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Abstract: This study is aimed to determine factors affecting local residents’ support on tourism development in Phong Dien district, Can Tho city. Research data from the study were collected from 125 households living in Phong Dien district. Application of Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and Multiple Linear Regression (MLR), the study results showed that there are five factors affecting local residents’ support on tourism development in Phong Dien including trade-off cost, participation, social utility, attachment and personal utility. In particular, attachment factor has the strongest impact to local peoples’ support on tourism development in Phong Dien district.
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1. Rational

Nowadays, tourism industry is considered as a very important role due to its contribution not only in economy but also in society, natural environment protection, culture and local history. Being aware of the significant role of tourism development, many localities have implemented some new rural areas associated with sustainable tourism development. Phong Dien district, Can Tho city, which has advantages in rivers and scenic countryside, has been in process of implementing new rural areas associated with tourism development. There have been positive changes in the initial results. Accordingly, tourism development cooperation of the local community is one of the important factors that helps Phong Dien district to implement some tourism development plans favorably aiming raising the material and spiritual life for people. Local community’s support, especially, the household who directly and indirectly involves in the supply of tourism products and services, are very important to the tourism development plans at Phong Dien district.

The local community’s support in the tourism development was researched by a lots scientists and managers in the world. Nancy Gard McGehee (2012) who researched some effecting factors belonging to the attitude of the community to the tourism development, confirmed that local community’s support through public relations campaigns aiming to the personal benefits to achieve by tourism development is very significant and it should be a top priority in tourism development. Juan Gabriel Brida et al (2011) supposed that the local community’s support is essential for the tourism development, the success of the activities and sustainability of the "smoke-free" industry in the long run. Besides, Stoddart et al (2004) also pointed out that the local people’s support is a very important factor to plan tourism development policies because of the success of tourism activities which depends on the positive local people’s support. Supporting on the tourism development is also a complex issue and the results from other researches show that community developers and tourism planners have to concern about the attitude of local people before investing to develop (McGehee et al, 2009). Therefore, the study on “Factors Affecting Local Residents’ Support on Tourism Development in Phong Dien District, Can Tho City” has scientific significance and practical significance.
2. Research Methodology

2.1. Research Model

Household’s support on tourism development is the activities they engage in to help tourism continuously developing (Nunkoo et al 2012). Michael Tinggi et al (2011) pointed out that local community’s support on tourism development is shown in: prioritizing the construction of new tourist facilities, participating in more work to promote tourism, recognizing the importance of tourism to the locality. McGehee et al (2009) also determined that local community’s support is the support on constructing of new tourist facilities, recognizing the necessity of local tourism, supporting more investment organizations in the locality. Tsung Hung Lee (2012) supposed that the local community’s support is cognitive support, actively participating in tourism activities and cultural exchange activities between local communities and tourists, advocating for tourism development initiatives and cooperating with tourism development plans. Jones (2005) confirmed that the attachment of an individual's community, integration into community life will reflect an emotional bond between an individual and a particular community, thereby promoting engagement in local activities. Household perceptions of the benefits and damages that tourism brings when they participate in local tourism service provision activities is the decisive factor in supporting the tourism development of local people (Michael Tinggi et al (2011)). From the survey of the above contents, the research models of factors affecting local residents’ support on tourism development in Phong Dien district is set up as shown in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. Research model proposed.

