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ABSTRACT

One way to ensure a good management and sustainable development in a destination is not only the development of some forms of sustainable tourism but also the management of community or even the development of community-based tourism as a new concept that is embraced by many countries that want to develop a successful and sustainable tourism. Looking at recent years, displayed an increasing tendency to plan and develop tourism with the participation of the host community, seeing it from the perspective of consumer, beneficiaries and developers of tourism activities. Community participation in the development of tourism in Korca Region is very low, especially in remote mountainous areas. There is a big commitment of major municipalities as Korca, Pogradec and Erseka to include relevant communities in decision-making activities which will affect their welfare.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Destination management is seen as a way to maximize the benefits to an area and alleviate problems that may arise as a result of development. Management should be a continuous process to maximize the contribution to human welfare and environmental quality. The researchers present a series of management methods need to show broad community involvement in these processes. The community is still treated as an object rather than as a partner observation in this process. The debate now focuses not on whether the community will be involved in the process of tourism development but how and when to get involved. The key question is whether community involvement will increase management control and the benefits of tourism development in their localities (Woodley, 1993). The locals in tourist destinations heard little or nothing in the tourism development process and as a result they can only react to the effects on the environment of their homes. However, the tourist industry is always criticized for making decisions on planning bodies or groups outside the
locality. Researchers are putting emphasis on decentralization of processes of the management and its integration with the development objectives of the orientation of the community (Haywood 1988; Long 1993; Simmons 1994; Timothy 1998). Increasingly being presented today, large levels of public participation in development planning destinations (Murphy 1985; Inskeep 1991; Gunn 1994; Timothy 1999). In recent years we can see a shift towards destination management more flexible methods of interactive processes to create and implement strategies. Destination management is focusing on the involvement of multiple groups as residents, public authorities, businesses who can collaborate to develop a clear vision (Ritchie 1993; Jamal and Getz 1997). The continuous process of destination management may allow the inclusion of these groups in the formulation, implementation and adoption of decisions. There are many techniques available to host community involvement in the management of destinations, such as the creation of technical surveillance of citizens groups, group discussions, meetings with residents, etc... Community involvement means the empowerment of people to set goals, hopes and concerns in the development of tourism. This concept involves the participation of other groups and supporters in making decisions. Revenue growth, local employment and education are the most visible members of the community involvement in tourism development benefits. Characteristics of community –oriented tourism resulting from the creation and preservation of traditions of planning , which protected the interests of smaller groups and local residents were given more control over social processes that govern their welfare. In community-based tourism the environment and social considerations are involved in the planning process and tourism should also serve to tourists and local residents. Local communities have their right to be involved in shaping their future and to maximize community involvement the government must maximize socio-economic benefits of tourism to these communities. Planning of community-based tourism requires finding ways to create more cooperation between the tourism industry and host communities as well as the creation of facilities for visitors and hosts.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study, some case studies are included to ensure the validity of results. So if cases provide similar results, conclusions will have a high degree of security. Types of destinations are specified in the search as follows:

a) Tourist area which offer tourist attractions and activities.

b) Active area with a population where community participation in tourism development process does not exist or is weak.

These specifications helped me in setting limits and territories where we can generalize the results of this study. To achieve the goals of the research I have chosen three local areas of Korca region. While the theme focuses on the urgent need to develop sustainable tourism in its results of this study are specified only for the region of Korca is can be applied to any destination where tourism is the main generator of economic activities in the region. As in other developing countries in the region of Korca tourism development requires the creation of an organization to manage the planning and marketing of a destination. Three destination areas were selected - Liqenasi, Voskopoja and Vithkuq - to provide examples of areas in the destination local levels.

The questionnaires focused on the local population tend to collect information from them as a consumer of product and decision-makers. This survey aimed at obtaining opinions about how local residents participate in the development process of their locality. Are mainly used two sources:

1) Theoretically, the research aims to demonstrate the link between a community management for sustainable development of tourist destinations.

2) Guided by theoretical development achieved by this study destination areas are studied and treated as a specific case. These cases will help to improve the theory.
Given the research issues, research goals lie not only in the breadth of research, but also the depth of knowledge. In the study are used as methods of analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Research methods and methodology of this study is not only designed to answer research questions but also provide a series of checks.

A vast literature has been used to support research and the field of study. Based on this literature were raised several hypotheses to show how a community management brings sustainability.

The questionnaire addressed to the host community is focused in some sections where it is trying to find how people can engaged in activities and in development of the area. Forms of how residents benefit from tourism, how to improve their locality attractions and about the impact that tourism has brought to the economic, environmental, socio-cultural and personal and taking their suggestions. Participation in local management or if they saw their necessary participation in planning, were they able to participate in the management process, if the level of participation is sufficient, if participation would bring benefits or problems for them, rather than incentive would be economic benefits to residents to increase their participation in local planning and a community training needs to be more effective in the management process.

3. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Regarding the local population sample was used a simple method for selecting those who will respond. In this study are used secondly and primary data and about 78 questionnaires were distributed. The information gathered reveals a presentation by some of the local community in the study. If we look at the study areas, they have a significant community with interesting features, so Liqenas area consists of a community which is considered as a minority (Macedonian) and displays some unique Albanian population, the area consists to Voskopoja with a great percentage of the Vlachs population which has different language, manner of communication and lifestyle, while in the area of Vithkuq Vlachs constitute a very small percentage of the population. Given these characteristics, the first question which relates to the length of time the residence of residents shows that a good part of the population has more than 10 years living in this area and a few came from other areas of remote as a result of internal migration and increasing difficulties to live in these areas after the ‘90s, especially after the economic difficulties of recent years. The survey results concluded, 43% of the population lived from 11-20 years, 29% lived for more than 20 years, 14% lived more than 12 months, and 7% respectively live 1-5 years and 6-10 years. We should note that a high percentage of the population in these areas has migrated to neighboring countries and perhaps this powerful migration affects the results presented above.

Regarding the work they did 36% of residents work in agriculture, 28% had private business, 22% worked in the private sector, 14% in the public sector and 0% were unemployed. To view links of residents and tourists the surveillance gives us the data about 43% had frequent contact with tourists (12-24 times per month), 35% some contacts (6-11here), 15% had few contacts (1-5 times), 7% had no contact and 0% very often (more than 24 times). Interests of tourist for the attractions around the area from the perspective of residents is: 43% of the tourists prefer to visit cultural places, 47% prefer natural scenic sites, 6% prefer to visit museums, 4% prefer other attractions. As seen most powerful attractions of these areas are cultural objects and nature. Seeing separately importance of these attractions have received the following conclusions: For the culture objects, 64% say they are very important, 14% think they are important average, 7% respectively and no less, 8% think they are enormously more important.

Visits to the museum about 33% think that they are less important, 23% not at all important, 24% moderately important, 14% very important, 6% extremely important. Visits to the natural attractions, about 0% think that they are not important, 7% important, 14% moderately important,
64% very important, 14% extremely important. - Visits to other countries, about 57% think that they are less important, 7% important, 22% moderately important, 7% very important, 7% extremely important. The results of the survey conducted shows that 63% of people benefit from tourism and 37% did not benefit. About how they benefit are these conclusions: 39% room rental yield, 28% yield rental homes, 26% are owned hotel and 7% benefit in other ways from the sale of agricultural products, crafts etc. Regarding improvements to be made in their locality, 100% of residents feel they need to make improvements in all existing attractions. Giving residents the opportunity to list three necessary improvements are these results: - 80% think that: 1. Improvements should be made in cultural objects, 2. Maintaining a significant architectural buildings, 3. Improve the infrastructure to go to these attractions. While 20% of people think that: 1. infrastructure must be improved, 2.to organize many events 3.organize cultural activities. In the opinion of the inhabitants effects that tourism has brought in these areas are:

- Economic Impacts: -86% think that tourism development has brought positive economic impacts, -14% think that tourism has brought negative economic impacts. - It is very important to determine the environmental impacts of tourism development brings to determine whether tourism has brought positive impacts or environmental impacts and whether measures should be taken to limit the development of tourism. Results of the survey on the environmental impacts are: 49% think that tourism development has brought positive environmental impacts, 51% think that tourism has brought negative environmental impacts. Socio-cultural impacts: 86% believe that tourism development has brought positive socio-cultural impacts, 14% think that tourism has brought negative socio-cultural impacts. Personal effects: 100% think that tourism development has brought positive personal impact. For each option residents were asked to give their suggestions on the impacts of tourism on the data collected from the survey to all residents who have given their suggestions which is focused only on negative environmental impacts according to their impacts tend to emphasize the future. This section requires the opinion of residents for their participation in local tourism planning. It is interesting to see how necessary it is participation from the perspective of residents, 73% feel that are strongly agree, 23% agree, 4% remain neutral and did not give any answer. So people are interested in getting involved and saw how necessary is the involvement in decision-making processes. But how many people are able to engage in local development processes -64% think they are very capable (and expressed strong agreement), 22% think they are capable (stating agree), 7% were neutral and 7% do not feel able to participate and there is no answer at all I do not agree or do not know. According to residents or have a good attendance in their localities, 36% do not agree, 22% were neutral, 21% do not know the answer, and 7% respectively positioned in the other options. The results tell that people do not have a good turnout and they are not well informed. For the question “Do I need to have a broad participation”, 29% are not agree, 29% agree, 14% disagree and 14% do not know the answer, 7% are neutral and most agree. Thoughts are so delivered equally positive (that is broad participation needed) and negative (not required broad participation) to see how people perceive participation as a way to bring more benefits than 29% remain neutral problem, 22% agree, 21% strongly agree, 14% disagree and 7% are not respectively disagree do not know. Seen that not all are able to perceive the results of participation and may not have the necessary information, but most believe that participation brings is very important benefits. The development of the sustainable tourism based to the community, it is necessary to inform residents about the benefits of participation and ways of involvement. If economic benefit is participation incentives have these results: -43% strongly agree, 29% disagree and 7% respectively disagree, are not agree, do not know and neutral. Do you see people getting necessary information and conduct training - 36% strongly agree, 29% agree, 14% are neutral and are not respectively disagree, 7% disagree and said no do not know. Some researchers believe that community participation (especially in developing areas where the qualification is low) is needed in the final stage of the planning process. In studies conducted in recently emphasized the importance
of community involvement in phases before the planning. The opinion of local residents in the study, 36% strongly agree, 21% agree, 29% were neutral, 7% were not and are not agreed upon, and no one has the answer I do not know. Often a broad participation of groups which have special interests in the tourism sector can bring and the appearance of conflicts in the study area have the following results: 58% agree, 17% strongly agree, 9% disagree and 8% respectively are not agreed and are neutral and none responded not know. Residents who are involved in the decision making process necessary feel for the area but did increase participation next engagement. -36% Strongly agree, 29% agree, 21% were neutral, 7% respectively give the answer that disagree do not know, and no one has responded that there is no agreement. As we see people hope that they will extensively involved with in future decision-making processes. The level of participation of citizens in various decision-making is different in the level of participation in the study is as follows: - Presentation of the problems that exist (in a rating of 1-5) - 58% attend more often, 29% always participate, 21% sometimes participate, 7% rarely participate and none responded that rarely attends or not participate at all. In the study areas do not see a rapid development of tourism but this does not mean that these regions do not need to set standards in tourism products and services. To see how many people are participating in the standards setting let’s see the results of the survey - 54% rarely participate, 31% ever attend, participate often 8%, 7% and rarely participate at 0% does not take part and always participate. As seen from the above results we see a large turnout for setting product standards so people still do not see the need to establish standards. While the level of participation in the evaluation of services presented: - 97% did not take part at all and 3% more rare. In these areas there is still a need to assess tourist services because more people see opportunities for profit in other sectors than in tourism. An important factor which is considered by tourists is security. All tourists who visit a destination they need to feel safe and secure. Participation setting standards of residents in this issue area presents that: - 58% often participate, 17% participate some times, 8% rare. So residents who participate are interested in creating a safe destination and setting safety standards. An important problem in the region of Korca is the destruction of natural and cultural values. Attractions are the most important components in the development of tourism and if it is needed the development of sustainable tourism this region should preserve natural and cultural attractions. From results the level of participation in the preservation of cultural and natural values is: -61% ever, 22% often participate, 7% always participating, 10% participate rare. These results show that people still do not seek to preserve the region. Local residents must be informed for the importance of preserving the values. A strong element of attraction for tourists are also activities, festivals and events that take place in different tourist areas. To observe how interested are people to be included in decision-making process in various development activities in the study area have the following results: 46% always, 38% often participate, 8% rarely ever participate. So the inhabitants are interested in developing activities and making decisions. In the realization of publications people's participation is: 31% participate sometimes, 31% often participate, 23% always participate, 15% participate rare. Factors affecting the growth of community participation in the study but are taken some of them into consideration. So for 53% of the surveyed population had incomes very influential in their increased participation in development processes, 32% were extremely influential, 13% on average, 2% very little and 0% had no impact. If employment grows more people are motivated to help develop tourism and certainly more interested to participate in the local survey. The results in the study area are: 46% believe that employment increases more participation, 35% on average, 18% more excessively, 1% and 0% very little. If people are informed they may be more interested to be involved in decision making processes and in the development of tourism. So 51% believe that increased knowledge must increased the participation, 31% average, 17% too much, 15% less and 0% at all. In terms of environmental quality affects 38% think that they have much influence, 34% average, 19% too little, 9% too much, 0% no influence. Certainly tourism development brings increased budget for the development of infrastructure and other facilities.
surveillance has the following results: 43% more, 35% too more, 21% on average, 1% very little, 0% no influence. For the investments 47% have too much desire to participate, 16% want to participate 34% average, 3% very little, 0% didn’t want to participate in tourism investments. The image of participation: -72% of the respondents think that the image affects on average, 21% more, 7% too more, 0% and very little at all. Results showed that 93% knew the decisions taken by local authorities and 7% did not know. Decisions taken by local authorities made known by the local government in several ways: 43% recognized the decisions themselves participating, 36% through the display of decisions at the municipal, 7% through television, 7% by radio, 7% in other ways (example from friends and relatives etc). About 50% said that local authorities may gave them the opportunity to give their openly opinions, 36% of the organized community meetings, 7% held meetings with the doors open, 7% of residents opinions dealing with other ways e.g. direct meetings with the president. For the way of how to engage residents in the planning of the area is showed that 38% believed that they should participate in the decision-making processes, 23% give their opinions, 31% being informed about decisions and react to them, 8% in other forms e.g. involving in different activities, with thoughts of residents etc. Finding of the ways that should be used to increase participation: 46% think that community should be aware, 39% should be informed about how they would benefit, 15% thought it should be developed more training and 0% of the problems presented to the public or used other given forms. From the analysis of the questions this section revealed that: 36% of respondents belonged to the age of 31-40 years, 28% were from 21-30 years, 29% were more than 40 years, 75 less than 20 years. Similarly, 64% of respondents were male and 36% were women. For the level of education about 43% have higher education, 43% with secondary education, primary education 7% and 7% had completed courses of study after university.

