

The Effects of Tourism on Quality of Life (A Case Study of Meshkinshahr)

¹Abolfazl Ghanbari, ²Robab Naghizadeh & ³Fereshteh Ahmadian

¹Associate Prof of University of Tabriz, Faculty of Geography and Planning, University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran

²M. A. Student in Geography and Tourism Planning, University of Tabriz, Iran

³M. A. Student in Geography and Tourism Planning, University of Tabriz, Iran

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 17 January 2018

Keywords

Quality of life, Tourism,
Meshkinshahr

*Corresponding Author

Email: fereshtehahmadian20@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Does tourism contribute to quality of life in tourism destinations? This study investigates the effect of tourism upon quality of life in Meshkinshahr. The study is an applied research based on the purpose. In terms of methodology, this study is a descriptive research. The survey instrument used in this research was a structure questionnaire, the validity and reliability of the survey was based on content validity, and Cronbach's Alpha value in SPSS Version 24. Also for the tourism impacts scale was 0.85 indicating good degree of reliability for the sample. According to the survey, quality of life in the city was poor. Moreover the local residents believe that tourism development would lead to the positive and negative outcomes on their quality of life, nevertheless they support tourism development.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is often viewed as an expression of human behavior (Kim, 2002). Harrill & Potts (2003, 233) believed that tourism is an invisible industry, encompassing transportation, loading, and entertainment. Tourism is the set of ideas, theories, or ideologies for being a tourist, and that it is the behavior of people in tourist roles, when these ideas are put into practice (Przeclawski, 1986). Once a community becomes a destination, the lives of residents in the community are affected by tourism, and the support of the residents is essential for the development, planning, successful operation and sustainability of tourism (Kim, 2002). In the beginning, the tourism industry was developed with the support of the residents who were involved in this industry. The residents play a pivotal role as the primary stakeholder in tourism development. The local community support is the key element in successful tourism development as tourism planners and other authorities engaged in the tourism industry have to be concerned with the communities' views on development plans. The involvement of communities is particularly crucial to the success of tourism development and the implementation of responsible tourism and the residents' attitude may directly affect the development of the tourism industry (Ling, Jakpar, Johari, Myint, & Rani, 2011). However, the central principle of community participation in planning the tourism development has been proven difficult to achieve (Shani & Pizam, 2012). The concept of quality of life was first used by Pigou, in 1920, however, it became widespread only in the 1950s. To determine what quality of life is we cannot find a uniform definition, it has been defined many times, e.g., by Godfrey (2002), Veenhoven (1996), Diener (1995). It occurs in the determinations that such factors are needed to the quality of life or to the increasing of it which contribute to people's social, economical and environmental welfare, therefore the improvement of these factors has to be emphasized (Gondos, 2014). Quality of life is the degree of well-being felt by an individual or group of people (Delibasic et al., 2008). Quality of life has been defined by World Health Organization (WHO) as individuals' perceptions of their position in life in

the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns (Skevington, Lotfy, & O'Connell, 2004).

Once a community becomes a tourist destination, the lives of residents in that community are affected by tourism economic, sociocultural, and environmental impact (Andereck et al., 2005; Harrill, 2004; Moscardo, 2009; Nunkoo & Smith, 2013; Sharpley, 2014; Sirakaya, Teye, & Sonmez, 2001). Therefore, a number of systematic approaches have been proposed to understand tourism impact on the host community; as a result, the impact of tourism has been historically the most researched area of tourism (Ap, 1992). Even though there are several types of tourism impact, the vast majority of the studies tends to fall into three domains: (1) economic (2) socio-cultural (3) physical and environmental (Sharpley, 2014). These three impact sets of studies have both positive and negative features; however, generally, residents recognize the positive economic impact of tourism development, but tend to be concerned with potentially negative social and environmental impact (Perdue, Long & Allen, 1990). Among tourism impact studies, the development of tourism impact measurement tools has also received much attention (Chen, 2000). Several studies successfully developed tools to measure resident attitudes toward tourism and its impact (Ap & Crompton, 1998). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development have been studied extensively (Gursoy et al., 2002). The reason is that perceptions and attitude of residents toward tourism development are important in planning and policymaking in relation to the successful development, marketing, and operation of existing and future tourism programs (Haywood, 1975). For tourism to thrive in a particular destination, any adverse impact has to be identified and measured in an effort to take corrective action (Ap, 1992). As such, many studies have investigated links between the tourism impact and attitudes toward tourism development by.

