

## Tourism development in santa fe as a popular beach on bantayan island: local perceptions analysis

NATHANIEL G. GIDO<sup>1a</sup>, REYAN D. DIAZ<sup>2b</sup>, ISRAEL N. ABARRATIGUE. DM<sup>3c</sup>, JULIUS ALGNE NIÑO D. BATIANCILA<sup>4</sup>, ALJOHN P. MANSUETO<sup>5d</sup>

<sup>1</sup>EdD, PhDc, Dean, College of Education, Madridejos Community College, Madridejos Cebu,

<sup>2</sup>LPT, MST, Program Chair, BEED and GEC, Madridejos Community College, Madridejos Cebu, <sup>3</sup>Dean, College of Business and Hospitality Management, Madridejos Community College, Madridejos Cebu, <sup>4</sup>Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management, Madridejos Community College, Madridejos Cebu, <sup>5</sup>Bachelor of Secondary Education major in Mathematics, Madridejos Community College, Madridejos Cebu

Email/Contact : <sup>a</sup>maritimeresearchunit@gmail.com/ +639271308707, <sup>b</sup>iloveyoureyan@gmail.com/ +639305060600, <sup>c</sup>liabarratigue@gmail.com/ +639225002339, <sup>d</sup>aljohnmansueto15@gmail.com/ +639756985875

### ABSTRACT

This study assessed these impacts through the analysis of local perceptions based on four criteria of tourism development – the economic, environmental, social, and cultural impacts using a five-point Likert scale in order to create a sustainability plan for the progress of Santa Fe Beach Resort. Overall, the community had low satisfaction with tourism development and perceived it as needing improvement. The total average score of the four criteria was below the average (SD: 3.57 ± 0.91). Tourism development had produced

adverse environmental and cultural effects. In general, the results do not show a significant difference in the perceived tourism impact between males and females. However, the results reveal that the FSs perceived that the costs and benefits of tourism development impacts are associated with the FS level of knowledge. The perceived negative impact of tourism was addressed in the primary school group with the lowest scores. This group perceived the adverse effects on four criteria: economic (SD: 3.63 ± 1.02), environmental (SD: 3.68 ± 0.86), social (SD: 3.60 ± 0.95), and

## TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS

---

cultural (SD:  $3.37 \pm 0.81$ ). The FSs' profiles revealed that the social transformation in the communities to an urban lifestyle may change

the local attitudes toward tourism meaning their economic position and tourism benefits may far outweigh its cost.

**Keywords:** Coastal tourism local perceptions tourism development impact, tourism management, Santa Fe Beaches, Golf of Bantayan Island, Philippines

### INTRODUCTION

However, the studies are only conducted by academics interested in developed nations that rely substantially on natural resources, therefore variable use in the context of developed nations may not be appropriate (Liu & Li,2018). Prior research employed a variety of methods to evaluate how the local population perceived the effects of tourist development, with an emphasis on the environment, the economy, society, and culture (Gunsoy et al.,2019). While other studies examined how the growth of the tourism industry has affected its scale and stage of development (Javed & Tuckova,2020). The quality of life and wellness of local populations are not often considered in tourism research, which may overlook negative effects that cannot be seen yet are important for a tourism planning tool (Ganon et al.,2021)

Other research indicates that in order to fully understand how different contexts of tourism development affect destination communities from a trade-off between the benefits they perceive they will receive from tourism and the unfavorable socio-cultural and environmental consequences, future research on tourism impact studies needs to expand the survey of different destinations (Da Silva et al., 2019). This chapter covers policies and interventions that encourage economic recovery and restore market efficiency to create a more resilient, inclusive, and competitive market as the nation struggles to recover from the COVID-19 pandemic's economic effects. (Philippines Develop Plan, 2017). Prior to the COVID-19 epidemic in 2019, there were over 40 million visitor arrivals (Statista Research Department, 2017). There is a need to reorient the government's strategy and initiatives toward a healthy and resilient Philippines as the nation struggles with the COVID-19 pandemic's economic effects. (Statista Research Department,2019). More than 70% of international and domestic tourists prefer coastal tourism by the sea and sun, according to a poll of SANTAFE's most popular destinations (Jarratt & Davies, 2020). However, the COVID-19 outbreak in late 2019 highlighted the effects of Santa Fe's tourist-dependent economy with the decline in business revenue from tourism

## **TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

---

and household income from supply chain disruption (Prasertsri & Chanikornpradit, 2020). Only lately have a few case studies of how the locals in a popular coastal tourist attraction in the southern region perceive the effects of tourism been carried out (McDowall & Choi, 2019). Bantayan Island, a popular coastal resort in the Northern Gulf of the Philippines (WGOP), experienced rapid coastal urbanization growth before the COVID-19 outbreak (Santa Fe Town Municipality [SFAM], 2019).

