



Assessing the Level of Community Capacity Building in Tourism Development in Local Communities

Fariborz Aref

Department of Social and Development Sciences
Faculty of Human Ecology, Putra University, Malaysia
Tel: 60-1-2299-9594 E-mail: fariborzaref@yahoo.com

Ma'rof Redzuan

Department of Social and Development Sciences
Faculty of Human Ecology, Putra University, Malaysia
Tel: 60-1-2348-4810 E-mail: marof@putral.upm.edu.my

Sarjit S. Gill

Department of Social and Development Sciences
Faculty of Human Ecology
Putra University, Malaysia
Tel: 60-1-225-911-410 E-mail: sarjit@putra.upm.edu.my

Abrisham Aref

Department of Social Science, Tehran Education, Ministry of Education, Iran
Tel: 98-91-2299-4824 E-mail: abrishamaref@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper attempts to summarize the findings of a study, which explored the levels of community capacity building (CCB) that contributed to tourism development in local communities. The study was carried out in Shiraz, Iran. The study focused on the level of community capacity building in local communities that involved in tourism activities. The research methodology of the study was based on qualitative and quantitative methods. Findings of the study show that the level of CCB in tourism development in the study area is generally low. Secondly, the CCB in the Old District of Shiraz was higher compared to the New District. The result also shows that the level of CCB is different according to types of tourism activities. The objective of the study also was to determine the relationship between the level of CCB and community leaders' perception of tourism impacts and their characteristics. The results from the multiple regression indicated that CCB can be predicted by community leaders' income, tourism income, extra activities, length of residence, educational level, and number of family members engaged in tourism activities.

Keywords: Community capacity building, Tourism development, Local communities

1. Introduction

Although CCB has been given only limited attention in the tourism literature, it has, however, been extensively discussed in other areas of development, especially health (George et al., 2007; Labonte & Laverack, 2001a; 2001b; Labonte et al., 2002; Maclellan-Wright et al., 2007; Raeburn et al., 2007; Seremba & Moore, 2005; Wickramage, 2006), education (Harris, 2001; Smyth, 2009) and agriculture (Dollahite et al., 2005). Lack of community capacity, coupled with limited understanding of tourism and its impacts, has been recognized as barriers to effective tourism development in third world countries (Moscardo, 2008). Capacity development in communities can be seen as the capacity of

community residents to participate in tourism activities. One important aim of CCB is to verify whether individuals, organizations and communities have been building their capacity for development of tourism in their communities.

Tourism development in local communities cannot be successful without the participation of community leaders and community residents. In the case of tourism development in local communities cannot be successful without participation of community leaders and community residents. In the case of study area, Shiraz has a lot of prospects in building various forms of tourism activities. However, in the absence of community participation, tourism industry in Shiraz is not likely to improve (Aref & Ma'rof, 2008). CCB is the key to tourism development. Understanding how CCB could develop tourism in local communities is fundamental to continued successful tourism development projects. Hence, assessing the level of CCB is an important step in developing community strategies for achieving community development (Marre & Weber, 2007).

2. Literature Review

Many local communities recognize the importance of tourism in stimulating change in social, cultural, environmental and economic dimensions, where tourism activities have had a close connection with the local communities (Richards & Hall, Beeton, 2006; 2000). Tourism is a community development tool used by many local communities to promote community economic development. In relation to this, local community leaders play a vital role in addressing tourism issues. Meanwhile, tourism development and CCB programs have increasingly placed emphasis on community development. In pursuing this direction, the concept of community capacity has become of particular importance in identifying priorities and opportunities for community development (Hackett, 2004; Victurine, 2000). Moreover, CCB is a necessary condition for improving the process of tourism development and enhancing its benefits for local communities. There is an argument that CCB is necessary for community development and participatory processes at the community level (Reid & Gibb, 2004). The term community capacity is widely used among those who are concerned about community development or involved in social work and social service delivery (Marre & Weber, 2007). Community capacity in tourism development can be seen as the capacity of the people in communities to participate in tourism activities (Cupples, 2005), where tourism developers often have the tendency to invest in community training and CCB as a way of contributing to long-term community development. In relation to this, community development practitioners should regard the concept of CCB not as something new, but as a refinement of ideas found within literature (Gibbon et al., 2002). CCB, like community development, describe a process that increases the assets and attributes that a community is able to draw upon in order to improve their lives (Labonte & Laverack, 2001a).

