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ABSTRACT

Previous studies have found that tourism provides economic benefits to host communities, including employment, income, foreign investment, improved infrastructure and facilities. However, positive impacts are often juxtaposed with local concerns regarding the negative aspects of tourism, such as seasonality, congestion, loss of culture and foreign ownership. Much literature supports the notion that residents support tourism, as long as benefits derived outweigh any costs incurred. All the same, recent studies advocate a movement beyond traditional social impact studies, specifically to advance scholarly inquiry into how tourism impacts the quality of life (QOL) of local inhabitants and how locals with a direct economic attachment to the tourism industry perceive the connection between tourism and QOL.

Consequently, the aim of this thesis is to explore the perceptions of locals employed in the tourism industry of Ubud, particularly, the impacts of tourism on QOL. This aim is achieved through the investigation of three key objectives, specifically (i) to explore what QOL means for locals employed in the tourism industry in Ubud, Bali; (ii) to investigate how locals perceive tourism contributes to, and detracts from their QOL; and (iii) to identify the connections between perceived QOL and support for future tourism development. A series of 21 semi-structured interviews with Balinese locals employed in the tourism industry were undertaken in May, 2014. The interviews were conducted under the expert guidance of a bilingual university-educated local “gatekeeper” (See Figure 3.1), and were audio-recorded, transcribed and then analysed using open, axial and selective coding to identify common themes.
Key findings revealed the core dimensions of QOL for respondents included family, health, friends, education and the working environment. Respondents value their community and surroundings, due primarily to the village feel, scenery and climate. Overall, respondents were primarily positive regarding the influence of tourism on QOL. However some questioned whether tourism was actually necessary in order to achieve QOL. Respondents showed concern for the potential of tourism development changes to Ubud such as modern, Western style accommodation, loss of traditional farming land and increased traffic. However, many were equally appreciative of the benefits received from tourism such as job opportunities, economic development, opportunities for cultural creativity and improvements to the local infrastructure and facilities.

This research extends traditional studies that focus primarily on identifying and measuring the perceived social impacts of tourism on host communities, by providing in-depth insights into what QOL means to locals employed in tourism. Future research should consider comparing and contrasting these with perceptions of QOL of residents in host communities not directly employed in the tourism industry, and their views on the impacts of tourism and future development. In addition, future research should enhance the conceptual clarity surrounding issues of how tourism and future development impacts the unique culture and traditions of destination communities.

**Keywords:** Bali, quality of life, tourism impacts, employees’ perceptions, host community, tourism development, sustainable tourism
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“It is certainly one of the most beautiful islands in the world, like every other part of South-East Asia, it has rice fields, palm trees and tropical flowers, but somehow in Bali these things fit together so perfectly that you feel when you come here like you have arrived in an enchanted garden. But there is one particular characteristic of Bali that makes it one of the most remarkable places on Earth…….the people.” (Attenborough, 1969)

The magic and appeal of Bali as a travel destination, described so precisely by Sir David Attenborough many years ago, still holds true today, particularly in the cultural paradise of Ubud.

This chapter introduces the purpose, objectives and design of this qualitative Master’s thesis which investigates how the presence of tourism in Ubud, Bali affects the quality of life (QOL) of local industry employees. It provides an overview of the thesis topic, including the aim and the three key objectives of the study. It also identifies and justifies the use of Ubud as the case study location.

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

The island of Bali is located between Lombok and Java in the Republic of Indonesia (Dahles, 2003). Bali is a well-known tourism destination in Indonesia, yet is comparatively small in size to the rest of the island archipelago, just 5,632 square kilometres (Hitchcock & Putra, 2007). The population of Bali is estimated to be 3.89
million people, of which a vast majority are Balinese Hindu (BPS Statistics Indonesia, 2010). Previous studies have identified Bali as a tourism paradise that boasts a range of accommodation choices from affordable resorts to luxury retreats, beautiful landscapes, friendly and welcoming people and attractive cultural offerings including dance, music, art and cuisine (Rubinstein & Connor, 1999). In 2015, it was estimated that there were over 9 million visitors to Bali, which is more than double the population of the island (Bali Government Tourism Office, 2016). Approximately 4 million visitors were international visitors, representing a significant proportion of the market (Ernawati, Dowling & Sanders, 2015). Recent studies predict that tourism visitation to Bali is expected to increase, with growth in visitor numbers from key market segments such as Australasia, Europe, the USA and mainland Indonesia (Xing & Dangerfield, 2010; Byczek, 2011; Cole, 2012).

Centrally located on the island, 35km north from the capital of Denpasar, the region of Ubud (see Figure 1.2) has been traditionally considered as a place to escape from the mass tourism and over development on the south side of the island (Harmini, 2009). Core visitor experiences to Ubud include the famous Monkey Forest, art and history museums and walking tours of the rice paddies (Bali Tourism Board, n.d.). Ubud is regarded as the arts and cultural centre of Bali with the local community committed to traditional methods of crafting stone (Batubulan), wood (Mas) and silver (Celuk) (Lonely Planet, 2013). At the centre of Ubud is the large art market, which has undergone extensive refurbishment recently (see Figure 1.1 below).
Figure 1.1 Ubud Market Transformation

(Source: Ooi, 2010)

(Source: Author’s own photo, 2014)
Ubud also showcases the traditional Balinese orchestra, known as the Gamelan which accompanies many of the cultural dance performances experienced by tourists at the Royal Palace (Bali Tourism Authority, 2013). Similar to South Pacific counterparts such as Vanuatu and Fiji, such a venue, with traditional music accompanied by an authentic narrative demonstrated by a sacred dance, holds special meaning in the Balinese culture (Hayward, 2009).

![Location of Ubud, Bali](Source: Alam Indah, 2016)

Tourism has been recognised by previous studies to generate economic benefits for the Balinese community such as employment, income, foreign investment, improved infrastructure and facilities (Dahles, 2002; Hampton, 2005). However, concerns about the environmental and social impacts of tourism on the Balinese community have been raised by tourism scholars (Cole, 2008). Cole (2012) suggests a key reason these concerns have been unearthed is because tourism in Bali lacks the capital or entrepreneurship for appropriate infrastructure and sustainable development. In addition, MacRae (2002)
argues that the scale of development which includes unlicensed and illegal support facilities has left irreversible scars on the landscape as traditional rice paddies and farm land is sold to developers (see Figure 1.3), 85 per cent of whom are non-Balinese. Compounding issues associated with unsustainable tourism development, it has also been reported that large numbers of tourists visiting the island are creating impacts on the environment including litter, waste and pollution (MacRae, 2011; Gurtner, 2007). Physical impacts on the environment are increasingly attributed to the level of tourism development, in particular strains on the water supply and associated issues with water quality and saltwater intrusion (Cole, 2012).

In addition to pressure on scarce resources such as water, Bali has experienced several negative social consequences of mass tourism including traffic congestion, overcrowding at key tourist sites, commodification of culture and undesirable tourist behaviour (Deery, Jago & Fredline, 2012). As a result a number of serious social issues have emerged including drug use, disease and child abuse (Cassells, 2011, Hodal, 2011 & Hickman, 2012). As Indonesia is a known terrorism hotspot (Prideaux, Laws & Faulkner, 2003), the town of Ubud and Bali more generally is also faced with a continuous security threat, stemming primarily from terrorist bombings in Kuta in 2002 and 2005. To alleviate this threat there is ongoing police surveillance and arrests relating to planned attacks on the island (Baker & Coulter, 2007). Consequently, although sustainable tourism in Bali may be desirable, it has been criticised for being difficult for tourism professionals and government officials to operationalise (Law, De Lacy, Lipman & Jiang, 2016).
Figure 1.3 Rice Paddy Villa Construction Jalan Bisma, Ubud

(Source: Author’s own photos, 2014)
Ubud itself is not without its share of tourism development issues, with agricultural land sold to developers to construct more hotels, villas and restaurants for visitors (Sutawa, 2012). Ubud is also beginning to display initial signs of acculturation, where one dominant culture, usually Western, infiltrates and suppresses another culture (Hillman, Moyle & Weiler, 2015). This is illustrated by the strong presence of imported American brands in the main tourist areas including its own Starbucks coffee outlet (Hall, 2007).

The focus of this thesis is on the nexus between sustainable tourism, social impacts and quality of life for tourism industry employees. Specifically this research seeks to discern how tourism impacts the quality of life of Ubud locals who are currently working in the tourism industry. By focusing on quality of life, this research extends traditional studies on resident attitudes that focus primarily on identifying and measuring the social impacts of tourism on locals. Adding a quality of life dimension presents the opportunity to develop conceptual clarity surrounding issues of how tourism can affect life satisfaction for locals in destination communities, especially those employed directly in the tourism industry. This research also provides practical implications for tourism planners and government officials, with results geared towards informing policy designed to ensure tourism enhances the quality of life for locals employed in the tourism industry, with flow on effects to other segments of the community, thus ensuring tourism is an appropriate sustainable development pathway.

1.2 RESEARCH AIM, OBJECTIVES AND METHOD

Although the impacts of tourism have been examined in a variety of different geographic contexts, there still remains a lack of knowledge surrounding how tourism
impacts the quality of life of destination communities, including residents with direct employment in the industry (Lin, Wong & Ho, 2013). The literature on tourism impacts and quality of life, in particular has an emphasis on attitudinal and perceptual studies (Moyle, Croy & Weiler, 2010). In this body of knowledge residents are commonly asked how tourism affects the local community, what changes have been evident in their surrounding environments, and to what extent they support tourism development (Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012).

Previous studies have a tendency to use quantitative methods, rating residents’ perceptions of impacts to discern support for future tourism development. However, this preference for quantitative methods has left areas such as quality of life, which is arguably more difficult to quantify, conceptually underdeveloped, particularly within a tourism context. Subsequently, this research employed a qualitative, interpretive methodology using techniques such as semi-structured, in-depth interviews to explore what QOL means to local tourism employees and tourism’s effect on QOL. This research also used photo elicitation to assess support or non-support for future tourism development in Ubud. This is a response to a call from Andereck, Valentine, Vogt and Knopf (2007) for further research to be undertaken on how tourism affects individual and family life satisfaction, including the level of satisfaction of residents, including local industry employees, with regard to their neighbourhood and community.

Consequently, the aim of this research is to explore tourism industry employees’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism on the quality of life in Ubud. Three key objectives drive the achievement of this research aim.

1. To understand what quality of life means to locals employed in the tourism industry in Ubud, Bali
2. To investigate how locals employed in the tourism industry perceive tourism contributes to, and detracts from, their quality of life in Ubud, Bali

3. To explore the connection between the perceived quality of life of locals employed in the tourism industry and support for future tourism development in Ubud, Bali.

To achieve the aim and objectives, this research blends core concepts derived from Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Social Representation Theory (SRT). SET lays the foundation for the research, enabling an exploration of how residents perceive tourism impacts and associated development. SRT was used as the guide to ensure that an accurate representation of the community’s exchange with the tourism industry was gathered from local tourism industry employees. Blending these two interconnected theories, and extending each from a focus on social impacts to QOL, presents the opportunity to make a unique and innovative contribution to the development of theory driven knowledge concerning the impact of tourism on the quality of life on locals employed in the tourism industry, which has a flow-on effect to the broader community especially when tourism is the dominant economic sector.

The fieldwork in this study was undertaken in a developing country, where the author does not have knowledge of the Bahasa Indonesia language and is from a Western cultural background. To mitigate this potential issue, a gatekeeper was employed to be present throughout the interview process, so as to explain and interpret responses when required. Further discussion of limitations is presented in Chapters 2 and 6.

1.3 CASE STUDY: UBUD, BALI, INDONESIA

The research into the social impacts of tourism on island environments is well established and documented (Moyle, Weiler & Croy, 2013), however its application to
Bali is limited (Wall, 1996). The island is cited in numerous tourism texts most commonly as a case study or as a cautionary tale about over-development and mass tourism (Sharpley, 2009; Yamashita, 2003). All the same there has been only limited research focus on tourism impacts and development in Bali specifically (Cole & Browne, 2015). The majority of research relating to tourism impacts in Bali took place after the Bali bombings in 2002 and 2005 and there is a need for updated information now that tourism has been rejuvenated and visitor numbers in 2015 (9.265 million tourists) far exceed those prior to the attacks (3 million tourists) in 2001 (Nordholt, 2007; Hanson, 2010; Bali Government Tourism Office, 2016). There is a burgeoning knowledge base of articles that connect tourism and terrorism in Bali (Putra & Hitchcock, 2006; Pambudi, McCaughey & Smyth, 2009).

Bali is an example of an island “enclave paradox” (Shakeela & Weaver, 2012, p.1353). This inherent juxtaposition refers to the seventy five percent of residents in Bali who are not directly employed in the tourism industry, yet are still receiving the economic benefits, without direct exposure to cultural differences between tourists and hosts on the basis of wealth, religion, language or race. Arguably such residents are buffered from conflict or offence caused from regular interaction with tourists. Previous literature has found that residents who directly benefit from the tourism industry are more likely to support tourism, however locals employed directly in the industry, especially in island communities such as Bali are a minority.

The community of Ubud, situated in the central region of the island, was selected as the case study setting for this thesis. The core rationale for the selection of this location is that Ubud is the traditional cultural centre of Bali, has a semi-rural landscape, with tourism developing at an exponential rate (Hillman et al., 2015). As such Ubud has been
identified by previous studies as a destination most at risk of losing the very qualities that attract tourists to the region if development continues at its current pace (Sutawa, 2012). For instance Ubud has several sawah or rice terraces surrounding the town. These terraces are aesthetically attractive to tourists and provide spectacular backdrops to the increasing number of villas and hotels being developed in the region. However, scholars have expressed concern that the new developments will compete with water needed for irrigation of the rice fields, thus placing tourism as the dominant development pathway and having adverse impacts on traditional industries (De Lacy, Law & Hoque, 2011; Cole & Browne, 2015).

Ubud also has several surrounding local villages which have been encroached by tourism development, such as Kedewatan, Payangan and Singekerta (Chen, Sindarta & Sarheim, 2015). As such, the domino effect from Ubud is now arguably spreading to other rural communities, leading to increased and intensive contact between tourists and hosts (Geriya, 2003). In 1971, French consultants from SCETO identified the southern regions of Nusa Dua, Kuta and Sanur as the centres for tourism specific facilities and development in the Bali Tourism Study prepared for the Government of Indonesia (Picard, 1993; Hitchcock, 2009). The plan supported concentrating tourist number in these regions and promoted growth of tourism as a development pathway (Dwipayanti, 2006). The initial tourism development plan in 1971 identified cultural tourism to Ubud as the most beneficial way to pursue increased visitation and to avoid environmental degradation, overuse and exploitation of the physical environment (Bhaskara, 2012). Tourism was identified as a development pathway, though it was advocated to be concentrated in the southern beach resort areas of Bali with a network of day-tripping routes to popular inland tourist attractions (Picard, 1993). Government officials cited that while small scale
cultural tourism would limit potential negative consequences for the physical environment in a destination such as Ubud, the consequences for cultural traditions such as art, dance, music and religious expression can be extensive and result in a loss of cultural identity (MacRae, 2002; Barker, Putra & Wiranatha, 2006; Davies, 2006).

Recent policy has diverted from this initial ideal of minimising environmental impacts, as cultural tourism has become a major drawcard for international visitors (Bhaskara, 2012). Along with impacts felt from increased tourism development, due to the cultural focus of tourism to Ubud, there is increased potential for misunderstanding between hosts and guests, as well as conflict between different segments of the community (Chiang, Stephenson, Kurashina & Iverson, 2009). Whether tourism to Ubud preserves and enhances traditional Balinese culture or alternatively places cultural traditions at risk of commodification is a pertinent issue that requires exploration, as culture has been identified in numerous island contexts as inextricably linked to quality of life (MacCannell, 1999; Suartika, 2005; Adams, 2008; Kerstetter & Bricker, 2012; Ridderstaat, Croes & Nijkamp, 2014; Moscardo & Murphy, 2016).

1.4 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESEARCH

This research is significant, as Deery et al. (2012) argue that many tourism studies focus on examining only the specific social impacts of tourism such as crime, without making the connection between tourism impacts and issues associated with quality of life. The study adopts a bottom-up approach to unearth what quality of life entails for local residents of tourism focused communities, thus minimising the impact of Western connotations of the core construct of interest. In addition, this research builds conceptual clarity on the role that tourism can play in contributing or detracting from quality of life.
for locals employed in the tourism industry. The research further contributes to theory by building on conceptual models of the impacts of tourism on the quality of life of local communities. By proposing a conceptual model for exploration and testing in other geographic and contextual contexts, it lays the foundation for future studies that can explore the connection between perceived quality of life and future tourism development. This will advance existing literature in the nexus between sustainable tourism, social impacts and quality of life for island and other cultural destination communities.

1.5 OVERVIEW OF THESIS

This introduction has provided an overview of the thesis topic including the aim and objectives of the study, and has identified and justified Ubud as the appropriate case study to explore issues related to tourism and quality of life. Chapter Two will review the literature on sustainable tourism development, social impacts, quality of life and tourism industry employees. Chapter Three provides an overview of the method consisting of 21 semi-structured interviews with locals employed in the tourism industry in Ubud, Bali. Chapter Four presents results of the research, specially narrowing in on what quality of life means for locals employed in the tourism industry, the connection between tourism impacts and quality of life, as well as support for future tourism development. Chapter Five connects these findings with those from existing literature, as a basis for refining Deery et al.’s conceptual model. Finally, Chapter Six concludes the research by presenting a summary of the core findings, as well as stipulating the core contributions to theory, outlining the practical implications of the research, identifying the limitations and presenting a series of recommendation for future research,
This chapter has provided an introduction to the beginning with the need for research on perceptions of tourism industry employees located in the cultural tourism hub of Ubud. It explained that while Bali has experienced many positive economic impacts from tourism, the socio-cultural and particularly physical environmental impacts have the potential to outweigh any benefits received. Chapter One then introduced the research aim of this thesis; “to explore tourism industry employees’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism on the quality of life in Ubud, Bali”, and explained how this aim would be achieved through the investigation of three key research objectives, underpinned by core concepts derived from Social Exchange Theory (SET) and Social Representation Theory (SRT). Next, the background of tourism in Bali including policy direction and development of the industry were explained, including an outline of the rapid increase in visitor numbers and tourism related development in recent years. The contributions of this study were also outlined, specifically the conceptual clarity that will be provided regarding the effect of tourism on local industry employees and whether tourism adds to or detracts from their QOL. Finally the structure of the remaining chapters of the thesis was outlined: Literature Review, Methodology, Results, Discussion and Conclusion including Implications and Future Research.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

As the focus of this thesis is on the impacts of tourism on the quality of life for locals employed in the tourism industry, this chapter reviews three interconnected bodies of knowledge. Specifically this thesis critically analyses the concepts and theories from previous studies on sustainable tourism, social impacts of tourism and quality of life for host communities. The chapter begins with a brief history and overview of the development of sustainable tourism (section 2.2), including a definition of this concept, as it is the aspiration for sustainability that underpins the need for positive social impacts and positive perceptions of these by host communities.

The second body of literature reviewed is this chapter is impacts of tourism (section 2.3). Previous studies have found that a destination is more sustainable when residents are involved and support tourism (Lee, 2013). Consequently this has led to an increased recognition of the importance of understanding resident perceptions of social impacts of tourism (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2010; Kim, Uysal & Sirgy, 2012) (section 2.3.1). Perceptions of and concerns with tourism impacts have been demonstrated to influence residents’ attitudes, particularly support for future development (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011), and so the body of literature on resident attitudes/favourability towards (support or lack of support for) tourism development is also reviewed (section 2.3.2).

As will be discussed later in this chapter, more recent literature has suggested that perceptions of impacts translate into positive or negative attitudes toward tourism depending on residents’ perceptions of how their quality of life is or will be affected by tourism (Huh & Vogt, 2008; Deery et al., 2012). An emerging area of scholarly inquiry
examined in section 2.4 is the effect of tourism on quality of life, such as an overall feeling of life satisfaction, through improved lifestyle achieved and overall positive sentiment to the surrounding community (Williams & Ponsford, 2009; Hunt & Stronza, 2013). Finally, section 2.5 reviews previous literature on tourism industry employees, living and working in various tourism destinations.

2.2 SUSTAINABLE TOURISM

The concept of sustainability first came to the attention of tourism researchers with the development of the Brundtland report in 1987 (Ruhanen, Weiler, Moyle & McLennan, 2015). Debate over what constitutes sustainable tourism has been widely discussed and reflected upon by the academic community (Edgell, 2006; Hall, 2010; Weaver, 2006). McCool and Moisey (2008) describe sustainable tourism as a softer form of tourism that is respectful of the cultural and physical environment, and inclusive of the local population, reflected by important policy decisions. Edgell (2006, p 15) defines sustainable tourism as:

“...achieving growth in a manner that does not deplete the natural and built environment and preserves the culture, history, heritage and arts of the local community.”

Although debate over the definition of sustainable tourism is still active in the literature, sustainability has become an underlying aim of tourism policy, planning and management in destinations around the world (Dredge, 2006; Lawrence & Dredge, 2007). Research on sustainable tourism is vast, and is multi-disciplinary in its approach, with studies stemming from core disciplines such as psychology, environmental science and geography, amongst others (Moyle et al., 2013). Sustainable tourism research has also
evolved over the last 20 years (Miller, Merrilees & Coghlan, 2015), with a range of new instruments developed to measure indicators of sustainable tourism (Miller, 2001). In addition to the development of indicators, there are a raft of policies, management tools and technological advances to support sustainable tourism ideals (Buckley, 2009).

Despite the idealistic notion of sustainable tourism, the success of these instruments is often negated by poor implementation practices, particularly in developing and less developed countries (Saarinen, 2006; Hall, 2010). In developing economies, the advancement of sustainable tourism can be influenced by power struggles, with certain actors and agencies attempting to influence the formulation of tourism policies for their own benefit (Yasarata, Altinay, Burns & Okumus, 2010).

