

Digital Governance of the Surfing Tourism Industry in Lanuza Philippines

Nancy Marie M. Arimang

Department of Computer Studies, North Eastern Mindanao State University – Cantilan Campus Cantilan, Surigao del Sur 8317, Philippines

Correspondence: nmmarimang@nemsu.edu.ph

Abstract: As emerging coastal destinations transition from manual oversight to smart tourism ecosystems, evaluating societal impacts becomes a critical requirement for designing effective Destination Management Systems (DMS). Guided by the Triple Bottom Line framework, this mixed-methods study modeled the socio-cultural, economic, and environmental data of surfing tourism in Lanuza, Surigao del Sur, Philippines, to establish foundational parameters for digital governance. Data acquired from 196 survey respondents, 15 key informant interviews, and three focus group discussions were computationally analyzed to structure community feedback into actionable variables. The extracted information models reveal that while surfing tourism strengthens community pride, cultural identity, and livelihood opportunities, systemic vulnerabilities remain regarding unequal economic benefits, youth lifestyle alterations, and coastal waste generation. By translating these traditional socio-environmental impacts into system requirements, this research demonstrates that sustainable tourism necessitates integrated Decision Support Systems (DSS) rather than fragmented manual policies. The findings advocate for the deployment of smart environmental monitoring and data-driven participatory frameworks to ensure equitable benefit sharing and long-term ecological resilience in vulnerable surf communities.

Keywords: information modeling; digital governance; destination management systems; surfing tourism; Triple Bottom Line

1. Introduction

While extensive research has focused on the socio-environmental impacts of surfing tourism in established global destinations, there remains a critical gap regarding how emerging Southeast Asian surf towns can utilize information modeling and digital governance systems to capture, evaluate, and manage these complex societal impacts. Surfing tourism has evolved from a niche recreational pursuit into a substantial driver of coastal economies, influencing destination identity and requiring sophisticated management of regional resources (Buckley, 2002; Ponting, 2022). Much of the existing scholarship continues to focus on established surf destinations, such as Hawaii, Bali, and Costa Rica, where tourism systems and governance structures are more developed (Ponting, 2022; Usher & Kerstetter, 2022). Consequently, less is known about smaller destinations in developing countries, such as Lanuza in Surigao del Sur, Philippines, which are gaining attention as alternative surf spots that blend local customs with international mobility (Dolnicar & Fluker, 2021; Towner & Davies, 2021). These nascent destinations face unique vulnerabilities due to limited institutional capacity and fragile coastal ecosystems, necessitating advanced, data-driven approaches to tourism management.

To effectively quantify and manage these impacts, the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework, which considers sustainability from economic, socio-cultural, and environmental perspectives (Elkington, 1997; Weaver, 2006), serves as a foundational data structure. Researchers contend that sustainable tourism cannot be understood solely through economic metrics; it requires processing complex variables regarding community well-being and ecological integrity (Hall, 2020). In surf tourism, TBL acts as an analytical framework to elucidate quantifiable advantages, such as employment and livelihood diversification, against disadvantages like coastal degradation and cultural commodification (Ponting & O'Brien, 2021). However, translating these TBL dimensions into actionable policies requires robust Information and Communication Technology (ICT). Technology alone fails without systematic governance integration; crucial findings indicate that successful smart destination systems require simultaneous



operation across strategic-relational (policy), instrumental (technology), and applied (operational) levels, rather than through sequential implementation (Ivars-Baidal et al., 2019).

As tourism complexity grows, evaluating the societal impacts of these ecosystems demands integrated computational solutions. Traditional Destination Management Systems (DMS) are insufficient for complex challenges like overtourism or rapid coastal development; successful data-driven management requires real-time measurement, examination, and prediction capabilities integrated into a single platform, not separate tools (Mršić et al., 2020). Furthermore, effective system architecture must distinguish between explicit feedback, such as resident surveys, and implicit information traces like navigation data, because data mining effectiveness depends heavily on the tourism data type and specific problem characteristics (Höpken et al., 2011). Studies applying the TBL framework show that host communities frequently emphasize socio-cultural benefits while expressing concerns about waste management and the erosion of local identity (Li et al., 2022). Capturing this explicit feedback through structured information modeling is critical for feeding accurate variables into intelligent Decision Support Systems (DSS).

