get along with one another. One means of doing is by hosting local tourism planning meetings involving residents so they may voice their perspectives on tourism and tourists (Gunn and Var 2002). Having such meetings using the nominal group technique (see Jennings 2005) can allow each resident the opportunity to voice their concerns, vote on importance of concerns, and help planners prioritize (as a consensus) plans of actions to remedy negative relationships. Throughout time, once concerns are addressed, opportunities for residents and tourists to interact more readily should be facilitated by planners. For example, festivals and special events as well as key attractions are ideal locations for residents and tourists to interact and should be promoted as such. Few other opportunities exist within a destination for residents to showcase the social, cultural, natural, and historical resources within the community that serve to define local culture and explain why tourists come to visit. As Prentice, Witt, and Wydenbach (1994) and Rothman (1978) each found, interaction has shown to bring residents and tourists closer.

Limitations and Future Research

This work did not seek to test the model as put forth by Durkheim ([1915] 1995); rather, it examined differences among residents and tourists on the outcome variable of the model, emotional

solidarity. Subsequent work should use data from residents and tourists to examine the relationship between Durkheim's antecedent constructs (i.e., shared beliefs, shared behavior, and interaction) and emotional solidarity. Such work has yet to be conducted. In addition, model testing including sociodemographic variables as predictors (see McGehee and Andereck 2004) or as covariates (see Peterson, Speer, and McMillan 2008) should be conducted.

While it was by design that a destination was chosen largely serving domestic tourists, some would consider this a limitation. Emotional solidarity should continue to be tested and examined with new populations and settings to ensure generalizability of both the measure and the theory. Would results be similar if American tourists were visiting more remote destinations in another country, such as Somalia or Suriname, where residents may be less familiar with the United States (i.e., fewer televisions and fewer tourists)? Work comparing emotional solidarity across culturally different residents and tourists (i.e., residents from developing countries and tourists from developed countries) should be conducted to see if measures of emotional solidarity (i.e., welcoming nature, emotional closeness, and sympathetic understanding) are significantly different among populations as was found in the current study. Such studies should examine destinations with varying degrees of contact and interaction between residents and tourists, potentially revealing varying degrees of emotional solidarity as Durkheim's ([1915] 1995) framework indicates. A specific emphasis should be placed on destinations that are beginning the development process as Harrill (2004) suggests, as well as those that are well established. Ultimately, the goal of research surrounding emotional solidarity is to further the theoretical advancement within the tourism field, all the while contributing to informed decision making among practitioners.

References

Angelou Economics. (2009). *Galveston Island: Tourism Economic Impact Analysis*. Austin, TX: Angelou Economics.

Aramberri, J. (2001). "The Host Should Get Lost: Paradigms in the Tourism Industry." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28 (3): 738-61.

Babbie, E. (2010). *The Practice of Social Research*. 12th edition. Belmont, CA: Thomson-Wadsworth.

Bagozzi, R., and Y. Yi. (1988). "On the Evaluation of Structural Equation Models." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16 (1): 74-94.

Bahr, H., C. Mitchell, X. Li, A. Walker, and K. Sucher. (2004). "Trends in Family Space/Time, Conflict, and Solidarity: Middletown 1924-1999." *City & Community*, 3 (3): 263-91.

Browne, M. W., and R. Cudeck. (1993). "Alternative Ways of Assessing Model Fit." In *Testing Structural Equation Models*, edited by K. A. Bollen and J. S. Long. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 136-62.

Browne, M. W., and G. Mels. (1990). *RAMONA User's Guide*. Columbus, OH: Department of Psychology, Ohio State University.

Buzinde, C. N., and C. A. Santos. (2009). "Interpreting Slavery Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36 (3): 439-58.

Byrne, B. M. (2006). *Structural Equation Modeling with EQS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming*. 2nd edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Caton, K., and C. A. Santos. (2008). "Closing the Hermeneutic Circle? Photographic Encounters with the Other." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (1): 7-26.

Caton, K., and C. A. Santos. (2009). "Images of the Other: Selling Study Abroad in a Postcolonial World." *Journal of Travel Research*, 48 (2): 191-204.

Churchill, G. (1979). "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16 (February): 64-73.

Comrey, A. L., and H. B. Lee. (1992). *A First Course in Factor Analysis*. 2nd edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Durkheim, E. (1995 [1915]). *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. New York: Free Press.

Evans-Pritchard, D. (1989). "How 'They' See 'Us': Native American Images of Tourists." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16 (1): 89-105.

Favero, P. (2007). "What a Wonderful World! On the Touristic Ways of Seeing, the Knowledge and the Politics of the 'Culture Industries of Otherness.'" *Tourist Studies*, 7 (1): 51-81.