While concerns over the sustainability of tourism were initially largely based on impacts to the physical environment, since the 1990s research has included a focus on social impacts on the community (Saarinen, 2006; Williams & Ponsford, 2009). During this time the concept of triple bottom line accounting featured prominently in tourism literature (Buckley, 2003; Faux, 2005). The triple bottom line approach measures the economic, socio-cultural and environment costs and benefits with the goal that tourism will produce more benefits than costs in all three domains (Buckley, 2003).

A key challenge for sustainability is that it is often managed by national or regional governing bodies, rather than at the local level (Murphy & Price, 2005). These government bodies have been criticised for pursuing short-sighted development agendas, with economic returns placed higher than preferences of the local community (Foley, Lennon & Maxwell, 1997; Gunn & Var, 2002).
There are a range of reasons why local governments and communities might seek to adopt sustainable tourism practices. For instance, it is important to conserve and protect unique features and sensitive sites, to strike a balance between conservation and development (Hunter, 1997), to promote the economic development of a community while preserving intrinsically important features local communities feel are important to protect, or in some cases regard as sacred (Lane, 1994). For example, Cahyanto, Pennington-Gray and Thapa (2013) interviewed twenty eight residents of a rural village in Indonesia finding it was important for the community to have tourist access regulated to the local mosque. In addition, the experiences locals were willing to share were varied, including farming practices, landscape, architecture, art and meeting the local villagers (Cahyanto et al., 2013). Taking the perspective of the locals into consideration enables a solid foundation for tourism planners to create experiences that can increase community support and integrate tourism into a destination region in a socially sustainable manner (Cahyanto et al., 2013).

Indeed, support and where possible involvement and participation in tourism from the host community and other stakeholders has been demonstrated in numerous empirical studies as an important requirement for the sustainability of tourism (Lee, 2013). Such alignment of the goals of sustainable tourism with the vision of a community has been demonstrated to be a critical factor in operationalising sustainable tourism across the triple bottom line (Williams & Ponsford, 2009). Some scholars have proposed that sustainable tourism should also reflect a single identity of the region with the views of core stakeholders taken into account, thus alleviating potential for conflict with the local culture and environment (Angelkova, Koteski, Jakovlev & Mirevska, 2012). However, Byczek (2011) identified that portraying a single identity can pose significant challenges
for tourism planners, as the traditional way of life is often at odds with a Westernised urban landscape often associated with mass tourism.

Thus, ineffective stakeholder participation is an obstacle in the pursuit of sustainable tourism. A lack of meaningful involvement in the tourism industry by locals has been identified to lead to unfavourable attitudes towards development (Lee, 2013). To date there is no one-size-fits-all approach to resolving this issue, as theoretical best practice may fail to materialise in an applied situation (Waligo, Clarke & Hawkins, 2012). Moreover, as the size and volume of tourism development in a destination increases, so does the risk of negative attitudes in local communities (Teye, Sirakaya & Sonmez, 2002).

The most common form of involvement in the tourism industry is through direct employment of locals in tourism related businesses such as hotels, transport and tour operators (Collinson, 2012). Previous studies have found that although locals working in tourism are in a position to identify negative impacts, this is mitigated by the provision of economic benefits (Liu & Var, 1986). Essentially, especially in developing contexts this phenomenon is driven by a lack of other alternatives to support local livelihoods and generate an increased quality of life (Lacey, Peel & Weiler, 2012). An increase in interaction and cultural exchange between residents and tourists driven primarily by employment, coupled with an increase in the provision of leisure opportunities, have been identified by Lee (2013) to be a potential catalyst for favourable perceptions towards tourism by locals. Previous studies have identified that if locals are not directly involved in the tourism industry, especially in concentrated tourism settings such as islands, the propensity for negative social impacts of tourism such as overcrowding, noise disturbances and tension between community groups increases (Moyle et al., 2010).
2.3 SOCIAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM: PERCEPTIONS OF IMPACTS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

2.3.1 Perceived Impacts of Tourism

Impacts are often classified into positive and negative, although previous studies note this can be dependent on an individual’s perceptions (Boley, McGehee, Perdue & Long, 2014). For instance increased nightlife may be perceived as a negative impact for certain segments of the community, but may be desirable for others (Garcia, 2015). Social impacts can be measured with indicators other than resident perceptions, for example observing and recording traffic congestion (Saenz-de-Miera & Rossello, 2012), comparing tourist arrivals and expenditure with distortions in criminal activity (Biagi & Detotto, 2012), and measuring amounts of litter produced in tourism destinations (Campbell, de Heer & Kinslow, 2014). This section refers to what residents perceive to be the impacts of tourism, primarily social impacts, however perceptions of environmental and economic impacts were also uncovered. Research on the environmental, social and economic impacts of tourism dates back to seminal work completed in the 1970’s (Pizam, 1978, Rothman, 1978, Thomason, Crompton & Kamp, 1979). Initially interest on impacts was driven by economists, seeking to demonstrate how tourism can benefit communities seeking to quantify the economic value as a basis for future development (Crouch & Ritchie, 1999). However, discourse began to shift as concerns regarding the impacts of tourism to the environment and society emerged in destination communities (Hall & Page, 2014).

Since this seminal work research on social impacts has become well advanced (Newsome, Moore & Dowling, 2012). Despite this, there are still a number of issues that require further conceptual clarity and refinement (Deery et al., 2012, Sharpley, 2014).
The social impacts of tourism refer to “the manner in which travel and tourism effects changes in collective and individual value systems, behaviour patterns, community structures, lifestyle and the quality of life” (Hall, 2007, p.236). Social impacts are critically important for sustainable tourism, which places importance on improving the livelihood of local residents and raising awareness of social issues among visiting tourists (Lansing & De Vries, 2007). The focus of this literature review is on studies of resident perceptions of social impacts, as featured in section B of the Deery et al. (2012) model (Figure 2.2 below) which could include perceptions regarding facility maintenance, community pride and having interesting things to do, amongst others.

2.3.2 Attitudes towards tourism

The attitudes of residents towards tourism have been demonstrated to vary within a destination community, especially in relation to proposed future development (Pearce, Moscardo & Ross, 1996; Mason & Cheyne, 2000). The advocacy for tourism is thought to increase through involvement which is designed to create a sense of belonging and inclusion in activities that showcase traditions of communities (Palmer, Koenig-Lewis & Medi Jones, 2013). This study will focus on tourism industry employees’ attitudes towards tourism and tourism development in Ubud, which includes support or non-support for future levels of development, as illustrated in section F of the Deery et al. (2012) model.

Previous studies have identified a number of factors which have the potential to influence residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism (Andereck et al., 2007; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011). Key factors include, though are not limited to, the type and length of tourist-host interaction, the importance of tourism to the community group, level of economic dependence on the tourism industry, the extent of tourism development
and density, length of time living in the community and the location of the community in relation to the tourism zone (Ap, 1990; Ross, 1992; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Teye et. al., 2002). In research conducted in Sardinia Italy, Pulina, Meleddu and Del Chiappa (2013) found that residents living in close proximity to tourism activity showed a more positive attitude towards tourism than those located further away. Key findings hypothesised this was because locals living in close proximity to the tourism industry are more likely to be economically dependent on tourism and are able to recognise the benefits tourism can provide. Previous studies have identified several other issues that influence the capacity of locals to support tourism, including the type of housing, neighbourhood, family, satisfaction with surrounding community, social life and employment (Filkins, Allen & Cordes, 2000; Sirgy & Cornwell, 2001 and Grzeskowiak, Sirgy & Widgery, 2003).

A majority of research into resident perceptions of tourism uses quantitative research methods such as mail out surveys to large sample resident populations (See Appendix Two), using data to test associations between a pre-determined list of variables and perceptions of tourism (Nunkoo, Smith & Ramkissoon, 2013; Palmer et al., 2013; Sharpley, 2013). This research is especially useful for identifying different segments of the community that support tourism, it does not have the capacity to elicit the salient responses of locals, whose attitudes towards tourism and associated development may be more fluid and dynamic (Deery, et al., 2012; Woosnam, 2012).

Social exchange theory (SET) has been the predominant theoretical framework used by researchers to investigate tourist-host relations (Moyle, Croy & Weiler, 2010). SET originated from economics and was subsequently applied by social psychologists to explore the interaction between groups at both an individual and a collective level. (Ward & Berno, 2011). Hence SET has been applied extensively in research on tourism
destination communities, presenting a framework to ‘explain the relationship between individual benefits and perceptions of economic development’ (Teye, et al., 2002, p.669). SET stipulates that residents will seek benefits from both individual tourists and the tourism industry as a collective entity (Ap and Crompton, 1998). According to the core premise of SET, individual residents evaluate the positive and negative consequences of tourism for themselves to determine their attitudes towards tourism and associated future tourism development in the region (Perdue, Long & Allen, 1990; Jurowski, Daniels & Pennington-Gray, 2006).

There have been several recent studies which have applied social exchange theory as a theoretical lens to explore the community’s attitudes towards tourism (Moyle, Croy & Weiler, 2010; Nunkoo & Ramkissoo, 2011; Látková & Vogt, 2012). Wang & Pfister (2008) interviewed residents in Washington, North Carolina, a rural community, finding personal benefits from tourism were closely tied to positive attitudes towards tourism activity. On Bruny and Magnetic Islands in Australia, Moyle et al. (2010) used SET to explore ways to enhance guest-host interactions, finding that if residents choose to attend local events where visitors are present, they retain ownership of the interaction. Thus, locals feel they have control of the core elements of the community to showcase to visitors, leading to more positive interactions between host and guest. Nunkoo and Ramkissoo (2011) used SET in their study of Grand-Baie, Mauritius, which found that residents’ satisfaction with their neighbourhood can influence their attitudes towards tourism, including indicating their likely support for future tourism development.

Social Representation Theory (SRT) is an alternative conceptual framework commonly used in social impacts research (Beeton, 2006). SRT investigates how people try to understand and clarify the surrounding environment (Moscovici, 1981). The
surrounding environment in this instance does not refer explicitly to nature, yet encompasses values, attitudes, knowledge and beliefs that form their everyday lives and sense of community (Pearce et al., 1996). SRT acknowledges that views are not permanent, changing through exposure to the media or through exposure to tourism activity including contact with outside visitors (Fredline & Faulkner, 2000). SRT has been applied in the resort destination of the Gold Coast in Queensland (Weaver & Lawton, 2013) to evaluate residents’ attitudes towards the annual end of year school celebrations held in the region. Weaver and Lawton (2013) found opponents (18%) were more likely to be influenced by print and mass media, and were likely to be foreign-born while supporters (15%) were drawing from personal experience. The majority of residents were either conditional supporters (33%) or conditional opponents (34%). Weaver and Lawton (2013) recommended the use of more positive images and news items in the media but found even the supporters are aware there will always be a delinquent element attached to the event.

SRT has been identified as particularly useful for researchers in explaining the meanings residents attach to their environment which are formed through a constant, evolving process of communication and interaction within the tourism system (Zhou & Ap, 2009). For example, SRT was used to examine residents’ attitudes in Pamukkale, Turkey, a World Heritage site that has been adversely impacted through tourism to the area resulting in damage to the once pristine travertine pools (Yuksel, Bramwell & Yuksel, 1999). Stakeholders were interviewed regarding a conservation plan proposed for the site and three broad social representations emerged; those who recognised the major environmental impacts to the site from tourism, those who blamed the problems on planning authorities and those who were concerned the implementation of the plan had
resulted in a downturn in the local economy that was personally affecting the residents. Yuksel et al. (1999) recommend a continuous and dynamic planning process including the monitoring of stakeholder views, yet found this would be unlikely to be used in a country such as Turkey with a centralised planning system.

Research on attitudes towards tourism is thus extensive. That said, the relationships between social impacts, perceptions of these impacts and attitudes toward development are not fully understood. Moreover, the notion of quality of life in the context of tourism and host communities is arguably conceptually underdeveloped and in need of conceptual refinement. Broader research in the social sciences has incorporated quality of life (Michalko & Ratz, 2010; Uysal, Perdue & Sirgy, 2012), yet its application into the tourism field is embryonic (Hillman et al., 2015). Recently the links between tourism and quality of life have begun to be explored within literature relating to the social impacts of tourism (Moscardo, 2009). Studies have identified future research in this arena as necessary between tourism, happiness, satisfaction and overall wellbeing of locals from tourism communities from both the supply and demand perspectives of tourism (Michalko & Ratz, 2010; Filep, 2014; Uysal, Sirgy, Woo & Kim, 2015).

2.3.3 Host Community Visioning

Aside from measuring resident attitudes towards current tourism development, this study also focuses on eliciting perceptions regarding future development and asking respondents for their thoughts on how they would like Ubud to be in ten years’ time, also known as host community visioning. Several studies have found that resident perceptions of tourism impacts can have an indirect effect on their support or non-support for tourism development in the future (Green, 2005; Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011; Stylidis, Biran, Sit & Szivas, 2014). Host community visioning is an important tool in tourism planning
as a form of consultation with direct tourism stakeholders which can efficiently address local needs and promote change in a community that will provide benefits for its residents (Elkins, Bivins, Holbrook, 2010). In a previous study on host community visioning in Bali (Filep, Law, DeLacy, Wiranatha, Hendriyetty & Filep, 2015), residents from the southern tourism zones of Bali – Kuta, Jimbaran, Sanur and Nusa Dua were asked through the use of a written template how they envisioned the future for Bali in 50 years, how it would look, including QOL of the community and what were their thoughts on tourism on the island, including if they desired any changes in tourism. Residents expressed a desire for more opportunities in education, including scholarships and an emphasis on learning cultural traditions including Balinese language, along with improved healthcare such as more public health facilities and access to care by poorer communities (Filep et al., 2015). In terms of future tourism development, common visions amongst the residents included better urban planning, fairer distribution of wealth along with clean and efficient transport (Filep et al., 2015). Residents also hoped for a shift from mass tourism to alternative tourism with smaller hotels, nature focused attractions and facilitating tourists’ enjoyment of Balinese culture (Filep et al., 2015)

2.4 QUALITY OF LIFE AND TOURISM

The concept of quality of life (QOL) is plagued by definitional issues (Woo, Kim & Uysal, 2015). Similar to sustainability, quality of life is multi-dimensional and widely debated in the broader social science and tourism literature (Andereck et al., 2007; Veenhoven, 2013). The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2011, p. 6) defines QOL (see Figure 2.1) as “a measure of well-being and has
identified several social indicators to enable an assessment of QOL to be undertaken: health status, work and life balance, education and skills, social connections, civic engagement and governance, environmental quality, personal security and subjective well-being.” In other words, individuals may be happier with life progression if satisfaction with other aspects of life such as work and family is experienced (Weiermair & Peters, 2012). While the OECD list is comprehensive and explores several facets of what is needed to obtain QOL, this study is based on an interpretive paradigm where the meaning of QOL is constructed by the respondents’ rather than drawing from specific OECD indicators, with responses compared to the OECD indicators in Chapter 5.

Figure 2.1 Framework for OECD Well-being Indicators (2013)
The conditions that must be in place to achieve QOL can be explored from a subjective or collective perspective. According to some recent studies, QOL is a subjective phenomenon influenced by an individual’s environment and experiences (Dolnicar, Yanamandram & Cliff, 2012; Liburd, Benckendorff & Carlsen, 2012). QOL can also be explored from a collective viewpoint adopting a community-wide perspective (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006). In this context, QOL takes into consideration core elements such as environmental quality, per capita income, life expectancy and other health and well-being indicators, with responses from the affected community adding a subjective perspective (Cummins 1996; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Uysal et al., 2015).

In previous studies undertaken in a tourism context the concept of QOL remains underdeveloped, requiring clarification on the specific dimensions underlying the social fabric of host communities. To date, research on QOL and tourism has focused on tourism impacts, without delving into sufficient depth surrounding what actually constitutes quality of life for different destination communities (Benckendorff, Edwards, Jurowski, Liburd, Miller & Moscardo, 2009). Several studies have focused on the influence of tourism on host communities with a varying level of economic dependence on the tourism industry (Neal, Sirgy, & Uysal, 2004; Moscardo, 2009; Michalko, Bakucz & Ratz, 2013). Such research integrates a QOL component, in the sense that studies seek to understand how residents perceive impacts, exploring if tourism influences lifestyle satisfaction, assessing such items as feelings of contentment or fulfilment (Andereck et al., 2007).

Host communities experience varying types and intensity of tourism impacts (Kim et al., 2012). Not surprisingly, previous literature has discovered the consequences tourism has for perceived QOL in the community varies according to the destination (Andereck & Jurowski, 2006). Thus there is no set of universal recommendations for
developing and enhancing the benefits of tourism (Pearce, 2008). The differences in perceived impacts to QOL have been identified to be influenced by the environmental settings in which tourism operates, the tourists’ behaviour and patterns of travel, expertise of tourism industry staff and the role of the community in further development and, importantly, cultural traditions (Dredge & Jenkins, 2007).

There is a tendency for QOL to focus on life satisfaction, primarily from the tourists’ perspective. Extant literature on the demand side, namely tourists, demonstrates how participation in travel can result in the creation of memories that will last a lifetime (Nawjin & Peeters, 2014). Tourism is regarded as a generator of happiness and positive, fulfilling experiences, often cited as a means for advancing the QOL for the tourists (Dann, 2012; Chen, Petrick & Shahvali, 2016). This has resulted in scholars questioning how to harness tourism as a tool for extending such benefits to the host in addition to the guest (Filep, 2008; Lipovčan, Brajša-Žganec, & Poljanec-Borić, 2014).

Each tourism destination is different, with residents’ perceptions varying across socio-demographic and psychographic characteristics. As such, scholars have emphasised the importance not to view the host community as one homogenous group, with varying levels of social status and power (Andereck et al., 2007; Salazar, 2012). For instance, those who have the most to gain from tourism are often the most supportive of current development and future plans for expansion (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011). Alternately vulnerable segments are left out of the planning process, with potentially negative consequences for future QOL.

Extant literature supports the notion there may be only a minority of residents’ who perceive more positive than negative effects from tourism. Previous studies have found while tourism improves the infrastructure of destinations (Shani & Pizam, 2012;
Webster & Ivanov, 2014), this, in turn, has been shown to contribute to community pride with locals who enjoy living in a place regarded as desirable to visit (Pulina et al., 2013; Boukas & Ziakas, 2014). All the same, the real beneficiaries of tourism who experience a high QOL is considered a minority in many tourism contexts, specifically in developing nations (Michalko et al., 2013). For instance, socially disadvantaged and vulnerable groups often suffer negative consequences of tourism development, whilst also receiving the fewest benefits (Andereck et al., 2007). Ultimately the more positive social, economic and physical environmental impacts a community receives from tourism, the higher the QOL experience should be for the entire destination community (Meng, Li & Uysal, 2010).

Despite a burgeoning interest in QOL in the tourism field, there is limited research actually exploring what QOL means for locals directly employed in the tourism industry. This is especially important for host communities with limited economic options and with high susceptibility to over-development, such as islands (Oreja Rodriguez, Parra-Lopez, & Yanes-Estevez, 2008). Tourism is often an integral part of the identity of islands’ and without a sustainable industry to drive the local economy, isolated communities have an uncertain future (Moyle et al., 2010; Butler & Carlsen, 2011). The relationship between tourism and the quality of life of local communities is paramount, especially in island settings.

The connection between perceived QOL and attitudes towards future development has been explored in recent studies on destination communities. Several authors have reported on the linkages between the perceived economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts of tourism and QOL (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2010; Ismail, King & Ihalanayake, 2011). There is a growing notion that perceptions of tourism impacts
influence residents’ QOL and may affect support for the industry and potentially for future tourism development (Jurowski et al., 2006; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011). QOL research in tourism aims to understand how impacts are internalised by the community and what influence they have on lives overall (Benckendorff et al. 2009). All the same, this literature tends to associate the effect on QOL for those situated in the destination, not all of which actually work directly in the tourism industry (Andereck & Jurowski, 2006; McCabe & Johnson, 2013; Michalko et al., 2013).

QOL for communities involved in tourism is quite often assessed from a Western economic perspective with a common belief that the more economic benefits of tourism the higher the QOL (Andereck & Jurowski, 2006). The economic focus of previous studies has been criticised by Woo et al. (2015), who states there is a lack of research on residents’ perceived value of tourism as a predictor of QOL and whether or not it can improve community well-being in a destination. There is limited research especially in a developing country context exploring how locals who are employed in the tourism industry perceive the impacts of tourism on their surrounding environment and how this adds or detracts from their own QOL.

In response to the changing nature of social impacts research to include QOL, Deery et al. (2012) has developed a conceptual model which outlines the most common variables in social impacts research that can influence QOL experienced by residents and thus, in turn, how much support there is for tourism development (see Figure 2.2). There are several factors that can affect the ability of a destination community to absorb tourism impacts, maximising benefits while mitigating negative impacts. These include reliance on tourism for income, ratio of tourists to hosts, the type of tourist/s visiting and seasonality (Faulkner & Tideswell, 1997). These are known as extrinsic variables,
whereas the intrinsic variables are those directly associated with QOL such as resident involvement in tourism, location of community in relation to tourism activity, length of residency, socio-economic characteristics and level of involvement within tourism (Deery et al., 2012). These characteristics are illustrated in Figure 2.2 below.

**Figure 2.2 Tourism and Quality of Life (Deery et al., 2012)**

The model developed by Deery et al. (2012) has been constructed to extend conceptualisation around social impacts research. However, as illustrated in Figure 1 there remains avenues that require further consideration, conceptual clarity and refinement. For instance, the placement of QOL (E) in Figure 2.2 seems to suggest that effects on QOL follow a one way, pre-determined path, with no suggestion that sometimes this can be a two way reciprocal process or exchange. The social impact outcomes, which is really attitudes toward tourism development (see section 2.3.1), suggest there will be clear support or non-support for tourism, when rarely do
communities have homogenous views, as suggested by studies on residents’ attitudes (Moscardo, 2009; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011).

In addition, as shown in Figure 2.2, the extent to which residents’ support tourism development (F) is included in the model as an outcome and a dependent variable of QOL (Sirakaya et al., 2002; Huh & Vogt, 2008). This suggests that tourism development influences QOL and that potentially resident perceptions are a preceding indicator of what QOL has been achieved and whether locals are likely to support further tourism expansion (Deery et al., 2012).