Tourism has an impact on economy, environment and society. The economic impact of tourism can make the population's life easier if we consider the touristic incomes. It

creates jobs, which generates income; as a result, the local standard of living can be raised, so they can travel in the future. Another feature is a great labor demand, which helps in reducing unemployment but can distract from other sectors, which is a negative factor. It ensures income for workers in the tourism sector, revenue in the form of various taxes (e.g. local tax) to the central budget and foreign exchange revenues are generated for the country as well. It can solve economic problems and stimulate the growth of other economic sectors. The environmental impact has both positive and negative sides. The positive side is to get to a new beautiful natural environment, landscapes which enjoy protection like national parks, while on the negative side there are territorial concentration (some places in the world try to limit the number of tourists, because of the sustainability e.g. Seychelles Island or Machu Picchu), reckless development and urbanization(Gondos,2014).

In the meanwhile, Iranian researchers in recent decades have studied effects of tourism development on the quality of life of the famous tourist destinations such as Shiraz, Ramsar, Tehran, etc. They, like previous studies, have confirmed significant and important effects of tourism development on the quality of life of locals in various aspectseconomic,socio-cultural, and environmental (Aref, 2011. Alipour Eshliki & Kaboudi 2012.Rezvani et al, 2012. Yeganeh et al, 2013). Moreover, simultaneous with increasing locals' awareness of the effects oftourism development (either positive or negative) and thus increasing their desire to attract tourists (either domestic or foreign) and on the otherhand raising the issue of sustainable tourism development in destinations, Iranian researchers have attempted to measure locals' willingness in tourism development(Zamani Farahani& Musa,2008. Rastegar, 2010. Foroughzadeh et al 2013).

The study area was Meshkinshahr City, located in the north-west of Iran and the nearest city to the Sabalan high mountain. The weather of the city and the district of Meshkinshahr is moderate mountainous. In the past it was referred to as "Khiav", "Orami", or"Varavi". The longest suspended footbridge of the world is located above the Khiav River. The most important places for touring in the district of Meshkinshahr are the following: - Meshkinshahr Suspended Footbridge - Sahar Yeri historical area - Hot water springs of

Moil, Eelando and Qaynarja located in the suburb of the city - Qara Soo River Sides - Water spring of Qotur Suie located 42 kilometers to Meshkinshahr - Old Castle of Meshkinshahr - Qahqaheh castle located 80 kilometers to Meshkinshahr - Deev castle located in kavij - Petrograph of Shapour Sasani in Meshkinshahr - Old cemetery in Oonar - Tomb of Sheykh Haydar in Meshkinshahr - Imamzadeh Seyyed Soleyman. Meshkinshahr City is passing from the involvement stage to the development stage (Zarabi & Eslami Parikhani, 2011). Undoubtedly, the development of tourism in this city is not far from environmental, socio-cultural, and economic influences on locals' quality of life (Zeinali, 2015). Therefore, the key issue is how the locals view these influences with regard to the present situation? In fact, for the first time, we decided to measure the of locals' attitude towards the effects of tourism, in terms of present condition to find out how locals view (positive or negative) the effects of tourism development on their quality of life. On the other hand, we seek to understand whether or not the locals, with the existing conditions, are willing to support the tourism development. The major purposes of the paper are:

- 1) To measure the quality of life of the city from standpoints of the residents,
- 2) To analysis of the host community attitudes toward the effects of tourism development on the quality of life, and
- 3) To assess the local resident's willingness for supporting tourism development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers in recent decades have studied effects of tourism development on the quality of life of the touristdestinations. They have confirmed significant and important effects of tourism development on the quality of life of locals in various economicaspects, socio-cultural, and environmental. Moreover, simultaneous with increasing locals' awareness of the effects of tourism development (either positive or negative) and thus increasing their desire to attract tourists (either domestic or foreign) and on the other hand raising the issue of sustainable tourism development in destinations, researchers have attempted to measure locals' willingness in tourism development.

Table-1 QOL from resident perspective

Author/Date	Purpose	Sample/Data collection	QOL measurement used	Notes on results
Allen et al. (1988)	To investigate whether residents' perceptions of community life Satisfaction vary depending on the Levels of tourism development.	721 respondents living in 20 rural Colorado communities that varied with respect to the amount of tourism development are asked to complete the survey.	Community life scales which groups 33community life indicators into seven community life dimensions are developed based on previous research and used for study.	Tourism development does benefit the host communities, but community life is perceived to decline as the tourism development continued.
Lankford (1994)	To compare attitudes toward tourism development and planning at the local and regional level among the key actors(residents, government employees, decision makers, and local business owners)	1436 residents of the Columbia River Gorge region of Oregon and Washington complete the mail survey.	9 items are developed based on scale development procedure and used to measure personal and community benefits.	Resident groups differ significantly from the other three groups regarding the quality of life issues such as noise, crime, litter, and environmental impacts.
Cecil, Fu,	To evaluate non-economic QOL	760 in 2004 and 960 surveys	Three-dimensional model developed by	Resident's understanding of the

