

**Rural Leaders' Perceptions of Tourism Development
in
San Juan County, Utah**



Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism

Department of Environment and Society

Utah State University

**Professional Report IORT-PR-2007-1
May 2007**

**Rural Leaders' Perceptions of Tourism Development
in
San Juan County, Utah**

Prepared for:
San Juan County Economic Development

Authors:
Steven W. Burr, Adam H. Neidig, and Jascha M. Zeitlin

**Institute for Outdoor Recreation and Tourism
Utah State University**

Professional Report IORT-PR-2007-1

May, 2007

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Introduction	1
Research Objectives	1
Statement of Problem	2
Methods and Procedures	3
Key Findings	4
Recommendations	5
References.....	7
 CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	8
Introduction	8
Study Site: San Juan County	9
Statement of Problem	14
Research Objectives	15
2. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	17
Exploratory in Nature	17
Sampling Techniques.....	17
Instrument	19
Interviews	20
Data Analysis	21
3. INTERVIEW RESULTS	24
Summary of Informants.....	24
Demographic Variables.....	24
Presentation of Results	27
Economic Questions	28
Tourism-Related Efforts	37
Tourism-Related Impacts	43
Tourism's Role	50
Future Tourism Development and Promotion.....	55
4. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	72
Respondents' Perceptions of Tourism's Impacts.....	73

Summary.....	79
5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	83
Recommendation 1: Obtain a Better Understanding of Residents' Perceptions of Tourism and Tourism Development	84
Recommendation 2: Improved Communication, Cooperation, and Collaboration.....	86
Recommendation 3: Identification of Residents' Visions of the Tourism Industry and the use of Special Places as a Planning Tool.....	89
WORKS CITED.....	93
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
APPENDIX: INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT	100

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Key and Action Informants by Location and Occupation/Affiliation	26
2 Years of Residency in Five Year Increments	27
3 Elements of County Economy by Occupation/Affiliation.....	29
4 Non-Tourism and Tourism-Related Economic Revitalization Efforts Mentioned.....	32
5 Respondents' Perceptions of Economic Revitalization Efforts within the Last Ten Years	33
6 Years of Residency and Perceptions of Economic Revitalization Efforts within the Last Ten Years	34
7 Stated Problems with Tourism by Community.....	36
8 Occupation/Affiliation and Tourism's Perceived Economic Role	37
9 Residents Responses Regarding Efforts to Market or Promote the Unique or Distinctive Features of the County.....	38
10 Specific Projects involving cooperation by Respondents' Locations	39
11 Identification of Specific San Juan County Tourism Board Projects Involving Cooperation by Respondents' Lengths of Residency	41
12 Respondents Noted Cooperation Exists Through San Juan County Tourism Board without Specific Mention of Project (by Length of Residency).....	41
13 Location and Tourism-Related Development Projects or Efforts.....	42
14 Occupation/Affiliation and Responses of "Don't Know of Any Effort"	43
15 Perceptions of Positive and Negative Economic Impacts by Respondents' Locations.....	44
16 Positive Economic Impacts by Respondents' Locations	45
17 Negative Economic Impacts by Respondents' Locations.....	46

18	Perceptions of Tourism-Related Environmental Impact	48
19	Respondents Perceptions of Social Impact.....	49
20	Responses Dealing with Positive Social Impacts	49
21	Responses Dealing with Negative Social Impacts	50
22	Responses Classifications for Respondents' Perceptions of the Future Economic Role of Tourism in the County.....	51
23	Perceptions of the Future Economic Role of Tourism	52
24	Years of Respondents' Residency and "Increasing Importance" as a Response to: <i>What is the Future Role of Tourism?</i>	53
25	<i>Do Attractions Have the Drawing Power to Attract More Tourists?</i>	55
26	<i>Do Attractions Have the Drawing Power to Attract More Tourists?</i> (By Community)	56
27	The Five Most Frequently Mentioned Attractions to Promote by Respondents' Locations.....	57
28	The Five Most Frequently Mentioned Attractions to Promote by Respondents' Lengths of Residency	58
29	The Four Most Frequently Mentioned Types of Tourism Development to Promote	59
30	Shorter-Term Residents Most Frequent Preferences for Tourism Development Promotion (Compared with Longer-Term Residents)	59
31	Longer-Term Residents Most Frequent Preferences for Tourism Development Promotion (Compared with Shorter-Term Residents).....	59
32	Occupation/Affiliation and Preferences for Tourism Development Promotion	61
33	<i>What Would Inhibit this Type of Development?</i>	62
34	<i>What Would Help this Type of Development?</i> (By Location).....	64
35	<i>What Would Help this Type of Development?</i> (By Selected Occupation/Affiliation Groups)	65

36	<i>Is the Citizenry of the County Prepared to Support Tourism by Extending Hospitality to Visitors and by Absorbing Certain Tourism-Related Costs? (By Location)</i>	66
37	<i>Is the Citizenry of the County Prepared to Support Tourism by Extending Hospitality to Visitors and by Absorbing Certain Tourism-Related Costs? (By Length of Residency)</i>	67
38	<i>Is the Citizenry of the County Prepared to Support Tourism by Extending Hospitality to Visitors and by Absorbing Certain Tourism-Related Costs? (By Occupation/Affiliation)</i>	68
39	Ideals for Future Tourism Development by Respondents' Locations'	69

Rural Leaders' Perceptions of Tourism Development in San Juan County, Utah

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This exploratory study is intended to provide a better understanding of rural leaders' perceptions of the tourism industry in San Juan County, Utah. The qualitative analysis of interviews with community leaders was used to identify differences and similarities in participants' responses. Results from this study are intended to help bridge what researchers perceived to be a gap in communication and mutual understanding among public officials, business owners, and other stakeholders with a connection to county tourism. In addition, this report makes recommendations for the development of San Juan County's tourism industry based on the collective input of study participants.

Research Objectives

Improved understanding of interview respondents' perceptions of the tourism industry may be helpful to San Juan County in planning for a growing tourism industry and in setting and attaining tourism development objectives by maximizing their economic benefits and minimizing negative environmental and social impacts. The authors hope the recommendations will also prove useful for other rural communities with similar tourism contexts. Three research objectives were established in order to achieve these goals:

Objective 1. Examine the extent to which rural leaders in San Juan County, Utah, perceive tourism and tourism development's effects on:

- (a) current economic activity;
- (b) the local society and environment (both positive and negative); and
- (c) the future vitality of the county and its residents.

Objective 2. Examine the issues of tourism and tourism development initiatives and projects in order to understand the current direction of the county's tourism development objectives, and to evaluate the success of these tourism development initiatives and projects.

Objective 3. Provide recommendations, which may give insights to help in the development of a successful tourism management plan based on common objectives expressed by the respondents.

Statement of Problem

Historically, San Juan County's economic base was tied to farming, ranching, and extractive industries such as mining and timber harvesting (Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2003). Within the last 20 years these industries have either ceased to exist or are becoming less profitable. As the county unemployment rate continues to climb, viable economic alternatives are become increasingly important. One possible alternative, into which many of San Juan's residents have already begun to put a great deal of hope, is the development of a larger tourism industry. While this strategy has brought economic revitalization elsewhere (Power, 1996), in places it has

led to disappointment with results and unanticipated and undesirable consequences (Rothman, 1998).

Methods and Procedures

Between November, 2000, and June, 2001, researchers conducted key informant interviews with 34 San Juan County community members who were identified as leaders. These individuals were selected via a snowball sampling technique, where individuals selected for interviews were asked to recommend other potential respondents in similar positions or with pertinent expertise. Appropriate individuals recommended in this manner were then added to the sample. All respondents were asked about other potential interview subjects until the researchers felt they had exhausted the applicable pool in San Juan County.

Those positively identified as rural leaders or other persons with potentially useful information for the study were asked to participate in a semi-structured personal interview consisting of 65 predetermined, open-ended questions. In order to provide tourism management strategies, the questions focus primarily on tourism, tourism development projects, associated impacts, and opportunities for collaboration and cooperation among San Juan County leaders.

In order to accurately and concisely represent the information contained in each recorded interview, a content analysis of words and phrases was performed for responses to each interview question. Data analysis was conducted using NUD*IST Vivo (NVivo) qualitative research software by QSR International. The distillation of perceptions expressed in the interviews helped identify the presence of convergent and

divergent themes. These were grouped together and placed in tables displaying the frequency of their occurrence. In addition, narratives from the actual interviews were incorporated into the findings section of the report in order to show representative examples of interview themes.

Key Findings

San Juan County leaders and other influential community members have mostly positive perceptions of tourism, show general support for future tourism development, and are optimistic about the future role of tourism in the county, overall. According to respondents:

- Tourism provides positive economic benefits.
- Tourism provides mostly positive social benefits.
- Most respondents don't recognize serious negative environmental impacts resulting from the tourism industry.
- The future role of tourism in San Juan County is considered important.
- The tourism industry is perceived to be growing.
- San Juan County attractions are perceived to have the drawing power to attract more tourists.
- Despite respondents' support for tourism, parts of San Juan County's general populace may not be as supportive of tourism and its future development.
- Some residents' lack of support for tourism may be related to attitudes and especially their fears of changes to their communities.

- Consensus appears to be lacking on actions that would aid the development of the tourism industry, although responses related to better multi-agency awareness and cooperation was the most frequently mentioned response category.
- Little consensus existed between respondents regarding the types of tourism development projects being undertaken and who was participating in them.
- The lack of consensus on tourism development projects observed among respondents from different communities may be indicative of a lack of cooperative efforts between these communities.

Recommendations

Each recommendation is based on and originated from San Juan County leaders' input and is aimed at creating tourism management plans representative of residents' interests. A brief summary of the recommendations from this study follows.

- The opinions and perceptions of tourism and tourism development among the general population of San Juan County are not sufficiently understood. Study results suggested only qualified support for tourism development among the general populace and potential groups or areas where opposition is prevalent. Future research should attempt to identify groups or locations that are supportive and unsupportive of tourism development. Future research should also attempt to discern residents' preferences for different management and development objectives. Improved understanding of residents might be achieved through surveys or participatory processes such as

community meetings, collaborative workshops, and various other public involvement processes.

- The authors also feel that San Juan County would be well served by an increased emphasis on cooperation and collaboration between different entities with a stake in county tourism development, such as county and municipal officials and agencies, tribal organizations, tourism promotion organizations, and tourism-related business operators. Such collaborative efforts, moreover, should be an effective vehicle for obtaining information on public tourism perceptions, as advocated in the first recommendation, above. When San Juan County community leaders' responses were compared based on differences in location, occupation, affiliation (public or private sector), and length of residency, notable differences were found on responses to most interview questions. This indicates that important differences in perceptions of tourism development exist and is suggestive of the need for increased communication, cooperation, and collaboration among tourism-involved entities. Collaborative processes may also be an effective means of dealing with residents' fears of the undesired consequences increased tourism may bring to their communities. The complexity of such situations is, we feel, best dealt with through collaborative processes and public involvement.

- The specific identification of residents' desires and expectations of the tourism industry and their ideas about "special places" can assist in the development of a plan to meet tourism development objectives while protecting important characteristics of San Juan County communities and their surrounding environments. This may also present opportunities for improved collaboration. This type of planning and consequent

tourism marketing efforts would seek to direct tourists to appropriate locations and communities while not encouraging visitation to sensitive areas and locations where tourism is less welcome. Such region-wide planning would necessitate further collaboration with federal and state land management agencies responsible for proximate recreation sites and attractions. In addition, outside assistance and funding from entities such as the Utah Office of Tourism, the Governor's Office of Economic Development, and the State of Utah Cooperative Program may be available for such efforts.

References

- Power, T.M. (1996). *Lost landscapes and failed economies: The search for a value of place*. Washington, D.C.: Island.
- Rothman, H.K. (1998). *Devil's Bargains: Tourism in the twentieth century American west*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.
- Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (2003). *San Juan County Profile*. Salt Lake City: Author.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Introduction

Tourism has successfully improved economic conditions in many areas and has, therefore, commonly been employed as a development strategy in rural communities (Power, 1996). This economic growth, however, is often accompanied by undesired impacts—social and resource-related impacts that are often overlooked as a result of the perceived economic benefits that tourism has the potential to generate (Rothman, 1998). Because of this, careful planning representing the goals of community members is often necessary in order to achieve balance between economic benefits and these types of impacts. An understanding of stakeholders' differences and similarities regarding the current and future economic role of tourism and acceptable levels of impact resulting from tourism (including both social impacts and those to natural and cultural/archaeological resources) are potentially very useful for planning and the future management of the industry.

Collaborative planning and management based on input directly from community members may allow for achievement of preferred outcomes of tourism development or, in some cases, desired restrictions on growth. Development strategies based on an understanding of a broad range of stakeholder perspectives and input should be more reflective of the objectives of community members as a whole. Without proper planning, tourism development outcomes may not be acceptable to the community and therefore undermine collective intentions.

This exploratory study is intended to give readers a better understanding of San Juan County leaders' perceptions of the tourism industry using the qualitative analysis of interviews to identify differences and similarities in participants' opinions regarding the tourism industry and tourism development. In addition, we conclude this report with a series of recommendations for tourism development and planning in San Juan County based on the collective input of study participants.

Study Site: San Juan County

San Juan County is a classic rural western U.S. county. Geographically, it is the largest county in Utah, with approximately 5.2 million acres of land, yet it has one of the lowest county populations with around 14,000 residents (Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, 2003). The county has a significant natural resource base that has provided residents with periods of ephemeral economic prosperity. Both the past and future of San Juan County's economic wellbeing appear to be strongly tied to natural resources, though tourists attracted by the scenic value of the region's landscape and the archaeological sites left on this landscape by past residents appear to be the driving force behind its emerging tourism economy.

Like the diversity of natural resources found within San Juan County, the communities found here also vary greatly. Towns are often sixty or more miles from one another and this great distance results in communities that have very different surrounding landscapes from one another. In interviews conducted for this study, one official attributed a lack of communication between communities the great distances that separate them.

While San Juan communities' pasts are all distinct, a common thread running through the county is the fact that most areas within the county were, at various times, subject to the boom and bust cycles resulting from extractive-type industries. In *A History of San Juan County*, author and historian Robert S. McPherson states, "San Juan County has seen its own rushes—first silver and gold, then oil, and finally uranium—each with its own get-rich-quick pattern, ebb and flow of men and machines, and frenzied quest for wealth" (1995, p. 241).

San Juan County experienced the first of a series of rushes in the late 1800s, when flour gold was discovered in the San Juan River. Locals took advantage of this new found economic activity, as Bluff became a major trading post to host the surge of prospectors. The gold rush came to an abrupt end—along with Bluff's economic prosperity—shortly before the turn of the century.

A mere decade after the end of the gold rush, copper arrived as San Juan's second major economic stimulator. Mines began popping up near La Sal and Lisbon Valley. By the mid 1900s, the mining and processing of copper had begun to taper off. One historian describes the economic history of a major claim as only having produced less than \$50,000 worth of copper in its 37 years of operation (McPherson, 1995, p. 249). These kinds of meager earnings seem to characterize the county's history in the copper industry.

Around the same time as the copper rush, oil pumping began near the town of Mexican Hat. The town was described as a "thriving village" with businesses moving in, and an estimated 1,500 people intending to make it their new residence (McPherson, 1995, p. 250). The oil boom also came to a quick end and today Mexican Hat is home to

around 100 people and has very few active economic sectors (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.).

This was not the last boom bust cycle to occur in San Juan County, as uranium mining began to dominate the local economy during the mid 1900s.

Monticello doubled its population to 2,500 in three years' time. A million dollars worth of buildings was constructed within city limits and included four motels and six trailer parks. The water and sewer system was expanded at a cost of \$500,000, and a dozen new businesses ranging from dry cleaners to investment brokers were established along with an expansion of the mill facilities. (McPherson, 1995, p. 259)

This cycle ended with a bust in the early 1980s when uranium mining became unprofitable. Today, Monticello has even fewer people than it did at the height of the uranium boom (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). Despite being the county seat and one of the county's centers of commerce, its economy has never recovered from the collapse and then Superfund clean-up of the uranium industry.

Many of the uranium mines and processing facilities still stand as reminders of a more economically prosperous time. One of this study's participants described the economic transition resulting from the collapse of the uranium industry this way:

There doesn't seem to be new growth of any kind coming in. There is nothing there. There are no new businesses opening up with the reduction in the uranium mill. This is why lots of people had to move and lots of homes are for sale in Blanding. The county's tax base is continually dwindling. The paper said that the proposed budget for the next year would need \$2.2 million over what they expect to bring in. So they have got to make some major cuts.

Nearly every participant, representing seven different communities throughout the county, shared similar stories of boom-bust cycles in various industries.

The timber industry exhibited similar boom-bust cycle in San Juan County. In June of 1911, the *Grand Valley Times* published an article entitled "San Juan is

Prosperous.” According to this article, “The residents and businesses in Monticello, Bluff, and Grayson required so much wood that the Grayson Co-op mill, [sawing] an average of 10,000 board feet per day, could not keep up, even with two other area mills in operation” (McPherson, 1995, p. 221). Around the same time this article was published, the federal government enacted legislation to significantly regulate the timber industry, reducing the amount of timber legally harvested.