Although a useful centrepiece of the model, there remains relatively little scholarly inquiry into the ‘black box’ of the QOL (E) component itself, specifically for locals working in the tourism industry. This study also explores if perceptions of tourism’s contribution towards QOL will influence the attitudes of (support by) locals employed in the tourism industry for future tourism development (F).

2.5 TOURISM INDUSTRY EMPLOYEES

As this study focuses exclusively on tourism industry employees it was important to examine the extant literature to explore if there were similarities to the current study. Beyond the tourism literature there is a broad body of knowledge on employees in general, especially in fields such as human resource management (Brzeziński & Bąk, 2015; Paillé & Raineri, 2015). In a tourism context there are several examples of studies that focus on staff predominantly in the hospitality sector, with both managerial and frontline roles core areas of scholarly inquiry (Tsaur & Tang, 2012; Jung & Yoon, 2013; Yeh, 2013; Sipe, 2016).
Previous studies on tourism industry employees that consider the influence of tourism on QOL are limited. As exception includes recent empirical research by Wan and Chan (2013) who explored the concept of quality of work life (QWL), focusing on casino employees in Macau. QWL refers to the employees’ overall perception of their work, including remuneration and future career opportunities. Wan and Chan (2013), found that employers providing QWL for staff by meeting personal and emotional needs such as a competitive salary, smoke-free workplace, clear supervision and increased training lowered turnover and organisational costs, encouraged more productive staff and resulted in lower absenteeism.

Another key study on QWL was conducted in China, with Chan and Wyatt (2007, p. 504) exploring the concept of ‘spillover’. In this context the notion of spillover alludes to satisfaction in one life domain affecting others such as leisure, work, family, social, health and financial well-being, also cited as ‘competing priorities (Lamont, Kennelly & Moyle, 2014). Core findings revealed each domain could be illustrated in a hierarchy, from most important to least important in achieving overall life satisfaction or QOL. The most important domain is dependent on the individual, however engagement in competing priorities is considered to have a spillover effect, as the more important domain influences each subsequent domain (Chan & Wyatt, 2007). For instance if an employee places family above work and is unhappy with their family life, this may have a negative effect on their performance in the workplace. In terms of effects on QOL for tourism industry employees, Lin, Wong & Ho (2013), queried if the nature of tourism employment, including irregular shift-work interfered with employees’ private leisure time. The notion behind conducting empirical work on the subject was that shift work could create work-leisure conflict, potentially influencing broader QOL, such as family
satisfaction, leisure time and employment whilst maintaining adequate psychological and physical health (Iso-Ahola & Wessinger, 1984, in Lin et al., 2013). The authors’ found that employers who provided a leisure benefit program including annual leave, subsidised recreation and staff travel could assist staff with attaining work-life balance and alleviating stress (Lin et al., 2013).

Aside from these studies, there is a dearth of literature focused explicitly on perceived QOL of locals employed in the tourism industry. Specifically there is a lack of attention paid to the attitudes of locals employed in the tourism industry towards future tourism development, and whether this has an influence on not only their own QOL, but for families and the broader community.

Pratt, McCabe and Movono (2016) recently conducted a study, focusing on locals employed in the tourism industry and how tourism influences perceived QOL. The authors examined two different communities, one heavily reliant on tourism for income, the other a more traditional, subsistence-based economy in the developing nation of Fiji. Residents were surveyed and their responses compared to indicators from the Gross Happiness Index (GHI). This index is based on Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness (GNH) Index which directly assesses community well-being. In this case, the authors wanted to ascertain whether hosting tourism influenced residents’ sense of well-being and happiness (Pratt et al., 2016). Often developed and less developed countries are compared using Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as a measure of living standards, as it is standardised and allows for quick and easy comparisons between nations, yet increased wealth does not necessarily translate to increased happiness for well-being amongst residents (Pratt et al., 2016).
One of the villages assessed was located next to a long-standing Fijian Resort, occupying land leased from the village with an agreement to recruit staff proactively from there (Pratt et al., 2016). As a result 92% of villagers were either directly employed in the resort or indirectly employed in associated tourism businesses such as operating tours or handicraft selling (Pratt et al., 2016). The other community on the island of Vanua Levu, was a more traditional subsistence-based village with only a handful of homestays and most residents engaged in traditional farming and fishing (Pratt et al., 2016). Results revealed that residents of the tourism village enjoyed a higher standard of living, earning more income annually than residents of the non-tourism village and had more modern housing in one of the most developed Fijian communities (Pratt et al., 2016).

All the same, despite the economic benefits associated with tourism, residents of the non-tourism village were significantly more like to describe themselves as “happy” (75%) than the residents who were working in the tourism industry (22%). Indeed, of the non-tourism villagers, 41.7% described themselves as “deeply happy” (Pratt et al., 2016). The authors attributed this to the demonstration effect, whereby residents had to adapt to customs that were not part of traditional culture (Hall, 2007). Other core reasons for this result included adapting to shift work, balancing tourism work with subsistence farming duties and seasonality. While this study by Pratt et al. (2016) shared some similarities in its focus on QOL and tourism industry employees, it adopted a positivist approach, yielding limited insights into the core factors that underpin tourism industry employees perceptions of QOL.
2.6 CONCLUSION

This literature review provided an overview of sustainable tourism, residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts, QOL and tourism employees. Chapter Two established that for tourism to be sustainable across the triple bottom line, host community involvement and support is imperative. Social Exchange Theory is the dominant theoretical paradigm in studies on tourism impacts. Although this work is predominantly quantitative, it provides a solid foundation to assess support for future tourism development. Attitudes toward development and perceptions of social impacts have been core areas of focus with studies across the triple bottom line. Variables which influence perceptions of the social impacts of tourism for residents have been extensively tested in previous studies. However, what actually constitutes QOL has been predominantly developed from a Western perspective. Finally, there is a gap in our understanding of how tourism employees perceive the impact of tourism on QOL including, in the case of the present study, in an island context which is also a cultural tourism hub.

From reviewing the QWL literature, it was found that nearly all studies focused on the workplace only, rather than how local employees perceived tourism impacted their QOL outside of the workplace. This supported the notion raised in the thesis that studies focusing on examining QOL for tourism industry employees are an avenue for further research (Kara, Uysal, Sirgy & Lee, 2013).

This research seeks to discern the core elements of QOL using a grounded approach, exploring connections between perceptions of tourism impacts, QOL, and support for future tourism development. As a result, a preconceived conceptual framework for the study is neither possible nor appropriate at this juncture, but rather that the researcher should remain open to what emerges from the data. Consequently, tourism
industry employees in Ubud were asked what QOL means to them in an attempt to populate Box E in the Deery et al. (2012) model and explore their perceptions of tourism impacts from a local, rather than a Western perspective. Chapter Three will discuss the method applied to achieve the aim and objectives of the research.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Two presented a review of the literature that relates to this study. Chapter Three presents the overarching research design and method used to address the aims and objectives of the study. The core aim of this research is to explore tourism industry employee’s perceptions of the impacts of tourism on QOL in Ubud, Bali. The following research objectives have been derived from a gap in existing literature.

1. To understand what quality of life means to locals in Ubud, Bali
2. To investigate how locals perceive tourism contributes to, and detracts from, their quality of life in Ubud, Bali
3. To explore the connection between the perceived quality of life of locals and support for future tourism development in Ubud, Bali

To achieve the aim and objectives of the study, a qualitative, interpretive methodology was employed. Adopting a qualitative interpretive methodology via a case study approach allowed exploration of the research objectives through the lenses of local employees, delving in depth into what constitutes QOL and potential links to tourism and associated future development initiatives. This research engaged multiple techniques within a qualitative approach, including semi-structured interviews and photo elicitation (Cahyanto et al., 2013; Waligo et al., 2013). Finally, Yin’s (1994) exemplary case study principles were followed, being significant (a study on tourism industry employees in a cultural tourism setting), complete (following a thorough literature review), consider alternative perspectives (even sample of respondents with different ages, backgrounds
etc.), show sufficient evidence (audio recordings, full transcription and coding of data) and be created in an engaging manner (see Chapter Four).

3.1.1 Philosophical Approach

The philosophical approach adopted for this study stems from the interpretivist paradigm. This position views reality as socially constructed and fluid, which alludes to a relativist ontology in which multiple versions of reality are shaped by the context in which they are found (Decrop, 2004). This ontology derives meaning developed through interaction with people, integrating the voice of the participant into the research (Tribe, 2008). In the context of the phenomenon studied, in this case local tourism employees in Ubud, this was deemed essential to gather in-depth insights into the overarching aim which guided the research. As a result, the researcher travelled to this environment (Ubud, Bali) and was able to conduct the in-depth interviews at the employees’ place of work, thereby absorbing both respondent and researcher in a natural context where gaining an understanding of perceptions of QOL, impacts from tourism on QOL and future support for development could be explored.

Epistemology is the theory of knowledge and explains how it can be acquired (Snape & Spencer, 2003). The epistemological component of this research, or the relationship between the researcher and those being researched, is undertaken with a subjective or emic approach. An emic approach is useful to understand the immaterial components of QOL from each respondent (Liburd & Derkzen, 2009). Hence, during the interviews, the respondents were asked what QOL meant to them, their families and their community to build knowledge entirely from their perspective.
3.2 CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

As the fieldwork component of this study was being conducted in a foreign setting to the researcher’s normal country of residence, it was important to build an understanding of the location in which the interviews were being conducted (Galletta, 2013). Paying careful attention to this process assisted to ensure the interview questions were relevant to the setting and that current issues affecting the tourism industry in the town of Ubud could be discussed with respondents.

The researcher has a history with the Balinese community, having visited the region on over 10 previous occasions, and thus has established networks in the region. As such in Ubud, Balinese respondents were accessed through an Indonesian ‘gatekeeper’ (Wang, Moyle, Whitford & Wynn-Moylan, 2014) who agreed to act as a contact point into the local community. The gatekeeper, whom the author has known for eleven years, is a graduate of the International College of Management, Sydney and now resides full time in Bali. The gatekeeper also agreed to act as a translator for interview documentation and as necessary during the interviews. As most respondents spoke a reasonable level of fluent English, the gatekeeper performed a minor role in translation. Previous studies have outlined the benefits of a gatekeeper to aid researchers as their local status can help respondents feel at ease, build rapport and trust with the interviewer and sensitively arrange interview times and locations the respondents would be comfortable with (Kasim & Al-Gahuri, 2015; Towner, 2016).
3.3 SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

In-depth, semi-structured interviews are an effective means of encouraging true reflections on perceptions of impacts and QOL and attitudes towards tourism development, as they allow participants a forum to put forward their own areas of key concern or support for tourism (Jennings, 2005). In addition recent studies with similar aims and objectives undertaken on islands advocate the use of interviews to provide in-depth insights into the impacts of tourism, especially on quality of life (Moyle et al., 2010;
Byczek, 2011, Cahyanto et al., 2013). Other studies that have examined residents’ preferences for future tourism development include Pulina et al. (2013), Kim et al. (2013) and Nunkoo and Ramkissoon (2010).

During the interviews, photographs of plans for a new Novotel hotel development were used to elicit opinions from respondents regarding tourism impacts over future proposed development scenarios (Mackay & Couldwell, 2004; Bricker & Kerstetter, 2006; Garrod, 2009; Matteucci, 2012). Photo elicitation builds on an approach by Lacey et al. (2012), who used semi-structured interviews to identify and categorise emerging themes in order of importance according to emotions displayed by participants when discussing the issues raised during the interviews.

### 3.3.1 Interview Design

Several key topic areas were identified during the literature review, with concepts and theory used to frame questions in relation to the aim and objectives of the research. The interview questions were derived from an inductive review of gaps in extant knowledge. As each interview commenced, respondents were taken through a series of questions as outlined above, adapted from studies undertaken by Filep (2008) and Kayat (2002), amongst others.

The interviews commenced with questions on QOL, with probing questions designed to capture what aspects need to be in place to achieve QOL (Objective One). Respondents were also asked about their background, involvement and connection to the tourism industry, including length of time in the industry and what their current and previous roles were. Questions also revealed perceived positive and negative impacts of tourism and explored the link between tourism and quality of life (Objective Two). Finally, the history of tourism growth in the region and attitudes towards further
development of Ubud as a tourist destination were explored (Objective Three). This design was informed by conducting an analysis of the methods used in previous studies with similar objectives. For more information please refer to Appendix Two.

The types of questions respondents were asked included, though were not limited to, the following key areas:

**Table 3.1 Example of Semi-structured Interview Questions and Connection to Research Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Background to respondents:</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How close to the centre of Ubud do you live?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do you have family living with you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What do you like about living in Ubud?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there anything you don’t like about living here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement in the tourism industry – length of time employed, duties, interactions with tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meaning behind QOL, what it means in the context of living in Ubud, what needs to be present for QOL to be experienced</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceived benefits/opportunities of tourism</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In your opinion, how has tourism impacted Ubud?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Probe: Economic, environmental, socio-cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you feel about these impacts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Links between tourism and quality of life</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How has tourism affected your QOL/ your family’s QOL/ your community’s QOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You mentioned earlier that to you QOL means…..? Do you feel tourism has changed your opportunity/access to ………?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has tourism changed your family’s access to…….?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has tourism changed the community’s access to …….?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for current and future tourism development in Ubud:</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do you support current levels of tourism in Ubud? Why/Why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do you support growth in tourism in Ubud? Why/Why not?</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much growth? What type of growth?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How would you like Ubud to be in ten years’ time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Photo elicitation: Respondents shown plans and photographic mock-up of Novotel project for Jalan Hanoman (Street) in Ubud:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you feel about the plans for this hotel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What do you think about the design of the hotel?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you think a project like this will affect Ubud?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.2 Interview Pilot Test

Before travelling to Ubud in Bali, based on an approach by Smagulova, Shegebayev, Garkavenko and Boolaky (2009), a pilot test of three semi structured interviews was undertaken. Two interviews took place with Indonesian Alumni Students of the International College of Management, Sydney who are now based in Bali working in the tourism and events industry. These interviews were conducted via Skype. Another interview was conducted with the owner of a prominent North Coast Holiday Park, based in Hawks Nest, New South Wales, a popular regional tourism destination, which allowed the author to test the interview questions in a face to face context without technological disruptions. These participants were interviewed for the pilot study, which allowed for the interview questions to be tested on this sample prior to interviewing the Ubud-based respondents.

A number of avenues for improvement were identified from the pilot test, resulting in some minor modifications to the interview design. Firstly, there were some technological issues with Skype which meant the interviews had to be conducted as an audio rather than a video call. This meant the photo elicitation method could not be used on all pilot interviews. Secondly some questions that had to be repeated to respondents were carefully re-worded to be clearer in their interpretation, for example “What was your course about?” was amended to “What did you study?” The pilot testing procedure provided a useful process because it gave the interviewer experience in interview recording and analysis, along with probing respondents for more detailed answers prior to conducting interviews in Ubud.
3.4 RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

Building on an approach from Simmons and Fairweather (2005) a systematic approach consisting of 4 sequential stages was used to recruit and select respondents for the research. In Stage 1 an online search was conducted to identify key tourism businesses in the region. In Stage 2 the list of businesses from which to source tourism employees was compiled and provided to the gatekeeper. In Stage 3 the gatekeeper was instructed to approach potential respondents and garner their interest to participate in interviews. If available for an interview, a date, time and location for the interview was arranged, and respondents were provided with an information statement, as well as a consent form. Finally, in Stage 4 an element of snowball sampling was utilised, with respondents asked if they knew of any other tourism industry employees who may be interested in participating in an interview. This process resulted in 21 locals employed at various levels of the tourism industry being interviewed for the research.

The respondents’ frequent interaction with Western tourists via their experience in the tourism industry was a notable advantage in these interviews, reducing the level of language barriers, prejudice or uneasiness in communicating with someone of a different cultural and racial background (Yuksel et al., 1999; Lepp, 2007; Paluck & Green, 2009). Whilst conducting the interviews, active and interpretive listening (Jennings, 2005), including seeking clarification of applied terms where ambiguities are unearthed, were utilised to maximise the quality of the interview. Selecting respondents who are residents of the region being studied and are bilingual, and using open response questions, served as strategies to reduce bias (He & van de Vijver, 2012), in particular construct bias, where the variable measured is not identical across cultures, in this case QOL.
To be eligible to participate in the research, a set of screening criteria was modified from a study conducted by Brunt and Courtney (1999). As a consequence, respondents needed to adhere to the following four key sampling criteria:

1. Respondents must be working in the tourism industry in Ubud, either as primary tourism employees including those employed at sites and venues such as hotels and attractions, or as secondary tourism employees such as those employed in restaurants and as taxi drivers (there is a taxi/vehicle charter base in central Ubud).

2. Respondents’ must be of Balinese descent, 18 years of age and over. The fact that Ubud is provincial and has a higher concentration of Balinese villages than southern resort areas assisted with recruiting Balinese respondents from this area (Brata, 2014).

3. Respondents’ must currently reside in Ubud and have done so for a period of no less than 2 years.

4. Respondents must have a competent level of English (e.g. frequent, high level of interaction with Western tourists).

Local tourism industry employees were spoken to individually at a place convenient to the respondent. Once it was determined each respondent met the sampling criteria, an interview was arranged at a time and place convenient to them.

3.4.1 Interview Administration

Following an approach by Miles and Huberman (1994), interviews continued until the point of saturation or literal replication had been reached. This resulted in 21 interviews taking place with tourism industry employees in Ubud. Interviews ranged between 30 and 60 minutes.
The printed interview invitation contained a Participant Information Statement (see Appendix Three). A consent Form (Appendix Five) was also provided to respondents and translated verbally into Bahasa Indonesia by the gatekeeper before the commencement of each interview. All respondents agreed to participate and signed and returned the consent form at that time. Respondents were also offered the opportunity to be emailed a copy of their transcript as a form of member checking to enhance the reliability of the data collection. A total of seven respondents accepted this invitation, however no one requested any changes to be made after receiving a copy of the interview transcript.

An interview protocol was developed to facilitate each interview (Appendix Four). With respondents’ consent, the interviews were recorded, transcribed and coded to allow for identification of key themes/patterns to emerge. At the conclusion of most of the interviews, where feasible the researcher and the gatekeeper would discuss and record initial impressions and additional information that the gatekeeper observed while the interview was taking place through participant’s body language or comments made in Bahasa Indonesia. As the respondent had left the site of the interview, the gatekeeper was able to speak freely regarding his observations of the interview and was able to identify themes and patterns emerging from the interviews. From this a journal was created to record thoughts about initial themes that were emerging from the interviews and ensure analysis commenced while in Ubud.

3.4.2 Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted following an interpretive research approach, which allows the researcher to build theory based on the data collected from a real-life situation and acknowledges the relationship between the researcher and subjects (Rowlands, 2005;
Walsham, 2006). This approach is used to go beyond providing a description of a given situation, to seeking causes that bring about the phenomenon and analysing its effects. This can be useful in a field where the research is limited, such as quality of life of tourism employees. Following this, the interview transcripts were inductively analysed to recognise key themes. A systematic, three-tiered procedure was employed to interpret and reduce the data, consisting of open, axial, and selective coding (Neuman, 2011). Open coding involved an initial examination of the interview transcripts. Broad emergent themes were identified and recorded during this process. Axial coding was then undertaken to refine and organize the open codes without detracting from the meaning of the raw data. Finally, during the selective coding phase deeper thematic patterns were identified (Neuman, 2011). Interviewees were given the option to review and respond to a summary of findings (Merriam, 2009). In presenting the findings, respondents’ names have been substituted with pseudonyms to preserve their anonymity.

Software programs such as NVivo (for data analysis) and Leximancer (for data presentation) were considered for this study but were judged to be unnecessary given the small sample size. Moreover, the researcher found she was better able to immerse herself in the findings by using manual methods for analysis and reporting. This also ensured the privacy of respondents’ data and allowed for the identification of common themes early in the process. Certainly, cross validation of the reliability of qualitative data via Leximancer would be an excellent avenue for future research.

3.5 RESPONDENT PROFILE

This section presents a profile of respondents who participated in the research. Table 3.2 below displays the respondents and corresponding pseudonyms, as well as provides a brief background on employment, gender and marital status of respondents.
The 21 interview respondents were Ubud locals of Balinese descent working in the tourism industry in Ubud. As depicted in Table 3.2 a suitable cross section of respondents was obtained from the variety of tourism based businesses located in Ubud. Table 3.2 also reflects how long each respondent has worked in their current tourism role, how far they live from the centre of Ubud, the frequency of contact they have with tourists, whether they have any family members working in tourism and if they have any contact with tourists outside of work.