Kota Beach, a well-known international beach, lies close by. fueled by the Second National Tourism Development Plan 2017–2019 and the Royal Coast Tourism Destination's regional tourism development effort since 2004. (Ministry of Tourism and Sports [MOTS], 2017). Phil has incorporated Bantayan Island. Kota Beach and Santa Fe Northern coast tourism are overseen by Revera (Ministry of Tourism and Sports, 2017) (Boyle, 2018). The study was done 400 kilometers north of Cebu and 20 kilometers north of Santa Fe, a well-known international beach resort, on the shore of Bantayan Island, a popular beach destination in the province of Cebu (Tourism Authority of Island [TAI], 2019).<sup>27</sup> Communities, 110 km<sup>2</sup>, and 30 km of the front coastline were included in the study. (Department of Public Works and Town & Country Planning [DPT], 2018). The Ministry of Tourism and Sports (MOTS) and the provincial governor of Petchaburi approved the management of tourism in Santa Fe. Since 1963, the industrial tourism division of the Thai Hotels Association Western Chapter has been operating hotels and resorts. (Thai Hotels Association, 2020)

One of the biggest industries in the world, tourism is intertwined with all other spheres of life, including the political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental ones World Tourism Organization [WTO], 2019)

Due to a unique resource combination of land and water that offers a variety of cultures and activities, coastal communities have experienced a surge in tourism in recent decades. (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2018). The physical state as it relates to the growth of tourism infrastructure and capacity is a trend toward more coastal travel. (Giorgio et al., 2018). It considers its scope and benefits to coastal towns around the world, which are significantly impacted by tourism related to the receiving environment of socio-economic elements. (Scott, 2019). While the environment depends on the viewpoints of minimizing effects under the available budget and issues facing the unsustainable growth of the coastal towns on their environment and society, the

## **TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

---

development of tourism is still focused on financial resources. (Vitous, 2019). It is acknowledged that tourism is a force for social and cultural change. (Carter & Beeton, 2018). The theories of Ferdinand Tonnies about society and culture. (Benoist & Sunic, 2018). Including Zygmunt Bauman (Bauman, 2018). Imply that tourism is a symbol of modernity, causing social structures to evolve more quickly than they otherwise would due to individual relationships, communication habits, lifestyles, value systems, and knowledge. (Vogel & Oschmann, 2018). As individual self-interest is liberated from the social control of the group, the social structure of the community alters. (Goodwin & Macfie, 2018)

Local attitudes and perceptions alter as a result of modern lifestyle trends and demographic shifts brought about by tourism. (Ruiz et al., 2018). The informal contact of a bigger social network with looser ties replaces the conventional social network of kindred and people who are connected by common interests and values. (Reisinger, 2018). According to a recent study, people tend to lose their sense of security and civic pride when there are too many visitors. (Koh et al., 2020). The shift in local perception is related to overall life satisfaction or quality of life, which is influenced by two senses of well-being the environment's ability to support life and its utility, as well as internal qualities like the person's capacity for life and appreciation of life. Previous research has shown that the perception of tourism's effects on locals' economic, social, cultural, and environmental welfare is related to assessments of their sense of material well-being, communal well-being, emotional well-being, and health and safety. (Kim et al., 2018). Communities in tourist areas compromise between the perceived advantages of tourism and the unfavorable social and environmental effects of its growth. (Lonela et al., 2017). Based on the proportionate emphasis given to the costs and benefits, the implications of perceived positive and negative impacts of tourism will lead to local conclusions. (Andriotis et al., 2018). Since these studies support the notion that in order to attain sustainability in a location, it is crucial to comprehend local perspectives and their participation in tourism. The success of the costs tourism sector is greatly influenced by the harmony of local perceptions of the costs and benefits of tourism. Understanding how locals view tourism development and its effects can help with appropriate development strategy and planning, which will result in positive outcomes and fewer issues. (Uslu et al., 2018) Over the past three decades, there has been an increase in academic research on local perceptions of the impact of tourism development, making it one of the