Community evaluation and empowerment represent the most vital data inputs for these management systems. Residents' attitudes toward tourism are shaped by their perceptions of its benefits and costs, alongside their level of involvement in planning (Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2020). Communities are more inclined to endorse development when they recognize concrete socio-economic advantages and environmental preservation (Almeida & Garrod, 2021). Consequently, modern DMS must move beyond marketing and booking functions to actively foster stakeholder networks; systems need built-in mechanisms to translate community input into actionable tourism development decisions using structured participation frameworks (Akbar, 2022). This structural inclusion prevents conflicts over resource access and cultural appropriation (Ponting, 2022) while maximizing opportunities for livelihood diversification and entrepreneurship (Gössling et al., 2021; Lazarow, 2007).

Furthermore, community-based tourism success depends heavily on coherent and inclusive governance systems that address socio-cultural and environmental challenges in marginalized destinations (Indama, 2026). The TBL framework is most efficacious in small coastal settings when integrated with participatory governance models that enhance local agency (Torres & Tan, 2023). Empowering coastal communities through eco-tourism education builds socio-economic resilience and encourages the shared stewardship of marine resources (Carpio et al., 2026). Simultaneously, effective tourism development requires strengthening the capacity of local stakeholders through proactive service practices to enhance both visitor satisfaction and system sustainability (Verano et al., 2026). Because rural and emerging communities require adaptable planning tools rather than rigid tech platforms, effective DSS must provide decision pathways that communities can modify based on local conditions while maintaining strategic coherence (Priatmoko et al., 2025).

Lanuza, Surigao del Sur, locally recognized as the "Surfing Capital of Surigao del Sur," provides an optimal setting to test these parameters. The town's annual surfing festival attracts varied demographics, making it a valuable case for examining tourism dynamics and community governance models. Guided by the TBL framework, this study explicitly structures community perceptions of surfing tourism's economic, socio-cultural, and environmental impacts. By translating these community evaluations into a structured information model, this research provides the essential system requirements for developing smart digital governance tools capable of sustaining equilibrium in emerging coastal destinations.

2. Methods

Research Design

This study utilized a mixed-methods descriptive research design to describe and model the complex socio-environmental impacts of surfing tourism in Lanuza. The quantitative aspect comprised a structured survey designed to assess residents' perceptions regarding the economic, socio-cultural, and environmental dimensions of the Triple Bottom Line (TBL). The qualitative aspect comprised semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs), facilitating the exploration of deep insights and intricate community perspectives. Combining both methods ensured the results were valid and established a reliable information baseline for the study.

Research Locale

The study took place in Lanuza, Surigao del Sur, a coastal town in the Caraga region of the Philippines. The town calls itself the "Surfing Capital of Surigao del Sur" and hosts the Lanuza Surfing Festival every year, which draws surfers from all over the world. Its surf culture connects local jobs, small businesses, and city-run tourism

programs. The municipality is a great example of a new surf destination growing in popularity with tourists while still maintaining a strong sense of community and relying on coastal resources.

Participants and Sampling

The respondents were residents, business owners, and community leaders who were directly or indirectly affected by surfing tourism. The researcher sent out 220 survey questionnaires and received 196 valid responses, for a 89% response rate. We used stratified random sampling to make sure that people from different barangays and socio-economic groups were represented. The researcher conducted 15 key informant interviews (KIIs) with local officials, surf school owners, and NGO representatives during the qualitative phase. We also held three focus groups with residents, youth groups, and fisherfolk associations, totaling 28 participants.