As the focus of the study was on local tourism employees whose work in local tourism businesses involves daily, face-to-face contact with tourists, only those working in the private sector were included. Those working in the public or cultural sectors would not have met the selection criteria for the interviews. At the time of Confirmation of Candidature, it was recommended that the focus be on private sector employees to ensure respondents had a similar economic connection to the tourism industry and to keep the study manageable and at an appropriate scale for a Masters thesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Born/ Distance from home to Ubud</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Employment/Type of contact with Tourists</th>
<th>Job Title/ Length of Time in Role</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Relationship Status</th>
<th>Family member involvement in tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anbeh</td>
<td>Tabanan Village 3 mins walk</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Ibu Rai (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Waitress 17 years</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Married 15 years</td>
<td>Husband - Painter Brother in law - Waiter/driver in hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba’Mua</td>
<td>Ubud In centre</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Keprabon Guesthouse (Hotel) Presenter – lives onsite</td>
<td>Owner/ Manager 10 years</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>Yes – in guiding, restaurants and hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catur</td>
<td>Ubud 5 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Puri Wulandari (Hotel) Presenter – frequent</td>
<td>Sales Associate Unknown</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Parents retired, used to work in guesthouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimia</td>
<td>Lombok 45 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Puri Wulandari (Hotel) Presenter – frequent</td>
<td>Sales Admin 1 year</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epana</td>
<td>Ubud 5 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bale Udang (Restaurant) Distant – only at work</td>
<td>Administratio n Six months</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Uncle – painter in Gallery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fina</td>
<td>Ubud 10 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bale Udang (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Receptionist Six months</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gusi</td>
<td>Ubud 15 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bale Udang (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Cashier 1 year</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Husband – cultural performer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yindah</td>
<td>Ubud 15 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bale Udang (Restaurant) Interactive – stays in contact with some tourists</td>
<td>Waitress Eight months</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Husband - bar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewi</td>
<td>Ubud 15 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Bale Udang (Restaurant) Presenter – stays in contact with some tourists</td>
<td>Greeter Six months</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Father – hotel driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jangha</td>
<td>Denpasar/ Ubud 60 mins drive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Ubud Market (Shops) Presenter – only at work</td>
<td>Seller 1 year</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Sister – also owns a market stall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pseudonym</td>
<td>Born/Distance from home to Ubud</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Employment/Type of contact with Tourists</td>
<td>Job Title/Length of Time in Role</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nyoman</td>
<td>Ubud 5 mins drive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Cafe Wayan (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Waiter 3 years</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kadek</td>
<td>Klung Kung 15 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Cafe Wayan (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Waitress 5 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Krishna</td>
<td>Ubud 1 min walk</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Pondok Inn (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Waiter 18 months</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Gianyar 10 mins walk</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Starbucks (Restaurant) Interactive – sometimes outside contact</td>
<td>Server 6 months</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dede</td>
<td>Gianyar 45 min drive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Unknown company name Distant – sometimes outside contact</td>
<td>Tourism filmmaker 9 months</td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Odmi</td>
<td>Ubud 10 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Villa Chempaka (Hotel) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Hotel allrounder 4 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pattem</td>
<td>Ubud 35 mins drive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Villa Chempaka (Hotel) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Hotel allrounder 20 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rishi</td>
<td>Ubud 10 mins drive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Semu Jaen (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Waitress 5 months</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lakshmi</td>
<td>Ubud 12 mins drive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Semu Jaen (Restaurant) Interactive – only at work</td>
<td>Waiter 3 years</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tanu</td>
<td>Ubud 10 mins drive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Self-employed (Driver) Presenter – sometimes outside contact</td>
<td>Tourist driver 15 years</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Uri</td>
<td>Ubud 40 mins drive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Villa Chempaka (Hotel) Distant – only at work</td>
<td>Owner 21 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 3.2, respondents possessed different levels of experience working in the industry. There were several respondents who were in their first year working in the tourism industry and five others who had been in their current roles from 10 to 21 years. There were similarities in the distance respondents lived from the centre of Ubud – 16 lived within a 10 to 15 minute drive. In regards to the location of their workplace, 13 respondents worked in the prime, central tourism area of Ubud. Eight respondents’ workplaces were a 15 minute drive away from the centre of town, being Puri Wulandari Hotel and Bale Udang Restaurant. The gender of respondents was split fairly evenly, with 12 females and 9 males.

The respondents were mostly well-educated with 10 having finished secondary school and five have completed university studies. As level of education was not a specific question in the interviews, this information was ascertained when the respondents mentioned it during the course of the interviews. Approximately half the respondents worked in restaurant roles in Ubud. The other respondents worked in hotels, the markets, as a tourist driver and a tourism film maker. In terms of marital status, again the sample was quite even with 11 respondents married or widowed, while 10 were of single status, these single respondents were also the youngest participants. Of the 21 respondents, 12 also had other family members working in tourism, mostly in hotels, bars and as drivers or spa owners.

3.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Due to the nature of these research methods, there were several ethical considerations to be addressed in association with the Ubud fieldwork component of the research (Veal, 2006). All respondents interviewed and observed in the pilot test and in
Bali were voluntarily taking part in the research, with all information and recordings kept strictly confidential with coded responses to retain anonymity. Each respondent was given a small gift box of locally produced gourmet jam to thank them for their time. The gatekeeper acted as an interpreter in Ubud when the researcher and participants agreed an interpreter would be helpful in attaining responses to the interview questions. Written consent forms were all translated verbally into Bahasa Indonesia. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Southern Cross University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) under reference ECN-14-052. For a more detailed description of how ethical issues were addressed, please see Appendices Three to Six.

This study was based on an interpretive research approach where the respondents articulated how they understood the concept of quality of life. This approach was selected as it is important not to impose a pre-existing notion of Western concepts when undertaking research across cultures (Govers, Go & Kumar, 2007). In a qualitative study such as this one, there is naturally a concern regarding researcher bias (Maxwell, 2012). In this case through preconceptions held by the researcher, there was a potential for misinterpretation due to cultural differences between the researcher and participants (Patton, 2005). In addition there was also a risk of being seen as an outsider or an intruder to the community whose views may influence the interview process (Lacey et al., 2012).

It is acknowledged this research was being conducted in a foreign country, in a culture and language that is different to the researcher’s own Western background. To overcome the issues associated with this, techniques were implemented to ensure respondents understood what was trying to be achieved by the research and trusted that all results would remain confidential. It was expected respondents would be willing to talk about their lives and surroundings (Walsham, 2006). While there was opportunity for
cultural or verbal misunderstandings, the researcher had visited the case study setting previously and was accompanied by a gatekeeper who resides in Bali. While the gatekeeper could not be considered fully objective or neutral, research has indicated a certain amount of interest in the group to be studied can be advantageous to generate the energy required to execute and complete the process (Wolcott, 1995; Jennings, 2005).

As already noted, all subjects approached for this study needed to have a competent level of English language skills and from their experience in the tourism industry were experienced in conversing with Western tourists. However, the gatekeeper was present throughout the whole interview process to assist and clarify any aspects of the interview research stage that needed a local perspective. The gatekeeper translated any interview responses made in Bahasa Indonesia on the audio recording into English in the presence of the respondent so they could agree his translation was accurate. The pilot test of interview questions which took place in the initial exploratory stage of the fieldwork ensured that questions were deemed to be comprehensible to the participants (Mason, Augustyn & Seakhoa-King, 2010).

Interpretation is a qualitative function that is founded on cultural understandings; therefore complete impartiality is unachievable for any researcher (Marry, 2011). Indeed, previous studies have actually argued that being an outsider to the community being studied in qualitative research can be beneficial. For instance, a study by Ganga and Scott (2006) found that being a member of the same cultural community as the participants can give the researcher such a degree of social proximity that it can exacerbate any social divisions that exist between them. Nonetheless, undertaking this study required some active strategies on the part of the researcher to limit the bias introduced by the position of the researcher as an outsider (non-Balinese). For instance, each participant was
provided a copy of the Interview Participation Information Statement (Appendix Three) outlining the purpose of the interviews which assisted with establishing rapport and transparency. To establish rapport it was explained to respondents by the gatekeeper using Bahasa Indonesian language that the researcher was interested in their views and was trying to understand how tourism affects their lives. While bias cannot be put on hold at any time chosen, at best it could be held in a productive tension with local understandings (Mandel, 2003). This statement and some initial conversation at the beginning of each interview acted as a caveat, explaining the researcher’s own story, the context of the study and cultural positioning which assisted in achieving cross-cultural competency, where the ability to interpret the meanings from other cultures exists along with being able to provide accurate meanings to respondents in return (Lacey, Weiler & Laing, 2008).

3.7 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

While this study focused solely on local employees working in tourism in Ubud, replication with the wider Balinese community would add further depth to the findings with respect to considering the perspectives of locals who may not be directly benefitting financially from the tourism industry. This study was originally designed to seek perceptions from Ubud residents who may or may not work in the tourism industry. At the time of Confirmation of Candidature, it was recommended that the researcher focus on local tourism employees only to give the respondents some common ground and also to reduce potential language barriers between the two parties. This, of course, limits the generalisability of the findings.

The sample for this study – tourism employees – provides one important perspective but not the whole story of how residents perceive tourism’s contribution to QOL. Future research could explore perceptions of local residents not directly employed
in tourism, alongside other important stakeholders such as local government and public sector employees and community groups.

3.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The aim of this thesis is to explore tourism industry employees’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism on QOL in Ubud. To achieve this, an interpretive, qualitative approach was undertaken, through the use of 21 semi-structured interviews with locals employed in the tourism industry in Ubud. Chapter Three presented the research methodology, including how respondents were recruited and selected for the study, which involved use of a gatekeeper in data collection and interpretation, and how potential difficulties of conducting this study in a foreign setting as a Western researcher were addressed. Chapter Three also explained how the data were collected and analysed using an open, axial and selective coding process.

Additionally Chapter Three provided a profile of those who took part in the interviews. Finally this chapter outlined the ethical considerations associated with the fieldwork component of the research in Ubud, including conducting research as a Westerner in a foreign setting, talking to local tourism employees about their lifestyles and ensuring confidentiality regarding personal details and responses. Chapter Four presents the results of the research on local tourism industry employees’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism on Quality of Life (QOL) in Ubud.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter Four presents the findings of this research on the impact of tourism on the QOL on local industry employees. The findings will be presented in four sections. The first section focuses on eliciting what quality of life actually means for Ubud locals employed in the tourism industry. The second section seeks to address how tourism adds to or detracts from perceptions of QOL of locals employed in the tourism industry. The third section explores the connection between QOL, tourism impacts and support for further development. The fourth and final section concludes the chapter, presenting a summary of the key findings.

This chapter is organised around the study’s research objectives. Each research objective is addressed and findings are presented through the quotes from the respondents of this study, in order to understand their perspectives on QOL, impacts from tourism on QOL and support for future development directly through their own words.

4.2 WHAT DOES QUALITY OF LIFE (QOL) MEAN TO LOCALS IN UBUD, BALI?

When respondents were initially asked about their concept of QOL family was the most common overarching theme to emerge from the data. When further probed it became clear that four core dimensions of family were central to respondents perceptions of QOL, these were subsequently labelled children, spouses, togetherness/quality time and health. All respondents currently resided with several family members, siblings and quite often lived with two or three generations in the same home.
Children emerged as one of the strongest themes for QOL and in Balinese culture children are highly regarded as an essential part of family life. Having a family was identified as desirable and a precursor to feelings of happiness from respondents that were already parents. Families with more than one child were also desirable as Odmi stated, "Big family and my children is very good!" Respondents who were recently married and yet to have children concurred but commented expanding their families was important, with a job and kids thought to be, “all that makes you happy” [Kadek]. In some cases children were valued above spouses, even when they are yet to be born. For instance, Yindah felt her life wasn’t yet complete without children. Two respondents mentioned that while they feel happiness with their respective marriages, they are anticipating further improvements to their QOL with the future addition of children to the family, the Gatekeeper noted of Gusi, “she is very happy she has a husband, but she has no kids, that’s the only thing that does not bring a positive impact on her life.” Respondents also had a tendency to put their family’s happiness ahead of their own, Ba’Mua was adamant that, “I will be happy if the family is happy, money does not guarantee you happiness.” Similarly, Anbeh stated that all you need is family to be happy and “a little money.”

Quality time with family, including spending time together enjoying each other’s company was mentioned by several respondents as being central to maintaining QOL. Feelings of “loved and togetherness” [Krishna] and being with extended family members on a daily basis is central to life in Ubud. Other family members were essential in passing on cultural and family traditions to younger members and assisting with childcare whilst parents were working. Dimia included her in-laws in her daily family plans, “I can balance with my husband and also the parents of my husband.”
Health was also a central component in discussions surrounding family and QOL, with Tanu stating that if the family is well they can take part in all aspects of their daily life in Ubud, “if we are healthy we can do everything.” Health wasn’t just about clean drinking water and sanitation, although this was mentioned by respondents. Health was also related to the soothing and friendly village surroundings as Dimia explained, “Ubud is comfortable and cosy, I like the situation here, fresh air and less traffic than in Denpasar.” Rishi mentioned that feeling comfortable in her own home with her family was tantamount to QOL for her.

Following the importance of family wellbeing to QOL, providing family members with an education that could generate career opportunities and a productive working environment was identified by respondents as integral to the concept of QOL. While the cost of education is high in Bali, respondents value the difference it can make to their lives, providing increased opportunities in the tourism industry, such as future promotion and even management roles. Since education is a big cost, many of life’s other essentials are expensive in Bali, however education is paramount to QOL with, “All of Bali, all of it is expensive, also Ubud, my kid’s in junior school also very expensive.” [Anbeh]. Another respondent Jangha noted his QOL is achievable by working in Ubud, his earnings from the local market, primarily selling to tourists allows him access to education and the ability to be financially independent, “I can buy everything for myself and a little money for my school.”

Moving beyond the theme of family, and specifically education and health, preserving Balinese cultural traditions was important to the quality of life of respondents. Respondents claimed that the influence of Western tourists has changed the culture in southern resort areas such as Kuta, respondents were confident their Balinese Hindu
culture will continue to remain traditional indefinitely. Essentially this was because, “In Kuta the culture has moved already. In Ubud, we still keep the traditional culture, Kuta now is not like real Bali, maybe it’s like Australia already” [Ba’Mua].

The interest in Balinese culture from tourists was identified to contribute to the enhancement of cultural pride and identity resulting in fulfilling creative expression for locals. Epana commented on the influence of visitor interest on pursuing artistic cultural traditions, “What I’ve seen has been good for the people here, they can build their creativity.” Preserving the Balinese culture was cited by several respondents as being necessary for QOL to be achieved including Dede, “What’s important is I can be there for my family first, I then want the next generation to still see this culture like it is today.”

Respondents felt pride that Ubud was famous in the world for its many attractions such as landscapes and sense of place, Jangha enthused, “I like Ubud because it’s very famous in the world.” When probed about why she still lives in her hometown Catur replied, “Everyone is coming to Ubud to enjoy the view, the atmosphere of Ubud. I really love staying in Ubud and I’m proud to be Balinese and born in Ubud, really proud”

Following culture, respondents cited career as central to achieving QOL with income, work environment, work/life balance and career opportunities raised during the interviews. Providing a source of income to cover family needs such as education and medical expenses was also important, as Anbeh explained, “Each month we have a budget, this for education, this one for food so if it’s low season our budget is less.” As tourism in Ubud increases, Fina noted that the stronger economy brings more cash flow into her family to cover their daily needs, a direct contribution to her family’s QOL.
Trying to achieve and maintain a positive work/life balance was important to respondents, particularly those in the early stages of their careers. As Dimia explained, “I have to balance my job, my family, and also the social community, we always join the activities so I have to balance the timing.” For some respondents this meant being happy in both work and family environments, as explained by Odmi who has an infant child at home being cared for by relatives, “I’m fine with the work, a little bit, no problem.”

Enjoying harmonious relationships with others in the workplace and effective teamwork was highly valued for achieving QOL, as Anbeh, who has worked in the same restaurant for 17 years said, “The staff and my boss, we have a good team.” Ubud was viewed by all respondents as providing a healthy work environment to contribute to QOL and offers further career opportunities in the long term future for them. Catur considered earning money and future opportunities to have her own family as central to QOL, “For now, I just enjoy my job so I am planning to continue my career and have a small family next.”

Another key consideration to emerge from the data was from respondents such as Nina, who felt that being employed in tourism gives her the ability to be independent in life and support herself as mentioned earlier, “I am happy because I am stronger, I don’t have family and I can live by myself,” and Ba’Mua, who valued self-employment as the key to his family’s QOL, “now we are happy because I have my own business.”

Alongside the financial and internal workplace aspects of working life as a precursor to QOL, social attributes of working with tourists were also raised by respondents including communication and interaction. The majority of those interviewed worked in front line roles within the tourism industry and seemed to enjoy communicating
and socialising with the tourists on a daily basis, Jangha explained, ‘From tourists coming here, I can earn while studying, speaking English, speaking Japanese, [and] speaking Mandarin’ and Tanu mentioned, ‘I like talking to tourists, we’re more like friends really’. Respondents such as Epana also commented that having face to face contact with tourists can assist with enhancing social skills, ‘local people get an opportunity to work in tourism, then they know how to socialise with other people.’

Other aspects of interpersonal relationships central to QOL include the importance of strong friendships which was cited by several of the younger respondents such as Epana, “I have a lot of friends, they are kind and we can share things with each other, after being away for four years studying, I came back here to find my job and we are happy to meet each other again.” This included friendships with both friends and family members and the interplay between the two groups, as Dewi mentioned, “Something that makes me happy is when I get together with my family, I can walk around with my friends and then I come here to work with my friends.” The gatekeeper also uncovered the importance of peers and friendships from two of the younger male respondents, Nyoman, “QOL is when he can do his job well and he can go travelling with his friends, that makes him happy.”

Following career and social aspects of life in Ubud, local amenities including the village feel and ease of living in the town was raised by respondents as important to QOL. Each person was asked what they liked and disliked about living in Ubud. All respondents were able to explain several elements of Ubud life they valued such as the village feel and community, culture, fame as a tourism destination, the economy, weather, convenient facilities, scenery and food, indicating that the residents enjoy living in Ubud and strongly
valued and appreciated their surrounding environment. The level of positive responses outweighed negatives, with respondents citing some neighbours, the cost of living, congestion and noise as the only drawbacks to residing in Ubud that could be directly associated.

Of the positive aspects raised regarding life in Ubud, the village feel was emphasised by many of the respondents, with good people living there and a scenic environment, as Odmi enthused, “Ubud is very nice, very good people and good rice fields!” Ubud can be viewed as more relaxed and friendly than the island’s capital, as Dimia who used to work in a travel agency there observed, “the people are more friendly than in Denpasar.” Anbeh preferred Ubud to her home village of Tabanan in West Bali, due to its cultural focus and modernity, she explained that unlike Kuta or Jakarta, “everyone in Ubud is friendly, they help each other, they look out for each other’s back.” Epana expressed gratitude towards simply being a resident of Ubud, that everything she needs is within close proximity and convenient, “I love living here because all the facilities that I need are here, it’s easy to get to, it’s not too far.” Ba’Mua explained, “I like the culture, the weather is also not so hot (as Kuta) and the people here are nice.” The pleasantness of the local population was mentioned frequently by respondents such as Epana, “the people here are kind,” and residents are “friendly” [Dimia]. Overall there was a very strong connection between the respondents and their feelings towards Ubud, one example from Krishna was noted by the gatekeeper, “He was born here and fell in love with Ubud, he is used to the surroundings and there is a bond between him and Ubud.”
The cultural and artistic aspects of Ubud life were appreciated by most respondents, Pattem mentioned they make Ubud an, “interesting place,” Krishna stated that he, “enjoys the culture and loves living in Ubud. Dede liked that Ubud can foster creativity amongst the locals, “I see women, men, children here every night perform dancing.” Lakshmi felt that because Ubud has cultural traditions, it has superior culture on display for tourists than other areas of Bali, “it’s very good here and there are some nice tourist spots,” emphasising a high level of community pride in local customs.

Respondents were determined to keep their cultural and religious life in Ubud protected from modification from external influences. Keeping the culture traditional and avoiding cultural change as seen in Kuta was of importance to locals and many felt residents were in a strong position to continue their cultural practices intact, as Tanu stated, “I want to keep the tradition, if the King is strong, I think it will not change, the King in Ubud is very strong” and Dimia agreed, “For the culture – Ubud keeps the culture very good, they still do what they have to do.”

In terms of Ubud as a tourism destination, many respondents liked that people from around the world were attracted to visit here and liked that it is famous, as Pattem stated, “Ubud is you know, an international village.” Catur felt pride that Ubud is her hometown and liked that tourists were attracted to, “enjoy the view, the atmosphere of Ubud.” Having a steady flow of tourists to Ubud was seen as desirable and welcomed in Ubud by respondents such as Nyoman, “I like many tourists come to Ubud, they say it’s beautiful, they said it has good food.” and Anbeh, “I like tourism but also that Ubud is very famous in the world.” Dewi appeared pleased to share the surroundings with the
tourists, “I like to be near the hotels and near to Monkey Forest, market, I can see the tourists more.”

A strong economy was another favoured aspect of life in Ubud, as respondents such as Jangha believed having tourism is crucial for the economy to thrive, “Tourism puts Bali into a more advanced state, it gives income to the local residents in Ubud.” Anbeh mentioned that many residents in Ubud work in the tourism industry due to local banjar (community organisation) regulations that fifty percent of staff must come from the surrounding community which is also good for the economy as it brings, “tax and money to the government.”

In terms of negative aspects of life in Ubud, the respondents did express concern over traffic levels and loss of traditional rice paddies and farming land, as Ba’Mua lamented, “During 10 years since I have been living back in Ubud – not too much change, only with traffic” and Nina observed, “As I see, it’s still good I think, but I don’t know whether (it will stay that way). I don’t like the traffic jams, so many buildings.” Dewi felt that the increase in traffic made Ubud, “noisy.” Some respondents felt that Ubud was crowded, “it’s full of people, too many people here, too many tourists.” [Epana]. Odmi felt that tourism was great for providing employment but confirmed that the town is on the cusp of, “getting crowded.”

Other negative points raised about life in Ubud included respondents’ neighbours. Anbeh mentioned in Ubud some people are seen as rich and others as very poor, her neighbours were “jealous” of others they deemed to have more successful businesses than them. Epana noted that some of her neighbours had turned their houses into a “homestay”
for tourists which annoyed others, especially those in close proximity. As mentioned previously the cost of living in Bali is seen as expensive by some respondents.

4.3 HOW DOES TOURISM ADD TO OR DETRACT FROM QUALITY OF LIFE?

This section investigates how locals perceive tourism contributes to, and detracts from, residents’ quality of life in Ubud. Respondents were asked whether they feel tourism has changed QOL at an individual as well as a collective level, with questions geared to probe into personal impacts as well as influence on family and the community. In terms of the respondents’ access to QOL, the results were largely favourable (16 out of 21 respondents), particularly in terms of long term job security and career prospects with Dimia reaffirming, “I need tourism, it can give more opportunities of course to my career.” Tourism was seen as a means of climbing the career ladder for respondents, as the gatekeeper observed of Rishi, “Yes, there’s a connection (between tourism and QOL), it’s a long term career for her. Catur was certain tourism was the right career choice for her, “I know my career is here, I hope next I can make my career higher than now.” Gusi felt that tourism had given her, “more opportunities,” and has taken on a second job as a dancer in a local hotel in addition to her full time cashier role in a restaurant.

