ABSTRACT

BANKS, SARAH KATHARINE. Tourism Related Impacts as Perceived by Three Resident Typology Groups in San Pedro, Belize. (Under the direction of Dr. Gene Brothers).

Tourism destinations located within a developing country will likely be increasingly made up of both Native Residents and foreign expatriates, either attracted based on perceived economic development potential or specific environmental and social characteristics making up the community. In recognizing this community makeup, and studying these varying points of view, a greater consensus pertaining to the direction future community development should take may be achieved. This study of tourism on Ambergris Caye, Belize compared the perceptions of three different resident typology groups so as to determine how their differing characteristics as defined by the typology influenced their particular views on acceptable levels of change pertaining to the impacts associated with tourism development. The study defined three resident typologies, the Developer Tourist, the Condo Tourist and the Native Resident, in order to assess their different perspectives toward the tourism industry based on their involvement in the tourism industry and level of attachment to the destination area. The study utilized secondary data analysis of current development levels, as well as survey questionnaires and in-depth qualitative interviews of members of the three typology groups in order to determine perceptions of the various impacts on a rapidly growing island destination. These methods enabled the researcher to determine whether and in what way the perceptions of the three resident typology groups differed concerning tourism impacts on the economic, environmental and sociocultural conditions of their home community. In addition, the findings were assessed through the use of three theoretical frameworks, McCool’s “Limits of Acceptable Change”, Butler’s “Tourism Area Life Cycle” and Nielsen et al.’s “Last Settler Syndrome.” It was believed that the perceptions of each of
the three resident groups would best be defined according to a specific development model, with any similarities or overlap of perceptions being of particular relevance. This analysis of the differences and similarities as viewed by three typology groups of tourism related impacts and the placing of these perspectives within three specific development conceptual frameworks has resulted in the opportunity to better explain these differences and move the analysis of tourism development and community planning forward.

It was found that each of the resident groups differ significantly concerning their own perspective of tourism related impacts within their home community. This signifies that even though the reality of the level of development is actually indisputable, based on factors such as number of hotels, rooms, and visitors enabling the placement of the tourism area within a particular development stage, the different perspectives expressed by the resident groups signify that they may believe this development stage to be quite different than that reality.

The importance in understanding that these differing perspectives exist within a single development stage and location is necessary to attempt to achieve a consensus among the different residents. The need is then to educate the various groups as to how their perspective fits within the current development stage, as well as within the perspective of the other groups. Further, findings showed that although the three resident groups differed concerning their opinions as to the economic and social costs and benefits of tourism, all three groups agreed that ongoing environmental degradation was likely based on current development levels. Through the use of such information, development patterns of typical tourism destinations may be better conceptualized and community-based concerns and consensus may be articulated as a means to help meet future development goals.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Over the course of the past several decades, tourism related research has shifted focus from the purely economic aspects and models of development to a myriad of issues pertaining more to impact assessment and outcomes. While the primary focus has been on the resources upon which tourism depends, the typical economic assessment and justification studies have also continued. However, more and more studies have been conducted in order to better measure and understand the influence of this diverse and expansive industry upon both the environmental and sociocultural makeup of a host destination (Ap, 1992). In light of sustainability, such an understanding has been purported as necessary to help ensure a healthy and equitable development model. Sustainability pertains to that type of development or growth that endeavors to meet the needs of the present population without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. This perspective is necessary in that the tourism industry, which is so dependent upon the natural and cultural resources of a destination, can easily develop beyond the capacity of the environment or setting to supply those resources (McCool, 1994). In the case of over development, not only will the destination be overused and degraded, the host population will be unfairly affected and left with the burden of paying the costs. While there have been many different models and stage analyses offered to explain and predict the typical patterns and impacts of tourism development upon a host community, there has been a lack of any real measurement or predictive indices. However, a key means to get at this information has been through the study of the perceptions and beliefs of the host population in relation to the growth of the tourism industry and subsequent changes taking place in the host community (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001; Tosun, 2001). Through the
use of such information, development patterns of typical tourism destinations may be better conceptualized and community-based concerns and consensus may be articulated as a means to help plan future development goals.

Tourism impacts are not universal. As would be expected, different community members undoubtedly view tourism related impacts and changes in vastly different ways, dependent upon any number of personal variables and characteristics. Conversely, considering the great range of potential influences likely to affect the environmental, sociocultural and economic makeup of a community, it is also necessary to understand the various sources of those impacts and the various ways in which the interrelated elements of the industry may be viewed to affect the different components of the destination. Much research segregates community members in terms of how they are uniquely tied to the tourism industry, as well as the host area, in order to understand how their assessment is affected by their individual goals and beliefs. In addition, it is also necessary to isolate the specific impact components as they are most likely to affect that assessment. Such an understanding is currently the primary means with which to assess the ongoing development of a tourism destination, but usually only one or the other side of the component may be assessed within a single piece of research and a wide failing within the tourism industry has been that few long-term or follow-up studies are ever conducted (Mansfeld & Ginosar, 1994). The present study built upon one such research study that reported on the effects of tourism as perceived by a host population and adds to the understanding of the ongoing development of that destination.

A study conducted by Stuart McMinn and Erlet Cater in 1992 (1998) examined the overall economic, sociocultural and environmental impacts of the tourism industry upon the
host community of San Pedro, Ambergris Caye, Belize. Through the extensive use of survey questionnaires and interviews of native residents, the researchers assessed their findings according to the likely sources of those impacts as related to three different tourist typology groups who visit Belize: the Developer-tourist, the Condo-tourist and the Itinerant-tourist. The tourist typology developed characterizes the three most typical foreign tourist types who visit Belize as dictated by the degree of permanence of their stay and level of financial involvement (McMinn & Cater, 1998). In recognizing that differing types of tourists have different needs and demands, it follows that such differing groups would also impact a destination in distinctive ways as those needs are met. A key finding of the 1992 study was that two of the visitor groups, the Developer-tourist and the Condo-tourist, actually have the greatest influence in area development decisions and financial input.

In the present study, members of the Developer Tourist and Condo Tourist typology groups, in addition to members of the native population as in the first study, were surveyed to assess their own perceptions of development and change as it pertains to the island’s tourism industry. As opposed to only assessing impacts caused by the different typology groups as in the 1992 study, the present study questioned members of those groups as a means to assess their own thoughts on those changes and determine where their points of concern fit or conflict with the native resident group population or each other. Therefore, a better understanding of their perception of change and level of satisfaction pertaining to area development may facilitate a greater understanding of areas of concern to those who make the key decisions that affect the entire process of development on Ambergris Caye. The three resident groups to be assessed are all therefore considered extended-stay/permanent inhabitants of the island and include Native Residents, people who were born and raised
either on Ambergris Caye or in some other area of Belize; Developer-Tourists, people who are foreign nationals or "expatriates" from another country who have come to Belize to acquire land and construct facilities as part of the tourism industry; and the Condo-Tourists, foreign nationals who have relocated or retired to Belize and have either purchased or rented homes in order to stay in the area for extended periods of time (McMinn & Cater, 1998).

The current research was focused on determining whether and in what way the perceptions of the three resident typology groups differed concerning tourism impacts on the economic, environmental and sociocultural conditions of their home community of San Pedro, Ambergris Caye, Belize.

As the purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of the three different resident typology groups of the effects of tourism development in their home area, representatives of each group had to be questioned. As in one part of the McMinn and Cater study, data were collected through the use of survey questionnaires of residents living in San Pedro, Ambergris Caye. A convenience sample was collected in and around areas where members of the three different resident groups were known to frequent, as well as through the more pointed seeking out of specific, highly involved members of each group as they pertain to the tourism industry of the island. The high number of collected surveys (160) counteracted a seeming lack of randomness in the sample collection design. As in much tourism related research, questions regarding perceived conditions related to tourism development were grouped into three categories of impact, including economic, environmental and sociocultural concerns. A second set of questions assessed those attributes considered most important in making San Pedro a desirable place to live, and a third section assessed the perceived state of the current condition of those attributes in order
to determine thresholds for change concerning likely future development outcomes. A final section of the questionnaire gathered sociodemographic data that was used to make comparisons with community statistics.

As a means to evaluate these perceptions, the findings were assessed through the use of three theoretical frameworks, McCool’s “Limits of Acceptable Change”, Butler’s “Tourism Area Life Cycle” and Nielsen et al.’s “Last Settler Syndrome.” While there will certainly be some overlap pertaining to individually reported perceptions, it is anticipated that responses of each typology group will best fit with one particular theory over another due to those characteristics classifying members within each group and the theoretical conceptual frameworks chosen for analysis. It is anticipated that members of the native population of Belizeans will express greater attachment to community and equitable resource allocation and while there will likely be great concern over job opportunity and economic development as well, it is believed that aspects of McCool’s Limits of Acceptable Change may best explain the perceptions as reported by this group. The Developer-Tourist group in being so highly involved with the tourism industry is expected to express greatest concern over investment potential and the ongoing success of the industry itself and so the stages of Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle may best overlay the findings expressed by this group. Lastly, the Condo-tourist group, made up of those people who have chosen to relocate to the area based on specific appreciated social and environmental conditions will most likely express clear examples of Last Settler Syndrome as they are most concerned with image of place and quality of lifestyle as provided by living on Ambergris Caye. These conceptual frameworks will be used to examine resident attitudes toward: current levels of tourism development in general, desirable levels of change, impacts of tourism on local conditions
and perceptions as to how future development should proceed. A focus of this research was on the identification of indicators to help identify issues/concerns of each typology group associated with tourism resource development within their home community and more importantly, those areas of common concern and similarity of perception from where a new direction of consensus may develop.

Therefore the objectives of this study were to:

1) Ascertain which community attributes are most important in contributing to San Pedro being a desirable place to live according to each of the three resident typology groups.

2) Learn of the opinions concerning the current condition of the most important community attributes and how the three resident typology groups perceive those conditions as likely to change due to continued tourism development.

3) Evaluate these perceptions through the use of three theoretical frameworks, including McCool’s “Limits of Acceptable Change,” Butler’s “Tourism Area Life Cycle” and Nielsen et al.’s “Last Settler Syndrome” in order to determine whether perceptions of each typology group best fit within one particular conceptual framework over another due to the specific characteristics making up each group and the theoretical models chosen for analysis.

4) Utilize this information to better inform the development process concerning the tourism industry on Ambergris Caye in order to ensure a greater consensus among the differing opinions and goals of the three resident groups affected by tourism growth and development.

Completion of these objectives utilized the following three hypotheses:

1) \( H_1 \) – Typology groups differ in their perceptions of which community attributes are most important in making San Pedro a desirable place to live

\( H_0 \) – Typology groups do not differ in their perceptions of which community attributes are most important in making San Pedro a desirable place to live
2) \( H_1 \) – Typology groups differ in how they rate the current condition of those community attributes
   \( H_0 \) – Typology groups do not differ in how they rate the current condition of those community attributes

3) \( H_1 \) – Typology groups differ in how they perceive those conditions as likely to change due to future tourism development
   \( H_0 \) – Typology groups do not differ in how they perceive those conditions as likely to change due to future tourism development

In short, there is a great deal of research and theory to argue for a multidimensional approach to studying tourism, a very complex system that undergoes constant change in any given destination. Through the use of various data collection techniques and the multi-model analysis, the true reality of the current level of tourism development in San Pedro and its subsequent impacts on the host community may be ascertained. These findings enabled a broader application of the conceptual frameworks and will ensure that the perceptions of the three resident typology groups will be incorporated into ongoing community planning and development.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

There is a great deal of research and theory to argue for a multidimensional approach to studying tourism, a very complex system that undergoes constant change in any given destination. Most research suggests a highly complex relationship between level of economic development, level of tourism development and expected and perceived social, economic and environmental impacts by residents resulting from tourism (Johnson, Snepenger & Akis, 1994). In order to help understand the factors influencing perceptions of the development and sustainability of tourism, as many of the qualities, conditions and players that make up the system should be assessed as possible. As there is an ongoing trend in many tourism destinations for native residents to increasingly live alongside newcomers who have either moved to the area to work within the industry or simply to retire to a place they fell in love with originally as tourists themselves, a better understanding of the differences and commonalities between groups needs to be studied. As this signifies an ever more common community make-up, there is a growing need to better understand the differences in opinions and perspectives among these varied groups, who at the same time, view a single community as their home. Members of these groups may all seek out very different qualities and conditions in making that community a desirable place to live. By including not only the perspectives of the three local resident typology groups, but also analyzing these opinions within specific development theories, a better conceptual framework for prediction and planning may result. In this way, it may be possible to not only document the state or condition of a destination, but to also guide its development toward a sustainable community that can continue to host an ongoing tourism product. This sustainable future would be the desired state rather than a community that explodes from too
much growth or implodes in stagnation, a vibrant, alive community that meets the changing needs of both its residents and its visitors.

The current study took place in the area of San Pedro, Ambergris Caye, Belize and combined analysis of the measurable impacts associated with environmental, economic, and community/social change using the public's perceptions of change collected using a survey questionnaire and interviews, as well as secondary data sources that documented changes overtime in the community’s development. The intention of this study was to compare the perceptions of three different resident typology groups so as to determine how their differing characteristics as defined by the typology influenced their particular views on acceptable levels of change pertaining to the impacts associated with tourism development. McMinn and Cater's extensive study identified three different kinds of tourist who either visited or relocated to Ambergris Caye, exploring how this disaggregated approach to the categorization of visitors could better inform policy makers as to which group's behavior led to which resulting effect upon the host community (1998).

The interest of this current study was to apply two of their typology designations, the Developer-Tourist and the Condo-Tourist, along with a Native-Resident group to provide the sub-sampling control variable necessary to answer the research objectives so that the difference in perceptions of these groups can be explored. In addition to the work done by McMinn and Cater, the relevance and character of these particular subgroups is demonstrated through past research that purports varying levels of resident support for tourism development contingent upon degree of dependence on the industry (McCool & Martin, 1994), level of input demanded as members of the community being impacted (Horn & Simmons, 2002), as well as level of attachment to the destination area being developed.
(Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001; Davis, Allen & Cosenza, 1988). All of these important considerations as widely reported in the research literature, and coupled with McMinn and Cater’s findings that it is the expatriate population that most controls development and policy decisions on Ambergris, will help shape the overall analysis of data collected. However, three theoretical frameworks in particular were utilized to assess the perceptions of each of the three resident typology groups and evaluate their specific points of concern and ongoing degree of comfort concerning impacts due to tourism development within their home community.

These conceptual frameworks include McCool's "Limits of Acceptable Change" (LAC) (1994) planning framework that has been used to help assess resident's feelings about development and change in their home community; Butler's "Tourism Area Life Cycle" (TALC) (1980) that first designated the various stages and related characteristics of each stage in the development life cycle of a tourism destination; and Nielsen et al.'s "Last Settler Syndrome" (LSS) (1977) that purports certain relocated groups will desire an area to remain as it was when they arrived with little or no more development permitted.

Resident Perceptions

Due to the very nature of tourism, which depends upon the resident community to not only act as host and service provider but also as an additional resource attraction contributing to the feel and aura of a destination, even those community members not otherwise affiliated with the industry must still contend with its impacts (Haywood, 1988). As such, proper planning and input should be encouraged to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are allowed to voice their concerns and have their perspectives incorporated into future plans. It makes
little sense for a community to develop and promote tourism if area residents’ lack of support leads to negative feelings toward the industry and off-putting reactions toward tourists (Taylor, 1995).

At one time, tourism related research focused mainly on the psychology and sociology of tourism and was mostly concerned with the tourist’s views and behavior. However, more recently, many studies have focused on resident attitudes, perceptions and tourism-related development (Allen et al., 1988; Brunt & Courtney, 1999). Much research has focused on the impacts of tourism development, which has identified both positive and negative economic, social and environmental impacts (Johnson, Snepenger & Akis, 1994). In order to understand the ongoing development and changes taking place within a tourism destination, resident attitudes and concerns must first be understood and considered (Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001). Residents of host communities that differ in development experiences, development level, carrying capacity and sociocultural, political and economic issues will likely have different perceptions of tourism (Tosun, 2001; Mansfeld & Ginosar, 1994). One attempt to link resident perceptions to stage of development in the host community was conducted by Ap and Crompton (1993) who suggested that resident perceptions toward development of the tourism product actually progresses through the stages of embracement, tolerance, adjustment and withdrawal. Specifically, there does seem to be a significant relationship between the impacts of tourism and the advancement of tourism in a host community, as well as spatial proximity to a tourism center or direct affiliation with the tourism industry and resident attitudes and perceptions toward tourism (Allen, Long, Perdue & Kieselbach, 1988; Wall, 1996).
In fact, several researchers theorize that it is necessary to understand the state of tourism activity or the developmental stage of a region in order to interpret resident perceptions of tourism impacts upon their home community (Upchurch & Teivane, 2000; Ap & Crompton, 1993; Butler, 1980). It has been presented that residents of destination areas in early stages of tourism development usually hold more positive attitudes toward tourism (Wall, 1996). However, Upchurch and Teivane (2000) found a general ambivalence in the early stages of tourism development in that it may be too early for residents to have made any clear-cut determinations as to their opinion of tourism within their community. Further, Johnson, Snepenger and Akis (1994) found that although residents did initially hold high expectations for tourism development, support diminished over time. Indeed, it does appear that locals in tourist destinations do have a certain social carrying capacity threshold beyond which they will start to show their irritation and dissatisfaction with the outcomes of tourism development (Mansfeld & Ginosar, 1994; Allen et al., 1988). Similarly, Ap and Crompton (1993) found that as the growth and demand for tourism increases in an area, the impacts upon the community tend to become more apparent and more negative in nature. Long, Perdue and Allen (1990) quantified the threshold for tourism development at the point where approximately 30% of a community’s retail sales were derived from tourism beyond which attitudes became less favorable and community residents no longer supported such development.

Great differences will likely exist between various impacted resident groups. While some individuals will firmly believe that the tourism industry enhances the overall quality of life for residents and so should continue to grow, others will be just as certain that it is an invasive and disruptive force on the very character and integrity of the community (Sauter &
Leisen, 1999). Further, local business owners in a destination may have greater concerns related to the balance of power and issues associated with opportunities for development, while environmental or other resident groups may be much more interested in quality-of-life values and push for protection of area resources (Sauter & Leisen, 1999). Failure to ensure and maintain a balance between economic benefit and resource protection will not only jeopardize relationships between stakeholders, but will also threaten the realization of community objectives and the long-term competitiveness and prosperity of a destination (Buhalis & Spada, 2000). Therefore, much research is conducted to gain a better understanding of the intricacies between economic, environmental and social resources so that this balance may be achieved. However, realization of the benefits and costs in one area may or may not influence opinion concerning those impacts in another area. For example, King et al. (1993) found that residents were able to differentiate between economic benefits and social costs and that awareness of negative consequences did not necessarily result in unfavorable opinion toward further tourism development. Further, Campbell (1999) found that even where tourism has been shown to lead to increased natural resource damage or threaten fragile ecosystems, the desire of most local residents has been to see development levels rise, as long as they are receiving some benefit from its growth. Therefore, the need is to gain an understanding of where the negative changes in one area overlap or cancel out the benefit gained in another. In this way, planning may be better informed and better enable tourism to be a proactive force which not only aims to maximize positive returns to a community’s overall growth, but also works to minimize the costs to the environment and resident culture (Sauter & Leisen, 1999).
Resident Typologies

It has been presented above that opinions about and expectations from tourism can be very different depending on which resident population or occupational group is considered or consulted (Krippendorf, 1987). In order to account for this in tourism research, many researchers have attempted to classify various residents according to certain characteristics, themes and experiences so that a better understanding of their particular frame of reference and subsequent opinion may be achieved. For example, Krippendorf (1987) defined four resident classification types in relation to area tourism development, including (1) those who experience direct contact with tourists and are directly dependent upon the industry, (2) those who run businesses which have no regular contact with tourists, (3) those who may have direct and frequent contact with tourists but who are not so directly dependent upon the industry and (4) those who have no contact with tourists and only see them in passing.

Madrigal (1994) developed a resident classification conceptual framework with the group termed ‘realists’ being those community members who appear to accept tourism and its growth, but who also recognize its negative consequences. It may be this group who has the most balanced perspective of the issue, but who lack the interest to participate or voice their own concerns and so are less heard from concerning their point of view. Conversely, it may be the ‘lovers’ and ‘haters’ of tourism who are the only people who feel strongly enough to participate in public forums (the squeaky wheel), but who may actually number less within the community. Due to this reason, it may actually be the view of the ‘silent majority’ in a community that could be of the greatest benefit to local tourism planning initiatives (Madrigal, 1994).
However, even if this ‘silent majority’ may more readily accept growth and change if it were perceived to be slow and controlled, they also may not, and with the pace of change in tourist destinations so deceptive, the next stage of the cycle may already be upon them and too far gone for their liking (Madrigal, 1994). Davis, Allen, and Cosenza (1988) also present a resident typology classification conceptual framework that identified five clusters of differing degrees of attitudes toward the state's tourism efforts in Florida. Of particular note was the presence of a strong anti-tourism, anti-growth segment that seemed to indicate to the researchers the need for the state government to devote a portion of their tourism promotion efforts toward educating the residents regarding the positive multiplier effects of tourism. Several other researchers also present the need to better inform local residents of the benefits of tourism in order to encourage more positive attitudes toward the industry and more tolerance toward any negative impacts possibly experienced (Haywood, 1988; Davis et al., 1988; Lankford & Howard, 1993).

It has been shown that those most knowledgeable of the industry and its benefits may be most tolerant, and Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) also found that those respondents most economically dependent on tourism were more generally positive about the industry than those who were not dependent on it. Additionally, Mansfeld and Ginosar (1994) found that as locals move from a non-occupational affiliation with tourism to the higher positions within the tourism industry, their levels of irritation due to the negative impacts of tourism development actually decreased. In this way, those most involved in the industry itself may actually be the most tolerant of its impacts. On the other hand, attitudes also appear to vary spatially as those residents who live closest to the center of tourism activity or are most familiar with its practices may actually have more negative opinions than those more
removed from it (Wall, 1996). However, this may be due to the fact that in some situations, the industry really does bring about more negative than positive impacts. Still, the need to classify resident attitudes and perceptions based on some specific level of involvement or familiarity is a common theme among previous studies and one that has proven to provide a better understanding of the overall industry and its impacts.

Limits of Acceptable Change

Although the Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) conceptual framework was first presented in relation to designated wilderness preservation and to help improve recreation management, McCool (1994) suggested that such a conceptual framework might be used to operationalize the concept of sustainability in terms of development of a tourist destination. To manage for sustainability, there must be a technical planning system (such as LAC) in place to address problems and force explicit decision-making, as well as a public involvement process oriented toward consensus building (McCool, 1994). In this way, McCool has applied this conceptual framework beyond a natural resource area to incorporate the human and social conditions making up a tourist destination. More recently, Ahn, Lee and Shafer (2002) utilized the LAC conceptual framework as a relevant model to demonstrate the sustainability concept in regional tourism planning. They found that when respondent attitudes from three different communities were compared, they differed in the way they felt about tourism, indicating to the researchers that tourism development zones may be justified in order to help separate development and activity types related to tourism.

The LAC management conceptual framework outlines a series of steps that can be used to define a set of desired conditions for some area where change is imminent, as well as
the various management actions required to help maintain or restore those conditions (Stankey, Cole, Lucas, Peterson & Frissell, 1985) (Figure 1). Defining the amount of change that is acceptable to stakeholders is at the heart of the LAC conceptual framework as well as the means to seek out some compromise among differing needs (Ahn et al., 2002). The nine steps of the LAC leads managers and researchers through the process so that not only can desired baseline conditions of a resource area be determined, but also so that necessary indicators and standards may be put in place to enable recognition of when degradation or too much change has occurred. These steps include: (1) identify the area of concern and related issues, (2) define opportunity classes or zones, (3) select indicators of resource and social conditions (as they apply to classes or zones), (4) inventory resource conditions, (5) specify standards for resource indicators, (6) identify alternative opportunity class
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allocations, (7) identify management actions for each alternative, (8) evaluate and select an alternative, and (9) implement actions and monitor conditions (Stankey et al., 1985).

The first step, *identify the area of concern and related issues*, looks to all involved stakeholders to help identify and define the various issues and concerns associated with the resource and the prospect of tourism development in the area (McCool, 1994). In most tourism planning literature, the need to allow all relevant players the chance to voice their concerns and help contribute to the planning process is deemed a central role to sustainable development options (Akis, Peristianis, & Warner, 1996; Allen et al., 1988; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Horn & Simmons, 2002).

