

Abstract

The interaction of goals and common respect of each perceptions and intents is complicated relationship and co-operation of participants. Mutual interests, goals and benefits or negatives are always the main issue.

Our interest is the topic of tourism development and its interaction with community development. The study will discuss the impact of casino building on communities, especially the interaction of tourism and community development. The principles of tourism development (focused at building of tourism attraction – casinos) will be discussed in the coherence to the concepts of community development – empowerment, participation, partnerships, community capacity building and community change.

The impact of tourism on the economic development of countries as well as social development has been a topic of many academic discussions and articles. There have been developed the main paradigms influenced the tourism development during the last 50 years, which are “modernization, dependency, economic neo-liberalism and alternative development” (Telfer 1996, 2002a). These factors have had an impact at tourism development in the recent period and its influence can be discussed also in the connection to the development of tourism in communities, not only in the development of tourism generally.

Key words: Community development, casino building, tourism development, partnerships, attitudes against casino building, quality of life

Introduction

We will focus at the concept of modernization of communities through tourism development, which can be explained as the development of new entrepreneurship opportunities, building of modern infrastructure in communities, improvement of services and consequently improvement of economic and social environment in communities. However, sometimes the uncontrolled and extensive development through tourism can bear also many negative factors and not always are beneficial for a community. In many cases

“economic growth is often associated with modernization and in terms of tourism development it is important to understand whether the economic benefits reach the local community and help build community capacity” (Telfer 1996, p. 158). Tourism development in majority cases is a factor of creation of positive impact on communities especially as a factor of increase of employment in a community.

From the other mentioned paradigms the main impact on community has also the factor of alternative development, which supports the idea of more community involvement in the tourism development through the participation of partners, community members and it has coherence to our studied topic. The approach of alternative development is “centered on grass-roots, participatory approach, which empowers local people.” It is a concept of sustainable development of tourism. In this type of development exists a possibility of higher participation of local community in tourism development.

Literature review

“Community is defined by Nagy and Fawcett (1998, p. 1) as a “group of people who share a common place, experience, or interest”. We often use this term for people who live in the same area: the same neighborhood, the same city or town, and even the same state or county. But people may also consider themselves part of the same community with others who have had similar experiencesracial or ethnic community religious community,community of people with disabilities. Finally, a community may be formed of people interested in the same things. “In a community, we have physical, emotional, psychological, social and economic communities of interest” (Pedlar, Haworth 2006, p. 518). For this reason is very problematic to find the preference of interests, however our argument is to find the common consensus, for example in economic and community development.

Community development can be defined as “a process of economic and social progress based on local initiatives. Its success depends on the full participation of the community, the development of community awareness of its needs and their possible solutions (Smith 1990, 56). In this definition could be found two approaches to community development – economic and social (community development). Economic development in this case means creation of incentives at macro and especially micro-economic level for the development of economy, growth of business, improvement of employment opportunities in communities (factor of multiplication effects on economy and community as well). Improvements in the economic position of communities lead to higher employment in a community, increase of living standard, which creates the attitudes of satisfaction in communities. In addition, the improvement of

economic milieu in a community has an impact on new investments into social and health care programs and facilities in a community.

“Community development (CD) may be seen as a process, a program, a methodology and movement, it is easier to consider these approaches within the context of macro level development and micro level development”(Scantlebury, 2003, p. 58). At macro level this definition could be understood as the government attempts to include communities in decision making processes. In market economy in many cases it is a market, which dictates the further development. More visible is the participation of communities at micro level in the form of citizen involvement and participation, however questionable is the measure of participation of community in decision processes about the community development, where can be applied the Arnstein model (1969, p. 295) of participation of citizens – from the higher level of involvement in citizens decision making processes (citizen control) to the lowest level of citizen participation in decision making processes (manipulation). This approach will be mentioned later in the connection to the decisions in tourism development in a community and partnerships creation, because partnerships in tourism are common in development of tourism especially due to the more effective approach in tourism development.

Daly and Colb define the distinction between the economic growth and development as the “economic growth as the quantitative growth of economic system in the framework of its physical dimensions, however the development as the qualitative change in the dynamic balance with a nature” (1989, p. 74). The latter could be understood in the connection to the community as well.

Rothman (1995, p. 26 - 63) describes community development as a process of change of quality of life, which is characterized by:

- locality development (involvement of community in changes of their community environment)
- social planning (state involvement into social development in communities)
- social action (solving of conflicts, radical changes in communities).

This concept will be later explained in the connection to tourism development and impact of community intervention approaches and tourism.

Improvements of quality of life and social benefits have positive impact on

locality development.

There is a difference between economic development and community development (Reid, Taylor, Mair, 2000, p. 4). Based on these authors both have impact on the quality of life, but there are fundamental differences in the process, ownership and the outcome of development. In community development the priority areas of development are identified by the community and profits are reinvested or disposed for community development (as is typical for not-for profit sector). This could be explained for example on the case of tourism development as an factor of economic development not only in a country, but also in communities.

Tourism as a factor of development in communities

The participation of community is the main precondition of sustainability of tourism. The question is if in all cases the tourism development is sustainable and if the community participation is visible, moreover how are solved the negative impacts of tourism development (despite the predominance of positive impacts)?