Improving access to QOL for the respondents’ families was also valued by some respondents, Ba’Mua noted, “Because my business is about tourism, I get the salary, the monies from tourism for my family and my life also,” and Uri, who has worked in tourism longer than any other respondents, “Before tourism life was very poor, now life was better because there is money to send children to school, not just the people from the hotel, the side effects like the farmers, transportation, it’s quite big the impact of tourism in Bali, the hotels started, gradually trying to upgrade the standard of life here in Bali.” Dewi
felt that through her job in tourism she, “earns money and she can use that to make her family happy.”

Other respondents felt that their family’s QOL wasn’t overly affected by the presence of tourism in their lives. Gusi stated there wasn’t, “any impact” in terms of economic benefits gained from tourism and Yindah noted that her husband was the only other member of the family who works in tourism so for the rest of the family there is, “no impact at all.” Lakshmi explained that his family that live and work in the tourism enclave of Nusa Dua need tourism for their income more than the family in Ubud.

Feelings about tourism improving QOL for the wider community of Ubud were mixed. Pattem commented that tourism is assists the people of Ubud, "Tourism is good and if there are a lot of tourists, it’s easy to get a job." Having tourism development in Ubud means locals working in the industry, “don’t have to travel too far to be able to earn money for a living,” [Lakshmi] and that without jobs available in Ubud, “residents would have to go elsewhere.” [Fina]. Also supporting these views, Gusi felt that tourism brings beneficial changes, including better opportunities for the town of Ubud, and pointed out the redevelopment of the local market, “it’s very nice now.” Others such as Ba’Mua felt that Ubud is yet to see the full benefits of tourism and noted, “at the moment in Ubud doesn’t feel that good effect yet, it’s not that obvious that it’s a better place.”

All the same, these results indicated positive views towards the contribution of tourism to the community of Ubud and their way of life, yet concerns were also raised by several respondents about the influence of tourists’ presence on the local youth. Epana reflected on the presence of a demonstration effect from the tourists, particularly evident in youth from her village, “Sometimes it's a bad effect - Tourism, once the fashion comes
out – boom I should have this, I should have this, yes, it becomes a trend that they should buy some shirt, yes, they get influenced from tourists.” Dede observed, “In terms of culture I see good and bad changes, good culture - the young people of Ubud can use it for business and in the bad side, the way they dress, for myself, it’s not ok.” Apart from material trends, the influence of tourist behaviour was also mentioned by Dede, “tourism is when they are kissing wherever they want, she is afraid the younger ones will follow it” and Ba’Mua who mused, "Young people, they don’t want to protect Ubud, just thinking modern, lifestyle is everything, it’s easy. It’s normal, like me, black skin, I like white skin, but for white skin, they want black skin."

In terms of there being a link between QOL and tourism presence, ultimately respondents were divided. Those who felt there was a direct link between the two such as Anbeh noted, “I don’t have another job, I just work for tourism, so for me its income, my husband also works for, he’s a painter so no tourists – no income.” Others such as Uri expressed strong support regarding a possible link, “Yes, yes, yes, yes” and Dewi, "I have just graduated so it makes an increase for my life, tourism has increased my life."

Those residents who rejected the idea of a link between tourism and QOL were identified by their responses to the gatekeeper, Krishna felt, “There’s no influence, no impact - if he didn’t work in tourism he would be a teacher, that’s what his parents wanted him to do but he chose tourism instead” and Lakshmi, “It doesn’t really have to be like that, he says if there is tourism, the family will work in the tourism industry, if there is no tourism, they will do farming.”

Respondents were asked for their opinion on how tourism has affected Ubud’s economy. Rather than suggesting what the impacts could be such as inflation, dependence
on tourism and job creation, respondents put forward their own suggestions so knowledge could be built entirely from a salient perspective. The residents raised a wide variety of economic effects and were balanced in their views with both positive and negative comments. The job opportunities available through tourism were frequently mentioned, as Ba’Mua confirmed, “When tourism or many tourists are coming then it is easy to get a job in tourism” and Catur agreed, “More hotels that means job vacancies, so all Ubud people and also from other parts of Bali and Indonesia, they can work in Ubud.” Tourism can be viewed as an effective job creator for many local residents, as Dede observed, “If I talk about the economy, I think it’s a good increase, we have a good economy here because there are a lot of work spaces (new jobs).”

In terms of economic effects from tourism, seasonality can be an issue for all of those working in tourism in Ubud and trying to provide for their families, Anbeh explained, “We have a low season and high season, low season is January to April, May starts high season and then June, July, August, we have also the same for Christmas and New Year, we have high season so the economy will drop in low season, my salary is also down.” Ba’Mua was pragmatic about the predictable quieter times and said, “it’s not so bad when the low seasons is here.” Uri, who owns a hotel in Ubud, was concerned about falling occupancy rates even though tourist numbers to Bali are increasing, “This year occupancy is dropping, I don’t know why it really puzzles me. I wonder if it was because of the election but it dropped. Some of the other hotels are empty and they’re suffering too.” Pattem who is employed at Uri’s hotel was concerned that bookings were quiet, even during the upcoming peak season, “normally at that time, June-July, we are fully booked, but not at this moment, not yet.”
Non-Balinese ownership of land and development was an issue of concern for locals such as Ba’Mua who would like to see Ubud locals retain their ownership of tourism businesses, “When the owner of the business is local people, like Balinese locals, they can keep it protected. But I worry when the owner is from foreigner, I worry they don’t use like traditional style here in Ubud. They use...everything is modern, like the style of hotel is modern.” The gatekeeper observed from another resident Nyoman, “he is actually worried about people in Ubud selling their land to foreign, outside investors. Then we have foreigners become our boss. He wants the local people to manage their own business to become the boss.”

Concerns regarding changes to development in Ubud such as Western style buildings and hotels and a loss of traditional farming land have also been raised, as Ba’Mua observed, “Bad changes in quality, in some areas, the style is like Kuta.” Land use and ownership was also commonly mentioned, as Uri explained, “Environmentally, Bali is bad now, more of the farming land is being sold for housing developments, you know, for development, which is not good.” Fina mentioned that because of the increase in new buildings, Ubud becomes, “too hot, too crowded and it becomes polluted.” Dede also mentioned that the traditional Ubud feels like it’s getting, “smaller and smaller,” because of the new development.

Issuance of building permits in Ubud and greater Bali was discussed by several respondents, suggesting perhaps the application process needs to be reviewed. Catur stated, “Too easy, too easy to get a permit” and Dimia agreed, “They give easily to make a building, so I’m a little bit disappointed with the government.” Another resident, Uri suggested zoning rules can be disregarded by those in power, “Everybody wants
development, ‘cause they say it will add to their cash... they don’t do a real good blueprint of development. Even if they do, they just ignore it, if an area is restricted not for building and somebody speaks to the authority and......they move the boundary!”

In terms of further socio-cultural effects from tourism, locals felt strongly that their Balinese Hindu culture has been preserved from any negative influences as Ba’Mua proclaimed, “culture is still perfect, still same as before,” and Dewi supported this view, “I think so far it is good, no nothing negative.” Epana felt that tourism stimulated creative expression amongst the residents, “what I’ve seen has been good for the people here, they will build and create something so they can join the tourism part of Ubud.” That said, there were respondents who mentioned the differences between dances performed at the local Hindu temples and performances with paid admission for tourists. Yindah believed that cultural performances for tourists had, “no impact at all” to traditional performances in local Balinese temples. Fina disagreed and observed that some dances which were only performed at the temple for special events are now being performed, “in front of the tourists.”

Respondents noted that tourists are attracted to Ubud partly because of the Balinese cultural experience and that keeping traditions alive is important not only for day to day lives but also as unique drawcard that sets Ubud apart from other tourist centres in Bali. Jangha confirmed culture is important for Ubud and felt it is being well preserved, “It gives interest to the tourists coming here,” this sentiment was shared by Epana, “the culture is one of the things that attract tourists” Ultimately, many respondents acknowledge that if culture is negatively affected it will also impact the appeal of the region to potential tourists, as Ba’Mua declared, "I think we are boring that we like
traditional but others like modern, but it’s important to protect because why many tourists come to Ubud, we must protect the question, the answer for the question.”

Respondents seemed to be pleased that Ubud has tight restrictions on bar and nightclub opening hours, as Anbeh stated, “*In Ubud, no way - no way pub, no way discotheque. Ubud is just a traditional village with culture.*” and Tanu noted of Kuta, “*Like many bars, dance for music, 24 hours a day. In Ubud, only until 12 o’clock, it’s really quiet yeah.*” Ubud now has Western branded stores on its main street such as Polo Ralph Lauren, Rip Curl and Pandora. However locals such as Uri aren’t necessarily keen to see this increase in the future, “*one thing that is good in Ubud, so far, they wouldn’t allow like McDonalds, bars, Starbucks, yes, but that’s not a bar!*” The presence of a Starbucks coffee outlet has led to mixed feelings from the respondents like Dede who reasoned, “*There’s a dilemma! In the first side, maybe it can give jobs for people in this place, but on the other side, Starbucks is not allowed maybe.*” Nina who is employed by Starbucks in Ubud mentioned it was only permitted to open as it is owned by a member of the region’s Royal Family.

The effects of tourism on the physical environment were deemed to be both positive and negative by the residents. Ubud has a pristine natural environment featuring green rice paddies, steep river gorges and colourful lotus ponds. Locals live in harmony with the environment and keeping it green and as undisturbed as possible was important to all respondents for QOL. Tourism was identified to promote neighbourhood pride in keeping their area looking aesthetically appealing, as Catur proudly mentioned, “*In my village Penestanan, we started the project, Penestanan Clean and Green every two weeks, on Sunday, we do that, so not only local people join that but also the tourists, the guests*
who stay in our village, they join with us to clean the village.” Anbeh also enthused that she has good neighbours who care about their environmental surrounds, “In Ubud, we already protect (the environment). We start early in the morning, 5 o’ clock in the morning, keep it clean…”

Alongside culture, Ubud is renowned for its scenic rice paddies throughout the region, the respondents frequently mentioned that the number of rice paddies appears to be declining, the gatekeeper mentioned regarding Nina, “back then as she remembered, there was still a lot of rice paddies, it was all green, but now it’s all buildings and she said there is significant changes for her as well from the physical environment.” Similarly Anbeh mentioned that, “Before around Monkey Forest there is rice fields, but now there is many restaurants, there is businesses also, us people, we are here.” Many feel the rice paddies are making way for further development including tourist accommodation and houses, as Catur mused, “A lot of rice field is changing to be villa, bungalow, like that in Ubud right now, they’re changing a lot, yeah? Some hotel…they build it in rice field, I don’t like that.” Dimia expressed concern for the future if the number of rice paddies continues to decline, “the rice paddies are almost gone” and Fina said it seems like there are, ‘less and less every year’. Pattem was worried about what further development will mean for Ubud, “you think - what will they do next?”

Pollution and traffic were the most frequently cited negative environmental effects from tourism in Ubud. Pollution was generally due to, “smoke from the cars and motorbikes,” [Gusi] and, “traffic, all the cars and big trucks, it is bad for the air in Ubud.” [Rishi]. Respondents often connected the increase in pollution to tourism, “many tourists come to Bali and it has an effect on traffic, [Ba’Mua], while others such as Kadek
felt that Ubud was, “still preventable and still liveable,” unlike busier tourism centres on the island. Pollution is also seen in the amount of rubbish dumped around Bali, including Ubud which Anbeh attributed to, “local tourists or immigrants from another part of Bali, they produce more rubbish and throw rubbish everywhere, they’re not concerned about Ubud.”

Some respondents were concerned about Ubud succumbing to mass tourism, as seen in the southern resort areas of Kuta and Nusa Dua. Ba’Mua observed that Kuta is more like Australia already, “People come here because it’s paradise, and it’s cheap, tourism has brought bad changes to Bali, but in Ubud we still keep the traditional culture.” Tanu said, “Of course yeah, I worry about that. If the rice is gone...not green yeah. Only like your country (Australia)” and Dimia felt similarly, "Building for tourism, like in Kuta area, I don’t like that, it will make more traffic also, less comfortable, feel hot everyday, different with Ubud, but I hope Ubud will not be like Kuta area.” Consideration of how sites are redeveloped was also mentioned by Catur, "They will build more tourist facilities, I just hope they can use more bamboo, not building like, what do they call it – concrete, so if like the restaurant is not working anymore, they can recycle the building materials" and Dede, “If the guests come to Bali, they want to see a nice view, not a building like that.” Interestingly the gatekeeper noted two of the youngest respondents who felt that tourism’s effects on the physical environment were minimal to non-existent, “For Jangha there is no impact on the environment” and, “In terms of the environment as long as it’s still being controlled, not being reckless, it’s still bringing a positive impact for Rishi.”
4.4 FACILITATORS AND INHIBITORS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN UBUD

A section of the interviews focused explicitly on uncovering respondents’ perceptions of proposed future development in the Ubud region. Respondents were asked whether they support current levels of tourism development in Ubud and whether they supported further growth in the industry. They were also asked if they would like more tourists to visit the town and how they would like Ubud to be in ten years’ time. Finally respondents were asked for their opinion on the proposed Novotel Ubud, which would be the first Western branded hotel to be constructed in the central area of the town.

Firstly respondents were asked how they felt about current levels of tourism development in Ubud. A common issue cited by respondents was perceived ‘crowding’ fuelled by the exponential growth in the local and tourist population. When Dimia was asked how she felt about tourism the way it is now in Ubud she replied, “Not really happy, yeah, not really – too crowded, too many people.” Others felt that there was too much development already, as Nina explained, “there’s no point in building more hotels or restaurants if they’re just going to block the view, and if there is no view, there is no point in coming to Ubud.” Nyoman also felt there was no need for further development saying, “I think it’s enough! Ubud will turn ugly if there is too much more.”

Traffic was a common theme identified not only to have the propensity to impact quality of life, but as an inhibitor to future tourism development. This was underpinned by a perceived lack of investment in viable infrastructure, particularly roads, to support the tourism boom, as Catur questioned, “more traffic, facilities not quite good, tourists (are) coming a lot, but not good facilities, these need more attention from the government and then tourists will feel more comfortable coming to Ubud.” Respondents showed
concern regarding a lack of support facilities in Ubud such as Dede who mentioned improved infrastructure such as more public transport may help ease traffic congestion.

In addition to traffic respondents also raised the increased amount of restaurants and hotels as one of the reasons why they feel there is too much development already, with concerns over the economic viability of new businesses driven by the seasonal nature of the tourism industry as Anbeh lamented, “the income is less, because of many restaurants.” Kadek confirmed that there are, “too many restaurants and hotels,” and Tanu had observed that, “so many restaurants are just making good luck (not making any money) as sometimes they are empty.” Several were supportive of the tourism development status quo; positive views were expressed by Jangha, “It’s ok, Ubud has so many hotels, so many stores,” and Ba’Mua agreed at that moment, tourism development was, “ok, not too much.”

Secondly, respondents were asked if they support further growth of tourism in Ubud including a potential increase in tourists, which resulted in mixed feelings regarding the prospect. Epana was cautious, “there could be more development, but maybe next year or the next two years, Ubud will be full.” Other respondents expressed conditional support if further development was to take place. Krishna felt that as long as development is built according to tradition or local rules then it was appropriate, but otherwise development should cease. Dewi said it was ok to have more development but as long as nobody, “breaks the rules.” Rishi responded that it was, “ok to develop more,” but not in the heart of Ubud, it needs to be outside of that area, “so tourism is not centralised.”

Yindah even expressed a desire for more development to occur, primarily due to the job opportunities they believe this would bring. Nina mentioned it would be, “difficult
for Ubud,” without tourists because the locals depend on tourism for their economy and financial support. Dewi hoped for tourism to provide more jobs for locals in the future to, “increase the economy so there’s no unemployment.” Lakshmi hoped that tourism would develop more in the future but at the same time would like to see, “the culture being preserved.”

Respondents were often directly opposed to future development, reasons cited included concerns over a loss of local land and open space, as well as, “more hotels means more land, more water used for the hotel, more rice field gone and I don’t like that” as Catur commented. Respondents expressed concerns that the aesthetic impact that inappropriate development may have on Ubud. In extreme cases respondents such as Tanu were adamant in their opposition to future tourism development in Ubud, “No, I don’t agree about more development, I do not agree with more hotels.” Uri mentioned that beyond Ubud, tourism development in Bali may have already exceeded government expectations, “There are too many hotels, the latest I read was that there are 75,000 hotel rooms in Bali, I remember about 20 years ago I was talking to the Governor and he said he would stop development at 25,000.” Krishna was also concerned about Ubud getting busier as Bali tourism continues to grow, “people have been saying Ubud is quiet this season, but what happens if Ubud gets too busy? It will become like Kuta.”

A final perceived inhibitor to future development was the type of tourism market desired by respondents in Ubud. There was an overwhelming sentiment that visitors from certain cultural backgrounds had a reputation for exhibiting undesirable tourist behaviour have the potential to, as Tanu mentioned, “make the situation more crowded.” Dimia felt like Bali in general was losing its exclusivity and was possibly too open to tourists, “too
many people, for a long time, Bali was famous for being a private island, still keep the culture, humble people, friendly people but now not private island!”

Whilst the respondents largely agreed that they would like more tourists to visit Ubud, some expressed they are worried about the density of tourism development in the centre of Ubud. Krishna observed, “It seems like everything is getting smaller and smaller because of the buildings.” Ba’Mua pointed out that if tourism development is excessive it may mean losing their visitor market, “tourism is controlled here, we must keep it traditional, it’s an asset for Ubud, when we cannot keep it traditional I worry that tourists will not come to Ubud again.”

Even though there was concern over future tourism development, especially the rapid nature of expansion, the general sentiment among respondents such as Anbeh was that Ubud is a now, “a modern village.” However, the findings indicated that much of this sentiment was echoed by a lack of other viable development options, as Tanu reasoned, “If no tourists, what we do? Go into rice field? Rice harvest has already finished!” Nonetheless, several residents like Epana did however express overt support for further development in Ubud, “There could be more, further, yes…. as long as they build hotels based on the rules, it’s ok.” Locals did mention that support would waiver if appropriate regulations were not put in place for future development in Ubud. Uri predicted, “if they don’t control it, don’t put restrictions, it will develop, so far, it’s still controlled, but not really tightly.”

Overall respondents seemed to genuinely enjoy having visitors and wanted even higher numbers of tourists to come in the future. The gatekeeper noted of several respondents that they feel to attract more tourists, they need to build even more facilities
and attractions; as Jangha stated, “it’s ok to have more hotels and more restaurants it can be a bigger tourist attraction for people to come to Ubud.” Rishi also supported this view, “she hopes that tourism increases in Ubud, and the guests in Bali feel comfortable with the facilities.” Lakshmi was hoping more tourists would come to Ubud, but only if development is controlled, “it should stay green.” Ba’Mua agreed, “more tourists and still keep Ubud like it is now.”

Thirdly, respondents were probed on their ideal view of the development of Ubud in ten years’ time. Despite several noting that the only constant in life is change, the overwhelming view was strong, their views seemed to confirm their desire for Ubud to retain its unique cultural and historic integrity and identity as Dimia stated, “I hope the rice paddies are still in front of our resort not buildings.” The vision of respondents like Catur was to mitigate the existence of key impacts reported to affect quality of life, “I hope it’s better than now, not more traffic, no more new hotels, no more new restaurants they can manage the old ones.” Unequivocally the most common response when probed into the vision for tourism development over a ten year period was that Ubud did not become another Kuta, as Nina declared, ”I think this is enough for Ubud, because otherwise it will become like Kuta.” Jangha wants Ubud to be better known by tourists around the world, like the other respondents his livelihood depends on tourists continuing to visit the town, “I want Ubud to be more famous, for me and my sister, all of my life’s from here.”

Over the next ten years respondents felt tourism development should pay particular attention to keeping the unique culture and traditions of Ubud vibrant and alive, such as the local market which Tanu stated is, “very important for ceremony, we get
everything in the market.” Importantly respondents revealed that if operationalised in a sustainable manner tourism provides hope for a more positive future for themselves and their family, central to the concept of quality of life. Respondents like Pattem expressed a desire for Ubud to be, “more advanced in the future, that the minimum salary increases and the quality of life in terms of the economy for each household gets better for the local residents.”

Rishi hoped that tourism development would not be, “recklessly built,” and Ubud would retain its natural, green environment including the rice paddies. Tanu expressed a desire for his children to work in tourism in the future, “I told my kids, you must learn English, you must hard learning, I said like that, later follow my job maybe, maybe you can work in a hotel, something like that if you get a good position in the hotel, good English, you bring later.”

Finally, respondents were shown an artist’s impression and plans (see below) for the proposed new Novotel hotel development in Jalan Hanoman, which is within a short drive to the centre of Ubud.
The proposed Novotel will be located on Jalan Hanoman (see Figure 4.2 below) which is located near the centre of Ubud. The exact location on the street is unknown as construction hadn’t yet started at the time when the interviews were conducted. The hotel will be situated on a site approximately 4573 square metres and includes a restaurant, bar, multifunction room, business centre and meeting room with a deli, drugstore and spa onsite (Siandana, 2014).
Respondents expressed limited knowledge over the proposed development, citing concerns over community consultation with respect to the decision making process. A binary measure was used in the semi-structured interview to identify support for the proposed Novotel development, with 8 respondents supporting the proposal, 11 locals opposing the proposal, and 2 respondents ambivalent to the proposal. Support was cited to be primarily due to the potential for the development to generate, “a lot of tourism schools that produce students all the time and this will open job opportunities for them,” as mentioned by Gusi. Support was expressed primarily as there were not hotels like it already in Ubud [Odmi], thus offering new support for the economy [Lakshmi].
Respondents who expressed mixed views were primarily driven by the scope of the development, Jangha noting that, “I don’t like the building, it’s too wide, long (perpendicular to the road) is ok.”