The second step, *define opportunity classes or zones*, presumes the idea that different areas are better equipped to accept certain types of visitation and should be managed in a way to better align environmental or societal characteristics with the desires of various visitor groups and overall management goals. This concept, harkening back to the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum, suggests that each zone should have different social, natural resource or managerial conditions to meet the set conditions of the area best (Stankey et al., 1985). Recreation Opportunity Spectrum has generally be used by the Forest Service to inventory and classify National Forest System lands to best manage for a range of recreational experiences and opportunities based on the resources available to a particular setting (Stankey et al., 1985). In various destinations, however, development may already be too far advanced to overlay this conceptual framework over the existing layout or level of development.

The third step, *select indicators of resource and social conditions (as they apply to classes or zones)*, focuses on identifying the most important conditions of a setting and then
the specific indicators that might best measure any change in that condition (McCool, 1994). This aspect of indicator selection is rather challenging and even once relevant indicators are selected, can be difficult to measure and assess, actions that are necessary for subsequent steps in the process (Lawrence, Munasinghe & McNeely, 1994).

The fourth step, *inventory resource conditions*, requires that planners use selected indicators to assess current conditions so a baseline can be recorded against which future change could be monitored and compared. In a 1987 study, for example, the number of marina moorings located on Michigan’s Great Lakes were used to determine both the level of development over time and to evaluate marina needs indices for the area (Brothers, 1987).

The fifth step, *specify standards for resource indicators*, can be one of the most difficult parts of the process as agreement must be reached on how much change is acceptable before some sort of management action is to be taken (Ahn et al., 2002) and an objective system must be established to enable assessment of that change. Those who benefit from tourism have been shown to be more likely to support its development and to view the costs of tourism as less of a hardship than other residents do and so may favor its expansion at the expense of other stakeholder interests (Taylor, 1995). In developing and attracting tourism to an area, the goal is to achieve outcomes that obtain the best balance of benefits and costs for stakeholders, residents and tourists (Ap, 1992). An example of a misleading indicator is where it may not be the case that a decline in absolute numbers of visitors is necessarily bad, if there is a beneficial change in the type or quality of tourist associated with this decline overall (Strapp, 1988).

The sixth step of the conceptual framework has managers then *identify alternative opportunity class allocations*. This is only possible once new opportunities and capabilities
of an area are identified due to the better understanding of existing infrastructure, access and natural resources as determined in the second step of the LAC conceptual framework. Ahn et al. (2002) were able to determine how residents of different communities felt differently about tourism development so that a specific type of tourism might be most appropriately planned for their area or “zone”. In this way, the LAC conceptual framework would not only incorporate resource identification and conditions suitable to specific types of tourism development, but would also include resident attitudes and perceptions pertaining to tourism types in overall development plans.

The seventh step, identify management actions for each alternative is necessary so that pros and cons of each potential decision can be compared in order that the eighth step, evaluate and select an alternative may be completed. For example, once the limits of acceptable change for a study area had been established, Lawrence et al. (1994) used the Delphi technique to evaluate the results and establish goals so that tourism development could be planned to stay within the pre-set limits.

The final step, implement actions and monitor conditions, provides the feedback necessary to determine whether, what kind and at what rate change is occurring (Stankey et al., 1985). As would be expected, the LAC conceptual framework is an ongoing, cyclical assessment of a destination area and must be regularly used to monitor an area for impacts, ongoing change and degradation. It may indeed be the rate of change rather than the degree or kind of change that most leads to negative perceptions by local residents. In situations where development seems controlled or managed, fewer negative perceptions seem to exist (Madrigal, 1994; Horn & Simmons, 2002). In addition, Akis et al. (1992) found that it may
not be the increase in number of visitors that leads to negative perceptions, but rather the corresponding perceived negative impacts of the tourism-related development instead.

McCool's Limits of Acceptable Change provides the framework necessary to determine the indices needed to assess respondents' perceptions and feelings toward the level of development and change as it pertains to the tourism industry of their home area. In particular, this conceptual framework is presented as being most useful in dealing with problems such as carrying capacity (environmental, physical, as well as social) that are characterized by conflict and the need for compromise (Cole & Stankey, 1997). It is this need to determine such a balance between conflicting interests and existing characteristics that mark the search for sustainability.

In order to ensure ongoing support for local tourism initiatives, local (i.e. Native) residents must feel their concerns are being heard and impacts being addressed amidst the push for ongoing development. The types of conditions that are related to tourism development and that should be monitored for change have typically been grouped in the literature into three categories representing the economic, environmental and social characteristics of a destination area and host community (Ahn et al., 2002). While it is inevitable that tourism development will induce sociocultural changes upon the host destination, the type and magnitude of these changes depends upon the degree to which carrying capacity is met or exceeded in terms of ongoing development (Saveriades, 2000). While Getz (1992) argues that “capacity” is more of a management concept rather than an absolute limit to possible development, Mansfeld and Ginosar (1994) found that locals have a certain social carrying capacity threshold with respect to tourism development and that there
exists a tolerance level above which they will start to express their irritation and dissatisfaction with the ongoing outcomes of tourism development.

Perceptions of negative impacts due to tourism development have been shown to influence attitudes toward the industry and its purveyors (Carmichael, 2000). Such common concerns have included ongoing maintenance of local access to resources, participation in the benefits of development, and involvement in the decision-making process. The adequate meeting of these needs will better foster positive local support for new tourism initiatives (Simpson & Wall, 1999). However, despite Butler’s argument that as tourism development grows, residents can be expected to show increasing signs of resentment and hostility toward visitors, Akis et al. (1996) found that residents with more exposure to tourists tended to regard such interaction as positive. Wall (1996) found that attitudes varied due to distance from tourism centers, and so seemingly with the level of familiarity with the industry. Horn and Simmons (2002) found that in an area where tourism is more spread around with a lower ratio of tourists to residents, tourism is viewed as being under local control and so is generally supported whereas an area experiencing a series of rapid changes generates more negative perceptions. In this way, it is the rate and concentration of development that may most influence perceptions of impact.

Allen et al. (1988) also argue that local communities must be willing partners in the process and that their attitudes toward the industry and perceptions of tourism’s impacts on their way of life must be continually assessed. However, it may be the case where those in the community with most to gain from expansion of tourism already know how to sell themselves and others, and their support and ‘insider approach’ for a project may be more persuasive and seemingly acceptable, but may be no different or no more supportive of local
concerns than if such development was initiated by some outside source (Taylor, 1995). Johnson, Snepenger, and Akis (1994) found that residents who initially had high expectations for tourism development could lose feelings of support when their expectations for economic development are not met and perceived socioeconomic and environmental impacts exceed anticipated levels. Akis et al. (1996) also found that original expectations for development are often unrealistic and unable to be fulfilled and so negative attitudes toward the industry result. However, residents of communities already dependent on tourism are still able to differentiate between its economic benefits and social costs and that such awareness of negative consequences does not necessarily lead to opposition of further tourism development (King, Pizam & Milman, 1993). Therefore, education to increase knowledge of the benefits of tourism has been demonstrated to help improve overall support (Davis, Allen & Cosenza, 1988). It may be that even those residents most dependent on tourism, while shown to be the most tolerant of its costs, are still aware of those negatives, but feel either the benefit provided to themselves or to their home community outweighs the downside. An interesting proposition by Akis et al. (1992) suggests that as tourism development increases, the view that development is positive declines, but as the number of visitors increases, positive views of tourists increase. If this holds true, it may not be the increase in numbers of visitors that leads to negative perceptions, but rather the corresponding perceived negative impacts of the tourist-related development. It may also result that it is not the changes themselves that have limits, but is rather the rate of change that has residents dissatisfied (Horn & Simmons, 2002).
Tourism Area Life Cycle

It has been suggested that residents’ attitudes toward tourism may be directly related to the degree or stage of development of the area, in addition to reflecting the perspectives of various resident groups (Allen, Long, Perdue & Kieselbach, 1988). Early researchers assessed destination development in terms of three stages, including discovery, growth and decline, but it was Butler who first presented the now widely accepted more detailed conceptual framework of Tourism Area Life Cycle (TALC) destination development (Cooper & Jackson, 1989). Researchers have used TALC to track the progress of a tourism area by identifying the various stages of development and sequence of corresponding characteristics that most destinations commonly proceed through (Figure 2). TALC can serve as a conceptual framework providing guidance regarding appropriate action and management guidelines based upon the stage a destination is currently within and where it is heading.
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Although the validity of Butler's TALC has been well documented, there is still considerable difficulty in identifying the transitions between development stages, what influences different lengths of stages, or even the different aspects of certain stages
themselves (Haywood, 1986). However, it does appear that Butler’s framework can provide a useful conceptual basis for comparison with other destinations (Hovinen, 2002). Regardless of specific transitions between stages, it does appear that as the growth and demand for tourism continues to increase as the life cycle of a destination matures, the impacts upon a community also tend to become more apparent and in many cases, negative (Butler, 1980). Therefore, in order to best understand resident perceptions, one must also understand the context of the stage of development that the community is currently within (Upchurch & Teivane, 2000).

Using secondary data analysis drawn from information pertaining to available number of rooms, past and current number of visitors, past and current number of tourism-related businesses, rate at which these businesses began, ex-patriot information, especially pertaining to ownership in tourism related industries, policy and regulatory information concerning environmental and development issues, maps and area layout, and the implementation of basic infrastructure services (according to Butler, 1980), it will be possible to assess the current "stage" of development of San Pedro, Ambergris Caye. Furthermore, it has been suggested that in addition to tracking number of visitors, it is also possible to trace the development life cycle of a destination in terms of physical facilities, as well as administration structures (Cooper & Jackson, 1989).

Butler suggests that an evolution similar to the Product Life Cycle befalls a destination which is brought on due to such factors as changes in visitor preferences, gradual deterioration of the physical plant and facilities, and the change or disappearance of the original natural and cultural attractions that lead to the initial popularity of the area (Butler, 1980). Each stage is identifiable by a number of criteria and in understanding the life cycle
and recognizing its stages, measures may be taken to avoid the ultimate decline stage and enable a healthy and sustainable market to continue (Hovinen, 2002; Russell & Faulkner, 1999). According to Butler (1980), the tourism area life cycle most commonly follows an asymptotic curve and is characterized by six stages. The following description is taken from Butler’s 1980 article.

“The exploration stage is characterized by small numbers of visitors who first discover a destination. There would be no specific facilities to provide for them, so the use of local services would commonly lead to high contact between visitors and locals, but little impact upon the local community. The involvement stage occurs with greater and regular visitation leading local entrepreneurs to convert existing facilities or construct new ones to provide for visitors and a specific “tourist season” emerges, which is likely to somewhat impact the local residents. A well-established tourism market marks the development or take-off stage and with it the establishment of expansive tourism related infrastructure. Local involvement and control of development declines rapidly and there is the general replacement of smaller locally-controlled facilities by larger non-locally owned facilities along with the increased use of imported labor. Regional and national involvement in planning and provision of facilities will be necessary and are likely to now further conflict with local perceptions and goals. The consolidation stage marks the final stage of initial growth, with the rate of increase of visitors declining by this point. Control of marketing, development and visitor services is now mostly located in the origin-areas of visitors, with major franchises and chains now represented. There will likely now be general discontent over issues such as ownership, decision-making and rate of development among local residents. As peak numbers of visitors are realized and capacity levels of many environmental and social variables are exceeded, the stagnation stage is reached. Problems relating to the physical environment and human/cultural makeup can be expected and strenuous effort is needed to maintain previous levels of visitation. The decline stage occurs when capacity levels have been exceeded so that environmental degradation sets in with the subsequent reduction in attractiveness and competitiveness. At this point, the host area is unable to compete with newer attractions. Local involvement again increases as employees and residents are often able to purchase back facilities at falling prices as the market declines. If steps are taken to simply keep the product constant, a stage of stability may occur. With proper planning and foresight, this state is possible but requires ongoing redevelopment, maintenance of quality and appeal, and a respect for social and environmental carrying capacity levels. In other cases, a rejuvenation stage may be possible if sufficient capital and redevelopment is invested so that the image and attractiveness of an area is either restored or dramatically refocused (Butler, 1980)”.

There have been many studies conducted to assess the validity of Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle Model on developing tourist destinations, although it is generally accepted that the study of the life cycle can primarily be utilized for two purposes: to help guide strategic decision making and to help forecast ongoing development patterns (Cooper & Jackson, 1989). The conceptual framework can also be a useful tool for comparing one area with other destinations (Hovinen, 2002). Douglas (1997) suggests that while Butler’s life cycle model is a useful theoretical tool, there are inherent weaknesses in applying the conceptual framework to colonial and post-colonial societies. Hovinen (2002) suggests that in Lancaster County there is actually the coexistence of growth, stagnation, decline and rejuvenation all at once and that it is this combination that marks maturity and depicts the more common pattern of development. Haywood generally rejects the ability for any model to aid in predicting and planning because of the wide range of any number of intervening variables and infinite variations in social, geographical, political, and economic resources which exist in various destinations (1986). However, the Tourism Area Life Cycle Model continues to be utilized in assessments of tourism destinations.

In the years preceding their study, McMinn and Cater (1998) found Ambergris Caye to be experiencing great growth in tourism as evidenced through the growing number of rooms from four in 1965 to 606 in 1992 and increasing number of visitors which had reached 10-20,000 a year by the mid-nineties. As a result, they concluded that Ambergris was moving from the “involvement” to the “development” stage of the Tourist Area Life Cycle, mainly marked by the growing level of foreign ownership of hotels, increasing numbers of visitors and the presence of external organizations making changes within the community. As primary players in this industry, Developer-Tourists generally hold much of the power
among community leaders and take great effort to favorably influence development decisions. It is the development stage where economic, sociological, cultural and ecological impacts most become an issue upon the host community (Upchurch & Teivane, 2000). For the current study, it needed to be determined whether Ambergris was still within the Development stage, or if consolidation had been reached. According to Lindberg and Johnson (1997), it is the strength of resident values regarding economic gain that better predict attitudes than do values regarding disruption within the community. Their primary interest will likely be to continue to encourage the ongoing growth of the tourism industry within the host destination.

Hovinen (2002) found that, with little exception, tourism business owners and managers seem to lack any sense of a longer-range vision necessary for sustainable tourism development. In exploring long-term development data of the Isle of Man, Cooper and Jackson (1989) found that much of the development of the life cycle is dependent upon the actions of managers, as well as the type of setting of the destination. Russell and Faulkner (1999) sought to emphasize the role of entrepreneurs in creating the conditions for shifts from one stage in the evolutionary cycle to another. McMinn and Cater (1998) found that local residents felt a sense of exclusion and of alienation from local control over planning and development concerns which was attributable to foreign domination due to all three types of tourist groups, but particularly with respect to the local entrepreneurs, the Developer-Tourist. There is often uncertainty over the current stage of tourism development since individual businesses experience differing short-term problems pertaining to day-to-day operations. Issues may arise, such as lack of land for development or low average lengths of stay, so business owners may feel that later life cycle stages have already been reached,
warranting community based efforts to sustain visitation numbers, when in fact it may be that overall decline has not been reached (Getz, 1992; Hovinen, 2002). However, Butler would argue that if tourist areas are managed to keep development and visitation within certain capacity limits from the beginning, ongoing potential competitiveness and sustainability may be achieved (Butler, 1980).

It has been shown that those residents most economically dependent upon tourism favor its development and generally have more positive attitudes toward the industry than those who are not dependent upon tourism (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Prentice, 1993; Allen et al., 1988). Further, the majority of such economically dependent respondents are often most in favor of seeing the number of tourists visiting their home area increase. As determined by how tourism is perceived to personally affect one’s life and community, Lankford and Howard (1993) also found those who felt economically dependent upon tourism generally had the most benign view of its impacts. In the case of the mature destination of Waikiki, Sheldon and Abenoja (2001) found that residents had a strong sense of attachment toward their home community and favorable attitudes toward tourism in that it is this industry upon which their community’s sustainability depends. However, characterizing the perceptions and attitudes of residents toward tourism development as “euphoria,” “enthusiasm,” or “apathy” is no longer relevant, as local’s perceptions are now understood to be much more complex and multi-dimensional (Mansfeld & Ginosar, 1994).

According to Taylor (1995), it is those in the community with the most to gain from tourism expansion that are most in favor of its growth and so are less inclined to argue for limits to development. It is in this way that the entrepreneurs of a community may influence the ongoing evolution of a tourism destination. Further, this pressure to increase visitor
numbers could also widen community differences between various resident groups. However, unless there is recognition of limits to growth, tourists numbers can be expected to decline as the physical appearance of the destination and quality of experience deteriorate (Butler, 1980; Hovinen, 2002). To avoid this stage of stagnation and decline, effective strategic planning is required of both the industry and the community in order to address problems of overuse and create a more sustainable tourism industry (Butler, 1980). Getz (1992) would argue that it is more important to monitor important market, product and impact-related indicators which better reveal the overall health of the industry as opposed to simply seeking to identify the current stage of development.

However, TALC provides an important conceptual framework within which we may assess respondents' perceptions of change as they pertain to a particular life cycle stage and its corresponding characteristics, in particular the Developer-Tourist who has the most at stake in tourism’s ongoing growth. In addition, the individual perspectives and findings ascertained from the initial research of McMinn and Cater, along with the findings of the current study, may be placed within the larger conceptual framework of TALC by comparing the two points in time. To compare these findings, along with an analysis of other secondary data over this same time period, would be an opportunity to further explore the development and life cycle of this tourism product. In this way, we may discover, (1) whether the situation viewed on Ambergris Caye, a primary coastal tourism destination within a poor, developing nation, does follow within Butler's life cycle model and if so, (2) at what life cycle stage is Ambergris Caye currently within and (3) what is the level of satisfaction of this degree of development as viewed by the members of each resident typology group. In determining the current stage of development of Ambergris Caye, the perceptions of
development of the resident typology groups may be better understood in terms of the reality of the development as identified by its stage characterization.

In identifying the various conditions of a life cycle stage, such specific indicators would be most useful in measuring change in the acceptable condition as perceived by members of the public and notifying managers and planners of what variables should not be allowed to change in order to promote the most satisfaction with ongoing development. This research examined the impact of such change from the perspective of the three different defined resident typology groups directly affected by tourism development in order to help identify the particular characteristics that correspond with that stage and perceptions of satisfaction associated with it.

Last Settler Syndrome

First proposed by Nielsen, Shelby and Haas in 1977, the Last Settlers Syndrome (LSS) signifies a process where successive first-time visitors are likely to be more tolerant of certain conditions, such as crowding or commercialization, because that is how they first experienced the site and judgment is based upon how they first encountered it, whereas repeat or long-time visitors resent the changes and eventually stop returning altogether.

This syndrome is thought to account for discrepancies in reports of visitor satisfaction at sites that have changed over time because when visitors to a destination are surveyed, satisfaction levels appear to remain high because those users who may actually have become dissatisfied with the changes are no longer coming to the site and so cannot be interviewed and allowed to voice their concerns (Nielsen et al., 1997). Even though the setting has changed considerably, at any one point in time, most visitors express high levels of
satisfaction because those dissatisfied have been displaced (Getz, 1983). This is viewed as a limitation in the area of research procedure and has been linked with displacement theory (Getz, 1983).

Mention of this syndrome in the literature however, often refers to one group of recreationists or users resenting intrusions of another type or class of recreationist into what they deem their own resource area. Visitors to a site or destination often want that site to remain as it was when they first discovered it themselves and first or traditional users want to be the last ones allowed access to pursue their chosen activity (Moore, Scott & Graefe, 1998). Expanding further on this phenomenon, and for the purposes of this study, LSS has also been applied to changing attitudes in a host population where each successive wave of settlers tends to favor conditions remaining the same as when they arrived and are loathe to allow any further development or change beyond that which allowed them to relocate (Nielsen et al., 1977). In one study, urbanites choosing to relocate to a forested area because of its environmental attributes were resentful of logging taking place in the vicinity, although that is what had historically taken place in the area by other, long-time landowners (Wadsworth, 1999). This example also applies to a tourist destination in Hawaii where relocated ‘mainlanders’ were against the local initiative to build a golf course to encourage increased tourism to the destination. The claim was that they wished to maintain the pristine natural environment that brought them to the area in the first place, despite the lack of economic opportunity for local community members (Wyllie, 1998). In both cases, those who had most recently resettled in an area were against any further change or alteration to what drew them to the area in the first place, even if the original residents were in favor of it.
McCool and Martin (1994) found that people who specifically choose to live in a new area can become rapidly attached to it. In fact, highly attached respondents were found to live in the most tourism-developed areas. McCool and Martin (1994) also found that people living in these communities with higher levels of tourism development actually had the strongest sense of community attachment, but these residents also typically had lived in the community for the shortest period of time. It would appear that someone who has taken the time and expense to relocate to a new home area quickly becomes attached to those qualities that initially drew them there and would most likely be in favor of that area staying much the same as when they first encountered it. It has also been shown that residents with comparatively little exposure to tourism, often the newest arrivals to the island, may actually be more pro-tourism than those who have lived in the area for longer periods of time and have had to deal with its impacts to a greater degree (Akis, Peristianis & Warner, 1996; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). Length of residency has been shown to be influential in determining resident attitudes to tourism impacts, where the longer people have lived in a community, the more negative their attitudes tend to be (Davis et al., 1988; Brundt & Courtney, 1999), but other studies suggest that newer residents may have negative attitudes to tourism and tourists (Wyllie, 1998). A key realization of both LSS and LAC is that visitors often chose to become residents of a community while not realizing that the community, as evident by their own relocation, is still within a "development" stage of rapid change (Ap, 1992), as may be the case in San Pedro, with more growth likely to come.

Since Belize is home to such a large population of expatriate residents it is likely there will exist some instance of LSS, most notably among the Condo-Tourists. There can be numerous impacts associated with this particular class of visitor who often also expects to be
treated as a local. Often the syndrome is not mentioned in the tourism literature by name, but its telling characteristics make analysis possible and can be readily applied to any instance of newcomers, relocated retirees, or second home owners newly moved to a tourism destination. Like McMinn and Cater, Gerard and Gartner (1993) found that second home owners often influence the facilities, services and sociocultural aspects of the host community since they often direct community development as much or even more than the permanent resident population. Strapp (1988) argues that the inclusion of the growth of second home residential development within the life-cycle destination analysis may actually be shown to revitalize what is a seeming stagnating stage of development within the destination, resulting in a corresponding demand of area services and goods. This can be a positive aspect of year-round tourism development, but such demands can also be perceived as negative and disruptive, especially those placed upon local community development decisions.

Particularly in poor, developing regions of the world where retirement checks are found to go much further, there is often some friction or sense of alienation between certain local groups and these “outsiders” (McMinn & Cater, 1998). McMinn and Cater (1998) found that a “foreign clique” had emerged within the community of San Pedro where Condo-Tourists live apart from the rest of the community, do not work and most often have more money than the local population.

Such growing acrimony between Native-Residents and expatriate groups of both the Developer-Tourists and Condo-Tourists concerning development and economic growth throughout Belize was found to be of great concern to the Native-Residents in the earlier study of 1992. The feeling that both groups of expatriates demand an equal or even greater role in community development decisions has met with great resistance among Native-
Resident members due to the simple fact that decisions are sought after which best benefit those groups and Native-Residents express great concern over losing control of their home community and its development. However, it is likely that each expatriate group, while still fighting for their own interests, will not share the same concerns over future development options. Under the guise of LSS, relocated Condo-Tourists are expected to express greatest concern over those community attributes which first attracted them to the area of San Pedro and will likely argue for community decisions which protect those attributes, at the expense of other, more economically-minded development options.
III. RESEARCH DESIGN

Study Background

Research Area

An important consideration of sustainable tourism is that the industry remains relatively small-scale and that local community members are largely in control of the industry and decisions regarding the development of their home area (Prentice, 1993; McCool & Martin, 1994; Haywood, 1988). Recognizing the unique scenario characterizing the small Central American country of Belize, which is still minimally populated and largely environmentally intact, the Belizean government has chosen specific policy to both encourage tourism development while also maintaining the unique and beautiful characteristics that make Belize what it is (Government of Belize, 1990). Whereas tourism is the primary export product of the country, San Pedro, located about 45 miles off the coast directly to the east of Belize City on the island of Ambergris Caye, is the country’s primary tourism destination, responsible for bringing in over 40% of the country’s tourism revenue and generating nearly one-third of its overall GDP (Appendix A). Overall, Belize enjoys a wealth of natural and cultural resources, including a range of forest ecosystems covering about 60% of its territory, vast marine and underwater habitats, including the longest barrier reef in the Western Hemisphere, and a number of significant archeological Mayan ruins (Audubon Society, 1994). There also co-exists a number of distinct populations and indigenous cultures, including the Mestizos, the Garifunas, the Mayans, the Mennonites and a large number of expatriates from around the world.