Balint (2006, p. 140) states that CCB as a level of competence ability and skill and knowledge, is necessary in order to achieve the community goals. It, therefore, concerns the development of skills and abilities that will enable local people to make decisions and actions for tourism development. The decisions and actions of the community are based on their desire to develop their community tourism. Thus, community capacity in tourism development is closely linked to community development. This study provides a portrait of applying an approach of the level of CCB in 175 local communities which involved in tourism development. While there is a substantial body of literature on the definition and conceptualization of CCB (Chaskin, 2001; Clinch, 2004; Goodman et al., 1998; Laverack, 2001), however, CCB has proven difficult to measure (Ebbeseb et al., 2004), and also there is very little literature which discusses practical application of approaches that have been successfully used to measure CCB in tourism development. CCB can be seen as the capacity of community residents to participate in tourism development activities, both as individuals and through groups and organizations. It is not primarily about their ability to act in their personal, family or employers' interest, which are catered for in other spheres. However, many of the same skills are involved, and people who are active in the community invariably benefit in other ways as well (Cupples, 2005). Meanwhile, CCB is widely acknowledged as an important strategy for community development. It is recognized as an essential strategy to strengthen the wellbeing of individuals and local communities and underpins much of the work of government and non-government agencies (Fiona 2007). CCB also is the ability to empower community residents to self-manage their community tourism through participation in the building and enactment of shared community vision.

3. Methodology

The study was carried out in local communities of Shiraz. Shiraz is a central area for Persian civilization and culture. It is situated in the south western region of Iran. Shiraz also is one of the most popular cultural tourism destinations in Iran with a long interesting history of the Roman Empire (Cultural Heritage News Agency, 2006). Throughout history, foreign visitors to Shiraz have praised the city's gardens, its site, its wines, and the charm of its people. Iranians themselves, however, have long treasured Shiraz as a city of Islam. Its traditional Iranian name is Dar al -Elm (Abode of Knowledge) (Aref & Ma'rof, 2009b; Limbert, 2004).

The research methodology of this study was based on qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate building community capacity for tourism development. The geographical area of analysis is divided into two districts; the Old District and the New Districts. The Old District includes 84 communities, which are located on the central part of Shiraz,

whereas the New District includes 91 communities which are modern (Aref et al., 2009; Aref et al., 2009). The research study uses questionnaire survey and focus group discussion (FGD).

The data for this study were collected from community leaders and local residents which engaged in tourism activities. Community leaders was identified as a key factor in developing tourism in local communities (Aref & Ma'rof, 2009a; Moscardo, 2008). According to Eyler et al. (1999), Thompson et al. (2000), and Von et al. (1992) community leaders are able to speak for the community because of their knowledge and their roles in the community. For this study, community leader is defined as those who can influence policy, or opinion, or action on community because of their roles and positions in the community (Aref et al., 2009). For the purpose of this survey, questionnaire was designed for data collection. Moutinho (2000) believed that questionnaire is the most commonly used in tourism marketing research. The items in the questionnaire for this survey were measured using Likert scale. The Likert scale is also commonly used in marketing research (Grover & Vriens, 2006).

In this study, CCB is a composite variable, consisting of eight domains, namely, participation (7 items), community leadership (6 items), community structure (5 items), skill and knowledge (5 items), community power (5 items), sense of community (7 items), resource mobilization (5 items) and external support (5 items). The study used Likert-scale to measure every item. For measurement of the level of CCB in tourism development, as well as to determine the relationship between level of CCB and the leader characteristics and their perception towards tourism impacts, this study performed descriptive statistics, utilizing t-test, one-way Anova, correlation and multiple regression analysis. The sample population for questionnaire survey were community leaders. The respondents for FGD were residents who engaged in tourism activities.

4. Findings of the Study

4.1 Level of CCB in Tourism Development and its difference based on districts and types of tourism activities

The result from questionnaire indicated that generally the level of CCB in tourism development is low, except for the sense of community. However, based on the findings of the measurement of the three levels of CCB, it shows that according to the scores of individual level of CCB, sense of community is higher than skill and knowledge. In the organizational level of CCB; it shows that the score of leadership is higher than external support and resources mobilization. At the community level of CCB, the level of participation scores higher than community structures and community power. Overall, the results which illustrate the skill and knowledge, community structure, external support and resource mobilization are given a low rating of 2.0, and have been identified as being weak. This is might be due to the failure of community leaders to provide resource and skills to other members of the community. Therefore, it can be deduced that the leaders had failed to develop community structures adequately. The findings also show that 'sense of community' received a high rating of three (3). This is an indication that the overall level of CCB is weak, and that there is a need for the community to prioritize which domains they wish to strengthen. Hence, the findings imply that the community leaders were unable to develop CCB for tourism development. However, due to lack of technical assistance and other support from the government, community leaders could not be blamed as the main reason for the low level of CCB for tourism development. When comparing the three levels of CCB descriptively, the results show a high level of CCB in individual level for tourism development. By using the mean readings, it is found that generally, the individual level in tourism development is higher than organizational and community levels.