Historically, farming and ranching also played large roles in San Juan County’s economy. From the early 1900s until the late 1930s both farming and ranching were practiced with little attention to the environmental consequences of contemporary management practices. By the early 1940s, the federal government became involved with what was termed the “terrible mismanagement of the land throughout the nation [and] became increasingly involved in saving and controlling their condition” (McPherson, 1995, p. 188). Part of these “salvage and control” efforts involved purchasing huge tracts of land, including three million acres in Grand and San Juan Counties, in order to protect it (p. 188). Other measures included government regulation of land use practices. While these “good land practices” were intended to improve degraded farm and range land, the regulations also made both farming and ranching unprofitable for many operators. The 1990 U.S. Census showed that less than fifty people in San Juan County indicated agriculture was their primary livelihood and only a few ranchers still raise cattle (p. 189).

Despite San Juan’s periodic economic prosperity, the county is among the poorest in Utah and has posted some of the highest unemployment rates over the last twenty years. USDA Economic Research Service (2005) data shows that San Juan

County's median annual household income in 2002 was the lowest out of the 29 counties in Utah, at \$27,111. The county with the second lowest median household income in Utah was over \$4,100 more per year than San Juan County. Part of San Juan County's low median household income can be attributed to the high unemployment rates the county has continued to post. From 1990-2004 the county's unemployment rate averaged 9.07%. In 2004, it reached a state high among counties, at a staggering 12.2%. During that same year, the state's overall average had actually dropped to 5.2% (USDA Economic Research Service, 2005).

Responding to this economic situation, one frustrated interview participant pleaded:

Our state representatives, any of them can take a look. As a matter of fact, they sent out an economic letter from the state and it shows right there that San Juan County has the highest unemployment, jobs that pay the lowest, and that San Juan County is probably the most needy county in the state. You know I would like to see them become more involved in San Juan County and see what they can do to help.

Many former San Juan County residents have apparently given up hope of economic improvement and moved away in search of jobs. The county's population actually dropped by 3.5% between April 1, 2000 and July 1, 2003, while the state's average population increased by 5.3% (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.).

One of San Juan County's most notable features is its overlap with much of the more than 27,000 square mile Navajo Nation (Navajo Nation Department of Information Technology, 2005). In fact, 54% of San Juan County's population are Native Americans—mostly Navajos (Diné) (Maryboy & Begay, 2000). San Juan County tourist attractions such as Monument Valley Navajo Tribal Park, Four Corners Monument, Lake Powell, and the San Juan River are located on or border Navajo Nation lands. The

presence of an additional sovereign governmental entity has increased the complexity of planning for tourism development in the county.

Statement of Problem

A potential economic alternative, and one into which many of San Juan County's residents have already begun to put a great deal of hope, is development of the tourism industry. Despite being one of the Nation's poorest counties economically, "San Juan still remains one of Utah's richest counties in such resources as archeological sites, scenic vistas, and historic landmarks" (McPherson, 1995, p. 396). Residents have increasingly begun to recognize that a potentially sustainable economic base may be provided by tourist visitation to resources such as Canyonlands National Park, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and Lake Powell, Natural Bridges, Rainbow Bridge, and Hovenweep National Monuments, Monument Valley Navajo Tribal Park, Edge of the Cedars and Goosenecks State Parks, Manti-La Sal National Forest, Dark Canyon Wilderness Area, Grand Gulch and Dark Canyon Primitive Areas, the San Juan and Colorado Rivers, the Navajo Nation's Four Corners Monument, thousands of acres of BLM-managed public lands, and numerous other attractions within the county and the surrounding area.

This report is intended to provide useful information for San Juan County planners, tourism managers, and other tourism-involved parties in order to inform them regarding the range and diversity of opinions about tourism growth, popular support for the tourism industry, negative impacts of tourism to be mitigated, tourism goals and objectives, restraints to industry growth, and related topics. Given several comments

received during study interviews regarding a lack of sufficient communication between tourism-involved individuals and organization in San Juan County, this report may help get stakeholders on the same page and, we hope, help foster cooperation and collaboration between them in the development of the county's future tourism industry.

Research Objectives

This study was undertaken in order gain a better understanding of San Juan County leaders' perceptions of tourism and tourism development in order to aid the county in planning for a growing tourism industry. This report may prove helpful in attaining tourism development objectives, such as maximizing potential economic benefits while minimizing undesired environmental and social impacts. The authors also hope the report and its recommendations will prove useful for other rural communities in similar tourism situations. Three research objectives were established in order to achieve these goals:

Objective 1. Examine the extent to which rural leaders in San Juan County, Utah, perceive tourism and tourism development's effects on:

- (a) current economic activity;
- (b) the local society and environment (both positive and negative); and
- (c) the future vitality of the county and its residents.

Objective 2. Examine the issues of tourism and tourism development initiatives and projects in order to understand the current direction of the county's tourism development objectives, and to evaluate the success of these tourism development initiatives and projects.

Objective 3. Provide recommendations, which may give insights to help in the development of a successful tourism management plan based on common objectives expressed by the respondents.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Exploratory in Nature

This study was designed to be an exploratory, in-depth examination of rural leaders' perceptions of tourism in San Juan County. The exploratory nature of the study was necessitated by a genuine lack of similar research within the field of tourism. Few studies have focused on community leaders' perceptions of the tourism industry and no tourism-related studies have ever been conducted in San Juan County. In addition, subjective, individual perceptions are difficult to both adequately capture and explain.

True (1983, p. 53) suggests "the objective of exploratory research is discovery, and that such studies are suitable for investigation of unique or unusual subjects. As such, exploratory studies do not usually include formalized hypotheses or rigorous statistical tests." In line with this description, neither hypothesis testing nor formal statistical tests were used in this research. Rather, the aforementioned research objectives were addressed through descriptive means, relying on presentation of response percentages and more in-depth reporting of individual respondents' comments.

Sampling Techniques

Key informant interviews were conducted with 34 community members who were identified as leaders within San Juan County, Utah. All interviews occurred between November, 2000, and June, 2001. Initially, several community leaders were selected

based on their official positions in the county. Examples of those selected include county commissioners, mayors, city council members, and other county officials. A snowball sampling technique was then used to identify others considered leaders within the county. Following each interview, participants were asked to identify other knowledgeable community members who they considered leaders and who were active in local policy and decision making. After participants identified other leaders, researchers narrowed the potential pool of respondents by selecting only those individuals identified as “local leaders” and deemed beneficial to the study.

Because of their role in policy making and implementation, respondents’ perceptions are believed to have an influence over San Juan County’s tourism industry and its future development. Respondents were identified as either “key informants” (local leaders) or “action informants” (those personally involved with tourism) and interviews were conducted with both groups in order to gain a broad understanding of tourism and its development within the county (Burr, 1994). Respondents were selected from seven different towns within the county: La Sal, Monticello, Blanding, Bluff, Mexican Hat, Monument Valley, and Montezuma Creek.

The sampling techniques used are non-random and non-probabilistic as respondents were not selected by any random procedure, nor can the researchers be sure that every potentially appropriate interview participant was selected (Huberman & Miles, 2002). All community members did not have the same probability of being selected and specific criteria were used to pick particular individuals to participate, as described above. As a result, this sample is likely not representative of any larger group

of individuals such as residents of the county as a whole or any community within it, nor can they be externally generalized as Huberman and Miles (2002) describe below:

Internal generalizability is far more important for most qualitative researchers than is external generalizability because qualitative researchers rarely make explicit claims about the external generalizability of their accounts. Indeed, the value of a qualitative study depends on its lack of external generalizability in a statistical sense, it may provide an account of a setting or population that is illuminating as an extreme case or "ideal type." (p. 54)

In this report, responses from the community leaders and influential tourism-connected individuals merely represent a small subgroup of the population with data being internally generalized in order to reach conclusions (often tentative conclusions) about this subgroup. However, these individuals' connection with, and influence over, the tourism industry makes them valuable subjects for this type of research and ensures that information gained from these interviews has a great deal of utility in tourism planning and development.

The sampling and interviewing process ended when limited additional and meaningful information was being reported, the information was beginning to be repetitious, and no new informants were being recommended through the "snowball" sampling method. All of these indicators were prevalent after the collection of 34 interviews.

Instrument

The interview itself consisted of 65 predetermined, open-ended questions. Researchers posed all interview questions in a consistent manner in order to avoid creating biases in responses. However, the structure of the instrument also permitted the interviewer to probe beyond initial answers to the predetermined questions. This

encouraged information-rich, flexible responses and was chosen based on the exploratory objectives of the study (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). A copy of the interview instrument is reprinted in the Appendix. The questions focus primarily on the study's stated objectives of: gaining a better understanding of tourism, tourism development projects, associated impacts, and opportunities for collaboration and cooperation among San Juan County's leaders for the recommendation of community tourism management strategies.

Interviews

Informants were first contacted by telephone in order to set up interview times. The informants were told the purpose of the interview was to determine which types of development strategies various counties in Utah had adopted. The topic of tourism was not mentioned in the initial contact in order to minimize informant bias toward tourism. Informants agreeing to be interviewed were then sent a letter of confirmation with the interview date and time.

Each of the interviews was tape recorded. This allowed the interviewer to concentrate on the actual interview while completely preserving the information-rich data. The recorded interviews were then transcribed in order to simplify the analysis procedures. Field notes were also taken at the time of the interviews. These consisted of the interviewer's personal notes identifying: the interviewee's gender, age, other demographic characteristics; perception of his/her role and work place (if appropriate); presence of other personnel and their roles; and other information deemed appropriate by the interviewer.

Data Analysis

The data collected for this study consist of the words and ideas contained in the interview transcripts. In order to accurately and concisely represent the information contained in this data set, researchers performed a content analysis of words and phrases in relation to each question asked on the interview instrument. This data analysis was conducted using the NUD*IST Vivo (NVivo) qualitative research software by QSR International.

Analyses of interviews targeted key words and phrases related to the study objectives. When searches of the transcripts revealed convergent and divergent themes, patterns, and categories, the respective passages from the documents were stored and classified together as nodes. Nodes representing additional emergent ideas and unforeseen themes outside of the study objectives were also coded and analyzed. Nodes are essentially “place markers” that represent a theme or category of information described in these collected textual passages. Nodes were ordered, rearranged, combined, and removed depending on their individual role in both elucidating study objectives and revealing emerging, unforeseen themes.

Nodes are typically organized in the form of trees. This provides a structure for sorting identified themes into major categories, or “parent nodes,” and subcategories, or “child nodes.” Parent nodes consist of the main themes identified from interview transcripts. In this study, community leaders’ perceptions of *tourism impacts* provide one example of a parent node. Any passage in interview transcripts that addressed tourism impacts was stored within this parent node. “Child nodes” are composed of passages containing sub-themes that represent more specific components of a parent

node or, in turn, sub-sub-theme of a child node. For example, a child node branching off of the parent node *tourism impacts* is *social impacts* (resulting from tourism). Additional child nodes, such as *positive social impacts* (resulting from tourism), branch off from this child node. Lower levels of child nodes become increasingly specific (Richards, 2000).

Not only were nodes based on convergent or similar perceptions recorded and analyzed, nodes derived from differences of perceptions were also considered. Both convergent and divergent perceptions were examined, coded, and placed into trees based on variables such as respondent's geographical location, occupation, and length of residency. Other variables that show differences in perceptions were also included as they arose.

The systematic classification of nodes has several benefits. Trees of nodes are an effective tool for distilling large data sets into more manageable groupings of concepts while maintaining the overall integrity of content. This system of classification also allows for the location and organization of themes, patterns, categories, and differences by frequency of response. All of the data relevant to the study's objectives, as well as emerging, unforeseen themes were searched, coded, arranged into trees of nodes to facilitate analysis that would most effectively meet the study's objectives.

The distillation of perceptions expressed in the interviews helped identify convergent and differing perceptions and expectations. These were grouped together and put into tables showing their frequency of occurrence. In some cases, extremely infrequent and non-pertinent responses are not reported or discussed in the interest of producing a concise and clear report.

In addition, narratives from the actual interviews were incorporated into the Interview Results section (Chapter 3) of this report in order to show representative examples of reported themes. The distilled groupings and interview narratives were intended to serve as a means of communicating two ideas to San Juan County stakeholders: county leaders' perceptions of tourism and their desires regarding the future role of the tourism industry in their communities.

CHAPTER 3

INTERVIEW RESULTS

Summary of Informants

Thirty-four leaders were interviewed. Both key informants (local leaders) and action informants (those personally involved with tourism) were chosen for this study. Twelve of the leaders were key informants; 17 were action informants. Four of the leaders were classified as both key and action informants for analysis purposes because they simultaneously had jobs or positions both inside and outside of the tourism industry. One interview was unintelligible as the result of background noises and therefore not used. Four participants were recommended but were unavailable. Besides this, there were no refusals to participate.

Demographic Variables

Three specific demographic differences were of interest to researchers—particularly in the ways in which these differences influenced participants' responses to interview questions. In order to compare these differences, responses were frequently separated into different categories based on the respondents' demographic characteristics. The three demographic criteria for this were 1) geographical location, 2) occupation, 3) length of residency within the county.

Individual communities have different resources for hosting tourists and different attractions to draw visitors. This was expected to have some effect on respondents' perceptions and objectives regarding the tourism industry. Seven different communities

were represented by the 33 decipherable interviews. Seven respondents came from Blanding, eight from Bluff, eleven from Monticello, one from Montezuma Creek, two from Monument Valley, three from Mexican Hat, and one from La Sal. Table 1 shows the location of the 34 respondents interviewed, their occupation or affiliation, whether they were classified as key informants, action informants, or both, and the number years of their residency in San Juan County.

Upon initial analysis, notable differences appeared between private and public sector participants' responses within both key and action informant classifications. As a result, the occupational or affiliation variable was not only classified based on whether the leader worked directly in the tourism industry (action) or outside the tourism industry (key) but also whether his/her particular position was within the public or private sector. Therefore, four different occupational affiliation classifications were used as variables: Private Non-Tourism-Related, Private Tourism-Related, Public Non-Tourism-Related, and Public Tourism-Related. Action informants fell into one of the two appropriate "tourism-related groups" while the key informants were classified into one of the two appropriate "non-tourism-related groups."

Examples from the Private Non-Tourism-Related group include bank managers, farmers, and ranchers. Examples from the Private Tourism-Related group include motel owners, agritourism (dude/guest ranch) operators, and tour guide service operators. Examples from the Public Non-Tourism-Related group include city mayors, county commissioners, and an extension agent. Examples from the Public Tourism-Related group include employees and board members from the San Juan County Community Development & Traveler Services Department, and federal/tribal land managers.

Table 1
Key and Action Informants by Location and Occupation/Affiliation^a

Location	Occupation/Affiliation	Type of Informant		Years of Residency
		Action	Key	
Blanding	Public official; NTR entrepreneur		X	15
	Entrepreneur NTR; public official; TR benefactor		X	20
	TR entrepreneur; Chamber of Commerce	X ^b	X ^b	entire life
	Board Member public TR organization	X		entire life
	TR entrepreneur; NTR entrepreneur	X ^b	X ^b	17
	Attorney; TR entrepreneur	X ^b	X ^b	11
	Public official		X	59
Bluff	TR entrepreneur	X		19
	Long-term resident	X		41
	TR entrepreneur	X		7
	TR entrepreneur	X		14
	TR entrepreneur; active in preservation efforts	X		4
	TR NGO		X	10
	TR entrepreneur	X		22
Monticello	Public official; NTR entrepreneur		X	50
	TR entrepreneur; board Member, public TR organization	X		37
	Public official; NTR entrepreneur		X	23
	Public official		X	22
	TR NGO		X	22
	Extension Agent		X	15
	Chamber of Commerce; land management official; NTR entrepreneur		X	13
	Manager, public TR organization	X		24
	Manager, public TR organization	X		19
	Public Official		X	59
Montezuma Creek	TR entrepreneur; NTR entrepreneur	X ^b	X ^b	entire life
	Public official		X	entire life
Monument Valley	Land management official	X		entire life
	Manager, TR business	X		13
Mexican Hat	TR entrepreneur	X		21
	Manager, TR business	X		26
	TR entrepreneur	X		41
La Sal	TR entrepreneur	X		40

^a "TR" denoted *tourism-related*; "NTR" denoted *non-tourism-related*; "NGO" denotes *non-governmental organization*.

^b These respondents were classified as both Key and Action informants due to multiple occupations or affiliations.

Respondents' length of residency within the county was divided into five year increments for analysis purposes. Most of the length of residency tables report differences between 0-20 or 0-25 year residents and 21+ or 26+ year residents. These large divisions of respondents were used because approximately 20-25 years ago economic shifts within the county lead to an out-migration of residents and an in-migration of new residents. These gross divisions are intended to provide insight into the differences between newer and long-term resident perceptions. Table 2 shows respondents' length of residency within San Juan County.