Wang & Avgoustis (2008)	measures before full implementation of the initiative in 2004 and two years later in 2006.	in 2006 are Collected in Indianapolis.	Raphael et al. (1999) is used to measure Quality of life.	importance of cultural tourism development positively affects their perception of quality of life for two years.
Chancellor, Yu & Cole (2011)	To examine the relationship between tourism development and residents' quality of life using the CP model as a conceptual framework.	649 households in Orange county, Indiana complete the survey.	Subjective dimensions are used to measure resident's life satisfaction, happiness, feelings of well-being, and beliefs about their standard of living.	Tourism development may be contributing to the difference in quality of life scores for the respondents and that the CP context might help explain these differences.
Nawijn & Mitas (2012)	To examine the relationship between Perceived tourism impacts and residents' well-being.	373 residents of Palma de Mallorca which is a mass tourism destination participate in the survey.	10 specific life domains are adopted from Gilbert and Abdullan (2004) to measure life satisfaction.	Tourism impacts are associated with the cognitive component of subjective wellbeing, life satisfaction rather than the affective component.
Woo (2013)	To determine the relationship between Perception of tourism impacts and community stakeholders' quality of life.	407 stakeholders living in tourism destinations (Hawaii; Nevada; Florida; Virginia) are participated in the online survey.	6 subjective items are adopted from previous research in order to measure overall quality of life.	Satisfaction with material and non-material life positively affect their overall quality of life moreover, the type of community stakeholder group moderate this relationship.
Jeon, Kang, & Desmarais (2014)	To investigate influences of seasonal attributes on residents' perceptions of tourism impacts and, residents' perceived quality life in a cultural-heritage tourism destination.	347 residents living in of the city of Salem and its four adjacent towns for the sample population were included in this study	4 subjective items are used for the resident quality of life construct.	Perceived economic benefits, environment sustainability, and perceived social costs positively affected residents' perceived quality of life

METHODOLOGY

The study is an applied research based on the purpose. In terms of methodology, this study is a descriptive research. The survey instrument used in this research was a structure questionnaire, which based on a review of the literature and opinions of academicians. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section gathers information on the residents' socio-demographics. This section contains seven aspects namely gender, marital status, age, length-of-residence, education level, occupation and monthly income. The second section measures the quality of life in Meshkinshahr, and the effects of tourism development on the quality of life in the city. In order to measure the quality of life in the city we used 25 elements of quality of life. This study used a five-point scale: (1) very poor, (2) poor, (3) fair, (4) good, (5) very good, to measure resident perceptions on 25 quality of life aspects. In order to evaluate the effects of tourism development on the quality of life we used other five-point scale: (1) very bad effect, (2) bad effect, (3) neither good nor bad effect, (4) good effect, (5) very good effect. The third section assesses the local resident's willingness for supporting tourism development. This section contains 11 statements. The scale options for measuring resident willingness for supporting tourism development were: 'strongly disagree' (1), 'disagree' (2), 'neither agree nor disagree' (3), 'agree' (4), and 'strongly agree' (5), analogous with previous Research. After the above process, to evaluate validity and reliability of the survey instrument, two steps were passed: (1) Handing in the questionnaire to the specialists and

experts, who has ensured content validity of the survey instrument, and (2) Cornbach's alpha using SPSS version 24.0 also for the tourism impacts scale was 0.85 indicating good degree of reliability for the sample. Two hundred questionnaires were distributed to the residents of Meshkinshahr city at main public areas. The study sample was selected by the convenience sampling method due to time and cost restraints. In total 184 usable questionnaires were collected from residents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sample Profile

In the respondents' profile, the majority of the respondents participated in this study are males (53.8%), 62% are married, approximately 34.2% are aged between 31 and 40, and nearly 39.1% have resided in Meshkinshahr over 20 years. Most of the respondents hold a university degree (46.1%). Based on occupation type the respondents are divided into five categories, which most of them were employees in the private sector or business (31%), 27.7% worked in the public sector, 21.7% were unemployed, 13.9% was retired, and 5.7% were choose other. Based on the monthly income, most of the respondents (40.2%) indicated earning between 600.000-1.000.000 Tomans (The rate change of 3500 Tomans is equal with 1 USD.), 31% indicated earning upper than 1.000.000 Tomans, and (28.8%) indicated earning less than 600.000 Iranian Tomans (Table 2).