To support of the findings, the FGDs were also performed. Base on FGD, local people illustrated that community capacity in tourism development was weak. This finding emerged pursuant in 10 FGD sessions conducted in response to this objective. The findings support the researchers' argument that CCB needs to be developed further to enable local people to participate in tourism development processes. However, as it was mentioned earlier, one of the reasons of underdevelopment of tourism industry in Iran is the low level of collaboration between government sector and the local communities. In other words, the government has taken little initiative to improve tourism as a source of income for local communities. The role of government is important for tourism development in third world countries. In support with this argument, Cole (2007) believes that government can play an important role in mediating for tourism development in local communities. Some writers also believed technical assistance from government as the key element in building community capacity (Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition, 2007). This might also the reason why there was a little effort taken by the community leaders to building capacity in tourism development, even though there are many tourist attractions found in Shiraz. In relation to the above discussion, community leaders could not be blamed as the main reason for the lack of community capacity for tourism development.

According to the results of this study, individual level of capacity building has more effect in the process of CCB in tourism development. The findings illustrate a range of strengths and weaknesses of the level of building capacity in local communities for tourism development. Skill and knowledge, community structure, external support and resource mobilization were given a low rating of 2.0, and were identified as being weak because of the failure of community leaders to provide resources and skills to other members of the community. Therefore, the community leaders failed to develop the community structure for tourism development. In local communities of Shiraz, this situation had led to a

reduction in the number of community meetings and low level of participation in tourism decision making among community residents. However, most research suggests that tourism is a community decision making, and tourism development is an effort that has community support (Luloff et al., 1994). But in some local communities of Shiraz, the respondents indicated that the decision making to develop tourism was not a community decision. This follows the paradigm that without community participation, it "is difficult to develop a tourism industry in the community" (Andereck & Vogt, 2000 p. 27). The interpretation of the findings gives 'sense of community' a high rating of 3. Therefore, the hospitality of the local community is vital to the tourism development. Hence, tourism in the local communities should be developed according to sense of community (Andriotis, 2005). However, Chapman & Kirk (2001) state that skill and knowledge is vital to CCB, but the finding of this study shows that skill and knowledge is not that important. However, the result of analysis of the 392 case studies of tourism development indicated that the most barriers to effective tourism development were a lack of skill and knowledge. The lack of tourism knowledge is a critical barrier that not only directly limits the ability of local people to participate in tourism development but also contribute to the next barriers: a lack of local tourism leadership and domination of external agents (Moscardo, 2008).

To prove whether the differences are significant, t-test statistical analysis was used. According to the results, the Old Districts of Shiraz reported significantly higher level of CCB compared to the New District of Shiraz, with significant comparative levels of .000, $t = 9.465$, $p < .05$. Findings show that development of sense of community in the New District is lower than the Old District of Shiraz. This is because of community diversity in culture and ethics. This result also indicates that most people in this city are hospitable towards tourists. However, participation in the New District is lower than the Old District. This is due to fact that people in this district are closely related to each other. The findings of this study also illustrate the level of sense of community as a high when compared to other levels. This finding is consistent with Andriotis' finding (2005,) which illustrated that hospitality of the local communities is vital to development of tourism industry. Meanwhile, Murphy (1985) agrees that tourism development depend not only on the natural and community resources but also on the sense of community. Thus the sense of community is essential for tourism development. Therefore, the communities that are antagonistic to tourists, no amount of attractions will compensate for the hospitality. The findings can be support by the Gemeinschaft theory. According to Tonneis's theory; the local communities in the Old District of Shiraz are a sample of Gemeinschaft and local communities in the New District are a sample of Gesellschaft. Based on Tonneis theory, in a Gemeinschaft society, the members live together and develop common experiences, interests, memories and histories (Appelrouth & Edles, 2007).

To test the difference between the levels of CCB based on types of tourism activities One-way Anova was performed. The results show that the levels of CCB in medical services (Mean = 93.25) and culture tourism activities (Mean = 91.67) are higher than other types of tourism activities. These results show the variance between groups and the variance within groups. For CCB significant level =.000 shows a significant difference of CCB between different types of tourism activities, $F(4,170) = 9.014$, $P < .000$. The findings of comparison of CCB according to types of tourism activities illustrated that level of building capacity in cultural activities is the highest than others tourism activities. The findings are consistent with previous studies about cultural tourism (Aref & Ma'rof, 2009c). According to Moscardo (2008, p. 86) types of tourism activities identified which supposedly has the potential to involve and capacity development for tourism development. Therefore, these finding are consistent with the findings of Moscardo (2008) about the importance of cultural tourism activities. It is considered that the government have special vision and attention on cultural tourism activities. Also, Godfrey & Clarke (2000) stated that types of tourism activates do not have same effect and impacts on local communities. Therefore, level of development in each type of tourism activity is different. The finding of this study is also supported by Cole (2007) in which he believes that cultural tourism is one of the important types of tourism activities that brings community development. According to the Travel Industry Association of America (2005), the cultural tourism is more educational when compared with others types of tourism. Thus, cultural tourism, in addition to having more impacts on the level of community development, it has many potential for development. Among all findings, the work of Ivanovic (2009) is highly supporting the findings of this study. Ivanovic (2009) states that the cultural tourism has more resources than other types of tourism activities. This is because cultural tourism is dependent more on community cultural resources than on expensive infrastructures and accommodations. This characteristic gives cultural tourism activities the power to become the main tool of socio-cultural development through poverty alleviation and job creation among historically disadvantaged communities (Ivanovic, 2009, p. xx).