Table 2
Years of Residency
In Five Year Increments

Years of Residency	0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	45-50	Entire Life
Number of Respondents	1	2	7	3	7	1	0	3	2	2	4

Presentation of Results

In the section that follows, responses to interview questions are reported under italicized headings stating the corresponding interview questions. Questions fall into five general sections: economics, current tourism development efforts, tourism impacts, tourism's current and future role, and future tourism development and promotion.

Due to the sheer amount of information compiled, much of the following analysis is presented by frequency of occurrence of ideas or themes—in essence, the number of responses recorded within a given category. Because

more than one response was permitted for each respondent for each question, and because respondents did not always offer responses to all questions posed, most results tables report both numbers of *respondents* and numbers of *responses*. For example, if eight responses were obtained from a sub-group of respondents, those responses may have come from fewer than eight respondents with one or more person giving two or more responses. In a similar manner, a sub-group of eight respondents may have offered fewer than eight responses.

However, within a response category (a column in a results table), only one response per category is allowed. Thus a respondent may have given responses that fall within several response categories but only one response within each category. Also, when respondents are separated into groups based on occupation/affiliation, some are classified within more than one group. Rows showing totals take this into consideration and only record a single response per respondent per response category. In essence, any given results table cell may be regarded as a total of the number of respondents who gave such an answer, though the total number of responses received to an interview question does not reflect this.

Economic Questions

What Are the Major Elements in San Juan County's Economic Base?

Interview participants were asked to identify the major elements in San Juan County's economic base. "Tourism" was the most frequently mentioned

response (82%; $n = 27$) (Table 3). The second most frequent response category was “Farming and Ranching” (73%; $n = 24$), followed by various “Extractive Industries” (70%; $n = 23$). The frequency with which tourism was reported indicates that the tourism industry is a very well recognized part of the county economy. Despite this, tourism was not usually the first economic sector mentioned and was often discussed as an afterthought following several more traditional industries. When tourism was mentioned, it was usually referred to as the “future solution” or the “next big thing.” The following statement made by one respondent was typical of these responses: “Of course ranching, ranching and farming, put that together. It was obviously the backbone and it was until the oil

Table 3
Elements of County Economy by Occupation/Affiliation^a

Occupation/ Affiliation	Tourism	Extractive Industries	Farming & Ranching	Government	Private Business & Manufacturing
Public Tourism- Related $n=4$	100%; $n=4$	75%; $n=3$	75%; $n=3$	50%; $n=2$	50%; $n=2$
Private Tourism- Related $n=17$	82%; $n=14$	53%; $n=9$	65%; $n=11$	65%; $n=11$	12%; $n=2$
All Tourism- Related (Action Informants) $n=21$	86%; $n=18$	57%; $n=12$	67%; $n=14$	62%; $n=13$	19%; $n=4$
Public Non- Tourism $n=9$	67%; $n=6$	89%; $n=8$	89%; $n=8$	56%; $n=5$	33%; $n=3$
Private Non- Tourism $n=11$	82%; $n=9$	82%; $n=9$	82%; $n=9$	82%; $n=9$	36%; $n=4$
All Non-Tourism (Key Informants) $n=16$	75%; $n=12$	81%; $n=13$	81%; $n=13$	75%; $n=12$	38%; $n=6$
Total $n=33$	82%; $n=27$	70%; $n=23$	73%; $n=24$	64%; $n=21$	24%; $n=8$

^a Some respondents' multiple occupations or affiliations caused them to be classified in more than one category for analysis purposes. This is why there are more than 33 respondents classified in the occupation/affiliation categories and why total and subtotal n s appear to be smaller than the total of their component n s.

and gas came in. Now tourism is obviously the one thing that we can look towards.”

“Farming and Ranching” are also well recognized sectors of the county economy. However, these industries may play more of a symbolic role at this point, in contrast to the financial role they played in the past. “The 1990 census showed that less than 50 people in San Juan County indicated agriculture as their primary livelihood and only a few ranchers still raise cattle” (McPherson, 1995, p.189). While traditional industries have certainly been declining, in terms of their economic contribution, they appear to still define San Juan County communities’ image of themselves to some extent.

When responses are divided based on occupation/affiliation groups, tourism remains the most frequent response of most groups. However, it was mentioned less frequently than other economic sectors by key informants—the two groups not working directly within the tourism industry (Table 3). When combined as a single group, key informants mentioned “Farming and Ranching” (81%; $n = 13$) and “Extractive Industries” (81%; $n = 13$) slightly more often than “Tourism” (75%; $n = 12$). A slightly lower percentage of public sector affiliated or employed key informants discussed tourism (67%, $n = 6$) than did key informants in the private sector (82%; $n = 9$), though the small number of respondents involved and low magnitude of this difference makes drawing conclusions from this result problematic.

Some of the differences between groups of respondents are potentially significant, particularly those between key and action informants. This is

especially true of the emphasis placed by key informants on extractive industries and, to a lesser extent, farming and ranching. This coupled with the context in which tourism-related comments were made, as discussed above, may be indicative of the transitional period in which San Juan County appears to be, with tourism taking on additional economic importance as time goes on.

What is the present economic situation in the county?

Each respondent was asked: *What is the present economic situation in the county?* As expected (see pp. 9-13), by far the most frequent response was the “Economy is Depressed” (83%; $n = 29$). Eight respondents (23%) offered some discussion of localized “Declines in Tourism” due to external events at the time. This was somewhat surprising because the topic of tourism had not yet been mentioned and the respondents were not prompted about tourism. “Declines in Extractive Industries” (23%; $n = 8$) were tied with “Declines in Tourism” as the second most frequent response. The third most common type of comment dealt with the county’s “Dependence on Tourism” (20%; $n = 7$). The following dialogue between a respondent and the interviewer address both the declines in the tourism industry and the county’s dependence upon it.

Interviewer: Ok, let me ask you in your opinion, what is the present economic situation in the county?

Respondent: Tenuous.

Interviewer: Tenuous? Ok, why do you say it is tenuous?

Respondent: Because if the tourists don’t come for one year we are screwed.

Interviewer: So it is that heavily dependent on tourism?

Respondent: Yeah.

Within the last five to ten years, have there been any economic revitalization efforts in the county of which you are aware?

Without tourism having yet been mentioned by the interviewer, respondents were asked: *Within the last five to ten years, have there been any economic revitalization efforts in the county of which you are aware?* Eighteen respondents (55%) reported some form of effort. Ten respondents (30%) reported at least one tourism-related effort and 11 (33%) reported at least one non-tourism-related effort (three respondents are represented in both of these categories). Table 4 shows a listing of the individual revitalization efforts mentioned. While references to non-tourism-related themes were slightly more common, almost twice as many unique tourism-related efforts were brought up by respondents. This may be indicative of a somewhat greater degree of consensus around defining certain non-tourism-related projects as “economic revitalization efforts.” Knowledge of tourism-related efforts—or an inclination to

Table 4
Non-Tourism and Tourism-Related
Economic Revitalization Efforts Mentioned^a

Non-Tourism Related Effort	33%; n=11	Tourism Related Effort	30%; n=10
Uranium Clean Up	21%; n=7	Advertising & Funding	9%; n=3
Non-Tourism Private Business	12%; n=4	Private Tourism Business	6%; n=2
Oil, Gas, & Mining	9%; n=3	Motorcycle Race Track	3%; n=1
Sewer System	3%; n=1	Golf Course	3%; n=1
		Museums	3%; n=1
		Jones Farm Project	3%; n=1
		Heritage Tourism Initiative	3%; n=1
		Trail of the Ancients	3%; n=1
		Tour Operator	3%; n=1
		Blanding Event Center	3%; n=1

^a Respondents were not limited to one response. Therefore, a single respondent may be represented in more than one of the response categories above. Percentages reflect the relationship of the respondents in the response category to the overall number of respondents (n=33), as only one response per response category was allowed for each respondent.

define these projects as “economic revitalization efforts” related efforts— appeared to be more diffused.

Table 5 displays responses to this interview question divided based on respondents’ occupation/affiliation groups. Each cell reports the number of responses (in parentheses) and the number of respondents from which these responses came. The most remarkable feature of these results is the relative infrequency with which public officials in non-tourism-related positions identified tourism-related economic revitalization efforts. This is especially true when looked at in terms of number of responses. Whether this reflects a lack of focus on tourism, a lack of knowledge about such efforts, or a greater perceived economic pay-off in other sorts of revitalization efforts is impossible to determine from this data. However, this result does corroborate the relative scarcity of

Table 5
Respondents’ Perceptions of Economic Revitalization Efforts within the Last Ten Years

	Tourism-Related Economic Revitalization Responses ^b	Non-Tourism-Related Economic Revitalization Responses ^b
Private Sector; Non-Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =11 ^a (7 responses)	18%; <i>n</i> =2 (43%; 3 responses)	36%; <i>n</i> =4 (57%; 4 responses)
Private Sector; Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =17 ^a (11 responses)	29%; <i>n</i> =5 (55%; 6 responses)	29%; <i>n</i> =5 (45%; 5 responses)
Public Officials; Non-Tourism- Related <i>n</i> =9 ^a (8 responses)	11%; <i>n</i> =1 (11%; 1 response)	33%; <i>n</i> =3 (88%; 7 responses)
Public Officials; Tourism Related <i>n</i> =4 ^a (3 responses)	50%; <i>n</i> =2 (67%; 2 responses)	25%; <i>n</i> =1 (33%; 1 response)

^a Note that respondent totals exceed 33 as several respondents’ multiple occupations/affiliations put them more than one group.

^b *n* sizes refer to number of respondents; number of responses is reported in parentheses. Some respondents reported both tourism-related and non-tourism-related comments. Some respondents did not give any response.

tourism-related responses from public officials in non-tourism-related positions observed in description of San Juan County's economic base (pp. 28-31).

Comparison of groups based on respondents' length of residency also yielded some potentially meaningful differences (Table 6). The 20 respondents who have been residents of San Juan County for less than 25 years were somewhat more likely to describe a tourism-related revitalization effort than a non-tourism-related effort. Frequencies are reversed for the 26- to 50-year and life-long residents who were more than three times more likely to discuss a non-tourism-related effort than a tourism-related effort.

In contrast to this, these two *length of residency*-based groups' responses were similar when they were asked to identify elements of the county's economic base. Sixteen (80%) of the 20 shorter-term residents mentioned tourism, while 11 (85%) of the 13 longer-term residents mentioned it. Thus, while both groups seem to be aware of tourism's position in the economy generally, they are quite different in the frequency of their perceptions that tourism-based projects are

Table 6
Years of Residency and Perceptions of
Economic Revitalization Efforts within the Last Ten Years^a

Years of Residency	Tourism-Related Econ. Revitalization Efforts	Non-Tourism-Related Econ. Revitalization Efforts
0-25 <i>n</i>=20 respondents (16 responses)	40%; <i>n</i> =8 (63%; 10 responses)	25%; <i>n</i> =5 (38%; 6 responses)
26-50 & Life-long Residents <i>n</i>=13 respondents (12 responses)	15%; <i>n</i> =2 (25%; 3 responses)	46%; <i>n</i> =6 (75%; 9 responses)

^a *n* sizes refer to numbers of respondents; number of responses is reported in parentheses. Some respondents recorded both tourism-related and non-tourism-related comments and are represented in both columns. Not all respondents offered a comment.

revitalization efforts or their general awareness of tourism-based revitalization efforts.

One possible explanation for shorter-term residents' relative focus on tourism-based economic revitalization efforts is that these may have been more prevalent over the last ten years than in the past. It is also possible that "newer" residents put more of an emphasis on, or pay more attention to, tourism-related economic revitalization efforts.

Overall, differences between groups of respondents suggest differences in San Juan County residents' levels of knowledge about economic revitalization efforts. It is possible these differences are based on different perceptions of what type of program constitutes an economic revitalization effort.

What is the role of tourism in this county's economy?

When respondents were asked about the role of tourism in the county's economy, the most frequent response overall was that tourism plays a "Major Role" (79%; $n = 26$), followed by there are "Problems with Tourism" (45%; $n = 15$), and there is a "Dependence on Tourism" (15%; $n = 5$). Only three respondents (9%)—one from Montezuma Creek and two from Mexican Hat—stated that tourism "Does Not Play a Major Role." In all communities, tourism plays a "Major Economic Role" was either the most frequent response or tied for this position with the exception of Montezuma Creek, where the sole interview respondent felt it "Does Not Play a Major Role."

Respondents in three out of the seven towns reported “Problems with Tourism”: Bluff, Monticello, and Blanding. The stated problems, according to town, are listed in Table 7. The following comment is representative of the type of response that falls into the “Problems with Tourism” category.

As a business owner you do pretty good, but if you are a worker you’re at the low end of the pay scale and you’re seasonal and you get laid off in the winter. Our season ends in October and doesn’t pick up until mid-March. So it makes some real lean months here.

Table 8 shows that key informants mentioned “Problems with Tourism” much more often than action informants. Key informants, and both private and public subgroups, mentioned problems with tourism far more frequently than action informants. This supports previous research showing that greater received economic tourism benefits are correlated with less recognition of negative tourism-related impacts (Milman & Pizam, 1988; Murphy, 1983; Pizam, 1978; Purdue, Long, & Allen, 1990).

Table 7
Stated Problems with Tourism by Community

Communities/Stated Problems
Bluff’s “Problems with Tourism” are:
It is complex and there is no formula for attracting tourists
Monticello’s “Problems with Tourism” are:
Low Paying
Community Pays for Infrastructure Costs
Offers Seasonal Employment
Locals View Tourists Negatively
Blanding’s “Problems with Tourism” are:
It is seasonal
Low Paying
“Fickle”
“Not Sustainable”
Tourists “Just Pass Through”

Table 8
Occupation/Affiliation and Tourism’s Perceived Economic Role^a

Occupation or Affiliation	Tourism Plays “Major Economic Role”	“Problems With Tourism”
Private Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =17	88%; <i>n</i> =15	29%; <i>n</i> =5
Public Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =4	75%; <i>n</i> =3	25%; <i>n</i> =1
All Tourism-Related (Action Informants) <i>n</i> =21	86%; <i>n</i> =18	29%; <i>n</i> =6
Private Non-Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =11	82%; <i>n</i> =9	73%; <i>n</i> =8
Public Non-Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =9	67%; <i>n</i> =6	78%; <i>n</i> =7
All Non-Tourism-Related (Key Informants) <i>n</i> =16	69%; <i>n</i> =11	75%; <i>n</i> =12
Total <i>n</i> =33	67%; <i>n</i> =22	36%; <i>n</i> =12

^a Some respondents’ multiple occupations or affiliations caused them to be classified in more than one category for analysis purposes. This is why there are more than 33 respondents classified in the occupation/affiliation categories and why total and subtotal *ns* appear to be smaller than the total of their component *ns*.

Tourism-Related Efforts

Have there been any conscious efforts that you know of to market or promote the unique or distinctive features in your county with respect to tourism?

When the respondents were asked about their awareness of efforts to market or promote attractions within the county, 18 different types of responses were given (Table 9). The two most frequent responses were “brochures” and “efforts from the San Juan County Visitors Services.” Both of these efforts were identified eight times. Of the 18 different efforts discussed, 10 were mentioned only once.

The third most frequent response, mentioned seven times, was “there have not been enough efforts made.” The wording of the interview question

Table 9
Residents' Responses regarding Efforts to Market or
Promote the Unique or Distinctive Features of the County

Efforts Mentioned	Number of Responses
Brochures	<i>n</i> =8
San Juan County Visitors Services Efforts	<i>n</i> =8
"Not Enough Effort"	<i>n</i> =7
Private Business Promotion	<i>n</i> =6
County Promotion	<i>n</i> =4
Utah Travel Council	<i>n</i> =3
County Website Promotion	<i>n</i> =2
Tribal Park Efforts	<i>n</i> =2
Radio Advertisements	<i>n</i> =1
General Advertisements	<i>n</i> =1
Workshops	<i>n</i> =1
Festivals	<i>n</i> =1
Visitor Center	<i>n</i> =1
Magazine Advertisements	<i>n</i> =1
Business Owners of Bluff	<i>n</i> =1
Organized Tours	<i>n</i> =1
National Parks, Monuments, & State Parks	<i>n</i> =1
Blanding Slogan	<i>n</i> =1

asked the respondents to identify specific marketing and promotion efforts with no prompting regarding the adequacy or level of promotion. The frequency of this response suggests a potentially significant perception of inadequate tourism promotion efforts. The following is representative of these comments: "As a joint effort, as a county, I don't think we have done enough."

What kinds of cooperation occur around tourism development in San Juan County?

When asked about the kinds of cooperation that occur around tourism development in San Juan County, nearly every respondent indicated that cooperation exists (94%; *n* = 31). When they were asked about the specific type of cooperative project, however, close to two-thirds (61%; *n* = 20) could not identify any type of project while about only one-third (34%; *n* = 11) were able to

name a specific cooperative project. This seems to indicate that respondents do in fact believe cooperation exists around tourism development but for the most part do not know what specifically occurs.