Data collection

To properly model the community feedback, the researchers organized the structured questionnaire into three parts: (1) socio-cultural effects, (2) economic effects, and (3) environmental effects of surfing tourism. The items were evaluated using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 indicated strong disagreement and 5 indicated strong agreement. Twenty people took the survey before it was sent out to make sure it was clear and reliable. The Cronbach's alpha score of 0.87 indicated that the survey was highly internally consistent. A thematic protocol guided the interviews and focus group discussions, focusing on perceived advantages, obstacles, and community aspirations for sustainable tourism development. All sessions were recorded with permission, transcribed for analysis, and held in English and the local language.

Data analysis

The analysis utilized descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency distributions) to process the quantitative data and employed SPSS for calculations. To clarify, the analysis modeled the results within TBL dimensions. Thematic analysis in NVivo coded the qualitative data, inductively generated codes, and grouped them into structured themes that aligned with the TBL framework. This enabled comparison of the quantitative and qualitative findings.

Ethical considerations

The university's research ethics committee approved the study. The researchers informed all participants about the study's objectives, methodologies, and the voluntary aspect of their involvement. They obtained informed consent before collecting data and promised to protect respondents' privacy and anonymity. To avoid community tension, the team discussed sensitive issues, such as disagreements over resource use, with care and cultural sensitivity.

Results

Socio-cultural effects of surfing tourism

The quantitative data modeled in this study indicates that most respondents perceive surfing tourism to have a positive effect on local culture and identity. The survey metrics show that approximately 82% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that surfing tourism makes people proud of their community, and 76% stated it encourages cultural exchange between locals and tourists. Qualitative interviews corroborated these data points, with numerous residents highlighting that the annual Lanuza Surfing Festival has evolved into a venue for showcasing local traditions, music, and cuisine. However, the data also captured community apprehensions; 41% of respondents expressed concern regarding how younger residents' lifestyles were changing, especially due to shifting social values and greater exposure to Westernized surf culture. Focus group participants emphasized the dual variables of potential youth empowerment (e.g., via surf schools) and the dangers of cultural dilution.

Table 1. Socio-cultural perceptions of surfing tourism

Indicator	Mean Score (1-5)	Interpretation
Surfing tourism fosters community pride	4.21	Agree
Promotes cultural exchange	4.08	Agree
Enhances sense of place identity	3.97	Agree

Encourages lifestyle changes among youth	3.64	Moderately Agree
--	------	------------------

Economic effects of surfing tourism

Based on the gathered economic indicators, respondents perceived surfing tourism as a major source of job opportunities. Around 79% of the surveyed population indicated that tourism helps families make money, either directly by providing jobs in surf-related businesses or indirectly by increasing demand for local goods and services. The data suggests that small businesses, such as restaurants, homestays, and souvenir shops, benefit the most. Key informants revealed that, even though there are more job opportunities, they are not evenly distributed. Business owners and families who work in surf-related businesses benefit the most, while traditional jobs like fishing do not experience equivalent advantages.

Table 2. Economic perceptions of surfing tourism

Indicator	Mean Score (1-5)	Interpretation
Creates employment opportunities	4.12	Agree
Increases household income	4.07	Agree
Stimulates local entrepreneurship	3.98	Agree
Unequal distribution of benefits	3.55	Moderately Agree

Environmental effects of surfing tourism

The structured information gathered regarding environmental impacts highlighted significant community concerns. According to 65% of respondents, surfing tourism increases waste production, especially during festival seasons and the busiest surf season. Interview data modeled the community's concern about the stress on coastal ecosystems and the inadequacy of waste management systems. Conversely, 71% of respondents agreed that surfing tourism raises community sensitivity to conservation, indicating a measurable growth in ecological awareness. Qualitative inputs cited programs like youth organizations and surf schools organizing beach clean-ups as examples of environmental progress.

Table 3. Environmental perceptions of surfing tourism

Indicator	Mean Score (1-5)	Interpretation
Surfing tourism increases waste generation	4.12	Agree
Raises ecological awareness among locals	4.07	Agree
Pressures natural resources (water, coastal areas)	3.98	Agree
Encourages environmental initiatives (clean-ups, conservation)	3.55	Moderately Agree

3. Discussion

The structured data retrieved from Lanuza affirms that the impacts of surfing tourism on host communities can be systematically quantified and modeled using the Triple Bottom Line (TBL) approach. However, the novelty of this study lies in interpreting these traditional socio-environmental variables as critical system requirements for future technological integration. While existing literature frequently explores the deployment of smart systems in highly developed destinations (Ivars-Baidal et al., 2019), this study demonstrates that emerging coastal towns require localized data architecture to manage these impacts effectively. The findings establish Lanuza as a viable paradigm for sustainable surf tourism growth by highlighting the necessity of translating community feedback into actionable data for Destination Management Systems (DMS).

The data indicates that surfing tourism has successfully enhanced community pride and identity, with locals perceiving the Lanuza Surfing Festival as a cultural emblem. Concurrently, apprehensions regarding lifestyle alterations and youth exposure to external factors reflect complex cultural negotiations. From an information systems

perspective, capturing this explicit feedback is critical; effective systems must distinguish between explicit feedback, such as these resident surveys, and implicit transaction data (Höpken et al., 2011). The Lanuza instance underscores that digital platforms cannot merely focus on marketing and booking (Akbar, 2022). To protect cultural authenticity while leveraging tourism-induced opportunities, future AI-driven management systems must incorporate built-in mechanisms that translate this socio-cultural input into structured participation frameworks (Akbar, 2022).

The economic advantages within the destination were broadly recognized in the data, particularly regarding livelihood diversification and micro-entrepreneurship support. Nevertheless, the disproportionate allocation of benefits remains a systemic vulnerability, where businesses near the beach prosper while traditional sectors like fishing do not experience equivalent advantages. This uneven distribution highlights a critical failure point in traditional, manual tourism management. Traditional DMS approaches are insufficient for resolving complex challenges regarding resource distribution; successful data-driven management requires real-time measurement and predictive capabilities integrated into a single platform (Mršić et al., 2020). By converting these economic disparities into structured variables, developers can build adaptable Decision Support Systems (DSS) that provide decision pathways tailored specifically for rural communities (Priatmoko et al., 2025), ensuring that algorithms optimize economic benefits across all socio-economic sectors.

Respondents expressed heightened ecological consciousness fostered by surfing tourism, alongside significant concerns regarding waste production and the strain on coastal resources during peak seasons. Currently, the community relies on proactive but manual measures, such as surf schools conducting beach clean-up activities and ocean conservation education. While these small-scale initiatives are beneficial, they are inadequate without established digital waste management systems and robust tracking frameworks. This dual perspective proves that technology alone fails without systematic governance integration; successful smart destination systems must operate simultaneously across strategic-relational policies, technological instruments, and applied operations (Ivars-Baidal et al., 2019). The environmental data modeled in this study proves that surfing tourism poses a threat to ecological resilience if its expansion exceeds the local government's computational and governance capabilities.

This study advances the field of computer information systems by applying the TBL paradigm to formulate the foundational data architecture for a nascent Philippine surf town. Theoretically, it bridges the gap between socio-environmental tourism research and ICT development by demonstrating that qualitative community concerns, such as uneven wealth distribution and cultural dilution, can be operationalized as critical system requirements for digital governance tools.

Practically, the findings suggest a mandate for local decision-makers to invest in digital infrastructure. For Lanuza, this entails utilizing the information modeled in this study to develop smart monitoring dashboards that track waste management capabilities and monitor the equitable distribution of tourism traffic. By safeguarding the surf locations through data-driven environmental management, the destination can ensure a steady influx of visitors and mutual benefits for all stakeholders. Ultimately, this research provides the necessary knowledge discovery and structured data essential for deploying AI and integrated management platforms in vulnerable coastal ecosystems.

4. Conclusion

The integration of the Triple Bottom Line framework with information modeling provides a critical mechanism for transitioning emerging coastal destinations from manual oversight to digital governance. The structured data extracted from the Lanuza community proves that socio-cultural preservation, equitable economic distribution, and environmental resilience require robust computational management rather than fragmented traditional policies. Relying on manual governance is no longer sufficient to mitigate the pressures on coastal resources and the uneven distribution of tourism benefits.

To operationalize these findings, local decision-makers must prioritize the development of integrated Destination Management Systems that process real-time community feedback and ecological indicators. Municipalities are highly encouraged to invest in smart waste management infrastructure and digital tracking tools that directly address the environmental pressures identified by the residents. Inclusive digital participation frameworks must also be established to guarantee fairer benefit sharing and ensure that traditional livelihood sectors are systematically integrated into the modern tourism economy.

Future academic inquiries should focus on prototyping and deploying AI-driven Decision Support Systems specifically calibrated for small-scale surf towns. Subsequent research must test the efficacy of predictive algorithms in forecasting waste generation during peak festival seasons and monitoring the socio-cultural carrying capacity of

marginalized coastal ecosystems. Investigators should further explore the deployment of mobile digital platforms designed to empower local stakeholders through technology-mediated education and participatory policy modeling.

References

1. Akbar, M. (2022). Destination management systems and community participation: Indonesia case. *Rangahau Aranga AUT Graduate Review*.
2. Almeida, G., & Garrod, B. (2021). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in small coastal communities: A longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(7), 1125–1143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1789153>
3. Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665–690.
4. Boley, B. B., McGehee, N. G., Perdue, R. R., & Long, P. (2014). Empowerment and resident attitudes toward tourism: Strengthening the theoretical foundation through a Weberian lens. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 49, 33–50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.08.005>
5. Buckley, R. (2002). Surf tourism and sustainable development in Indo-Pacific islands. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 10(5), 405–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580208667186>
6. Buckley, R. (2012). Sustainable tourism: Research and reality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 528–546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2012.02.003>
7. Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution. *The Canadian Geographer*, 24(1), 5–12.
8. Carpio, C. O., Narimin, R. S., Raveche, J. R. C., & Sarles, B. S. (2026). Participatory governance and the empowerment of coastal communities through eco-tourism education. *Journal of Global Tourism Research*, 11(1), 97–102. https://doi.org/10.37020/jgtr.11.1_97
9. Deery, M., Jago, L., & Fredline, L. (2012). Rethinking social impacts of tourism research. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.01.026>
10. Dolnicar, S., & Fluker, M. (2021). Special interest tourism. Channel View Publications.
11. Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor–resident irritants: Methodology and research inferences. In *Proceedings of the Travel Research Association* (pp. 195–198).
12. Elkington, J. (1997). Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business. Capstone.
13. Gössling, S., Scott, D., & Hall, C. M. (2021). Pandemics, tourism and global change: A rapid assessment of COVID-19. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708>
14. Gursoy, D., Jurovski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79–105.
15. Hall, C. M. (2020). Constructing sustainable tourism development and the managerial ecology of sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(10), 1785–1805. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1758708>
16. Höpken, W., Fuchs, M., Keil, D., & Lexhagen, M. (2011). The knowledge destination - a customer information-based destination management information system. *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism*.
17. Indama, A. C. (2026). Sociocultural dynamics, governance gaps, and sustainable environmental barriers in community-based tourism: Stakeholder perspectives from Basilan. *Journal of Global Tourism Research*, 11(1), 25–40. https://doi.org/10.37020/jgtr.11.1_25
18. Ivars-Baidal, J., Celdrán-Bernabeu, M. A., Mazón, J., & Perles-Ivars, Á. (2019). Smart destinations and the evolution of ICTs: A new scenario for destination management? *Current Issues in Tourism*.
19. Jalani, J. O. (2012). Local people's perceptions of ecotourism in Kinabalu Park, Sabah, Malaysia. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science*, 24(4), 459–468.
20. Ko, D.-W., & Stewart, W. P. (2002). A structural equation model of residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 165–190.
21. Lazarow, N. (2007). The value of coastal recreational resources: A travel cost method for surfers in Australia. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 23(6), 1103–1114.
22. Li, Y., Chen, C., & Wang, J. (2022). Community perceptions of sustainable tourism impacts in coastal destinations: A triple bottom line approach. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 41, 100949. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2021.100949>
23. Lucrezi, S., Saayman, M., & Van der Merwe, P. (2015). Managing beaches and beach-goers: Lessons from and for the blue flag award. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 101, 67–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.08.013>
24. Mach, L., Ponting, J., Brown, J., & Savage, J. (2020). Riding waves of intra-seasonal demand in surf tourism. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 23(2), 184–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2018.1491801>
25. Mason, P. (2003). *Tourism impacts, planning and management*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
26. Mršić, L., Surla, G., & Balković, M. (2020). Technology-driven smart support system for tourist destination management organizations. *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*.
27. Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243–268.
28. Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2020). Residents' support for tourism: An identity and justice perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 81, 102888. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102888>
29. Ponting, J. (2009). Projecting paradise: The surf media and the hermeneutic circle in surf tourism. *Tourism Analysis*, 14(2), 175–185.