Community development will be focused at the priority of community, people's priorities; however tourism has different character and it has in many cases positive impact on communities, the community development is not the main priority of tourism development. "Tourism proceeds both as a planned intervention, as a local, regional or national development strategy, and as an unplanned free market process" (Telfer, 2000a, p. 162).

There exists a planned process of tourism development, tourism policy in every country, region, and municipality; however the main development processes are influenced also by decisions of entrepreneurs, because tourism enterprises are mostly in the ownership of private sector entrepreneurs. For this reason some decision about the tourism development cannot be governed by the community decisions, however "as the tourism continues to expand throughout the world, community and local people should have a greater to say in that development" (Telfer 2000a, p. 162).

During many studies and forums held about the tourism policy and its implementation have been found two major trends (Hawkins et al, 1991):

- that the physical environment is taking "centre stage" in tourism development and management; furthermore, there is recognition that there are finite limitations to tourism development in terms of both physical and social carrying capacity of destinations;

- that resident responsive tourism is the watchword for tomorrow; community demands for active participation in the setting to the tourism agenda and its priorities for tourism development and management cannot be ignored. (Bramwell, Lane 2000, p. 44)

The authors state that "a large number of publications have demonstrated just how seriously both scholars and the public have taken the call for more active collaboration in community socio-economic planning (Chrislip & Larson, 1994; Jamal & Getz, 1995; Huxham, 1996 in Bramwell, Lane 2000, p. 44). Public consultations and community attitudes are for this reason important impulse for creation of more positive entrepreneurship environment in communities.

The decision process about tourism development depends on the issue and the opportunities of community to be involved in the decision process, if this is possible in the framework of economic and social planning, community planning and legislation; however, the community has strong impact on many decisions and developments.

"Tourism can be defined as the act of travel and set of actions engaged in by people in by people during the trip to places away from their home environment. It is an aggregate of all businesses that directly provide goods or services to facilitate business, pleasure and leisure activities away from the home environment" (Smith 1990, p. 323)

This definition is important to understand a concept of importance of communities in tourism. Communities are important factors in tourism supply offer, if they are understood from the geographical point of view, because they offer the location for the tourism attraction (primary offer), superstructure and infrastructure (from the point of view of location of these facilities and their maintenance as well). Another factor of development of tourism in communities are entrepreneurs bearing risk and know-how.

Murphy (1985, p. 153) argues that "tourism relies on the goodwill and cooperation of local people because they are part of its product." Local people can create positive environment for tourists or can be a source of tension and stress for tourists and vice versa. Tourists can be a reason of creation of negative externalities for local people. Gearing and Swart classified these negative factors as "production externalities, externalities of consumption, externalities of environmental protection and socio-cultural externalities" (1976, p. 14).

"Tourism academics have generally referred to communities as locals, residents, natives, indigenous people and hosts. It is important to define this

term in connection to tourism, because our interest is focused at the attitudes of communities to casino building and the analyze of benefits and negatives of casinos construction in communities" (Singh 2003, p. 19).

In a community "all persons and public and private bodies are affected positively and negatively by the impacts of tourism development. People's participation through power sharing, social cohesion and knowledge enhancement is very important in community development" (Singh 2003, p.19). Tourism development creates in a community some new relations, partnerships, positive environment and multiple beneficial economic effects or negative effects. Impact of tourism on communities is crucial in creation of communities' attitude to the development.

Partnership in a community and tourism development

There is no doubt that booming economic environment has a synergetic effect on the other activities in a community. Moreover, members of a community are more interested to co-operate in challenging environment and create partnerships. However, Hall states that "business interests may have a tendency to dominate and that this may have precluded inputs from stakeholders from organizations and wider community interests" (in Bramwell, Lane 2000, p.14). We oppose with the opinion that besides the economic interests in tourism development in communities, important for sustainability in a community are also community interests and for this reason has to be taken into account not only governance managed strongly by economic goals, but also by community interests. These could be for example the interest to maintain quality of life of citizens, to preserve community values, to protect culture, to recognize "human factor" in development, to maintain safety, quality of public services in communities, to take into account community health and well-being (in case of casinos is important the attitude of citizens against casino building and the positive and negative impacts of this planning decisions on communities, which will be discussed later). For this reason the involvement of non-formal groups and not-for profit sector in partnerships could be helpful for further communication (creation of trust and relationship with a community), however in tourism development are mostly all partnerships created on the base of business interests and mutual beneficial entrepreneurship co-operation (pooling resources, pooling interest, pooling profit).

Partnerships in a community could be created in different areas of activities and development and the members of partnerships could be representatives of different sectors – private, public and not-for profit as well as the members

could be also informal groups." Partnership does not include all members of a community" (Singh 2003, p. 149).

As has been already explained, the idea of creation of partnership in tourism in a community is to create mutual beneficial environment for the tourism development. This empowerment could be positive also for the other members of community (multiplication effect) or could have negative consequences (which is less common case, usually it could have some consequences on the less economically powerful members of community, at the most vulnerable, or the community as the whole – environmental pollution, etc.).

It is important to respect the community needs and potential in development of entrepreneurial activities and to offer mutual benefits for business environment (entrepreneurs) and community (citizens) in any activity – it means also in tourism entrepreneurship.