Table 2. Sample profile

Gender	male	99	53.8%
	female	85	46.2%
Marital status	married	114	62%
	single	70	38%
Age	<20 years old	25	13.6%
	20-30	51	27.7%
	31-40	63	34.2%
	41-50	24	13%
	51-60	10	5.4%
	>60 years old	11	6%
Length-of-residence	1-3	13	7.1%
	4-10	21	11.4%
	11-15	34	18.5%
	16-20	72	23.9%
	20>	44	39.1%
Education level	Elementary	22	13%
	high school	78	41.9%
	university degree	84	46.1%
Occupation type	public service	51	27.7%
	private sector	57	31%
	unemployed	40	21.7%
	Retired	10	13.9%
	other	26	5.7%
Monthly income	600000 Tomans<	53	28.8%
	600000-1000000	74	40.2%
	Tomans 1000000<	57	31%

The results of respondents' ratings of quality of life elements are illustrated in Table 3. Table 4 shows that residents recognize the potential for a wide range of positive and negative outcomes on the quality of life by tourism development. In the element 'traffic congestion' most of the sample population by 37 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 31 percent were believed 'fair', and by 31 percent were considered 'good or very good'. The mean for traffic congestion was 2.88, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 59 percent are believe that tourism development will affect traffic congestion bad or very bad i.e. tourism will bring more traffic to the city (Table 4). In the element 'cleanliness of natural environments' the sample population by 65 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 12.5 percent were believed 'fair', and by 21 percent were considered 'good or very good'. The mean for cleanliness of natural environments was 2.25, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 46 percent are believe that tourism development will affect cleanliness of natural environments good or very good, in other words, most respondents are believe that tourism development will improve cleanliness of natural environments (Table 4). In the element 'Water quality' most of the sample population by 39 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 32 percent were believed 'fair', and by 27 percent were considered 'good or very good'. The mean for water quality was 2.78, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 44 percent are believe that tourism development will affect water quality good or very good i.e. most respondents are believe that tourism development will enhance water quality in the city (Table 4). In the element 'Cleanliness within the city' most of the sample population by 50 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 33 percent were considered 'good or very good' and by 16.8 percent were believed 'fair'. The mean for cleanliness within the city was 2.69, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 57 percent are believe that tourism development will affect cleanliness within the city bad or very bad, in other words, most respondents are believe that tourism development will decrease the cleanliness within the city (Table 4). In the element 'emergency services

(police and fire)' the sample population by 51 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 39 percent were considered 'good or very good'. and by 8 percent were believed 'fair'. The mean for emergency services was 2.67, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents believed that by 51 percent are believe that tourism development will affect emergency services good or very good, in other words, most respondents are believe that tourism development will improve emergency services (Table 4). In the element 'health and medical services' most of sample population by 38 percent were considered 'fair', by 41 percent were believed 'poor or very poor', and by 21 percent were considered 'good or very good'. The mean for health and medical services was 2.67, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most respondents 53 percent are believe that tourism development will affect health and medical services good or very good, in other words, tourism development will improve health and medical services (Table 4). In the element 'calmness and tranquility' most of the respondents by 40 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 38 percent were believed 'fair', and by 21 percent were considered 'good or very good'. The mean for calmness and tranquility was 2.69, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While the respondents are believe that tourism development will increase calmness and tranquility (Table 4). In the element 'education opportunities' most of sample population by 62 were believed 'poor or very poor', by 29 percent were considered 'good or very good' and by 7.6 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for education opportunities was 2.41, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 47 percent are believe that tourism development will affect education opportunities good or very good, in other words, they are believe that tourism development will enhance education opportunities in the city (Table 4). In the element 'leisure and recreation opportunities' most of the respondents by 54 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 33 percent were considered 'good or very good' and by 11.9 percent were believed 'fair'. The mean for leisure and recreation opportunities was 2.37, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 57 percent are believe that tourism development will affect leisure and recreation

opportunities good or very good, in other words, most respondents are believe that tourism development will improve leisure and recreation opportunities (Table 4). In the element 'protection of local tradition and identity' most of sample population by 48 percent were considered good or very good', by 40 percent were believed 'poor or very poor', and by 10.9 percent were believed 'fair', The mean for protection of local tradition and identity was 3.15, the equivalent of 'good' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 48 percent are believe that tourism development will affect protection of local tradition and identity good or very good, in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will enhance protection of local tradition and identity (Table 4). In the element 'reconstruction of historical sites' most of sample population by 64 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 24 percent were believed good or very good' and by 10.3 percent were believed 'fair'. The mean for reconstruction of historical sites was 2.26, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 50 percent are believe that tourism development will affect reconstruction of historical sites good or very good, in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will improve reconstruction of historical sites (Table 4). In the element 'safety from crime' most of sample population by 55 percent were considered 'good or very good', by 35 percent were considered 'poor or very poor' and by 8.6 percent were believed 'fair'. The mean for safety from crime was 3.21, the equivalent of 'good' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 52 percent are believe that tourism development will affect safety in the city 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will enhance safety in the city (Table 4). In the element 'civil liberties' most of sample population by 66 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 28 percent were considered 'good or very good' and by 10.9 percent were believed 'fair'. The mean for civil liberties was 2.40, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 46 percent are believe that tourism development will affect civil liberties 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will improve civil liberties in the city (Table 4). In the element 'parks and resort areas' most of sample population by 48 percent were considered 'good or very good', by 40 percent were considered 'good or very good' and by 10.3 percent were believed 'fair'. The mean for parks and resort areas was 3.17, the equivalent of 'good' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 60 percent are believe that tourism development will affect parks and resort areas 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will enhance parks and resort areas in the city (Table 4). In the element 'accessibility to the public transports' most of sample population by 55 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 34 percent were believed 'good or very good', and by 9.8 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for accessibility to the public transports was 2.54, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 43 percent are believe that tourism development will affect accessibility to the public transports 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will improve accessibility to the public transports in the city (Table 4). In the element 'investment on the infrastructures e.g. highway, railway, ports, and sewer' most of sample population by 57 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 23 percent were believed 'good or very good', and by 18.4 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for investment on the infrastructures was 2.48, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 49 percent are believe that tourism development will affect investment on the infrastructures 'good or very