However, a number of respondents were strongly opposed to the Novotel plan, Dimia stated, “No - I disagree about this because it is not like our Ubud,” Epana said, “I’m speechless, no - it's not right for Ubud - it's too big,” and Uri declared, “I think if they allow this, then that’s very bad.” Catur felt very strongly that this development was not suited to Ubud, “That’s terrible, and that (Novotel) is not my Ubud!” Others were more indifferent, “it’s ok, nothing special.” [Nyoman]. The scale of the development appeared to be the main reason for opposition, including the building height, location on a narrow road which already has many hotels and will block the view for other residents. Ba’Mua felt, “It’s too big for in the centre of Ubud,” and Jangha agreed, “It’s ok, but there are a lot of rooms mixed with a lot of tourism countries and the impacts from tourists will affect business in Bali in a good way.” Also, the style of design was viewed as too Western rather than Balinese style by many respondents such as Uri, “The style and the size, Ubud it should be 30 or 40 rooms only and the style should merge with the surroundings,” and Ba’Mua who also felt, “it’s not Balinese style, it makes Balinese culture lost.” Dede felt the design was, “over the top,” and Krishna notes that there, “had never been any tall buildings like this in Ubud before.” The gatekeeper observed that this hotel is proposed for a residential area where every house has a shrine for religious practices, if this building is 3 or 4 storeys high then this will be a problem as buildings must not exceed the heights of religious structures in Bali. These findings about future development highlight the polarising nature of tourism and associated development and emphasise the importance of community consultation in the early stages of the
development process. The gatekeeper also noted that before they can build anything they have to go through consultation with the community about the construction as it is proposed for a residential area.

Respondents also expressed concern that the hotel would be situated so close to residents’ homes, as Anbeh explained, “I think if it’s in the area, this place (Jalan Hanoman), the thing is, I am disappointed about it. Because it’s close to the village,” and Catur agreed, “I don’t think so, Jalan Hanoman is already full, it is very close to central Ubud so that will be more traffic.” Respondents were also concerned that this development would worsen the area’s traffic issues, with Anbeh identifying that if the development was located further away from town, then perhaps the proposal would be more acceptable, “Maybe ok Novotel in Ubud, but maybe outside, around with a nice view, we have nice views here, so maybe outside, around 10 minutes from here, many places.” Ba’Mua was adamant, “Not in Ubud centre in Jalan Hanoman because it will make a big effect, a bad effect, so like traffic, too busy, it’s too big maybe a bit outside, near Ubud, 5km then it’s ok no problem.”

The gatekeeper noted that several respondents who supported the project liked that the Novotel was built to the back on a narrow block of land rather than taking up a wide street frontage, “Yindah’s ok with this building because it’s built to the back, the same as the others, she likes the design of the building,” and, “Jangha’s saying it will affect business in Bali in a good way, it’s OK to have the hotel long at the back but not too tall.” The main benefits from this development appeared to be economic as Dewi explained, “It’s ok to have that because it gives job opportunities and gives tax from the
guests that stay in the hotel so it’s good for the economy,” and Lakshmi concurred, “It will support the economy, as long as they get the licences or permits from the authorities.”

Overall respondents were all very supportive of more visitors coming to Ubud, but cautious about the type and scale of development. The rationale for supporting the development was predominantly economic, with potential to benefit their careers and allow them to support their families financially. There was also a genuine sense that respondents enjoy seeing and interacting with tourists and interacting and if tourists enjoy Ubud, they are intrinsically more satisfied. Respondents were divided over an increase in further tourism development, an inherent juxtaposition as to accommodate more visitors, more development must occur. The younger respondents were supportive of more tourism development, as were respondents whose workplace was located further away from the centre of Ubud.

4.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Section 4.1 introduced the chapter, explaining that the results were gathered from 21 in-depth, semi-structured interviews with Balinese locals working in the tourism industry in Ubud. Section 4.2 unearthed what QOL means to local in Ubud, identifying family as central to life satisfaction and feeling happiness. Family includes children, spouses, togetherness and quality time. Other important personal themes related to quality of life included health, education, environment, friendships and culture. Some career-related themes also emerged such as work/life balance, income, good working environment and independence.
Section 4.3 examined how tourism adds to or detracts from QOL of respondents. The majority of respondents agreed that tourism does contribute to their QOL and there is a visible connection between the two. Tourism is viewed favourably in terms of job creation and economic development, however concerns about the physical environment such as increased traffic and loss of traditional farming land such as Ubud’s famous rice paddies were also raised. Residents felt that tourism has not adversely influenced Ubud’s Balinese culture, allowing it to be preserved for future generations. Tourism and development were seen to be tightly controlled and monitored with strong policies to promote local ownership and employment.

Section 4.4 focused on facilitators and inhibitors of tourism development in Ubud. Locals were concerned with congestion, development density and the rapid pace of tourism development in the area. Respondents felt there was enough hotels and restaurants already, however they would welcome an increase in visitors. When considering a vision for tourism to Ubud in the future, the core wish was that it not transform into another Kuta, the mass tourism hub of Bali’s south. Chapter Five will present a discussion of the aim and objectives, connecting to core findings of the existing literature.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this research was to explore local tourism employees’ perceptions of QOL. This thesis achieved this aim by investigating three key objectives. The first objective was to understand what quality of life means to locals in Ubud, Bali. The second objective was to investigate how locals perceive tourism contributes to, and detracts from, their quality of life in Ubud. The third objective was to explore the connection between the perceived quality of life of locals and support for future tourism development in Ubud.

Chapter Five discusses the results of the research objectives, aligning the key findings of the research with the literature reviewed in Chapter Two. Section 5.2 connects the findings from the in-depth, semi-structured interviews with Ubud locals employed in the tourism industry with previous research on QOL (section 2.4). Section 5.3 links perceptions of tourism impacts to key findings from previous studies, specifically on social impacts of tourism, including perceived impacts of tourism (section 2.3.1) and QOL of tourism employees (section 2.5). Section 5.4 explores the connection between QOL of tourism employees and support for future development, linking these to previous studies on attitudes toward tourism development (section 2.3.2), host community visioning (section 2.3.3) and sustainable tourism (section 2.2). Finally, Section 5.5 outlines a summary of the key findings as presented in Chapter Five.

5.2 DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVE ONE

Research Objective One sought to understand what quality of life means from the perspective of locals in Ubud. QOL is related to life satisfaction, in particular an intrinsic assessment of how well a person’s life is progressing overall, influenced by their
experiences and environment (Moscardo, 2009; Dolnicar et al., 2012). Much of the extant literature on QOL and tourism focuses on impacts of tourism and asks residents whether they agree or disagree with various statements, along with examining the influence of tourism on residents with varying economic dependence on the industry (Neal et al., 2004; Benckendorff et al., 2009). This research has sought to identify whether impacts of tourism are felt intrinsically by the host community, potentially influencing residents’ satisfaction with their own lifestyle (Andereck et al., 2007). While this research can provide valuable insight to tourism planners and decision makers, it is important not to view the whole host community as one homogeneous group as attitudes can vary and there is no one-size-fits-all management approach that will improve QOL for all residents in a destination (Pearce, 2008; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011). This study has interpreted what QOL means to Ubud locals employed in the tourism industry, along how the effects they feel from tourism, are contributing to or detracting from their perceived QOL (Pearce et al., 1996).

Objective One was achieved through conducting a series of 21 in-depth, semi structured interviews with Balinese locals working in the tourism industry in Ubud. After conducting the interviews a series of themes emerged from the data, which outlined what respondents consider are the essential elements required for QOL to be achieved. These themes are illustrated in Table 5.1 below.
As displayed in Table 5.1, tourism was found to have a predominantly positive influence on QOL, primarily by providing job opportunities that contribute to family togetherness, as well as to the health and education. In addition, positive work/life balance, enhancing friendships and preserving culture were all QOL themes mentioned by respondents. There was an overall sense that respondents were pleased to be working in the tourism industry. Even though respondents worked, in most cases, six days a week, no concerns were expressed over tourism being unable to provide work/life balance (Deery & Jago, 2009). Respondents largely felt that tourism had not negatively affected Ubud’s Balinese culture and expressed a strong desire for culture to be preserved, considering it intricately connected to QOL.

These findings support previous studies undertaken in similar contexts which found residents’ who are economically dependent on the tourism industry are more likely to be positive and supportive of tourism in their community (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Deery, et al., 2012). However, whilst respondents spoke positively towards tourism’s influence on QOL, it was questioned whether tourism was actually needed in
order to achieve QOL and thus if tourism was actually an appropriate development pathway for an area steeped in such cultural tradition. For instance, respondents such as Krishna and Lakshmi felt that if they didn’t work in tourism, they would be willing and able to work in another occupation such as teaching or farming to earn the income necessary to achieve QOL (Husbands, 1989; Moscardo, 2009; Pratt et al., 2016).

While respondents alluded to a number of the OECD’s (2011) social indicators (e.g. health, work/life balance, education, social connections) for QOL, one that was not mentioned was personal security or the threat of crime. Crime was not raised by any of the respondents as a concern regarding living in Ubud or as a risk posed by involvement in tourism, possibly a reflection of the stage of tourism development in the region.

On the other hand, family emerged through the course of conducting the interviews as the most important consideration for QOL in Ubud. This is a QOL indicator not mentioned in the OECD list of social indicators. Important determinants of QOL for families included children, spouses, a sense of togetherness and quality time. Enjoying these aspects of family life was confirmed by respondents as key to achieving QOL (Filep, 2008; Benckendorff, et al., 2009).

The QOL themes identified in Objective One will be utilised to populate component E in the theoretical model by Deery et al. (2012) in section 5.5 to provide insight into what QOL means to locals living and working in a tourism destination.

5.3 DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVE TWO

Research Objective Two sought to investigate how locals perceive tourism contributes to, and detracts from, their quality of life in Ubud. During the course of the in-depth interviews, respondents were asked about perceived positive and negative
impacts from tourism across the triple bottom line of socio-cultural, economic and environmental. While previous studies have identified a number of attributes against which resident attitudes may be measured, these studies merely raise pre-identified impacts with residents and assess their feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction towards them, rather than building new knowledge of tourism impacts, based on the locals’ perspectives (Easterling, 2005; Hunt & Stronza, 2013). As previously stated, by utilising the interpretivist paradigm it was important to elicit respondents’ salient perceptions of tourism impacts rather than being presented with a predetermined list of attributes (Nunkoo et al., 2013; Sharpley 2014). Utilising this research approach enabled perceptions and knowledge of tourism impacts to be discerned from the locals’ perspective, without the presumption that any particular impact (e.g. increased nightlife) is problematic.

Whilst quantitative, survey-based approaches are common in this area of research (Látková & Vogt, 2012; Lee, 2013; Palmer et al., 2013), there have been some studies which have adopted a qualitative approach, such as the methodology used in the current study which allowed residents to put forward their own perceptions of the impacts of tourism (Deery et al., 2012; Woosnam, 2012). This approach is an example of SET, where individuals can evaluate the benefits received from tourism against the costs, which in turn can be expected to influence their attitudes towards tourism and any future expansion of the industry in their community (Teye et al., 2002; Jurowski et al., 2006).

When respondents were asked how they perceive the impacts of tourism to affect their QOL (Andereck et al., 2007), 15 respondents stated that tourism does influence their QOL in a positive way, which echoes findings from several studies that state that residents
with a direct economic connection to tourism tend to express positive perceptions regarding the tourism industry (Meng et al., 2010; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011).

Respondents were asked for their salient perceptions on the economic impacts of tourism, specifically how tourism has affected Ubud’s economy. A wide variety of economic impacts were identified, such as increased income and job creation. However, respondents were balanced in their views with both positive and negative comments about the trade-offs required to ascertain economic benefits. For instance tourism was viewed favourably for the economic development of the community (Lansing & De Vries, 2007). However seasonality was raised as an issue affecting income for those trying to provide for their families. This was similar to the Fiji study by Pratt et al. (2016) of a tourism village located next to a large resort. During low seasons there would not be enough paid work for all who needed it. When compared with a village with little to no contact with tourists, tourism villagers also had a higher incidence of negative emotions such as anger, fear, jealousy and worry in their lives, women were also more likely to be employed in the tourism village (36% worked in the resort) which led to some demanding more say in village affairs which has led to conflict in the village (Pratt et al., 2016). As a result of this study the assumption that those with direct economic ties to tourism, who may even benefit greatly in a financial sense, will directly translate into better QOL overall has been challenged. Residents in the non-tourism village were found to be “socially wealthier” which may be preferable for overall QOL (Pratt et al., 2016).

In terms of other perceived negative economic impacts from tourism, foreign ownership of land and developments was a key issue of concern for Ubud locals seeking to retain ownership and control of tourism businesses (Shakeela, Ruhanen & Breakey, 2011). Ease and frequency of obtaining building permits in Ubud and greater Bali was
also identified as a concern, suggesting perhaps the application process needs to be
reviewed (Yasarata et al., 2010). These findings are similar to a study of Mycoo (2006)
in Barbados who found tourism development was proceeding on the island with
inadequate building regulations, environmental measures such as impact assessments
were not required by law and there was inadequate public consultation on current and
future tourism development. On the contrary in a study by Vianna, Meekan, Pannell,
Marsh and Meeuwig (2012), in Palau found tourism eased seasonality and sustainability
issues associated with fishing, the other primary industry, as it provided more stable
employment, generated more revenue, which in turn delivered an increased multiplier
effect for the island economy’.

All the same, despite considerable debate in the literature, this research revealed
while locals perceived more negative than positive economic impacts from tourism, the
positive impacts such as job opportunities and economic development were raised more
frequently, resulting in an even balance of positive and negative perceptions overall. A
summary of tourism economic impacts perceived by locals is represented below.
Table 5.2 Perceived Economic Impacts of Tourism in Ubud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adding to Respondents’ QOL</td>
<td>Money for government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job opportunities</td>
<td>Dependence on tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>Too many restaurants and hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>Foreign ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too much development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ease of obtaining building permits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western style of development</td>
<td>Detracting from Respondents’ QOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the socio-cultural impacts of tourism, respondents acknowledged that by tourism providing so many jobs in Ubud, families are able to work locally and extended families can stay together without having to move to other areas to look for work. This directly related to their responses regarding whether tourism provides access to QOL for their families and the wider community, as several respondents had family members working in tourism and emphasised that tourism’s presence has been beneficial for the community. This confirms findings in previous studies that those with a high level of contact with tourists and a direct economic attachment to the industry will have positive perceptions of tourism’s contribution to their QOL (Kim et al., 2012; Rivera, Croes & Lee, 2015).

The most frequently mentioned perceived positive effect from tourism in this study was the belief that the Balinese Hindu culture has been preserved from any negative influences. Respondents appreciated that culture is an important tourism drawcard for
Ubud with many visitors interested in viewing dance performances (Pulina et al., 2013). While respondents agreed that dances that are performed for the tourists have not been modified to for tourist audiences, one respondent was concerned that dances traditionally reserved for temple ceremonies are now being performed in front of tourists. Keeping the culture traditional and avoiding cultural change was also of importance to respondents and many felt residents were in a strong position to continue their cultural practices intact (Lane, 1994). Many saw tourism as fostering creativity amongst locals, encouraging them to keep traditional arts and crafts going as they are seen as a way to make income and be involved in the tourism industry in Ubud. By working in tourism, opportunities for socialising also increased, both with work colleagues and tourists, in a pleasant working environment which has already been deemed to be important for achieving QOL in this study.

Unlike other tourism centres on Bali offering late night entertainment, respondents’ were pleased that Ubud has tight restrictions on bar and nightclub opening hours which mean establishments must shut at midnight which might be surprising for some visitors. In the Fiji study by Pratt et al., 2016, the authors found that catering to a majority of foreign tourists may influence the host community to adopt part of the tourists’ culture, also known as the demonstration effect (Hall, 2007). This was particularly true for the tourism village where traditional duties and gender roles are affected by tourism as more women are formally employed and workers have to adapt to shift-work requirements of tourism (Pratt et al., 2016). As a result, tourism villagers were found to have problems with time management, as they struggled to balance demands of their formal employment with traditional subsistence farming duties in the village, often resulting in long working days (Pratt et al., 2016). In Ubud, tourism employees were
singly employed in tourism, they did not have the demands of another family responsibility such as farming to fulfil and as a result work/life balance and long working hours were not inhibitors towards achieving QOL, even though their tourism roles were a six day a week commitment. The demonstration effect was mentioned in terms of Ubud youth copying the fashion worn by tourists and engaging in affectionate behaviour in public like tourists do, however there was no mention of traditional gender roles being affected by tourism employment.

There were some other negative socio-cultural impacts perceived by respondents such as success in business causing a gap between the rich and poor in Ubud, and sparking jealousy amongst neighbours. Similar findings resulted from a study of two small townships in Cape Town, South Africa (Koens & Thomas, 2015) where local ownership of businesses involved in tourism caused conflict amongst residents, as an oversupply of small businesses leads to heavy competition and rivalry.

Crowding, as Ubud’s tourism industry gets busier was seen as detracting from QOL for some respondents, as they mentioned this results in congestion, pollution, and a feeling that Ubud is getting smaller which would conflict with the local amenities needed for QOL as outlined in Objective One, which included feeling comfortable, having fresh air, enjoying the scenery and village atmosphere. Previous studies have also confirmed congestion and crowding are common complaints of residents living in tourism destinations (Teye et al., 2002; Jeon, Kang & Desmarais, 2014).

Ultimately, many respondents acknowledge that if culture is negatively affected it will also impact the appeal of the region to potential tourists (Telfer & Sharpley, 2007). A summary of key themes raised in relation to socio cultural impacts is presented below.
Table 5.3 Perceived Socio-Cultural Impacts of Tourism in Ubud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adding to Respondents’ QOL</td>
<td>Tourism providing employment for locals</td>
<td>Traditional dance now in front stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tight restrictions on bars and nightclubs</td>
<td>Jealousy amongst neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation of local culture</td>
<td>Crowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering creativity</td>
<td>Demonstration effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialising</td>
<td>Acculturation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The perceived impact of tourism on the environment was also found to be both positive and negative by the respondents. Tourism was identified to promote neighbourhood pride in keeping their area looking aesthetically appealing for visitors (Cahyanto et al., 2013). However, respondents also expressed concern over crowding and traffic in the region as more tourists’ came to visit. Ubud is renowned for its scenic rice paddies throughout the region, with respondents expressing concern that the number of rice paddies appears to be declining, affecting their enjoyment of the scenery of Ubud, which was frequently mentioned as one of the things respondents most liked about living in the area (Cole, 2012; Wu, 2016). A summary of the environmental impacts of tourism as perceived by locals is illustrated in Table 5.4 below.
Table 5.4 Perceived Environmental Impacts of Tourism in Ubud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adding to Respondents’ QOL</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recycling programs</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment preservation</td>
<td>Temperatures increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rice paddies decreasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detracting from Respondents’ QOL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the course of the interviews most respondents found it difficult to provide examples of how tourism contributes positively to the environment; they were more likely to mention a negative impact. Two respondents appreciated that their villages had started neighbourhood recycling and clean-up programs to keep their surroundings pleasant and to alleviate waste issues with so much plastic and paper not being recycled. The increased traffic was mentioned by five respondents, as was pollution which was attributed to the increase in traffic from more tourists arriving in Bali. One respondent mentioned as more and more buildings appear in Ubud, it feels hotter as open space decreases. Again, this affects the village amenity which was so important to several respondents for achieving QOL.

5.4 DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVE THREE

Research Objective Three sought to explore the connection between the perceived QOL of locals and attitude toward (support for) future tourism development in Ubud. First, this involved exploring if local tourism employees were supportive of current levels
of development. Second, this section sought to ascertain whether locals would support future growth in tourism, including more tourists. Finally Objective Three asked how respondents would prefer development in Ubud to look in ten years’ time. As respondents were positive about the influence of tourism on their QOL, it was important to find out whether or not this support would necessarily translate into a high level of approval for the expansion of tourism development in Ubud.

Central to the concept of sustainable tourism is the involvement and participation of the host community, which can include employment in tourism, without which support for tourism may not be forthcoming (Deery, Jago & Fredline, 2005; Lee, 2013). As the density of tourism development increases, so is the likelihood of negative attitudes towards tourism from those living in the destination (Moyle et al., 2010; Collinson, 2012). The results of Research Objective Three thus have been connected to the literature related to sustainable tourism and attitudes toward tourism.

Tourism in Ubud was viewed favourably in terms of job creation and economic development. The town is reliant on tourism as a source of income, similar to many island economies, and therefore ensuring a sustainable future is important to consider in future policy making and planning (Oreja Rodriguez et al. 2008; Butler & Carlsen, 2011). There was also a genuine sense that residents enjoy seeing tourists and interacting with them on a day-to-day basis, and if tourists have fun in Ubud, residents are intrinsically more satisfied. This supports findings in previous studies that when locals feel engaged and considered in the tourism industry they are more likely to be welcoming and supportive of future visitors (Moyle et al., 2010; Weaver & Lawton, 2013).

The interview results revealed that, in general, the favourable view of tourism’s contribution to QOL did translate to a similar level of support for the current tourism
development levels in Ubud (17 out of 21 respondents agreed). The support was often conditional, for example, some respondents felt improvements to infrastructure were still needed and provided no more hotels or restaurants were opened, then the future of Ubud would have a better chance of being sustainable if development was limited (Bramwell & Lane, 1993). All the same, the respondents who felt current levels of development were already too high were mostly concerned about crowding, traffic and too many buildings as it is. To support development, infrastructure was lacking with inadequate public transport and parking facilities. This is a similar finding to Michalko et al. (2013) in a study conducted in Harkany, Hungary that found although locals supported tourism, it was important to ensure infrastructure was developed to mitigate potential negative impacts, in this case inadequate public transport services and access. Whilst previous studies have identified positive views towards tourism from those with a direct economic attachment, it should also be noted that those employed in tourism are also in a strong position to be able to identify issues associated with future development (Ghaderi & Henderson, 2012; Hunt & Stronza, 2013).