Respondents mentioned nine different specific projects (Table 10). Only two of these efforts were mentioned in more than one community; both were mentioned by respondents in two communities. Those were two specific “San Juan County Tourism Board” efforts and the Monticello “Multi-Agency Visitor Center.” Based on this, it appears that there are very few cooperative efforts occurring that involve more than one community. Rather, efforts that are occurring may be mostly within communities or undertaken by individuals.

Table 10
Specific Projects Involving
Cooperation by Respondents’ Locations^a

Community	San Juan County Tourism Board	Multi-Agency Visitor Center	Tribe of Nations	Business	County & City	Transient Room Tax	Chamber of Commerce	Art & Conference Center	County Project
Blanding <i>n=7</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>
Bluff <i>n=8</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>
Monticello <i>n=11</i>	<i>n=2</i>	<i>n=2</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>
Montezuma Creek <i>n=1</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>
Monument Valley <i>n=2</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>
Mexican Hat <i>n=3</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>
La Sal <i>n=1</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>	<i>n=0</i>
Totals Respondents <i>n=33</i>	<i>n=3</i>	<i>n=3</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>	<i>n=1</i>

^a The total number of responses does not equal 33 because some respondents did not offer a response. Respondents were allowed more than one response

When respondents could not identify a specific project, they often mentioned an area or organization where they believed this type of cooperation exists. The San Juan County Tourism Board (San Juan County Economic Development and Tourism Board) was the organization most frequently identified both in cases where a specific cooperative project was acknowledged and in cases where an area or organization was mentioned without reference to a specific project. Interestingly, both employees of the San Juan County Tourism Board who were interviewed described a lack of cooperative efforts within the county.

Shorter-term residents had a higher level of awareness of the San Juan County Tourism Board's role in cooperative efforts than the longer-term residents. Only respondents in the former group identified specific cooperative programs involving the San Juan County Tourism Board (Table 11). All three cooperative efforts mentioned were related to the issuing of grants. When no specific project was mentioned but the San Juan County Tourism Board was identified as an organization involved in cooperative projects, six out of seven of those responses came from shorter-term residents (Table 12). These findings may indicate that projects and awareness of cooperation from the San Juan County Tourism Board may be more popular with, or geared more toward, people with shorter residency. It is also possible that the short-term residents are more aware of tourism related efforts because more of them work within the tourism industry.

Table 11
Identification of Specific San Juan
County Tourism Board Projects Involving
Cooperation by Respondents' Lengths of Residency

Years of Residency	San Juan County Tourism Board
0-25 Years <i>n</i> =20	<i>n</i> =3
26-50 Years & Life-long <i>n</i> =13	<i>n</i> =0

Table 12
Respondents Noted Cooperation Exists
Through San Juan County Tourism Board without
Specific Mention of Project (by Length of Residency)

Years of Residency	San Juan County Tourism Board
0-25 Years <i>n</i> =20	<i>n</i> =6
26-50 Years Life-long <i>n</i> =13	<i>n</i> =1

Identify any specific tourism-related development projects or efforts that you know of undertaken over the past ten years in San Juan County?

Earlier in the interview, respondents were asked to identify any economic revitalization efforts in the county of which they were aware. Despite the fact that tourism had not yet been mentioned by the interviewer, respondents frequently reported tourism-related efforts (pp. 32-35). However, few of the reported development efforts were mentioned by multiple respondents.

When respondents were asked to identify specific *tourism-related* efforts, 31 different projects or efforts were mentioned. Thirteen of those efforts were mentioned only once and nine were mentioned twice. The remaining nine efforts were mentioned more than twice. In order to investigate what appears to be a

lack of county-wide tourism development collaboration, responses have been divided by respondents' communities of residence (Table 13). References to the Multi-Agency Visitor Center in Monticello were the most reported responses. This answer was given by respondents from four of the seven communities. The only other response given by respondents in different communities was "Tourism-Related Business," and these two references were to different businesses. The fact that there were 31 different projects or efforts mentioned and that only one of the efforts was mentioned by respondents in more than one community may indicate that communities often engage in individual tourism promotional efforts rather than working together or in a county-wide effort. It may also indicate a general lack of awareness of tourism development projects or efforts.

Table 13
Location and Tourism-Related Development Projects or Efforts

Location	Projects/Efforts Mentioned	% of Leaders' Responses From Each Community
Blanding	Visitor Center	71%; <i>n</i> =5
Bluff	Bluff Balloon Rally	65%; <i>n</i> =5
Monticello	Visitor Center	27%; <i>n</i> =3
	Museums	27%; <i>n</i> =3
Montezuma Creek	Visitor Center	100%; <i>n</i> =1
	Airport Project	100%; <i>n</i> =1
Monument Valley	Native American	50%; <i>n</i> =1
	Tourism-Related Business	50%; <i>n</i> =1
	Visitor Center	50%; <i>n</i> =1
Mexican Hat	Tourism-Related Business	67%; <i>n</i> =2
La Sal	Website	100%; <i>n</i> =1

With the exception of the relative consensus on the “Visitor Center,” respondents also displayed a lack of consensus based on occupational background (all four occupational groups referred to the Multi-Agency Visitor Center as their most frequent response). Both of the Non-Tourism occupational groups (key informants) gave responses of “Don’t Know” as their second—or tied for second—most frequent response (18% and 33%) (Table 14). “Don’t Know” responses were given very infrequently by the Tourism-Related occupational groups (action informants) (0% and 6%). Other responses were very dispersed and did not show any discernable pattern.

Table 14
Occupation/Affiliation and Responses of “Don’t Know of Any Effort”^a

Occupation or Affiliation	Don’t Know of Any Effort
Private Tourism-Related <i>n=17</i>	6%; <i>n=1</i>
Public Tourism-Related <i>n=4</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Private Non-Tourism-Related <i>n=11</i>	18% ; <i>n=2</i>
Public Non-Tourism-Related <i>n=9</i>	33%; <i>n=3</i>

^a Some respondents’ multiple occupations or affiliations caused them to be classified in more than one category for analysis purposes. This explains why there are more than 33 respondents classified in the occupation/affiliation categories. Not all respondents offered a response.

Tourism-Related Impacts

What have been the economic results or impacts of tourism in San Juan County?

Respondents were asked about the economic results or impacts of tourism in San Juan County. Responses to this question were, for the most part, positive. Of every category of tourism impacts analyzed (economic,

environmental, and social impacts), the largest ratio of positive to negative responses came from economic impacts. For every respondent giving a negative economic consequence there were 2.7 positive economic responses given.

When breaking up economic perceptions of tourism development by community, respondents in all seven communities represented made much more frequent references to tourism's positive economic effects than to negative ones. The range of positive versus negative responses between communities may be related to the differing levels of tourism each community receives and the resulting differences in economic benefits. Table 15 shows positive and negative responses by location. The most frequent positive responses were that tourism

Table 15
Perceptions of Positive and Negative
Economic Impacts by Respondents' Locations^a

Community	Positive Economic Effect Total	Negative Economic Effect Total
Blanding <i>n=7</i>	100%; <i>n=7</i>	29%; <i>n=2</i>
Bluff <i>n=8</i>	63%; <i>n=5</i>	38%; <i>n=3</i>
Monticello <i>n=11</i>	91%; <i>n=10</i>	36%; <i>n=4</i>
Montezuma Creek <i>n=1</i>	100%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Monument Valley <i>n=2</i>	50%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Mexican Hat <i>n=3</i>	67%; <i>n=2</i>	33%; <i>n=1</i>
La Sal <i>n=1</i>	100%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Totals for Economic Responses <i>n=33</i>	82%; <i>n=27</i>	30%; <i>n=10</i>

^a Multiple positive and negative economic responses were allowed for each respondent. Not all respondents offered a response.

“Helps the Economy,” followed by “Increased Employment,” and “Increased Tax Revenue” (Table 16).

The following comment was made by an outfitter located in Bluff. This comment is typical of those indicating tourism makes a positive economic contribution.

It has been a plus to the economy, it is a major part of the employment availability in San Juan County and I feel that is a good thing. It has supported my family and we have twenty-seven employees here so we are one of the bigger employees in Bluff.

Responses reporting negative tourism impacts can be split into two categories. The first of these consists of results causing a financial loss or expense of some sort. The second category consists of responses that indicated

Table 16
Positive Economic Impacts by Respondents' Locations^a

Community	Helped Economy	Increased Employment	Increased Tax Revenue	Increased Property Values
Blanding <i>n=7</i>	71%; <i>n=5</i>	43%; <i>n=3</i>	29%; <i>n=2</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Bluff <i>n=8</i>	63%; <i>n=5</i>	25%; <i>n=2</i>	13%; <i>n=1</i>	13%; <i>n=1</i>
Monticello <i>n=11</i>	91%; <i>n=10</i>	18%; <i>n=2</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Montezuma Creek <i>n=1</i>	100%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Monument Valley <i>n=2</i>	50%; <i>n=1</i>	50%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Mexican Hat <i>n=3</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	67%; <i>n=2</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
La Sal <i>n=1</i>	100%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Totals for Positive Economic Responses <i>n=33</i>	70%; <i>n=23</i>	30%; <i>n=10</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>	3%; <i>n=1</i>

^a Multiple positive economic responses were allowed for each respondent. Not all respondents offered a response.

the tourism industry is not as lucrative as other industries or is not equally beneficial to all parties involved.

Many of the responses to this question dealt with financial costs or impacts on profits (Table 17). Specifically, these categories are “Search and Rescue Expenses,” “Negative Impact on Ranching,” “Prosecution and Defense Expenses,” and “Infrastructure Costs.” Despite “Search and Rescue Expenses” being the most frequently reported negative economic result of tourism, even this expense did not demonstrate any consensus with only four responses from the 33 respondents.

Table 17
Negative Economic Impacts by Respondents’ Locations^a

Community	Search and Rescue Expenses	Low Paying or Entry Level Jobs	Seasonal Employment	Negative Impact on Ranching	Prosecution and Defense Expenses	Infrastructure Costs	Raised Property Values
Blanding <i>n=7</i>	14%; <i>n=1</i>	14%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	14%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Bluff <i>n=8</i>	13%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	13%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	13%; <i>n=1</i>
Monticello <i>n=11</i>	18%; <i>n=2</i>	18%; <i>n=2</i>	9%; <i>n=1</i>	9%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	9%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Montezuma Creek <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Monument Valley <i>n=2</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Mexican Hat <i>n=3</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	33%; <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
La Sal <i>n=1</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>	0%; <i>n=0</i>
Totals for Negative Economic Response <i>n=33</i>	12%; <i>n=4</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>	6%; <i>n=2</i>	6%; <i>n=2</i>	3%; <i>n=1</i>	3%; <i>n=1</i>	3%; <i>n=1</i>

^a Multiple negative economic responses were allowed for each respondent. Not all respondents offered a response.

Negative response categories that result in no direct financial loss account for two of the categories: “Provides Only Low Paying or Entry Level Jobs” and “The Industry is Seasonal.” These two categories account for five responses. An example of a comment expressing these negative types of responses follows:

There is also the down side of tourism. It tends to be seasonal, the jobs are low paying with almost no career ladders, ...cooks, waitresses, maids, clerks, I think there is some like the local grocery store that might have to put on more clerks and that kind of thing. That may be related to the seasonal fluctuation brought in by tourists but those are basically dead end kind of jobs that surely couldn't support a family very well.

What have been the environmental results or impacts of tourism in San Juan County?

While most of the economic and social impact-related questions had the possibility of being either positive or negative, no respondents reported positive effects of tourism on the natural environment. Sixteen of the 25 responses received, however, indicated perceptions that tourism does not have a significant environmental impact (Table 18).

“General impacts” make up the most frequent category of impacts mentioned (21%; $n = 7$). Of the more specific environmental impacts given, only two were mentioned more than once: impacts to archeological sites (15%; $n = 5$) and impacts resulting from OHV/ATV use (12%; $n = 4$). The following quote is a representative example of the “general” impacts described:

Oh their trash, their garbage, their tracks, I don't care what it is, people are hard on the environment. That's just a natural fact. And so tourism probably had a little bit of a negative impact on the environment. Probably bigger than anything that's ever happened in the county. Uranium mining and all the rest of it all included.

Table 18
Perceptions of Tourism-Related Environmental Impact^a

Respondents	Neutral or No Environmental Impact Total	Negative Environmental Impact Total
<i>n</i> =33	48%; <i>n</i> =16	27%; <i>n</i> =9

^a The total number of responses does not equal 33 because some respondents did not offer a response.

This particular respondent initially indicated tourism had only “a little bit of a negative impact on the environment,” but then went on to indicate that it has had more of an impact than any of the other economic uses of local natural resources. Nevertheless, this was not a majority perception.

What have been the social results or impacts of tourism in San Juan County?

It appears that social benefits of tourism are more recognized than negative social impacts in San Juan County, as benefits were mentioned three times as often as negative effects (Table 19). The six most frequent responses were: “Improved Services,” “Native American Stability” (economic and cultural sustainability of Native Americans), “Future Vitality,” “Increased Cultural Awareness,” “Improved Road System,” and a “Positive Effect on the Community” (Table 20). When asked about the social results of tourism, several respondents indicated that opportunities for cultural exchange were personally satisfying. Statements such as “I enjoy sharing it [my culture] and I enjoy meeting with them [tourists]” are representative of this sentiment. One 25-year resident and tourism-related business owner from Bluff stated the following:

We have such a small resident population and such a dependence on tourism. But the community probably wouldn’t exist without tourism and so

Table 19
Respondents Perceptions of Social Impact^a

Respondents	Total Positive Social Impact	Total Negative Social Impact
<i>n=33</i>	36%; <i>n=12</i>	12%; <i>n=4</i>

^a The total number of responses does not equal 33 because some respondents did not offer a response. Multiple responses were allowed for each respondent.

Table 20
Responses Dealing with Positive Social Impacts^a

Respondents	Improved Services	Native American Stability	Future Vitality	Increased Cultural Awareness	Improved Road System	Positive Effect on Community
<i>n=33</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>	6%; <i>n=2</i>	6%; <i>n=2</i>	%; <i>n=2</i>

^a The total number of responses does not equal 33 because some respondents did not offer a response or did not indicate social impacts were positive. Multiple responses were allowed for each respondent.

the effects that residents feel by having people in and out, I don't think are negative here as they may be, say, in Moab where there is such a crunch of people. I think almost to a person, residents of Bluff enjoy it when a tourist comes.

Only four respondents stated that tourism had a negative social effect on San Juan County. Two of these responses addressed tourism as "Threatening a Way of Life" as shown in Table 21. Both of these remarks were intended to describe the feelings of other community members rather than the respondent him/herself. The first of these comments was: "I think many of them feel impacted. This is their private domain. It has been isolated for so many years. So the impact is that now they have to share it with the world." The other comment of this type was:

Respondent: It brings in the attitudes, which some local people don't like. I happen to like it but if you are a local person who wants to go back to the 50s and 60s then you don't like it, this sort of outside influence in different areas.

Interviewer: *So would you say that some locals perceive tourism as a threat to their way of life?*

Table 21
Responses Dealing with Negative Social Impacts^a

Respondents	Threatens Way of Life	Increases Traffic	Arrowhead Collection
<i>n</i> =33	6%; <i>n</i> =2	3%; <i>n</i> = 1	3%; <i>n</i> =1

^a Many respondents did not offer a comment on this question or have a negative social impact to report.

Respondent: Yeah, because of the new ideas, new values, those kinds of things.

While there were only four specific mentions of tourism as a negative social force, many of the respondents expressed concerns about preserving their “small town character” in the future. This was often done through statements such as, “We don’t want another Moab [Utah] here.” In fact, similar comments came up numerous times without the interviewer mentioning the southern Utah tourism hotspot of Moab. Several of these comments follow:

I apologize for my friends in Moab; but that’s not the type of environment that I want to see in some of the Business Owners of Bluff meetings. I don’t think it’s a type of environment where you would find desire of any of our business owners here. We don’t want to turn into a zoo, we don’t want a water park and water slide.

Thirty years ago Moab was one darn neat little town, we all have sat here and watched what has happened to Moab and we are going ‘Oh man, let’s not have that happen here’ and you can’t stop growth, and we are aware of that, but you can guide it.

Tourism’s Role

In your opinion, what is the future role of tourism in San Juan County’s economy?