Feng, D., R. Giarrusso, V. L. Bengston, and N. Frye. (1999). "Intergenerational Transmission of Marital Quality and Marital Instability." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61 (2): 451-63.

Fish, J. (2002). "Religion and the Changing Intensity of Emotional Solidarities in Durkheim's The Division of Labour in Society (1893). *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 2 (2): 202-23.

Fisher, D. (2004). "The Demonstration Effect Revisited." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (2): 428-46.

Fornell, C., and D. F. Larcker. (1981). "Evaluating Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1): 39-50.

Franklin, A. (2003). "The Tourist Syndrome: An Interview with Zygmunt Bauman." *Tourist Studies*, 3 (2): 205-17.

Galani-Moutafi, V. (2000). "The Self and the Other: Traveler, Ethnographer, Tourist." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27 (1): 203-24.

Geiger, K. (1955). "Deprivation and Solidarity in the Soviet Urban Family." *American Sociological Review*, 20 (1): 57-68.

Goodman, C., and M. Silverstein. (2002). "Grandmothers Raising Grandchildren: Family Structure and Well-being in Culturally Diverse Families." *The Gerontologist*, 42 (5): 676-89.

Gronvold, R. (1988). "Measuring Affectual Solidarity." In *Measurement of Intergenerational Relations*, edited by D. Mangen, V. Bengston, and P. Landry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 74-97.

Gunn, C. A., and T. Var. (2002). *Tourism Planning, 4th ed*. New York: Routledge.

Hall, C. M., and A. L. Lew. (2009). *Understanding and Managing Tourism Impacts: An Integrated Approach*. New York: Routledge.

Hammarstrom, G. (2005). "The Construct of Intergenerational Solidarity in a Lineage Perspective: A Discussion on Underlying Theoretical Assumptions." *Journal of Aging Studies*, 19 (1): 33-51.

Harrill, R. (2004). "Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development: A Literature Review with Implications for Tourism Planning." *Journal of Planning Literature*, 18 (3): 251-66.

Harwood, J. (2000). "Communicative Predictors of Solidarity in Grandparent-Grandchild Relationship." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 17 (6): 743-66.

Hernandez, S., J. Cohen, and H. Garcia. (1996). "Residents' Attitudes towards an Instant Resort Enclave." *Annals of Tourism*, 23 (4): 755-79.

Hu, L., and P. Bentler. (1999). "Cutoff Criteria for Fit Indices in Covariance Structure Analysis: Conventional Criteria versus New Alternatives." *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6 (1): 1-55.

Jacobs, S., and R. T. Allen. (Eds.). (2005). *Emotion, Reason, and Tradition: Essays on the Social, Political and Economic Thought of Michael Polanyi*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Jennings, G. (2005). "Interviewing: A Focus on Qualitative Techniques." In *Tourism Research: Integrating Theory with Practice*, edited by B. W. Ritchie, P. Burns, and C. Palmer. Wallingford, UK: CABI, pp. 99-118.

Kaplan, D. (2009). *Structural Equation Modeling: Foundations and Extensions*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. 2nd edition. New York: Guilford.

Lance, C. E., M. M. Butts, and L. C. Michels. (2006). "The Sources of Four Commonly Reported Cutoff Criteria: What Did They Really Say?" *Organizational Research Methods*, 9 (2): 202-20.

Lawson, R., J. Williams, T. Young, and J. Cossens. (1998). "A Comparison of Residents' Attitudes towards Tourism in 10 New Zealand Towns." *Tourism Management* 19 (3): 247-56.

Laxson, J. (1991). "How 'We' See 'Them': Tourism and Native Americans." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18 (3): 365-91.

Lazaridis, G., and E. Wickens. (1999). "Us and the Others: Ethnic Minorities in Greece." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (3): 632-55.

Li, X., and J. Petrick. (2008). "Examining the Antecedents of Brand Loyalty from an Investment Model Perspective." *Journal of Travel Research*, 47 (1): 25-34.

Lin, M., and J. Harwood. (2003). "Accommodation Predictors of Grandparent-Grandchild Relational Solidarity in Taiwan." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20 (4): 537-63.

MacCannell, D. (1999). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

McGehee, N. G., and K. L. Andereck. (2004). "Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (2): 131-40.

McNaughton, D. (2006). "The 'Host' as Uninvited 'Guest': Hospitality, Violence and Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33 (3): 645-65.

Maoz, D. (2006). "The Mutual Gaze." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33 (1): 221-39.

Mason, P. (2008). *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. 2nd edition. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Nash, D. (2001). *Anthropology of Tourism*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Netemeyer, R. G., W. O. Bearden, and S. Sharma. (2003). *Scaling Procedures: Issues and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Peterson, N. A., P. W. Speer, and D. W. McMillan. (2008). "Validation of a Brief Sense of Community Scale: Confirmation of the Principal Theory of Sense of Community." *Journal of Community Psychology*, 36 (1): 61-73.