4.2 Community leaders' perception toward tourism impacts and its relation with level of CCB

Descriptive statistics reveal that respondents from both districts of Shiraz rated high positive perception and lower negative perception towards tourism impacts in local communities. Based on the mean measures of impact items, the impact items related to economic impacts has the lowest scores. When comparing between the three aspects of tourism impacts descriptively, the findings reveal that the community leaders have positive perceptions towards these threes aspect of impacts. Meanwhile, differences among respondents were also observed. The size of the standard deviations of 20 statements also indicated a moderate spread around the theoretical mean of three (3). The study has also found that

the community leaders perceived socio-cultural aspects of tourism impacts as more favourably than environmental and economic impacts (Aref et al., 2009).

This study also recognized community residents' perception towards tourism impacts through focus group discussions (FGD). It indicates a certain level of harmony between residents' perception and community leaders' perception toward tourism impacts. Relationship between leaders' perception toward tourism impacts with the level of CCB was also measured. For an alpha level of .05, the correlation between socio-cultural impacts and level of CCB was found to be statistically significant, ($r = -.092$, $N = 175$, $p < .224$), and the correlation between economic impacts and level of CCB was found to be statistically significant too, ($r = -.252$, $N = 175$, $p = .001$). This indicates that environmental impacts, and level of CCB are correlated negatively significant ($r = -.257$, $N = 175$, $p < .001$). The result also illustrated that leader' perception towards total tourism impacts has no significance ($r = -.075$, $N = 175$, $p < .325$). When comparing the socio-cultural, environmental and economic impacts of tourism and total tourism impacts descriptively, only economic impacts show positive relationship with the level of CCB for tourism development (Aref, Ma'rof, & Sarjit, 2009). However, the perception of environmental impacts has a negative significant relationship with levels of CCB. As have been mentioned earlier, Moscardo (2008) believed that the lack of understanding of tourism impacts can be a factor for underdevelopment of tourism in third world countries. Therefore, the findings of community perception towards tourism impacts on local communities helps to understanding relationship between community perceptions of tourism impacts with community support for building capacity for tourism development.

Based on all results that have been indicated above, it could be concluded that community leaders' perception towards tourism impacts cannot be a factor for underdevelopment tourism industry in local communities of Shiraz. These findings are inconsistent with the findings of Hafeznia et al., (2007), in which they believed in local communities of Iran; many people have negative perceptions especially about external tourism. In addition, the findings provide an introduction for discussion about relationship between level of CCB in tourism development and community leaders' perception towards tourism impacts. Gursoy & Rutherford (2004) suggested that tourism developers need to consider the perception of residents before they start investing resources in tourism development. Fisher (2005) also states on importance of leaders perception as an effective element in the processes of community economic development. The findings from this study supported the previous studies in terms of positive tourism impacts and their support for tourism development.

The finding which related to the perception towards economic impacts is consistent with the past studies that have been conducted by Ap (1992) and Yoon et al (2001). Most of these studies evaluated community residents' perception and assessments of cost and economic benefits of tourism and their support for further tourism development in their communities. In relation to this, social exchange theory supports that community residents balance the costs and benefits of tourism development, and their support for tourism depends on the outcome of this cost-benefits equation (Andriotis, 2005). Thus, it is believed that the economic impacts of tourism are the most widely researched impacts of tourism on a destination (Mason, 2003). Studies done by Andereck & Vogt (2000) also support the findings of this study. According to their studies, there is a relationship between community residents' support for tourism development and their perception toward tourism impacts. However, it can be concluded that community leaders support for building community capacity in tourism development is positively related to their benefits from tourism development. Empirical findings from these studies have suggested that people will act to maximize benefits and minimize costs in different situations. They also weigh total benefits against total costs that effect their decision to participate in tourism decision making and tourism development planning (Kayat, 2002; Lawler, 2001; Yoon et al., 2001). Andriotis & Vaughan (2003) also found that when the exchange of the economic, social, and environmental resources is at least balanced for the local communities, only then tourism will be perceived positively by residents. However, they caution that the benefits of tourism may be experienced by only a handful of individuals in the community and only those who benefit will be more likely to support tourism development. Accordingly, in order to have tourism be supported by all community members, the benefits of tourism must be evenly distributed (Andriotis & Vaughan, 2003). Hence, social exchange theory helps us to build a clear relationship between perceived impacts and support for tourism development (Perdue et al., 1990).