Respondents were classified into typologies based on their perceptions of the future role of tourism in this county’s economy (Table 22). These typologies

Table 22
Response Classifications for Respondents'
Perceptions of the Future Economic Role of Tourism in the County^a

<p>Strongly Optimistic (n=7)</p> <p>Respondent: I think it is extremely important.</p> <p>Respondent: I think it could be the savior of this county.</p> <p>Respondent: The picture is extraordinary bright.</p> <p>Respondent: I see tourism as being the backbone of San Juan future.</p> <p>Respondent: The future growth of San Juan County is going to be on tourism.</p> <p>Respondent: I think it has to continue to be a big, a very big, factor.</p> <p>Respondent: It's the only major thing that has any potential.</p>
<p>Optimistic (n=11)</p> <p>Respondent: I think it will grow here.</p> <p>Respondent: I think it will continue to have an increasingly important role.</p> <p>Respondent: Well I think it's always going to be an important part.</p> <p>Respondent: I think at least it will remain as strong if not stronger.</p> <p>Respondent: I think it will take an increasingly more important role in the economy.</p> <p>Respondent: I feel pretty sure it is going to stay a real important factor.</p> <p>Respondent: It has a major role to play and that is going to increase hopefully.</p> <p>Respondent: I think it should bump itself up on their list of priorities.</p> <p>Respondent: The future is of course jobs and providing economic opportunity for the county.</p> <p>Respondent: I think it is big. It is going to play a big part.</p> <p>Respondent: Oh I think there is a great future for tourism.</p>
<p>Somewhat Optimistic (n=8)</p> <p>Respondent: Well tourism is good but I don't think we want to hang our hats on tourism.</p> <p>Respondent: Oh I think there is no question that you know, future expansion is called forward, you know, will happen. For the present, well, that's good enough</p> <p>Respondent: We need to let it play a role; it shouldn't be the whole part.</p> <p>Respondent: It is going to increase. Tourism is growing and it does every year.</p> <p>Respondent: Tourism drops but it will come back up.</p> <p>Respondent: Tourism has slight increase all the time.</p> <p>Respondent: Well it will still be, it is still one of the three legs of the stool, it is tied to the economy.</p> <p>Respondent: The future role is that it should be just one of the legs of the stool.</p>
<p>Unsure (n=4)</p> <p>Respondent: The money exchange thing is odd (foreign visitation).</p> <p>Respondent: I don't see a huge factor economically.</p> <p>Respondent: It is uncertain because so much of it is dependent on the global economy.</p> <p>Respondent: What you get from oil that comes out of the ground is tons different than what you get from people eating a meal or filling up their gas.</p>
<p>Pessimistic (n=2)</p> <p>Respondent: I think there is going to be a time when you could put up a gate and you couldn't keep the people out.</p> <p>Respondent: I fear that we are going to overdose.</p>

^a Data was missing for one respondent.

range from strongly optimistic to pessimistic. The method used to classify typologies was developed in a similar study on perceptions of tourism in relation to community members' sense of place (Burr, 1994). The typologies were: strongly optimistic ($n = 7$), optimistic ($n = 11$), somewhat optimistic ($n = 8$), unsure/uncertain ($n = 4$), or pessimistic/negative ($n = 2$).

Overall, the 33 respondents gave 46 different responses regarding the future economic role of tourism. The four most frequent responses were: "Increasing Importance," "Inevitable Growth," "Good/Very Good Thing," and "Decrease Dependence On/Diversify From." These responses are presented in Table 23.

When respondents were grouped based on years of residency, the shorter-term residents were four times more likely to mention tourism's "Increasing Importance" than the longer-term residents (Table 24). A typical response of this type was: "I think it will take an increasingly more important role in the economy. It will have to if we are going to maintain a more stable economy replacing all the jobs we are losing in the extraction industries." Despite "Increasing Importance" being the most frequent response classification, only respondents in three of the seven communities mentioned it: Bluff ($n = 6$),

Table 23
Perceptions of the Future Economic Role of Tourism^a

Respondents	Increasing Importance	Inevitable Growth	Good/Very Good Thing	Decrease Dependence On/ Diversify
<i>n=33</i>	42%; <i>n=14</i>	36%; <i>n=12</i>	12%; <i>n=4</i>	12%; <i>n=4</i>

^a Multiple responses were allowed from each respondent; not all respondents offered a response.

Table 24
Years of Respondents' Residency and "Increasing Importance" as a Response to: *What is the Future Role of Tourism?*^a

Years of Residency	Increasing Importance	Diversify From
0-25 Years n=20	60%; n=12	0%; n=0
26-50 Years & Life-Long Residents n=13	15%; n=2	31%; n=4

^a The total number of responses does not equal 33 because some respondents did not offer a response or did not discuss tourism's economic "Increasing Importance." Multiple responses were allowed from each respondent.

Blanding ($n = 4$), and Monticello ($n = 4$). This may be a result of the particular importance respondents in these towns place on tourism's future economic role compared to other communities in the county.

Most respondents' descriptions of tourism's future role were positive. The only negative responses were: "Decrease Dependence On/ Diversify From" the local economy (12%; $n = 4$), "Ups and Downs" (9%; $n = 3$), "Small Economic Contribution" (6%; $n = 2$), and "Over-Visitation" (3%; $n = 1$). The most frequent of these negative responses, "Decrease Dependence On/ Diversify From," also showed some notable differences between groupings of responses based on years of residency and location. There were no indications from any of the shorter-term residents that San Juan County should diversify away from tourism. However, 31% of the longer-term residents mentioned a need to diversify the economy beyond tourism development.

Only respondents from Blanding ($n = 2$) and Monticello ($n = 2$) expressed a need to "Decrease Dependence On/Diversify From" tourism, which was the fourth most frequent response overall and the top negative response. Specific

comments reflecting this classification include: “We need to let it play a role but it shouldn’t be the whole part” and “I don’t think we should hang our hats on it.”

It appears that differing perceptions exist between longer-term and more recent residents and members of different San Juan County communities as to the nature of tourism’s future economic role. Several respondents indicated that levels of tourism were determined by the specific attractions and facilities located in the surrounding area. This may be an influence on these respondents’ perception of tourism’s future economic role, particularly in communities that are more isolated from currently popular tourist attractions. Respondents from Bluff, in particular, though also Blanding and Monticello, seem to perceive that proximate attractions or facilities are—and will continue to be—significant tourism draws. This would explain the more frequent discussion of a growing future economic role for tourism from respondents in these towns, relative to the lack of such comments from respondents in other communities. Bluff is also the community with the highest concentration of newer residents. Factors correlated with greater support for tourism development may be somewhat intertwined here, as the effects of more recent residents’ greater support for tourism development and the seemingly closer proximity of tourist attractions to these towns are difficult to separate in this data.

Future Tourism Development and Promotion

Do the county's attractions have the drawing power to attract more tourists?

Of all the interview questions posed in this study, the greatest consensus among respondents was found here. Twenty-eight respondents (85%) indicated that the county's attractions do have the drawing power to attract more visitors (Table 25). Most of these responses were quite emphatic with remarks such as, "Oh, absolutely," "Yeah, definitely," and "Oh, unquestionably." Several of these responses were followed up with comments such as "With the right promotion" and "If there were proper advertising behind it." There was only one "No" response (3%). The respondent elaborated on this, saying that the county as a *whole* could not attract more tourists because some areas do not have the attractions or the proper facilities found in other areas.

When dividing responses to this question by location, most communities overwhelmingly felt San Juan County had the drawing power to attract more tourists (82%-100%) (Table 26). Mexican Hat was the only community where respondents did not give a strong indication that the county's attractions could attract more visitors (33%). Of the three respondents from Mexican Hat, one

Table 25
Do Attractions Have the Drawing Power to Attract More Tourists?^a

Respondents	Yes, Attractions Have Drawing Power to Attract More Tourists	No, Attractions Do Not Have Drawing Power to Attract More Tourists
<i>n</i>=33	85%; <i>n</i> =28	3%; <i>n</i> =1

^a One response per respondent allowed; not all respondents offered a response.

Table 26
Do Attractions Have the Drawing Power
to Attract More Tourists? (By Community)^a

Community	Yes, the County's Attractions Have the Drawing Power to Attract More Tourists
Blanding <i>n=7</i>	100%; <i>n=7</i>
Bluff <i>n=8</i>	88%; <i>n=7</i>
Monticello <i>n=11</i>	82%; <i>n=9</i>
Montezuma Creek <i>n=1</i>	100%; <i>n=1</i>
Monument Valley <i>n=2</i>	100%; <i>n=2</i>
Mexican Hat <i>n=3</i>	33%; <i>n=1</i>
La Sal <i>n=1</i>	100%; <i>n=1</i>
Total <i>n=33</i>	85%; <i>n=28</i>

^a The total number of responses does not equal 33 because some respondents did not offer a response or did not indicate the county's attractions have the drawing power to attract more visitors.

answered yes, one answered no (as the result of the unequal county wide distribution of attractions and facilities; see above), and one did not respond.

What attractions would you promote?

After they were asked whether San Juan County attractions had the drawing power to attract more tourists, respondents were asked what specific attractions they would promote. The five most frequently given responses were: "Parks and Monuments" (30%; *n* = 10), "Archeological Sites" (21%; *n* = 7), "Recreation" (18%; *n* = 6), the "Natural Environment" (15%; *n* = 5), and "Scenic Drives" (12%; *n* = 4). Only one respondent felt the county should not promote any attractions (3%).

Responses did not show an overwhelming consensus between any of the communities on what attractions to promote (Table 27). This likely stems from the diversity of natural features and facilities proximate to the various San Juan County communities. For example, the second most frequent response was “Archeological Sites,” but this was only reported within two communities, suggesting that these locations have a relatively large number of archaeological sites within the surrounding area while other towns may not.

Once again, respondents’ length of residency appears to be related to their perceptions regarding which attractions should be promoted. More recent residents put slightly more emphasis on archeological sites than did the longer-term residents, who mentioned recreation more frequently (Table 28). The most

Table 27
The Five Most Frequently Mentioned
Attractions to Promote by Respondents’ Locations^a

Community	Parks & Monuments	Archeological Sites	Recreation	Natural Environment	Scenic Drives
Blanding n=7	57%; n=4	57%; n=4	1%; n=1	29%; n=2	43%; n=3
Bluff n=8	25%; n=2	38%; n=3	0%; n=0	38%; n=3	0%; n=0
Monticello n=11	27%; n=3	0%; n=0	27%; n=3	0%; n=0	9%; n=1
Montezuma Creek n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
Monument Valley n=2	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	50%; n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
Mexican Hat n=3	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
La Sal n=1	100%; n=1	0%; n=0	100%; n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
Totals n=33	30%; n=10	21%; n=7	18%; n=6	15%; n=5	12%; n=4

^a Multiple “Attractions to Promote” responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

Table 28
Five Most Frequently Mentioned Attractions
to Promote by Respondents' Lengths of Residency^a

Length of Residency	Parks & Monuments	Archeological Sites	Recreation	Natural Environment	Scenic Drives
0-25 Years n=20	30%; n=6	25%; n=5	15%; n=3	25%; n=5	10%; n=2
26-50 Years & Life-Long Residents n=13	31%; n=4	15%; n=2	23%; n=3	0%; n=0	15%; n=2
Total n=33	30%; n=10	21%; n=7	18%; n=6	15%; n=5	12%; n=4

^a Multiple "Attractions to Promote" responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

notable discrepancy between these categories of respondents dealt with promotion of the "Natural Environment," which was the fourth most frequent response overall. Several of the shorter-term residents mentioned "Natural Environment" (25%; $n = 5$), while none of the longer-term residents recommended any attractions in this category.

What development would you promote?

Responses dealing with specific tourism development projects to promote were fairly diverse, with fourteen different suggestions. The four most frequent responses were: "Events and Festivals" (21%; $n = 7$), "Organized Tours" (21%; $n = 7$), "Archeological Sites" (15%; $n = 5$), and "OHV/ATV Opportunities" (12%; $n=4$) (Table 29).

Shorter- and longer-term residents showed a notably different set of responses to this question. The comments made more frequently by respondents from the zero- to 25-year residency group are recorded in Table 30, below. Table 31 shows comments made more frequently by longer-term residents. These

Table 29
The Four Most Frequently Mentioned
Types of Tourism Development to Promote^a

Respondents	Events & Festivals	Organized Tours	Archeological Sites	OHV & ATV
n=33	21%; n=7	21%; n=7	15%; n=5	12%; n=4

^a Multiple "Development to Promote" responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

Table 30
Shorter-Term Residents' Most Frequent Preferences for Tourism
Development Promotion (Compared with Longer-Term Residents)^a

Years of Residency	Events & Festivals	Organized Tours	Archeological Sites	Farm & Ranch Recreation	Tourist Facilities	Native American Culture	Web Sites
0-25 Years n=20	30%; n=6	30%; n=6	20%; n=4	15%; n=3	10%; n=2	10%; n=2	10%; n=2
26-50 Years & Life-Long Residents n=13	8%; n=1	8%; n=1	8%; n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0

^a Multiple "Development to Promote" responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

Table 31
Longer-Term Residents' Most Frequent Preferences for Tourism
Development Promotion (Compared with Shorter-Term Residents)^a

Years of Residency	OHV & ATV	Lake Powell	Winter Activities	Interpretive Waysides	Movie Industry
0-25 Years n=20	5%; n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
26-50 Years & Life-Long Resident n=13	23%; n=3	8%; n=1	8%; n=1	8%; n=1	8%; n=1

^a Multiple "Development to Promote" responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

show a substantial difference between respondents from these two different groupings. Omitted from Table 30 is a single response (5%) from a shorter-term resident expressing interest in the development of a "Pioneer Museum."

Some support was shown by both groups for development of “Parks and Monuments,” with two responses (10%) from shorter-term residents and one (8%) from the longer-term group (not shown in Tables 30 and 31). Responses directed at promotion of “Events and Festivals,” “Organized Tours,” “Archaeological Sites,” and “OHV and ATV” tourism also occurred within both groups to a limited extent. These seemed to be the only points of agreement found between the two groups in responses to these open-ended questions. One zero- to 25-year resident expressed dissatisfaction with this type of difference between longer-term and newer residents:

I don't think we have that new blood... When I moved to Moab in 1984, I lived on a block with ten houses and five were for sale. Everyone left town but they had enough of an influx of people that wanted to take the chance. Here we don't have that.

Several of the respondents expressed the sentiment that local government was not taking enough of a role in the development of the tourism industry. When asked what development he/she would promote, one frustrated study participant responded, “The problem is that the city and the county have not felt it is their job to spur the county's economic development.” Based on differences between the responses of the public officials in non-tourism-related positions—the occupational group primarily responsible for economic development—and other occupational groups, individuals not involved in the tourism industry may have different economic development objectives than those in the tourism industry (Table 32). While “Events and Festivals” were the most frequently mentioned type of development to promote overall, this response was not given by any of the Public Officials in Non-Tourism-Related Positions, and this was the only

Table 32
Occupation/Affiliation and
Preferences for Tourism Development Promotion^a

Occupation or Affiliation	Events & Festivals	Organized Tours	Archeological Sites	OHV & ATV
Private Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =17	18%; <i>n</i> =3	18%; <i>n</i> =3	12%; <i>n</i> =2	12%; <i>n</i> =2
Public Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =4	50%; <i>n</i> =2	25%; <i>n</i> =1	25%; <i>n</i> =1	0%; <i>n</i> =0
Private Non-Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =11	27%; <i>n</i> =3	36%; <i>n</i> =4	18%; <i>n</i> =2	36%; <i>n</i> =4
Public Non-Tourism-Related <i>n</i> =9	0%; <i>n</i> =0	11%; <i>n</i> =1	22%; <i>n</i> =2	22%; <i>n</i> =2

^a Some respondents' multiple occupations or affiliations caused them to be classified in more than one category for analysis purposes. This explains why there are more than 33 respondents appear in the occupation/affiliation categories. Multiple "Development to Promote" responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

group not to mention this as a development strategy. The second most frequent response category was "Organized Tours." Public Officials in Non-Tourism-Related Positions only mentioned this type of tourism development once.

Results divided based on respondents' length of residency seem to reflect differing perceptions of the tourism industry and resulting differences in views regarding future promotion and development efforts. As for the occupation/affiliation groups, differences may be the result of a lack of communication, or they may be indicative of a dissimilarity in development objectives.

What would inhibit this type of development?

When respondents were asked what would inhibit the types of tourism development they were interested in promoting, the most frequent response was "Attitudes" (21%; *n* = 7). Table 33 presents the six most frequent responses.

Table 33
What Would Inhibit this Type of Development?^a

Respondents	Attitudes	Lack of Promotion	Alcohol Regulations	Politics	Lack of Facilities	Money
<i>n=33</i>	21%; <i>n=7</i>	12%; <i>n=4</i>	12%; <i>n=4</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>

^a Multiple "Development Inhibitor" responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

The category "Attitudes" is somewhat general because those who mentioned this went on to identify the attitudes of various groups that would inhibit the development of a tourism industry. These comments included the identification of attitudes based on individuals' geographical location, as exemplified by the respondent making the following comment regarding differences between San Juan County's northern and southern populations:

"Clearly it is the mind set of what's north." He/she also indicated that the county government is in the north, which somewhat alienates the southern population.

Other comments pointed toward attitudes of representatives of the county and city governments as inhibitors of the development of a tourism industry. Numerous comments indicated that the attitudes of the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS/Mormon), the dominant religious group in this region, would inhibit changes.

Like I say, we cater to a niche market but to cater to the general tourist, you got to furnish alcohol, you got to furnish swimming pools, you got to have all that sort of stuff. I am not sure that this little Mormon community wants to furnish that kind of stuff.