good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will enhance investment on the infrastructures (Table 4). In the element 'personal incomes' most of sample population by 69 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 23 percent were believed 'good or very good' and by 7.6 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for personal incomes was 2.16, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 50 percent are believe that tourism development will affect personal incomes 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will improve personal incomes (Table 4). In the element 'job opportunities' most of sample population by 61 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 22 percent were believed 'good or very good', and by 16.2 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for job opportunities was 2.31, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 49 percent are believe that tourism development will affect job opportunities 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will enhance job opportunities (Table 4). In the element 'created income from local business' most of sample population by 61 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 22.2 percent were believed 'fair'. and by 16 percent were considered 'good or very good'. The mean for created income from local business was 2.28, the equivalent of 'poor' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 51 percent are believe that tourism development will affect created income from local business 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will improve created income from local business (Table 4). In the element 'property value' most of sample population by 58 percent were considered 'good or very good', by 30 percent were believed 'poor or very poor', and by 11.4 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for property value was 3.50, the equivalent of 'good or very good' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 53 percent are believe that tourism development will affect property value 'good or very good', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will enhance property value (Table 4). In the element 'cost of living' most of sample population by 44 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 41 percent were believed 'good or very good', and by 14.1 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for cost of living was 3.01, the equivalent of 'good or very good' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 57 percent are believe that tourism development will affect cost of living 'bad or very bad', in other words, the respondents are believe that tourism development will increase cost of living (Table 4). In the element 'purchasing power' most of sample population by 52 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 27 percent were believed 'good or very good', and by 19.6 percent were considered 'fair'. The mean for purchasing power was 2.60, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While the respondents are believe that tourism development will increase purchasing power, although there is a twofold attitude toward this element, in the one hand some of the respondents by 43 percent are believe tourism development affect purchasing power 'bad or very bad', on the other hand others by 40 percent are believe that tourism development affect purchasing power 'good or very good' (Table 4). In the element 'price of goods and products' most of the sample population by 56 percent were considered 'poor or very poor', by 32 percent were believed 'good or very good', and by 11.4 percent were considered 'poor or very poor'. The mean for price of goods and products was 2.57, the equivalent of 'fair' (Table 3). While most of the respondents by 62 percent are believe that tourism development will affect price of goods and products bad or very bad i.e. tourism development will rise price of goods and products, thus they are believe tourism

development may lead to the inflation (Table 4).In the element ‘life expectancy’ most of the sample population by 41 percent were considered ‘poor or very poor’,by 29.3 percent were believed ‘fair’, and by 28 percent were considered ‘good or very good’. The mean for life expectancy was 2.78, the equivalent of ‘fair’(Table 3).While most of the respondents by 54 percent are believe that tourism development will affect life expectancy good or very good i.e. tourism development will enhance life expectancy in the city (Table 4).In the element ‘job quality’ most of the sample population by 50 percent were considered ‘poor or very poor’, by 29 percent were believed ‘good or very good’,and by 20.1 percent were believed ‘fair’. The mean for job quality was 2.66 , the equivalent of ‘fair’(Table 3). While most of the respondents by 53 percent are believe that tourism development will affect job quality good or very good i.e. tourism development will enhance job quality (Table 4).

SUPPORTING TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN THE FUTURE

Table 5 provides a list of statements gathered from previous studies that were used as basis for this study to measure the

level of Meshkinshahr local residents’ willingness for supporting tourism development in the future. The overall mean of willingness for supporting tourism development was 3.72, the equivalent of ‘agree’ (Table 5).Indeed the majority of respondents believe that the tourism industry should be developed in in the future, not only because of the increase in job opportunities, or increase in personal incomes, or local business development, or increase in the property value, but also because of local residents’ belief in that simultaneous with tourism development, aspects of quality of life in the city, including emergency services, health services, protection of local identities and traditions, educational opportunities, recreation and leisure opportunities, reconstruction of historical and archaeological sites, civil liberties, parks and recreation areas, access to public transportation, investment in infrastructures, life expectancy, and quality of employment will be improved considerably (Table 5). Furthermore, promotions and facilities to attract more tourists should also be expanded. It should be added that simultaneous with the tourism development they want a greater role in decision-making processes for tourism development.