Table 1. Interpretation of variables in the research model.

| SIGN   | INTERPRETATION                                                                 | SCALE  |
|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| P1     | Be willing to participate in local tourism service activities                 | Likert 1-5 |
| P2     | Always plan for travel services                                               | Likert 1-5 |
| P3     | Always engage in visitor service                                              | Likert 1-5 |
| P4     | Always participate in the management and evaluation of the household's travel services | Likert 1-5 |
| A1     | Prefer to live in this locality                                               | Likert 1-5 |
| A2     | Live in this locality for long                                                | Likert 1-5 |
| A3     | Feel comfortable, full when living in the locality                           | Likert 1-5 |
| A4     | Feel good when staying in the best place                                      | Likert 1-5 |
| U1     | Have many types of clean products catering to the people and visitors         | Likert 1-5 |
| U2     | Create more jobs for the household                                           | Likert 1-5 |
| U3     | Educate the consciousness of environmental protection for people and visitors | Likert 1-5 |
| U4     | Create many forms of investment for the household                            | Likert 1-5 |
| U5     | Create opportunities for cultural exchange between people and tourists        | Likert 1-5 |
| U6     | Local cultural identity is preserved and handed down                          | Likert 1-5 |
| U7     | Provides many recreational facilities for residents and visitors              | Likert 1-5 |
| U8     | Improve traffic and other public services                                     | Likert 1-5 |
| U9     | Improve the local infrastructure and infrastructure                           | Likert 1-5 |
| U10    | Improve the lifestyle of the community                                        | Likert 1-5 |
| U11    | Strengthen the activities for the benefit of the environment                 | Likert 1-5 |
| U12    | Increase the pride in the locality                                           | Likert 1-5 |
| TC1    | Badly impact on the environment                                               | Likert 1-5 |
| TC2    | Increase conflict between tourists and residents                              | Likert 1-5 |
| TC3    | Increase social evils                                                         | Likert 1-5 |
| S1     | Support for the construction of new tourism facilities                        | Likert 1-5 |
| S2     | Be more active to promote tourism development                                 | Likert 1-5 |
| S3     | Help other households develop tourism in the right direction                  | Likert 1-5 |
| S4     | Always cooperate with partners to develop tourism                             | Likert 1-5 |

Source: McGehee (2012), Nunkoo et al(2009), Tsung Hung Lee (2012)

2.2. Analytical Methods

The quantification of the factors affecting local residents' support to the tourism development in Phong Dien district is carried out through 3 steps: (1) Step 1: Use Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient to test for the degree of rigor and correlation between observed variables in the research model. (2) Step 2: Use an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to test
the factors that influence and identify factors that are deemed to be consistent with the support of the population for tourism development. (3) Step 3: Use a multiple linear regression model to analyze the effects of independent variables on local residents’ support for tourism development, and to quantify the impact of each variable.

2.3. Data Collection Methods

The research data was collected by interviewing households directly at the typical tourist sites in Phong Dien district by using a convenient sampling method. Currently, according to many researchers, the size of the sample as large as possible (Nguyen Dinh Tho, 2011). Hair et al (2006) suggested that for the use of exploratory factor analysis (EFA), the sample size should be at least 50, preferably 100, and the measurement / measurement ratio is 5:1, it means that 1 measurement variable needs a minimum of 5 observations. In fact, the sample size for the study was collected at 125 observations that met the minimum sample size required for the study method.

3. Research Results and Discussions

Step 1: Evaluate the reliability of the scale

Based on the analysis results in Table 2, the scales are highly reliable because the Cronbach Alpha coefficient is greater than 0.7. Furthermore, the variable correlation coefficient - the sum of the items with Cronbach Alpha is greater than 0.3 (Nunnally, 1978; Peterson, 1994; Slater, 1995). Therefore, all 23 observations of the scales will be used in the next exploratory factors analysis steps.

Table 2. The result of evaluating the reliability of the scale after eliminating the variables.

| Factors          | Average scale if factor is eliminated | Scale deviation if factor is eliminated | Coefficient of correlation of total variables | Cronbach’s Alpha if the variable is eliminated |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Participation:  | 11.14                                 | 6.358                                  | 0.534                                         | 0.733                                         |
| P1               | 12.06                                 | 5.097                                  | 0.509                                         | 0.756                                         |
| P2               | 11.30                                 | 5.405                                  | 0.619                                         | 0.683                                         |
| P3               | 11.75                                 | 5.214                                  | 0.643                                         | 0.669                                         |
| Attachment:     | 11.82                                 | 8.454                                  | 0.632                                         | 0.755                                         |
| P1               | 11.71                                 | 8.292                                  | 0.584                                         | 0.711                                         |
| P2               | 12.62                                 | 6.875                                  | 0.651                                         | 0.741                                         |
| P3               | 12.40                                 | 7.200                                  | 0.633                                         | 0.748                                         |
| Utility:        | 11.82                                 | 32.689                                 | 0.491                                         | 0.835                                         |
| U1               | 11.46                                 | 31.467                                 | 0.558                                         | 0.830                                         |
| U2               | 11.58                                 | 32.851                                 | 0.425                                         | 0.841                                         |
| U3               | 11.37                                 | 33.773                                 | 0.498                                         | 0.835                                         |
| U4               | 11.29                                 | 33.284                                 | 0.464                                         | 0.837                                         |
| U5               | 11.38                                 | 32.961                                 | 0.575                                         | 0.830                                         |
| U6               | 11.40                                 | 32.948                                 | 0.500                                         | 0.835                                         |
| U7               | 11.24                                 | 34.118                                 | 0.347                                         | 0.846                                         |
| U8               | 11.75                                 | 31.550                                 | 0.597                                         | 0.827                                         |
| U9               | 11.28                                 | 32.827                                 | 0.539                                         | 0.832                                         |
| U10              | 11.37                                 | 32.839                                 | 0.553                                         | 0.831                                         |
| U11              | 11.51                                 | 31.328                                 | 0.633                                         | 0.824                                         |
| Trade-off cost: | 4.47                                  | 4.554                                  | 0.739                                         | 0.875                                         |
| Y= Support:     | 4.60                                  | 4.528                                  | 0.813                                         | 0.809                                         |
| S1               | 4.63                                  | 4.503                                  | 0.786                                         | 0.832                                         |
| S2               | 12.24                                 | 4.639                                  | 0.586                                         | 0.690                                         |
| S3               | 12.18                                 | 4.885                                  | 0.641                                         | 0.671                                         |
| S4               | 12.68                                 | 3.966                                  | 0.628                                         | 0.668                                         |
| S5               | 12.55                                 | 5.325                                  | 0.415                                         | 0.777                                         |

Source: Cronbach’s Alpha test results from survey data, 2014

Step 2: The results of the exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

According to the results of the exploratory factors analysis after 3 rounds with the test is guaranteed as follows: (1) The reliability of the observed variables (Factor loading> 0.5); (2) Validate the fit of the model (0.5 <KMO = 0.682 <1.0); (3) Validate Bartlett for correlation of observed variables (Sig. = 0.00 <0.05); (4) Verification of cumulative variance = 66.97% > 50%. The variables B1, B4, B11 (with a factor load factor <0.5) were excluded from the model because it did not guarantee the practical significance of the factor (Hair et al, 1998).
Table 3. The results of factor matrix after rotation.

| Sign | Factor group | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 |
|------|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| P1   |              | 0.799 |  |    |    |    |
| P2   |              | 0.558 |  |    |    |    |
| P3   |              | 0.765 |  |    |    |    |
| P4   |              | 0.801 |  |    |    |    |
| P1   |              |      | 0.738 |  |    |    |
| P2   |              |      | 0.777 |  |    |    |
| P3   |              |      | 0.813 |  |    |    |
| P4   |              |      | 0.785 |  |    |    |
| U2   |              |      |    |    | 0.549 |    |
| U3   |              |      |    |    | 0.694 |    |
| U5   |              |      |    |    | 0.652 |    |
| U6   |              |      |    |    | 0.550 |    |
| U7   |              |      | 0.777 |  |    |    |
| U8   |              |      | 0.657 |  |    |    |
| U9   |              |      | 0.569 |  |    |    |
| U10  |              |      | 0.755 |  |    |    |
| U12  |              |      | 0.565 |  |    |    |
| TC1  |              | 0.879 |    |    |    |    |
| TC2  |              | 0.873 |    |    |    |    |
| TC3  |              | 0.884 |    |    |    |    |