Native American "Attitudes" were also identified as a hindrance to the development of the tourism industry. The following comment first blames the Mormon population, then goes on to point the finger at the Navajo population:

People's attitudes and I'm not just talking about the power structure of Mormon attitudes but Native American culture. Navajo culture is not a very aggressive, competitive culture, so every time you try to include Native Americans in these efforts it is a real struggle to get them to participate.

The diversity of people found within San Juan County lends itself to varying perceptions of nearly every issue examined. The diversity of responses among various groups can be seen not only in the different demographic groups separated for comparison in this study (location, length of residency, and occupation/affiliation), but also between LDS and non-LDS residents, and between non-Native Americans and Native Americans.

What would help this type of development?

There were only five different response types received when asked what would help the types of tourism development respondents felt should be promoted. "Multi-Agency Awareness and Cooperation" (9%; $n = 3$) was the only response mentioned more than once. "Casino" (3%; $n = 1$), "Changing Values" (3%; $n = 1$), "Control and Planning" (3%; $n = 1$) and, "Pave County Roads" (3%; $n = 1$) made up the other four responses. Due to the relatively small number of responses to this question, and the lack of consensus on those responses given, it appears that leaders and other influential individuals within San Juan County communities don't have a firm grasp—much less shared common goals—as to what would help in the development of the tourism industry.

The most frequent response, "Multi-Agency Awareness and Cooperation," did, however, come from three different leaders in three different communities. This may indicate more of a county-wide perception of this need than if the three

responses had come from respondents in the same town. Table 34 shows a summary of respondents' locations.

Responses from different occupation/affiliation groups displayed a great deal of difference—the most notable was that between Private Tourism-Related and Public Non-Tourism-Related groups (Table 35). Public Officials in Non-Tourism-Related Positions could arguably be seen as the group with the most influence over policy making since mayors, city and county commissioners, and councilpersons are represented here. Respondents from this group gave only one response as to what would help the development of the tourism industry: “Paving County Roads.” The most frequent response, “Multi-Agency Awareness and Cooperation,” was exclusively mentioned by respondents in the Private

Table 34
What Would Help this Type of Development? (by Location)^a

Community	Multi-Agency Awareness & Cooperation	Casino	Changing Values	Control & Planning	Pave County Roads
Blanding n=7	14%; n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	14%; n=1	0%; n=0
Bluff n=8	13%; n=1	13%; n=1	13%; n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
Monticello n=11	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	9%; n=1
Montezuma Creek n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
Monument Valley n=2	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
Mexican Hat n=3	33%; n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
La Sal n=1	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0
Total Responses n=33	9%; n=3	3%; n=1	3%; n=1	3%; n=1	3%; n=1

^a Multiple responses were allowed; some respondents did not offer a response.

Table 35
What Would Help this type of
Development? (By Selected Occupation/Affiliation Groups)^a

Occupation or Affiliation	Multi-Agency Awareness and Cooperation	Casino	Changing Values	Control and Planning	Pave County Roads
Private Tourism Related n=17	17%; n=3	6%; n=1	6%; n=1	6%; n=1	0%; n=0
Public Non-Tourism Related n=9	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	0%; n=0	11%; n=1

^a Some respondents' multiple occupations or affiliations caused them to be classified in more than one category for analysis purposes. More than one response was allowed for each respondent.

Tourism-Related group. This group was comprised of motel owners, tour guide operators, and those who make their living directly off the tourism industry. Their other responses were "Casino," "Changing Values," and "Control and Planning." It is notable that none of the responses between these two groups were similar, though very few responses were received overall.

Is the citizenry of the county prepared to support tourism by extending hospitality to visitors and by absorbing certain tourism-related costs? If so, how? If not, why?

With 85% of the participants agreeing that the county's attractions have the drawing power to attract more tourists (p. 55), it is important to know whether community leaders and influential community members feel the citizenry of the county is prepared to support tourism. This may be one of the more important questions asked within the study, as a lack of general support for tourism

development would likely render any recommendations for such development moot.

When respondents were asked if the citizenry of the county was prepared to support tourism, 50% ($n = 16$) indicated “Yes” while 28% ($n = 9$) said “No” (Table 36). Four respondents (13%) described a mixture of supportive and resistant San Juan County residents. Responses ranged from description of very high levels of support to general opposition. Of those indicating “Yes,” few were emphatic and most hedged their response with comments on the economic need to be supportive of tourism. Examples of these types of responses were: “Yes, we see how to boost the economy in what we are doing” and:

Table 36
Is the Citizenry of the County Prepared to Support Tourism by Extending Hospitality to Visitors and by Absorbing Certain Tourism-Related Costs? (By Location)^a

Community	Yes	Mixed: Some are & some are not	No,	Don't Know
Blanding $n=7$	86%; $n=6$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	14%; $n=1$
Bluff $n=8$	75%; $n=6$	0%; $n=0$	25%; $n=2$	0%; $n=0$
Monticello $n=11$	27%; $n=3$	18%; $n=2$	45%; $n=5$	9%; $n=1$
Montezuma Creek $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	100%; $n=1$
Monument Valley $n=2$	50%; $n=1$	50%; $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$
Mexican Hat $n=2^b$	0%; $n=0$	50%; $n=1$	50%; $n=1$	0%; $n=0$
La Sal $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	100%; $n=1$	0%; $n=0$
Total Respondents $n=32^b$	50%; $n=16$	13%; $n=4$	28%; $n=9$	9%; $n=3$

^a One response per respondent was allowed.

^b One respondent from Mexican Hat was not asked this interview question.

Well some of them, they are [supportive]. They would like to see more tourism. It's enough of an impact on the community that I think everybody [pause] and then there is a chance where local folks can reach out and be friendly.

Table 36 also shows a breakdown of responses to this interview question by community. Due to the small number of participants in this study it is difficult to generalize using the answers. Nevertheless, this data has some significance in its ability to communicate specifics about leaders' and other influential community members' perceptions of their own communities. The differences between the larger communities of Blanding and Monticello seem particularly noteworthy, where Blanding's populace appears to be far more supportive of tourism development according to respondents. In general, Blanding and Bluff indicated more support, with Monticello, Mexican Hat, and La Sal showing less.

Shorter- and longer-term residents do not appear to have substantially different perceptions of popular support for tourism development and its associated impacts (Table 37). Approximately half of both groups felt that the

Table 37
Is the Citizenry of the County Prepared to Support
Tourism by Extending Hospitality to Visitors and by
Absorbing Certain Tourism-Related Costs? (By Length of Residency)^a

Years of Residency	Yes	Mixed: Some are & some are not	No,	Don't Know
0-25 Years <i>n=19^b</i>	53%; <i>n=10</i>	5%; <i>n=1</i>	32%; <i>n=6</i>	11%; <i>n=2</i>
26-50 Years & Life-Long Resident <i>n=13</i>	46%; <i>n=6</i>	23%; <i>n=3</i>	23%; <i>n=3</i>	8%; <i>n=1</i>
Total Respondents <i>n=32^b</i>	50%; <i>n=16</i>	13%; <i>n=4</i>	28%; <i>n=9</i>	9%; <i>n=3</i>

^a One response per respondent was allowed.

^b One shorter-term resident was not asked this interview question.

citizens were ready to support tourism. Similarly, key and action informants are relatively similar in their perceptions of popular support for tourism development and its associated costs, though action informants (those involved directly with tourism) reported support for this slightly less frequently (45%; $n = 9$) than key informants did (56%; $n = 9$) (Table 38).

Table 38
Is the Citizenry of the County Prepared to Support Tourism by Extending Hospitality to Visitors and by Absorbing Certain Tourism-Related Costs? (By Occupation/Affiliation)^a

Occupation/ Affiliation	Yes	Mixed: Some are & some are not	No,	Don't Know
Private Tourism-Related $n=16$	50%; $n=8$	13%; $n=2$	31%; $n=5$	6%; $n=1$
Public Tourism-Related $n=4$	25%; $n=1$	25%; $n=1$	25%; $n=1$	25%; $n=1$
All Tourism-Related (Action Informants) $n=20$	45%; $n=9$	15%; $n=3$	30%; $n=6$	10%; $n=2$
Private Non-Tourism-Related $n=11$	63%; $n=7$	9%; $n=1$	18%; $n=2$	9%; $n=1$
Public Non-Tourism-Related $n=9$	56%; $n=5$	11%; $n=1$	22%; $n=2$	11%; $n=1$
All Non-Tourism-Related (Key Informants) $n=16$	56%; $n=9$	13%; $n=2$	19%; $n=3$	13%; $n=2$
Total Respondents $n=32^b$	50%; $n=16$	13%; $n=4$	28%; $n=9$	9%; $n=3$

^a Some respondents' multiple occupations or affiliations caused them to be classified in more than one category for analysis purposes. This is why there are more than 32 respondents classified in the occupation/affiliation categories and why total and subtotal n s appear to be smaller than the total of their component n s. One response per respondent was allowed.

^b One respondent was not asked this interview question.

In your opinion, as a current or potential “host” county for tourism, what is the “ideal” for which to strive in terms of tourism-related development.

Respondents were asked about the ideal for which to strive in terms of tourism-related development. The five most frequent responses were: “Protection: Land and Cultural/Archeological Resources” (19%; $n = 6$), “Control Growth” (9%; $n = 3$), “Provide Diverse Tourism Opportunities” (9%; $n = 3$), “Infrastructure” (9%; $n = 3$), and “Not Moab” (9%; $n = 3$) (Table 39). All five of these, with the exception of “Provide Diverse Tourism Opportunities,” were related to ensuring sufficient regulation and/or control of the tourism industry.

Table 39
Ideals for Future Tourism
Development by Respondents’ Locations^a

Community	Protect Land/ Archeo- logical Sites	Infra- structure	Diverse Tourism Oppor- tunities	Control Growth	“Not Moab”
Blanding $n=7$	14%; $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	14%; $n=1$
Bluff $n=8$	50%; $n=4$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	25%; $n=2$	0%; $n=0$
Monticello $n=11$	0%; $n=0$	9%; $n=1$	27%; $n=3$	9%; $n=1$	18%; $n=2$
Montezuma Creek $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$
Monument Valley $n=2$	0%; $n=0$	50%; $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$
Mexican Hat $n=2^b$	33%; $n=1$	33%; $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$
La Salle $n=1$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$	0%; $n=0$
Total Respondents $n=32^b$	19%; $n=6$	9%; $n=3$	9%; $n=3$	9%; $n=3$	9%; $n=3$

^a More than one responses per respondent was allowed; not all respondents offered a response.

^b One respondent from Mexican Hat was not asked this interview question.

Based on the responses received, many respondents appear to care about the protection of the small town character of their communities and the preservation of the natural and cultural resources that draw tourists to the area. Responses suggest that community leaders want to be able to take advantage of, and be adequately prepared for, growth in the tourism industry. The importance of both using and protecting tourism-related resources was expressed by one of the respondents in the following statement:

Oh I think that the development would be to protect the land. Use it, enjoy it, protect it, under no conditions just be neurotic about protecting those ruins. Don't step on walls. Every time you start a new development, think about it. How does this affect everything else, the view, and all of that kind of thing.

When respondents were asked about the environmental impacts of tourism (pp. 47-48), the most frequent specific impact mentioned was impacts to archeological resources (15%; $n = 5$). Despite the current concern for, and future protection of San Juan County's archeological sites, the community leaders also recognize that this as an important resource with the potential to attract tourists and generate economic growth. When respondents were asked what development they would promote, the third most frequent response was "Archeological Sites" (15%; $n = 5$) (pp. 58-61). This was one of the more frequent responses, ranked only behind "Events and Festivals" (21%; $n = 7$), and "Organized Tours" (21%; $n = 7$), the latter of which would likely include a substantial focus on archaeological resources.

Respondents from different communities appear to have somewhat different opinions in their responses to this interview question (Table 39). As

previously discussed, this may be the result of the different attitudes or different levels of support for the industry within different communities. These differences may also be the result of the different potentials for tourism development, different perceived opportunities, or different attractions and/or facilities possessed by, or proximate to, individual communities.

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This study was undertaken in order to gain a better understanding of the perceptions of tourism and tourism development among San Juan County leaders and other influential citizens. Improved understanding may prove helpful to the county in planning for a growing tourism industry and attaining their tourism development objectives by maximizing economic benefits and minimizing negative impacts. The authors hope the recommendations also prove useful for other rural communities with similar tourism situations. Three research objectives were established in order to achieve these goals:

Objective 1. Examine the extent to which rural leaders in San Juan County, Utah, perceive tourism and tourism development's effects on:

- (a) current economic activity;*
- (b) the local society and environment (both positive and negative); and*
- (c) the future vitality of the county and its residents.*

Objective 2. Examine the issues of tourism and tourism development initiatives and projects in order to understand the current direction of the county's tourism development objectives, and to evaluate the success of these tourism development initiatives and projects.

Objective 3. Provide recommendations, which may give insights to help in the development of a successful tourism management plan based on common objectives expressed by the respondents.

Research objectives one and two will be described in the remainder of this chapter. Chapter 5 will deal with Objective 3: Conclusion and Recommendations.

Respondents' Perceptions of Tourism's Impacts

The first research objective was to *Examine the extent to which rural leaders in San Juan County, Utah, perceive tourism and tourism development's effect on current economic activity, impacts on the local society and environment (both positive and negative), and the future vitality of the county and its residents.* In this study, we have recorded the perceptions of community leaders and other influential community members on the assumption that these perceptions are reasonably indicative of the communities as a whole. Respondents' perceptions are particularly important to capture because of their role in policy making and implementation. Without the interest, support, and involvement of those who are influential in local policies, initiatives, and projects, the eventual success of rural tourism development efforts becomes questionable. Ideally, the community development efforts of these leaders should be representative of, and in the best interest of, their fellow citizens. Through respondents' perceptions, San Juan County can, we hope, more appropriately determine which changes are appropriate and inappropriate in their planning and tourism development processes.

Respondents' Perceptions of Tourism's Current Economic Impacts

In general, local leaders participating in this study thought of tourism as a mostly beneficial influence, and describe it as a powerful economic force and an important component of the county's economy and employment base. In order to emphasize this perception of tourism's economic importance, it is useful to reexamine responses to several economic questions. Prior to researchers querying respondents about tourism or even mentioning it, respondents were asked what the major elements in San Juan County's economic base were. Tourism was the most frequent response (82%; $n = 27$). This method was used in order to ascertain the perceptions of respondents without the possibility of bias being introduced by the tourism-centered context of the remainder of the interview or by the suggestion of researchers.

When the topic of tourism was addressed directly, respondents were asked about the economic results or impacts of tourism in San Juan County. Responses were mostly positive, with 2.7 positive responses for every negative comment. The three most frequent responses, which account for 36 total responses, were "Tourism Helps the Economy" ($n = 23$), followed by "It Increases Employment" ($n = 10$), and "It Increases Tax Revenues" ($n = 3$).

In general, San Juan County leaders view tourism's economic role as both positive and important. They generally believe the industry is currently contributing a significant amount to the county's economy. Respondents also tended to believe tourism is increasing employment and increasing county tax revenue.

Respondents' Perceptions of Tourism's Social Impacts

Social benefits were much more recognized than negative social impacts of tourism. For every three positive social impacts, only one negative social impact was mentioned. Respondents discussed a diverse set of social benefits. While twelve respondents offered 18 specific responses describing positive social impacts, only five of these reiterated similar specific ideas of other respondents. The three most frequent were each referenced only three times. These are: "Improved Services" ($n = 3$), "Native American Stability" ($n = 3$) (economic and cultural sustainability of Native Americans), and "Future Vitality" ($n = 3$). In all, only three different negative social responses were given (by four respondents), one of which was mentioned twice. These were "Threatens Way of Life" ($n = 2$), "Increases Traffic" ($n = 1$), and "Arrowhead Collection" ($n = 1$).

Respondents' Perceptions of Tourism's Environmental Impacts

By a ratio of almost two to one (16:9), respondents perceived that tourism has insignificant effects on the natural environment ($n = 16$). Nine respondents discussed some type of negative effect on the natural environment. Impacts nonspecifically described by respondents were categorized by researchers as "General Impacts" and make up the largest category of negative environmental impact responses ($n = 7$). Of the environmental impacts given, only two specific types were mentioned more than once—"Impacts to Archaeological Sites" ($n = 5$) and "Impacts Resulting from OHV & ATV Use" ($n = 4$).

*Respondents' Perceptions of Tourism's
Role in the Future Vitality of the County
and Its Residents*

Possibly the Economic Question that lent the greatest insight into respondents' tourism perceptions was: *In your opinion, what is the future role of tourism in San Juan County's economy?* Overall, the clear majority of respondents (26 of 32 respondents for whom data was available) were at least somewhat optimistic about the future economic role of tourism in the county. The three most frequent responses to the question were: "Increasing Importance" ($n = 14$), "Inevitable Growth" ($n = 12$), and "Good/Very Good Thing" ($n = 4$). These three responses account for well over three quarters of the total number of responses given. The responses "Increasing Importance" and "Good/Very Good Thing" show the value respondents place on tourism's future economic contribution. The second most popular response, "Inevitable Growth," indicates that these respondents believe the tourism industry will grow whether residents want it to or not. From responses to various interview questions, this seems to be a very common perception.