Table 3. Rating of the current condition of elements of the quality of life in Meshkinshahr City

Elements	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Traffic congestion	14.1	22.8	31.5	7.6	23.9	2.88
Cleanliness of natural environments	44.6	21.2	12.5	14.1	7.6	2.25
Water quality	23.4	16.3	32.6	13.6	14.1	2.78
Cleanliness within the city	30.4	19.6	16.8	16.3	16.8	2.69
Emergency services (police & fire)	38.6	13	8.7	16.8	22.3	2.67
Health and medical services	22.8	18.5	38	11.4	9.2	2.67
Calmness and tranquility	23.9	16.3	38	11.4	10.3	2.69
Education opportunities	43.5	19	7.6	17.4	12.5	2.41
Leisure and recreation opportunities	38.9	15.7	11.9	13.5	20	2.53
Protection of local tradition and identity	22.8	17.4	10.9	29.9	19	3.15
Reconstruction of historical sites	47.3	17.9	10.3	14.1	10.3	2.26
Safety from crime	24.9	10.3	8.6	25.4	30.8	3.21
Civil liberties	42.9	17.4	10.9	14.7	14.1	2.40
Parks and resort areas	23.4	17.9	10.3	34.2	14.1	3.17
Accessibility to the public transports	44	11.4	9.8	19	15.8	2.54
Investment on the infrastructures (highway, railway , ports, & sewer)	28.1	29.7	18.4	10.8	13	2.48
Personal incomes	50.5	18.5	7.6	12.5	10.9	2.16
Job opportunities	37.3	24.9	16.2	9.7	11.9	2.31
Created income from local business	36.2	24.9	22.2	9.2	7.6	2.28
Property value	19	11.4	11.4	41.8	16.3	3.50
Cost of living	21.7	22.3	14.1	25	16.8	3.01
Purchasing power	24.5	28.3	19.6	10.3	17.4	2.60
Price of goods and products	35.9	20.1	11.4	16.3	16.3	2.57
Life expectancy	22.8	19.6	29.3	15.8	12.5	2.78
Job quality	27.2	23.4	20.1	15.2	14.1	2.66

Note: 1= very poor; 2= poor; 3= fair; 4= good; 5= very good.

Table 4. Respondents’ attitudes toward the impact of tourism development on the elements of quality of life

Elements	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Traffic congestion	37	22.8	12	12.5	15.8	2.44
Cleanliness of natural environments	27.7	15.8	9.8	21.7	25	2.97
Water quality	20.7	17.4	17.9	22.3	21.7	3.07
Cleanliness within the city	37.5	20.1	10.9	15.2	16.3	2.51
Emergency services (police & fire)	12	17.4	19.6	22.8	28.3	3.32
Health and medical services	23.4	13.6	8.7	21.7	32.6	3.15
Calmness and tranquility	19	9.8	9.8	33.7	27.7	3.47
Education opportunities	14.1	16.2	22.7	21.6	25.4	3.24
Leisure and recreation opportunities	19.5	13.5	9.7	22.7	34.6	3.27
Protection of local tradition and identity	31.4	13.5	7	28.1	20	3
Reconstruction of historical sites	27	12.4	9.7	35.7	15.1	3.20

Safety from crime	23.2	16.2	7.6	19.5	33.5	3.09
Civil liberties	30.3	12.4	10.8	13	33.5	2.86
Parks and resort areas	14.6	16.8	8.6	33.5	26.5	3.47
Accessibility to the public transports	24.3	17.8	14.1	24.9	18.4	3.02
Investment on the infrastructures (highway, railway , ports, & sewer)	20.5	18.4	11.9	27.6	21.6	3.17
Personal incomes	17.8	19.5	11.9	28.6	22.2	3.24
Job opportunities	16.8	22.7	10.8	32.4	17.3	3.25
Created income from local business	15.1	21.6	11.4	28.6	23.2	3.28
Property value	13	25.4	8.6	30.8	22.2	3.32
Cost of living	30.8	27	16.8	11.9	13.5	2.48
Purchasing power	20	23.8	15.1	28.6	12.4	3.05
Price of goods and products	32.4	30.8	9.2	15.1	12.4	2.47
Life expectancy	17.3	11.9	16.2	37.3	17.3	3.45
Job quality	16.2	20.5	10.3	18.9	34.1	3.34

Note: 1= very bad effect; 2= bad effect; 3= neither good nor bad effect; 4= good effect; 5= very good effect.