Partnerships in tourism could be defined "as tourist destination areas and organizations which may be able to gain competitive advantage by bringing together the knowledge expertise, capital and other resources of several stakeholders." (Kotler et al., 1993, p. 248) In the process of partnership creation and decision process is crucial to understand, that the main reason of establishment of a partnership is the economic reason and mutual benefit interest, wider community interests are not dominant. "The community tourism approach of Murphy (1985, 1988) emphasizes the importance of community in destination management, because this means also working with industry and community – based groups and wider public participation." (Singh 2003, p. 44). "The difficulty in implementing community based tourism strategies is reflective of wider difficulties with respect to effective destination management and tourism planning (Davidson & Maitland 1997), namely the diffuse nature of tourism phenomenon within economy and society" (Bramwell, Lane 2000, p. 144). This problem has been already discussed – there exist economic interests – tourism development interests (to create employment opportunities, to gain profit, collect taxes) and social interest (stated above) – healthy and sustainable communities, quality of life in communities, fulfillment of social needs and human needs. For this reason we have to discuss the relationship between tourism and communities and their interdependence.

Community offers its nature, culture, society and its economy as commodities (Fry, 1977) in the form of primary conditions for the tourism development:

- attractions (cultural, sport facilities, casinos, leisure and

recreation facilities)

- superstructure (accommodation and catering facilities, markets, shopping facilities)
- infrastructure (transportation facilities, visitor centers, markets, shopping facilities).

The synergy of community interests and entrepreneur's interests in tourism development is the optimal outcome of a symbiosis of these two elements in economic, social and natural environment.

Hall (2000 a, p. 174) raises issues in discussing tourism collaboration and partnerships stating that "unless there are attempts to provide equity to access to all stakeholders then collaboration will become another tourism cliché. There may be the undermining of social capital required for sustainable development."

"Social capital is composed of the non-market relationships that individuals bring to bear to cope with inevitable risks of market imperfections associated with asymmetrical knowledge between contracting agents." (Stiglitz, 1989 – in Rothman, 1995) Stiglitz' s incorporation of social variables as endogenous to market behavior violates the "rules" of market preferences and exogenous social context." "Social capital refers to the aggregate of social control behaviors that individuals cause to address negative market externalities." The impact of negative externalities on a community and tourists has been already discussed.

"When examining the role of the community in tourism it is impossible to separate the social, economic and political processes operating within a community from the conflict which occurs between stakeholders." (Singh 2003, p. 100) This conflict could be based on the interaction of stakeholders with members of community and especially on the type of relationship a community has with local entrepreneurs in tourism and partners in a partnership. It is not obvious that community dictates entrepreneurs what should be developed and how the entrepreneurs activities have to be managed (this is based on legislation and market decisions), however a community could express its attitude against some development and activities.

Methods and materials

Methods applied in the exploratory and empirically based study were used in

the framework of the secondary research. There have been used examples and secondary research cases from the U.S.A., Canada (a place of principal research), particularly from Europe. This study acknowledges the merits of qualitative research as it provides a pragmatic response for an in-depth understanding for this exploratory research. One of the key strengths of case study is the flexibility of method and the potential for practical application to use varied evidence, multiple sources and techniques in the data gathering process, for instance: interviews, observations, documents, arte-facts (Yin, 2003; Vissak, 2010). In our study, we will only use the secondary existing materials from literature, studied journals and research studies and from materials existing on website. The interviews and observations as a primary research tools have not been used in this stage of research, but might be a possible tool for further in-depth research.

Research and results

Gambling and creation of casinos has started to boom in U.S.A and Canada in the past and the idea was originated in Europe (Monte Carlo, Monaco – combination of spas and casinos – places for leisure and entertainment). First development planes did not develop casinos in cities, preference was the development in smaller communities or in the abandoned destinations. Later development concepts brought up casinos closer to urban destinations and communities. “Unprecedented growth of gambling was the main reason of a justification for the legalization of gambling.” (Wall, 2006 p. 248) Legalization of casino building and gambling has avoided the growth of illegal casinos, money laundering and fraud in tax payments.

Casinos were legalized in the hope that they would generate tourist activity and local employment and economic activity to the resort and surrounding region (communities and region – synergic effect).

Creation of casinos and gambling is a controversial topic, however the economic impact on the tourism growth, tax collection and employment improvement in the communities, where casinos have been built, is evident. “Gambling in the U.S.A and abroad has always been questionable commercial activity, which has been linked to the corruption of public officials, to organized crime, to personal, family and social misfortunes.” (Pizam 1986, p. 279). Generally impacts of casino building in communities could be characterized as political, economic and social impacts. Pizam links main political impacts the interventions of entrepreneurs and people from outside communities into community development. Building of casinos influences the community life, employment, cost of living and services in a community and the income tax

rate, which has also impact on the quality of life and living standard. The most crucial are from the standpoint of community attitudes against gambling the social impacts based on the quality and availability of public services, infrastructure, its congestion, occurrence of negative externalities in a community (crime, drug dealership etc.).

Many authors documented also positive economic impact of casinos on community development – Pizam and Pokela (1985, p. 12), Roehl (1998) and Heneghan (1999). Wall mentioned that “the spread of casino tourism has brought a corresponding body of research literature that attempts to provide a balanced perspective between the readily apparent economic benefits (tax revenues, employment opportunities, regional development and capital investment stimulation” (2006, p. 249).