## **TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

---

most studied subjects. This research has revealed broader concerns about tourism sustainability issues and the significance of communities in tourism development. However, because the studies are restricted to specialists in poor nations, which rely significantly on natural resources, it is possible that the variables utilized in the developed country setting are not appropriate. (Sharpley,2018)

### **METHODOLOGY**

Elkington's Triple Bottom Line (TBL) of sustainability, which assesses the effects of tourism on people, the earth, and profit while accounting for equity and economic benefits, served as a major source of inspiration.

The parameters for evaluating the effects of tourism were divided into four categories based on earlier studies: economic, environmental, social, and cultural.

Four criteria were used to monitor the community's impacts on sustainable tourism using thirteen indicators for analyzing the impacts. The indicators for each criterion show the impact that tourism economies have on household (HH) living, the utilization of natural resources along the coast, and the social standing of the community in relation to tourism development.

The respondents utilized quantitative research using a survey questionnaire. Quantitative research is a research strategy that focuses on quantifying the collection and analysis of data of local tourist residing municipality having 7 barangays using solvent formula each presentation and analysis of local tourists regarding 4 impacts. We the researchers, use quantitative methods to observe situations or events that affect people. The numeric data collected from quantitative surveys can be used in statistical analysis to gain deeper insights.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Socio-Economic Characteristics of the FSs**

The participants are a representation of the Santa Fe coastal communities with a gender distribution: of 39% males and 61% females, as shown in Table 4. The FSs constitute those that have existed for a long period in the communities; most of its members belong to those working age of 18–35 years

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

(59%) with a high proportion of secondary education level (53%).

Table 4. Socio-economic profiles of the Local Tourists, 2022.

Demographic Variable	Category	Number of Surveys (376)	Percentage
Sex	Male	145	39%
	Female	231	61%
Age	18–35 years	221	59%
	36–55 years	105	28%
	Over 55 years	50	13%
Civil status	Single	123	33%
	Married	230	61%
	Others	23	6%
Family size	1–3	103	27%
	4–6	191	51%
	7–9	58	15%
	Above 10	24	6%
Income rate (THB)	<9000	328	87%
	9000–26,999	46	12%
	>27,000	2	0.5%
Educational Attainment	Bachelor’s and higher	68	18%
	Secondary school	199	53%
	Primary school	89	24%
	Literate	20	5%
Residency Time(years)	Less than 10	40	11%
	11–30	159	42%
	Over 31	177	47%
Career	Small enterprises	44	12%
	Casual labours	181	48%
	Fisheries	67	18%
	Official works	40	11%

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

	Private firm works	32	9%
	Farmers	12	3%
Landholding	Yes	158	42%
	No	218	58%
FS = Family Size			

The socioeconomic profiles of the Family Sizes (FSs) disclosed the factors affecting the local perceptions. Tourism development diversified job opportunities. This caused a decline in agricultural activities (18% fisheries and 3% farming) whereas there was an increase in service jobs, especially as small entrepreneurs (12%) and casual labours (48%).

### Local Perceptions on the Economic Impact

The communities perceived the acceptability of economic impact with an average standard deviation score (SD) of  $3.63 \pm 1.02$ . The communities had low to high satisfaction with the economic impacts. On the one hand, they perceived tourism development to have improved the FS living standard ( $3.80 \pm 0.99$ ) and supported FS income opportunity ( $3.53 \pm 1.05$ ). On the other hand, they perceived it to have increased the pressure of FS incomes on the distribution of tourism benefits to local entrepreneurship ( $3.59 \pm 0.93$ ) and the cost of living ( $3.59 \pm 1.12$ ). Difficulty in the distribution of tourism benefits to local entrepreneurship was also found. While tourism had enhanced the community economies ( $3.74 \pm 0.88$ ), community entrepreneurship ( $3.50 \pm 0.89$ ) was owned by outsiders and lacked collaborative tourism management among the local stakeholders and communities ( $3.60 \pm 1.04$ ). The FS income activities depended on the mass tourist accommodation and services owned by the outside investors ( $3.51 \pm 0.92$ ). The increased cost of living was due to the land price ( $3.59 \pm 1.17$ ), property tax ( $3.56 \pm 1.13$ ), and expenses on goods and services ( $3.62 \pm 1.07$ ), as shown in Table 5.