Table 5. Supporting of tourism development in the future

Statements of tourism development supporting	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Tourism is able to be the most important industry for our community.	8.6	10.3	16.8	40.5	23.8	3.77
Tourism would help our community to grow in the right direction.	11.4	13.5	14.6	36.2	24.3	3.60
I am both happy and proud when tourists come to our city.	4.9	9.7	18.4	26.5	40.5	3.88
I agree with making new facilities to attract more tourists.	13.5	12.4	15.7	20	38.4	3.57
I agree with more promotions to attract tourists.	16.8	14.1	7.6	36.8	24.9	3.38
Our community should plan for tourism development.	8.1	8.6	12.4	29.2	41.6	3.87
Tourism must be developed focusing on natural attractions (beach, forests, mountains, etc.)	3.8	10.8	11.9	41.1	32.4	3.87
Tourism should play the most important role in our community's economy.	1.6	3.8	19.5	41.6	33.5	4.01
I tend to participate in the decision making process of tourism development.	10.8	12.4	21.1	36.2	19.5	3.41
I tend to volunteer to work in the local committee of tourism development.	10.3	11.4	10.8	40.5	27	3.62
I support tourism and would like to see it become important part of my community.	1.6	9.2	16.2	31.9	41.1	4.01

Note: 1= strongly disagree; 2= agree; 3= neither agree nor disagree; 4= agree; 5= strongly agree.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study provided some explanation of tourism effect on quality of life. The results showed that respondents agree that tourism has many effects on their quality of life. As Moscardo (2009) believed, lack of understanding of tourism impacts is a factor for underdevelopment of tourism in third world countries. Hence, the findings help to understanding relationship between tourism impacts and level of quality of life with support for tourism development (Aref, 2010). The findings of this investigation can assist tourism stakeholders community developers in the implementation of tourism development strategies based on residents' attitudes

towards tourism impacts on quality of life in tourism destination. It is commonly accepted that sustainability, tourism activities, and quality of life are all interrelated. The provision of quality tourism experiences should meet the needs of the present generation as well as future generations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research paper was made possible through the help and support from everyone, including the parents, family and friends. I sincerely thank my parents, family, and friends who provided the advice and financial support. The product of this research paper would not be possible without all of them.

REFERENCES

[1] Alipour Eshliki S, Kaboudi M. Community perception of tourism impacts and their participation in tourism planning: a case study of Ramsar,Iran. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.2012;Vol.36, 333 – 341. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.

[2] Allen LR, Long PT, Perdue RR, Kieselbach S. The impact of tourism development on residents' perceptions of community life,Journal of Travel Research, 1988;Vol.27, No.1, 16-21.

[3] Andereck KL, Valentine KM, Knopf RC, Vogt CA. Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. Annals of Tourism Research, 2005; Vol. 32, 1056-1076.

[4] Ap J. Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. Annals of Tourism Research.1992; Vol.19, No. 4, 665-690.

[5] Ap, J, Crompton JL. Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. Journal of Travel Research.1998; Vol.37, No. 2, 120-130.

[6] Aref, F.Residents' attitudes towards tourism impacts: A case study of Shiraz, Iran.Tourism Analysis.2010;Vol.15, No. 2, 253-261.

[7] Cecil AK, Fu Y, Wang S, Avgoustis SH. Exploring resident awareness of cultural tourism and its impact on quality of life. European Journal of Tourism Research.2008;Vol.1, No. 1, 39-52.

[8] Chancellor C, Yu CS, Cole ST. Exploring quality of life perceptions in rural Midwestern (USA) communities: an application of the coreperiphery concept in a tourism development context. International Journal of Tourism Research.2011;Vol.13, 496-507.