The question is if the casino development is a burden for a community or if it also brings positive development and if communities have some power to deal with a problem of casino development in case of disagreement with this type of development. It is a matter of solving of conflict in a community.

“When examining the role of the community in tourism it is impossible to separate the social, economic and political processes operating within a community from the conflict which occurs between stakeholders. Conflict is a normal consequence of human interaction in the periods of a change.” (Singh 2003, p. 30) This conflict could be created on the consequences of some negative outcomes of tourism activities and our role is to summarize positives and negatives of such activities as gambling and analyze from the studied materials some attitude of citizens in communities in connection to gambling activities.

Benefits of creation casinos and gambling activities:

- creation of new product as the new tourism attraction offer
- multiplication effect – increase of employment possibilities in communities with high unemployment
- new employment possibilities lead to the decrease of people's dependency on welfare
- infrastructure building, service improvement
- multiplication effect on other business performance – hotels, restaurants, markets, etc.

- higher tax collection in a community – the income from higher taxes could be used for community services or tourism development. (Pizam and Pokela, 1985, p. 12).

Negatives:

- increase of the price of property (this process could lead to the gentrification)
- growth of demand on building of new infrastructure and improvement of existing infrastructure (roads, parking places)
- negative externalities for the community – environment pollution, noise, congestion, crime
- increase of social problems which are created by the gambling habits of most vulnerable people, mostly low income people, who cannot manage their social status and start to be addictive to gambling
- in many cases gambling, which is not regulated could lead to corruption and infiltration of criminal into casino business
- existence of so called “cannibalism effect” – which could cause the bankruptcy of other businesses, which cannot compete with their rivals – casinos
- stress, increase of traffic accidents – (Pizam, 1985, p. 12)

“In many tourist-gambling communities gambling often destroys the fabric of communities both in physical and social terms (increased deviant behavior, addiction and organized crime). (Singh 2003, p.19) “There have been some winners within the community, but the majority of them are employed by the gaming industry.” Does a community have some right to express its attitude? Another question is if a community can manage casino development without some tensions and benefit from the casino activities? We have studied some reports and discussions about gambling and there have been different attitudes against or pro gambling activities.

For example, there was an opposition against the increase of casino building in the City of Red Deer, Alberta in 2002. Gambling was viewed by the local government as a revenue source and community expressed its disagreement stating that the “province is ignoring negative social implications of gambling.” Council members argued in this dispute and came with the argument that gambling is provincially licensed and the city's power to regulate gambling is

very limited.

Gambling and casino building is the activity of high interest of first nation tribes and for example in 2002 "The Enoch Cree Nation's proposed multi-million dollar casino west of Edmonton with a cost of project \$ 120 million. The province of Alberta has indicated about 10 First Nations bands to be interested in building of a casino in that period.

Residents' attitudes against or in a favor of casino building have an enormous importance. "These attitudes are not easily expressed in the usual local political and economic development decision-making process. Local residents do not have the same power to affect the results of the development. They are not able to take proactive role in determining the direction of gambling (Long, Clark, Liston, 1994, in Carmichael, Peppard, Boudreau, <http://jtr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint>). These authors suggest that "community leaders and state policymakers should face the political, economic, and moral controversies connected with gaming".

There have been studied social implications of casino tourism attractions on the residents (Wall 2006, p. 250):

1. Residents are often unprepared for the rapidity and magnitude of changes brought about by casino tourism.
2. Gambling can lead to personal and family tragedies from compulsive or pathological gambling behavior and these are likely to grow as access to legalized gambling increases.
3. There has been political corruption and organized crime linked to casino gaming. However, as legal casinos have become common and accepted and regulations more stringent, opportunities for corruption or organized crime infiltration have diminished.
4. The inequitable distribution of the benefits of casino tourism to residents and inequitable taxation for those in casino tourism locales versus other resort residents in the surrounding area. Studies reveal that gambling taxes tend to be regressive, i. e. taxes being levied disproportionately against residents of the resort versus the surrounding area (Mason, Shapiro, Borg, 1989, Roehl, 1994 in Wall, p. 249).
5. Residents of casino tourism resorts do recognize both positive and negative impacts. Interestingly, despite this seeming ambivalence, the

perception of the impacts of casino tourism by residents is tolerant, tempered by the expectations of future benefits. While casino tourism shares many of the same characteristics of mass tourism, the added dimension of gambling does provide significant differentiation in terms of social impacts."

The contemporary research is still not sufficient to create the realistic picture about the gambling impact on communities, society. The economic impact is more measured than the social impact. There have been done some research studies which state "that though casinos are seen as welcome relief for economic problems and as catalyst to the areas' sagging tourist industry, they are also perceived as having a variety of negative effects" (Pizam, Pokella 1985, p. 163).

The question is, if in a case of community opposition against casinos development or some negative consequences, does the community have some opportunity to oppose or change decision of the tourism development and casinos building decision?

Joppe (1996, p. 173) "suggests that tourism continues to be driven by levels of government rather than community interests and there is a great deal of rhetoric surrounding community involvement" and it means also some impacts on tourism development.

Jenkins (1993, p. 173) characterized these forms of tourism planning and public participation relationship as following:

- the public generally has difficulty in comprehending complex and technical planning issues
- the public is not always aware of, or understands the decision making process
- it is difficult to attain and maintain representatives in the decision-making process
- apathy of citizens
- the increased cost in terms of staff and money
- the prolonging of the decision-making process
- adverse effects on the efficiency of the decision-making process.