4.3 Leaders' characteristics and level of CCB in tourism development

The result from the present study shows that there was a significant positive correlation between age and CCB ($r = .416$, $N = 175$, $p = .000$). Moreover, there is a significant positive correlation between duration of residence and CCB ($r = .402$, $N = 175$, $p = .001$). The result also shows there is a significant positive correlation between duration of position held and CCB ($r = .462$, $N = 175$, $p = .000$) and significant positive correlation between income and CCB ($r = .601$, $N = 175$, $p = .000$). A Spearman correlation also found that there is a significant positive correlation between education and CCB ($r_s = .401$, $N = 175$, $p < .000$), income and CCB ($r_s = .644$, $N = 175$, $p < .000$), extra activities and CCB ($r_s = .214$, $N = 175$, $p < .004$), tourism jobs and CCB ($r_s = .546$, $N = 149$, $p < .000$) and number of family engaged in tourism activities with CCB ($r_s = .356$, $N = 175$, $p < .000$). The present findings are consistent with the findings of study by Fisher (2005) which stated that the characteristics of the leaders have successful effect in the context of community

economic development. Meanwhile, Schultz (2004) also stated the importance of leaders characteristics in relations to community development effort. One of the key leaders' characteristic in this study is educational level. In relation this, Vaughan (2003) stated that people with high education have the tendency to support tourism development.

The finding also shows that educational level has a significant relationship with level of CCB. This consistent with the finding of the study Andriotis & Vaughan (2003), who found that the higher the level of education, the more likely residents were to express their apprehension to tourism development in their communities. Meanwhile, age is also considered as a leaders' characteristic which has a significant relationship with the level of CCB. Consistent with this finding is the findings by Chen (2000) and Lawton (2005), who found that older residents also more likely to support tourism. Other key leaders' characteristic is income. A leaders' annual income is also found to have a significant relationship with the level of CCB. Chen (2001) also states that people with high income have more tendency to get involve in tourism development. He stated that economic benefits of tourism have an effect on the support given by local people for the development of tourism. Income from tourism and the number of family members who engage in tourism activities also have a positive significant relationship with the level of CCB for tourism development. Moreover, social exchange theory also supports the findings of the study. Length of resident was significantly relation to level of CCB. These findings are also supported by the studies carried out by Green et al. (1986) and Lawton (2005). Green et al. (1986) state that permanent residents may be more supportive of tourism development than seasonal residents (Green et al., 1986). Lawton (2005) also finds that the duration of residence in the destination plays an important role when examining community residents' support for tourism development. The duration of the leaders' position is also considered to have a significant relationship with the level of CCB. Those community leaders who have lived in the community with the longer duration as leaders have a tendency to exert more effort for development of CCB for tourism development. However, the variable related to having activities related to tourism, has a negative significant relationship with the level of CCB for tourism development. The finding shows that community leaders who may not work directly in the tourism industry may have different effort in CCB for tourism development. Martin et al (1998) conclude that those who do not receive real economic benefit from tourism do not have the tendency to seriously involve in the development of tourism industry.

4.4 Contributing factors in predicting the level of CCB in tourism development

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to identify the factors that contributed to the level of CCB in tourism development. Twelve predictors were included. However, based on the interviews with the leaders, only six predictors (income, tourism income, extra activities from tourism, duration of residence, educational level, and family engaged in tourism activities) were considered in the regression modelling. In the first model, only income was adopted as a predictor. The R^2 value of 0.737 implies that the six variables explain around 74% of variance/variation in the CCB in tourism development in local communities of Shiraz. According to the model summary, about 74% of the variation in the criterion variable Y (level of CCB) can be explained by the regression model with the six predictors. The regression model with six predictors is significantly related to the criterion variable Y, $F(6,141) = 65.912$, $p < .05$. The finding shows that the largest beta coefficient is 0.350, which is for the tourism income. The beta value for "income" is the second highest (.299). Thus, the model summary information reveals that the R^2 for this data set was .737. This indicates that 74% of CCB for tourism development by community leaders could be predicted by the independent variables of leaders' income, tourism income, extra activities, length of residence, educational level, and family engaged in tourism industry.

Since the findings of the present study shows that the important predictors for CCB in tourism development are income and income from tourism activities, therefore, it can be inferred that community leaders' support for CCB in tourism development is positively related to their economic benefits from tourism industry. Moreover, the findings of this study could be explained by theory of social exchange. Based on the social exchange theory community residents' support for tourism development depends on the outcome of this cost-benefits equation (Andriotis, 2005). Findings from these studies have suggested that local people will act to maximize benefits and minimize costs in different situations. They also weigh total benefits against total costs that effect their decision to participate in tourism decision making and tourism development planning (Kayat, 2002; Lawler, 2001; Yoon et al., 2001). The findings of this study also emphasize on role community leaders in CCB for tourism development. The findings are supported by Austen (2003), who stated that without the community leaders effort in building the community capacity in local communities, the tourism development would not materialized. Littrell & Hobbs (1989) also confirmed the importance of community leaders role in their discussion of the self help approach to building capacity in communities. According to Israel & Beaulieu (1990), without powerful leaders, it was virtually impossible for local communities to tackle problems. Taylor (2003) also believed that without the significant role of community leaders, building capacity cannot be developed. Therefore, tourism development planners should take into considerations the community leaders' characteristics as important elements in the development of tourism in local communities.

5. Conclusion

The main purpose of this paper is to illustrate and discuss variables related to the CCB for the tourism development. Although, there are several studies which discuss the construct of CCB, particularly in health promotions and agriculture, however, there seems a very few studies that discuss the CCB in the context of community tourism development. In relation to this, the present researchers have attempted to embark a study in order to understand CCB in tourism development. The data presented in this paper demonstrate that there is a need for the development of CCB in local communities of Shiraz. In terms of assessing levels of CCB; three main findings have been discovered. Firstly, CCB in tourism development in the study area is generally low. Secondly, the CCB in the Old District is higher than the New District of Shiraz. Thirdly, the level of sense of community is the dominant factor compared to other dimensions. Moreover, the results also show that the levels of CCB are different according to the perception of types of impacts of tourism. These findings have also been supported by FGD. The study also proves that a high percentage of the answers stressed the positive aspects of socio-cultural, environmental and economic impacts of tourism in local communities. The results of the study also show that there is a relationship between the level of CCB and community leaders' perception of tourism impacts as well as leaders' characteristics. The findings show that perception of economic impacts has a positive significant relationship with the level of CCB. Furthermore, some leaders' characteristics also had significant relationships with levels of CCB in tourism development. Meanwhile, the results from the multiple regression analysis indicated that CCB can be predicted by community leaders' income, tourism income, extra activities form tourism, duration of residence, educational level, and number of members family engaged in tourism activities. According to the result, the largest beta coefficient is for the perception of income. In sum, regression analysis indicated that approximately 74 percent ($R^2 = .737$) of the variance in CCB was predicted by those variables. It is hoped that the findings of this study could be used to assist community leaders in the design and implementation of tourism development strategies in local communities that are undertaking tourism planning. Moreover, it is expected that the findings of this study could be utilized by the leaders and tourism developers for their future follow-up studies and reassessment of CCB for tourism development.

References

- Andereck, K., & Vogt, C. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27-36.
- Andriotis, K. (2005). Community Groups' Perceptions of and Preferences for Tourism Development: Evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 29(1), 67-90.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 172-185.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665-690.
- Appelrouth, S., & Edles, L. D. (2007). *Sociological Theory in the Contemporary Era*. California State University, Northridge: Pine Forge Press.
- Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. (2008). Barriers to Community Participation toward Tourism Development in Shiraz, Iran. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(9), 936-940.
- Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. (2009a). Community Leaders' Characteristics and their Effort in Building Community Capacity for Tourism Development in Local Communities. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(10).
- Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. (2009b). Community Leaders' Perceptions toward Tourism Impacts and Level of Building Community Capacity in Tourism Development. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(3, Nov).
- Aref, F., & Ma'rof, R. (2009c). Level of Community Capacity Building for Tourism Development According to Types of Tourism Activities. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, 5.
- Aref, F., Ma'rof, R., & Sarjit, S. G. (2009). Community Perceptions toward Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tourism on Local Communities. *Asian Social Science*, 5(7), 130-137.
- Aref, F., Ma'rof, R., Zahid, E., & Sarjit, S. G. (2009). Barriers of Tourism Industry through Community Capacity Building. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(4), 399-408.
- Austen, P. (2003). Community Capacity Building and Mobilization in Youth Mental Health Promotion. Retrieved 5, September, 2008, from <http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/mh-sm/mhp-psm/pub/community-communautaires/pdf/comm-cap-build-mobil-youth.pdf>
- Balint, J. (2006). Improving community-based conservation near protected areas: the importance of development variables. *Environment Management*, 38(1), 137-148.
- Beeton, S. (2006). Community development through tourism. In: Landlink Press, Australia.

- Chapman, M., & Kirk, K. (2001). Lessons for Community Capacity Building: A summary of the research evidence. Retrieved 2, October, 2007, from <http://www.scot-homes.gov.uk/pdfs/pubs/260.pdf>
- Chaskin, R. (2001). Building community capacity: a definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. *Urban Affairs Review*, 36(3), 291–323.
- Chen, J. S. (2000). An investigation of urban residents' loyalty to tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 24, 5-19.
- Chen, J. S. (2001). Assessing and visualizing tourism impacts from urban residents' perspectives. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 25, 235-250.
- Clinch, R. (2004). *The Community Capacity Building Impacts of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone*. Baltimore, USA: The Jacob France Institute.
- Cole, S. (2007). *Tourism, culture and development: hopes, dreams and realities in East Indonesia*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Cultural Heritage News Agency. (2006). Shiraz to be registered in UNESCO's city of literature. Retrieved 1.April, 2008, from [http://www.chnpress.com/news/?section=2&id=6162CHN\(Cultural](http://www.chnpress.com/news/?section=2&id=6162CHN(Cultural)
- Cupples, J. (2005). What is community capacity building? Retrieved 3, March, 2008, from <https://www.ccwa.org.uk/v2/downloads/cms/1121303664.pdf>
- Dollahite, S., Nelson, A., Frongillo, A., & Griffin, R. (2005). Building community capacity through enhanced collaboration in the farmers market nutrition program *Agriculture and Human Values*, 22, 339-354.
- Ebbesen, L. S., Heath, S., Naylor, P., & Anderson, D. (2004). Issues in Measuring Health Promotion Capacity in Canada: a multi-province perspective. *Health Promotion International*, 19(1), 85-94.
- Eyler, A., Mayer, J., Rafi, R., Housemann, R., Brownson, C., & King, C. (1999). Key informant surveys as a tool to implement and evaluate physical activity interventions in the community. *Health Education Research*, 14(2), 289.
- Fiona, V. (2007). Community Capacity Building – A review of the literature. Retrieved 12, July, 2008, from <http://www.health.sa.gov.au/PEHS/branches/health-promotion/0711-capacity-building-review-lit.pdf>
- Fisher, D. K. (2005). Characteristics of Effective Leaders in Economic Development: An Exploratory Study. Retrieved 5, June, 2009, from <http://www.allbusiness.com/human-resources/employee-development-leadership/1052513-1.html>
- George, L. S., Fulop, M., & Wickham, L. (2007). Building capacity of environmental health services at the local and national levels with the 10-essential-services framework. *J Environ Health*, 70(1), 17-20, 63.
- Gibbon, M., Labonte, R., & Laverack, G. (2002). Evaluating community capacity. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 10(6), 485-491.
- Godfrey, K., & Clarke, J. (2000). *The tourism development handbook: a practical approach to planning and marketing*. London: Continuum.
- Goodman, R., Speers, M., Mcleroy, K., Fawcett, S., Kegler, M., Parker, E., et al. (1998). Identifying and defining the dimensions of community capacity to provide a base for measurement. *Health Education & Behavior*, 25(3), 258-278.
- Green, G. P., Marcouiller, D., Deller, S., Erkkila, D., & Sumathi, N. R. (1986). Local dependency, land use attitudes, and economic development: Comparisons between seasonal and permanent residents. *Rural Sociology*, 61, 427-445.
- Grover, R., & Vriens, M. (2006). *The handbook of marketing research: uses, misuses, and future advances*: Sage Publications.
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. G. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An Improved Structural Model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495-516.
- Hackett, H. (2004). *Community capacity building*. Paper presented at the conference of social assistance professionals in the provincial and municipal sectors. Retrieved 29, May, 2009, from <http://www.ranaprocess.com/Articles/Articles/Community%20Capacity%20Building.pdf>
- Hafeznia, M. R., Eftekhari, A., & Ramazani, I. (2007). A Comparative Study on the Tourism Policies in Pre and Post Islamic Revolution of Iran, Case Study: Babolsar in the Coast of Caspian Sea. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 7(24), 3836-3874.
- Harris, A. (2001). Building the capacity for school improvement. *School Leadership and Management*, 21 (3), 261-270.
- Israel, D., & Beaulieu, J. (1990). Community Leadership. In A. Luloff & L. Swanson (Eds.), *American rural communities*. San Francisco: CA: Westview Press.