The island of Ambergris Caye is about 25 miles long and largely inhabited only in specific pockets along its length, spreading out from the economic center of San Pedro.
There are approximately 12,500 (+/- 1000) full-time inhabitants on the island, many of which are illegal workers from other parts of Central America. Growing numbers of people are attracted by jobs within the industry and the large discrepancy in approximated population numbers is most likely due to the ever-growing number of illegal residents on the island, rather than seasonal fluctuations. There has also been an ongoing influx of expatriates moving onto the island from the U.S., Canada and Europe, as well as many residents from other parts of Belize seeking out better employment opportunities within the tourist industry. In addition, the government of Belize also actively works to attract expatriate retirees and business investors to the country through various tax credits and other business incentives (Government of Belize, 1990).

Ambergris Caye is the only area of Belize that has a fully bilingual native population along with the strong Hispanic influence one might expect (but would be unable to find) in other parts of Belize, due to its close proximity to and strong historical attachment with the Yucatan peninsula to the north. The mainland of Belize can be reached in two hours from either Miami or Houston, with San Pedro then only a short 20-minute trip by air. The island offers various water-based, coastal activities, as well as some nature-based experiences and a fun, “party” type atmosphere. The island has experienced continuous and steady growth related to the tourism industry since it’s first “discovery” as such a destination in the 1960s. Likely due to its specific location and bilingual, Hispanic population, the people of San Pedro feel themselves to be different and separate from the rest of country, both to their pleasure and chagrin. The people of San Pedro, Ambergris Caye and the rest of the country are heavily dependent upon tourism which generates a high percentage of the country’s annual
revenue, as well as numerous employment opportunities for a large proportion of the local and mainland population (especially during the height of the tourist season).

It has been presented that perceptions and attitudes of residents toward the effects of tourism are likely to be an important planning and policy consideration for the successful development, marketing and operation of existing and future tourism programs and projects (Lankford, 1994). By understanding the impacts of tourism on the environment and the people of Belize, it is more likely that a healthy and sustainable tourism based economy may emerge. To this end, there have been various research projects and studies conducted throughout Belize on the effects of tourism on the natural environment and on local residents' perceptions of how this industry affects their homes and their lives (McMinn & Cater, 1998). This study, through the use of secondary data sources, surveys and qualitative interviews, builds upon those earlier works and offers new insight into the unique characteristics of the area of San Pedro and its inhabitants by: 1) determining which community attributes different resident typology groups consider to be most important in making San Pedro a desirable place to live, 2) learning how the typology groups rate the current condition of those attributes and believe they may change due to continued tourism development, 3) analyzing the perceptions of each typology group within one of three tourism development conceptual frameworks, and 4) utilize the information to determine consensus among the three resident groups which may aid future community planning and tourism development.

Resident Typologies

The present study relies largely on the initial operational definitions as originally defined by McMinn and Cater (1998), including the Developer-tourist and the Condo-tourist,
utilized along with a third group, the Native-resident defined specifically for comparison within this research. Although specific to the scenario encountered an Ambergris Caye, the defining characteristics of the above typologies do fit within other typologies described by researchers. Although the three typologies employed for this study represent a specific, relevant development and growth scenario characteristic of many developing tourism destinations, in particular San Pedro, the makeup of these typologies does have its roots in research of the past. The Developer-tourist, indicative of a highly engaged resident, who may be directly dependent upon the industry to varying degrees, and generally has a great deal of contact with tourists, mirrors the typology described by Krippendorf (1987). The Condo-tourist can be equated to Krippendorf’s fourth group, those who have little to no direct contact with tourists and only see them in passing, but “still wish to have some say over the area’s development” (1987). This group can also be compared with Davis, Allen and Cosenza’s (1988) anti-tourism, anti-growth segment that is most against increased development. The Native-resident is more economically dependent upon the industry and may have much direct contact with tourists, but will often have less control over development and less status within the higher positions of the industry and so may feel differently about ongoing, increased development as opposed to the Developer-tourist who has greater affiliation at the higher levels, and as according to Mansfeld and Ginosar (1994), may show less irritation toward more development as a result. As displayed by these and other researchers, those groups most engaged with the industry and most likely to benefit from its development will most often be more tolerant of its impacts.

The purpose of this study was to assess and compare the perceptions of the three different resident typology groups as to their impression of the impacts of tourism.
development on their home community of San Pedro, Ambergris Caye, Belize. The three resident groups assessed are all considered extended-stay/permanent inhabitants of the island and include Native Residents, people who were born and raised either on Ambergris Caye or in some other area of Belize; Developer-Tourists, people who are foreign nationals or "expatriates" from another country who have come to Belize to acquire land and construct facilities as part of the tourism industry; and Condo-Tourists, also foreign nationals, who have relocated or retired to Belize and either own or rent homes in order to stay in the area for extended periods of time (McMinn & Cater, 1998).

**Study Methodology**

A survey questionnaire and an informal interview technique were used to collect information from members of each typology group in order to assess perceptions of the current and future condition of tourism development on their home community. Responses among the three resident groups, as determined through sociodemographic information collected as part of the questionnaire, were compared to ascertain similarities, differences and correlations between group members. The resulting data were also assessed to determine the perceived Limits of Acceptable Change according to each typology group and those condition characteristics that may or may not contribute to acceptable levels of that change. Further, the results were assessed according to the conceptual framework of Last Settler Syndrome to determine whether perceptions of acceptable change vary according to economic involvement or level of dependency on the tourism industry within a home community. In an effort to explore attitudinal opinions other than those listed in the survey questionnaire, informal interviews were also conducted with several key and involved
members of the community. Respondents were allowed to discuss any issues of greatest concern to them regarding development within San Pedro, with results used to elaborate on and validate the survey findings. In addition, the area of San Pedro was assessed according to Butler's Tourism Area Life Cycle using secondary data collection and analysis to determine current stage of development. The study was conducted during a six-week period from September to November 2002.

This research was undertaken as a quasi-experimental design study, in that members of each group were not randomly assigned and no experimental treatment was conducted on respondents, with a survey instrument used to question respondents as to their perceptions of tourism impacts upon their home area, including their opinion of those community attributes they consider to be most important, how they rate the current condition of those attributes and how they believe continued tourism development may change those attributes, as well as basic socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. A phenomenological qualitative research approach was also employed, primarily using an informal interview technique, to gather additional, in-depth information in the respondent’s own words to better depict the reality of community life in San Pedro (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). In addition, secondary data analysis was employed to determine the tourism area life cycle stage of development of Ambergris Caye by assessing past and current levels of construction, water usage, visitation numbers to the island and occupancy rates over time. The population of study included all extended-stay/permanent inhabitants of San Pedro, Belize over the age of 18.
Secondary Data Collection

As a means to determine the reality of current development within San Pedro and place the island with a particular stage of the Tourism Area Life Cycle, secondary data were collected. This consisted of the researcher contacting various service offices, government officials and the local Tourism Board in order to obtain information related to specific numbers concerning development and growth of tourism in the area. It should be noted that in a developing country, certain figures are difficult to obtain and some sources may be more reliable than others. For instance, there was no accurate census data or employment records seemingly available for the island. In addition, the scale and time of collection for this information varies widely, depending on the office or service.

A local representative of the Belize Tourism Board provided a most recent publication concerning current and past statistical figures pertaining to tourism throughout Belize (Belize Tourism Board, 2001). This publication tracks visitation numbers, country of departure, and reason for the trip of visitors, as well as revenue, room occupancy and rates and employment, specifically pertaining to the hotel industry. Some figures were reported for the entire Belize district, of which Ambergris Caye is a part, and others applied specifically to the island. The breadth of information enabled specific data to be ascertained concerning San Pedro and Ambergris Caye, as well as throughout Belize. The local Ambergris Caye Planning Board provided current figures on approved planning blueprints, once a formal letter of request was submitted by the researcher. In addition, a Board representative provided some information concerning policy and past practices. Local service offices were contacted for internal figures concerning level of service provided, such as local water usage and installations. Efforts were made to obtain information concerning
number of vehicle permits, permit policy, current or upcoming road construction and projects, or any other information concerning this issue, but any such usable information was not made available.

Survey Instrument

In much tourism related research, a primary means to gain an understanding of the many elements influencing a destination includes the collecting of opinion through the use of surveys and questionnaires of local residents, business owners, interest groups and other relevant stakeholders in the area as to their thoughts and concerns pertaining to the industry and their home community. Real and perceived conditions related to tourism development are most often grouped into three categories of impact, including economic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts (Williams, 1979; Johnson, Snejenger & Akis, 1994). These indicators of change may be assessed in the following ways: economic, which pertains to contributions of the tourism industry on the overall standard of living, increased employment opportunities or increased tax revenue; environmental, which includes the state of the natural environment, an area’s appearance, levels of crowding, noise and litter; and social and cultural indicators related to changes in value systems, individual behavior, community organizations, local resources, and traditional ceremonies or practices (King, Pizam, & Milman, 1993). These indicators are used to get at local opinion concerning levels of change and perceptions of development.

For this study, it was deemed necessary to use these same types of indicators in order to assess resident’s perceptions of change and level of satisfaction as it pertains to tourism development within San Pedro, Ambergris Caye. A specific list of twenty-five community
attributes, developed by Ahn, Lee and Shafer (2002) to assess how respondents from three different communities felt about tourism and level of development, was adapted to develop the survey instrument for this study (Appendix B). The original list of items was developed based on workshops previously conducted by Ahn, Lee and Shafer (2002) where the work of several other researchers was also reviewed (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Ross, 1992). This list was utilized for this study as it referred to those attributes most often used to describe a destination host community and items related to desirable/undesirable change due to tourism development (Ahn et al., 2002). Such a survey made up of these items was utilized to first understand how each typology group feels about various attributes making up their home community and then how they believe tourism development will ultimately affect them.

The survey used for collection of data included a scale of twenty-five attributes making up the tourism destination of San Pedro with respondents asked to score the items on three different issues. Respondents were first asked to rate these items in order to determine which of those attributes they consider most important in making San Pedro a desirable place to live, then as to how they perceive the current condition of these attributes and finally, how they think continued tourism development will likely change these conditions. For the first section, importance of attributes, the twenty-five items were scored on a 1 to 5 point Likert scale of Very Unimportant (VU), Unimportant (U), Neutral (N), Important (I), or Very Important (VI). This information on importance of community attributes was deemed necessary in order to further assess acceptable limits of change to those attributes as answered in the later section of the survey. In the next section, residents were asked to assess the current condition of those same twenty-five attributes in their community as Appalling (A), Poor (P), Neutral (N), Good (G), or Excellent (E), which were also given a 1 to 5 point
Likert rating for the analysis. The third section then asked respondents how they feel the same conditions might change if tourism development continues as it has in the past five years (or for the same time period as the resident has been present on the island to witness change). This response scale was also scored on a 1 to 5 point Likert scale and responses ranged from Large Change for the Worse (LW), Some Change for the Worse (CW), No Change (N), Some Change for the Better (CB), or Large Change for the Better (LB). The results provided 75 scored items per survey.

Basic sociodemographic information for each respondent was recorded in the final section of the survey, including gender, age, nationality, education, amount of time of residency on the island or in Belize, where the respondent previously resided and aspects of employment and ownership within the tourism industry so that respondents could be grouped into one of the three resident typology groups for analysis. The collection of such sociodemographical information is necessary in order to assign respondents to one of the three resident typology groups so that attitudes pertaining to perceptions of tourism development, most important community attributes and limits of acceptable change may be assessed, as well as to ensure representativeness of the overall sample. According to the operational definition of the typology classification system, all extended-stay/permanent residents of Ambergris Caye could be grouped into one and only one of the three resident typologies.

Data collection consisted of the pre-structured survey instrument being administered in person via a convenience sample to area respondents, in that the researcher sought out specific members of each typology group by inquiring where such members would work and frequent. Following initial consultation with local tourism and community leaders and one
week living within the community, various locations were chosen as viable distribution points for survey questionnaires via the snowball method where participants and people met were asked to recommend and give leads for where other potential respondents might be found. Such a method was deemed superior to a purely random sample of area homes which would likely result in overly large sample sizes of native residents. In order to remain most systematic, every hotel, restaurant, souvenir store, guide shop and specialty establishment along the four-mile length of “Front Street” facing the Caribbean Sea was targeted. Surveys were administered face-to-face by a single investigator and, in some instances, were left at the site to allow respondents some time to complete the survey with the investigator returning at a later time to retrieve it. If at the time the investigator returned and the survey was not yet completed, the investigator would subsequently return up to four more times to retrieve the survey if necessary, resulting in 161 usable surveys. These follow-up contacts resulted in a response rate of nearly 77%, with 77 Native Resident surveys collected, 45 Developer Tourist surveys and 39 Condo Tourist surveys.

Qualitative Method and Interview Process

Qualitative research enables researchers to “look at settings and people holistically; people, settings, or groups are not reduced to variables, but viewed as a whole” (Taylor & Bogden, 1984, p. 6). The use of qualitative methods in this research allowed the researcher to explore the unique perspectives of community residents in order to uncover a more detailed understanding of how ongoing tourism development and related community changes affect the lives of members of the various resident typology groups and their resulting opinion of ongoing development and change. As such, this method enabled the researcher to
better understand the participants from their own frame of reference (Bogden and Biklen, 1982). The specific qualitative research method used was a phenomenological approach that allowed the researcher to obtain an understanding of events and interactions of people through in-depth, open-ended interviews and participant observations (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Such a method allowed the researcher to better understand the meaning of events and interactions of ordinary people in the situations in which they find themselves (Bogden & Biklen, 1982). In this method, the researcher does not assume to know what things mean to the people being studied, but instead “attempts to gain entry into the conceptual world of their subjects in order to understand how and what meaning they construct around events in their daily lives” (Bogden & Biklen, 1982, p. 31).

As a primary form of data collection, informal interviews were conducted with several key members of private and public agencies and organizations related to tourism, ordinary employees, governmental organizations, and other citizens of the community, all found through questioning of other participants, residents or initial contact by the researcher. The qualitative interview method was used to gather descriptive data in the subject’s own words so that the researcher could better develop insights on how subjects interpret their community (Bogden & Biklen, 1982). This method of data collection also gave the researcher a perspective as to how the interviewee feels about specific ideas, thoughts and/or beliefs. Information in the qualitative interview process can be thought of as cumulative, with each interview building on and connecting with the others and adding to the quantitative information gathered through the more structured survey instrument. Crandall (1994) offers the following guidelines for this type of research within developing regions: Interviews of key informants, community leaders and tourism employees can provide general descriptions
of local people and their relation with tourism, as well as their own attitudes and behavior toward tour operations and development. Key informants can be defined as the tour operator’s employees and their families, local people related to tourism services, local people with key jobs in the host community, such as school teachers, churches, police, community groups and older people. Experts are defined as local or non-local people working in NGOs, governmental institutions, private consultants, and other people with a recognized knowledge base or expertise in tourism issues in the region or community to be studied (Crandall, 1994). During initial contacts, respondents were asked to identify these types of community leaders for San Pedro.

The unstructured interview is a free form of conversation in which the interviewer presents and explains the general nature of the issue and then asks the interviewee questions related to the issue. It is a flexible form in which the content of the questions, their sequence and their wording are chosen by the interviewer (Pizam, 1994), but with the express purpose of allowing the respondent to answer based on what he or she deems most relevant to the issue at hand. In this way, any issues not presented in the survey instrument, or those topics respondents may feel most strongly about, may be better expressed through the open-ended interview with the purpose of enhancing the findings of the quantitative part of the research study. The interview procedure followed the guidelines as presented by Bogden and Biklen (1982), including: 1) the use of open ended questions to ensure respondents will share their own perspectives rather than simply answering specific questions, 2) a period to warm up and establish rapport with participants prior to the start of the interview, 3) the interview itself, 4) the cool down where the interviewer asks for any further comments, thanks the participants for their time, and invites the participant’s input on preliminary findings or to
discuss the study’s findings where appropriate. Some of the issues brought up by the respondents included the dreadful road conditions, issues of health and crime, increasingly high cost of living and government corruption. A total of 45 area residents, including 15 Native Residents, 20 Developer Tourists and 10 Condo Tourists were interviewed in order to provide a cross-sectional view of area attitudes. Note taking was the chosen method for preserving information collected during the interviews because many interviews took place in casual settings where the use of a tape-recorder could be considered intrusive or likely to impinge on the flow of conversation.

Method of Analysis

Three forms of data collection were utilized in order to learn of the varying perceptions of local residents pertaining to ongoing tourism development. Secondary data was collected and assessed to determine the reality of the current stage of development within San Pedro, survey instruments allowed a quantifiable means to compare varying perceptions of the three resident typology groups, and qualitative analysis of informal interviews was analyzed to further enhance the findings of the surveys and add additional, more in-depth information to the results. These three types of collected data and analysis resulted in the ability to triangulate the findings for further validity of the research. The purpose of data triangulation is “to validate each data collection method and sample against an other source and/or a second method” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 283), so that where the findings are the same or overlap from both the survey, interviews, and/or secondary data it can be determined that the findings are both stronger and better grounded in the reality of the situation being studied.
Secondary Data

The secondary data analysis employed to determine the tourism area life cycle stage of development of Ambergris Caye was conducted by determining past and current levels of construction, water usage, number of jobs provided, visitation numbers to the island, occupancy rates over time and earned revenue so that trends and direction of development could be ascertained. These data were graphed to assess trends and significant patterns in the growth and development of tourism on Ambergris Caye. Trends were then compared to the typical Tourism Area Life Cycle model in terms of the defined stages and curve shape. The perceptions of the three resident groups could then be assessed in terms of how their perspective of change and development fit within the reality of the situation in San Pedro.

Survey Data

The mean values for each of the twenty-five items making up the three sections of the survey (75 scored items) were assessed according to the three resident typology groups. Statistical comparison could then be conducted among individual items as perceived by the different resident groups, as well as the establishment of the x and y coordinates necessary for a graphical analysis of the findings for each resident group.

By comparing means among resident typology groups, any statistically significant differences pertaining to the importance of community attributes, the perception of current conditions and feelings toward changes likely to be incurred due to future tourism development as perceived by the three resident typology groups could be determined, as well as any similarities. This comparison was accomplished using the Kruskal-Wallis statistic, a non-parametric test used to compare three or more independent groups of sampled data. This
statistic was deemed appropriate for this study because, unlike the parametric independent
group ANOVA, the Kruskal-Wallis requires no assumption about the normal distribution of
the sample population and is very effective with ordinal data (Siegel, 1956).

As with most other non-parametric tests, the Kruskal-Wallis uses the ranks of the data
rather than their raw values to calculate the statistic. The test first ranks all the values from
low to high, regardless of which group the value belongs. If two values are the same, then
they both get the average of the two ranks for which they tie. The smallest number gets a
rank of 1. The largest number gets a rank of N, where N is the total number of values in all
the groups, in this study, N = 75, because there were 75 scored items per survey (Kerlinger &
Lee, 2000). The ranks are then summed within in each group and if the sums of the ranks are
very different, the P value will be small. The discrepancies among the rank sums are
combined to create a single value called the Kruskal-Wallis statistic (sometimes referred to
as H). A larger value of the Kruskal-Wallis statistic corresponds to a larger discrepancy
among rank sums, signifying a statistically significant difference between the groups in that
they are not likely to have come from the same population (Siegel, 1956).

On the basis of chance alone, the sum or average of the ranks in each group would be
expected to be about the same, so if they are not, and the higher or lower ranks tend to be
clustered in one of the groups, it can then be inferred that “something” other than chance has
operated within the sample findings (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Once this was determined, the
Wilcoxin method, the non-parametric equivalent to the t-test used to compare two samples
that cannot be assumed to be normal when the data are discrete, was performed to determine
between which of the three groups the statistically significant difference existed. In addition,
the list of twenty-five variables were grouped into the three categories of environmental,
economic and community/social characteristics for further ease in comparison between the three resident typology groups.

In order to gain a better understanding of the perceptions of each group pertaining to current conditions and how they feel those conditions might change as a result of continued tourism development, an analysis deemed Condition-Change was conducted. Condition-Change analysis, first utilized by Ahn, Lee and Shafer (2002), was patterned after Importance-Performance analysis of expectation as well as satisfaction in not only assessing the performance of an item, but also the importance of that item as a determining factor in satisfaction to the respondent (Martilla and James, 1977). For this study, the third variable, importance of the attribute, was also included to better inform the survey process in determining that these survey variables were in fact important to the respondents in the first place in characterizing their home area. The Condition-Change scaling of these two coordinates for each variable enabled a visual representation of these perceptions as measured attributes are displayed in graphical form.

The Condition-Change analysis was conducted by plotting conditions based on how conditions of the variables or attributes are perceived to exist now versus how it is felt they might change in the future as perceived by each of the resident typology groups. The analysis resulted in four quadrants. The midpoint value of No Change (3) was used as the divider on the “Change in Condition” y-axis, because change is generally viewed as either positive or negative in nature, whereas the mean value was used as the divider for the “Current Condition” x-axis, since this is rated more on a continuum (Ahn et al. 2002). Further utilizing the methodology developed by Ahn et al., each quadrant was summarized according to those items that plotted within them. Quadrant I encompasses those conditions
currently perceived to be below average, but which tourism could improve upon, labeled “Tourism could help;” quadrant II, labeled “Keeping things good,” portrays those conditions which are currently above average and which tourism is perceived to be able to help continue as is or improve upon; quadrant III shows those items which are perceived to be below average and which tourism development may make even worse, labeled “Bad and worse; and quadrant IV portrays those good conditions that tourism development could negatively impact and was labeled “Tourism could hurt.”

The attributes plotted within quadrants I and IV have the greatest perceived potential for both positive and negative changes that may result from continued tourism development in that these conditions being of poor condition that are improved upon or of good condition that are negatively impacted upon may be the most recognizably impacted to area residents. The third quadrant, labeled “Bad and worse;” is also of interest in that the condition of attributes within this quadrant, already perceived to be poor, may signify those impacts leading to the most negative affects due to tourism development so that they may be identified and then minimized. The second quadrant, “Keeping things good,” contains those positively perceived attributes which will hopefully maintain its current good quality or even improve.

Qualitative Data

For the qualitative assessment of the informal interviews and field observations, notes were transcribed and then content analyzed for dominant themes with pertinent statements highlighted and then used to identify the most important topics of thought. Specifically, from the time data had begun to be collected, a constant comparison method was used to analyze
The data. This method “combines inductive category coding with a simultaneous comparison of all social incidents observed. As social phenomena are recorded and classified, they are also compared across categories. Thus the discovery of relationships, or hypothesis generation, begins with the analysis of initial observations, undergoes continuous refinement throughout the data collection and analysis process…” (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 107).

In order to utilize the constant comparison method for analysis, a coding system was developed by listing every theme, concept, and topic identified from the data with a word or phrase assigned each coding category identifying each theme, concept and topic within the transcribed data. All the data were then sorted by placing each piece of relevant data under the appropriate code heading. It was then possible to further refine the analysis of the data by comparing all related data to each theme, concept and topic and determine how the data related to these themes, trends and patterns of the participants and their responses (Taylor & Bogden, 1984). The final topics of discussion were also grouped into the three categories of environmental, economic and community/social, as was the list of twenty-five variables from the survey, to enable greater ease in comparison between the three resident typology groups. The obtained information was utilized to further inform and add to the discussion concerning the findings obtained through the survey questionnaires.