30. Ponting, J. (2022). Surf tourism and sustainability: Global challenges and local realities. *Tourism Geographies*, 24(4), 589–611. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2021.1970952>
31. Ponting, J., & O'Brien, D. (2014). Liberalizing nirvana: Anarchy, utopia and neoliberalism in surf culture. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 38(4), 315–339.
32. Ponting, J., & O'Brien, D. (2021). Surf tourism, sustainability and community development in the Global South. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(9), 1405–1422.
33. Priatmoko, S., El Archi, Y., Listyorini, H., Bujdosó, Z., & Dávid, L. (2025). Decision support systems for developing community-based tourism. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*.
34. Román, C., Borja, Á., Uyarra, M. C., & Pouso, S. (2022). Environmental and socio-economic aspects of surf tourism and recreation. *Science of the Total Environment*, 830, 154122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.154122>
35. Scarfe, B. E., Healy, T. R., & Rennie, H. G. (2009). Research-based surfing literature for coastal management and the science of surfing: A review. *Journal of Coastal Research*, 25(3), 539–557.
36. Scheyvens, R. (1999). Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management*, 20(2), 245–249.
37. Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007>
38. Slaper, T. F., & Hall, T. J. (2011). The triple bottom line: What is it and how does it work? *Indiana Business Review*, 86(1), 4–8.
39. Stone, M. T., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2016). Protected areas, tourism and community livelihoods linkages: A comprehensive analysis approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(5), 673–693.
40. Torres, R., & Tan, S. (2023). Unequal tourism development in small island economies: Implications for sustainability and resilience. *Island Studies Journal*, 18(1), 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.24043/isj.386>
41. Towner, N., & Davies, S. (2021). Surf tourism and sustainable development: A systematic review. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 90, 103264.
42. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. UN.
43. Usher, L., & Kerstetter, D. (2022). Lifestyle mobilities and surf tourism: Rethinking community integration and cultural change. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 47(2), 214–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2021.1929356>
44. Uslu, A., Alagöz, G., & Güneş, E. (2020). Socio-cultural, economic, and environmental effects of tourism from the point of view of the local community. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 11(21), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.29036/jots.v11i21.147>
45. Verano, R. T., Grefalde, J. Q., Erlina, C. G., & Chavez, J. V. (2026). Proactive mindsets in tourism-oriented business: Resolution skills in customer complaints. *Journal of Global Tourism Research*, 11(1), 91–96. https://doi.org/10.37020/jgtr.11.1_91
46. Weaver, D. (2006). *Sustainable tourism: Theory and practice*. Elsevier.
47. Wilson, J., Harris, C., & Small, J. (2008). Surfing spaces: Surfing cultures and the politics of space. *Tourist Studies*, 8(3), 253–270.
48. Zhang, H., & Xiang, Z. (2021). Community-based tourism and residents' perceptions: A case study in Southeast Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 26(5), 497–511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2020.1856798>