- [9] Chen, JS. An investigation of urban residents' loyalty to tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*.2000; Vol.24, No. 1, 5-19.
- [10] Delibasic R, Karlsson P, Lorusso A, Rodriguez A, Yliruusi H. Quality of life and tourism in Budecsko. Retrieved January.2008;Vol.5, 2011, from [http://www.cenia.cz/_C12572160037AA0F.nsf/\\$pid/CP_RJ6WECYXIH/\\$FILE/SED%20Budec%20final%20report.pdf](http://www.cenia.cz/_C12572160037AA0F.nsf/$pid/CP_RJ6WECYXIH/$FILE/SED%20Budec%20final%20report.pdf).
- [11] Diener E, Diener M. Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfactions and self-esteem. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*.1995;Vol. 68,653-663.
- [12] Foroughzadeh S, Shariati S, Danaee M. A developing factor or a threat to tradition, Kang residents' perception of tourism, *Biannual Journal of Touris Studies*.2013;Vol.2, No. 3, 46-73. Retrieved from <http://www.journalitor.ir>.
- [13] Godfrey J. Standard of Living or Quality of Life: Does One Come First? *TD Forum*.2002.
- [14] Gondos B. Relationship between Tourism and Quality of Life - Researchers at Lake Balaton.Human Capital without Border: Knowledge and Learning for Quality of Life; 2014; 25-27 June 2014, 897-888.
- [15] Gursoy D, Jurowski C, Uysal M. Resident attitudes: a structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*.2002; Vol.29, No. 1, 79-105.
- [16] Harrill R. Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: a literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*.2004; Vol.18, No. 3, 251-266.
- [17] Harrill R, Potts TD. Tourism Planning in Historic Districts: Attitudes Toward Tourism Development in Charleston, *Journal of the American Planning Association*.2003; Vol 69, No. 3,233-244.
- [18] Haywood KM. Criteria for evaluating the social performance of tourism development projects: tourism as a factor in national and regional development. In *Trent University, department of geography Peterborough, occasional paper*.1975; Vol.4, 94-97.
- [19] Jeon M, Kang M, Desmarais E. Residents' perceived quality of life in acultural-heritage tourism destination. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 2014; <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11482-014-9357-8>.
- [20] Kim, K. The effects of tourism impacts upon quality of life residents in the community.Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.2002.
- [21] Lankford SV.Attitudes and perceptions toward tourism and rural regional development. *Journal of Travel Research*.,1994; Vol. 32, No. 3, 35-43.
- [22] Ling LP, Jakpar S, Johari A, Myint KT, Rani NSA. An evaluation on the attitudes of residents in Georgetown towards theimpacts of tourism development. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*.2011;Vol.2, No.1, 264-277.
- [23] Moscardo G . Tourism and quality of life:Towards a more critical approach. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*.2009;Vol. 9,No. 2, 159-170.
- [24] Przeclawski K. Humanistic foundation of tourism. Warsaw: Poland: Institute of Tourism.1986.
- [25] Nawijn J, Mitas O. Resident attitudes to tourism and their effect on subjective well-being: the case of Palma de Mallorca. *Journal of Travel Research*.2012;Vol.51, No. 1,531-541.
- [26] Nunkoo R, Smith SL. Political economy of tourism: trust in government actors, political support, and their determinants. *Tourism Management*.2013; Vol.36, 120-132.
- [27] Perdue RR, Long PT, Allen L . Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*.1990; Vol.17, No. 4,586-599.
- [28] Rastegar H. Tourism development and residents attitude: a case study of Yazd, Iran. *Tourisms: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*.2010; Vol. 5, No. 2, 203-211.
- [29] Rezvani M, Badri S, Sepahvand F, Roonizi S. The effects of second home tourism on improving life quality of rural residents (Case:Roudbar-e Qasran District Shemiranat County). *Urban - Regional Studies and Research Journal*.2012;Vol. 4 No.13, 23-40.
- [30] Shani A, Pizam A. Community participation in tourism planning and development *Handbook of Tourism and Quality-of-Life Research*.2012;(547-564): Springer.
- [31] Sharpley R. Host perceptions of tourism: a review of the research. *TourismManagement*.2014; Vol.42, 37-49.
- [32] Sirakaya E, Teye V, Sonmez SF. Examining sources of differential supportfor tourism industry in two Ghanaian cities. *Tourism Analysis*.2001; Vol. 6, No.1, 29-40.
- [33] Skevington SM, Lotfy M, O'Connell KA. The World Health Organisation's WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment: Psychometric properties and results of the international field trial. A report from the Who Qol Group. *Quality of Life Research*, 2004; Vol.13, 299-310.
- [34] Veenhoven R. The study of life satisfaction. In: Saris, W.E. – Veenhoven, R. –Scherpenzel, A.C. – Bunting, B. (eds). *A comparative study of satisfaction with life in Europe*.Eötvös University Press. Budapest.1996; pp.11-48.
- [35] Woo, E. The impacts of tourism development on stakeholders' quality of life(QOL): A comparison between community residents and employed residents in the hospitality and tourism industry. Unpublished Dissertation. Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.2013.
- [36] Yeganeh B, Cheraghi M, Vollaiee M. Role of religious tourism to the rural development, emphasizing on the quality of life and social capital; case study of Ghopchagh Village. *Journal of Applied research in Geographical Sciences*.2013;Vol.13,No. 30, 7-25. Retrieved from <http://jgs.khu.ac.ir>.
- [37] Zamani Farahani H, Musa, G. Residents' attitudes and perception towards tourism development: a case study of Masooleh, Iran. *Tourism Management*, 2008;Vol.29, No. 6, 1233-1236. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>.
- [38] Zarabi A, Ealami Parikhani S.Measuring of Economical, Social- Cultural and Environmental Affects Tourism development, *Research in Human Geography*.2013; Vol 75, 37-52.
- [39] Zeinali B, Jafarpour M, Omidi E, Tahmasbi N, Dorangard S.Will Tourism Development Improve the Quality of Life in Hashtpar City? An Analysis of Local Residents' Attitudes. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*.2015;Vol (4), No (3), March, 2015, 293-300.