- Ivanovic, M. (2009). *Cultural Tourism*. USA: Juta and Company Limited.
- Kayat, K. (2002). Power, social exchanges and tourism in Langkawi: Rethinking resident perceptions. *The International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(3), 171-191.
- Labonte, R., & Laverack, G. (2001a). Capacity building in health promotion, Part 1: for whom ? and for what purpose ?' *Critical Public Health*, 11(2), 111-127.
- Labonte, R., & Laverack, G. (2001b). Capacity building in health promotion, part 2: whose use? And with what measurement? *Critical Public Health*, 11(2), 129-138.
- Labonte, R., Woodard, G. B., Chad, K., & Laverack, G. (2002). Community capacity building: A parallel track for health promotion programs. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 93(3), 181-182.
- Laverack, G. (2001). An Identification and Interpretation of the Organizational Aspects of Community Empowerment. *Community Development Journal*, 36, 40-52.
- Lawler, E. J. (2001). An affect theory of social exchange. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 107(2), 321-325.
- Lawton, L. J. (2005). Resident perceptions of tourist attractions on the Gold Coast of Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44, 188-200.
- Limbirt, J. W. (2004). *Shiraz in the age of Hafez: the glory of a medieval Persian city*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Littrell, D. W., & Hobbs, D. (1989). "The self help approach". In J. A. Christenson & J. Robinson (Eds.), *Community Development in Perspective*.
- Luloff, E., Bridger, C., Graefe, R., Saylor, M., Martin, K., & Gitelson, R. (1994). Assessing rural tourism efforts in the United States. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(46-64).
- MacLellan-Wright, F., Anderson, D., Barber, S., Smith, N., Cantin, B., Felix, R., et al. (2007). The development of measures of community capacity for community-based funding programs in Canada. *Health Promot. Int.*, 22(4), 299-306.
- Marre, A., & Weber, B. (2007). *Assessing Community Capacity in Rural America: Some Lessons from Two Rural Observatories*. Corvallis: Rural Studies Program, Oregon State University.
- Martin, B., McGuire, F., & Allen, L. (1998). Retirees' attitudes toward tourism: Implications for sustainable development. *Tourism Analysis*, 3, 43-51.
- Mason, P. (2003). *Tourism impacts, planning and management*. Jordan Hill, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Moscardo, G. (Ed.). (2008). *Building community capacity for tourism development*. Australia.
- Moutinho, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Strategic management in tourism*. University of Glasgow Business School, UK: CABI Publishing
- Murphy, P. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*. New York: Methuen.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599.
- Raeburn, J., Akerman, M., Chuengsatiansup, K., Mejia, F., & Oladepo, O. (2007). Capacity building: Community capacity building and health promotion in a globalized world. *Health Promotion International*, 21(1), 84-90.
- Reid, M., & Gibb, K. (2004). 'Capacity building' in the third sector and the use of independent consultants: evidence from Scotland. Paper presented at the International Society for Third Sector Research 6th International Conference, Ryerson University, Toronto, July 11-14 2004.
- Richards, G., & Hall, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Tourism and sustainable community development*. USA: Routledge.
- Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition. (2007). Building Community Capacity Issue Paper. Retrieved 10, June, 2009, from <http://www.sustainablenorthwest.org/quick-links/resources/rvcc-issue-papers/Capacity%20Building%202007.pdf>
- Schultz, J. (2004). *Boomtown USA: The 7 keys to big success in small towns*: Hemdon, VA: National Association of Industrial and Office Properties.
- Seremba, F., & Moore, J. (2005). Building community capacity for healthy eating through the use of tailored resources. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 105(8, Supplement 1), 56-56.
- Smyth, J. (2009). Critically engaged community capacity building and the 'community organizing' approach in disadvantaged contexts. *Critical Studies in Education*, 50(1), 9-22.

Taylor, R. (2003). *Indigenous Community Capacity Building and the relationship to sound governance and leadership*. Paper presented at the National Native Title Conference. Retrieved 3, April, 2009, from <http://ntru.aiatsis.gov.au/conf2003/papers/russell.pdf>

Thompson, B., Lichtenstein, E., Corbett, K., Nettekoven, L., & Feng, Z. (2000). Durability of tobacco control efforts in the 22 community Intervention trial for smoking cessation (COMMIT) communities 2 years after the end of intervention. *Health Education Research, 15*(3), 353-366.

Travel Industry Association of America. (2005). Executive summaries – The historic/cultural traveller 2003 edition. Retrieved 20, December, 2008, from <http://www.tia.org>

Victurine, R. (2000). Building tourism excellence at the community level: capacity building for community-based entrepreneurs in Uganda. *Journal of Travel Research, 38*(3), 221-229.

Von Kroff, M., Wickizer, T., Maeser, J., O'Leary, P., Pearson, D., & Beery, W. (1992). Community activation and health promotion: identification of key organizations. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 7*, 110-117.

Wickramage, K. (2006). Building the capacity for health promotion in resource poor, tsunami devastated and conflict ravaged zones. *Promot Educ, 13*(3), 208-210.

Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. (2001). Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation modelling. *Tourism Management, 22*(4), 363-372.