KMO = 0.682 Sig. Bartlett = 0.00 Cumulative variance = 66.97%
Source: The results from the survey data, 2014

In general, the composition of the factor groups after the exploratory factor analysis does not have much confusion, the name of the factor groups remains the same, except that the “Utility” group is divided into two groups. They are “Social Utility” and “Personal Utility”.

Table 4. New factors are formed from the EFA analysis.

| Sign | Observed variables | Factor |
|------|--------------------|--------|
| F1   | 3 variables: TC3, TC4, TC5 | Trade-off cost |
| F2   | 4 variables: P1, P2, P3, P4 | Participation |
| F3   | 5 variables: U7, U8, U9, U10, U12 | Social utility |
| F4   | 4 variables: A1, A2, A3, A4 | Attachment |
| F5   | 5 variables: U2, U3, U5, U6, U14 | Personal utility |

Source: The results from the survey data, 2014

Step 3: The results of linear regression model

The findings of the exploratory factor analysis have identified five factors influencing the tourism development in Phong Dien district. These factors are the explanatory variables included in the regression model to assess the impact of each factor on the support of people in tourism development. Multivariate regression models are established as follows:

\[ Y \text{ (support)} = f (F1, F2, F3, F4, F5) \]

In particular, the variables included in the regression equation are determined by the factor score. Multiply \( i \), determined by the equation \( F_i = W_{i1}X_{i1} + W_{i2}X_{i2} + … + W_{ik}X_{ik} \). \( W_{ik} \) is the factor coefficient represented in the Component Score Coefficient. \( X_{ik} \) is the observed variable in factor \( i \).

Table 5. The results of multivariate linear regression model.

| Variable | Coefficient (B) | Significant level | VIF coefficient |
|----------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Constant (C) | -0.182 | 0.105 | - |
| F1: Tradeoff cost | -0.317 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| F2: Participation | 0.176 | 0.011 | 1.000 |
| F3: Social utility | 0.326 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| F4: Attachment | 0.414 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| F5: Personal utility | 0.235 | 0.001 | 1.000 |
| Sig.F | 0.000 | | |
| Corrective Coefficient R² | 0.441 | | |
| Durbin-Watson coefficient | 1.923 | | |

Source: The results of linear regression analysis from survey data, 2014

According to the analysis, all 5 variables included in the regression model are statistically significant and most have a positive correlation with the support for tourism development of Phong Dien people, except that the variable “Tradeoff cost” is counterproductive. In particular, the “Attachment” factor is the strongest impact on the tourism development of people in Phong Dien district. From that point, Phong Dien tourism industry wants to develop, there is no lack of community’s support. However, in order to win the support, local authorities need to pay attention to the factors of participation, benefit, costs and community cooperation. That is, Phong Dien tourism development must create more jobs to attract people’s participation. At the same time, social benefits as well as personal interests must be paid attention and be solved in harmony with the investment of the community. Especially, tourism development must be associated with local community development. Accordingly, the residents’ support on the tourism development will be enhanced and contribute to the success of tourism at Phong Dien.
4. Conclusion

Phong Dien tourism industry is always evaluated to have a lot of potential development in the future. However, this development must be associated with the local community’s support. Through the application of the regression analysis combined model, research results show five factors that affect people's support to tourism development in Phong Dien district. They are trade-off cost, participation, social utility, attachment and personal utility. In particular, the attachment factor has the strongest impact on the support of tourism development of the people. The results of the study are effective scientific information for tourism authorities, tourist sites, tour operators can apply in the development of tourism development plan, contributing to improve life living people, socio-economic development Phong Dien district.
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