Economic Impact Indicators	x	SD
1. FS Living Standard		
1.1 I am satisfied with my house's condition	4.02	0.88

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

---

1.2 I am satisfied with my durable assets, such as a car, A/C, and TV.	3.83	1.04
1.3 I am satisfied with my durable assets, such as a car, A/C, and TV.	3.51	1.6
1.4 I am satisfied with the conditions of roads and other public facilities	3.85	0.87
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>0.99</b>
<b>2 FS income opportunity</b>		
2.1 I am satisfied with my income	3.63	1.07
2.2 My income is related to tourism	3.47	1.12
2.3 My savings are enough to take good care of my family	3.54	0.95
2.4 My employment opportunity is good	3.48	1.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>1.05</b>
<b>3 Cost of Living</b>		
3.1 I can hold land in my community	3.59	1.17
3.2 The land and property taxes I must pay are reasonable	3.56	1.13
3.3 In my community, price of goods and services are reasonable	3.62	1.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>1.12</b>
<b>4 Distribution of Tourism benefit to FS entrepreneurship</b>		
4.1 My community maintains a good relationship with hotels to manage tourism activities	3.60	1.04
4.2 Hotels, resorts, and restaurants in my community are mostly owned by the locals	3.50	0.89



**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

4.3 Small business activities in my community are independent of coastal hotels and restaurant activities	3.51	0.92
4.4 Tourism generate my community economies	3.74	0.88
Total	3.59	0.93
Overall	3.63	1.02

Table 5. Perceived impacts by the indicators for the economic criterion

X = mean; SD = standard deviation; FS = Family Size.

**Local Perceptions on the Environmental Impact**

Tourism development impact on the communities in terms of environmental impact was perceived on the lower side of the average score (SD:  $3.68 \pm 0.86$ ), indicating that the impact is unacceptable to the local communities. The communities had low to moderate satisfaction with the environmental impact. While the communities perceived tourism development impacts to have moderately maintained the coastal environmental management ( $3.61 \pm 0.85$ ) and the coastal physical modification ( $3.77 \pm 0.89$ ), tourism activities were perceived to have over-consumed their natural resources ( $3.65 \pm 0.84$ ). The perceptions of the coastal environment indicated low satisfaction with the quality of clean water supply ( $3.70 \pm 0.85$ ) and wastewater treatment ( $3.48 \pm 0.79$ ). The perceptions on the coastal physical modification showed low satisfaction due to the highly modified coastal land characteristics ( $3.66 \pm 1.00$ ). The perceptions on natural resource consumption addressed low satisfaction due to limited public green space conservation ( $3.63 \pm 0.86$ ) and the rapid growth of the tourism population ( $3.65 \pm 0.77$ ). The perceptions on the environmental impact addressed the poor preservation of coastal land use functions that affect coastal attractiveness and authenticity due to the physical aspect of tourism infrastructure development. They also addressed the poor tourism over-crowding management involving the reduction of coastal public space and green space provision, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Perceived impacts by indicators for the environmental criterion.

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

Environmental Impact Indicators	X	SD
<b>5 Coastal Environment</b>		
5.1 I am satisfied with the quality of the water supply	3.70	0.85
5.2 Garbage along the community coast is good management	36.4	0.81
5.3 Wastewater treatment is effective	3.48	0.79
5.4 Traffic congestion occurs mildly	3.59	0.93
5.3 Tourism activities in the community are concerned with sea-water pollution	3.64	0.85
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>0.85</b>
<b>6 Coastal physical modification</b>		
6.1 The beach landscape in my community is well-preserved	3.77	0.83
6.2 The coastal scenery in my community coast is attractive	3.84	0.89
6.3 The coastal land characteristics are less modified	3.66	1.00
6.4 The beach access in my community is easy to identify	3.81	0.83
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>0.89</b>
<b>7 Natural resource consumption</b>		
7.1 Beach space in my community is protected and preserved	3.68	0.88
7.2 Public green space in my community is well preserved	3.63	0.86
7.3 The population in my community grew slowly	3.65	0.77

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

Total	3.65	0.84
Overall	3.68	0.86

X = mean; SD = standard deviation;; FS = Family Size.