Pizam, A., N. Uriely, and A. Reichel. (2000). "The Intensity of Tourist-Host Social Relationship and Its Effects on Satisfaction and Change of Attitudes: The Case of Working Tourists in Israel." *Tourism Management*, 21 (4): 395-406.

Prentice, R. C., S. F. Witt, and E. G. Wydenbach. (1994). "The Endearment Behaviour of Tourists through Their Interaction with the Host Community." *Tourism Management*, 15 (2): 117-25.

Reisinger, Y. (1994). "Social Contact Between Tourists and Hosts of Different Cultural Backgrounds." In *Tourism: The State of the Art*, edited by A. Seaton, C. Jenkins, and R. Wood. Chichester: Wiley, pp.743-54.

Reisinger, Y., and L. Turner. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Behavior in Tourism: Concepts and Analysis*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Rosengren, W. R. (1959). "Symptom Manifestations as a Function of Situational Press: A Demonstration in Socialization." *Sociometry*, 22 (2): 113-23.

Rothman, R. A. (1978). "Residents and Transients: Community Reactions to Seasonal Visitors." *Journal of Travel Research*, 16 (3): 8-13.

Santos, C. A., and G. Yan. (2008). "Representational Politics in Chinatown: The Ethnic Other." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (4): 879-99.

Sherlock, K. (2001). "Revisiting the Concept of Hosts and Guests." *Tourist Studies*, 1 (3): 271-95.

Silverstein, M., and V. L. Bengston. (1991). "Do Close Parent-Child Relations Reduce the Mortality Risk of Older Parents." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 32 (4): 382-95.

Sirakaya-Turk, E., Y. Ekinci, and A. Kaya. (2008). "An Examination of the Validity of SUS-TAS in Cross-Cultures." *Journal of Travel Research*, 46 (4): 414-21.

Smith, V. (Ed.). (1989). *Hosts and Guests: The Anthropology of Tourism*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Street, D. (1965). "The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings." *American Sociological Review*, 30 (1): 40-55.

Suchman, E. (1964). "Sociomedical Variations among Ethnic Groups." *American Journal of Sociology*, 70 (3): 319-31.

Tabachnick, B. G., and L. S. Fidell. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 5th edition. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Texas Tourism. (2010). "2008p direct travel impacts by county (within The Economic impact of Travel on Texas)." http://travel.state.tx.us/getattachment/d9991ff8-343d-4d31-ada9-31429a6c8ff5/TXImp08rpt.aspx (accessed March 1, 2010).

Timothy, D. (2005). *Shopping Tourism, Retailing and Leisure*. Tonawanda, NY: Channel View.

Trauer, B., and C. Ryan. (2005). "Destination Image, Romance and Place Experience—An Application of Intimacy Theory in Tourism." *Tourism Management*, 26 (4): 481-91.

Urry, J. (2002). *The Tourist Gaze*. 2nd edition. London: Sage.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). "2008 American community survey data profile highlights: Galveston County, Texas." http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?_bm=y&-context=dt&-ds_name=ACS_2008_1YR_G00_&-mt_name=ACS_2008_1YR_G2000_B05002&-CONTEXT=dt&-tree_id=308&-redoLog=true&-geo_id=05000US48167&-search_results=01000US&-format=&-_lang=en (accessed March 1, 2010).

van den Berghe, P. (1994). *The Quest for the Other*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Wallace, R. A., and A. Wolf. (2006). *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition*. 6th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Wang, Y., and R. E. Pfister. (2008). "Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Perceived Personal Benefits in a Rural Community." *Journal of Travel Research*, 47 (1): 84-93.

Wearing, S., D. Stevenson, and T. Young. (2010). *Tourist Cultures: Identity, Place and the Traveller*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wearing, S., and B. Wearing. (2001). "Conceptualizing the Selves of Tourism." *Leisure Studies*, 20 (2): 143-59.

Wearing, S., and M. Wearing. (2006). "Rereading the Subjugating Tourist in Neoliberalism: Postcolonial Otherness and the Tourist Experience." *Tourism Analysis*, 11 (2): 145-63.

Williams, A. (2004). "Towards a Political Economy of Tourism." In *Companion to Tourism*, edited by A. A. Lew, C. M. Hall, and A. M. Williams. London: Blackwell, pp. 61-73.

Woosnam, K. M., and W. C. Norman. (2009). "Measuring Residents' Emotional Solidarity with Tourists: Scale Development of Durkheim's Theoretical Constructs." *Journal of Travel Research*, doi:10.1177/0047287509346858

Bio

Kyle M. Woosnam is an assistant professor at Texas A&M University in the department of recreation, park & tourism sciences. His research interests include examining the social impacts of tourism on communities and relationships between residents and tourists in rural destinations.