Limitations

Possible limitations include the fact that the research was conducted during the off-season and as a result, many expatriate owners were out of the area and unable to be surveyed. The survey was also conducted as a convenience sample, with a possible result being a lack of randomization and a lack of generalizability, however the use of the non-
parametric statistical tests will likely overcome that issue as the normal distribution of the sample does not have to be assumed. There were also a limited number of surveys administered, since surveys had to be administered in person, resulting in a sample size of 161 total. This sample size may hinder the ability to relate these findings to other developing regions or coastal tourism destinations. Threats to internal validity include the fact that the survey instrument was an extension of another measurement instrument, and as such lacked the validity testing inherent to other tests but were minimized by having first presented the instrument to tourism professionals and stakeholders in order to gain their assessment.

Problems with qualitative research can exist pertaining to the credibility of such studies if proper procedures are not followed. To ensure reliability, extensive research logs were kept of all contacts, interviews and observations in order to “leave an adequate amount of evidence that interested parties can reconstruct the process by which the investigators reached their conclusion” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 230). In addition, the method of triangulation, through the use of three different data collection methods including secondary sources, a quantitative survey instrument and the use of open-ended interviews and field observations, was utilized to enhance overall credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
IV. RESULTS

Introduction

The following section discusses the findings collected through the three data collection methods: statistics assessed from secondary sources, results compiled via the survey questionnaire, and the qualitative findings collected through interviews and observations. The secondary data analysis provides the information needed to understand the current stage of tourism development in San Pedro. The questionnaire results provide quantitative information allowing comparison between the three typology groups pertaining to their perceptions of tourism related impacts. The results of the informal interviews allows a deeper understanding of these perceptions and aids in assessing the perceptions of each of the three typology groups relative to the three tourism development conceptual frameworks used for this discussion: Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle, Limits of Acceptable Change and Last Settler Syndrome.

Secondary Data Analysis

The following section describes the current condition of visitation, construction, infrastructure and utility usage pertaining to the level of development currently existing on Ambergris Caye. A large section is devoted to the visitation patterns and use levels associated with the tourism industry, as well as the construction that must also take place in ongoing support of this growth. The information provided is intended to serve as a ‘snapshot’ in time of the reality of the built environment and tourism destination experience within which local residents live and must contend. It should be noted that in a developing country, such figures are somewhat difficult to come by and may not be completely accurate.
In addition, many of the following figures vary in their scaling and years of collection. However, the intent in reporting these statistics is to convey overall patterns of growth and development trends.

The tourism market in Belize as a whole continues to increase by what has largely been word of mouth exposure and a devoted repeat market (Belize Tourism Board, 2001). Despite the strong web presence maintained by the country of Belize, there is still a lack of general recognition throughout the world. This is changing, however, with the recent exposure due to such media pieces as the U.S. television show, ‘Temptation Island.’ The Visitor Expenditure and Motivation Survey of 2000, a study conducted every two or three years by the Belize Tourism Board and the Central Bank of Belize (2000), reveals that of the nearly 2000 visitors surveyed, 44% of the respondents stated that they visited San Pedro during their trip. Overall visitation numbers to Belize were 176,054 in 1998 and 195,955 in 2001 (Figure 3). Although the last two years show nearly break even numbers, it can still be considered significant that the previous year’s numbers were even maintained at that level considering the severe impacts felt in 2001 due to the US terrorist attacks of September 11th.
However, the time period of data collection on these figures is not sufficient to determine a true pattern of growth over time. Statistical data concerning tourism expenditures, number of hotels, rooms, beds, room revenue and employment, however, is more readily available. Therefore, these statistics are analyzed in the following sections in order to ascertain the ongoing growth and development patterns for Belize and Ambergris Caye. Further, the following figures will show that Ambergris Caye, as the primary tourism destination within Belize, has continuously provided a large portion of overall revenue earned and employment opportunity for the people of Belize.

Tourism expenditures within the country as a whole have been continuing to rise at an increasing rate. Overall expenditures in 1988 were Bz$44.2 million, and had increased to Bz$241 million by 2001 (Figure 4), signifying a pattern of growth of more than five-fold. Tourism expenditures appear to increase in something of a stair step pattern, taking a rather large jump one year, and then leveling off for the next two years or so, with another large increase following that. The most recent leveling off of this type was in 2001. While

![Figure 4: Tourism Expenditures for Belize 1988-2001 (Source: Belize Tourism Board 2001)](image-url)
tourism visitation and expenditures were certainly affected by the September 11th attacks in the United States, it will still be unclear whether the stair step pattern will continue as it has over the past fourteen years, signified by a larger jump to come in 2002 or 2003, or if this is the beginning of an overall leveling off in tourism expenditures, and so tourism related growth, within Belize.

Room revenues contribute a significant portion of overall tourism expenditures in nearly every type of tourism destination. The same is true for Belize. The $66.7 million earned through room revenue in 2001 (Figure 5) for Belize as a whole, signifies 27.7% of the total tourism expenditures of $241 million spent in country for that year. Overall room revenue for Belize has continued to increase over the past four years, after a leveling off between 1995 and 1998 (Figure 5). Other figures discussed in this section also depict some type of economic slowing for this time period, as well. The pattern of growth in room revenue for Ambergris followed a similar pattern, with increasing growth marking the past four years following a leveling off between 1995 and 1998.

Figure 5: Room Revenue for Belize and Ambergris Caye (Source: Belize Tourism Board, 2001)
Throughout this time period, Ambergris Caye has continued to generate a significant proportion of the overall room revenue of the Belize total. As the total room revenue earned in Belize has nearly doubled from 1993 at Bz$33.3 million to 2001, at Bz$66.7 million, Ambergris has continued to provide nearly half of that revenue on its own, most recently contributing 45.2% of the total in 2001 (Figure 6). It is of note that there has been a great deal of growth in the Cayo district, an area on the mainland largely known for its ecotourism and jungle type adventures, as well. This growing market has still not taken much away from the popularity of Ambergris, but visitors are increasingly choosing to split their trips between the two areas, enjoying both the marine resources of Ambergris and the forest and historic

![Figure 6: Percent Room Revenue by Area – 2001 (Source: Belize Tourism Board, 2001)](image)

resources of the mainland. As the home district for the main economic center and primary point of enplanements, Belize City, the Belize district also generates a considerable share of the room revenue for the country. However, no other district can compare to the impressive
market share enjoyed by Ambergris Caye, earning 45.2% of overall room revenue while only having 22.9% of all the rooms available in Belize.

The number of hotels on Ambergris Caye, and throughout Belize as a whole, has been on a steady incline for at least the past two decades. The first hotel opened in 1965 and there were only 37 hotels with 413 rooms on Ambergris Caye in 1988, whereas thirteen years later in 2001, there were 63 hotels, signifying a 70.3% increase in hotels and 1020 rooms, or a 147% increase in rooms (Table 1). There is a tremendous jump in rooms from 1996 to 1997, following a year of no increase in rooms for the island. This corresponds to the great growth for this time period on Ambergris evident from other data analyzed in this section. For the country of Belize, there was an even greater rate of growth, with 183 hotels and 1855 rooms in 1988, to 418 hotels in 2001, a 128.4% increase in hotels from 1988, and 4463 rooms in 2001, or a 140.6% increase in overall rooms from 1988.

Table 1: Number of hotels, number of rooms and percent change in rooms for Ambergris Caye and Belize

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ambergris Caye</th>
<th>Belize total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of hotels</td>
<td>Number of rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Belize Tourism Board, 2001
The number of hotel beds also rose at a similar rate, with 775 beds available on Ambergris Caye in 1988 and 1470 available in 2001 (Figure 7). Whereas the number of hotel beds for Ambergris Caye has shown some ebb and flow during the time period analyzed, overall numbers have nearly doubled over the past fourteen years. However, there was a noticeable drop from 2000 to 2001. It cannot be determined until further numbers are collected whether the up and down pattern of overall growth will continue, or whether this is indicative of the beginning of a more dramatic drop or leveling off.

The rate of growth in number of hotel beds for the country of Belize has been steadily increasing as well and has more than doubled in this same time period. The available beds for Belize as a whole were 3180 in 1988 and 7187 in 2001 (Figure 8) with more of an overall stair step pattern of growth, signified by a rather large jump in number of beds one year, and then a leveling off in this number for the next two years or so, with another large increase following that, with a continued pattern of overall growth.
Occupancy rates for Ambergris Caye over the past five years shows a fairly consistent overall pattern of occupancy, but with a steady increase in overall numbers, even considering that the number of beds on the island has been increasing as well (Figure 9). To this end, the best numbers are shown to have been most recently in 2001, despite the noticeable drop in September of that year due to the US terrorists attacks. However,
September and October are traditionally the low season for tourism in Belize, with the traditional high season of the year being from December to March, marking the Christmas holidays through Easter and Spring Break vacation time periods.

The average room rates for both Ambergris Caye and the country of Belize have also been increasing, with the average for Ambergris being the highest of any area of the country and well above the overall Belize average (Figure 10). The average room rate per night for Ambergris is currently at Bz$204.31, signifying an increase of Bz$38.02 in just eight years. While the average for the country of Belize as a whole is only at Bz$150.91, this does show an increase of Bz$44.41 over the same time period. The drop in average room rates for Ambergris Caye evident from 1996 to 1997 is most likely due to the increase of 10 in the number of hotels on the island (Table 1), leading to greater competition among area hotels for visitors. The average room rates for Ambergris Caye have just recently recovered back to the 1996 rates, but shows a fairly steady increase in these rates from 1998 to 2001.

Figure 10: Average Nightly Room Rates for Ambergris and Belize (Source: Belize Tourism Board, 2001)
Of great importance in considering the contribution of tourism to the economy of a region or country, is the number of jobs that tourism contributes to the people of Belize. One indicator is the number of direct employment positions available at hotels. This number has also been on the rise for Ambergris Caye with 407 hotel positions available in 1994, increasing to 664 positions in 2001 (Table 2), out of the total hotel employment of 2,934 for Belize as a whole.

Table 2: Hotel Employment by Year for Ambergris Caye and Belize

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ambergris</th>
<th>Belize total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>1816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>2107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>2092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>2186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>2203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>2570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>2769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>2934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Belize Tourism Board, 2001

The preceding discussion has focused on the statistics related directly to the tourism industry itself on Ambergris Caye and throughout Belize. In addition to these indicators of growth and visitation to the island, there are a number of additional indicators that can be tracked to give an idea of the growth and change to a destination. In addition to the ever increasing number of hotels constructed related to the tourism industry, as depicted in Table 1, the approval and construction of other buildings in the area also give an idea as to the rate of growth and change. The following table (Table 3) depicts the approved proposals for all hotels, second home condos signifying the ever growing presence of the Condo Tourist, private residences and

Table 3: Number of Approved Planning Committee Blueprints by Type – 1993-1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hotels</th>
<th>Condominiums</th>
<th>Individual Residences and Apartments</th>
<th>Other Establishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ambergris Caye Planning Committee, 1999
apartments, as well as the construction of other establishments, such as stores, guide shops, and office buildings. It should be noted that the number of condominiums depicted in this table are actually complexes, housing any number from 15 to over 30 individual units per complex, most often centered around a central open area facing the ocean. The relatively large number of 6 and 5 complexes built in 1997 and 1998, respectively, mirrors the growth of this period as evident in other points of discussion throughout this section. In addition, the number of condo complexes year to year closely matches the number of hotels, signifying a shift in the overall type of tourist market for the island or at least a greatly growing component of the Condo Tourist. The number of hotels approved by the San Pedro Planning Committee may differ from the number of hotels actually in existence year by year as depicted in Table 1 due to the fact that the time between approval and actual construction has likely lagged.

The number of tour guide positions, traditionally the most highly sought out tourism related jobs, makes up about a third as many positions as those now available at hotels on Ambergris Caye (Table 4). Perhaps more importantly, the number of tour operators in existence has greatly increased over the past three years, indicating a tremendous growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tour Guides</th>
<th></th>
<th>Tour Operators</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999/2000</td>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>1999/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambergris</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize total</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Belize Tourism Board, 2001

in the entrepreneurial initiative of area residents and foreign born business developers and likely offering even more tour guide and related positions in the future. This tourism related development has required a corresponding increase in related facilities and services. One
example of this is the increase in water connection hookups on the island over the past nine years (Figure 11). Ambergris Caye must produce its water, relying upon a technologically advanced water treatment system to turn salty seawater into potable water. On average, 9,446,727 gallons of water were produced each month in 2002, versus an average of only 6,372,725 gallons each month in 2000. Information on water production prior to 2000 is not available due to the destruction of records resulting from a hurricane in 1999. The number of water customers has increased from only 464 in 1994 to 1,849 total in 2002, serving not only the rising number of new hotels, but also the increasing number of homes, apartment complexes and businesses. It should be noted that these hookups are counted the same whether they service a single residence home, an individual condo, or an entire apartment complex, so the number of establishments being serviced is likely even higher than the 1,849 recorded.

Figure 11: Number of Water Customer Accounts for Ambergris Caye (Source: Belize Water LTD, 2002)
Survey Data Analysis

The following section discusses the findings obtained through the use of the survey instrument. The survey assessed the perceptions of three resident typology groups about, level of importance, current condition and likely future impacts on these community attributes due to ongoing tourism development. The use of the survey method provides quantitative evidence of the differences and similarities among the three defined resident typology groups of San Pedro, Belize. This, in turn, enables the categorization of the important patterns of perception that allows analysis of the three typology groups relative to the three development conceptual frameworks used for this discussion: Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle, Limits of Acceptable Change and Last Settler Syndrome.

The twenty-five variables listed for each of the three issue areas were organized into three a priori categories, environmental, economic and community/social (Table 5). The first

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Attributes</th>
<th>Economic Attributes</th>
<th>Community/Social Attributes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Litter</td>
<td>Number of Jobs</td>
<td>Community Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Erosion</td>
<td>Personal Income</td>
<td>Awareness of Local Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Uncontrolled Development</td>
<td>Amount of Local Tax</td>
<td>Historical Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Natural Environment</td>
<td>Attractiveness to Invest</td>
<td>Amount of New Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Pollution</td>
<td>Availability of Hotels</td>
<td>Quality of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of Shopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount of Noise Heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety from Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chance to Meet New People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of Entertainment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the following subsections of importance of community attributes, current condition of community attributes and potential for change due to future tourism development are organized according to the three grouped categories described above. The findings are discussed according to the differences and similarities among the three resident typology groups within these three categories.

Level of Importance of Community Attributes

The first of the three issues addressed in the survey, importance of community attributes, was scored on a Likert scale of Very Unimportant (1), Unimportant (2), Neutral (3), Important (4), and Very Important (5). The following discussion analyzes the survey findings of differences and similarities among the three resident typology groups on individual attributes grouped within the three defined categories of environmental, economic and community/social.

The three resident typology groups rated all the twenty-five variables at a score of at least 3.00, neutral, or higher (Table 6). Therefore, all the attributes listed in the survey instrument concerning their home community were deemed important to members of each resident typology group to some degree, verifying the original items put forth by Ahn, Lee
importance ranging from nearly neutral to important to very important according to the three
and Shafer (2002) as important. However, there were varying degrees of reported

Table 6: A Comparison of Perceived Level of Importance of Community Attributes among Three Resident Typology Groups in San Pedro, Belize using the Kruskal-Wallis Statistic to test for differences among means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Item</th>
<th>Native Resident Group 1 n=77</th>
<th>Developer Tourist Group 2 n=45</th>
<th>Condo Tourist Group 3 n=39</th>
<th>Kruskal-Wallis Statistic</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference between which groups²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of litter</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>5.5715</td>
<td>0.06168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of erosion</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.9789</td>
<td>0.08295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of uncontrolled development</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.2826</td>
<td>0.19372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the natural environment</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.2213</td>
<td>0.19976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of pollution in the area</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.1271</td>
<td>0.20939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of wildlife</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.9204</td>
<td>0.63114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of open space</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.1253</td>
<td>0.93928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of hotels</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>21.2154</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
<td>Group 3 is different from other two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>16.2923</td>
<td>0.00029</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>13.0723</td>
<td>0.00145</td>
<td>Groups 1 is different from other two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness to invest</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>12.7804</td>
<td>0.00168</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of local tax</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>9.2383</td>
<td>0.00986</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of traffic</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>12.8219</td>
<td>0.00164</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of shopping facilities</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>11.9573</td>
<td>0.00253</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical buildings</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>11.4218</td>
<td>0.00331</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of local culture</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>8.1413</td>
<td>0.01707</td>
<td>Groups 1 is different from other two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of noise heard</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>8.0447</td>
<td>0.01791</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>7.5771</td>
<td>0.02263</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of entertainment</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>7.2232</td>
<td>0.02701</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of transportation</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>6.2564</td>
<td>0.04380</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to meet new people</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.6757</td>
<td>0.05855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of restaurants</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.6927</td>
<td>0.26019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of new buildings</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.7922</td>
<td>0.67295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>0.2261</td>
<td>0.89311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety from crime</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>0.1093</td>
<td>0.94680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Bold items indicate those variables which were shown to be statistically significantly different at p<.05, using the Kruskal-Wallis statistic.
² The difference between individual means is given if the Wilcoxin statistic indicated a statistically significant difference at p<.05 once the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference among the means at p<.05.
resident typology groups. Although scores on amount of litter and amount of erosion within
the environmental category did show a statistically significant difference between the Native
resident group and the Developer Tourist group at p<.10 using the Kruskal-Wallis test (Table
6), the difference was slight. Interestingly, these were the only statistically significant
differences among the resident groups pertaining to level of importance of any of the
environmental attributes at all. There were no other variables from the environmental
category where the mean scores differed on level of importance according to the three
resident groups. Therefore, all three resident groups considered all environmental attributes
equally important.

Conversely, for the second category, economic, every variable showed a statistically
significant difference for degree of importance among the three groups (Table 6). For
availability of hotels, the Condo Tourist group differs from the other two groups in finding
this attribute to be the least important attribute to any group of them all. In fact, all of the
variables deemed least important (still over 3.00, but only slightly so) are reported by the
Condo Tourist group. These include not only availability of hotels within the economic
category, but also the quality of transportation, historical buildings, variety of shopping
facilities, and attractiveness to invest for the community/social category. In these cases,
Condo Tourists differ from the Native Resident group in that Native Residents find all of
these to be of much greater importance than either Condo Tourists or Developer Tourists.
Continuing with the economic category, Native Residents differ from both Developer
Tourists and Condo Tourists on level of importance of personal income, as well as number of
jobs, rating both as more important.
The third category, community and social, showed a number of statistically significantly different levels of importance among the three resident typology groups, as well (Table 6). For amount of traffic, the Native Resident group is again different from the other two groups with a score of 3.95, but with Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists finding this issue to be of greater importance than the Native Resident group at 4.57 and 4.46 respectively. The same is true for amount of noise heard with Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists showing this to also be of greater importance than does the Native Resident group. Native Residents find community spirit more important than either of the other two groups and believes awareness of local culture to also be more important than does the Developer Tourist or the Condo Tourist group.

Current Condition of Community Attributes

The current condition of community attributes was also scored on a Likert scale, using the rating of Appalling (1), Poor (2), Neutral (3), Good (4), and Excellent (5). This section discusses the survey findings by analyzing the differences and similarities among the three resident typology groups on individual variables grouped within the three defined categories of environmental, economic and community/social.

Concerning the current condition of the variables listed within the environmental category, most variables are rated below the mean by each of the resident groups (Table 7), but only two variables are statistically significantly different at p <.05. The current condition of amount of litter is rated the worse by all the groups, however Native Residents do not view the current condition as bad as the other two groups at 2.61 versus 1.89 for the Developer Tourists and 2.13 for the Condo Tourists. For amount of open space, the Native Resident
differs from the Developer Tourist group, in that the Developer Tourists view the current condition to be well above neutral at 3.64, while the Native Residents view the current

Table 7: A Comparison of Perceived Current Condition of Community Attributes among Three Resident Typology Groups in San Pedro, Belize using the Kruskal-Wallis Statistic to test for differences among means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Item</th>
<th>Native Resident Group 1 n=77</th>
<th>Developer Tourist Group 2 n=45</th>
<th>Condo Tourist Group 3 n=39</th>
<th>Kruskal-Wallis Statistic</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference between which groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of open space</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>16.2358</td>
<td>0.00029</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 2 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of litter</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>13.8989</td>
<td>0.00096</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the natural environment</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>6.4560</td>
<td>0.03964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of uncontrolled development</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>5.9905</td>
<td>0.05002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of pollution in the area</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.8570</td>
<td>0.08817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of erosion</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>4.6915</td>
<td>0.09578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of wildlife</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.2694</td>
<td>0.53010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>11.4467</td>
<td>0.00327</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>10.9973</td>
<td>0.00409</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness to invest</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>10.9918</td>
<td>0.00410</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of hotels</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.9378</td>
<td>0.23018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of local tax</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.6855</td>
<td>0.26112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of transportation</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>19.6528</td>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of shopping facilities</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>18.7602</td>
<td>0.00008</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>14.3659</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of new buildings</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>12.6464</td>
<td>0.00179</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of restaurants</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>10.6283</td>
<td>0.00492</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety from crime</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>8.1436</td>
<td>0.01705</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of traffic</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>6.0097</td>
<td>0.04955</td>
<td>Groups 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to meet new people</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.2940</td>
<td>0.11683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of noise heard</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.0254</td>
<td>0.13363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of entertainment</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.9430</td>
<td>0.22958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical buildings</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.5629</td>
<td>0.27764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of local culture</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.4233</td>
<td>0.29770</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.7024</td>
<td>0.42691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Bold items indicate those variables which were shown to be statistically significantly different at p<0.05, using the Kruskal-Wallis statistic.
2 The difference between individual means is given if the Wilcoxon statistic indicated a statistically significant difference at p<0.05 once the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference among the means at p<0.05.
condition to be below neutral at 2.95, a statistically significant difference toward the poorer end. Quality of the natural environment shows a statistically significant difference among the three typology groups based on the Kruskal-Wallis statistic, but not so between individual means using the Wilcoxin test at $p < .05$. Most importantly, however, is that the three groups rate the current condition of nearly all of the environmental attributes, except quality of the natural environment and amount of wildlife, as well as amount of open space for the Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists, as below neutral.

Two variables within the economic category, number of jobs and attractiveness to invest, show a statistically significant difference among the three resident typology groups. Native Residents differ in these cases from the other two, rating the current condition of both variables at a higher score, with number of jobs rated at 3.39, and attractiveness to invest at 3.73 (Table 7). In these cases, the Condo Tourist group rates the current condition of these attributes the lowest of the three groups and is the only group to rate any of the current conditions in this category as less than neutral, with number of jobs at 2.92. The Developer Tourist group rates current condition of number of jobs only slightly higher, at 3.02. In this vein, even the higher scores rated by the Native Residents for these two variables are still below the ‘Good’ rating of 4.00. The Native Residents also rate the current condition of personal income statistically significantly higher than does the Condo Tourist group, with a mean of 3.58 versus only 3.08 for the Condo Tourists.

Clearly, it is the current condition of amount of traffic that rates the worst of all the attributes for each of the three groups, placed within the community/social category (Table 7). However, the Native Resident group does differ from the Condo Tourists on this variable, with the Native Residents rating the current condition as somewhat better, but still
only a 2.14. For safety from crime, not only does the Native Resident group also statistically significantly differ from the Condo Tourists, the Native Residents rate the current condition of that as above neutral at 3.26, while the Condo Tourists rate the current condition as much lower and below neutral at only 2.66. For variety of restaurants, amount of new buildings, and number of people, the Native Resident group differs from both other groups, rating the current condition as better, but with the mean scores for all three groups still in the positive range. For quality of transportation and variety of shopping facilities, the Native Residents are again statistically significantly different from the other two groups, rating the current condition for both attributes as better (at 3.49 and 3.55, respectively). In addition, for these attributes, the Developer Tourist group and the Condo Tourist group rate the current condition not only as worse than does the Native Resident group, but also below neutral (except for the Condo Tourist score of quality of transportation as barely neutral at 3.03). It is important to note that the three groups did not differ in their rating of amount of noise heard or historical buildings, with the current condition of both attributes being rated by all three groups as below neutral.

Perceived Potential for Change in Community Attributes due to Increased Tourism Development

The third survey section assessed the potential for change to community attributes due to increased tourism development also using a Likert scale, with the rating of Large Change for the Worse (1), Some Change for the Worse (2), No Change (3), Some Change for the Better (4), and Large Change for the Better (5). The following section again groups the discussion of the differences and similarities among the resident typology groups on the
twenty-five variables according to the three a priori categories, environmental, economic and community/social.

For every attribute listed within the environmental category, the Native resident group was statistically significantly different from the other two groups in their perception of how ongoing tourism development will likely affect their home community of San Pedro, Belize. However, it is of note that every mean score for each of the three resident groups pertaining to the environmental attributes of their community falls below the no change score of 3.00, along the negative end of the survey scale of some change for the worse or large change for the worse (Table 8). For amount of wildlife, quality of the natural environment, amount of erosion, amount of open space, amount of uncontrolled development, amount of pollution, and amount of litter, the Native Residents believe ongoing tourism development will impact these attributes negatively, but less negatively than do the other two groups. For amount of open space, amount of uncontrolled development and amount of litter, the Native Resident group is statistically significantly different from the Condo Tourist group, with the Condo Tourists rating the potential for change to these variables at 1.90, 1.85, and 1.77 respectively. For amount of pollution in the area, both the Developer Tourist group and the Condo Tourist group rated the potential for change at 1.95, with the Native Resident group being statistically significantly higher at 2.60, but still below the neutral score of 3.00.

For every variable within the economic category, except amount of local tax, there were statistically significant differences among the groups, but with all scores on potential for change in the positive end of the scaling of some change or large change for the better (Table 8). Not only was there no statistically significant difference between the three groups pertaining to potential for change to amount of local tax, but all three groups also rated this
Table 8: A Comparison of Perceived Potential for Change to Community Attributes due to Increased Tourism Development among Three Resident Typology Groups in San Pedro, Belize using the Kruskal-Wallis Statistic to test for differences among means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Item</th>
<th>Native Resident Group 1 n=77</th>
<th>Developer Tourist Group 2 n=45</th>
<th>Condo Tourist Group3 n=39</th>
<th>Kruskal-Wallis Statistic</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Difference between which groups2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of wildlife</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>15.4234</td>
<td>0.00045</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the natural environment</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>14.0705</td>
<td>0.00088</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of erosion</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>11.3793</td>
<td>0.00338</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of open space</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>10.3445</td>
<td>0.00567</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of uncontrolled development</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>10.1024</td>
<td>0.00640</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of pollution in the area</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>9.8874</td>
<td>0.00713</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of litter</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>8.0225</td>
<td>0.01811</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>22.2038</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of hotels</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>19.4201</td>
<td>0.00006</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to invest</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>9.8148</td>
<td>0.00739</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>9.1131</td>
<td>0.01050</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of local tax</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.3056</td>
<td>0.52059</td>
<td>Group 1 is different from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>22.0064</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of transportation</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>21.6712</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of new buildings</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>12.3639</td>
<td>0.00207</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of shopping facilities</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>11.5758</td>
<td>0.00306</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety from crime</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>10.9562</td>
<td>0.00418</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to meet new people</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>10.9537</td>
<td>0.00418</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical buildings</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>10.0167</td>
<td>0.00653</td>
<td>Group 1 differs from other two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of local culture</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>5.6565</td>
<td>0.05911</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of restaurants</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>7.0315</td>
<td>0.02973</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of noise heard</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.2408</td>
<td>0.19782</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.9213</td>
<td>0.23209</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of entertainment</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>2.2521</td>
<td>0.32432</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of traffic</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.7309</td>
<td>0.42086</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 3 differ from each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Bold items indicate those variables which were shown to be statistically significantly different at p<.05, using the Kruskal-Wallis statistic.
2 The difference between individual means is given if the Wilcoxin statistic indicated a statistically significant difference at p<.05 once the Kruskal-Wallis test showed a statistically significant difference among the means at p<.05.

Potential change likely to be in the negative end of some change or large change for the worse. For the other four variables within this category, again the Native Resident group
rated the potential for change the highest and statistically significantly different from the other two groups. In this category, it is the Developer Tourist group that consistently rates the potential for change as the lowest (but still positive), with opportunity to invest and personal income showing the largest difference from the Native Resident group and the least positive potential for change of the three groups.

From the discussion of the preceding two categories, it can be inferred that, overall, environmental variables are perceived to be generally negatively impacted by ongoing tourism development while economic variables are perceived to be generally positively impacted. For the community and social category of attributes, it is interesting that it is the potential for change to the amount of noise heard and the amount of traffic that shows no significant difference among the three groups, as well as also resulting in some of the lowest scores pertaining to potential for change due to ongoing tourism development overall (Table 8). It seems that noise and traffic are two universally viewed variables believed to likely be further negatively impacted by ongoing tourism development within the area. While safety from crime does show a statistically significant difference between the Native Residents and the other two typology groups, all three groups do rate the potential for change to this variable as negative as well, with the Condo Tourists rating potential for change of this variable the lowest of all at 1.82. For variety of shopping facilities and the chance to meet new people, the Native Resident group statistically significantly differs from the other two groups rating the potential for change higher, however, all still rate these variables as potentially positively impacted by ongoing tourism development to the area. For community spirit, quality of transportation, amount of new buildings, historical buildings, and awareness of local culture, the Native Resident group again is statistically significantly different from
the other two groups in their rating, which is not only higher, but also views the potential for change as positive for these five variables. The Native Resident group feels the potential for change to historical buildings is only somewhat likely to be positive at 3.06. The Condo Tourists view the potential for change for these same five variables as negative. The Developer Tourists also view the potential for change to these variables as mostly negative, with community spirit and awareness of local culture rated as only slightly positive at 3.05 for both.

Condition Change Analysis

In order to gain a better understanding of how the three resident typology groups perceive the current condition of community attributes and how those attributes are likely to change due to increased tourism development, a graphical analysis deemed ‘Condition-Change’ was conducted for each of the resident groups. Plotting conditions based on how they are perceived to currently exist versus how it is believed they might likely change enables a simple, visual way to analyze the findings and possibly determine which community attributes may be good indicators of too much change due to ongoing tourism development (Ahn et al., 2000). The following section discusses the condition-change analysis according to each of the three resident typology groups, concluding with a comparison among the findings of all three groups.
Native Residents

The Native Resident group places only four variables total within one of the two quadrants, ‘Tourism could help’ or ‘Tourism could hurt’ (Figure 12). In the first quadrant, ‘Tourism could help’, there are placed those items with a current condition rated below the mean, but with perceived potential change rated as being above the neutral point of 3.00 and so is felt could be improved upon with more tourism development. For the Native Residents, the only two variables that fall within this quadrant include historical buildings and [diagram description]

Figure 12: Condition-Change grid for Native Residents relative to changes in community attributes if tourism development continues
Note: Current condition mean = 3.27, anticipated changes neutral point = 3.0
awareness of local culture. The low number of attributes within this quadrant may be due to the fact that the Native Residents view so many more attributes to be in a positive condition to begin with and so are then located within the second quadrant, ‘Keeping things good.’

Within quadrant IV, ‘Tourism could hurt,’ are those variables rated as having a current condition as positive, but with the perceived potential for change to be negative (Figure 12). The Native Resident group attributes included amount of wildlife and quality of the natural environment. All the other variables for this group either fall within the second or third quadrant of the graph, ‘Keeping things good’ and ‘Bad and worse’.

Those attributes included within quadrant III, ‘Bad and worse,’ are those community variables already believed to be in poor condition and perceived to only be further negatively impacted due to ongoing tourism related development (Figure 12). These include amount of erosion, amount of litter, amount of pollution, amount of open space, and amount of uncontrolled development of the environmental category; amount of local tax of the economic category and amount of traffic and amount of noise heard of the community/social category.

In the second quadrant, ‘Keeping things good,’ are those attributes currently believed to be in good condition with the perception that continued tourism development will keep the condition in good quality (Figure 12). The attributes in this quadrant include the largest number of attributes with 12 total, or almost half of all the community attribute variables. These include number of jobs, opportunity to invest, personal income and availability of hotels of the economic category and the chance to meet people, variety of shopping facilities, variety of restaurants, variety of entertainment, community spirit, quality of transportation, amount of new buildings and number of people from the community/social category.
Developer Tourists

For the Developer Tourist group, only variety of shopping facilities and amount of jobs falls within the first quadrant, ‘Tourism could help’ (Figure 13), signifying those variables as currently perceived to be poor but ones where continued tourism development is believed to be able to improve upon the condition. On the other hand, there are several more variables located within quadrant IV, ‘Tourism could hurt,’ so are those attributes currently believed to be in good condition, but perceived to likely be negatively impacted by continued

Figure 13: Condition-change grid for Developer Tourists relative to changes in community attributes if tourism development continues
Note: Current condition mean = 3.05, anticipated changes neutral point = 3.0
tourism development (Figure 13). These include number of people, amount of local tax, new buildings, quality of the natural environment, amount of wildlife and amount of open space. Those attributes that fall within the third quadrant, ‘Bad and Worse,’ mark those variables currently believed to be in poor condition and perceived as likely only to get worse with continued tourism development in the area. These attributes include four variables from the environmental category, including amount of litter, amount of uncontrolled development, amount of erosion and amount of pollution and five variables from the community/social category, with historical buildings, quality of transportation, safety from crime, amount of noise and amount of traffic. There were no variables in this quadrant from the economic category for the Developer Tourist group.

The second quadrant, ‘Keeping things good,’ includes those variables the Developer Tourists currently rate as in good condition which continued tourism development is believed to either not make worse or even improve upon (Figure 13). These attributes include personal income, opportunity to invest and availability of hotels from the economic category and the chance to meet new people, variety of restaurants, variety of entertainment, awareness of local culture, and community spirit of the community/spirit category.

**Condo Tourists**

The Condo Tourist Group also has variety of shopping facilities and number of jobs located within the first quadrant ‘Tourism could help,’ signifying the belief that although these variables are currently believed to be in poor condition, ongoing tourism development might improve the situation (Figure 14). The Condo Tourist group has the most variables located within the fourth quadrant, ‘Tourism could hurt,’ and so rates more variables as
currently in good condition but as the most likely to be negatively impact upon due to continued tourism development (Figure 14). These include amount of wildlife, quality of the natural environment and amount of open space from the environmental category, amount of local tax of the economic category, and number of people, awareness of local culture, community spirit, quality of transportation from the community/social category.

Within the third quadrant, ‘Bad and Worse,’ are amount of erosion, amount of pollution, amount of uncontrolled development and amount of litter from the environmental category; from the community/social category are historical buildings, amount of new buildings, amount of traffic, amount of noise and safety from crime (Figure 14). As with the
Developer Tourist group, there were no community attributes from the economic category located within this quadrant.

Located within the second quadrant, ‘Keeping things good,’ are those variables felt to currently be in good condition and believed to be the most likely kept the same with ongoing tourism development or made even better (Figure 14). These include investment opportunities and personal income of the economic category and the chance to meet new people, variety of restaurants, availability of hotels, and variety of entertainment from the community/social category. There were no environmental variables included within the ‘Keeping things good’ quadrant for the Condo Tourists.

**Comparison Among Resident Typology Groups**

The only variables agreed upon by all three resident groups pertaining to the fourth quadrant, ‘Tourism could hurt,’ include amount of wildlife and quality of the natural environment. All three groups rate current condition of both of these variables as above neutral, but perceive the potential for change to these variables due to increased tourism development as likely to be at least some change for the worse (Table 9). The Developer Tourist group and the Condo Tourist group also place amount of open space within this same quadrant, perceiving quite a large change for the worse to what they currently feel is a good condition. In fact, these two groups rate these three variables as potentially the worse affected of all. The Native Resident group, however, does not view the current condition of amount of open space to even be positive to begin with, but then does feel ongoing tourism development will also negatively change the condition of this attribute in the future, as well.
The Developer Tourist group and the Condo Tourist group concur on a number of other variables, as well (Table 9). These include number of jobs and variety of shopping facilities being located within the first quadrant ‘Tourism could help,’ with both attributes being viewed as having a current condition below the mean, but with the potential to be

Table 9: Mean values for perceived Current Condition of Community Attributes and perceived Potential for Change Due to Increased Tourism Development according to three resident typology groups of San Pedro, Belize*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute Item</th>
<th>Native Resident Group</th>
<th>Developer Tourist Group</th>
<th>Condo Tourist Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Condition</td>
<td>Potential for Change</td>
<td>Current Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of wildlife</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of open space</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the natural environment</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of pollution in the area</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of erosion</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of uncontrolled development</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of litter</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of local tax</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness to invest</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of hotels</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of local culture</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical buildings</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of new buildings</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of transportation</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of shopping facilities</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of traffic</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of noise heard</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety from crime</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to meet new people</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of restaurants</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of entertainment</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Averages</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold items denote those attributes upon which all three typology groups agree on both condition and direction of change and **bold, underlined** items denote those attributes where two groups disagree and place in opposite quadrants.
positively affected by ongoing tourism development. The Native Residents, however, only
place awareness of local culture and historical buildings within this first quadrant. The
Developer Tourists and the Condo Tourists agree on amount of local tax and number of
people, located these within the fourth quadrant, ‘Tourism could hurt,’ feeling these variables
are currently positive, but will likely be negatively affected by ongoing tourism development
in the future. However, the Native Residents view amount of local tax to already be negative
and only likely to get worse with ongoing tourism development, so located within the third
quadrant, ‘Bad and worse.’ Conversely, the Native Residents also perceive the current
condition of number of people as positive, but likely to be improved upon due to increased
tourism development instead of negatively impacted as perceived by the other two groups.

For the ‘Bad and Worse’ quadrant III, there is more agreement among the three
typology groups. These variables include a number of variables from the environmental
category, including amount of erosion, amount of uncontrolled development, amount of
pollution, and amount of litter. From the community/social category, there was also greater
consensus among the three groups, including amount of traffic, amount of noise, and safety
from crime. All three typology groups view the condition of these variables as currently
below neutral and likely to only get worse with ongoing tourism development into the future.
The Developer Tourist group and the Condo Tourist group also place historical buildings
within this quadrant. The Native Residents are the only group to place an economic variable
within the quadrant ‘Bad and Worse,’ this being amount of local tax.

For the second quadrant, ‘Keeping things good,’ all three groups perceive variety of
entertainment, variety of restaurants, availability of hotels and the chance to meet people as
currently of good quality and likely to improve with ongoing tourism development. From the
economic category are two variables agreed upon by all three groups, including opportunity to invest and personal income. There are no variables from the environmental category perceived by all three groups to be located within this quadrant. The Developer Tourists and Native Residents do both place community spirit within this quadrant, believing the condition of community spirit to currently be good and likely to get even better due to ongoing tourism development, not worse.

The only scenario where two groups actually disagree in direction of both current condition and potential for change is the Native Resident group and the Condo Tourist group on the variable, awareness of local culture. Whereas the Native Resident group views the current condition as below the mean, this group feels ongoing tourism development could actually improve upon the issue. On the other hand, the Condo Tourist group views the current condition of awareness of local culture as just above the mean, but feels the potential for change to the variable would be negatively affected by ongoing tourism development within the area.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

The following section discusses the thoughts and statements offered by residents themselves, as well as observations made by the researcher during her time in San Pedro, Belize working on this research. The data collection method was intended to allow residents the opportunity to voice their particular concerns and thoughts pertaining to their home community of San Pedro and the changes they have observed relating to ongoing tourism related development. The organization of the results follows the three a priori categories used for the twenty-five variables of the survey above, including environmental, economic
and community/social and are subcategorized into specific points of interest as presented by the respondents. These findings are further discussed in relation to the other two methods of data collection in the final chapter and enable a broader and richer perspective on these other data.

Environmental

Environment

A number of Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists complain that the Native Residents do not take care of the natural environment. One Condo Tourist states that the reason she and her husband chose to move to San Pedro was because of the beautiful natural environment and atmosphere of the island, so she says, of course they do not wish to see any more development or changes to the area. However, she does not think the locals appreciate the environment or work to take care of it. A Developer Tourist also complains that the locals do not have any value for the natural resources or the coral reef of the area. He says they will just go out and fish for themselves with no regard to the damage they do to the environment. However, a number of Native Residents state how much they value the natural environment, not just because much of their livelihood depends upon it, but because it is part of their home and heritage. They too are concerned with the growing amount of damage occurring to the reef.

Litter

Another Developer Tourist claims that a major problem she has seen is litter, where locals will just throw their paper or trash over their shoulder when they are done with it. She
says her guests would complain about it and were very surprised that it was such a common problem. She says it does now seem to be improving to her, probably due to the fact that the children of the area are being educated on the problem in school. In the nine years she has been here, it seems to her there has been a growing understanding of how the cleanliness of the community reflects on the tourism industry and can help to both attract and keep customers coming back. However, a number of residents say there is still the regular practice of dumping sewage and debris into the ocean, as well as golf cart batteries and construction debris. There seems to be a general consensus that the government should do more to clean up the island.

The researcher is told that an early project of the newly formed Chamber of Commerce, primarily made up of Developer Tourists, was designed to clean up the golf cart battery problem on the island. One of the Chamber of Commerce leaders, a Developer Tourist, reports that people would routinely throw these batteries out, into a ditch, along the coast, and even use them to make retaining sea walls around the island. She further reports that the clean up effort became rather politicized with local officials claiming they were already working to solve the problem and so seemed to resent the new Chamber taking charge of the issue. As a result, she says the local government ended up blaming the Chamber for getting in the way and making it out to be a worse problem than it really was. In an effort to overcome the problem, the Chamber took out an ad in the local papers explaining their position and that they were working in conjunction with local officials. As a result, the government came to support the effort once the wheels were properly greased. She reports that to this point, nearly 1000 golf cart batteries have been removed from the island for recycling or disposal on the mainland.
Construction

The construction of new hotels and other buildings seems to be a major cause of a tremendous amount of erosion, pollution and litter on the island as well, according to the reports of various residents and based on observations of the researcher. There is an amazing amount of new construction going on in the area, especially south of the main area of San Pedro, extending the amount of construction and habitation further along the southern part of the island than ever in the island’s history. A number of Native Residents say that they can remember when nothing existed in certain parts of the island, but that these areas are now commonly built upon and cleared. Construction sites are the sites of much runoff, mud, clearing and back filling of land that is both ugly and polluting with no visible environmental protective measures taken. An environmental engineer from the mainland discusses a housing project he is currently working on to the southern end of the island. He states that he knows there is not adequate sewage capacity in these units or proper disposal of debris, but that the Developers make no effort to fix the problem. He states that this is a very common scenario. The roads are also terrible due to this runoff and debris around these areas. In addition, the shoddy quality of the dusty roads is not only an environmental issue, but also a health one according to various medical professionals on the island. The dust itself poses a number of health risks when breathed into the lungs, but is made worse by the number of stray dogs urinating and defecating in the streets. Construction workers working at a site regularly relieve themselves along the side of the buildings they are working on as well, according to a Developer Tourist. This excrement matter then blows around in the dust as well.
Economic

*Work and the Native Residents*

The group of residents easiest to meet for interviews was the Native Resident group. In particular, the men seem to always be hanging around the streets and beaches, whereas women are harder to find as they are the ones mostly working in the stores and restaurants. This conclusion is based on observations made by the researcher. According to a Native Resident, the men are often quick to get their tourism guide license, but then have little to do but hang around during the low season. A number of Native Residents who work for the industry, either for the water taxi service, as a tour guide, or some other related job, and so during the low season, all have little work or little to do and generally live off family and hang around. A number of Native Residents report that they and many other people come here for work on the island, but can’t afford to bring their families to live here with them. Several different types of workers, including carvers, employees in the water treatment plant (which is a rather well paying job), and an airplane mechanic, all Native Residents, came here for the work and pay, but support families who live back on the mainland. Other Native Residents say that it is also common for other people to come here looking for work and essentially rely on family and temporary employment to get by when no permanent jobs can be found. A Condo Tourist, who works for a major resort, states that they have many Native Resident workers who come to the island for the construction and renovation jobs which require full out effort during the low season, yet are all largely temporary. For example, the Victoria House, a rather luxurious, foreign owned hotel complex, hires 18 extra workers who work as hard as possible on renovations for 1-2 months with no days off to prepare for the upcoming tourism season. He further reports that there is little other opportunity to find
further work once this assignment is concluded. In addition, many of these temporary workers are illegal and compete with Native Residents for limited jobs.

The low season poses a number of challenges to both Native Residents and Developer Tourists in particular, with several places closed for the low season with the owners (especially foreign ones) away on vacation. The Condo Tourist group seems to better appreciate the lack of people in the area. One Developer Tourist states that this past season has been particularly slow and will mark the first time she has had to close for dinner since she came to the island 12 years ago. As already stated, this is also a time for tremendous construction and renovation on area hotels and businesses, so there is an influx of workers, supplies and activity. However, for the Native Residents, there is almost a sense of being bored during this season. There are a number of activities planned for locals, such as a weekly party at one of the hotels with a reggae band and the pool open for the local children, as well as the bar and restaurant open for business. It is something for locals to do during the low season and can generate some much needed business for the hotel. The Developer Tourist owner of Belikin beer puts on a fishing tournament every year during the slow season to bring people into the area and generally draws people and boats from all over the southern United States, Central America and Mexico. The clientele are mainly wealthy American and European owners, with local crews with the income generated through the entrance fee. In addition, the tournament serves as another excuse for a party during this time, with people from all over town coming out to see what was caught during the day. There is also a make-shift bar located out on the dock made out of a folding card table, selling beer and liquor.

Of course, there is simply less work, money and business all around during this time. For this research, it turned out to allow people the time to sit and talk and fill out a survey.
One Native Resident states that he does not understand the surprise everyone seems to have over the coming low season. He says that you know it is coming every year, so you would think people would prepare for it, but they never do and so have to struggle every time.

The Craft Trade

A considerable amount of tourism revenue and available employment is generated through the craft trade and selling of souvenirs. Many Native Residents sell their crafts outside of the stores, along the streets and beaches. One Native Resident does have a little shop on the beach which he packs with carvings during the high season, but during the low season, he also sits out on the street with only a few pieces and sells to any tourists walking by. The carvers state that the government and souvenir stores would like to run them off the streets altogether. They say they are hard working and have to hustle all the time to make a living, but if they go up to the tourists themselves on the street or the beach, they’re accused of hassling them. Several different Native Resident carvers state that they would like to have the Belizean government provide a place for them to sell their crafts. As for the small time carvers and merchants, they can’t get a loan of even a few thousand dollars to establish themselves and build up their businesses. They say they would like to be provided a place to work and sell and are interested in starting a trade union or coop because they think it could help provide enough influence to get money from the bank for local carvers. They say the banks require so much information and permanency that most can’t meet the requirements. Therefore, a lot of carvers come over to San Pedro from the mainland to sell their work and have to go back home to see their families. They also state this lack of assistance can lead to crime when people can’t help themselves or get ahead.
The tourism industry can also be an opportunity for craft men of another kind. A thatching crew from a tiny village near the Guatemalan border was “booked” by a Developer Tourist to come to San Pedro to work on a major bar/restaurant/shopping complex renovation. These authentic roofs are often used to make an establishment appear more “authentic.” The Developer Tourist talked about them as if they would hardly know about indoor plumbing, but as it turned out, she says they were fun, outgoing and truly artists of their craft who were given the opportunity to earn a living off a dying trade due to the continued growth of the tourism industry.

The Role of Government

It is government policy that even foreign owned businesses must hire Belizean residents, where a worker either has to hold a resident card or pay for a temporary work permit which costs Bz$1500/year. It seems it can be rather difficult to gain residency and often takes at least a year. It appears that the intention of such a policy is to ensure that local Belizeans are not beaten out for available jobs. One Developer Tourist tells how his wife had to leave the country for two weeks for shoulder surgery and so her year towards residency had to start over. Now, she must go to Belize City once a month to get her passport stamped and cannot work legally in their own store without paying for a work permit. However, there are also reports that there are a huge number of illegals working in the country, but if they are caught, they can go to jail and be charged a large fine. During the time of this research, there was a raid in the backside bars (local hangouts versus tourist establishments) for illegal workers and the researcher was told the workers and boss each had to pay a $1000 fine and that the worker may spend up to three years in jail before then being deported. A Developer
Tourist states that only local Belizeans, not even residents, can actually be tour guides. Although he can and does own a tour company, he cannot take visitors out himself and does not think this is fair.

A number of Native Resident carvers report that most tourism money leaves the area or stops at Belize city, while this island is used only to make money for the rest of the country. They feel the government should be working harder to help their own people for they work in true native Belizean crafts, but the stores all sell Guatemalan and Mexican stuff.

A Developer Tourist talks about a student group she has had stay at her hotel. It was a group of architecture students who came to do a study on the planning and design for future development of the community. A number of people felt it to be a very worthwhile project and the students presented their findings to the Town Board. However, it doesn’t seem if anything did or will come of their recommendations. Several other Developer Tourists say that there is no order to development or business practices in the area. There is a lack of proper marketing for the industry here and, for example, the government didn’t capitalize on the Temptation Island exposure as they could have to further build up the tourism market.

One man who is given a survey asks what good it will do for the people filling it out when they put their heart and time into doing the survey, but will likely see nothing come of it. The researcher explained that while it is for her research, the results will be given to the mayor and town board so that the resident’s concerns may help guide future development decisions. He does not seem convinced, but seems more to hold the government as the ones at fault for not doing anything with this information, but can see some good in doing this for research.
Taxes

Belize is a welfare state, and largely depends on money for support from other countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada. Therefore, very little money goes toward taxes here and currently, income taxes are very low. A Native Resident states that the richest group, as well as those who make less than $20k a year, don’t have to pay direct tax on income. As one Developer Tourist puts it, for the first time, he is at the receiving end of the money-giving conveyor belt that lets him keep what he earns. However, a Native Resident explains that everyone does have to pay tax on goods purchased, but that the tax is not listed on the receipt, but added as a value added tax to the flat price instead. A number of Native Residents state that in their opinion, taxes are still too high on goods for those who don’t earn much and that those who are rich contribute too little by paying no tax on income. The opinion of a Native Resident is that the owners of the really large scale companies are at least supposed to pay taxes on sales, but no one monitors the amount they sale, so who knows how much they are supposed to pay. He says that these businesses can easily sell $1 million a day, and only report $500k, because who will know? The researcher notes that even though these residents don’t know how sales are monitored, their perception is an unfavorable one.

Corruption and Business

The issue of government corruption is a common and pervasive issue mostly brought up by Developer Tourists in terms of the set-up and running of their businesses. Many examples are reported of the unfair and corrupt treatment as perceived by various businessmen on the island. One Developer Tourist couple gives an example of their efforts
to start a coin-operated laundry in the bottom portion of a nightclub they also own. They describe how they had gone through all the steps in getting the project approved; including holding the required hearings, following all regulations, and paying the costs of permits, but when it came time to actually open the laundry, they were told they’d then have to wait another year to do so. They added that there is essentially nothing they could do and if you protested about it, you’d be made to wait two years. It is their opinion that because there was already another laundry (full service) owned by a San Pedrano on the island, authorities were willing to take all the money, but would then bow to pressure to not allow something that could possibly compete with a local business. A common joke among the Developer Tourists is “how do you make a million dollars in Belize? Start out with two million.”

Two other Developer Tourists state that although they are legitimate business people, providing a quality product and jobs to local people, they are continuously being “screwed over.” They say that it is because they are legitimate they can be taken advantage of. According to these residents, the government and customs and immigration office tries to get as much money, bribes, and excessive duty as possible from Developers like themselves. They state that they are charged something extra for every piece of equipment brought here, charges for the shipping of it, insurance for it and then duty and taxes on the shipping and insurance. They point out that then the costs have to be charged on to the customers, leading visitors to complain that Belize is so expensive. An example they give is their effort to bring in 10 bags of hickory chips which they need for their product, maybe $50 worth of product in the United States but unavailable here, through customs. They say they had to pay a Bz$250 bribe to import it, and the wood chips were also ‘held hostage’ for 4 ½ months where they also had to pay the daily storage fees!
On the other hand, according to them, any number of Central Americans come into the country illegally, offer nothing, and only contribute to crime and unemployment and are not hassled at all. However, they say that the official government position invites potential investors and business people down here, telling them to come and invest, that there is plenty of opportunity and you will be able to do whatever you want with no problem. Investors find just the opposite when they get here and are given the complete runaround. Officials say that they’ll take money for permits and regulations, but then charge extra fees, change the rules, and then charge for many of the same things all over again. Several Developer Tourists believe that this is why there is so little reinvestment and development in the area, because so much of the money earned goes directly into the pockets of a few. In short, they would not recommend that someone come here to invest or start a business. Other Developer Tourists say one price is charged for locals and another for transplants, so it is not uncommon for people to get a local partner or name to put on deeds and purchases in order to gain the ‘local benefit,’ but they are also able to be ripped off that way too.

A Condo Tourist medical school instructor, who states he was taxed unfairly when he brought his printer and computer into the country, gives an example of corruption dealing with immigration. He views it as the government being willing to take advantage of the many medical students who come here and contribute to the local economy by charging exorbitant fees for items they need to complete their studies. The issue of unfair fees charged by immigration on items brought into the country seems to be a common one.
Work and the Developer Tourists

It becomes evident as surveys are distributed around town that there are many Developer Tourist/owners who are not on site at their hotels and the researcher is actually told that many never visit to oversee the work going on there. The general reaction of the office workers is much the same when the researcher asks for the owner, they most often roll their eyes and give a little laughing ‘humph,’ indicating the owners are rarely on site and certainly not during the low season. This mirrors what a Native Resident says about so many newer owners never being around and she believes they don’t care what is going on or how their workers are doing. She says they simply buy the property and leave it for the locals to run, collecting their money back home. A couple of Developer Tourists state directly that they view their restaurants purely as money-making investment opportunities with intentions to buy low, build it up over a couple of years, and then sell it off for a profit. One says ‘there is always a new gringo sucker around looking to buy.’ Gaining residency status was too much work for them not to stay in the country and keep prospecting. They say there are many more money making/investment opportunities on the mainland as well, and fully intend to continue to speculate as many here do and buy, sell, buy, sell. Another Developer Tourist is about to start a major new company and states that he believes there is still tremendous opportunity and a ton of money to be made here. A long time Developer Tourist complains about what he calls the “sand pimps,” realtors who have moved to the area, set up shop and only work to drive up property costs, a scenario rarely seen 15 years ago.

A number of Developer Tourists have banded together to start a local Chamber of Commerce. They say that although the Chamber is largely made up of expatriate owners, some local businessmen are also members because they want to keep a hand in, but that they
usually don’t attend meetings or announce involvement because they don’t want to be too closely associated with what is viewed as a foreign organization. There are several reports of a still prevalent view of foreign-born Developer Tourists as ‘Them.’ Another Developer Tourist explains that when he decided to come here and start a business, he first talked to the locals about his plans and how he had no intention to compete with any other dive companies/guide tours and so has generally been accepted by the local businessmen.

A Condo Tourist says she and her husband came down to Belize to get out of the rat race, leaving good jobs in Houston, but that they still have to work to support themselves here. She says her current job as a hotel clerk came along and while it is enjoyable and located in a beautiful place, it obviously doesn’t pay very much. She says that if you are willing to hustle, you can make money here, but that is the life they decided to leave in Texas in the first place.

There has also been a noticeable shift in the type of businesses and clientele in the community pertaining to the growing expatriate population in the area. As an example of this, the Developer Tourist owner of a local pizza place says that although at one time he depended heavily on orders from foreign guests at hotels, they have been increasingly taking orders from both local and expatriate workers in town. Similarly, the wife of another Developer Tourist had been teaching yoga classes mainly to tourists staying at the resorts and hotels, and is now building a following with local, mainly expatriate, residents, both in San Pedro and over on the neighboring island of Caye Caulker. There are also a number of businesses specifically designed to serve a predominantly expatriate clientele, such a restaurant serving American food and depending heavily on the medical students and professors of the area. The medical school itself is the third of its kind on the island (the
other two have closed), a privately owned establishment mainly serving foreign-born students and run and taught by expatriates.

*High Costs of Living in Belize*

As already stated, Belize is considered a rather expensive country to live and visit, especially compared to other Central American countries. This is exacerbated due to many factors. One Native Resident who owns his own tour company discusses the need for the government to subsidize gas prices. He states that currently, gas is so expensive here that tour guides and operators are forced to charge visitors more money to cover costs. With lower or subsidized gas prices, he says that guides could lower their prices and get more visitors, earning more money in the long run. The researcher also observes that guides generally won’t take out much less than a full boat in the low season because they can’t cover the cost of gas, so they earn no money at all and visitors are denied the opportunity for such service. This Native Resident also discusses the high cost of hardware and building and office supplies. He says that someone could make a killing here with that kind of business if they offered a lot of variety, because there is currently not a lot to choose from and most is very expensive.

Several residents from all typology groups discuss the high costs incurred from other forms of corruption in particular those associated with monopolies providing services, such as the phone company. They state that monopolies in these services result in unfair pricing and poor and limited quality. The researcher is told that Belize charges the second highest phone rates in the world, only second behind Afghanistan, and this affects not only phone service, but the price and speed of internet service, as well. A Developer Tourists says that
residents are charged six dollars an hour, plus a monthly registration fee, for this use. In addition, the more you use, the more you are charged, instead of the other way around, when most providers would bring overall charges and costs down with higher use. Conversely, the cost of cable is quite low because it is pirated in from the United States. Further, the Belize bank encourages businesses to pass on the high governmental credit card tax to customers with businesses more than willing to go for the one time higher price, instead of working to encourage repeat business by absorbing the credit card tax themselves.

Also due to the high costs of rent, property and fees, various business owners are forced to come up with creative ways to circumvent costs. One Developer Tourist states that he brought down a custom pizza trailer, driving it all the way here from the states, buying the land it sits on outright so he doesn’t have to worry about ongoing rent rates, which can be outrageous or changed and increased with little to no notice. Another Developer Tourist says that he is interested in setting up a business to sell woodwork and jewelry, but is interested in finding a place like the other carvers on the street, so he wouldn’t have to worry about rent or overhead.

*Work ethic*

A number of residents state that if there is ever a good idea here, there will soon be several copycats so the new idea or market is then flooded. Examples include apartments that were first built to serve the medical students and the opening of a pizza delivery place. Once these businesses were opened, many others soon came along with no limitations placed on those type of businesses because of the potential seen to make money off it. It seems that if one such business is good, then more is better. This same criterion does not seem to be in
place concerning businesses competing with long-standing local San Pedrano businesses. A
Developer Tourist states directly that he could not have opened his store if another like it
already existed on the island and that this limitation helped determine the type of store he
opened.

Along this line, several Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists say that too many
businesses (and service providers) have no competition at all and so there is little work ethic
and generally poor service on the island. The researcher is both told and observes first hand
that area businesses often close early, fail to open on time, and often times don’t carry what
they advertise. They also don’t seem to care about customers, because there is no
competition. Further, nearly all service stops from 12:00pm-1:00pm in town with local
business owners failing to think to keep one person in house to provide service during that
time. A Developer Tourist says that she can’t keep the locals working during lunchtime. She
looks over at 12:00pm and they are all just sitting around, taking a break at once, with people
waiting. She kind of laughs about it, but says she still can’t get it through to them to take
their breaks in shifts. Conversely, a Native Resident who works as a housekeeper in a hotel
explains that she and the rest of the staff want to do a good job and know what’s expected of
them, but their previous manager, a Developer Tourist, would not entrust them with any
extended duties. Further, when he sold their hotel to buy another, he took everything over to
his new hotel, including trying to take his previous guests with him, which the workers do
not believe to be ethical.
Community/Social

Tolerance

There are a number of different ethnic groups, nationalities, and national holidays celebrated due to their being so many cultures co-existing within Belize. This is also the case on Ambergris Caye, which is the only area in the country with a population that is fully bilingual, with direct descendents of Spanish-speaking Mexicans who migrated down from the Yucatan Peninsula since the last century. Even within a single family, members may all have different features and skin color. A Native Resident says this may be what encourages tolerance here. Although the researcher has found many examples of prejudice, it seems to depend more upon where someone is from and who their family is, and less just the color of their skin. As a result, Belize is really a very friendly place, with most people willing to talk and help someone out. There also seems to be an appreciation for their dependency on the tourism industry and a genuine interest in people from other places. The researcher also observed an appreciation for anyone who is interested in their culture and greater respect resulted for her once it was known she had traveled throughout Belize and stayed in various parts of the country.

Another Native Resident reports that the government actually encourages different groups to fear and be prejudiced against each other. For example, in school, he says they were taught the Garifuna were lesser people and they should be hated, even for Creole people who are also black and have no real reason to dislike the other. As the researcher has observed in the southern Belizean district of Toledo (Banks, 2000), there is still great distrust among the different ethnic groups and those from different areas of the country, however, these Native Residents say it actually encourages disenfranchised groups to ban together.
A number of children of the island, especially girls, are involved in one or often several types of dance classes. The costumes are very elaborate and often very expensive, costing several hundred dollars. Influences include Mexico, other parts of Central America, Belize, and Mayan. A long time Developer Tourist resident says everything here is a reason for a celebration or festival, or a party or dance with everyone included. However, it does take a lot of money to be involved and often the older San Pedrano families and foreign-born Developers are the only ones who can afford it.

*Sense of Being an Outsider*

However, there is the strong sense of Ambergris being separate from the rest of the country, with people stating they feel somewhat left on their own due to the fact they are different from the main population, separated by the ocean, and are remotely located from the government center on the mainland. This concept mirrors the way people of the southern Toledo district also speak about their home area (Banks, 2000). One Native Resident spoke about the stereotypes mainlanders have of San Pedranos, that they are thought to all be rich, spoiled and big partiers. When she went to school in Belize City, she says she didn’t tell anyone where she was from at first, because people over there either say they don’t like San Pedranos (even if they have never met any) or would bug her to come over to visit. Another Native Resident states that there is quite a number of differences between the islanders and mainlanders of Belize and it may be the mainlanders who are more disliked than some of the foreign expatriates.

There also seems to be the belief that San Pedro has a lot of money and so some Native Residents report that it is hard to get the same government support and funding as
mainland towns. So despite that fact that the island brings in the most amount of revenue for the entire country, they say they get less support for services or development.

There is quite a subculture within the medical school and the community of businesses here, with a number of Middle Easterners making up a large proportion of the businesses owners, and as one Condo Tourist puts it, either you are a Muslim, a local or an outsider for this group. This group generally owns the nicest and most modern businesses and stores, with the most variety and best air-conditioning. One female Condo Tourist medical student seems especially pleased to meet another American woman to talk with (the researcher) as she says most of the students are from Pakistan or are Muslim and so belong to this group, whereas she does not.

The other populations of foreign-born business owners also seem to ban together, with the locals remaining separate. Within the population of the islanders, either you are a native San Pedrano or an outsider, even if you are from elsewhere within Belize. Further, it is often said, if you are an outsider, you will always be an outsider, no matter how long you have lived on the island. This further reminds the researcher of the social situation in southern Belize.

A Condo Tourist who works with the local tourism industry says that although she has lived in the country since she was 7 and has a Mexican mother, she is still considered an outsider and must work against this stigma to do her work. However, she does gain some respect because of her mother’s nationality. The researcher inadvertently offended a Native Resident when she suggests his boss does not speak English. He says “. . . , we are Belizean, do you think only Americans know English?” Perhaps he felt he was being looked
down upon by an American and maybe mistaken for being a Central American and not a Native.

*The Native Residents*

The researcher met several people who are originally from the island, who had moved away to live in the United States for any number of years, but eventually came back here to stay. They are also told that it is common for a local boy or girl to marry an outsider or foreign spouse and bring them back here to work and often, run a business. There is often increased acceptance of the outsider in this situation.

A number of Native Residents and Developer Tourists state that the older San Pedranos are often the most resistant to change from the outside, many of which have been due to the ongoing tourism development. For example, they may refuse to speak English and a Developer Tourist says that the mayor himself once said ‘San Pedro doesn’t need tourism.’ It seems the younger generation is much more used to tourism and its ongoing changes and also accepting of it. An older San Pedrano discusses the many changes over the years and how tourism, as well as the growing population of Condo and Developer Tourists, has led to a greater awareness and acceptance of outsiders. The current mayor states that the question on the survey of whether you own /partially own a tourism related business is redundant, because he points out that all business here is related to tourism now.

There is a lot of talk among Native Residents about the changes that have taken place on the island, including the introduction of the big trucks used for construction and carrying supplies; how once only golf carts were allowed; that the roads used to be soft sand, but are now so compacted by the heavy traffic that a fine dust blows up and cakes everything; that
there were once no internet cafes; and the point where construction ended along the beach. Many people remember how things once were and talk about how fast it has all changed. A number of Native Residents especially, mention how much has changed during the time they were away from here and how built up the area has gotten, but that despite this fact, they came back and fell in love with the island all over again and felt they were back home.

A number of Native Resident tour guides discuss how much they used to drink with the guests they would take out, but have mostly come to realize it was getting to be too much. Further, they know that if there were ever an accident or a problem, they would be held liable. So now, they say they try to moderate their partying and better realize that their guests are on vacation, whereas they would be doing it every day. One Native Resident in particular discusses his business and how he wants to work to expand it. This type of work ethic and foresight seems to place him in the minority of many Belizeans. But he says he loves his work and his home and especially wants to use his business to help protect the natural environment because he is very concerned with the damage occurring to the reef due to the practices of so many other tour guides and divers.

*The Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists*

A couple of Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists make statements as if to claim a sense of belonging or place to this area for themselves that probably really doesn’t exist. The Developer Tourists who own one of the local papers state that theirs has the highest oversees distribution of any Belizean paper. This seems to indicate a strong connection to the island for the Condo Tourists who may only live on the island part time or for those tourists who may not even own property, but continue to revisit.
There are many stories about the illegal practices of the foreign expatriates among the Native Residents. One is of a foreign expatriate businessman who took out a loan for several million dollars, using the money to build a house in town for maybe one or two million and then taking the rest and leaving the country. So the nice new house is left standing empty, like a ‘white elephant,’ for the government to deal with and no chance of the loan being paid back. There are a number of Native Residents who believe this is a common scenario concerning foreigners, whereas small time local entrepreneurs are unable to get a loan for even a few thousand dollars. They say all help and financing goes to foreigners, not locals, and then they regularly just run off with the money and never intend to pay it back and aren’t made to.

There are a number of examples of Developer Tourists not making the best bosses, as well. One Developer Tourist tells the researcher that he thinks the survey question about importance of personal income is stupid because, of course, it is most important to everyone so it’s stupid to even ask on the survey. Another story told by a Native Resident is of her former boss, a hotel manager who refused to pay overtime, which is required in Belize for over 45 hours a week, but rarely enforced. The fact that this manager refused overtime for his housekeepers who earn Bz$4.00/hr is even more telling. Further, this manager had kept nearly all of his staff for 4-7 years, but after he sold this hotel, he later talked badly about one of his former staff to the new owners. Another new owner talks about how the construction crew hired to do renovations on his hotel has worked as a ‘tag team’ where one works for a while, then hands off the job to another. The researcher states that in this heat, it is to be expected that things have to go a bit slower. He states, “not for me, I’ve heard of that ‘island time’ bullshit, not if they want to work for me.”
A Native Resident describes the differences between the expatriates who came here a long time ago and those that have come here more recently or just now. Those long-time Developer Tourist residents relocated here either to retire or because they loved the area and so liked and cared for the locals. These Developer Tourists have always cared about getting along with the locals and taking care of the area as their own home. So, she says that the locals for the most part, like them and accept them almost like locals themselves. Now however, people come here just to buy a business and many don’t even live here full time and are just interested in their business and making money and don’t care how it may affect the local community or with working with or knowing the locals at all. She says that the newer owners just care to have locals work for them and know they can always find someone else to do the job if they leave or are unhappy they can be replaced so they don’t have to care about how they treat them. She says that these are the owners who just sit at home and collect their money and don’t know or care about what’s going on here or with the locals, their employees or the community. She says these are the Developer Tourists who make the locals distrust foreigners.

It is another Developer Tourist who claims that about half of the expatriates down here are running from something, the law, taxes, money problems, or child support and are lying, thieving scoundrels. The same privacy laws that attract people here in the first place also protect them from prosecution, even from the government of the United States. For this Developer Tourist, he says the others are like him, people who left their home country because they didn’t like the direction it was going. They can come here, smoke where they want, go barefoot, be left alone and keep the money they make. He further brags about being one of the first down here and how it will further prove to be the best choice as the rest of the
world’s economy, especially that of the United States, job market, tax situation and debt keeps going to hell. He, at least, has gotten out in time. So, even though he has been here fourteen years, he seems to have no concern for or even notice, the local population even as the people he now lives with and the place where he earns his living. This Developer Tourist seems to only be interested in what he gets out of living here, such as freedom and lack of responsibility.

The local Chamber of Commerce was first developed by and is largely made up still of Developer Tourists. They talk about trying to get other businesses to join, but that some may refuse simply because the Chamber is considered a ‘gringo group.’ However, they say that so far all of their projects have been to help the community as a whole, not just their own businesses. Of course, they say that cleaning and revitalizing the town, some of their early projects, obviously helps all of their own businesses, too. There is also much talk about those who are well-connected or particularly close with some locals on how they might encourage other groups to join the Chamber.

Views of Each Other

The researcher met many people who have only very recently moved to San Pedro. A Native Resident says that makes sense because a lot of people move here thinking they want to live here forever because they love to visit, but then they stay for a year or two and decide it is really just too slow for them. They miss going out, going shopping or going to Walmart. More than once, the researcher heard of long-time Developer Tourists and Native Residents making bets on how long new people will stay here once they decide to come and invest here themselves. There are stories of multi-millionaires who think it would be fun to own a
business here, but who are too uptight or stressed out and clearly will not do well. Most agree that you can’t make it here with that attitude. An example is given of a rich couple who came down here and bought a business together, but who are now broken up with him left to sell off everything having to do with the business. It seems that two or three years is about the threshold of whether people will make it here or not.

A number of Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists state that the Belizeans are too proud to ask or accept help, but that they have no pride in other areas, which is why they lack a work ethic or are unable to get ahead and develop their country on their own. Another Developer Tourist states the reason so many houses burned when a man set his house on fire was because the fire department couldn’t get the pump to work and when some Americans tried to get it started, the fire fighters were too proud to take the help. So a massive fire could have been contained, but instead, many homes were lost. Another Developer Tourist tried to start a community toy drive to help a smaller effort put forth by the local health clinic. He states that it was amazing how much flak and red tape there was involved in getting such a project passed by the town board. As mentioned by other Developer Tourists, it seems that the only good idea is their (the Town Board) idea. Further, even though they did raise quite a bit of money, it came almost entirely only from other expatriate owners. He says it is just a different culture here, one that does not give like Americans and Europeans are accustomed to doing.

Some other Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists speak about the legacy of Belize being a British colony, which has resulted in what has been called a welfare mentality, although the researcher observes the people of San Pedro to generally be hard workers. A
Condo Tourist says he has not seen this, but knows of many examples of people here with jobs or an opportunity to work who will just not show up.

Some Native Residents speak about people living here who are from other parts of Central America. Although they themselves want to make changes, they say that Belizeans are not revolutionaries. Further, if they did have a meeting and make a plan, they could walk only a few blocks up the way, and everybody already knows about it so nothing could be accomplished. So they say it is the other Central Americans who are the sneaky, clever ones, used to having to be covert, who will be able to uprise and organize together with the Belizeans to defy the government.

A Native Resident discusses how mainland Belizeans are actually less welcome than most long-time expatriate residents. She says that mainlanders often just come to the island for work, for a short time and can be obnoxious to tourists, hassling women on the street. San Pedranos are not only more used to tourists, but they know from being taught from when they are very young that without tourists, there would be nothing here. She says that they are told how your mom would not have her shop or restaurant and so you would not have any money to go to school or buy necessities. So, she asks, why would locals, who know how dependent they all are on tourism, do anything to make tourists feel uncomfortable or unwelcome? It is the mainlanders who do this.

A Developer Tourist states that it seems that the corrupt local government and police not only screw over the ‘rich gringos’ here, but even each other. Even though locals believe the foreigners who move here to be rich, which may encourage them to try to take advantage of them, she says she certainly is not rich, but has her entire life savings is in her establishment.
A number of people tell the researcher how important they think it is that this type of research is being conducted and believe it will be good to find out how the people feel and think about tourism and development. In addition, many people, especially the Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists, are very interested in what the researcher has found out, especially the opinions of other expatriates. However, if the researcher tries to explain a bit about the early findings and differing impressions of the residents, especially of the Native Residents, they don’t seem to really listen and are more likely to give their opinion as the right one. They seem to infer that there is much wrong with the other group’s opinion and view their own as the more correct and superior point of view.

Road Conditions

The quality of the roads and issue of the increasing traffic are rather contentious problems on the island. There is only a few hundred yards of paved road on the entire island, privately paid for by a number of businessmen and so located in front of their stores. After a rain, the roads, once made of a white sand that has now been crushed into a fine powder that blows in the wind, turns into a white, creamy mud. Linked to the increase in vehicles and larger styles, there are now many huge potholes and divots in the roads. The roads were never made for the big construction-grade trucks that are now commonplace, mostly only to carry groceries or supplies and not necessary to be that big, or really for anything other than bikes and golf carts. A number of people still largely get around on bicycles and are crowded out on the narrow roads. It is becoming even more of a problem with too many people driving unsafely and too fast. In an effort to deal with this problem, a number of the main
roads have been designated as one-way. However, during the time of this research, a man fell off his bike and was tragically run over by a Mack truck.

In addition, there is an ever increasing number of vehicles permitted on the island where once only golf carts were allowed. Although there is a traffic committee on the island in charge of limiting the number of vehicles and addressing the traffic problems, they keep giving out vehicle permits even though there is supposed to be a moratorium on allowing anymore. A number of Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists say it is because committee members still give them out to friends and family or are bought off for the permits. These same residents say that although there is supposed to be a limit on vehicles and golf cart rental companies, if you know someone or have enough money to pay, you can get anything you want. For a long time, the People’s United Party (PUP) was in power and only allowed their friends and followers to have permits for vehicles, then when the United Democratic Party (UDP) was elected, they only gave out permits to their people because they had been denied any for so long and they didn’t allow PUP to have any. This in part led to the huge increase in vehicles on the island because as each party switched, they would only give out vehicle permits to their own people to retaliate and kept them away from the other group.

Some Developer Tourists also say they think both foreigners and Belizeans are equally abused and both have to pay or are equally likely to be denied a permit or benefit. An important Chamber of Commerce issue is the closing of the main “Front Street” to all traffic but golf carts, bikes and pedestrians. Representatives of the Chamber state that this policy will likely take a very long time to pass, if it ever does at all, because they say the locals worry about still being able to deliver goods and supplies to businesses, material for renovations and construction projects. However, most people agree that the traffic and road
conditions are two of the major problems on the island. The Chamber is also working on a project to have the street paved and beautified, having first to acquire mayoral approval and support. The project looks to cost $1200 in wood and $1000 for a week of labor to construct a block-long model street restoration and beautification in order to demonstrate how attractive and desirable they could make Front Street look.

Further exasperating the traffic and road problem is the behavior of the many cab drivers on the island, another group of vehicles and drivers that has greatly increased in recent years due to the ongoing tourism development. They often, as one Developer Tourist puts it, ‘drive like crazy’ and even worse in the slow season where they have to further compete for limited visitors and must hurry back from a trip in order to get another fare. This only adds to the dust and danger on the roads. A couple of residents, including a Condo Tourist working with the tourism industry, want to push for specific training of cab drivers. Currently, there are no regulations or criteria to drive a taxi, anyone with a vehicle can do it. The researcher is told that the drivers do seem interested in getting ‘certified,’ if they feel they will be recouped for this effort. In addition, there are a number of serious health issues related to the dust blown around from the roads, leading to a high number of cases of respiratory problems, asthma and bronchitis on the island, and which also transports disease and flu.

Health Issues

A Native Resident, upon completing a survey, is certain to point out to the researcher that the survey did not mention anything about health issues on the island which is very important. In particular, Belize has the second highest rate of AIDS in Central America. In
addition, there are also many other issues related to the inequities in health, basic services, and living standards that exist on the island and throughout Belize. While this is true, the researcher states that although these are very important issues, they are beyond the purview of this research. A number of Condo Tourists, working at the medical school discuss some of the other health issues on the island. For example, the mosquito problem, responsible for transmitting dengue fever and malaria, is made worse by standing water sources, construction sites and garbage, as well as the unmanaged growth of natural resources on the island. The researcher believes this may be an example of a foreigner wanting to clear the natural habitat and wooded areas that have so far been left alone. The mangrove forests and forested wetlands are havens for mosquitoes and have traditionally been cleared for resort and hotel complexes for the comfort of the visitors. Entire habitats have been destroyed throughout Central America due to this common practice.

Perhaps the most common health related issue again deals with the road situation on the island. A number of medical school instructor Condo Tourists concur that there are many cases of the above dust related illnesses on the island, including respiratory problems, asthma, bronchitis, and the flu. They explain that Ambergris is a coral island, so the dust is even more dangerous because it is organic and so it grows and causes infection in the bronchial tubes and breathing pathways. The researcher is told of at least one woman who, although she has lived here a long time, has had to move away, because her allergies had gotten so bad due to the dust. One of these professors states that she finally just decided to move to the northern part of the island and away from the bad and dusty roads. On this part of the island, one is basically dependent upon water taxi for travel, so it is safe from the dusty main roads.
Crime

Growing crime on the island is a concern for many residents. Developer Tourists, Condo Tourists and Native Residents state how it is almost too easy for criminals here. These people have no job and no other purpose but to sit around and watch houses and walk right in. A number of Developer Tourists say that once the tourism season starts, many people will actually come over to the island from Belize City, specifically to just feed off the tourists as easy marks. One Developer Tourist says that there are only 12 police officers on an island of 12,000. In addition, there was supposed to be added tourism security, but none have been added and although there will be a big announcement that the island is getting six new officers, they won’t tell you that at the same time, six other officers are being removed. Another Developer Tourist says that Caye Caulker, a neighboring island, has 11 police officers for an island population of only 2,500, plus 2 tourism security officers as well. Neither these residents nor the researcher can understand the disparity.

According to both Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists, there are not enough repercussions for crimes committed. One Developer Tourist states that for non-violent crimes, such as drugs, you can buy your way out of prison because there is simply not enough room. This is partly why drugs are a growing problem on the island and are continuously being brought over from Belize City and sold here. Another Developer Tourist describes how a man was shot with a speargun by a drunk fisherman and how another man set his house on fire after locking his wife in the bedroom, burning it along with nine other houses so that about 90 people were left homeless. She says that neither man went to prison or were even charged because both were local San Pedranos, so all officials were either paid
off or willing to look the other way and ignore it. Further, these men go around town and are still accepted and well-liked.

Another Developer Tourist couple states that their home was recently broken into at 4:30 in the afternoon, when it was still daylight. For about $60/week, many people choose to hire their own security guards, but they don’t come on to work until 8:00pm. Therefore, thieves will just come in before the guards are there. The Developer Tourists say they have heard many other similar stories, too. The researcher had a bike stolen from within the gated side yard of her hotel, located beside the kitchen, in the morning after the workers had arrived. Upon hearing this, two other Developer Tourists each have their own stories and start out with ‘welcome to Belize!’ and ‘You had it a whole month before it got stolen?’ They have each had golf carts stolen as well, even when they were locked up. Perhaps most tragically, during the time of this research, a local man is brutally murdered in his own home.

*Government and Corruption*

Some Native Residents discuss the upcoming elections. They say they are all crooks. Before independence in 1981, the PUP party ruled for some 25 years, then the first election after, the UDP party took over. Now, the two parties switch back and forth every election. They say that the first after the new year, ‘we will be told gold coins will drop from the sky and it will rain silver paper.’ They say that people’s yards will be fixed up and people will literally be given money and gifts to buy votes. However, it doesn’t matter which you vote for, both are corrupt. They go on to say that government officials will take money in aid in the name of the people of Belize and either keep it for themselves or only loan it back to the people for a profit at a high interest, or they will loan the money or give it at a very low rate.
to the rich foreign people who don’t even need it. They say that aid money is not seen to go to the people. They describe the situation as the government aiming to ‘keep the people dependent so they will always need those in control. That’s how you retain power over the people. That is the British system.’ These Native Residents also state that the government won’t help, give loans, fix roads, or provide better services because that is how they keep people down and dependent. They ask why would they choose to assist the people when they don’t have to, as long as a few high ups keep getting rich, they don’t need to worry about the rest.

There are also a number of Developer Tourists, Condo Tourists and Native Residents who all agree that the police force is also corrupt like the rest of the government and that this ultimately just hurts their own people. One Condo Tourist asks that if bribes at the border can get anyone into the country, who knows who is here or for what purpose? He goes on to say that such a person could be coming into Belize to kill someone, but the border patrol cares more for the bribe than if he has valid papers. With a bribe able to get people across, there is no protection of the people and he says that eventually, maybe there will be a crime against someone they do care about. This Condo Tourist says there can be no way to protect the people or be safe if there is no means to uphold the law, simply because they are more interested in getting a bribe or favoring a friend.

There is a lot of talk about the corruption and difficulty in starting a business if you are not local. There is always a huge runaroud in getting things passed and approved for the go-ahead by the government. One Developer Tourist had originally come here to retire, but got bored and so started a business. He says it has been very hard and the rules seem to
change everyday. The government says one thing to get you to invest, but then nothing is easy or direct and they have paid thousands in bribes and ‘taxes.’

There is also the issue of hotels paying a commission to cab drivers to bring tourists to certain hotels. Most Developer Tourists who discussed this problem considered it to be an unethical business practice and unfair to other hotels and so needs to be addressed.

A long-time Developer Tourist mentions the construction of the eight-foot wall built along Front Street to block the public park on the beach from the road and from view. She says that most people agree it is really very ugly and there was absolutely no notice, vote or discussion about the decision to build such a thing. The researcher asks why would the Board pay to have that built anyway? She says she believes it is because there are many concerts, festivals, and dances held at this park which are a huge part of island life, but this way, who comes in can be controlled with everyone charged. Now, no one can sit and watch from the street anymore and it was the only area where the beach was visible from the street. Although this may not exactly be an example of corruption, it does seem an unfair and unjust government action.
V. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research has been to discuss the three defined resident typology groups, Native Residents, Developer Tourists, and Condo Tourists in terms of their perceptions of the changing conditions due to ongoing tourism development in their home area of San Pedro, Belize. The differing characteristics that define these resident groups determine a unique perspective of the community attributes and their feelings pertaining to related changes. This research has shown that, indeed, these resident typology groups do differ in terms of which community attributes they consider important, the condition they currently rate those attributes, and how they believe continued tourism development will likely impact those attributes in the future. The importance of these findings is that such a resident typology make-up likely exists within any number of developing tourism destinations. Further, the specific findings and characteristics pertaining to the three typology groups are also considered within the parameters of three predominant development conceptual frameworks, the Tourism Area Life Cycle, the Limits of Acceptable Change and the Last Settler Syndrome. This analysis, supported by a three-prong data collection methodology, allows a comprehensive understanding of the current and potential future development scenario which could assist ongoing community planning within San Pedro, as well as other growing tourism destinations.

Through the use of both a survey questionnaire and open-ended interview process, the differing perspectives of the three resident typology groups could be ascertained. The statistical findings of the survey further supported by statements made by representatives of each typology group themselves, shows that concerning specific attributes of the community and tourism related development, the three typology groups do differ but also demonstrate a
number of similarities. In general, the Native Resident group seems to be the most tolerant of the three groups to current conditions and changes within the community, rating several of the current conditions as more acceptable than either the Developer Tourist or Condo Tourist groups. The Condo Tourist group generally rates those attributes from the environmental and community/social categories as both of a poorer current condition and most likely to be negatively affected by ongoing tourism development, and show the least concern over economic attributes. The Developer Tourist group especially shows greatest concern over business and economic related issues, based on both the qualitative discussion and survey results.

**Differences and Similarities Among Resident Typology Groups Regarding Importance of Community Attributes**

It is of particular significance that of the twenty-five community attributes listed within the survey instrument, none were rated by any of the three typology groups as not important in contributing to San Pedro being a desirable place to live. However, there were varying degrees of rated importance among the three groups and statistically significant differences concerning various attributes within the economic and community/social categories, but not for the variables within the environmental category (see Table 6). All variables within the environmental category were rated as equally important by all three groups and were generally rated as some of the most important of all the twenty-five community attributes. This would suggest that environmental issues were of the greatest importance to all of the residents of San Pedro. However, in the qualitative interview discussions, environmental related issues were much more rarely presented by respondents as a topic of utmost importance. Instead, issues of business, government corruption and road
conditions were most often mentioned in the interviews. Despite this lack of concordance between the survey findings and the qualitative interviews, the environmental quality of San Pedro appears to be of common concern to all three groups.

Conversely, there were statistically significantly different ratings among the three typology groups pertaining to every variable within the economic category (see Table 6). In particular, the Native Residents differed most from the Condo Tourists concerning importance of economic variables, with the Developer Tourists rating attributes from this category in closest relation to the Native Residents. Most significantly, the Condo Tourist group rated every attribute of the economic category the lowest of the three groups in level of importance in contributing to San Pedro being a desirable place to live. The Native Residents and Developer Tourists both rated importance of all the economic variables as more important than the Condo Tourists. This indicates that the Native Residents and Developer Tourists have greater concern over the various economic attributes of their home community, whereas the Condo Tourists, who have generally come to the area to retire or own second homes, do not feel as concerned with economic issues such as number of jobs, personal income or attractiveness to invest. In addition, the Native Residents ratings of the economic variables were the highest of all the groups and statistically significantly different from the scores of the Condo Tourists. This is likely due to the fact that this group has traditionally had the least economic opportunity and so values these attributes as more important than the other two groups who are likely to be more fiscally secure. Qualitative discussions with Native Residents indicate that although to this point they have not received the economic benefits they may have expected, their interest in ongoing tourism development and optimism for future benefit continues. This contradicts Johnson et al. (1994) who found
that residents with high expectations for tourism development initially would often lessen their support over time.

From the community/social category, Native Residents rated both community spirit and awareness of local culture as more important than the other two groups (see Table 6). This signifies a greater interest of this group in the quality of their home community and attachment to this area. This follows from the fact that San Pedro is their home, whereas the other two groups have relocated here from some other area. Native Residents, who have long seen the changes that have taken place within their home, indicate in the qualitative discussions that they wish to have greater control over development and equal opportunities as foreign investors do. A valuation of community spirit and awareness of local culture by this group indicates a wish to maintain this identity and control. Other researchers (Mansfeld & Ginosar, 1994; Allen et al., 1988) have found that local residents do appear to have a certain social carrying capacity threshold beyond which they will show their irritation and dissatisfaction with ongoing tourism development, especially when they have not felt to have benefited from the industry. However, the Native Residents of San Pedro have not seemed to demonstrate such a threshold, generally expressing instead dissatisfaction with government policies and foreign business owners, but not with the tourists and the industry in general.

Attributes such as amount of traffic and amount of noise heard of the community/social category are rated as more important by the Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists, signifying a greater interest in the physical comfort of the community, less than the character (see Table 6). From the qualitative interviews, quality of the roads and amount of traffic were consistently two of the most important attributes mentioned. In this respect, survey data and qualitative data each support the findings of the other with traffic and quality
of the roads being two of the most important community attributes needing to be addressed. Finally, all three groups rated safety from crime as one of the most important of all the community attributes in the survey. Concern over crime was also commonly discussed in the qualitative discussions, as well. In addition, this attribute is believed by the different groups to also be most negatively impacted by ongoing tourism development.

In terms of the different categories, environmental, economic, community/social, the three resident typology groups both agreed and disagreed on the importance of various community attributes of San Pedro. Concerning the environmental category, the three groups generally agreed that all environmental variables are equally important, with no statistically significant differences among the groups concerning any of these variables. Based on this, the null hypothesis was failed to be rejected:

Ho – Typology groups do not differ in their perceptions of which environmental variables are most important in making San Pedro a desirable place to live.

For the economic and community/social attributes, however, the three typology groups did have varying opinions on the importance of these attributes. Based on this, the null hypothesis can be rejected:

Ho – Typology groups do not differ in their perceptions of which economic and community/social variables are most important in making San Pedro a desirable place to live.

**Perceived Current Conditions and Potential for Change of Community Attributes according to the Three Resident Typology Groups**

There are several significant differences among the three resident typology groups concerning both how they rate the current condition of various community attributes and how these attributes are perceived as likely to be affected by ongoing tourism development. In the
preceding section, all variables listed within the environmental category were rated as some of the most important of all the twenty-five variables of the survey and nearly consistently so among the three typology groups. However, concerning the current condition of the environmental variables, every attribute is rated statistically significantly different among the three groups. For the most part, however, these variables are still all rated as poor or appalling (see Table 7). Quality of the natural environment is the only variable which all three groups rate as above neutral, which seems ambiguous since all but one of the variables making up the natural environment, including amount of litter, amount of uncontrolled development, amount of pollution and amount of erosion, is rated as poor or appalling. The question is how can the natural environment be considered above neutral, and by all three groups, when those qualities making up the environment are rated as below neutral at the same time. This may be due to the fact that when questioned about the natural environment on the survey, respondents were evaluating the natural environment as it is in their minds, beautiful and pristine, whereas once degradation due to pollution or erosion has taken place, these areas are then thought of as ‘trashed’ or altered and so are no longer the natural environment.

However, this sense of ambiguity is also mirrored by the fact that even though every environmental variable was rated as the most important, largely of poor quality and most likely to be negatively impacted by ongoing tourism development, these attributes were rarely mentioned in the qualitative interviews. This suggests a disconnect between the reality of what residents view as important and what they may think they should rate as important. It appears that when given the survey prompt asking for an evaluation of area environmental attributes, members of every resident group think to value these as important. However, in
open-ended discussion, the same environmental topics come up much less often and therefore, seem less important. It may also be that the environmental attributes of a community rate as more important when considering these as qualities making up a tourism destination dependent upon its natural resources as attractions.

For the Native Resident group, generally of lower economic status, concerns over the natural environment may simply not be as relevant as economic variables in contributing to overall quality of life. For the Developer Tourists, however, interest over the quality of the natural environment would appear to be more closely tied in with economic dependency. It would also seem that the Condo Tourists would be more concerned with ongoing environmental quality as this is likely a contributing factor in their choice to relocate to the area. In fact, the few comments in the qualitative discussions concerning the natural environment did come from the Condo Tourists, but mainly in accordance with related health issues. For perceived potential due to increased tourism development, every environmental variable was rated as most likely to be negatively affected by all three groups (see Table 8). This marks the only category consistently rated as only being negatively affected due to increased tourism development by all three groups. This would appear to be the one universally held topic of concern for all three resident groups. However, these concerns were only mentioned one or two times in the qualitative discussions. This disconnect would suggest a need for greater education concerning the role the natural environment plays not only in the growing tourism industry, but also in overall quality of life, and to encourage higher construction and development standards so as not to further degrade the natural environment.
The current condition of all the economic variables, except for number of jobs, is rated by the three typology groups as above neutral (see Table 7). It is the Native Resident group, who rated number of jobs as a most important community attribute, who also rated the current condition of this variable the highest and statistically significantly different from the other two groups. This suggests a satisfaction with the current number of jobs for these Native Residents. However, in the qualitative discussions, there is much more of a sense of this group not currently having adequate economic opportunity. A number of researchers have found connections between level of dependency on the tourism industry and acceptance of it (Lankford & Howard, 1993; Mansfeld & Ginosar, 1994; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996), most significantly, the more one is economically dependent upon tourism, the more benign their view of its impacts. However, this does not explain the perspective of the Native Residents of San Pedro who appear extremely tolerant of the industry, even when not fully receiving adequate economic benefits from it. Evidently, there are other factors contributing to this sense of satisfaction and tolerance. It is quite possible that even some jobs, for some members of one’s family, for some part of the year, may be adequate economic opportunity for these residents.

Conversely, the Developer Tourist and Condo Tourist groups rate the current condition of number of jobs as just above and as a bit below neutral (see Table 7). This seems curious in that these groups, the least concerned with number of jobs, should judge the condition of that number the most harshly. Perhaps, these groups are demonstrating a concern with the quality of life for the Native Residents in rating the current condition for available jobs as below satisfactory, in effect, desiring a better situation for the locals. It is also possible that the Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists who both express great concern
over growing crime in the area view greater employment opportunity as an effective way to curb crime among locals. In this respect, providing greater opportunity for local employment may in fact satisfy all three resident groups, even if based on different expressed needs.

Concerning perceived potential for change, all the variables of the economic category, except for local tax, are rated as likely to be positively impacted by ongoing tourism development by the three resident groups (see Table 8). This demonstrates a great deal of optimism concerning the perceived impacts tourism will have on the future economic situation in the area. This perspective also supports the notion that so many Developer Tourists come to the area based on the belief that tourism will continue to provide the opportunity for their own personal economic gain. Again, it is the Native Resident group that is the most optimistic, rating perceived potential for improvement of all the economic variables, except local tax, statistically significantly higher than the other two.

The issue of local tax is of common concern to the three resident groups. Currently in Belize, there is very little income tax taken, with only a value added tax placed on goods purchased. This was mentioned by several Developer Tourists as part of the attraction in choosing to develop in Belize. Conversely, several Native Residents remarked that the wealthy foreigners should be required to give more money in taxes. Perhaps the three resident groups believe increased tourism development will require a change in these policies because the government will require greater resources to pay for necessary increases in infrastructure and in maintenance of the quality of the natural environment. This could be the case, but also a necessary scenario with costs easily passed on to visitors. The model of tourism development requires some input by area businesses benefiting from the industry into the overall maintenance of its resource base. Inputs through taxes, permit fees and
inspection charges ought to go to community level infrastructure which would be of benefit to everyone, such as the paving of roads. Education on the relationship of these factors could likely increase awareness and acceptance of what could be a worthwhile community benefit.

In rating all economic variables as likely to be positively changed because of increased tourism development, but all environmental attributes as likely to negatively be so, the question of whether this will be an acceptable trade-off remains to be seen (see Table 8). Research has shown that even those residents most dependent upon tourism and so shown to be most tolerant of its costs, are still aware of its negatives, but may still support the industry anyway or at least believe the positives outweigh the negatives (Davis et al., 1988). So despite the fact that the Developer Tourists expressed great concern over the quality of the natural environment on the surveys, predominant points of discussion concerning ongoing economic opportunity in the qualitative interviews show that this group is willing to accept the trade-off. Further, that the majority of respondents in the Native Resident group expressed concern over issues of business, economics, and costs of development and investment also suggests that this category is more relevant to these residents than the environment, perhaps in spite of how it was scored on the survey. Their ongoing optimism toward the industry despite these vocalized concerns are the likely result of what they have been promised concerning the economic benefits resulting from tourism development and that they still anticipate receiving some proportion of its proceeds, perhaps mitigating any concerns they may have over its impacts.

Concerning the current condition of variables of the community/social category, Native Residents again consistently rate these conditions higher than either of the other two resident groups (see Table 7). In particular, Native Residents rate the current condition of
quality of transportation, variety of shopping facilities, number of people, amount of new buildings, and variety of restaurants statistically significantly higher. This demonstrates a degree of tolerance and acceptance of social and community attributes not evident in the other two groups. This could easily be due to the fact that the majority of Native Residents have never lived anywhere else to make a comparison, unlike the Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists who have moved to the area from somewhere else and so have more experiences against which to compare and judge San Pedro. This is curious in considering the fact that the Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists specifically have chosen to come to San Pedro to make this their new home, at least part time, yet they consider so many community variables as below neutral, particularly environmental and community and social attributes. There may be the belief that their numbers and political will may be able to ultimately encourage change and influence local government decisions to encourage future development more to their preferences. Concerning the Developer Tourists, it is likely that the economic variables, which they especially rate as above neutral and likely to be positively impacted due to increased tourism development, outweigh the perceived negative environmental and community/social attributes of the community, further supporting previous research studies (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Davis et al., 1988). As already mentioned, the current condition of amount of traffic is rated as well below neutral by each of the groups, but with Native Residents still statistically significantly higher than the other two (see Table 7). Safety from crime also has Native Residents statistically significantly higher than the other two groups, and the only group to rate this current condition as above neutral. Again, the Native Residents appear to be more tolerant of area conditions, but still express great concern over this issue. Concern over issues of crime
was also commonly discussed in the qualitative interviews with all three groups rating the potential for change to safety from crime as most likely to be negatively affected by increased tourism development (see Table 9). As such, this is certainly a problem needing to be better addressed within the community. This could be achieved by placing greater numbers of law enforcement officials on the island or even having the local government and area businesses unite in some type of community watch, at any rate, the combined effort would likely result in great support by all three resident groups.

Of particular note is the fact that there is one variable, awareness of local culture, that two groups rate as opposite for both quality of the current condition and perceived potential for change due to increased tourism development. The Native Residents place awareness of local culture in the “Tourism could help” quadrant, believing that while the current condition is below the mean, it is something that could be improved upon with increased tourism development. In fact, increased tourism development has been shown to aid in rediscovery by local residents of past customs and practices as they learn tourists are interested in viewing these traditions. There may also be the hope that increased economic opportunity or development related to ongoing tourism development will provide the means necessary for Native Residents to band together to be heard and contribute to the ongoing planning process. The Condo Tourists, however, place awareness of local culture, in “Tourism could hurt,” rating the condition as currently above neutral, but likely to be negatively impacted in the future. It is a common fear that too much tourism may serve to saturate a local community’s character and increase the copying of tourists by local residents. In addition, the Condo Tourists were likely attracted to the area of San Pedro at least in part due to the local residents and fear too many outsiders may negatively influence this population. However, it
is interesting that the Condo Tourists believe that tourism can be a negative influence on a community’s culture, while at the same time being a large part of what is contributing to this influence.

A number of variables from the community/social category are grouped within the second quadrant, “Keeping things good” by all three typology groups. The Native Residents place the most variables in this quadrant, which again demonstrates a tolerance and acceptance of both the current conditions of the community and the likely future changes to it (see Figure 12). The Developer Tourists place a number of these same variables here, but not nearly as many (see Figure 13). This group does include both awareness of local culture and community spirit in the “Keeping things good” quadrant. There are the least amount of variables for the Condo Tourists here, perhaps indicating a lack of acceptance to tourism and its influences (see Figure 14). The individual environmental variables are what are most agreed upon by all three groups as not only likely to be degraded due to further tourism development, but also as largely already in poor condition. However, the general attributes, quality of natural environment, amount of wildlife, and for the Developer Tourists and Condo Tourists also amount of open space, are viewed as currently acceptable. However, as with all the other environmental variables, were also viewed as the most likely to be negatively impacted by ongoing tourism development. The survey findings seem clear on this point, but the qualitative interview discussions do not support that these resident groups hold these variables as such a potential problem or source of concern.

Concerning the three categories, environmental, economic, community/social, the three resident typology groups both agreed and disagreed on the current condition of certain community attributes of San Pedro, as well as the potential for change to these attributes as
affected by ongoing tourism development. The three groups again agreed concerning the 
environmental category, with all three groups generally perceiving the current condition of 
the environmental variables about the same, with all groups also indicating that the 
environmental variables will likely be negatively impacted due to ongoing tourism 
development. Based on this, the null hypotheses were failed to be rejected: 
Ho – Typology groups do not differ in how they rate the current condition of the 
environmental variables, and Ho – Typology groups do not differ in how they perceive the 
condition of the environmental variables as likely to change due to future tourism 
development.

For the economic and community/social attributes, however, the three typology 
groups did have varying opinions on the current condition of these attributes, as well as the 
potential for change to these attributes due to ongoing tourism development. Based on this, 
the null hypotheses can be rejected: 
Ho – Typology groups do not differ in how they rate the current condition of the economic 
and community/social variables and, Ho – Typology groups do not differ in how they 
perceive the condition of the economic and community/social variables as likely to change 
due to future tourism development.

Evaluation of the Perceptions of the Three Resident Typology Groups within Three 
Conceptual Frameworks of Tourism Development

Limits of Acceptable Change

The Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) best fits the Native Resident point of view 
in that for this group, those people living in an area where tourism has been thrust upon them, 
such a planning framework can help address problems, force decision-making and involve
the public in the planning process. In a setting such as San Pedro, with at least three distinct resident typology groups which all differ in their views of tourism related development, the LAC can serve as a way to design different development zones or areas of activity as well as provide a means for communication across stakeholder boundaries. Most importantly, the LAC management conceptual framework outlines a series of steps that can be used to first define a set of desired conditions where change is imminent, as well as the management actions necessary to maintain or restore those conditions (Stankey et al., 1985). For this group of Native Residents, the need to be allowed the right to voice their concerns in the definition of desired conditions is essential to avoid the overtaking of their home community by foreign outsiders. In addition, this is their home first and so this group is also perhaps best able to help define opportunity zones pertaining to tourism activities. Members of this group represent all the different stakeholders of the community and so are uniquely able to inform the development and planning process.

Through the course of the qualitative interviews, the Native Residents repeatedly complained of the government’s practice of favoring foreign investors and businesses over themselves, while neglecting their own people in terms of giving loans, a place to sell their goods, or even in providing basic services and infrastructure in their community. The LAC conceptual framework would enable a forum for discussion between relevant parties in order to provide guidance to the planning process. This is not to say that other resident groups could not also help inform the planning process. However, McMinn and Cater (1998) found local residents to be alienated from local planning and development decisions mostly attributable to the domination within the business sector by the Developer Tourists. The LAC conceptual framework can provide the indices necessary to determine the respondents’
perceptions and feelings toward the level of development and change as it pertains to the tourism industry of their home area and allow them a comparable voice. It has been repeatedly shown that negative aspects of tourism related development can greatly influence resident’s perceptions, however, public participation can encourage more favorable attitudes (Carmichael, 2000). In understanding these needs, they may also be better met, thereby encouraging greater support for ongoing development and its impacts.

For example, the Native Resident carvers have already suggested one possible opportunity zone. They desire a centralized, government supported place to sell their crafts. This would enable them the permanency necessary to meet bank requirements in order to secure loans to develop their businesses, as well as get them off the streets and beaches, as desired by the government and Developer Tourists. Further, this could become a tourism attraction in its own right, with tourists choosing to seek this area out, both for the opportunity to buy a souvenir and also interact with local craftsmen. This could also encourage the development or rediscovery of other forms of arts and crafts, such as local women of Mexican heritage, utilizing weaving and sewing skills now largely reserved for making their children’s dance costumes. In fact, the selling of local arts and crafts has been shown to be a primary way in which Native Residents can benefit from a growing tourism industry within their community.

The LAC may also determine the process by which equitable distribution of benefits and costs of ongoing tourism development may be established. As mentioned above, the Native Residents do not feel the wealthy foreign investors contribute enough in taxes, probably because they see little of it redistributed back to the community. However, it is more likely the case that whatever is paid by the Developer Tourist group is seemingly
‘swallowed’ up by corruption within the government, or at least reallocated into a national general fund. If community level improvements were evident, the Native Residents may be more tolerant of other costs incurred through ongoing tourism development.

It is interesting that this group that laments a lack of economic opportunity or government representation, still rates the current condition and future potential of jobs and personal income as positive and favors the ongoing development of the tourism industry. It appears as quite a contradiction for the Native Residents to be the most tolerant and optimistic of the three groups, while at the same time perceiving themselves to be the most disenfranchised and left out of planning decisions and area benefits. Overall, the Native Residents appear still tolerant and accepting of area changes. This is evident based on the higher scores by this group concerning both current condition and potential for change for a large number of community attributes scored on the survey. The quadrant ‘Keeping things good’ for the Native Residents included the largest number of attributes with 12 total, or almost half of all the community attribute variables. These included number of jobs, opportunity to invest, personal income and availability of hotels of the economic category and the chance to meet people, variety of shopping facilities, variety of restaurants, variety of entertainment, community spirit, quality of transportation, amount of new buildings and number of people from the community/social category (see Figure 12). What is markedly missing from this quadrant are any environmental variables. However, it seems that not much would necessarily be required to ensure a greater sense of participation and inclusion for the Native Residents if some consensus could be reached on these economic and community/social variables in the future. Currently, this group speaks of being slighted by both the Developer Tourists, especially, as well as their own government. As the primary
bearers of the impacts occurring within their home community, the LAC conceptual framework may provide some sense of control and representation for this group.

Tourism Area Life Cycle

Butler’s Tourism Area Life Cycle model has been utilized for over two decades to characterize a destination’s evolving development. The model can be used as a conceptual framework to provide guidance regarding appropriate action and management planning based upon the stage a destination is currently within and where it is heading. The mainstay of this conceptual framework is the identification of the development of tourism-related businesses, infrastructure, and visitation with the resulting affects on social and environmental conditions. Through the analysis of secondary data, the current life cycle stage of San Pedro could be determined. Clearly, San Pedro continues to be the primary tourism destination for the country of Belize. Tourism expenditures, number of hotels, rooms, and beds, occupancy rates and average room rates have continued to be on the rise. This would suggest that San Pedro is representative of a well-established tourism market, currently in the development or take-off stage. Some of the specific characteristics of this stage include the decline of local involvement and control of development with the replacement by larger, non-locally owned facilities (Butler, 1980). This is evident in San Pedro by the continued growth in larger scale hotels, nearly all owned by Developer Tourists and that this same group now expects greater participation in area planning and management policies. The many comments made by Developer Tourists in the qualitative discussions pertaining to the difficulties in getting one’s business started due to government interferences and corrupt practices further maintains their desire to be allowed control over their own business practices and development. There is
also the suggestion that local Belizeans and the national government also lacks the ability to make proper management decisions. However, most often during the development stage, there is supposed to be an increased government presence in providing greater tourism infrastructure and facilities. This does not appear to be the case in San Pedro, signified by poor road conditions, a lack of proper sewage and sanitation systems, insufficient police protection and erosion and environmental degradation due to increased construction is prevalent with little to no inspection or oversight. These conditions are actually mentioned more pointedly by the Native Residents, in particular lamenting the lack of opportunity for local, small-time merchants to get ahead. For Developer Tourists, however, it appears they would favor an even greater removal of any government presence.

During the development stage, it is largely economics that drives the system. It is of significance that both the Developer Tourists and the Native Residents feel that the quality of nearly all the economic variables will improve with continued tourism development, in effect reflecting the belief that any and all future development will be positive. However, it is this very belief that most often gets communities into trouble as too much development is allowed to happen, along with the occurrence of other subsequent effects which ultimately negatively affect the entire industry. This perspective is supported by Hovinen (2002) who found that, with little exception, tourism business owners and managers seem to lack any real sense of longer-range vision for a more sustainable tourism development model. In working under the prevalent business model that ‘more is better,’ such residents continue to operate under the conviction that ongoing development will even be able to solve or prevent subsequent environmental and social problems caused by the ongoing growth and increasing number of tourists. When, in fact, this demonstrates the most common scenario likely to
ultimately cause the entire industry to go into decline. Russell and Faulkner (1999) emphasize the role of entrepreneurs in actually helping to create the conditions necessary to incur the shifts from one stage to the next in the evolutionary cycle. If the Developer Tourists were allowed complete freedom to develop and build as they would like, there would likely be a shift from the development stage to that of consolidation. In fact, the one significant decline in average room rates for San Pedro in 1997, resulting not from a lack of visitation, but rather a surplus of available rooms with the construction of 10 new hotels that year. It is unlikely that any group of entrepreneurs would be willing or even able to self-regulate their own growth.

Therefore, it appears that the Developer Tourists’ primary interest will continue to be to encourage the ongoing growth of the tourism industry within the host community. There were a number of survey variables rated at an acceptable current condition and likely to be positively impacted due to further tourism development. These variables are largely economic in nature. As with the other two resident typology groups, it was the environmental attributes which were largely viewed to be negatively affected. However, based on the interviews, no Developer Tourist mentioned this potential as reason enough to curb further growth. However, the development stage is also the point where social, community and environmental impacts become greater concerns for area residents. The fact that this group does not mention the environment as a primary consideration demonstrates that economic development interests are of greater concern for this group. However, commonly mentioned issues pertaining to traffic, road conditions and crime speak to those issues perhaps that the Developer Tourists feel most closely affects them. The negative
scoring of the environmental items on the survey may represent concerns evident only when prompted or those deemed to reflect on the potential for ongoing tourism popularity.

Last Settler Syndrome

The Last Settler Syndrome has been utilized to explain changing attitudes in a host population where each successive wave of settlers tends to favor conditions remaining the same as when they arrived and becoming advocates against any further development or changes in those conditions which first drew them to the area. Based on this characterization, it was expected that the Condo Tourists would share some of the opinions that characterize the Last Settler Syndrome. Members of this group, first attracted to San Pedro as short-term visitors who came to enjoy the area for its many tourism attractions, have since chosen to relocate to the area either full or part-time. As they are generally not dependent on the economic or investment situation of the area, they are expected to mostly value maintaining existing social and environmental qualities of the area. It is therefore expected that this group would be the most resistant to change of any of the three typology groups.

This growing population of foreign settlers, attracted by the amiable qualities of the community and contributing to the local economy by their very presence, has come to expect more of an equal say in area planning decisions. As reported by McMinn and Cater (1998), this population is found to mainly live within condominium complexes, largely separate from other aspects of the community. McMinn and Cater characterized this as a “foreign clique” of Condo Tourists who not only live separately from the rest of the community, but who also do not have to work, and most often have more money than the rest of the local population.
As residents who own property, yet also exist as tourists and consumers of the destination product, they hold a unique place within the community framework. Such a population has become a much more common fixture within tourism destinations, with long-time visitors choosing to expand their association with an area with which they have fallen in love. So, it would make sense that they would most appreciate as little change to the area as possible. Their growing presence, coupled with their financial influence, makes this group likely to expect to get their way. This is supported in that this group, as well as the Developer Tourists, spoke rather dismissively of the ability of the Native Residents to make proper decisions (as they view them) concerning development decisions or management of their own home area.

For the Condo Tourists of San Pedro, those survey variables rated of greatest concern pertained to the environmental and community/social variables, with much less importance placed on economic attributes of the community. As was expected, none of the economic variables were rated as important by the Condo Tourists as they were by the other two groups. However, the community/social variables were also not rated as important by the Condo Tourists as they were by the Native Residents or the Developer Tourists. In terms of the qualitative discussions, however, there was much concern specifically focused on traffic, road conditions, health and crime. This group also generally rated the current condition of all the community attributes as lower than did either of the other two resident groups, with every economic and community/social variable rated the lowest and fully half rated as being below neutral. Further, the current condition of the environmental variables were rated lower than the Native Residents, but higher than the Developer Tourists. What is also significant and that places the Condo Tourists within the Last Settler conceptual framework is the fact that
this group places the greatest number of community attributes within the quadrant, ‘Tourism could hurt,’ rating the most variables as currently in good condition, but as the most likely to be negatively impact upon due to continued tourism development (see Figure 14). These include amount of wildlife, quality of the natural environment and amount of open space from the environmental category, amount of local tax of the economic category, and number of people, awareness of local culture, community spirit, quality of transportation from the community/social category. Clearly, this group perceives great potential for negative impacts in the future due to ongoing tourism development.

Length of residency has been shown to be influential in determining resident attitudes to tourism impacts, where the longer people have lived in a community, the more negative their attitudes tend to be (Davis et al., 1988; Brundt & Courtney, 1999), but other studies suggest that newer residents may have negative attitudes to tourism and tourists (Wyllie, 1998). Those residents with comparatively little exposure to tourism, in this case the newest arrivals to the island, may actually be more pro-tourism than those who have lived in the area for longer periods of time and have had to deal with its impacts to a greater degree (Akis, Peristianis & Warner, 1996; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996). The motivation for an itinerate tourist becoming a Condo Tourist lies much in the person’s appreciation of an area being enough that they want to become more permanently connected to it. So, for this group to generally express the least satisfaction with the community attributes of any of the groups is significant. McCool and Martin (1994) found that people who specifically choose to live in a new area can become rapidly attached to it. In fact, highly attached respondents were found to live in the most tourism-developed areas. The study further showed that people living in these communities with higher levels of tourism development actually had the
strongest sense of community attachment, but these residents also typically had lived in the community for the shortest period of time (McCool & Martin, 1994). This high level of attachment may be reflected in a lower tolerance for change by the Condo Tourists.

Much of the literature discusses Last Settler’s as having replaced previous waves of users who were displaced due to dissatisfaction pertaining to too much change. Therefore, this dissatisfied group is no longer in place to voice their concerns, so subsequent visitors continue to rate current conditions as acceptable as that is all they know of the area as they have found it. There is the possibility that the Condo Tourists, having come to know the area first as repeat visitors, are more acutely aware of changes that may have already taken place and for reasons mentioned above, are the most against these changes and so also the current condition the changes have helped create. Conversely, this group may also have either outstayed their dissatisfaction (possibly due to the fact they are loathe to leave an area where they have invested in a home or condo) and so are still present to voice their displeasure, or they have overcome this dissatisfaction due to other, more important attributes of the community or experience. There is also the possibility that the mini-communities created within the enclaves of their condominium complexes serves to shield this group from many of the negatives they view within the community, so they rated the community as they view it rather negatively, but actually feel more separate and so protected from it. This perspective may be supported by the fact that such enclave condominium development continues to flourish within San Pedro.
VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There has been a great deal of research in the literature concerning the impacts related to ongoing tourism development in host communities. An increasing body of study has related to those impacts dealing not only with the economic qualities of a community, but also the environmental and social issues. As a primary means to determine the affects of these changes, local residents are questioned and studied. This public participatory process is also viewed to provide a more just means of directing future development decisions. In an effort to further home in on the varying perspectives of stakeholders making up a single destination, various typology classifications and development models have been proposed and tested. This research has expanded on previous conceptual frameworks to better fit the unique scenario characterizing the tourism destination of San Pedro, Belize.

In defining this resident typology conceptual framework, made up of Native Residents, Developer Tourists, and Condo Tourists, building upon the original categorization proposed by McMinn and Cater (1998), testing for differences and similarities among the groups pertaining to twenty-five community variables, and then evaluating these findings within three predominant development conceptual frameworks, it is intended that a better understanding of an increasingly common development scenario may be achieved. Tourism destinations located within a developing country will generally be increasingly made up of both Native Residents and foreign expatriates, either attracted based on perceived economic development potential or specific environmental and social characteristics making up the community. In recognizing this community makeup, and studying these varying points of view, a greater consensus pertaining to the direction future community development should take may be achieved.
There are many findings resulting from this research that may contribute to the planning and development literature. Perhaps of more significance than the fact that several specific differences exist among the three groups is that there is also quite a bit of overlap and similarity of opinion. Even if the reasoning or motivation behind this similarity of opinion is motivated by very different points of view, it may still provide the commonality needed to make specific policy able to satisfy all three groups. For example, Native Residents, traditionally viewed as those more likely annoyed due to tourism related impacts, unless receiving direct economic benefit, were found to be more tolerant of impacts regardless of this benefit. This would suggest that as long as Native Residents are allowed some role in the planning process, they may likely remain in favor of ongoing development. As evident from several other studies, foreign expatriate business owners are generally more vocal and demanding of a part in community management decisions, especially pertaining to economic concerns. Developer Tourists within these survey findings do express a great concern over environmental variables as well. The Condo Tourists, most likely to be concerned over social and environmental attributes of the community, do demonstrate an interest in economic conditions which would most likely impact Native Residents lives, expressing an interest in the overall local quality of life.

It has been shown that each of the resident groups differ significantly concerning their own perspective of tourism related impacts within their home community. This signifies that even though the reality of the level of development is actually indisputable, based on factors such as number of hotels, rooms, and visitors enabling the placement of the tourism area within a development stage, the different perspectives expressed by the resident groups signify that they may believe this development stage to be quite different than that reality.
The secondary data shows San Pedro to be well within the development stage, and as such, ought to be subject to what are considered to be a set number of corresponding characteristics. The mid-development stage is most notable by the high number of foreign owners, increased government involvement and decline of both local involvement and benefit. With this is typically a corresponding increase in community conflict as greater amounts of societal and environmental impacts occur and different groups are not felt to benefit, most often, the original local population.

However, this research shows that the three resident typology groups do not all place San Pedro, and their experience of living there, at the same point in development. Most notably, the Native Residents should show greater dissatisfaction, especially considering that they do, in fact, feel themselves to currently lack equitable benefit. However, the results of this study display an ongoing optimism that increased tourism development will likely benefit them still. In terms of the Tourism Area Life Cycle, these views should only be evident at the very beginning of the development stage, as it first shifts from the period of involvement, before the later disenfranchisement has had time to occur. The Condo Tourists generally arrive at a destination in the later development stage, even marking the beginning of consolidation. As the rate of itinerate visitors begins to decline, Condo Tourists generally then move in, taking their place. This shift may be due to the fact these Condo Tourists may prefer a place as it receives less visitation, not more and are able to benefit from the reduced costs due to lower numbers. However, in the case of San Pedro, ongoing increases in short-term visitors has actually corresponded to ongoing increases in Condo Tourists. To the Condo Tourists, then, their perspective and relocation to San Pedro places them at a much later point of the development stage. It is the Developer Tourists who are most in accordance
with the actual current stage of development in San Pedro. This is likely due to the fact that the evolution of area destinations, as conceived within the TALC, is largely marked by the economics of a region and the ongoing growth of Developer Tourists and their perspective corresponds to what economic opportunity exists.

The importance in understanding that these differing perspectives exist within a single development stage of reality is necessary to attempt to achieve a consensus among the different residents. Further, the need is to educate the various groups as to the way their perspective fits within the current development stage, as well as within the perspective of the other groups. As has been shown in this study, there is actually quite a bit of overlap among the perspectives already. Therefore, this analysis of the differences and similarities as viewed by three typology groups of tourism related impacts and the placing of these perspectives within three specific development conceptual frameworks has resulted in the opportunity to better explain these differences and move the entire analysis of tourism development and community planning forward. What will be necessary is to ensure the recognition of these factors and make ongoing community planning decisions based on these factors.

Recommendations for Further Research

1) The three resident typology categorization discussed in this research could be expanded and tested in other developing tourism destinations. This would enable greater understanding of those areas and further verify the typology conceptual framework.

2) The recognition of a new resident typology may enable a more accurate understanding of a community’s true makeup and societal reality. In studying these varying points of
view, a greater consensus pertaining to the direction future community development should take may be achieved.

3) The analysis of the differing resident perspectives within three different conceptual frameworks of tourism development could be utilized to better understand the true development of area destinations so that more favorable and sustainable community planning may result.

4) Concerning future research, the added perspective of the itinerate, short-term tourist, especially in San Pedro where repeat visitation is so prevalent, could also be incorporated into tourism development analysis so that their perspective of change could be better understood.

It is hoped that this research may enable a greater understanding of the differing perspectives that exist within a single community, as well as within a single development stage of reality in order to attempt to achieve a consensus among the different residents. Further research of these issues could better enable the formulation and implementation of specific policies to target issues related to the resulting impacts of tourism as viewed by each group. In this way, the various groups may be educated as to how their perspective fits within the current development stage, as well as within the perspective of the other groups, so that a more equitable and sustainable tourism product may result.
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I. Following is a list of community attributes related to San Pedro. Please check (●) each item according to how important these are to you:

- Very Unimportant (VU)
- Unimportant (U)
- Neutral (N)
- Important (I)
- Very Important (VI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>VU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of noise heard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety from crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community spirit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of hotels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance to meet new people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of local culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of pollution in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of uncontrolled development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of local tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of erosion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractiveness to invest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of litter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of new buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of shopping facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of the questionnaire is about you. Please remember all responses are confidential.

1) Gender: ☐ male ☐ female
2) What is your age? ________
3) What is your nationality? ________
4) How long have you lived on Ambergris Caye? ________ (number in years)
5) Where did you live before moving to this area? ________
6) Do you work in the tourism industry? ☐ Yes ☐ No
7) Do you own or partially own a business related to the tourism industry? ☐ Yes ☐ No
8) What level of education have you completed?
   ☐ no formal education
   ☐ elementary school
   ☐ middle school
   ☐ high school
   ☐ some college
   ☐ Bachelor’s degree (university degree)
   ☐ Graduate degree
   ☐ other ________ (please indicate)

Do you have any comments you would like to share about tourism in San Pedro or comments about this questionnaire?

Thank you so much for your help!

North Carolina State University

Perceived Impacts of Tourism Development in San Pedro, Belize

Funded through the Office of International Studies Program

This questionnaire is an invitation for you to take part in an assessment of tourism related impacts upon your home community of San Pedro, Belize. This study is being conducted as part of the degree requirements for a doctorate in Tourism Management at NC State University. Your input is critical in this effort and the information you provide will represent hundreds of residents in your community. This is your opportunity to be a part of this study and I sincerely appreciate your time and effort in providing this information.

Please remember, there are no right or wrong answers and all of your responses will be strictly confidential, so please give the answer that most closely expresses your thoughts or opinion.

Thank you!
Sarah Banks, Ph.D. Doctoral Candidate