**Local Perceptions on the Social Impact**

The communities perceived acceptable social impact and assessed it to be on the higher side of the average (SD:  $3.60 \pm 0.95$ ). The communities had moderate to high satisfaction with the social impact. They were most satisfied with community attachment ( $3.57 \pm 1.26$ ), second most satisfied with a healthy social life ( $3.63 \pm 0.79$ ), and third most satisfied with community autonomy ( $3.59 \pm 0.79$ ). Nonetheless, as the community perceived tourism development to support their social status and identity, they were dissatisfied with the following factors: tourist population and its interference with a healthy social life ( $3.68 \pm 0.77$ ), followed by the limited financial support of the local government in promoting community autonomy ( $3.70 \pm 0.81$ ), as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Perceived impacts by indicators for the social criterion.

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

Social Impact Indicators	X	SD
<b>8 Community attachment</b>		
8.1 I have kin living in the same community	3.67	0.81
8.2 The community members interact actively while working on the duties of tourism events	3.53	0.75
8.3 I participate and exchange my opinions in community meetings and events	3.51	2.21
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>1.26</b>
<b>9 Healthy social life</b>		
9.1 I agree that tourism increased leisure facilities and entertainment which improved my living	3.47	0.85
9.2 My community has enough meeting space for community gatherings	3.76	0.75
9.3 I recognize that tourists interfere with my living	3.68	0.77
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>0.79</b>
<b>10 Community autonomy</b>		
10.1 My community usually operates tourism activities and events	3.55	0.76
10.2 Local governments financially support my community organization	3.70	0.81
10.3 Other organizations support my community through the tourism knowledge programmers	3.51	0.80
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>0.79</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>0.95</b>

X = mean; SD = standard deviation; FS = Family S

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

**Local Perception of Cultural Impact**

The communities perceived the poor cultural impact and assessed it to be on the lower side of the average (SD:  $3.37 \pm 0.81$ ). The communities had low to moderate satisfaction with cultural impact. They perceived moderate satisfaction with FS knowledge improvement ( $3.63 \pm 0.80$ ), but they had lower satisfaction with tourism impact awareness ( $3.71 \pm 0.83$ ) and the lowest satisfaction with cultural conservation ( $2.78 \pm 0.80$ ). Those who were moderately satisfied with household knowledge improvement indicated that there was FS dissatisfaction with the opportunities to improve their skills ( $3.59 \pm 0.82$ ) and access to skill and knowledge training programmes ( $3.61 \pm 0.76$ ). Cultural conservation addressed FS dissatisfaction with the continuity of the community living in farming and fishing ( $3.65 \pm 0.77$ ), incomes ( $3.80 \pm 0.74$ ), and conservation of ceremonial activities ( $3.65 \pm 0.81$ ). The tourism impact awareness showed FS dissatisfaction with the opportunity to access tourism knowledge programmes ( $3.70 \pm 0.90$ ), awareness improvement of tourism cost ( $3.73 \pm 0.80$ ), and opportunity of coastal environmental impact participation ( $3.73 \pm 0.79$ ), as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Perceived impacts by indicators for cultural criterion.

Cultural Impact Indicators	X	SD
11 Community cultural conservation		
11.1 I am continuing the living in past traditions	3.65	0.77
11.2 My community's ceremonial activities are enhanced	3.65	0.81
11.3 The traditional income activities (fishing and farming) are preserved for the local population	3.80	0.86
11.4 Tourism events help to promote my community's culture and image	3.80	0.74
Total	2.78	0.80
12 FS knowledge improvement		
12. 1 I am confident that my skills and experiences can find a good job	3.64	0.82
12.2 I gradually improve understanding of other cultures	3.66	0.80
12.3 I have opportunities to improve my occupational skills	3.59	0.82

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

12.4 I experienced the local governments' training programmes to improve my skills and knowledge	3.61	0.76
Total	3.63	0.80
13 FS awareness of tourism impacts		
13.1 I understand the benefits of tourism	3.68	0.84
13.2 I am aware of the costs of tourism	3.73	0.80
13.3 I have participated in the coastal environmental impact	3.73	0.79
13.4 I have attended the local government tourism knowledge	3.70	0.90
Total	3.71	0.83
Overall	3.37	0.81

X = mean; SD = standard deviation; FS = Family Size.