However, we cannot state "that residents are animals, the industry becomes
(100)

the predators, and both residents and tourist are the prey" (Getz 1985, p. 669).

Community has a power to express its opinion and attitude, even though the planning and decision process is made by government, tourism developers and entrepreneurs. The main problem is to comply with community development with the tourism development, which has been already mentioned before in Rothman's statement and their three methods of community interventions which can be used in tourism development.

Characteristics	Locality development	Social planning policy	Social action
Direction	Community change due to tourism should be pursued through broad participation of a wide spectrum of people	Technical process of problem solving regarding substantive tourism development issues through expert planners	Disadvantaged group that needs to organize to make demands surrounding tourism development
Goal	Process goals of working to increase community capacity for community development	Focus on task goals to solve problems related to tourism development	Shifting of power relationships and resources in tourism development
Strategy for change	Involve a broad cross section of people in determining and solving problems related to tourism	Gathering data about potential tourism developments and making decisions on the most logical course of action	Crystallizing tourism development issues and mobilize people to take action
Characteristic change tactic	Consensus: communication among groups	Consensus or conflict	Conflict confrontation, direct action, negotiation
Medium for change	Guiding small, task Oriented groups	Guiding formal organizations and treating data	Guiding mass organizations and political process
Control	Broad community involvement in tourism development issues	Tourism planners as experts	Mobilize people to take action over tourism development
Approach	Bottom up	Top down	Militant
Advantages	Build community capacity with respect to tourism development	Draw on outside expert opinions for tourism development	Raise community awareness and challenge status quo over tourism development
Disadvantages	Difficult to build Consensus around tourism development	Limited local involvement or control	Can lead to a fragmented approach

Sources: Rothman(1995,p.44).

Table 1 Community development intervention approaches and tourism

To understand this Rothman's model of community interventions into tourism development is important, however the common practice in tourism development is not always based on this model. Community attitudes to tourism developments can be negative, if there is not planning and development of tourism in a framework of their attitudes as well. In the case of casinos the main entrepreneur is the state and the economic benefits prevail, moreover casinos enrich the portfolio of attractions in tourism business. This is unquestionable issue, even though there will be always benefits and negatives as in every economic or social decision. The last table helps to understand the approach of how to built community capacity and implement the tourism beneficiary impacts in the development of communities, maybe also casino building is one example of coherence of different interests which can be "smoothly" managed in communities for mutual benefits of stakeholders (state, partnerships) and community.

Our research was mainly focused on general characteristics of gambling business and the comparison of countries as the U.S.A., Canada and some European countries (specifically Great Britain).

Studies in the U.S.A. revealed that in the past conducted casinos in the U.S.A. mostly the illegal activities because only the states of Nevada and the Atlantic City (since 1977) were given a permit to run casinos. However, nowadays the situation in the U.S.A. has changed dramatically and there is a growth of casinos market across the country. Some authors, as for instance Eadington (1999) examined the economic impact of casinos in the state Nevada. Later, Lambert et al (2010) focused his attention at the impact of legalized gambling in the United States over the past thirty years, especially the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa and Missouri, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Based on his research, a majority of casinos exist in cities; however, they also exist in rural areas. A good example of gambling in the U.S.A. is Atlantic City. The authors Teske and Sur (1991) observed the economic consequences of casino building, which might be one of the pro-casino building arguments. However, the authors argued that the economic rewards are in many cases not proportionally distributed and it creates a polarity among the gainers and losers in a society. As a consequence, many social problems (crime, prostitution, addiction to gambling, etc.) occurred. The positives of this activity might be a job creation and a growth of tourism businesses. Several authors as for instance Thomson (2011), Li, Gui & Sui (2009) admitted that casino building might be a positive argument for the economic development despite the social problems accompanying these activities.

Still our secondary research in the U.S.A. as well as in the other searched countries (Canada and the United Kingdom) confirmed that despite the

economic growth, the social ills of this part of the U.S.A. and the fact that some revenues collected from casinos do not stay in the regions or cities, but flows into hands of the foreign owners. A good example is for instance in Illinois a case of so called "riverboat communities", where gambling is conducted on the boats and the revenues goes to the hands of the owners from different communities, as is for instance the state of Illinois. Richards (2009) studied the legalization conditions in the U.S.A. in 13 states and especially explored the reasons of problems with the legalization of casinos. These obstacles were mostly based on religious reasons. In several American states and cities, for instance in Atlantic City, Chester (Pennsylvania), Philadelphia, were found similarities, especially the opinion that the attitudes of communities depend on the planning of the activities and the involvement of public sector in it. Generally, casinos could be beneficial for the improvement of the product offer of the tourism places, but there should be taken into account also the social consequences of such a decision to built casinos in cities or rural areas. It all depends on the co-operation of partners in cities (public and private sector and their willingness to solve the possible externalities) and especially a co-operation of citizens and the whole community. Culture and religion is a decisive factor, which has been stated in the case of building casinos in the U.S.A. and our opinion is that it is also in the other countries all over the world. Culture, religion, legislation influence the existence of casinos.

Based on the study (Federal Reserve Study, 2007) the profit created in communities was extracted from the local market, which means that the multiplier effect of casinos is really questionable and all depends on the ownership of casinos and the profit distribution.