Respondents were asked if they would support more tourism development in Ubud. Only half of the respondents interviewed felt that it was acceptable to allow more tourism development in Ubud. Again, those who supported this notion nominated some conditions upon which it would be agreeable, such as, building according to regulations and local style, provision of more employment or the development was situated well outside of the Ubud central business district. Others who were supportive of further development reasoned that it would provide additional job opportunities for locals (Lee, 2013). This is similar to findings in a previous study by Tao and Wall (2009) in Shanmei,
Taiwan, where residents were further accepting of increased tourism activity when it was integrated into an existing industry and provided more job opportunities for locals.

Respondents who were opposed to further development were concerned over loss of land to foreign investors, exploitation of natural resources such as rice paddies and water supply, and a reduction in the aesthetic appeal of Ubud, due to the density of development (Lane, 1994). In a study conducted in Hawraman Village in Iran, Ghaderi and Henderson (2012), found that residents were concerned with natural and cultural resources being used for tourism initiatives which yielded very little benefits for locals, who felt left out of planning decisions. While the respondents in Ubud showed concern over environmental changes, none said that they felt excluded from decision making or that they had a lack of involvement with tourism, this may be due to the fact that they all worked in the tourism industry, and also because Bali has a network of local *banjar* (community organisations) which hold regular community meetings, if there are changes proposed to the neighbourhood such as construction or renovations, everyone can express their opinion.

From the results of the in-depth interviews, Ubud would appear to be in the construction phase of development reflecting the growth stage of McLennan, Pham, Ruhanen, Ritchie and Moyle’s (2012) theory of tourism transformation where there is some risk of locals becoming negative if appropriate measures are not undertaken to ensure sustainable development.

Along with increased tourism development, respondents were also asked whether they were in favour of a higher volume of tourists to travel to Ubud. This question provoked a far more positive response, with only one respondent declaring that there are too many people already. While it might seem obvious that the respondents would like
more tourists as their livelihoods depend on it, there was a genuine sense that respondents felt a sense of pride Ubud was popular with tourists and seemed happy regarding the prospect of more tourists, particularly during the low season from October to April. This is similar to a study done by Wang and Pfister (2008), in Washington, North Carolina, where residents felt that tourism had brought improvements to the town’s waterfront amenities therefore increasing their sense of shared social benefits with the tourists and overall community pride. In Ubud, some respondents mentioned the positive changes to Ubud such as the new market and modern feel, yet in Washington, 99% of respondents did not have a direct economic link to the industry (Wang & Pfister, 2008).

Finally, respondents were asked for their preferred development scenario for Ubud in ten years’ time. This provided an opportunity for host community visioning, or imagining a potentially better future, which is under-utilised in the tourism literature (Filep et al., 2015). Visioning has been credited with encouraging communities to adopt more sustainable tourism practices through innovation and a long term focus on the ideal future for the destination (Davies, Doyle & Pape, 2012).

The findings of Filep et al. (2015) produced a similar desire to the current study as respondents stressed improvements to transport were needed, such as improved infrastructure and variety of transport available, along with access to education and healthcare. This relates quite closely to themes raised by Ubud locals in Objective One, specifically education, health and culture which were all nominated as being paramount for achieving QOL. Also consistent with the findings of the current study was the largely positive view of tourism in Bali by residents, with a mutually beneficial relationship between culture and tourism (Picard, 1990; Wall, 1996; Filep et al., 2015). The only
negative aspects of tourism in Bali were traffic, crowding and hot weather, which echoes responses from the current study on negative effects associated with tourism.

When respondents in the current study were asked how they would like Ubud to be in ten years’ time, many expressed a desire for limited further development, especially for hotels or restaurants, no further increases in traffic and for the rice paddies to be preserved. This reflects the findings of Williams and Ponsford (2009) that even though tourism requires environmental resources to facilitate tourism experiences, the protection of such resources is critical for sustained competitiveness of the destination.

Protecting the cultural identity and traditions of Ubud was also identified as important which presents a dilemma for the town whose primary tourist attraction is also the feature most respondents want protected and according to the themes raised in Objective One, is central in achieving QOL. This need for preservation relates to previous studies stating the importance of community participation and involvement in the planning process so that key cultural and environmental values can be protected more efficiently (Deery et al., 2005; Williams & Ponsford, 2009; Angelkova et al., 2012).

Overall, while respondents were nearly all happy to welcome additional visitor numbers to Ubud, there was some restraint shown when they were asked about current levels of development in Ubud. This intensified to largely negative views over future tourism development in the region, particularly in the already congested central business district. While perceptions of QOL obtained through the presence of tourism in Ubud were favourable, this did not translate to guaranteed support of future development in the region.
5.5 ACHIEVEMENT OF RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The research suggests that, for tourism employees in Ubud, there are strong links between perceived impacts of tourism, especially social impacts, perceptions of quality of life and attitudes toward (support for) future tourism development. While this is perhaps not surprising, the study identified some QOL elements that were prominent in the minds of respondents, notably family, education and health, and others that were less prominent such as achieving work/life balance and socialising. One OECD QOL indicator was absent which was personal security. It was also noted that QOL could be achieved via means other than working in tourism. Respondents perceived a number of positive impacts such as job creation that have direct links to QOL. They perceived relatively few negative socio-cultural impacts from tourism, which perhaps explains why they associate tourism with QOL outcomes. Working in the tourism industry, however, does not equate with perceiving all impacts as positive. A number of negative (environmental and economic) impacts were mentioned such as foreign ownership, traffic, pollution and an increase in waste, but perhaps they are seen as removed from the day-to-day lives of these residents, as they did not seem to be associated with decreased QOL. They also mentioned actions that could be and were being undertaken to address these. Working in the tourism industry also does not equate with favourability toward any and all forms of future tourism development. Support for future development seems to be linked to having the capacity and voice to continue to minimise its impacts and risks.
Figure 5.1 – Tourism and Quality of Life for Local Tourism Industry Employees (adapted from Deery et al., 2012)

Pink Shading = case study focus (there is little or no variation of these in the study)

Grey Shading = case study “variables” (interviewees are asked about these in the study)

A = section 2.5 of the literature review
B = section 2.3.1 of the literature review
E = section 2.4 of the literature review
F = section 2.3.2 of the literature review
G = section 2.2 of the literature review
5.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The aim of this research is to explore tourism industry employees’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism on the quality of life in Ubud. Chapter 5 presented a discussion of the three key objectives of this research, each relating to previous studies from the fields of sustainable tourism, social impacts of tourism, QOL and tourism employees.

Research Objective One revealed QOL for locals from Ubud Bali included family, health, education, employment, friends and culture. Tourism was found to positively influence QOL, providing a source of income to meet family needs and opportunities for the remaining criteria to be met and satisfied. However respondents also noted that QOL could also be achieved by working in another industry such as education or farming. Consequently, while tourism was a valuable source of income, it wasn’t necessarily the only option. Respondents enjoyed their daily face-to-face contact with tourists and appreciated that Ubud was desired by tourists as a popular destination, this positive relationship between tourist and host has also been found to leave locals feeling intrinsically satisfied with their daily lives.

Research Objective Two sought to explore local tourism employees’ perceptions of how tourism contributes to, or detracts from their quality of life. During this process respondents nominated what they perceive as the positive and negative effects of tourism in Ubud. The economic impacts that were appreciated by locals to contribute towards their QOL included job creation, economic development and money for the government, yet concerns were also raised over seasonality, foreign ownership and too much development. Socio-cultural impacts were considered minimal by local industry employees, with the culture considered to be well preserved. Results revealed that tourism also provides opportunities for socialising and artistic creativity.
The environmental impacts of tourism were perceived negatively by local industry employees with traffic, pollution, loss of traditional rice paddies and waste thought to negatively influence the QOL of locals. The positive environmental impacts unearthed were that some neighbourhoods had started recycling and clean-up programs in response to the waste and some respondents felt as long as tourism remains controlled rather than reckless, the effects on the physical environment would be minimal.

Research Objective Three explored the connection between perceived QOL and support for future development. Respondents were supportive of the current levels of tourism development in Ubud, and while they would welcome increased tourist numbers the support waned when future development opportunities were questioned, including the proposed Novotel Ubud (Chapter Four). While locals felt engaged in the industry through their frequent contact with tourists and seemed to genuinely enjoy welcoming visitors, respondents considered a lack of involvement and consultation in tourism planning decisions an issue which required attention. Chapter Six concludes the thesis, presenting a summary of the core findings, contribution of the research, practical implications and limitations, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this research was to explore tourism employees’ perceptions of the impacts of tourism on quality of life in Ubud. In particular, this research sought to understand what QOL means to locals working in tourism in Ubud, whether or not tourism adds to or detracts from their QOL and to explore the connection between perceived QOL and support for future tourism development.

This research centres on Ubud, an inland cultural tourism destination, located in Bali. A sample of 21 local tourism employees of Balinese descent who had lived in Ubud for at least two years was selected to ensure all respondents had a similar connection to the tourism industry and were well placed to comment on how tourism has affected life in their community. Interviews were designed to probe into what QOL means to locals employed in the tourism industry and its relationship to tourism.

This research was framed by tourism literature from the fields of sustainable tourism, QOL, social impacts of tourism (perceived impacts and attitudes toward tourism development), along with studies on tourism employees. Chapter Six outlines the key conclusions and implications that have emerged from the research aim and objectives. The theoretical contribution and practical significance of this research are highlighted, along with the limitations and avenues for future research inquiry.

6.2 SUMMARY OF THIS RESEARCH

This section provides a summary of the preceding chapters and highlights key conclusions and implications that were uncovered in the course of this research. Chapter One introduced this study by providing a background to the case study setting: Ubud,
Bali, Indonesia, alongside the theoretical approach, the research aim and objectives, and an outline of the contents of the thesis.

Chapter Two established the theoretical context for this research by reviewing the tourism literature related to QOL, sustainable tourism, social impacts of tourism and tourism industry employees. Sustainable tourism is a phenomenon growing in momentum across the world with a core mechanism to protect the unique natural, cultural and/or historic features that attract tourists and contribute to the well-being of the host community whilst generating economic benefits (Lane, 1994; Kytzia Walz & Wegmann, 2011). Chapter Two identified social impact studies have an emphasis on measuring resident attitudes towards tourism impacts with a specific focus on support or non-support towards future development, with an emergence of literature on QOL (Pearce et al., 1996; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; Deery et al., 2012).

Chapter Three presented the research methodology used to achieve the aim and objectives of this research, beginning with the overarching research design. An interpretive methodology was used to explore the perceptions of local employees in Ubud regarding impacts and QOL, and their attitudes toward future development, suing a case study approach (Yin, 1994). A series of 21 in-depth interviews were conducted with local residents of Balinese descent who met the selection criteria as outlined in Chapter Three. Respondents were asked about their experience, involvement and connection to the tourism industry, including what their current and previous roles were. Questions also asked about perceived positive and negative impacts of tourism and explored the link between tourism and QOL (Objective Two). Finally, the history of tourism growth in the region and attitudes towards further development of Ubud as a tourist destination were explored (Objective Three). During the interviews, photographs of plans for a new
Novotel hotel development were used to elicit responses regarding future development (Mackay & Couldwell, 2004; Bricker & Kerstetter, 2006; Garrod, 2008; Matteucci, 2012). At the conclusion of the interviews, transcripts were analysed for data pertaining to the three study objectives, including access to QOL for local employees of the tourism industry, their families and their community. These themes were then analysed to determine the frequency of each theme. Finally, Chapter Three concluded with a discussion of how ethical considerations of the study were considered and addressed.

Chapter Four presented the results of the in-depth interviews beginning with Objective One, what QOL means to each respondent. Family, including the sub-themes of children, spouses, togetherness/quality time and health emerged as core to the quality of life for these respondents. Education, the preservation of cultural traditions, career opportunities, work/life balance and a pleasant working environment were also important to attain QOL. Social attributes such as interaction with tourists and friends were also deemed important for QOL, particularly amongst the younger respondents. Finally, the local amenity and feel of Ubud Village, including friendliness of locals, cooler climate and beautiful scenery were emphasised by many of the respondents. One OECD indicator that was not mentioned by respondents at all was personal security.

Research Objective Two sought to explore how tourism adds to, or detracts from the QOL experienced by local industry employees. At an individual level, tourism was viewed as favourably contributing to QOL with 16 out of 21 respondents agreeing that the presence of tourism in Ubud enhanced their QOL, particularly in terms of job security and long term career prospects. Improving access to QOL for their families was valued by some respondents, mostly through provision of income and improving living standards in Ubud. When asked whether tourism had improved access for the wider community of
Ubud, feelings were mixed. While respondents appreciated tourism offered job opportunities for locals, concerns were raised about the region moving towards mass tourism, which was considered undesirable. In terms of there being a direct link between tourism and QOL overall, respondents were divided. Polarisation was centred around support for tourism presence in their lives, whereas others felt QOL could be achieved through working in other industries such as education or agriculture.

Respondents cited several economic impacts that they perceived tourism had brought to Ubud, such as job opportunities and money for the government, but also expressed concerns regarding foreign ownership, Western-style development and ineffective regulation of building permits. In terms of socio-cultural impacts, most respondents felt tourism had not adversely affected the local culture, and that it was beneficial for preservation and keeping traditions alive as they passed down through generations. Locals were pleased that unlike Kuta, Ubud has strict regulations on bars and nightclubs, which must close by midnight. Impacts on the physical environment were perceived as more negative than positive. Nearly all respondents complained about the increased traffic, which was attributed to the tourism industry presence. There was also great concern over the loss of traditional rice paddies, both in terms of more development taking place and a reduction in aesthetics. Pollution from traffic was also a commonly raised negative impact, as was waste such as garbage dumped by the roadside and a lack of recycling. Two respondents mentioned having green programs in their neighbourhoods where locals join forces to clean up their surrounds and separate rubbish for recycling.

Research Objective Three sought to explore the connection between perceived QOL and attitudes toward (support for) future tourism development in Ubud. When asked if they support current levels of tourism in Ubud, the results were largely favourable with
17 out of 21 respondents expressing their support for current tourism development. When asked if they would support the expansion of tourism development in the region, respondents became more cautious and cited increased traffic, with need for more restaurants and hotels, crowding and insufficient infrastructure as reasons for limiting further development. Respondents were generally more supportive of increased tourist numbers visiting Ubud utilising existing tourism services, as it would create more employment and enhance job security for those already working in tourism to be able to provide for their families.

Finally, respondents were shown an artist’s impression of the proposed Novotel to be developed in central Ubud. Nearly all respondents were unaware of this proposal and feelings were mixed, with 11 out of 21 respondents opposed to the development. While some respondents noted that this would bring more job opportunities and facilities for Ubud, particularly for hosting conferences, there were also concerns raised over the size and scale of the hotel. The height of the building would exceed permissible levels and the style of the building was too Western and was located on an already congested main street.

Finally, Chapter Five considered the findings from each of the research objectives in light of previous studies featured in the tourism literature in the fields of sustainable tourism, social impacts of tourism, QOL and tourism employees. The similarities to previous studies were highlighted to add depth to the findings, alongside a clear statement of key differences reflected in this study. A revised diagram reflecting the Tourism and Quality of Life Model (Deery et al., 2012) was presented in section 5.5 to show the application of findings from this study to complete the diagram, including the population of Box E with QOL themes raised by respondents in Ubud (see Figure 5.1). This
connection of the findings to the extant literature helped to achieve the overall research aim of this thesis and provide a foundation for the remainder of this chapter, the contribution to the literature (section 6.3) and recommendations for further research (section 6.4).

6.3 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

This research sought to identify what QOL means for locals employed in the tourism industry in Ubud, Bali. Overall, the lives of local industry employees appear to be enriched by the job opportunities and career prospects tourism offers, along with a genuine welcoming of visitors by the locals and a strong belief that the local culture and environment can be protected. In this study, QOL for residents means family, health, education, creativity and feeling comfortable and togetherness.

Locals employed in the tourism industry in this community defined QOL in some cases in the same way that the OECD defines QOL, emphasising the importance of health, education, social connections, and subjective well-being. In addition, local tourism employees consider family as a key element of quality of life, something not emphasized in the OECD social indicators.

Tourism in Ubud was perceived favourably in terms of job creation and economic development. However, concerns about the physical environment such as increased congestion and loss of traditional farming land, were also raised. Respondents largely felt that tourism has not affected Ubud’s Balinese culture allowing it to be preserved for future generations.

At the same time respondents seemed supportive of more visitors coming to Ubud, most likely as it will benefit their careers and allow them to support their families
financially. There was also a genuine sense that they like seeing tourists and interacting with them on a day to day basis in their jobs and if tourists enjoy Ubud, they are intrinsically more satisfied. Residents were divided over an increase in further tourism development. Some were supportive as they felt in order to attract more visitors, more development must occur. The younger respondents tended to be more supportive of more tourism development, as did respondents whose workplace was located further away from the centre of Ubud.

Tourism and development is seen to be tightly controlled and monitored with strong policies to promote local ownership and employment. However, locals were concerned with congestion, development density and the rapid pace of tourism development in the area. Most respondents felt there was enough hotels and restaurants already, however they would welcome an increase in visitors. When visioning how they would like Ubud to be in the future, all seemed to desire Ubud to remain exactly as it is, not wishing to become another Kuta, the mass tourism hub of Bali’s south.

**6.4 IMPLICATIONS**

As mentioned this study sought to identify what QOL means to residents directly employed in the tourism industry in Ubud. Respondents were also probed regarding the link between tourism and QOL for their own lives, their families and the wider community of Ubud. This research has uncovered that residents with a direct economic attachment to the tourism industry are largely positive regarding the influence of tourism on QOL. Given the developing country and somewhat unique context of the island of Bali in general and Ubud in particular, the study rejected the use of pre-existing indicators that make assumptions and potentially impose Western definitions about what QOL means to host communities, such as those proposed by the OECD. Instead, this study allowed
respondents to self-define what QOL means to them, and sought to extract the salient perceptions of how working in tourism influences their sense of QOL – for themselves, their families and the surrounding community of Ubud.

The findings for Research Objective One have clear implications for tourism researchers and those seeking to understand what QOL means to locals whose lives are embedded with tourism, both from working in a prominent destination and through tourism’s obvious presence in their everyday lives. It is hoped that more studies will incorporate a specific focus into building knowledge of what constitutes QOL from the residents’ perspective, particularly in contexts where imposing pre-conceived, Western concepts may be inappropriate. The findings from the interview results could be useful to tourism industry employers in workplace planning, understanding what is important for their employees to be satisfied with their lives which ultimately affects their job performance, tenure and their interactions with guests and clients (Yeh, 2013; Lee & Ok, 2015).

The findings for Research Objectives Two and Three have implications for tourism planners and developers, policy makers and government officials in Bali, Indonesia. Whilst there is an imperative for stakeholders to acknowledge the perceived and actual impacts of tourism in prime destinations such as Ubud, there is an even greater need for the inclusion of local residents in planning and decision making for tourism in the region. Ubud can be considered conservative and traditional compared to southern Bali resort areas, and the rapid pace of development and construction seems at odds with at least some residents’ perceptions of QOL. Planning and controlling tourism in an island context is already challenging enough (Moyle et al., 2010; Butler & Carlsen, 2011), controlling the expansion of tourism in a cultural tourism hub which by its very nature
must remain small scale to maintain its appeal to tourists and locals alike (Prideaux & Timothy, 2008), will require some proactive consideration and strategies on the part of tourism planners and government officials for its future to be considered sustainable.

6.5 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

In terms of limitations of the study, this research was conducted in a foreign country, in a culture that is different to the author’s Western background. To mitigate this limitation, positionality as a Western researcher is acknowledged, i.e. that there may have been misinterpretation due to cultural differences or unintended influences on responses through questions being asked in English. This limitation was reduced by the presence of the gatekeeper throughout the interview process, to explain and interpret responses when required.

Tourism has the ability to improve QOL not only for the residents directly employed in tourism, but for their families as well. Studies focused on resident perceptions of tourism need to go beyond measuring perceptions of social impacts and focus on what QOL means to residents directly and indirectly affected by tourism, and how tourism can play a role in contributing to QOL either positively or negatively. Replication with Ubud residents not employed in the tourism industry would add another important dimension to this study. Much more research is needed on what constitutes QOL for residents of other tourism destinations both in developing and developed countries and in communities and regions of varying sizes and varying levels of tourism development before conclusions can be drawn on the meaning of QOL to local residents and how QOL is impacted by tourism more broadly. Further research could also be undertaken examining the connection between perceptions of tourism impacts, QOL and attitudes towards tourism development in different geographical contexts, such as large
urban centres, coastal communities and more developed destinations where the economic
dependence on tourism is limited. This lens could also be applied to rural communities,
perhaps those with a shifting economic base from a primary industry towards tourism.
Future research could also examine a variety of communities with different relationships
between the tourism industry and host community, for example where the community is
empowered, or not in control of tourism, where development is locally owned or foreign
owned and where existing QOL is perceived as exceptional or inadequate. More
quantitative research could be undertaken regarding the OECD well-being indicators,
applying them to a specific community to measure QOL and/or perceived QOL. Future
studies could also delve further into examining the Host/Tourist relationship and Resident
characteristics (Figure 5.1, boxes A and C), that may influence different perspectives and
QOL outcomes. More comparative studies of destinations with two different tourism
development futures could be considered along with longitudinal studies to locations
previously studied from a QOL perspective to examine how QOL has changed over time.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s (in Jennings &amp; Nickerson)</th>
<th>Type of study (if applicable)</th>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>Research objectives</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andereck &amp; Jurowski</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>How tourism affects quality of life for residents and proposes a tool that can be used to assess this affect</td>
<td>Communicating benefits of tourism that are valued by the community is likely to result in positive attitudes towards tourism and amenable relationships with visitors – the TQOL can identify these benefits. Demographics can influence perceptions – older, less educated, ethnic minorities has a more positive view of tourism’s effect on QOL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andereck &amp; Nyaupane</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Investigate residents’ perception of the impact tourism has on their QOL, relationships between QOL perceptions and support for tourism in the community</td>
<td>The amount of contact tourists have with tourism substantially influences the perception of tourism’s role in the economy. Those who have frequent contact view tourism in a more positive light. Those who gain the most from tourism are the most supportive of existing and additional tourism development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andereck, Valentine, Vogt &amp; Knopf</td>
<td>Attitudes (Section 2.3.2)</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Believe studies have investigated the attitudes of residents towards tourism which have treated the local community as a homogeneous group of people rather than a diverse mix of individuals with differences in status, class and power. This is problematic as it is often the disadvantaged social groups that experience the most negative consequences and the fewest beneficial consequences of tourism development. Whether a resident agrees or disagrees that ‘tourism provides incentives for restoration of historic buildings’, it only becomes a QOL issue if the individual feels that restoration is important and it influences his or her life satisfaction. The results of this study show that some of the most important attributes to Arizona residents are prevention of crime and vandalism, feeling safe, clean air and water, and overall QOL. Knowing that these elements are important to Arizona residents provides managers and planners with valuable indicators of what can be done to improve the QOL of their communities. Tourism has both a positive and negative effect on resident’s QOL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benckendorff, Edwards, Jurowski, Liburd, Miller &amp; Moscardo</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Impact studies generally ask residents to agree or disagree with statements regarding perceived impacts from tourism on their community. By contrast, QOL research aims to understand how these impacts are internalised and influence an individual’s overall life satisfaction. Explores overall futures research - more concerned with thinking about the future in order to understand the identified the need for tourism to be better integrated with other social and economic activities, a perception that tourism was not as proactive as some other sectors in terms of embracing concepts related to corporate social responsibility, and a strong emphasis on identifying and working better with key stakeholders. Achieving the right outcomes to realise QOL through tourism will require an engaged tourism sector that is proactive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricker &amp; Kerstetter (in Jennings &amp; Nickerson)</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Examine meanings residents attach to their village and how they could affect development of sustainable quality experiences (QE) for hosts &amp; tourists. Developers need to consider how to involve residents in tourism that will preserve special qualities and allow equal opportunity for income. Consult with residents before introducing tourism product that could be offensive to their everyday life/traditions e.g. religion, dress code. QE depends on maintaining sense of place held by residents – assess how residents feel about their place and what impacts are they willing to accept from tourism development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmichael (in Jennings &amp; Nickerson)</td>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Understand role and importance of resident attitudes towards tourism. Literature review on resident’s perceived impacts &amp; quality of life. Examines social representation theory and social exchange theory. Need to explore desired levels of social interaction between hosts and tourists, are levels achieved and how that relates to quality. Comfortable = quality? Common factors that influence quality for hosts and residents; No. and type of residents &amp; tourists Social exchange relationships between them Social representations of each other, Type of tourism development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil, Fu, Wang &amp; Avgoustis</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Cultural tourism development is considered a viable channel to attract tourists to a destination and to enhance residents’ overall quality of life (QOL). This research reports the findings of a five-year study, from 2004-2008, to monitor patterns and changes in residents’ quality of life (QOL) measurement and perceptions of cultural tourism.</td>
<td>The results indicate that there are not significant increases in QOL ratings of Indianapolis residents, as it relates to cultural tourism development. However, the series of studies yield interesting conclusions that have practical implications for municipality and tourism leaders who continually evaluate the city’s cultural tourism initiatives. One implication of is that the level of residents’ awareness of the importance of cultural tourism may still be low and the city government and tourism marketers still need to work together to support this initiative through increased financial support and marketing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filep</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Presents tourist satisfaction as happiness and QOL rather than service quality The tourist satisfaction model links to QOL concept</td>
<td>As a generator of happiness, tourism could be viewed as an important tool for advancing tourists’ quality of life and as a creator of highly fulfilling, positive experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jago, Fredline &amp; Deery</td>
<td>Attitudes (Section 2.3.2)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Study into the risks associated with the impacts of tourism on the quality of life of residents in a small community in the Australian state of Tasmania. Investigates attitudes towards tourism and potential benefits</td>
<td>Demonstrates the role that community consultation can play in ensuring that the management of tourism impacts takes into account the perceptions of locals. It also demonstrates the need for ongoing monitoring of tourism to inform management strategies, particularly for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurowski, Daniels &amp; Pennington-Gray (in Jennings &amp; Nickerson)</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Discusses tourism development related to economic growth and the distribution of costs and benefits. Social exchange theory examined as a basis for evaluating the costs &amp; benefits experienced by residents and evaluating equity issues in tourism development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents are willing to support tourism when they feel the benefits are valuable, are likely to be received and are greater than the costs. Social exchange theory can be applied in the study of resident reactions to tourism. It can also underpin TQOL index in showing what costs and benefits residents are willing to exchange and to what extent the tourism industry can be held responsible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meng, Li &amp; Uysal</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>This article used China as a case to examine how tourism development relates to and possibly impacts objective measures of residents’ QOL at a regional level. Review of QOL literature.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The results indicated that the residents of provinces with the highest level of tourism development lead a significantly “better life” than those who are in the regions on medium or low level of tourism development. Accessibility and government policy of enhancing QOL of its citizens may be independent of tourism development, though tourism is a part of the strategy for financing such development. Government of all levels should take advantage of its tourism resources, if any, to promote tourism development of the region, and at the same time, invest in various segments such as education, transportation, health care, and social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michalko &amp; Ratz</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Proposes an indicator system to show the interrelationships between tourism and QOL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michalko, Bakucz &amp; Ratz</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The paper delineates the connections between tourism and the local population’s quality of life in Harkány, a spa-town located in Southwest Hungary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscardo</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Although there have been a number of approaches to classifying and measuring the different dimensions of QOL, there is considerable agreement about what the main components are;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardolet &amp; Sheldon</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Conducts a SWOT analysis of Hawaii &amp; Balearic Islands and how they are incorporating sustainability principles to address issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beedasy &amp; Whyatt</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Study of Mauritius, similarly to Bali has a limited amount of space and vulnerable physical environment Proposes a Spatial Decision Support System (SDSS) for sustainable tourism planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortuny, Soler, Canovas &amp; Sanchez</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Can tourism on the Balearic Islands (subject to large environmental pressures) be transformed to a sustainable destination? It has lost part of its quality value and tourist interest as other Mediterranean destinations emerge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton &amp; Christensen</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Considers relationships and resource competition between tourism and other industries such as offshore finance operating on islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ishikawa &amp; Fukushige</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Explores roles and relationships between government, municipalities and prefectures in forming tourism policy in Amami Oshima Island in Japan. Questions what extent do residents expect their municipality to take the initiative in implementing or financing tourism development policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismail, King &amp; Ihalanayake (in Carlsen &amp; Butler)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Host and Guest perceptions of tourism impacts in island settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakazu (in Carlsen &amp; Butler)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The roles of tourism in small island economies Challenges for sustainable tourism in Okinawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle, Croy &amp; Weiler</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunkoo &amp; Gursoy</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayag (in Carlsen &amp; Butler)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakeela &amp; Weaver</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Studies resident reactions to a service sabotage video using commentaries collected from social media. Enclave dynamics are suggested as a reason or strong support of tourism in a classic pleasure periphery destination. One possible explanation for such support, is suggestive of social exchange theory, implicates the longstanding resort isolation policy, wherein residents, other than resort employees, derive economic benefits without direct exposure to wealth/language/race &amp; religion differences. This ‘enclave paradox’ suggests that tourism is unsustainable from the employee perspective but sustainable from the broader resident perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulfa &amp; Carlsen (in Carlsen &amp; Butler)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The development of tourism in the Maldives where protection of the natural environment and economic prosperity are inextricably linked. Impacts associated with tourism development on ecologically fragile islands. The Maldives does have the appropriate plans, laws and regulations in place to effectively manage environmental impacts while ensuring the economic benefits are sustained. Some strategies to ensure future monitoring include applying conservation principles uniformly across all atolls, establishing country specific data against which EIA’s related to tourism could be assessed, the pristine marine environment is the basis for continued prosperity and should not be overtaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahyanto, Pennington-Gray &amp; Thapa</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole &amp; Eriksson (in Cole &amp; Morgan)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Examines the link between tourism and human rights. Tourism in LDC’s strives for better standards of living for residents yet rights for the rich to travel impacts negatively on the rights of people in destinations. Includes a section on the human right for water access and impacts from tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deery, Jago &amp; Fredline</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Examine literature on social impacts of tourism on communities (importance, current state, difficulties) Outlines similarities to org. culture research Provide alt. framework to quantitative research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Brown (in Cole &amp; Morgan)</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>To demonstrate a welfare approach to the study of tourism with an emphasis on social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Table/Section</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Uysal &amp; Sirgy</td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCabe &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>Relationships between tourism and QOL and subjective wellbeing (SWB)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunkoo &amp; Ramkissoon</td>
<td>Does participation in tourism affect the SWB of the tourists – the extent to which life has meaning/living well.</td>
<td>are often linked to personal growth and fulfilment. Therefore tourism has the potential to link to key aspects that lead to subjective well-being particularly the developmental aspects of self which contribute to eudaemonia (happiness).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Koenig-Lewis &amp; Medi Jones</td>
<td>Perceptions of tourism impacts were found to influence support for tourism development. Residents satisfaction with neighbourhood conditions and services are important determinants of perceived positive and negative impacts of tourism Community commitment was found not to be an antecedent of attitudes to tourism Local planners should have an internal marketing strategy to promote the benefits of tourism to the host community.</td>
<td>Higher levels of advocacy were seen to derive from residents’ involvement in tourism activities and their affective attitude, for example through working within the sector or encountering tourists as fellow consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulina, Meleddu &amp; Del Chiappa</td>
<td>Attitudes (Section 2.3.2)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio &amp; Nunes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>A monitoring and evaluation tool was elaborated based on indicators that analyse the relationships between natural resource, local community and tourism industry in a rural tourism destination and tested in Ukraine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpley</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>A critical review into the research on host community perceptions of tourism such as the uncertainty remaining over the level of understanding whether host perceptions of tourism have been enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelkova, Koteski, Jakovlev &amp; Mirevska</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Sustainability of tourism depends on environmental opportunities. All stakeholders in tourism activity must adapt to a new development philosophy and ways of thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramwell &amp; Lane</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Development of the concept of sustainable tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buckley</strong></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Review of ST literature as it enters 3rd decade of publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deery, Jago, Fredline</strong></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Presents a framework for the development of social indicators to measure the impact of tourism on communities. Theoretical background of ST Key impacts such as overdevelopment, the relationship between tourists and residents, the management of tourist flows, and the facilities that are created as a result of increased tourism. Potential list of indicators to be used for measuring the social and socioeconomic impacts of tourism on communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghaderi &amp; Henderson</strong></td>
<td>Perceptions (Section 2.3.1)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt &amp; Stronza</td>
<td>Attitudes (Section 2.3.2)</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kytzia, Walz &amp; Wegmann</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Aims to assess the support of community residents for sustainable tourism development using the latent variables of community attachment, community involvement, perceived benefits, perceived costs, and support for sustainable tourism development and elemental data of the residents of the Cigu wetland, Taiwan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luekveerawattana</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Explores how to manage tourism in Amphawa community, Thailand in a sustainable way to avoid destroying the various values of its natural and cultural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLennan, Pham, Ruhanen, Ritchie &amp; Moyle</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Agriculturally dependent economies &amp; the relationship between social, economic &amp; environmental across three phases of tourism transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle, McLennan, Ruhanen &amp; Weiler</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Examines the extent to which sustainable tourism is evident in tourism planning documents at all levels of govt. in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarinen</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Discusses increasing need to understand the nature of the limits of growth and how these can be approached and evaluated on a local scale. Also discusses the relationship between SD and ST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpley</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Reviewing development theory and the notion of sustainability, it proposes a model of sustainable development against which the principles of sustainable tourism are compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waligo, Clarke &amp; Hawkins</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>The lack of or ineffective stakeholder participation is a major obstacle to ST realisation and there is little clarity as to how best to resolve this problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>This paper positions sustainable mass tourism (SMT) as the desired and impending outcome for most destinations. It argues further that convergence towards this goal is occurring along distinctive organic, incremental and induced paths that reflect evolutionary change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams &amp; Ponsford</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Tourism requires environmental resources as core ingredients for tourism experiences. Paradoxically it also depends on the protection of the ecological integrity of these features for sustained competitiveness. Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yasarata, Altinay, Burns &amp; Okumus</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Investigates ways in which political obstacles inhibit the formulation and implementation of sustainable tourism development in small-island developing states through the example of North Cyprus. Uses in-depth interviews and participant observation of actors in the tourism sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/s &amp; Year</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andereck &amp; Jurowski (in Jennings &amp; Nickerson), 2006</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey (Phone screening then mail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andereck &amp; Nyaupane, 2011</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricker &amp; Kerstetter (in Jennings &amp; Nickerson), 2006</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Interviews (I) Survey (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurowski, Daniels &amp; Pennington-Gray (in Jennings &amp; Nickerson, 2006)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mail Survey Face to Face Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismail, King &amp; Ihalanayake (in Carlsen &amp; Butler, 2011)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moyle, Croy &amp; Weiler (in Carlsen &amp; Butler, 2011)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>In-depth interviews, Site observations, Secondary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunkoo &amp; Gursoy (2012)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayag (in Carlsen &amp; Butler, 2011)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Uysal &amp; Sirgy (2013)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunkoo &amp; Ramskissoon (2010)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer, Koenig-Lewis &amp; Medi Jones (2013)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Online survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulina, Meleddu &amp; Del Chiappa (2013)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio &amp; Nunes (2012)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byczek (2011)</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cole (2012)</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Interviews, Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hunt &amp; Stronza (2013)</strong></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Participant observation, Semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (Year)</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Data Collection Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence (2005)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Participant observation, In depth interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLennan, Pham, Ruhanen, Ritchie &amp; Moyle (2012)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahyanto, Pennington-Gray &amp; Thapa (2013)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Reflexive photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunkoo &amp; Ramkissoon (2011)</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX THREE INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT

Interview Participant Information Statement

Tourism and Quality of Life: Perceptions of Local Tourism Industry Employees in Ubud, Bali

Introduction

My name is Peita Hillman and I am conducting research as part of my Masters degree in Tourism and Hospitality Management at Southern Cross University, Australia. My research project, titled above, will explore the perceived impacts of tourism on the quality of life of locals that reside in surrounding areas. The aim of this research is to explore perceptions of the influence of tourism on the quality of life of locals working in the tourism industry in Ubud, Bali.

This research will be conducted by me under the supervision of Professor Betty Weiler and Dr Brent Don Moyle of the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Southern Cross University, Australia.

What is this research?

Tourism has been acknowledged to generate economic benefits for communities such as employment, income, foreign investment, improved infrastructure and facilities. However there remains concern about the environmental and social impacts of tourism on communities and whether the costs of facilitating tourism in the area are worth the benefits received by the community.

Tourism, regardless of its economic contribution affects the social and cultural life of communities and their surrounding physical environments. If the concerns of the host community and the physical environment can be managed appropriately then protection or even improvement in residents’ quality of life can potentially be achieved.

What does this research involve?

The research involves interviewing tourism industry staff who are also Balinese and residents of Ubud to ascertain their feelings and attitudes towards tourism impacts and their perceptions of the benefits and costs.

What are the researcher’s responsibilities?

In undertaking this research I am required to follow the Australian National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and my University’s policies and procedures. By completing the interview, you are consenting that you approve the use of your data to inform the research.

What are participants’ responsibilities?

Participation in this research is completely voluntary and you are able to refuse to answer any question(s) or withdraw from the study at any time. The information that you provide will be confidential and at no time will the data be made available to persons other
than the researcher and supervisors. All data from this research will be stored in a locked filing cabinet for the required 7 year period in accordance with Southern Cross University’s Policy on Quality in Research Practice. You are able to request general feedback on the interview by emailing the researcher using the below contact details. The research is deemed to be ‘low risk’ and does not involve any foreseeable risks to you.

**Publication of results of this research**

As part of a Masters degree, this research will form the written component of a thesis. This thesis, and any other publications that may be prepared from this research, may contain data and/or quotes from the interviews, but at no point will information be provided in these publications that will identify you. A summary of the results will be made available to you by mail or email by you supplying your contact details at the end of the interview.

**Enquiries**

If you have any enquiries about this research please contact Peita Hillman on +61 (0) 432 956 656 or p.hillman.10@student.scu.edu.au or supervisor Dr Brent Don Moyle on +61 7 5589 3053 or brent.moyle@scu.edu.au.

This research has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee at Southern Cross University. The approval number is: **ECN-14-052**

If you have concerns about the ethical conduct of the research, the following procedure should occur.

Write to:
The Ethics Complaints Officer
Southern Cross University
PO Box 157
Lismore, NSW 2480
Email: ethics.lismore@scu.edu.au
APPENDIX FOUR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview questions

Sample questions to be covered in Semi Structured Interviews will include, though are not limited to:

1. Background to interviewee
   - Where were you born?
   - How long have you lived in Ubud?
   - Do you have a family that live with you? (PROBE)
   - How close to the centre of Ubud do you live? (PROBE – minutes walk)
   - What do you like about living here? (PROBE – links to QOL)
   - Is there anything you don’t like about living here? (PROBE – links to QOL)

2. Meaning behind QOL to locals living in Ubud
   - Tell me more about what QOL in Ubud means to you?
     PROBE, e.g. for you as an individual, for your family (IF APPLICABLE), for Ubud as a community
     PROBE, e.g. financial/job, education, health etc. (see literature)

     Responses recorded as 2a, 2b, 2c etc.

3. Involvement/Connection to the tourism industry
   - How long have you worked in the tourism industry? (YEARS)
   - What sort of jobs have you had?
   - Where do you work now? What do you do?
     PROBE – frequency of contact with tourists – hours, daily, weekly
     PROBE – type of contact – presenter (e.g. guide), interactive (e.g. front desk), distant (e.g. cleaner/gardener)
   - Do any members of your family work in tourism as well? (PROBE – who / how many?)
   - What jobs do they do?
   - Do you or your family have contact with tourists outside of work? (PROBE)
4. Perceived benefits/cost (positive/negative impacts) of tourism

- In your opinion how has tourism impacted Ubud in Bali? (use literature to probe if needed)
  
  PROBE Economic – seasonality, dependence on tourism, facilities, maintenance opportunity cost, jobs
  PROBE Environmental – character of region, land use, streetscape, water usage
  PROBE Socio-cultural – tourist/resident ratio, tourist behaviour, activities, commodification

- How do you feel about these changes?

5. Link between tourism and quality of life

- You mentioned earlier that to you QOL means (2a): ………………………………………
  
  Do you feel tourism has changed your opportunity/access to ……………………………..? (PROBE)
  
  PROBE, e.g. How / in what way? Why?
  And what about for your family (if applicable), has tourism changed their opportunity/access to …………………………………………..? (PROBE)
  
  What about for the community of Ubud, has tourism changed the community’s opportunity/access to …………………………………………..? (PROBE)

- You also mentioned that to you QOL means (2b): ………………………………………
  
  Do you feel tourism has changed your opportunity/access to …………………………………………..? (PROBE)
  
  PROBE, e.g. How / in what way? Why?
  And what about for your family (if applicable), has tourism changed their opportunity/access to …………………………………………..? (PROBE)
  
  What about for the community of Ubud, has tourism changed the community’s opportunity/access to …………………………………………..? (PROBE)

6. Support for current and future tourism development

- Do you support current levels of tourism in Ubud? PROBE: why / why not?
- Do you support growth in tourism in Ubud? PROBE: why / why not?
- How much growth? (PROBE)
- What type of growth? (PROBE)
- How would you like Ubud to be in the future?
APPENDIX FIVE INFORMED INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

Interview Informed Consent Form

Tourism and Quality of Life: Perceptions of Local Tourism Industry Employees in Ubud, Bali

Researcher: Peita Hillman

NOTE: This consent form will remain with the Southern Cross University researcher for their records. The information sheet is kept by the participant. The participant may request a copy of their consent form.

Tick the box that applies, sign and date and give to the researcher

I agree to take part in the Southern Cross University research project specified above. Yes ☐ No ☐

I have been provided with information at my level of comprehension about the purpose, methods, demands, risks, inconveniences and possible outcomes of this research. I understand this information. Yes ☐ No ☐

I agree to be interviewed by the researcher Yes ☐ No ☐

I agree to allow the interview to be audio-taped. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that my participation is voluntary. Yes ☐ No ☐

I can choose not to participate in part or all of this research at any time, without consequence, in which case recorded material will not be used. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that any information that may identify me, will be de-identified at the time of analysis of any data. Therefore, I, or any information I have provided cannot be linked to my person/company. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that neither my name nor any identifying information will be disclosed or published, except with my permission. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that all information gathered in this research is confidential. It is kept securely and confidentially for 7 years at the University. Yes ☐ No ☐

I am aware that I can contact the researchers at any time with any queries. Their contact details have been provided. Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that the ethical aspects of this research have been approved by the SCU Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval number: ECN-14-052). If I have concerns about the ethical conduct of this research, I understand that I can contact the SCU Ethics Complaints Officer. Yes ☐ No ☐

I would like to receive a copy of my interview transcript Yes ☐ No ☐

I give permission for quotes from my transcribed interview to be used within publications Yes ☐ No ☐

I would like to receive a copy of the summary results of this research Yes ☐ No ☐

I have provided my email address details to receive the results of the research Yes ☐ No ☐

Participant’s name:

Date:

Participant’s signature:

Email Address (if transcript copy required):
Tourism and Quality of Life: Perceptions of Local Tourism Industry Employees in Ubud, Bali

Dear …………………..

xxxxx – Transcribed Interview Data

Thank you again for your time and effort associated with participation in my Masters thesis study on tourism and quality of life for industry employees. Please find enclosed the transcribed and interpreted data from your interview.

If you have the time and inclination, I would be very appreciative if you would read through your interview transcription and contact me if there is anything you would like to add, or comment further on. I am particularly interested in hearing your feedback regarding my interpretations of the key areas expressed within your interview. However, you are under no obligation to participate any further in the research if you do not wish.

Kind regards,

Peita Hillman