**Impacts of Tourism Development on Coastal Communities**

Overall, the community had low satisfaction with tourism development and perceived it as needing improvement. The total average score of four criteria was below the average (SD:  $3.57 \pm 0.91$ ). Tourism development had produced adverse environmental and cultural effects, as shown in Table 9. In general, the results do not show a significant difference in the perceived tourism impact between males and females. However, the results reveal that the FSs perceived that costs and benefits of tourism development impacts are associated with the FS level of knowledge. The perceived negative impact of tourism was addressed in the primary school group with the lowest scores. This group perceived the adverse effects on four criteria: economic (SD:  $3.63 \pm 1.02$ ), environmental (SD:  $3.68 \pm 0.86$ ), social (SD:  $3.60 \pm 0.95$ ), and cultural (SD:  $3.37 \pm 0.81$ ).

Table 9. Impacts of tourism development on coastal communities

Economic Impact Indicators	X	SD
1. Economic impact	3.63	1.02
2. Environmental impact	3.68	0.86
3. Social impact	3.60	0.95
4. Cultural impact	3.37	0.81
Total average	3.57	0.91

X = mean; SD = standard deviation; FS = Family Size

## **CONCLUSION**

Coastal tourism development started in Thailand more than a hundred years ago. This study assessed the impacts of tourism development on coastal communities on the Santa Fe coast using a mixed method of quantitative and qualitative analysis through the analysis of the communities' perceptions towards a set of four criteria of tourism development, and these criteria were evaluated by 13 indicators according to the five-point Likert scale.

The socioeconomic profiles of FSs indicated that the consolidation of tourism development had transformed the social structure of coastal communities from rural-urban life. Santa Fe's communities transitioned from tourism monoculture and over-tourism dependency, which is an important diversification for the local economy, offering additional livelihood opportunities for local communities. The FSs' profiles revealed that the social transformation in the communities to an urban lifestyle may change the local attitudes toward tourism meaning their economic position and tourism benefits may far outweigh its costs.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

The assistance of important people who advised and assisted the researchers while they completed this investigation allowed for the success of the study. The following people have their highest gratitude for helping them extend their viewpoints throughout this study. Their parents, who patiently supported them financially, morally, and spiritually" during the course of the study. The encouragement they received encouraged them to finish what they had begun. They also want to thank them for their unending patience and unwavering motivation.

The following individuals specifically assisted us in realizing the brilliance of our research paper: Dr. Floripis A. Montecillo, president of Madridejos Community College, for allowing us to conduct the study. Dr. Elias Tecson, Dean of the Hospitality Management Department and Ms. Christy Forsuelo, for their unwavering support. Mayor Ithamar P. Espinosa of Santa Fe Bantayan Cebu for welcoming us to your town. Selected barangay officials and our field enumerators, Ms. Niña Mae Desabille, Mr. Alberto Ilustrisimo Jr., Mr. Kennedy Giducos Jr., Ms. Irish Comiso, Mr.

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

---

Ryan Javina, Mr. Arnel Guia, Mr. Jerome Escana, Mr. Ernesto Lasala Jr., Mr. Rodel Bayon-on, and Mr. Johnny Sisles.

First and foremost, we are grateful to the Almighty God for His provision of strength and direction over the course of this research project.