The fact that community leaders overwhelmingly believe that tourism either will grow, or has the potential to grow, highlights the importance of planning to ensure this growth takes place in a desirable manner. This is true regardless of whether the growth is seen as an inevitable eventuality or an opportunity of which to take advantage. Even if San Juan County leaders express a desire not to promote tourism, and therefore do not support the development of the tourism industry, the fact the industry growth is perceived to

be inevitable illustrates the need to at least plan for the growth so it can be steered in the best possible directions.

Several questions asked during the interviews elaborate on the potential for future tourism growth in San Juan County. First, respondents were asked: *Do the county's attractions have the drawing power to attract more tourists?* The answer to this question was overwhelmingly "Yes" ($n = 28$), with a single "No" response ($n = 1$). With such a high degree of consensus on this point, it can be inferred that the resources to attract more tourists do exist in San Juan County.

One possible obstacle to tourism development in San Juan County, however, may be residents' attitudes toward the industry. In an attempt to understand how community leaders perceive residents' attitudes, respondents were asked, *Is the citizenry of the county prepared to support tourism by extending hospitality to visitors and by absorbing certain tourism-related costs?* Responses to this question were more closely divided, with 50% of respondents ($n = 16$) indicating "Yes" and 28% of respondents ($n = 9$) saying "No." The vast majority of respondents, however, did not indicate that they themselves were not supportive of tourism and its development, but instead alluded to "certain people" who were not supportive. Fear of changes in their community was often cited as the reason why these "certain people" were not supportive.

To further understand what might hinder the development of the tourism industry, respondents were asked what would inhibit the type of tourism development they would like to see occur. The most frequent response to this question was residents' attitudes ($n = 7$), which was mentioned almost twice as

frequently as the second most frequent responses, which were a lack of promotion ($n = 4$) and alcohol regulations ($n = 4$). Those who mentioned attitudes, went on to identify the attitudes of various groups that would encumber tourism development. Nevertheless, most of the respondents themselves expressed their support for increased tourism and its future development.

When asked what would help positive tourism development, better multi-agency awareness and cooperation was the only response mentioned by more than one respondent ($n = 3$). Both the small number of responses and the lack of consensus on this question imply county leaders may not have a firm grasp on means of assisting the development of a local tourism industry. Because the answer "Multi-Agency Awareness and Cooperation" did, however, come from three different respondents within three different communities, this may be indicative of a county-wide need.

In a related line of questioning, respondents were asked: *What is the ideal for which to strive in terms of tourism-related development?* "Protection of the Land and Cultural or Archeological Resources" (19%; $n = 6$) was the most frequent response and was mentioned twice as often as any other single category of responses to this question. The other most frequent response categories were: "Control Growth" (9%; $n = 3$), "Provide Diverse Tourism Opportunities" (9%; $n = 3$), "Infrastructure" (9%; $n = 3$), and "Not Moab" (9%; $n = 3$). Of these five most frequent response categories, four are related to protection, control, and infrastructure needs. Many respondents—and perhaps residents as a whole—were concerned about the preservation of the small town

character and protection the area's natural, social, cultural, and archeological resources by maintaining some degree of control over the tourism industry. It is not surprising that protection of archeological resources is of such concern, as impacts on archeological resources were also the most frequently mentioned specific type of environmental impact (pp. 47-48).

Summary

Respondents had a generally positive perception of tourism and the tourism industry, showed general support for future tourism development, and were optimistic about the future role of tourism in the county.

According to respondents:

- Tourism provides positive economic benefits.
- Tourism provides mostly positive social benefits.
- Most respondents don't recognize serious negative environmental impacts resulting from the tourism industry.
- The future role of tourism in San Juan County is important.
- The tourism industry is perceived to be growing.
- The county's attractions have the drawing power to attract more tourists.
- Despite the respondents' support for tourism, at least some groups of San Juan County residents may not be as supportive of tourism and its future development.
- Some residents' lack of support for tourism may be related to attitudes and especially their fears of changes to their communities.

- Consensus is lacking on actions that would help the development of a tourism industry, although better multi-agency awareness and cooperation was the most frequently mentioned developmental approach needed.

Tourism and Tourism Development Initiatives and Projects

The second research objective was to *examine the issues of tourism and tourism development initiatives and projects in order to understand the current direction of the county's tourism development objectives, and to evaluate the success of these tourism development initiatives and projects*. This objective was originally intended to be a major focus of the research. However, due to the initial lack of responses to these questions, 15 tourism development project follow-up questions were dropped from the interview instrument after the first several interviews were conducted (see Appendix, question 10, p. 102). Nevertheless, several tourism development project questions were still asked but due to the lack of consensus in the responses given, an in-depth examination of this research objective was not possible.

Prior to the topic of tourism being addressed, respondents were asked: *Within the last five to ten years, have there been any economic revitalization efforts in the county of which you are aware?* Fifty-five percent ($n = 18$) of respondents described some form of effort. Non-tourism efforts were mentioned by 33% of respondents ($n = 11$), and tourism-related efforts were given by 30% ($n = 10$) (some respondents mentioned both). Of the 15 non-tourism-related efforts mentioned by these 11 respondents, only four different types were

mentioned. In all, respondents mentioned ten different tourism-related efforts, with only two receiving multiple responses (Table 4 on p. 32). Many different tourism-related efforts were mentioned but little consensus appears to exist, given that so few of these efforts was mentioned by more than one respondent. This may indicate that non-tourism-related efforts are what residents more collectively identified as “economic revitalization efforts” since a greater degree of consensus appears to exist on these.

After the topic of tourism was addressed by interviewers, respondents were asked to identify any specific tourism-related San Juan County development projects or efforts that they knew of undertaken over the previous ten years. Respondents identified 31 different efforts but these revealed very little consensus. Of the 31 efforts described by respondents, 13 were mentioned only once and nine were mentioned twice. Also, of the 31 different efforts mentioned, only one was mentioned by respondents in more than one community. This was the construction of the Multi-Agency Visitor Center in Monticello, which was mentioned by leaders in three different communities. The fact there were 31 different efforts mentioned and only one of the efforts was mentioned in more than one community may indicate different communities rarely work together on tourism development projects and may not even be aware of each other’s actions in this regard.

Researchers also asked respondents specifically about the kinds of cooperation that occur around tourism development in San Juan County. Even though 94% ($n = 31$) of the respondents indicated cooperation does exist, when

probed, only 34% ($n = 11$) were able to name a specific cooperative project. Of the nine different specific projects described, only two were mentioned by leaders within two different communities. These were the efforts of the San Juan County Tourism Board and the construction of the Multi-Agency Visitor Center in Monticello, both of which were mentioned twice by respondents in one community and once by a respondent in another.

Despite the fact nearly all of the respondents believe cooperation exists, as well as statements from many saying cooperation is needed for ideal development, nearly two out of three are unable to identify examples of cooperation in the county. Furthermore, when specific efforts are mentioned, there was very little discussion of the same efforts among different communities. These results indicate there may not be very many cooperative efforts being undertaken by community leaders, and even fewer efforts taking place between different communities in the county.

The main points identified based on respondents perceptions of tourism and tourism development initiatives and projects in San Juan County are:

- Very little consensus exists regarding types of tourism development projects being undertaken or on the parties participating in them.
- Even less consensus exists regarding tourism development projects among respondents from different communities. This may be indicative of a lack of cooperative efforts between different communities.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Objective 3: Provide conclusions and recommendations, which may give insights to help in the development of a successful tourism management plan based on common objectives expressed by the respondents.

As previously stated, this study was intended to assist San Juan County communities in planning for a growing tourism industry by providing recommendations based on an analysis of rural leaders' perceptions and stated objectives. The authors hope the recommendations will help to both maximize economic benefits and minimize negative environmental and social impacts. This chapter attempts to address Objective 3, above, using results obtained in addressing the first two research objectives. Central to questions of future tourism development are the issues raised by differences between the attitudes and perceptions of shorter- and longer-term residents, particularities of each community, the challenge of maintaining an acceptable sense of community or "small town" identity, and potential conflict between promotion of the area's natural and archaeological/cultural resources while at the same time preserving and protecting them. Ideally, a sustainable tourism management plan should address these issues in a manner that is "ecologically sustainable, economically viable, and socially acceptable" (Gilmore, 1997, p. 562).

Differences in responses received from respondents in different communities hint at probable differences in the desirability of tourism growth and

promotion in the residents of these locations. Potentially substantial differences in perceptions were present between the demographic groups examined in this study on many of the interview questions posed. In developing plans for the future development of the tourism industry, planners would be well served by considering public input and involving the populace throughout the planning process. This would help to ensure the diversity of opinions present are both heard and considered.

Recommendation 1: Obtain a Better Understanding of Residents' Perceptions of Tourism and Tourism Development

While respondents were generally supportive of tourism development and the tourism industry, they also expressed some concerns about its growth. Many respondents also perceived that some, if not many, residents of San Juan County are not entirely supportive of tourism and its future development. On several of the study questions, respondents implied that various groups of people, or people located in certain regions of the county, were not supportive.

Many respondents perceived that county residents' attitudes could potentially inhibit the development of a tourism industry in San Juan County. The differing degrees of support and negative attitudes toward the industry were often perceived to be the result of a fear of the changes that might result from outside visitation. When respondents spoke of unwanted changes, they often referred to the importance the residents place on their "small town character" or way of life. These results corroborate Hester's (1985) contention that a fear of change and

consequential opposition to increased tourism and tourism development is a common attitude found among rural residents.

When community leaders perceive certain residents are not as supportive of tourism and its future development, this of course merely represents their *perceptions* of other residents' attitudes and opinions. For tourism planning to be successful, it would benefit from a basis in stakeholders' actual development and management objectives for the industry, and not merely the perceptions of a small, though important, subgroup. Since respondents did not show any real consensus on residents' overall perceptions of tourism, it would be difficult to characterize residents' objectives or goals for compatibility with, support of, and even awareness of tourism.

Because of this, the first recommendation to come out of this study is to obtain a better understanding of *residents'* perceptions of tourism and tourism development in San Juan County. This could be achieved through surveys of residents—perhaps attached to utility bills or by a similar means in order to reduce cost. Participatory processes such as community meetings may present an even more effective means of obtaining this information. Use of an outside facilitator may make meetings more effective by ensuring the public is comfortable divulging opinions and perceptions about these subjects. These meetings would be most effective at a community, rather than county-wide, level. A concerted effort to involve both Navajo tribal officials and members would also be necessary given that this represents a separate governmental entity with a

stake in county tourism development. This is also particularly important because of a lack of Navajo participation in past efforts noted by interview respondents.

Such meetings might focus on issues such as groups of people or regions and communities within the county that are more and less supportive of tourism development and the development of specific, broadly acceptable objectives. These processes would also be well served by attempting to ascertain and establish acceptable and unacceptable levels of changes—particularly social changes—among these groups or regions.

Recommendation 2: Improved Communication, Cooperation, and Collaboration

We also recommend that tourism planning entities within San Juan County improve communication, cooperation, and collaboration with others who have a stake in tourism development. This recommendation stems, in part, from the first recommendation—that of obtaining a better understanding of residents' perceptions of tourism and tourism development. We believe this will occur through improved communication. This understanding could be used to increase awareness of potential tourism development goals and impacts among citizenry. This, in turn, could be used to facilitate collaborative approaches to tourism development planning. Broader awareness may help tourism entrepreneurs and tourism development officials identify collaborative marketing opportunities where similar tourism development objectives are found.

Analysis of this interview data implied that significant differences in opinion exist on this matter within San Juan County. This, coupled with the apparent lack

of communication between tourism stakeholders, makes it extremely difficult to provide any specific county-wide tourism development and management recommendations. Examples from the data that illustrate this apparent lack of communication and collaboration with regard to respondents from different locations can be found in discussion of respondents' perceptions of problems with tourism (Table 7, p. 36), perceptions of cooperation (Table 10, p. 39), and positive and negative economic impacts of tourism (Table 15, p. 44). Most notably, respondents' perceptions of residents' support for growth in the tourism industry (Table 36, p. 66) displayed responses ranging from high levels of support to unanimous opposition.

Shorter- and longer-term residents of the county display some of the most notable areas of divergent perceptions. Examples of this can be seen in the questions through responses dealing with economic revitalization efforts (Table 6, p. 34), the increasing importance of tourism (Table 24, p. 53), the need for economic diversification beyond tourism (pp. 53-54), and attempts to promote tourism (Table 28, p. 58). Particularly, different preferences for the promotion of tourism development (Tables 30 and 31, p. 59) highlight this.

Differences in responses also appeared when analyses separated respondents based on occupation and affiliation. Some of the most frequent and largest magnitude differences appeared between Public Officials in Non-Tourism-Related Positions, representing mayors, city and county commissioners, and councilmen, and the Private Tourism-Related occupational group, made up of motel owners, tour guide operators, and those who make their living directly in

the tourism industry. On nearly every question, these two groups' responses varied considerably from one another. Examples are most apparent in discussion of local economics (Table 3, p. 29), the economic role of tourism (Table 8, p. 37), specific tourism-related development projects (Table 14, p. 43), actions that would assist the development of the tourism industry (Table 35, p. 65), and resident support for tourism development (Table 38, p. 68). This suggests that more open lines of communication may need to be opened between county officials and tourism-dependent business operators.

Respondents from three different communities ($n = 3$, one per community) stated that collaboration between agencies would be helpful for further tourism development in San Juan County. Despite the fact that only three respondents mentioned this, it was, in fact, the most frequent response to the interviewer's query regarding actions that would be helpful for tourism development (pp. 63-63).

This recommendation for improved communication, cooperation, and collaboration may best be justified by respondents' stated desire to protect the county's small town character, natural environment, and cultural/archaeological resources. The complexity of balancing these goals with a growing tourism industry seems likely to require a substantial amount of county-wide cooperative effort, especially given the variety of locations, stakeholders, and overseeing agencies involved. An integral part of this recommendation is the inclusion of, and open engagement with, San Juan County residents regarding tourism and tourism development. This was discussed in recommendation one but the

authors wish to stress the importance of continuous public involvement in the planning process.

Recommendation 3: Identification of Residents' Visions of the Tourism Industry and the use of Special Places as a Planning Tool

The third and final recommendation is identification of residents' vision of the tourism industry and special or sacred places as a planning tool. This recommendation is an extension of suggestions in the previous recommendations. The specific recommendation that planning involve identification of residents' vision of the tourism industry and of residents' "special places" is intended to allow for the development of a plan to meet stated development and management goals while protecting things and places identified as important to residents. This type of approach is particularly important in light of concerns about county residents' support for tourism and tourism development.

Respondents described differing abundances of tourism-related facilities—lodging, restaurants, etc.—in different San Juan County communities. The quality and quantity of resources and facilities within certain areas at least partially dictates the amount of tourism that can be accommodated. As a result, when respondents from different communities were asked what development they would promote some differences emerged, particularly involving archaeological resources which may not be proximate to all localities (Table 27, p. 57).

Identification of tourism development goals at specific locations could allow for the development of individual tourism management plans catered to that group of residents' needs. Smaller communities with specific resources and facilities to attract tourists can focus their management objectives on these features. This has been called the identification of "cluster packages" (Murphy and Keller, 1990, p. 50). Cluster packages are specific local tourist attractions that are promoted in a larger package with other regional attractions. If, as asserted by some respondents, residents in specific communities are not in favor of additional tourism, they may choose not to promote proximate sites within a larger promotional package of regional attractions. This type of micro-regional management allows for the consideration of the diverse range of tourism-related, community-specific goals. This management strategy could also provide a diverse range of tourism opportunities for visitors, thus appealing to a broader base of potential clientele.

Several respondents identified residents' fear of change as a cause of a lack of support for tourism development (nine of 33 respondents reported overall opposition in their communities; see p. 66). In addressing this concern, identification and protection of an area's special places by the local residents has proven successful in other areas in guiding tourism management. Hester (1985) explains how, through a collaborative effort, community members in Manteo, North Carolina, created a list of places and objects considered "sacred." During the planning and development of the local tourism industry, these special or sacred places were consciously protected by promoting other, less significant,

places and objects. Krannich and Petrzelka (2003, p. 198) paraphrase Hester's claims stating, "Identification and protection of these sacred structures helped preserve the local culture while simultaneously providing a foundation for new development." Finding the balance between stimulating San Juan County's economy and preserving important qualities and features is clearly a difficult endeavor, but more and more, there are successful examples of similar efforts.

Through the identification of what is special and/or in need of particular protection, visitors can be redirected to more appropriate areas through marketing in regional packages. These marketed, higher-use destinations can serve as "designated high density areas" for the protection of more locally sensitive special places. The designated high visitation areas may be more accessible, already well known, or contain more (or more developed) facilities for higher levels of use. This strategy may also help strike a balance between the marketing and protection of area attractions.

Outside assistance may be able to greatly enhance collaborative efforts geared toward appropriate tourism development focused on marketing of San Juan County attractions. State resources may be available through agencies and programs such as the Utah Office of Tourism, Governor's Office of Economic Development, or State of Utah Cooperative Program. Such efforts should begin, however, with public involvement and input in order to identify goals for tourism development. Collaboration should also occur with federal land management agencies (U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and National Park Service), and state agencies, such as the Division of Parks and Recreation (Utah

State Parks) and the Division of Wildlife Resources, who manage attractions and resources in San Juan County, and Navajo Nation land management and development agencies.

REFERENCES

- Auerbach, C.F. & Silverstein, L.B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York, NY: New York University.
- Burr, S.W. (1994). *An examination of the rural action class perceptions of rural tourism and tourism-related development in relation to their sense of place*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Gilmore, D.W. (1997). Ecosystem management—A needs driven, resource-use philosophy. *The Forestry Chronicle*, 73(5), 560-563.
- Hester, R. (1985). Subconscious landscape of the heart. *Places: A Quarterly Journal of Environmental Design*, 2(3), 10-22.
- Huberman, M.A., & Miles, M.B. (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krannich, R.S., & Petrzela, P. (2003). Tourism and natural amenity development. In D.L. Brown & L.E. Swanson (Eds.), *Challenges for rural America in the twenty-first century* (pp. 190-199). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Maryboy, N.C. & Begay, D. (2000). The Navajos of Utah. In F.S. Cuch (Ed.), *A History of Utah's American Indians*. Logan, UT: Utah State University.
- McPherson, R.S. (1995). *A history of San Juan County: In the palm of time*. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Historical Society.
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 191-204.
- Murphy, P.E. (1983). Perceptions and attitudes of decision making groups in tourism centers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 21(3), 8-12.
- Murphy, P.E., & Keller, A. (1990). Destination travel patterns: An examination and modeling of tourist patterns on Vancouver Island, British Columbia. *Leisure Sciences*, 12, 49-56.
- Navajo Nation Department of Information Technology. (2005). Official site of the Navajo Nation: History [online]. Available at <http://www.navajo.org/history.htm>

- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8-12.
- Power, T.M. (1996). *Lost landscapes and failed economies: The search for a value of place*. Washington, D.C.: Island.
- Purdue, R.R., Long, P.T., & Allen, L.R. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599.
- Richards, L. (2000). *Using NVivo in qualitative research*. Victoria, Australia: QSR NVivo International.
- Rothman, H.K. (1998). *Devil's Bargains: Tourism in the twentieth-century American west*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.
- True, J.A. (1983). *Finding out: Conducting and evaluating social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.). Quick Facts: U.S. Census Bureau Homepage [online]. Available at <http://www.quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html>
- USDA Economic Research Service (2005). Data Sets: County-Level Unemployment and Median Household Income for Utah [online]. Available at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/Unemployment/RDList2.asp?ST=UT&SF=11A>
- Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (2003). San Juan County Profile. Salt Lake City, UT: Author.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, L.R., Hafer, H.R., Long, P.T., & Purdue, R.R. (1993). Rural resident's attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research, 31*(4), 27-33.
- Allen, L.R., Purdue, R.R., Long, P.T., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impacts of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life. *Journal of Travel Research, 27*(1), 16-21.
- Andereck, K.L., & Vogt, C.A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*, 27-36.
- Ap, J. (1990). Residents' perceptions research on the social impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 610-616.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research, 19*(3), 665-690.
- Auerbach, C.F. & Silverstein, L.B. (2003). *Qualitative data: An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York, NY: New York University.
- Belisle, F., & Hoy, D. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents. *Annals of Tourism Research, 7*(1), 83-101.
- Brown, D.M. (n.d.). Rural tourism: An annotated bibliography [online]. Available at http://www.nal.usda.gov/ric/ricpubs/rural_tourism.html
- Burr, S.W. (1994). An examination of the rural action class perceptions of rural tourism and tourism-related development in relation to their sense of place. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Castleton, K.B. (1987). *Petroglyphs and pictographs of Utah volume two: The South, Central, West, and Northwest*. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah Museum of Natural History.
- Chubb, M., & Chubb, H.R. (1981). *One third of our time: Introduction to recreation behavior and resources*. New York, NY: Wiley.

- Eisenhauer, B.W., Krannich, R.S., & Blahna, D.J. (2000). Attachment to special places on public lands: An analysis of activities, reasons for attachments, and community connections. *Society & Natural Resources*, 13, 421-441.
- Fleming, W.R., & Toepper, L. (1990). Economic impact studies: Relating the positive and the negative impacts to tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, Summer, 35-41.
- Fredrickson, L. (2002). The importance of visitors' knowledge of the cultural and natural history of the Adirondacks in influencing sense of place in the High Peaks region. In S. Todd (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 2001 Northeast Recreation Research Symposium* (pp. 346-355) (Gen. Tech. Report NE-289). Newtown Square, PA: USDA Forest Service Northeastern Research Station.
- Freitag, T.G. (1994). Enclave tourism development: For whom the benefits roll? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 538-553.
- Gilmore, D.W. (1997). Ecosystem management—A needs driven, resource-use philosophy. *The Forestry Chronicle*, 73(5), 560-563.
- Greider, T., & Garkovich, L. (1994). Landscapes: The social construction of nature and the environment. *Rural Sociology*, 59(1), 1-24.
- Haralambopolous, N., & Pizam, A. (1996). The case of Samoas. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, 503-526.
- Hedden, B. (1994). Towns angling for tourism should be aware of the great white shark. *High Country News*. Available at http://www.hcn.org/servlets/hcn.PrintableArticle?article_id542.
- Hester, R. (1985). Subconscious landscape of the heart. *Places: A Quarterly Journal of Environmental Design*, 2(3), 10-22.
- Huberman, M.A., & Miles, M.B. (2002). *The qualitative researcher's companion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jacob, G.R., & Schreyer, R. (1980). Conflict in outdoor recreation: A theoretical perspective. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12, 368-380.
- Jafari, J. (1986). A systematic view of sociocultural dimensions of tourism. In *President's Commission on American Outdoors: Tourism* (pp. 33-50). Washington, D.C.: United States Travel and Tourism Administration.
- Jafari, J., A. Pizman, & Przeclawski, K. (1990). A sociocultural study for tourism as a factor of change. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 469-72.

- Johnson, J.D., Snepenger, D.J., & Akis, K. (1994). Residents' perception of tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 629-642.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D.R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(2), 3-11.
- King, B.A., A. Pizman, & Milman, A. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 650-65.
- Krannich, R.S., & Petrzela, P. (2003). Tourism and natural amenity development. In D.L. Brown & L.E. Swanson (Eds.), *Challenges for rural America in the twenty-first century* (pp. 190-199). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.
- Leatherman, J.C., & Marcouiller, D.W. (1996). Income distribution characteristics of rural sectors: Implications for local development policy. *Growth & Change*, 27(4), 434-460.
- Lewis, J.B. (1998). The development of rural tourism. *Parks and Recreation*, 33(9), 1-6.
- Liu, J., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 193-214.
- Long, P.T., & Nuckolls, S.J. (1994). Organizing resources for rural tourism development: The importance of leadership, planning and technical assistance. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 19(2), 19-34.
- Maryboy, N.C. & Begay, D. (2000). The Navajos of Utah. In F.S. Cuch (Ed.), *A History of Utah's American Indians*. Logan, UT: Utah State University.
- Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391-411.
- McCool, S.F., & Martin, S.R. (1994). Community attachment and attitudes toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(3), 29-34.
- McPherson, R.S. (1995). *A history of San Juan County: In the palm of time*. Salt Lake City, UT: Utah State Historical Society.
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 191-204.
- Murphy, P.E. (1983). Perceptions and attitudes of decision making groups in tourism centers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 21(3), 8-12.

- Murphy, P.E., & Keller, A. (1990). Destination travel patterns: An examination and modeling of tourist patterns on Vancouver Island, British Columbia. *Leisure Sciences, 12*, 49-56.
- Muth, M.R., & Hendee, J.C. (1980). Technology transfer and human behavior. *Journal of Forestry, 78*, 141-144.
- Navajo Nation Department of Information Technology. (2005). Official site of the Navajo Nation [online]. Available at <http://www.navajo.org/>
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research, 16*(4), 8-12.
- Power, T.M. (1996). *Lost Landscapes and Failed Economies: The search for a value of place*. Washington, D.C.: Island.
- Power, T.M. (1996). Soul of the wilderness: Wilderness economics must look through the windshield, not the rear view mirror. *International Journal of Wilderness, 2*(1), 5- 9.
- Purdue, R.R., Long, P.T., & Allen, L.R. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 586-599.
- Richards, L. (2000). *Using NVivo in qualitative research*. Victoria, Australia: QSR NVivo International.
- Richards, R.T., & Brod, R.L. (2004). Community support for a gold cyanide mine: Resident and leader differences in rural Montana. *Rural Sociology, 69*(4), 552-575.
- Rothman, H.K. (1998). *Devil's Bargains: Tourism in the twentieth-century American west*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.
- Schindler, D.E., Geib, S.I., & Williams, M.R. (2000). Patterns of fish growth along a residential development gradient in north temperate lakes. *Ecosystems, 0*, 1-10.
- Smith, M.D. & Krannich, R.S. (2000). "Culture clash" revisited: Newcomer and longer-term residents' attitudes toward land use, development, and environmental issues in rural communities in the Rocky Mountain West. *Rural Sociology, 65*(3), 396-421.
- Snaith, T., & Haley, A.J. (1995). Tourism's impact on host lifestyle realities. In A.V. Seaton (Ed.), *Tourism, the state of the art* (pp. 826-835). New York: Wiley.

- Spies, S., Murdock, S.H., White, S., Krannich, R.S., Wulfhorst, J.D., Wrigley, K., Leistritz, F.L., Sell, R., & Thompson, J. (1998). Support for waste facility siting: Differences between community leaders and residents. *Rural Sociology*, 63(1), 65-93.
- Stynes, D.J. (2000). Economic impacts of tourism [online]. Available at <http://www.msu.edu/course/prr/840/econimpact/>
- Travel Industry Association of America. (2001). Rural tourism: Small towns and villages appeal to U.S. travelers [online]. Web site: Available at <http://www.tia.org/Press/pressrec.asp?Item=111>
- True, J.A. (1983). *Finding out: Conducting and evaluating social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Tuan, Y.F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- U.S. Census Bureau (n.d.). Quick Facts: U.S. Census Bureau Homepage [online]. Available at <http://www.quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/index.html>
- USDA Economic Research Service (n.d.). USDA Economic Research Service homepage [online]. Available at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/>
- Utah Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (2003). *San Juan County Profile*. Salt Lake City, UT: Author.

APPENDIX INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Introduction

I would like to begin by thanking you for agreeing to meet with me. I am working on a research project for Utah State University, and we are interested in learning about the extent to which several rural Utah counties, in this case, _____ County, have utilized different development efforts directed toward economic revitalization, and to determine how such strategies can be maximized in the future. Because of your position, knowledge, and involvement in the county, we are very interested in your ideas, perspectives, and insights on this subject.

The information you provide will be used only for our research. Your name will be included as one of the sources of information for the project. All information you give will be attributed to you, unless you specifically request that certain information be kept confidential or anonymous. In such a case, you can be assured of complete confidentiality. The findings of this research project may be used to develop policy initiatives for state agencies that will assist rural areas in assessing and developing their economies.

If you would like additional information about this study, the person to contact is the project director: Dr. Steven W. Burr, Department of Forest Resources, Utah State University, 5215 Old Main Hill, Logan, UT 84322-5215; Telephone: (435) 797-7094.

First, I need to get some background information:

Name:

Address:

Telephone Number:

E-mail Address:

Organizational Affiliation:

Organizational Position:

Organizational Information:

Length of time in this position:

Length of residence in the county:

Previous Residence:

How long?

Distance?

Rural, urban, or suburban?

Educational Background:

Next,

I would like to ask you some questions about your general perceptions of life here as a resident.

0. a. What can you tell me about this place in which you live?
(Let respondent define any of the following as “this place:” community, communities, county, region, state)
- b. Do you think this place is unique or distinctive in any ways?
If so, what is unique or distinctive?

How widely held is this perspective among other residents in this place?

Now, in your opinion as _____ (vocational/avocational position from above)

1. a. What are the major elements in _____ County’s economic base?
- b. Who are the primary employers in the county?
- c. What is the present economic situation in the county?
2. Within the last five to ten years, have there been any economic revitalization efforts in the county of which you are aware?
3. Within the last ten years, how has _____ County changed?
(economy, population, age cohorts, local society, land use, quality of life, environment, etc.)
4. a. What is the role of tourism in this county’s economy?

OR—if tourism was mentioned above as a major element in the county’s economic base,

- b. What types of tourism are present in the county?
5. a. In your opinion, what are the key tourist attractions in _____ County?
- b. Do tourists typically visit more than one of these attractions during their visit?
If so, how many attractions do they visit?
What is the typical pattern of their visitation?
6. In your opinion, what are the key visitor services in _____ County?

7. a. Who are the “typical” tourists coming to _____ County?
 Where do the tourists come from? Distance traveled?
 How do tourists find out about your county?
 What experiences and benefits do tourists seek in _____ County?
- b. What is the tourists’ image of _____ County?
8. a. Have there been any conscious efforts that you know of to *market or promote* the unique or distinctive features in your county with respect to tourism?
 If so, at what level?
- b. Have there been any conscious efforts that you know of to *protect or preserve* the unique or distinctive features in your county with respect to tourism?
 If so, at what level?
9. What kinds of cooperation occur around tourism development in _____ County?
10. a. Identify any specific tourism-related development projects or efforts that you know of undertaken over the past ten years in _____ County?
- b. For each project/effort:
1. What were the project’s objectives?
 2. How was the project administered and managed?
 3. Who were the people involved and what were their tasks/roles?
 4. What was the time frame for the project?
 5. What was the cost-estimate for the project and how was it funded?
 6. What were the marketing-promotion efforts or components?
 7. The results to date?
- c. For each project or effort you’ve identified, what role have the following taken in the county?
1. federal government
 2. state government
 3. regional/multi-county organizations
 4. county government
 5. local government
 6. Chamber of Commerce/Travel Councils
 7. Other community organizations?
- d. How can I reach the primary actors in these efforts in order to personally contact them for further information?
 (Want names, addresses, telephone numbers)

11. a. What have been the results or impacts of tourism in _____ County?

To the residents of the county?

To the communities in the county?

To the county's economy?

To the environment of the county?

b. Do you know if there is a County Conservation and Development Plan which takes tourism development into account?

If yes, what is involved with the tourism development component?

The following questions ask about the future role of tourism in the county.

12. a. In your opinion, what is the future role of tourism in _____ County's economy?

Do the county's attractions have the drawing power to attract more tourists?

What attractions would you promote?

What potential do you see for additional tourism development?

What would you promote?

What would inhibit this type of development?

b. Is the citizenry of the county prepared to support tourism by extending hospitality to visitors and by absorbing certain tourism-related costs?

If yes, how? In what ways?

- Community attitudes towards change (e.g. population, traffic, social impact)
- Apathy/interest among local residents
- Political structure
- Availability of information and assistance for tourism development
- Promotion/marketing
- Fiscal feasibility
- Environmental impacts
- Infrastructure needs—transportation, services, and utilities
- Hospitality services—accommodations, food service, visitor information
- Other: _____

c. In your opinion, as a current of potential "host" county for tourism, what is the "ideal" for which to strive in terms of tourism-related development.

13. Is there anyone else in the county you could recommend for us to talk with regarding our interest in economic revitalization and tourism development efforts?

(Want name, address and telephone number)

Finally,

I would like to ask you a few more questions about your general perceptions of life here as a resident.

- 0. c. What is the meaning of this place for you?
- d. What is happening in this place that's important?
- e. What's really important to your quality of life in this place?
- f. How many and what percentage of your relatives would you say live in this place?
- g. How many and what percentage of your close friends would you say live in this place?
- h. Are you personally active in any group organizations or clubs in this place?
If so, what are the organizations and activities in which you actively participate?
- i. When you're not working, what do you like to do for recreation?
Are there any "special" places in this place where you like to recreate?
With whom do you usually recreate?
- j. Supposing for some reason you had to move away from this place.
How sorry or pleased would you be to leave?
What would it take to get you to leave this place?
Where would you go if you had to move away?
- k. Does this place define or shape your future?
Why or why not?
How? In what ways?

Will it be OK to get back in touch with you, if necessary, in order to verify any information? **If, yes**, ask the interviewee for his/her business card **or** make sure we have the correct address and telephone number.

PERSONAL NOTES

- a. In your own words, describe the person you've interviewed (age/gender) and what you perceive that person's role to be.
- b. Describe the interviewee's office or work place, if appropriate.
- c. Were there other office personnel present? If so, what are their roles?
- d. Other information, from your perspective, if appropriate.