By analyzing data collected, it is seen that local habitants have a great desire to participate in the decision-making process, they want to know everything also they thing that tourism could bring them benefits.

Based on the study and even in the theory are build some hypothesis. Evaluations of whether or not the hypothesis was conducted through tests where possible are logical connections between the research variables and statistically significant relationships (correlations) of research variables. Increasing local participation in management processes give rise to benefits for tourism destinations. Community involvement in the management of destination is a good way to bring stability to its authenticity of destinations. Let see hypotheses (a, b, c).

For hypothesis a - "Increased revenues from tourism activities bring increased community participation in the processes of local management." Found the following results: $\chi^2$ calculated = 21.396 (annex 1 table 1), the number of degrees of freedom 15, for $p = 0.05 \chi^2$ tab = 25. So $\chi^2$ calc < $\chi^2$ tab, so hypothesis “a” has been confirmed.

Authentication of this hypothesis suggests that the primary motivation to participate in the management processes is the increasing of revenue as a result of community business development. For hypothesis “b” - "Employment growth in tourism can increase community participation in the processes of local management." Found the following results: $\chi^2$ calculated = 16.9 (annex 1 table 2), the number of degrees of freedom 9, for $p = 0.05 \chi^2$ tab = 17.2. So $\chi^2$ calc < $\chi^2$ tab, so hypothesis “b” has been confirmed.

It showed good motivation for host communities to become part of the management processes is the creation of local jobs mainly from tourism sector and then from other sectors who strongly linked with.

For hypothesis “c” - "The increase of the activities can grow up community views in their participation at local management processes." Found the following results: $\chi^2$ calculated = 20.314 (annex 1 table 3), $p = 0.05$, the number of degrees of freedom 12, $\chi^2$ tab = 21.0, since $\chi^2$ < $\chi^2$ tab, the hypothesis “c” has been confirmed.
If we develop as many activities, ways or techniques to get community opinions, would then increase the tendency of citizens to participate in local management processes.

For hypothesis “d” - "The increase of local participation in management processes can rise the benefits for tourist destinations". "Found the following results: $\chi^2$ calculated = 32,500 (annex 1 table 4), p = 0.05, the number of degrees of freedom 25, $\chi^2$ tab = 37.7. So $\chi^2$ calc < $\chi^2$ tab, so hypothesis “d” has been confirmed.

All these hypotheses verifies again that the participation of the community in processes of the development of tourism can bring benefits for them, local government must increase activities which may involve community in the management processes.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Planners and marketers should consider residents as primary consumers of tourism products. They should study the characteristics of communities and increase their participation in tourism development. The success of the development of a competitive destination and tourism is sustainable development which will include community activities and the reduction of power in local decision-making processes. Host community awareness about the importance of their participation in building strategies, plans, programs, tourism development and in the protection of natural and cultural attractions is very important. The participation of host community in decision-making processes may grow up employment, can increase revenues and can bring the development of sustainable tourism. So the local government must train and educate host community.
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### Annex 1

**Table 1-hypothesis “a”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>21.396</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>14.689</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2-hypothesis “b”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>16.936</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>17.323</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3-hypothesis “c”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>20.314</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>17.311</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4 –hypothesis “d”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>32.500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>27.690</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>