Despite of the fact that casinos are perceived in the U.S.A. as a private-public partnerships between government and the gambling industry (except Kansas, where are 3 casinos owned by the state), it must be clear that casinos are mostly given special regional monopoly by the state in order to create a source of revenue, which is separated from direct taxation. Legal rules, regulations, governmental support are important for the existence of casinos. Finally, our research based on the studied secondary evidence and the evidence from the health and social sciences sources suggests that American casinos are despite the economic positives and some source of income also a source of negative, health, economic, political, intellectual and social outcomes. Similar cases have been studied in Canada, which is also very well known for casino building.

In Canada, several similarities to the situation in the U.S.A. occurred. Especially not only the benefits, but also the social costs have to be taken into the account. Despite of the fact that government values the job and revenue

creation, the community in several cases suffers. Since 1985 there exists an agreement between the federal and provincial governments in matter of gambling policies. Campbell (2009) mentioned the Eadington's opinion that the Canadian provincial governments legalized gambling to generate government revenue, stimulate economic growth through tourism, to create urban revitalization, job creation, to prevent illegal gambling, prevent organized crime and to modernize outdated or unworkable laws. However, not similar rules can be found for the cities in Canada or the communities, especially some are more benefiting from casino businesses and some are bearing more negative consequences. Good examples of such cities or communities are for instance St. Catharines with its casino, which benefits from the closer distance to the U.S. border and the presence of splendid Niagara Falls, one of the most important tourism attractions of Canada. Despite of this fact, there is the existing competition on the other side of the border, where exist a casino on the American side. However, a casino in the St. Catharines is a good example of the symbiosis of the tourism attraction and a leisure business. Another good example might be Windsor or Ottawa. Some studies revealed that not all casinos bear economic benefits, but could be destructive for a community. For instance Casino Rama in Orillia was a case where local business owners lost their profits due to the casino business in their community. Hendrickson and Lipsey (1999) mentioned that less money has been spent on local businesses due to the gambling activities, which means that local people could not afford to go to the local restaurants, bars, etc. These communities are not so famous for the international visitors and especially they are not located close to the borders where the American tourists gamble. The location and familiarity of a place also play an important role in consideration of the gambling businesses existence.

The economic benefits, which are created by gaming industry, are overruled in many cases by social problems, negative impacts on local businesses, crime and injustice. For instance, the study revealed that one third of employees in gambling sector (Statistics of Canada) are part-time workers and for this reason are not highly paid. The multiplier impact on local communities is, for this reason, not so strong. On the other hand, some studies revealed that each problem gambler costs a taxpayer \$19,272 in order to treat the addiction and cover several public services or personal fees. Except of these negative consequences, gambling in Canada bears similar characteristics as in the U.S.A and might be one of the reasons of so called regressive taxation, which means that the gains from the lottery commissions support some activities (for instance sport of culture) in provinces of Canada.

In Canada, specific rules are used for gambling for First Nations, for instance

Casino Rama in Orillia is run by First Nation community. Alberta, Manitoba has First Nations Gaming Policy permitting on-reserve casinos. Different rules are in Nova Scotia, Quebec, New Brunswick and Manitoba. British Columbia, New Foundland, Labrador and Prince Edward Island have no rules from the government for the gambling business.

In Europe, our interest was focused on gambling practices and community development problems in the United Kingdom. In the United Kingdom exist about 140 casinos and in many cases it is a combination of traditional casinos, table games, section for sports, race betting, etc. From the 19th century to the year 2001 bets in the United Kingdom were discouraged by the government till the year 2005, when a the Gambling Act was approved. However, the act also mentioned that the gaming industry must act responsibly on the issue of addiction and gaming. The British gaming industry contributes annually up to £3 million to programs that combat gambling addiction. Despite of these negative consequences, it is important to mention that in fact, betting is a part of UK culture. Casinos started to become popular also in the United Kingdom for similar reasons as in the other countries due to the ability to create a revenue and profit. United Kingdom by planning the activities in their country tried to avoid harsh consequences and first allowed only limited forms and time of gambling and limited forms of service or advertising. Still in this period of time, there exists a regulation from the government. Since the UK lies both geographically and culturally between Europe and America, the United Kingdom's taste for gambling lies somewhere on the spectrum between the United States and continental Europe. The legality of certain types of betting in pubs is a unique feature of gaming law in the UK. A larger than normal variety of lottery games is another feature that sets this jurisdiction apart from its neighbours. United Kingdom has similar problems with gambling as the other above mentioned countries, but the positive is the size of casinos, which is smaller than in the U.S.A and Canada. Despite of it, problem gambling costs the UK up to £1.2bn a year and the report (GambleAware) revealed the growing mental problems, crime, and homelessness due to the increase of gambling in the country.

Discussion and conclusion

The community attitudes and summarizing of negative and positive factors against or pro favor of casino building as the tourism attractions in communities – tourism destinations, is the main focus of our paper discussion, which was shortly introduced by the theoretical view at the communities, community development, partnerships and partnerships in tourism.