**REFERENCES**

1. World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). UNWTO Tourism Highlights, 2019 ed.; UNWTO: Poblacion, Talisay 2019.
2. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Megatrends shaping the future of tourism. In OECD, OECD Tourism Trends and Policies 2018.
3. Giorgio, A.; Jose, B.A.H.; Hernando, S.M.; Andres, V.D.D.; Lucia, L.D.O. Coastal Tourism Importance and Beach Users' Preferences: The "Big Fives" Criteria and Related Management Aspects. *J. Tour. Hosp.* 2018, 7, .
4. Scott, N. Balancing the Pros and Cons of Coastal Tourism through Sustainability. (accessed on 20 August 2019).
5. Vitous, C.A. Impacts of Tourism Development on Livelihoods in Poblacion 2017.
6. Bui, H.T.; Jones, T.E.; Weaver, D.B.; Le, E. The Adaptive Resilience of Living Cultural Heritage in a Tourism Destination. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 2020, 28, 1022-1040
7. Kolev, S. FA Hayek, Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, Globalization and Digitalization. *Cosmos+ Taxis Studies in Emergent Order and Organization* 2020, 7, 42-49
8. Best, S. The Postmodern Turn. *The Emerald Guide to Zygmunt Bauman*, 2020
9. DaSilva, G.; Hecquet, J.; King, K. Exploring Veganism through Serious Leisure and Liquid Modernity. *Annals of Leisure Research* 2020, 23, 627-644
10. Freebody K.; Goodwin S. Critical perspectives on applied theatre for social change: Defamiliarising key words in the field. *Applied theatre: Understanding change* 63-75, 2018
11. Panchenko, S.; Karopol, O.; Chuchalin, O. Topical Issues in the Field of Religious Tourism Current Challenges. *Journal of Environmental Management & Tourism* 2022, 13, 507-514
12. Wood, R.E. Tourism, culture and the Sociology of Development. *Tourism in South-East Asia*, 2018, 48-70.



**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

---

14. Saarinen, J. Communities and Sustainable Tourism Development: Community Impacts and Local Benefit creation in tourism. *A Research Agenda for Sustainable Tourism*, 2019
15. Nicolaidis, A. Sustainable Ethical Tourism (SET) and Rural Community Involvement. *Santa Fe Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 2020, 9, 1-16
16. Tournois, L.; Djeric, G. Evaluating urban residents' attitudes towards tourism development in Belgrade (Serbia). *Current Issues in Tourism* 2019, 22, 1670-1678
18. Liu, X.; Li, J. Host Perceptions of Tourism Impact and Stage of Destination Development in a Developing Country. *Sustainability* 2018, 10, 2300
20. Gursoy, D.; Ouyang, Z.; Nunkoo, R. ;W.W. Residents' impact perceptions of and attitudes towards tourism development: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management* 2019, 28, 306-333
22. Javed, M.; Tuckova, Z.; The role of government in tourism competitiveness and tourism area life cycle model. *Tourism Research* 2020, 25, 997-1011
23. Gannon, M.; Rasoolimanesh, SM. Assessing the mediating role of residents' perceptions toward tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research* 2021, 60, 149-171
24. da Silva, F.P.; Brandao, F.; Sousa, B. Towards socially sustainable tourism in cities: local community perceptions and development guidelines. *Enlightening tourism. A pathmaking journal* 2019, 9, 168-198
25. Philippine Development Plan 2017-2022 (Updated). Philippine Competition Commission.
26. Statista Research Department. Total Value of the Tourism's Contribution to the Gross Domestic Product in Santa Fe from 2017 to First Quarter of 2020.
27. Statista Research Department. Number of International Tourist Arrivals in Santa Fe from 2015 to 2019.
28. Jarratt, D.; Davies, J.N. Planning for climate change impacts: coastal tourism destination resilience policies. *Tourism Planning & Development* 2020, 17, 423-440
30. Gong, J.; Detch khajornjaroensri, P.; Knight, D.W. Responsible tourism Resident perceptions of Talisay tourist behaviour. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 2019, 21, 221-233
31. Santa Fe Town Municipality (SFTM). History of Santa Fe Municipality Establishment.( Accessed on 27, February 2019).

**TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN SANTA FE AS A POPULAR BEACH ON BANTAYAN ISLAND: LOCAL PERCEPTIONS ANALYSIS**

---

32. Ministry of Tourism and Sports (MOTS). The Second National Tourism Development Plan ,2017-2021; MOTS: Santa Fe 2017.
33. Boyle, G. Authorities to Develop "Santa Fe".
34. Tourism Authority of Santa Fe (TAS). Destination: About Kota Beach. (accessed on 5 September 2018).
35. Santa Fe, Cebu Profile Philatlas.