Community attitudes to tourism developments can be negative, if there is not

planning and development of tourism in a framework of their attitudes as well. In the case of casinos the main entrepreneur is the state and the economic benefits prevail, moreover casinos enrich the portfolio of attractions in tourism business. This is unquestionable issue, even though there will be always benefits and negatives as in every economic or social decision. However, casinos have also positive impact on community development, especially if the revenues from the gambling activities are used for some community development activities.

The important task is to manage casino building or development in such a manner, which could be sustainable for a community or just respect a social environment with a specific culture or religion by giving a community a chance to express its desire or opinion. In business, this could be sometimes an obstacle and even governmental decisions can be irresponsible to the communities.

There might be different outcomes of the attitude in more liberal countries as for instance in conservative countries with the existing prejudice against gambling as a leisure and entrepreneurship activity. Legislative rules of specific countries and religious restrictions build a platform for the further decisions in a favor of building of casinos in communities or not. Typical example are for instance some Asian countries (China) or Israel, where gambling is prohibited on the territories of those countries. Our focus was the situation in North America, the U.S.A. and Canada and one European country, United Kingdom, which is culturally close to Europe and also to North America.

The results confirmed that casino building is one example of coherence of different interests which can be "smoothly" managed in communities for mutual benefits of stakeholders (state, partnerships) and community. In this case the development and decisions are based not only on economic conditions, community, government, but culture and religion play an important role, which could be another great opportunity for further discussion and research.

References:

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", *American Institute of planning Journal* 35, 216-22.
- Bramwell, B.; Lane, B. (2000). " *Tourism Collaboration and Partnerships – Politics, Practice and Sustainability*", Channel View Publishing: Toronto.
- Campbell, Colin S. (2009). "Canadian Gambling Policies." In *Casino State: Legalized Gambling in Canada*, edited by James F. Cosgrave, and Thomas R.

Klassen, 69–90. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Daly, H., Cobb, C. (1989). "For the common good". Beacon Press: Boston (In: Sharpley R., Telfer, D.J. "Tourism and Development – Concepts and Issues")

Hall, C.M. (2000a). Rethinking collaboration and partnership: a public policy perspective. In: Bramwell, B., Lane, B. (2000). "Tourism Collaboration and Partnerships: Politics, Practice and Sustainability. Channel View: Clevedon.

Hawkins, D.E., Ritchie, J.R.B., Go F., Frechtling, D. (1991). "Global Tourism Policy Issues for the 1990s Special Feature in World Travel and Tourism Review. Wallingford: CABI International (in Ritchie: Interest Based Formulation of Tourism Policy for Environmentally Sensitive Destinations – chapter 3 of Bramwel, B., Lane B. "Tourism Collaboration and Partnerships").

Heneghan, D. (1999). "Economic Impacts of casino gaming in Atlantic City, pp. 113-135 in Hsu, C.H.C.(eds) Legalized Casino Gambling in the United States. Haworth Hospitality Press, New York. (In: Wall, G. "Change, Impacts and Opportunities", 2006).

Henriksson, Lennart E., and Richard G. Lipsey (1999) "Should Provinces Expand Gambling?" *Canadian Public Policy* 25, no. 2 (1999): 259–275.

Huxham, C. (1996). "Creating Collaborative Advantage. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication (in Ritchie: Interest Based Formulation of Tourism Policy for Environmentally Sensitive Destinations – chapter 3 of Bramwel, B., Lane B. "Tourism Collaboration and Partnerships").

Eadington, W. R. (1999). The Economics of Casino Gambling. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 13(3), 173–192.

Long, P. et al. (1996) "Early impacts of limited stakes casino gambling on rural community life", *Tourism Management* 17: 341-353.

Jamal, T., Getz, D. (1995). "Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research* 22, 186-204.

Jenkins, J. (1993). "Tourism policy in rural New South Wales: policy and research priorities. *GeoJournal* 29, 281-290 (in Singh: "Tourism in Destination Communities").

Joppe, M. (1996). "Sustainable community tourism development revisited. *Tourism Management* 17, 475-479 (in Singh: "Tourism in Destination Communities").

Lowes, M. D. (2002). "Indy Dreams and Urban Nightmares", University of Toronto Press: Toronto, 2002.

Kotler P., Heider, D., Rein, I. (1993). "Marketing Places: Attracting Investment, Industry and Tourism in Cities, States and Nations. Free Press: New York (In: Wall, G. "Change, Impacts and Opportunities", 2006).

Lambert, T. E., Srinivasan, A. K., Dufrene, U., & Min, H. (2010). Urban Location

- and the Success of Casinos in Five States. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 3(3), 1–16.
- Li, G., Gu, X., & Siu, R. C. S. (2009). The Impacts of Gaming Expansion on Economic Growth: A Theoretical Reconsideration. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 26(2), 269–285. doi:10.1007/s10899-009-9165-5.
- Mason, P. M., Shapiro, S. L., Borg, M. O. (1989). "Gaming tax incidence for the groups of Las Vegas Gamblers, *Applied Economics*, 21, 1267-77 (In: Wall, G. "Tourism – change, impacts and opportunities" (2006).
- Murphy, P.E. (1985). "Tourism: as a community approach. Routledge: London (In: Sharpley, R., Telfer D.J. "Tourism and Development – Concepts and Issues".
- Nagy, J., Fawcett, S.B. (1998) "Building Capacity for Community Change, in *Community Tool Box*, website://ctb.lsi.uk.ans.edu/.
- National Opinion Research Center: 1999, Gambling Impact and Behavior Study. Available at <http://cloud9.norc.uchicago.edu/dlib/ngis.htm>
- Narayana N. (2006). "Against: Casinos in Singapore", also available at <http://newsintercom.org/index.php>
- Nichols, M., Stitt, B. G., Giacomassi, D. (2002). "Community assessment of the effects of casinos on quality of life" *Social Indicators Research* 57: 229-262.
- Eadington, W. R. (1986). "Impact of casino gambling on the community: Comment on Pizam and Pokela", *Annals of Tourism Research* 13: 279-285.
- Oh, H.; Hsu, C. H. C. (2001). "Volitional Degrees of Gambling Behaviors", in *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 618–637.
- Pedlar, A., Haworth (2006). "Community" from A Handbook of Leisure Studies, pp. 518-532, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pizam, A.; Pokela J. (1985). "The Perceived Impacts of Casino Gambling on a Community", in *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 12, pp. 147-165.
- Putnam, R. (1993). "Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of the American Community, Simon and Schuster: New York, 1993.
- Reid, D. G., Taylor, J., Mair, H. (2000). "Rural Tourism Development: Research Report, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada.
- Richard, B. (2009). Diffusion of an Economic Development Policy Innovation: Explaining the International Spread of Casino Gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 26(2), 287–300. doi:10.1007/s10899-009-9166-4.
- Roehl, W.S. (1998). "The changing economic geography of the casino industry in Nevada and Atlantic City, pp. 29-46 in Meyer-Arendt, K.J. and Hartmann, R. "Casino Gambling in America: Origins, Trends and Impacts. Cognizant Communications, New York (in Wall, G. "Tourism – change impacts and opportunities" (2006).

- Room, R., Turner, N.E., Ialomiteanu, A. (1999). "Community effects of the opening of the Niagara Casino", *Addiction* 94:1449-1466.
- Rothman, J. (1995). "Approaches to Community Interventions, in Rothman, J. Erloch L. and Tropman J.F. "Strategies of Community Intervention, Itasca, Illinois, P.E. Peacock Publishers.
- Scatlenbury, M. G. (2003). "The ownership structures of heritage tourism enterprises in Barbados and their institutional and community involvement" – PhD. Proposal, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Sharpley, R.; Telfer, D. (2002). "Tourism and development – Concepts and Issues", Channel View Publications: Toronto, 2002.
- Singh, S.; Dallen, J. T.; Ross, K. D. (2003). "Tourism in Destination Communities", CABI Publishing: Cambridge, 2003.
- Smith, S.L.J. (1995). "Tourism Analysis: A Handbook, Longman Publishing: London.
- Smith, S.L.J. (1998). "Tourism as an industry debates and concepts", in *The economic geography of the tourism industry a supply side analysis*, eds. Ioannides D. and Debbage K.G., Routledge: London, New York.
- Telfer, D. (1996). "Development through economic linkages: tourism and agriculture in Indonesia. PhD. Thesis, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada (in Singh: "Tourism in Destination Communities").
- Telfer, D. (2000a). "Agritourism: a path to community development?" In: Richards, G. and Hall, D. *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*. London, Routledge (in Singh: "Tourism in Destination Communities").
- Teske, P., & Sur, B. (1991). Winners and Losers: Politics, Casino Gambling, and Development in Atlantic City. *Review of Policy Research*, 10(2–3), 130–137.
- Thompson, W. N. (2011). Casino Taxes—Accentuating the Negative. *Gaming Law Review and Economics*, 15(10), 599–608.
- Vissak, T. (2010). Recommendations for using the case study method in international business research. *The Qualitative Report* 15 (2) 370-388.
- Wall, G., Mathieson A. (2006). "Tourism – change, impacts and opportunities", Prentice Hall: Essex, 2006
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*(3rded.). NewburyPark, Sage Publications. .
- <http://rgco.org/en/help/negativeimpacts.cfm>
- <http://www.vivaconsulting.com/advocacy>
- <http://abgaminginstitute.ualberta.ca>
- <http://jtr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint>

About the Author

Marica Mazurek, research interest is competitiveness of tourism destinations, branding, marketing, place marketing and place branding, innovations in tourism. She participated in several academic exchanges and Visitor Professorship activities in Canada (Brock University, University of Waterloo), where she participated in research activities dealing with tourism marketing and branding, innovations and tourism destinations competitiveness. She is the author of several academic publications. She participated at the international conferences in Turkey, Fethiye (2nd Interdisciplinary conference in Tourism research), 4th ATMC international conference in Maribor, Slovenia, the 5th ATMC international conference in Algarve, Portugal and the Multidisciplinary International Conference in Porvoo, Finland (Haaga-Helia University), the 5th International Conference of Marketing in Algarve, Portugal, the International Conference of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation in Poznań, Poland, and the 3rd Interdisciplinary Tourism Research Conference in Istanbul, Turkey, conferences in Taipei, Taiwan and Joensuu, Helsinki. Her project activities deal with Co-creation and Innovations (LIPSE project with the EU and several EU universities), Branding, Image and Reputation (Canada and Saudi Arabia), Marketing and Ethnocentrism (Canada, Brock University and Matej Bel University), Social Economy (University of Leuven and Matej Bel University), Consumer Behaviour and Motivation (Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan).