



Development and validation of the new resident empowerment through Tourism Scale: RETS 2.0

Edson Redy Moreira dos Santos^{a,b,*}, Luís Nobre Pereira^{c,d}, Patrícia Pinto^a, B. Bynum Boley^e

^a Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs), Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Campus de Gambelas, FE, Edifício 9, 8005-139, Faro, Portugal

^b School of Business and Governance, University of Cape Verde

^c School of Management, Hospitality and Tourism, University of Algarve, Portugal

^d Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs), University of Algarve, Portugal

^e Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management, Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, 180 East Green Street, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, 30602-2152, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

RETS 2.0
Resident empowerment
Support for sustainable tourism development
Scale development
Cape Verde

ABSTRACT

This study developed a new version of the Resident Empowerment through Tourism Scale - the RETS 2.0 by integrating two new dimensions of empowerment – economic and environmental empowerment – that the original RETS left off. The RETS 2.0 also abbreviates the original RETS to three items per a construct, reducing response burden, and opening up space for measuring different antecedents and outcomes of empowerment. The RETS 2.0 was empirically tested and validated in the small island destinations of Boa Vista and Sal, Cape Verde following Churchill's (1979) and Rossiter's (2002) three-stage mix-method scale development approach. After demonstrating convergent validity, nomological validity was demonstrated by all dimensions being significantly correlated with support for tourism. However, in the test of predictive validity, only psychological, economic, and environmental empowerment were found to be significant predictors of support for tourism. The RETS 2.0 is proposed as a holistic and parsimonious five-dimension scale that assesses resident's empowerment towards sustainable tourism development.

1. Introduction

Empowerment is a prominent construct within the disciplines of psychology, education, and community development because it provides avenues that enable individuals to guide their life's course and ability to take up decisions in community matters (Cole, 2006; Rappaport, 1987). Within tourism, it has been defined as “a multidimensional, context dependent, and dynamic process that provides humans, individually or collectively, with greater agency, freedom, and capacity to improve their quality of life as a function of engagement with the phenomenon of tourism” (Aghazamani & Hunt, 2017, p. 343). Hence, empowerment is commonly recognized as an integral component of sustainable tourism development (Cole, 2006; Nguyen, d' Hauteserre, & Serrao-Neumann, 2021; Scheyvens, 1999; Strzelecka, Boley, & Strzelecka, 2017).

The need for and importance of resident empowerment can be

grounded in Foucault's conceptualization of power. Foucault's conceptualized power as “complex strategical situation consisting of multiple and mobile fields of relations” (Foucault, 1978, p. 93). This contemporary view of power breaks from the traditional understanding of power by describing the concept as a zero-sum game that is omnipresent being “everywhere and come[ing] from everywhere” (Foucault, 1980, p. 63). Building on Foucault's thoughts of power being omnipresent, Zimmerman (1995) developed Empowerment Theory to better understand individual, organization, and community relationships of social, psychological, and political empowerment through a social psychology lens.

In the social psychology domain, several empowerment scales have been developed. Short and Rinehart (1992) developed the School Participation Empowerment Scale, Singh et al. (1995) developed the Family Empowerment scale, while Leslie, Holzhlb, and Holland (1998) introduced the Development of a Worker Empowerment Scale. Within

* Corresponding author. Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs), Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Campus de Gambelas, FE, Edifício 9, 8005-139, Faro, Portugal.

E-mail addresses: a70500@ualg.pt (E.R. Moreira dos Santos), lmp@ualg.pt (L.N. Pereira), pvalle@ualg.pt (P. Pinto), bbole@uga.edu (B.B. Boley).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2024.104915>

Received 29 April 2023; Received in revised form 13 January 2024; Accepted 27 February 2024

Available online 15 March 2024

0261-5177/© 2024 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

tourism, considering the significant role empowerment plays in the sustainability of tourism, several conceptualizations of Empowerment Theory (social, psychological, and political empowerment) have been employed within the tourism literature to better understand the processes and outcomes of empowerment (Aghazamani & Hunt, 2017; Strzelecka & Boley, forthcoming). One of the most embraced conceptualizations of empowerment has been Scheyvens' (1999) which synthesized the psychology and development literature to conceptualize empowerment as multidimensional consisting of economic, psychological, social and political dimensions. Ramos and Prideaux (2014) later added the environmental dimension and developed the *Wheel of Empowerment* to investigate the development of ecotourism in an indigenous Mayan community.

Building on the conceptual work of Scheyvens (1999) with the intention to operationalize the prevailing qualitative approaches to the multidimensional understanding of empowerment, Boley and McGehee (2014) developed the Resident Empowerment through Tourism Scale (RETS), as a quantitative assessment that measure residents' psychological, social, and political empowerment through tourism. With the ability to track residents' perception of empowerment, the RETS provides destination managers and decision-makers a holistic understanding of the challenges to develop tourism sustainably as well as ways to overcome difficulties associated with evaluating non-economic elements of tourism development (Boley & McGehee, 2014). Additionally, key benefits associated with the RETS has been its use as antecedent in shaping our understanding of resident support for tourism (Mody, Woosnam, Suess, & Dogru, 2020; Yeager, Boley, Woosnam, & Green, 2020), gaming and cultural tourism (Li, Boley, & Yang, 2022a; Li, Boley, & Yang, 2022b), resident connection to nature (Strzelecka, Prince, & Boley, 2021), and gender equality (Boley, Ayscue, Maruyama, & Woosnam, 2017). Although the RETS has contributed significantly to the understanding of residents' empowerment (Boley, Maruyama, & Woosnam, 2015; Strzelecka, Boley, & Strzelecka, 2017), gaps in the literature and limitations with the scale are worth addressing. First, the validation of RETS has been limited to developed countries, e.g., USA (Boley & McGehee, 2014; Boley, McGehee, Perdue, & Long, 2014; Yeager et al., 2020), Japan (Boley et al., 2015; Maruyama, Woosnam, & Boley, 2016), Poland (Strzelecka, Boley, & Strzelecka, 2017; Strzelecka et al., 2021), and China (Li et al., 2022a; Li et al., 2022b) overlooking its application in developing countries, especially those highly dependent on tourism. One exception is the application in Zimbabwe in the study conducted by Eluwole, Banga, Lasisi, Ozturen, and Kiliç (2022). It is important to emphasize that further testing and validation of the RETS is essential for the scale to become a universally accepted quantitative assessment of empowerment (Churchill, 1979; Malhotra, Agarwal, & Peterson, 1996). This is crucial because the results of the psychometrics properties may vary in a different context, which in turn can determine "whether the scores obtained from respondents in different cultures have the same meaning and interpretation" (Malhotra et al., 1996, p. 21).

A second limitation of the RETS is that, while focusing on psychological empowerment, social empowerment, and political empowerment, it neglects two fundamental dimensions of empowerment: economic empowerment and environmental empowerment. Taking into account that resident empowerment is an essential component of sustainable tourism development based on the triple-bottom-line premise (Stoddard, Pollard, & Evans, 2012), failure to examine these two dimensions may hinder the face validity of the scale as well as question its applicability to sustainable tourism development. Economic empowerment, which was first introduced in Scheyvens's (1999) work is described as the approach to ensuring that an equal distribution of wealth and benefits from tourism is shared between all members of the community. While there have been scales such as the Economic Benefits from Tourism Scale (EBTS) developed to measure residents' perception of the personal economic benefits from tourism (Boley, Strzelecka, & Woosnam, 2018), these types of scales do not necessarily measure

residents' perceptions of economic empowerment, as benefiting economically from tourism is different than being economically empowered through tourism. This is problematic because, as is the case in many island destinations, economic benefits from tourism or "profits are commonly retained by external travel agencies" (Nguyen, D'Hautesserre, & Serrao-Neumann, 2021, p. 4) which tend to be seasonal and cannot provide continuous income for tourism communities. In this context "only the most powerful will benefit" (Obradović & Stojanović, 2021, p. 2). Conversely, economically empowered communities are able to claim ownership of their financial resources and create means for long-term economic stability (Scheyvens, 1999). Moreover, economic gains through tourism should translate into economic empowerment for the community (Cole, 2006).

The original RETS also neglects to include a measure of environmental empowerment (Khalid, Ahmad, Ramayah, Hwang, & Kim, 2019; Ramos & Prideaux, 2014; Strzelecka, Boley, & Strzelecka, 2017). Environmental empowerment enables the local community to obtain power through the preservation of their natural resources (Ramos & Prideaux, 2014). Considering the environmental vulnerabilities of small island destinations (Grilli, Tyllianakis, Luisetti, Ferrini, & Turner, 2021; Nesticò & Maselli, 2020), a path toward the realization of environmental empowerment would be to transfer power to local residents and view them as "tourism activists who take over the major role in the process of sustainable development for tourism" (Shafieisabet & Haratifard, 2020, p. 486). Consequently, collective community action will contribute to the conservation of ecosystems and enrich their natural resources (Lee & Jan 2019). Additionally, environmentally empowered residents that participate and engage in tourism can take up the role of tourism agents and encourage tourists to adopt environmental-friendly behavior (Esfandiari, Pearce, Dowling, & Goh, 2022; Lee & Jan 2019).

Finally, in addition to these limitations associated with the current RETS, there is a growing body of research focused on reducing scale length for theoretical and practical reasons (Boley et al., 2021). Theoretically, scales should be reduced in length because shorter scales open up more room on surveys for researchers to add additional constructs and test new theories (Mowen & Voss, 2008). Practically, authors have argued that "constraints in time, monetary costs, respondent fatigue, and survey refusal" (Malhotra, Mukhopadhyay, Liu, & Dash, 2012, p. 843) might be factors that introduce response bias and diminish the quality of the research. Drolet and Morrison (2001, p. 198) caution the use of lengthy scales, contending that this can contribute to respondent's "fatigue, boredom, and inattention, which in turn, can lead to inappropriate response behavior." To overcome this, Malhotra et al. (2012) suggest that shortened scales with a reduced number of items are better suited to obtain key information and are less cost consuming. Shorten scales are beneficial because it allows the integration of new constructs to the survey since there is more room and the respondents have a greater attention span from the reduced number of items, which in turn, help investigate the antecedents and outcomes of empowerment. While Neuts, Kimps, and van der Borg's (2021) recently attempted to abbreviate the RETS, their study did not present or rigorously test the reliability and validity of the abbreviated RETS as advocated by the scale development literature or include the dimensions of economic and environmental empowerment (Churchill, 1979; Hair, Risher, Sarstedt, & Ringle, 2019).

With the importance of resident empowerment to sustainable tourism development and the limitations of the current iteration of the RETS in mind, the purpose of this study is to attempt to extend Empowerment Theory by developing a new version of the RETS that includes new dimensions (economic and environmental empowerment) and abbreviate the existing dimensions to reduce response burden all while testing the scale's nomological and predictive validity in Cape Verde, a developing island nation. Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf (2019, pp. 1227–1228) write that "scales are only as good as their usefulness to identify and explain pressing phenomena," and "a scale can only be as good as the nomological network in which is placed and tested." The

application of the RETS 2.0 in Cape Verde, a developing island nation, will provide the appropriate test of nomological validity mentioned by Kock et al. (2019). The RETS 2.0 has many benefits to academics and practitioners alike. The measurement of economic and non-economic psychometric dimensions of empowerment within one scale provides researchers with a more direct way to operationalize the Empowerment Theory compared to the previous RETS and other measurements in the literature which only measured substantive rationality of empowerment (Boley & McGehee, 2014; Zimmerman & Warschausky, 1998). The updated RETS 2.0 will also better prepare destination management to acquire important information relating to residents' perception of empowerment and the necessary tools needed to influence their support for sustainable development. The literature around the topic of resident empowerment and support for sustainable tourism development will be reviewed followed by the methods used to develop and validate RETS 2.0 in the methods section.

2. Literature review

2.1. Theoretical framework of empowerment

"Empowerment Theory integrates perceptions of control, a proactive approach to life, and a critical understanding of the sociopolitical environment" (Zimmerman & Warschausky, 1998, p. 4) Viewed as a strategy of prevention and community intervention, Empowerment Theory stems from the social action ideology of the 1960s and the self-help perspective of the 1970s (Kieffer, 1984). The manifestation of empowerment occurs within three layers of social fabric, which enables individuals, organizations, and communities to "gain mastery over their affairs" (Rappaport, 1987, p. 122). At the individual level, Empowerment Theory is concerned with the psychological factors at play when individuals become independent problem-solvers and feel psychologically empowered (Zimmerman, 1995). The organizational level of empowerment demonstrates how an individual can become politically empowered within an institution (Zimmerman, 2000), and at community level, empowerment gives credence to socially empower residents to take part in community matters (Zimmerman, Israel, Schulz, & Checkoway, 1992).

In the social psychology literature, empowerment is described as a guide for community development and a concept for understanding the process and efforts to exert control and influence over decisions that affect an individual's life, organizational functioning, and the quality of community life (Zimmerman, 2000). Beyond the decision-making aspects, empowerment should be a tool that drives individuals to perceive themselves as able and entitled to occupy decision-making outlets (Rowlands, 1995). Empowerment has been extensively studied in multiple social science disciplines including, education, psychology, planning/development (Freira, 1973; Kieffer, 1984; Rappaport, 1984; Zimmerman, 1995), and more recently tourism (Boley et al., 2014; Cole, 2006; Scheyvens, 1999; Timothy, 2002).

Tourism operates within a complex system of relationships and power. Foucault (1978) maintains that power manifests within a network of relations consisting of multiple forces present in all social relations. This is particularly important for tourism because relationships, whether political, social, cultural, or economic, are the key ingredients of successful tourism development (Cheong & Miller, 2000). Within this network of relations, Foucauldian's perspective of power argues that power should not be understood as a commodity or a possession, but rather a tool that is available to be used by everyone within this system (Foucault, 1978). Power "can be used, shared or created by actors and their network in many multiple ways" (Gaventa, 2006, p. 24) and is "produced from one moment to the next, at the very point, or rather in every relation from one point to another" (Foucault, 1978, p. 93). This decentralized notion of power gives credence to the premise that within tourism communities, power should be viewed as a mechanism and strategy that challenges traditional views by fully

engaging communities in tourism (Cheong & Miller, 2000). By leveling the playing field, power is understood as a strategy for capacity building that triggers collective efforts within tourism communities and empowers residents by creating opportunities for an equal distribution of benefits (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021).

2.2. Resident empowerment and tourism

Recent bibliometric research reports that empowerment is one of the most studied concepts within the sustainable tourism literature (Moyle, Moyle, Ruhanen, Weaver, & Hadinejad, 2020). This concept has contributed to the understanding of the important role residents play in tourism community (Joo, Woosnam, Strzelecka, & Boley, 2020; Strzelecka, Boley, & Strzelecka, 2017), and how empowered communities can contribute to the development of successful sustainable tourism (Nguyen et al., 2021). A key factor in the process of tourism development is its ability to contribute to community empowerment (Cole, 2006; Ramos & Prideaux, 2014) and improve community members' economic, social, and cultural lives (Khalid et al., 2019). However, as a tool used to enhance sustainable tourism development, community empowerment cannot be achieved without the collective efforts of implemented policies at local, regional and national level (Petrić, 2007).

Efforts to develop a mechanism capable of understanding local communities and their involvement in tourism resulted in the development of a multidimensional framework encompassing economic, psychological, social, and political empowerment (Scheyvens, 1999). The examination of environmental empowerment dimension, which give locals the opportunity to manage, monitor, and conserve resources in the community by actively engaging them in tourism related activities, was later presented in the literature by Ramos and Prideaux (2014). Building off these largely conceptual and qualitative discussions of empowerment, Boley and McGehee (2014), developed the RETS to provide quantitative measures to resident empowerment through tourism.

As a quantitative assessment of empowerment, the original RETS provides an understanding of the factors that enable residents to engage in important decision-making and take control of the benefits tourism brings to their community. Its three-dimensional components – psychological empowerment, social empowerment, and political empowerment – have helped managers and officials understand residents' perception and the importance of residents' support in the process of sustainable tourism development (Boley et al., 2014; Li et al., 2022a; Li et al., 2022b; Mody et al., 2020; Yeager et al., 2020). Each of the empowerment dimensions are discussed below.

2.3. Resident empowerment dimensions

2.3.1. Psychological empowerment

Psychological empowerment is explained by Scheyvens (1999) as the self-esteem and pride residents feel as a result of tourists recognizing the value of their culture, natural environment, and traditional values. Visitors willingness to experience local culture and explore natural resources, motivate residents to share their knowledge and skills with tourists (Boley & McGehee, 2014), which contributes to their psychological empowerment. Psychologically empowered residents place a great value on their culture and environment (Di Castri, 2004). Sense of community pride and self-esteem are considered key drivers that contribute to psychological empowerment and the development of sustainable tourism (Nguyen et al., 2021). For instance, Magno and Dossena (2020) demonstrate that community pride was reinforced by tourists attending mega-events, which in turn psychologically empowered locals and influence them to support sustainable tourism. Residents' involvement in planning and development is an approach that psychologically empowers them and the community (Strzelecka, Boley, & Strzelecka, 2017).

However, psychological disempowerment may occur when the

marketed place image lacks authenticity and does not capture the core value of a destination (Li et al., 2022b; Santos, 2014). In other cases, residents' psychological disempowerment can occur when residents lose interest in community development and wellbeing or feel they do not or have the opportunity to participate in important decision-making (Ramos & Prideaux, 2014). This can lead to frustration, disillusion and confusion, which are all indications of psychological disempowerment (Gohori & Van der Merwe, 2021).

2.3.2. Social empowerment

In tourism, social empowerment is the dimension that explains how community members work together in a cohesive manner (Scheyvens, 1999). This collaboration is known to increase community bonding and encourage them to take advantage of the benefits tourism brings to the community (Boley et al., 2015). Boley and McGehee (2014, p. 87) describe social empowerment as "when one perceives tourism as increasing his or her connection to the community." This construct has been investigated to examine the relationships between community bonding and collective efforts with community attachment, community involvement, and community-based tourism to understand the role of empowerment in sustainable tourism development in developing countries (Gohori & Van der Merwe, 2021; Nguyen et al., 2021). For example, Nguyen et al. (2021) note that the success of community-based tourism is highly influenced by community cohesiveness and contributed to resident social empowerment in Vietnam. In Manicaland, Zimbabwe, Gohori and Van der Merwe (2021) discovered that infrastructure development projects socially empowered residents, bringing them closer.

Conversely, increase competition among residents, especially in destinations highly dependent on the much needed income from tourism, can lead to conflict and disharmony among community members (Strzelecka, Boley, & Woosnam, 2017) which can socially disempower them. Additionally, prostitution, marginalization, alcohol and drug abuse, crime, and begging are also viewed as social disempowerment (Aghazamani & Hunt, 2017; Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021).

2.3.3. Political empowerment

Political empowerment is described as when residents in a tourism community demonstrate political efficacy and motivation to engage in "social and political resources" (Strzelecka, Boley, & Strzelecka, 2017, p. 559). This dimension is the community structure that represents the needs and interests of individuals and groups (Scheyvens, 1999). Politically empowered residents have a voice in the community and have at their disposal the necessary outlets to take part in important decision-making (Boley & McGehee, 2014). Although commonly compared to community participation and involvement where residents take part and become engaged in tourism related activities (Nicholas, Thapa, & Ko, 2009; Šegota, Mihalić, & Kušcer, 2017), political empowerment goes beyond participatory actions by giving "residents control over the tourism planning process" (Boley et al., 2015, p. 114).

In the ladder of participation Arnstein (1969, p. 217) presents two extremes of empowerment/disempowerment, in which the first rung – "Manipulation" – the "powerful" educate, advise and persuade citizens to heed to their manipulative agenda, a sign of political disempowerment, while the eighth rung of power give "Citizen Control" to have a seat at the decision-making table taking "full managerial power", a sign of political empowerment. When power and political agency are retained by authorities and external investors residents' voices are muffled, they become politically disempowered (Timothy, 2007). Eliminating, or lack thereof, platforms for residents to raise their concern regarding tourism in the community, put them at a disadvantage, as a consequence, politically disempowers them (Ramos & Prideaux, 2014). This control over tourism planning, development, and policies may hinder the process of sustainable tourism development (Phuc & Nguyen, 2020). Residents with control over socio-economic and democratic issues are motivated to find solutions to improve their future

and contribute to the development of sustainable tourism (Shafieisabet & Haratifard, 2020).

Although the Empowerment Theory and the initial development of the RETS have furthered our understanding of the complexity of power in tourism communities within the sustainable tourism development premise to "ensure collective realization of optimal benefits" (Weaver, Moyle, & McLennan 2021, p. 2), economic empowerment and environmental empowerment dimensions should also be considered within this framework. Moreover, the values and beliefs underpinning Empowerment Theory and the current RETS have supported several studies in explaining how residents' feel proud when visitors show interest in their culture and community (psychological empowerment), are politically engaged in tourism policies (political empowerment) and promote collective efforts in the community (social empowerment). However, taken into account the multifaceted components of tourism, and the current global events (climate change, economic uncertainty) this study attempts to extend these frameworks to encapsulate a more complete measurement of empowerment, encompassing economic empowerment and environmental empowerment. The integration of these constructs positions the theoretical underpinnings of Empowerment Theory within a holistic understanding of the complexity of development in tourism communities. Thus, the literature for these two dimensions is presented hereafter.

2.3.4. Economic empowerment

Economic empowerment was initially presented in Scheyvens's (1999) empowerment framework to explain how economic benefits derived from ecotourism should economically empower the local community. In this study economic empowerment is defined as "earnings from tourism-related activities" as well as "access to productive resources." It is evidenced by employment and businesses opportunities, sustainable economic gains, equitable distribution of benefits and improvements to infrastructure and buildings" (Scheyvens and Van der Watt's, 2021, p. 10). In the quest to promote sustainable tourism development through the lens of community empowerment, economic factors are essential, especially in developing destinations highly dependent on tourism (Knight & Cottrell, 2016). Gohori and Van der Merwe (2021) showcased that entrepreneurial ventures and services provided through tourism related employment contributed to resident economic empowerment. Other studies demonstrate that strategies implemented through community-based tourism (CBT) economically empowered the local community (Nguyen et al., 2021). Conversely, unbalance power dynamics among residents may favored a small group, while economically disempowering the majority (Schmidt & Uriely, 2019). This concentration of economic gains from tourism among the more powerful can contribute to inequality, discrimination, and consequently economic disempowerment (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021).

The measurement of economic benefits from tourism has been operationalized in the recently developed EBTS, which investigates residents' perception of the economic benefits from tourism (Boley et al., 2018). However, this scale does not attempt to make any advancements of how tourism benefits should be equitably shared in the community and "provide a regular, reliable income" (Scheyvens, 1999, p. 247) to economically empower residents. Moreover, although studies that examined the EBTS reported a positive relationship between resident perceived economic benefits and resident support for tourism (Boley et al., 2014; Yeager et al., 2020), these do not demonstrate how residents are able to take control of their finances and ensure future economic prosperity (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021).

To this end, one may argue that this relationship may be influenced by the temporary economic gain residents obtain from tourism but does not necessarily predict long-term economic stability for individual households in the community. Studies that examine the relationship between economic empowerment in tourism communities are evidenced in the literature (Gohori & Van der Merwe, 2021; Nguyen et al., 2021; Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021). Nevertheless, based on these findings

and considering that, to date, quantitative assessment of economic empowerment has yet to be measured within the residents' empowerment perception framework, this study aims to operationalize this dimension to better understand the benefits of economic gains through tourism and long-term economic stability in the community.

2.3.5. Environmental empowerment

Environmental empowerment is "capable of producing empowerment beyond economic, social, political, and psychological" empowerment (Aghazamani & Hunt, 2017, p. 339). In this study environmental empowerment is defined as a mechanism that offers residents the opportunity to manage and monitor their natural resources in the community by actively engaging them in tourism related activities (Ramos & Prideaux, 2014). This power is gained through biodiversity knowledge, environmental education, restoration of natural resources, and ecosystem management (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021). As a consequence, environmental impact is reduced and tourism is developed sustainably (Shafieisabet & Haratifard, 2020).

However, environmental conservation presents many challenges in small vulnerable destinations highly dependent on tourism (Butler & Menzies, 2007; Cole, 2006; Moyle et al., 2020). One of the chief concerns regarding this issue is the top-down tourism development approach, which often excludes locals from vital decision-making process (Nesticò & Maselli, 2020). In such case, "local people and their communities become the objects of development but not the subjects" (Mitchell & Reid, 2001, p. 114). Timothy (2007) highlights this as "impose development" where projects are implemented through centralized authorities, who deduce their actions are for community betterment. The underlying issue of this clinch to power by decision-makers is obviously economic interest, which often does not benefit the disadvantaged population (Shafieisabet & Haratifard, 2020; Timothy, 2007). Community-based tourism and capacity building, the grassroots of empowerment, that "allows communities to break away from the hegemonic grasp" (Timothy, 2002, p. 150) are suggested as effective tools that empower residents and contribute to sustainable tourism development (Knight & Cottrell, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2021).

Environmental empowerment was recently proposed in a newly developed empowerment framework (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021). Subsequently, attempts to operationalize environmental empowerment have been made by Eluwole et al. (2022) and Lwoga (2017). However, Eluwole's et al. (2022) examination of environmental empowerment was done so from a collective (community) perspective. Second, the environmental scale adopted from Chinyele and Lwoga (2019) which was borrowed from Lwoga (2017) is not in line with the current RETS scale, and "does not capture important aspects of a construct because its focus is too narrow" (Boateng, Neilands, Frongillo, Melgar-Quinonez, & Young, 2018, p. 6), focusing mainly on heritage conservation. Finally, the integration of a new dimension into an existing scale should also follow Churchill's (1979) scale development recommendations, an overlooked factor in Eluwole's et al. (2022) study.

With these observations in mind and following Churchill's (1979) scale development recommendations, this study aims to integrate the environmental empowerment dimension into the current RETS to better understand how tourism can serve as an agent to environmentally empower the local community and contribute to the development of sustainable tourism. As demonstrated in recent studies, the adaptation of social and environmental behavior can contribute to resident environmental empowerment, which in turn, promotes sustainable development practice (Khalid et al., 2019; Xu & Hu, 2021).

2.3.6. Residents' support for sustainable tourism development

Residents' support for sustainable tourism development is viewed as an important antecedent for the success and sustainability of destinations (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004; Qin, Shen, Ye, & Zhou, 2021). In a small island context, where destinations are characterized by their vulnerability, governments rely heavily on residents' long-term support

for sustainable tourism development (Man Cheng, So, & Nang Fong, 2021). Perceptions of the benefits and costs associated with economic, social, cultural, and environmental impacts of tourism have long been considered important predictors to support sustainable tourism development (Lee, 2013; Nicholas et al., 2009; Phuc & Nguyen, 2020). Other factors, such as perceptions of empowerment have also recently been regarded as antecedences for long-term support for tourism (Boley & McGehee, 2014; Cole, 2006; Ramos & Prideaux, 2014).

Although several studies have investigated the three dimensional framework included in the current RETS as an antecedent for support for tourism (Boley et al., 2014; Eluwole et al., 2022; Li et al., 2022b; Yeager et al., 2020), studies that examine residents' perception of empowerment and how this affect their support for sustainable tourism development in small island destination context are rare. Further, this study seeks to examine residents' economic empowerment and environmental empowerment within these frameworks to explain how this affects residents' support for sustainable tourism development. The integration of these two dimensions within the current RETS will strengthen the scale's ability to explain the complex relationships between residents' perception of economic and non-economic factors, residents' attitude, power, and the process of sustainable tourism development. Within the context of highly economic dependent tourist destinations, a more holistic conceptualization and measurement of Empowerment Theory will provide further understanding of the power relations and the important role of residents' empowerment in the sustainability of tourism in these fragile economic and environment ecosystems. The holistic measurement of the Empowerment Theory will also help explain how empowered residents will demonstrate their support for sustainable tourism development when power is transferred to them, and they have economic, psychological, social, political, and environmental control of their resources (Shafieisabet & Haratifard, 2020).

3. Methods

3.1. Developing the new resident empowerment through Tourism Scale: RETS 2.0

This study followed Churchill's (1979) and Rossiter's (2002) scale development recommendation to develop and validate the RETS 2.0. As previously considered in other tourism studies (Beall & Boley, 2021; Boley & McGehee, 2014; Kim, Ribeiro, & Li, 2021; Wu, Wu, Li, & Tong, 2022) Churchill's (1979) recommendations are the benchmark used to evaluate psychometric properties in scale development. However, Rossiter's (2002, p. 308) content validity procedure diverges from the focus on psychometrics to ensure that the measured items "properly represent the construct." Thus, a two-stage, mixed approach of qualitative and quantitative methods was used in this study to follow both the best practices in scale development from a psychometric perspective as well as content validity perspective. The scale development relied on 7 steps (Table 1). The first step was to specify the domain in order to generate item pools through an extensive literature review and in-depth interviews. Following this step, the items generated were purified through multiple rounds of data collection. This process utilized exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (to refine and purify the item pool) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (to further purify the scale and confirm the factual structure and reliability and validity of RETS 2.0). Lastly, Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was performed to evaluate the structural relationships between the RETS 2.0 dimensions and residents' support for sustainable tourism development as a test of nomological validity.

3.2. Step 1: identification of domains

Churchill's (1979) first recommendation for scale development includes an extensive review of the literature to understand the measured phenomenon. Within Scheyvens and Van der Watt's (2021)

Table 1
Scale development steps and procedures.

Steps	Procedures	Techniques
1.	Identification of domains	Literature review on empowerment.
2.	Item pool generation	Literature review, in-depth interview ($n = 10$), generations of 15 economic empowerment items and 15 environmental empowerment items (30 items), and content validity. Sustainable tourism and scale development expert inputs (scale refinement) regarding questions' understanding.
3.	Data collection for pilot study	Survey on the island of Boa Vista ($n = 233$)
4.	First purification	Exploratory factor analysis (EFA), Cronbach alpha, and reliability test.
5.	Data collection for primary study	Survey on the island of Sal ($n = 509$)
6.	Second purification	EFA Cronbach Alpha, reliability analysis.
7.	Validation (validity and reliability assessment)	CFA construct validity, convergent validity, discriminant validity, nomological validity, and predictive validity.

empowerment framework, economic empowerment should provide the means for communities to benefit long-term through tourism-related activities. Other interpretations in the literature suggest that economic empowerment should incorporate equitable distribution of economic benefits, promote economic stability, and provide employment opportunities (Aghazamani & Hunt, 2017; Gohori & Van der Merwe, 2021; Nguyen et al., 2021). The environmental empowerment domain was established using Ramos and Prideaux's (2014) framework. Additionally, other advancement in the literature, which highlight environmental education, natural resource preservation, and management of scarce and protected areas, were also considered (Aghazamani & Hunt, 2017; Khalid et al., 2019; Shafieisabet & Haratifard, 2020).

The next step in Churchill's (1979) recommendations is to develop a pool of items to measure the constructs. The findings of economic empowerment and environmental empowerment presented in the literature guided the item pool generation process. Furthermore, this review of the literature provided the guidelines for the inductive method using an in-depth interview technique to collect data from residents. Item pool generation using mixed approaches of deductive and inductive methods in scale development studies are suggested so that items developed represent the full breadth of the construct (Boateng et al., 2018; Cheng et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2022).

3.3. Step 2: item pool generation

3.3.1. In-depth interviews

In-depth interviews are the most common approach for gathering insight from participants in qualitative studies (Man Cheng et al., 2021). Open-ended semi-structured questions about economic and environmental empowerment were asked to participants (face-to-face and via zoom) on the islands of Santiago, Sal, and Boa Vista, Cape Verde, during the months of November and December 2021. An information saturation threshold was reached after ten interviews. Six females and four males age between 34 and 71, with more than five years of experience in their respected field participated. Participants' affiliation included associations, private and public sector, and non-governmental organizations (NGO). Participants' consent was obtained to audio-record the interviews, which lasted between 20 and 60 min each. The interviews were all conducted in Portuguese and generated 85 pages of transcribed data. The data were later translated from Portuguese to English by an expert translator and underwent content validity to extract relevant information.

3.3.2. Content validity of in-depth interview

The content validity procedure followed a rigorous revision of the

transcript by the research members. Cross-examination of the text was done to ensure face validity of item pool (Wu et al., 2022). The study identified a total of 30 items, e.g., 15 for economic empowerment, of which 8 from literature review and 7 from in-depth interview, and 15 for environmental empowerment, of which 9 from literature review and 6 from in-depth interview, as presented in Table 2. Items that captured how residents are able to control their financial resources generated through tourism in order to guarantee long-term economic stability were considered for the economic empowerment dimension. Environmental empowerment dimension incorporated items related to natural resource management, preservation of natural environment, environmental awareness, environmental responsibility, and education.

Subsequently, the items generated along with definitions of economic and environmental empowerment were analyzed by a panel of 4 experts familiar with scale development, resident perception and attitude, and resident empowerment. These experts provided their insights regarding content validity of the constructs, wording of items, clarity, neutrality, simplicity, directionality, and lack of ambiguity (Choi & Sirakaya, 2005; Lin, Shi, & Gursay, 2022). Expert panel opinions pertaining to economic empowerment dimension included double-barrel items, ambiguity, and too much focus on financial and fiscal management aspects. Items that did not reflect the research setting, e.g., sharing economy, were also removed. In total, five items were removed from this list at this stage. Environmental empowerment dimension was less problematic. One double-barrel item, and three items (opportunity to enhance outdoor recreation, environmental agent, and managerial environmental skills) were removed. One item was reworded and retained. A total of 8 items were removed from both lists.

The retained 22 items were translated from English to Portuguese and pretested for comprehension and easiness of the questions. Fifteen residents provided their judgement regarding appropriateness of the items and the measurement domain within the target population (Boateng et al., 2018). This further assessment provided the researchers with insight relating to the suitability and clarification of the items, which were all retained.

After ensuring content validity of the 22 items, a back-translation technique was performed. Native English and Portuguese speaking scholars supervised this process to guarantee rigor of the translated items as well as ensure that the constructs were functionally and conceptually equivalent in the context of Cape Verde. This process, which also included items from the current RETS, followed Portuguese to English and back from English to Portuguese translations. Upon confirmation of the functional and conceptual equivalence as well as the translational/linguistic equivalence of the items recommended by (Malhotra et al., 1996), the 34 items (22 from this study and 12 from current RETS) were integrated in a survey questionnaire for a pilot study.

3.4. Step 3: data collection for pilot study

Following steps 1 and 2, Churchill's (1979) third and fourth steps are to pilot test and purify the item pool. A two-part questionnaire was designed to first collect data relating to resident perception of economic, environmental, psychological, social, political empowerment. A 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* was used to measure each dimension. The second part of the questionnaire gathered data pertaining to sociodemographic information. The study site for the pilot study was on the island of Boa Vista. Data from the Census 2021 reported that the population of Boa Vista, Cape Verde's second most sought tourist destination after Sal, is 12,613 (53.8% male and 46.2% female), of which 24.7% (pre COVID-19 pandemic) are employed in tourism-related activities (INE, 2021; TradeInvest, 2019). The island of Boa Vista (also known as Island of Dunes: *Ilha das Dunas*) attracted 240,876 visitors in 2019 through its 55 km of white sand and turquoise waters (INE, 2020). Dunes and oasis, palm trees, extensive beaches and irresistible waters depict the charms of this island. The

Table 2
Item pool generation from literature review and in-depth interview.

Literature Review	Interview	Reference
Economic Empowerment		
Makes me want to control my economic resources	Provides me with health, food, education, and security benefits	Scheyvens (1999); Scheyvens and Van der Watt (2021)
Makes me feel I can benefit economically short and long-term	Makes me want to create strategic partnership with private and public sector	Scheyvens and Van der Watt (2021)
Provides ways for me to support my family	Provides me with the opportunity to certify my product	Boley et al. (2018)
Provides me with the opportunity to have access to international market	Provides ways for me and other residents from the fishing, agriculture, and arts sector to earn stable income	Gohori and Van der Merwe (2021); Nguyen et al. (2021)
Makes me feel I can improve my standard of living	Makes me want to be part of a sharing economy	Scheyvens (1999); Scheyvens and Van der Watt (2021)
Provides ways for me to have access to government funding to finance my project	Provides ways for me to use funds allocated from tourism to improve my community	Gohori and Van der Merwe (2021)
Provides ways for me to make informed economic decisions	Reminds me of the importance of financial/economic management practice	Boley et al. (2018); Gohori and Van der Merwe (2021)
Makes me feel I can benefit from tourism even though I am not employed in tourism		Nguyen et al. (2021); Scheyvens (1999)
Environmental Empowerment		
Makes me feels I access to traditional uses of natural resources	Fosters an ecological behavior and awareness in me	Shafieisabet and Haratifard's (2020); Cole (2006); Ramos and Prideaux (2014)
Provides ways for me to acquire regional, local, and institutional environmental knowledge	Provides ways for me to develop managerial skills for long-term environmental conservation	Ramos and Prideaux (2014); Nesticò and Maselli (2020); Lee and Jan (2019)
Makes me want to protect Cape Verde's biodiversity	Reminds me that I have the obligation to protect my natural surrounding	Eluwole et al. (2022); Lee and Jan (2019); Ramos and Prideaux (2014)
Provides ways for me to take up the role of environmental agent	Makes me want to adopt reuse, reduce, and recycle practices	Lee and Jan (2019); Moyle et al. (2020); Nguyen et al. (2021)
Reminds me that I have the obligation to preserve our natural heritage	Makes me feel I have the obligation to manage scarce resources (water)	Ramos and Prideaux (2014); Nesticò and Maselli (2020); Lee and Jan (2019); Xu and Hu (2021)
Makes me feels like I have the capacity to mitigate negative environmental effects	Provides ways for me to promote environmentally friendly initiative	Eluwole et al. (2022); Nesticò and Maselli (2020); Ramos and Prideaux (2014)
Makes me feel I can contribute to my community's wellbeing through preservation of physical surrounding		Shafieisabet and Haratifard's (2020); Cole (2006); Ramos and Prideaux (2014)
Provides me with the opportunity to enhance outdoor recreation		Lee and Jan (2019); Knight and Cottrell (2016); Nguyen et al. (2021)
Makes me want to participate in the creation of environmental regulations		Eluwole et al. (2022); Ramos and Prideaux (2014); Nguyen et al. (2021)

Viana Desert, the fishing village of *Spinguera* and the Plain of *Campo da Serra*, besides the Saint Monica Beach and *Ervatão*, are famous tourist attractions. *Morna* (a famous music genre) is heard throughout the island, in the late afternoons, rhythmic by this melody, in varied poems.

During the months of April and May 2022, under the supervision of one of the researchers, a research team collected data from residents. The pilot questionnaire was distributed door-to-door to residents, following a random route with a systemic sampling selection method, including instruction on how to fill out the questionnaire (Boley & McGehee, 2014). Residents that had difficulty filling out the questionnaire were assisted by one of the members of the research team. The research team distributed 350 questionnaires, of which 267 were returned and 233 were validated. Several studies have considered similar sample sizes for pilot tests and Churchill's item generation phases, e.g., Boley and McGehee (2014) ($N=113$); Boley et al. (2018) ($N=113$); Wu et al. (2022) ($N=225$); Otoo, Kim, and Choi (2021) ($N=209$); and Soulard, McGehee, and Knollenberg (2021) ($N=242$). Survey data were introduced into SPSS v.27 software to prepare the data for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and reliability analysis.

4. Results

4.1. Step 4: first purification of the RETS 2.0

Following Churchill's (1979) fourth step for scale development, the first purification of the RETS 2.0 was performed using EFA. To verify this method's adequacy, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy and Bartlett Test of Sphericity were observed. Guided by Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2010) recommendations, the study established the following cut-off values as: KMO values greater than 0.60, eigenvalue greater than 1.0, communalities greater than 0.50, and factor loading greater than 0.40 or cross loading less than 0.40 (Kim et al., 2021). Internal consistency reliability was also performed to identify item-to-total correlation of the items with values greater than 0.50. Items with Cronbach alpha values greater than 0.70 were retained (Hair et al., 2019).

To determine the factor loading strength and item dimensionality, the study used principal component and Promax rotation to examine 34 items included in RETS 2.0. This analysis confirmed that, within the dimensions of environmental and economic empowerment, some items were causing issues in the model and were not loading well onto a factor. These items were identified as follow: Environmental Empowerment ("Fosters an ecological behavior in me", "Provides ways for me to acquire local environmental knowledge", "Makes me feel I have the obligation to manage scarce resources (water)", and "Makes me want to participate in the creation of environmental regulations") Economic Empowerment ("Provides me with healthcare benefits" and "Provides me with educational benefits"). After several rounds of test, these items were removed one at a time from the model (Wu et al., 2022). With the elimination of these 6 items, the variance explained increased from 73.48% to 75.54% showing a strong correlation of the five-dimensional model (Boley & McGehee, 2014). Therefore, it was deemed that the 28 items be retained for the next phase of scale development.

KMO coefficient value for the five-dimension scale of RETS 2.0 was 0.908, while Bartlett's test revealed that there are statistically significant correlations between the measurement items ($\chi^2 = 6052.368$, $df = 378$, $p < 0.001$). These results suggested that the data examined in the pilot study was appropriate for EFA. The eigenvalue for all five factors were above the 1.0 threshold. The established cut-off values criterion for communality (>0.50) was satisfied for all items. Item-to-total correlation output ranged from 0.507 to 0.758. The pilot study confirmed a high level of internal consistency and reliability of the Cronbach alpha values for all five factors, which exceeded the 0.70 threshold, as seen in Table 3. The 28 items retained from the five-dimension scale solution explained 75.54% of the total variance. All factor loadings exceeded 0.70 threshold, meaning a strong association with the corresponding

Table 3
Exploratory factor analysis results for pilot study (n= 233).

	Factor Loading	Item to Total Correlation	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
Environmental Empowerment (α = 0.934)			12.262	43.792
Reminds me that I have the obligation to protect my natural surrounding	0.858	0.649		
Makes me want to adopt reuse, reduce, and recycle practices	0.835	0.612		
Provides ways for me to promote environmentally friendly initiatives	0.712	0.629		
Makes me want to protect Cape Verde's biodiversity	0.885	0.673		
Makes me feel I have access to traditional use of natural resources	0.832	0.633		
Reminds me that I have the obligation to preserve our natural heritage	0.842	0.617		
Makes me feel like I have the capacity to mitigate negative environmental effects	0.778	0.668		
Makes me feel I can contribute to my community's wellbeing through preservation of physical surrounding	0.853	0.712		
Economic Empowerment (α = 0.922)			3.623	12.939
Makes me feel I can benefit from employment opportunities	0.729	0.507		
Provides ways for me to earn stable income from complementary sector (exp. Fishing, agriculture, and arts)	0.735	0.597		
Provides ways for me to use funds allocated from tourism to improve my community	0.736	0.510		
Makes me want to control my available income	0.842	0.540		
Makes me feel I can benefit economically long-term	0.853	0.629		
Provides ways for me to support my family	0.866	0.585		
Makes me feel I can improve my standard of living	0.898	0.614		
Makes me feel I can benefit from tourism even if I am not employed in tourism	0.731	0.653		
Psychological Empowerment (α = 0.942)			2.339	8.355
Makes me proud to be a Boa Vista resident	0.850	0.596		

Table 3 (continued)

	Factor Loading	Item to Total Correlation	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
Makes me feel special because people travel to see my country's unique feature	0.899	0.692		
Makes me want to tell others about we have to offer in Boa Vista	0.879	0.648		
Reminds me that I have a unique culture to share with visitors	0.889	0.667		
Makes me want to work to keep Boa Vista special		0.646		
Social Empowerment (α = 0.939)			1.911	6.827
Makes me feel more connected to my community	0.797	0.696		
Fosters the sense of community spirit within me	0.807	0.702		
Provides ways for me to get involved in my community	0.813	0.758		
Political Empowerment (α = 0.908)			1.014	3.623
I have a voice in Boa Vista tourism development decisions	0.882	0.608		
I have access to decision-making process when it comes to tourism in Boa Vista	0.868	0.576		
My vote makes a difference on how tourism is developed in Boa Vista	0.890	0.547		
I have an outlet to share my concerns about tourism development in Boa Vista	0.888	0.527		
Total variance explained				75.536

Note: α = Cronbach's alpha.

factor (Hair et al., 2019).

4.2. Step 5: data collection for primary study

Churchill (1979) specifically recommends that the fifth step to scale development should include primary data collection to further refine the scale. Following the same procedure as the pilot study, a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree* was used. Sociodemographic variables were also considered in the primary data collection process. Data was collected during the months of July, August, and October of 2022 on the touristic points (Santa Maria, Murdeira, Palmeira) on the island of Sal. Using a random route method with a systemic sampling approach, a self-administered, door-to-door, paper and pencil questionnaire technique was adopted to collect the data (Boley & McGehee, 2014; Woosnam & Norman, 2010). This sampling scheme allowed the researchers to gather a representative sample of the population, reduce non-sampling errors, increase response rate, and minimize measurement error. It is also representative in terms of gender and age group, containing a similar distribution of the population as included in the 2021 Census (INE, 2021). A data collection team composed of two undergraduate students and the primary researcher used the information obtained from the country's census tracts as a guide for data collection. One questionnaire was distributed for each individual household. Of the 836 questionnaires distributed by the

research team, 643 were collected and 509 were validated.

To ensure rigorosity of the collected data and identify any potential problem within the data, a common method bias (CMB) test was performed (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). This was to mitigate CMB, in which several similar procedures were conducted, as maintained in Fuller, Simmering, Atinc, Atinc, and Babin (2016). First, to reduce any ambiguity and assure proper wording of items, clarity, neutrality and simplicity, the questionnaire was carefully designed to obtain the intended information measured in the study (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Second, during data collection, participants were ensured of the confidentiality of their response. They were also informed that the collected data was strictly for academic purposes and that there were no right or wrong answers. Third, a Harman's single-factor test was performed to assess the presence of CMB in the data. The 28 items were all loaded onto a single unrotated exploratory factor analysis (EFA). Results revealed that the general variance reported by a single construct was 43.9%, which suggested that CMB was not present in the data (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Forth, further analysis of CMB was conducted through the marker variable approach. Results suggested that this additional test did not yield common method bias in the data. Lastly, the data was subject to a normality test to assess skewness and kurtosis values. SPSS outputs from the two models indicated that the skewness and kurtosis were both below the recommended threshold – 3.0 and 7.0, respectively (Kamath, Ribeiro, Woosnam, Mallya, & Kamath, 2023).

4.2.1. Study site and sociodemographic profile of primary study

Due to its historical colonial past and the current conditions of tourism development, dominated by foreign multinational investors, Cape Verde is a fascinating setting to study power and residents' empowerment. Cape Verde is heavily reliant on the tourism sector for its economic development, which contributes 25% to the national GDP, creates 23% of formal employment, and accounts for about 55% of exports of services and goods (World Bank, 2021). However, these figures were compromised when the COVID-19 pandemic hit. As a means to reboot the tourism sector and overcome the devastating losses experienced during the crisis, in partnership with the UNWTO, the country hosted the Global Tourism Investment Forum in 2021 on the island of Sal (UNWTO, 2021). Guided by UN's Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDG), this initiative was aimed to attract foreign direct investment. Key areas of development included specific guidelines for recovery: community capacity building, economic diversification, biodiversity protection, climate action, global tourism plastic initiatives, and hotel energy solution (UNWTO, 2021). Data from the 2021 Census reported that the population on the island of Sal is 33,347 (53.5% male and 46.5% female), of which 52.9% (pre COVID-19 pandemic) are employed in tourism-related activities (INE, 2021; TradeInvest, 2019). This island represents 45.5% of tourism activities in Cape Verde. Before the COVID-19 pandemic, Sal attracted 372,785 tourists to its shoreline in 2019 (INE, 2020). The island's white sandy beaches and warm climate offer unique conditions for water sports including surfing, windsurfing, fishing, kitesurfing, and deep-sea diving. Places like the *Rabo de Junco*, *Joaquim Petinha*, *Buracona*, *Ponta Preta*, and *Gruta do Amor* are known to attract thousands of tourists.

Data pertaining to residents' sociodemographic characteristics were collected. Following the census-guided scheme, these data included 49.5% males and 50.5% females, as seen in Table 4. Age group ranged from 18 to 24 (8.8%) to >65 (1.0%). The majority of the participants possessed a high school diploma (47.2%). In addition, 75.4% of respondents worked in the public-private sector (mostly tourism related) and 29.9% lived on the Island of Sal for more than 20 years. Marital status indicated that 73.5% of respondents were single while 19.3% were married. About 213 (41.8%) families had an average income of €362.76 – €544.13, while 51.8% of families received their income from tourism.

Table 4

Sociodemographic Profile of the sample – Primary Study ($n = 509$).

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	252	49.5
	Female	257	50.5
Age	18–24	45	8.8
	25–36	267	52.5
	37–46	161	31.6
	47–56	18	3.5
	57–64	13	2.6
	>65	5	1.0
Marital Status	Single	374	73.5
	Married	98	19.3
	Divorced	31	6.1
	Widow	6	1.2
Education	Primary School	34	6.7
	Secondary School	240	47.2
	Technical Training	111	21.8
	University	124	24.4
Occupation	Self-employed	71	13.9
	Public-Private sector	384	75.4
	Student	16	3.1
	Unemployed	24	4.7
	Maid	14	2.8
Income	< €181.38	39	7.7
	€181.38 – €362.75	113	22.2
	€362.76 – €544.13	213	41.8
	€544.14 – €725.52	84	16.5
	> €725.53	60	11.8
Length of Residence	1–5	31	6.1
	6–10	104	20.4
	11–15	139	27.3
	16–20	83	16.3
	>20	152	29.9
Tourism as Primary Income	Yes	264	51.9
	No	245	48.1
Work in Tourism	Yes	336	66.0
	No	173	34.0
If yes, how?	Employer	55	10.8
	Employee	276	54.2
	Missing	178	35.0

Note: Missing data related to the question: *Work in tourism*, if participants did not work in tourism, the question was left blank, corresponding to missing data.

4.3. Step 6: second purification of the RETS 2.0

Prior to performing CFA and with the aim to validate the RETS 2.0, it was determined that a second EFA was needed to further purify the newly developed scale. Following the same procedure as in the first EFA, a closer observation concluded that some items were problematic. Within the Economic Empowerment scale, the research team identified that similarities in the wording of two items were causing discrepancy in the model (Neuts et al., 2021). For instance, Economic Empowerment items “*Makes me feel I can benefit from employment opportunities*” and “*Provides ways for me to earn stable income from complementary sector (exp. Fishing, agriculture, and arts)*”, were asking the same question, e.g., if residents earn stable income through tourism than he or she is also benefiting from employment opportunity that the sector presents. In the Environmental Empowerment dimension items such as “*Makes me feel I have access to traditional use of natural resources*” and “*Makes me feel like I have the capacity to mitigate negative environmental effects*” presented a factor loading below 0.70, which was causing issues with the Cronbach alpha. In order to improve the model these 4 items were deleted. It was deemed that the 24 items be retained for the next phase of scale development.

The KMO coefficient for the five-dimension scale of RETS 2.0 was 0.903, while the null hypothesis of the Bartlett's test was rejected ($\chi^2 = 7610.745$, $df = 276$, $p < 0.001$). These results suggested that the data examined in the second EFA was appropriate. Factor loadings ranged from 0.733 to 0.868, while a high level of internal consistency and reliability were revealed since the Cronbach's alpha values for all five

factors were higher than the 0.70 threshold. The 24 items retained from the five-dimension scale solution explained 70.08% of the total variance (see appendix 1). Upon these results, it was decided that the items retained from the second EFA be prepared for the next phase of scale development.

4.4. Step 7: validation of RETS 2.0

To examine the reliability and validity of the RETS 2.0, the study followed Churchill’s (1979) sixth and seventh scale development recommendation. The study used IBM Amos v28 Software and Maximum Likelihood Estimation (ML) in this process. The goodness-of-fit of the measurement model followed Kline’s (2016) and Brown’s (2015) recommended indices cut-off values of the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA <0.08), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR <0.08), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI >0.90), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI >0.90). The examination of the model fit of the parsimony criteria, which includes the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and Browne-Cudeck Criterion (BCC), were also considered (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Results from first round of CFA yielded the following: $\chi^2 = 843.723$, $df = 243$, $p < 0.001$, RMSEA = 0.070, SRMR = 0.171, TLI = 0.909, CFI = 0.920, BCC = 963.624, and AIC = 957.723. These results indicated that one item from the Political Empowerment scale (“My vote makes a difference on how tourism is developed in Sal”) one from Economic Empowerment (“Makes me want to control my available income”) and one from Environmental Empowerment (“Reminds me that I have the obligation to preserve our natural heritage”) had a factor loading below 0.70 and were effecting the AVE results. These items were considered for deletion.

With the aim to improve the validity and reliability of the scale and present an abbreviated measurement (Boley et al., 2021) of resident perception of empowerment, this study established the following criterion: (1) to present a more parsimonious measurement of resident perception of empowerment (Malhotra et al., 2012), (2) to reduce respondent fatigue (Mowen & Voss, 2008), and (3) to increase response rate (Lin et al., 2022; Rhee & Choi, 2016). Based on these criterion the following items were deleted: Psychological Empowerment (“Makes me proud to be a Sal resident” and “Makes me want to tell others about what we have to offer in Sal”), Environmental Empowerment (“Makes me want to adopt reuse, reduce, and recycle practices” and “Makes me want to protect Cape Verde’s biodiversity), and Economic Empowerment (“Provides ways for me to use funds allocated from tourism to improve my community” and “Makes me feel I can benefit from tourism even if I am not employed in tourism”). Upon removal of these items, a final round of CFA of the 15 items scale indicated the following results (Table 5): $\chi^2 = 305.741$, $df = 81$, $p < 0.001$, RMSEA = 0.074, SRMR = 0.147, TLI = 0.931, CFI = 0.947, BCC = 386.278, and AIC = 383.741.

Construct validity for the RETS 2.0 was evaluated using convergent, discriminant, nomological, and predictive validity (Hair et al., 2010). As shown in Table 6, standardized factor loading for the 15 items were all significant at ($p < 0.001$), ranging from 0.755 to 0.920. Each of the constructs within the five-dimensional scale had an average variance extracted (AVE) value above the 0.5 threshold (Hair et al., 2010), which indicated convergent validity for the RETS 2.0.

To assess the distinctiveness between constructs and determine how each construct captures a unique phenomenon in the measurement model, discriminant validity was considered (Brown, 2015). First, the study assessed the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criteria to verify if the

Table 5 Model fit and scale abbreviation steps.

RETS 2.0	χ^2	df	p -value	TLI	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC	BCC
24 items	843.723	243	0.001	0.909	0.920	0.070	0.171	957.723	963.624
21 items	473.509	179	0.001	0.946	0.954	0.057	0.162	619.509	626.118
15 items	305.741	81	0.001	0.931	0.947	0.074	0.147	383.741	386.278

Table 6 Confirmatory factor analysis results for primary study (n = 509).

	Factor Loading	T-value	CR	AVE
Environmental Empowerment ($\alpha = 0.829$)			0.880	0.710
Reminds me that I have the obligation to protect my natural surroundings	0.845	N/A		
Provides ways for me to promote environmentally friendly initiatives	0.825	22.203***		
Makes me feel I can contribute to my community’s wellbeing through preservation of physical surrounding	0.857	23.449***		
Economic Empowerment ($\alpha = 0.840$)			0.904	0.759
Makes me feel I can benefit economically long-term	0.865	28.005***		
Provides ways for me to support my family	0.843	26.578***		
Makes me feel I can improve my standard of living	0.905	N/A		
Psychological Empowerment ($\alpha = 0.824$)			0.894	0.739
Makes me feel special because people travel to see my country’s unique feature	0.834	25.549***		
Reminds me that I have a unique culture to share with visitors	0.836	25.639***		
Makes me want to work to keep Sal special	0.906	N/A		
Social Empowerment ($\alpha = 0.833$)			0.879	0.709
Makes me feel more connected to my community	0.819	N/A		
Fosters the sense of community spirit within me	0.849	22.286***		
Provides ways for me to get involved in my community	0.857	22.556***		
Political Empowerment ($\alpha = 0.880$)			0.895	0.741
I have a voice in Sal tourism development decisions	0.899	N/A		
I have access to decision-making process when it comes to tourism in Sal	0.920	29.582***		
I have an outlet to share my concerns about tourism development in Sal	0.755	21.221***		

Note: α = Cronbach’s Alpha; CR = Construct Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted; *** $p < 0.001$.

square root of AVE values were greater than the correlations between the five measured dimensions. The square root for the AVE of all five factors ranged from 0.860 to 0.899. Next, Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT) was evaluated to establish if the correlations of indicators across constructs measure different phenomena (Henseler, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2015). Table 7 shows that all inter-construct correlations were below the 0.85 threshold.

4.4.1. Nomological validity

Next, the study conducted a nomological validity to test the conceptual model of the newly developed RETS 2.0. Resident support for sustainable tourism development scale was added to the survey to assess the influence these various dimensions of empowerment have over

Table 7
Discriminant Validity Test based on Fornell-Larcker Criterion and Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio (HTMT).

	Means	SD	EcoEmp	EnvEmp	PolEmp	PsyEmp	SocEmp
Economic Empowerment (EcoEmp)	3.452	0.886	0.870	0.702	0.564	0.469	0.601
Environmental Empowerment (EnvEmp)	3.548	0.864	0.587	0.864	0.555	0.530	0.703
Political Empowerment (PolEmp)	2.995	1.207	0.486	0.474	0.899	0.177	0.665
Psychological Empowerment (PsyEmp)	3.919	0.817	0.392	0.441	0.135	0.860	0.590
Social Empowerment (SocEmp)	3.464	0.885	0.505	0.586	0.575	0.491	0.866

Note: The bold diagonal elements are the squared root of the AVE. Above-diagonal elements are the HTMT ratio; below-diagonal elements are correlations between the constructs for Fornell and Larcker.

support for sustainable tourism (Lee, 2013; Man Cheng et al., 2021; Nicholas et al., 2009). When developing a new scale, Kock et al. (2019) contend that nomological validity should go beyond reporting numbers from structural equation modeling result, rather it should demonstrate the usefulness and scales' ability to predict certain phenomenon. Nomological validity provides conceptual clarity of the nomological network of the constructs being measured and assists on specifying the relationship between them (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2016), e.g., it governs the correlations of observed constructs in a theoretical framework (Borsboom, Mellenbergh, & Van Heerden, 2004). Within the theoretical framework of Empowerment Theory and sustainable tourism development, this study identified the concept of resident empowerment within the nomological network of support for sustainable tourism development (Table 8). As maintained in the literature, there is a strong conceptual connection between these concepts (Nguyen et al., 2021; Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021). For this reason, it is the researchers understanding that, as observed in Table 8, with the newly proposed RETS 2.0, resident perception of economic, environmental, psychological, social, and political empowerment is highly correlated with their support for sustainable tourism development.

4.4.2. Predictive validity

Following the test of nomological validity, predictive validity was performed to determine to what extent the RETS 2.0 predicting power influenced residents' support for sustainable tourism development. SEM using SmartPLS 4 analyze the path coefficient of the model. The coefficient of determination (R^2) was 0.254. Results for the Q^2 ($=1-SSE/SSO$) yield the following: Economic Empowerment (0.494) environmental Empowerment (0.469), Political Empowerment (0.467), Psychological Empowerment (0.460), Social Empowerment (0.477), and Support for Sustainable Tourism Development (0.454). The effect size (f^2), t statistics and confidence interval scores are seen in Table 9.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The literature highlights that resident engagement, community-based tourism, and empowerment are key factors that contribute to the development of sustainable tourism (Gohori & Van der Merwe, 2021; Li et al., 2022b). It also emphasizes that residents' empowerment has become a prevalent concept in resident perception and attitude

Table 8
Nomological validity test: Correlation coefficient (N = 509).

	Support for Sustainable Tourism Development (SSTD)	p-value
Economic Empowerment	0.596	0.001
Environmental Empowerment	0.580	0.001
Political Empowerment	0.230	0.001
Psychological Empowerment	0.687	0.001
Social Empowerment	0.514	0.001

Note: Result of the structural equation modelling (n = 509). $R^2 = 0.254$, $\chi^2 = 378.168$, $df = 262$, $p < 0.001$; CFI = 0.948; RMSEA = 0.065; SRMR = 0.145; TLI = 0.934; AIC = 478.168; BCC = 482.054.

studies (Moyle et al., 2020). Ten years ago, Boley and McGehee (2014) sought to address a gap in the literature by developing and operationalizing the RETS, measuring residents' perception of psychological, social, and political empowerment and its role in sustainable development of tourism. However, considering the shifting tides of tourism and the alteration of social fabrics in today's world, new advancements in the current RETS are needed to better position the scale in the sustainability process (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021). For this reason, this study intended to address the Empowerment Theory and RETS limitations by integrating the economic empowerment and environmental empowerment dimensions in the measurement with the aim to present a more holistic perspective of the sustainable tourism planning and development.

The present study proposes a new five-dimensional measurement of the Resident Empowerment through Tourism Scale: RETS 2.0 encompassing Psychological Empowerment, Social Empowerment, Political Empowerment, Economic Empowerment, and Environmental Empowerment. The economic and non-economic factors measured in the RETS 2.0 provide managers with a holistic tool to better understand residents' engagement in the tourism development process. Although it is evident that not all five dimensions of empowerment may yield positive results within a particular destination (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021), the RETS 2.0 can assist managers in closing the disempowerment gaps in tourism communities. The RETS 2.0 also offers new avenues to overcome obstacles of income inequality in tourism communities by providing a tool to measure resident perceptions of long-term economic wellbeing and future prosperity. Considering the negative environmental impacts associated with tourism activities, the RETS 2.0 provides a measure to ensure that our "natural environment is not sacrificed for tourism" (Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021, p. 14). The newly proposed framework is intended to better align the empowerment underpinnings within the sustainable tourism development discourse as well as help explain residents' attitude through the employment of Empowerment Theory orientations. By bringing in the Empowerment Theory into the discussion of residents' perception of empowerment, researchers are in better position to advance new frontiers of tourism research and unlock the sector's full potential to lead the way for inclusive development while inspiring a global shift toward a more sustainable and equitable economy (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2022).

Additionally, within the theoretical nomological network, the RETS 2.0 can be triggered during the implementation of tourism planning. This will guide managers and governments on the creation of a roadmap to engage and gain residents' support for sustainable practice. Equipped with the values of merging fields within this theory-driven perspective, researchers can use RETS 2.0 to make new advancements on ways to mitigate negative impacts associated with tourism by improving community wellbeing and addressing urgent matters effecting the development of sustainable tourism.

5.1. Theoretical implications

Resident empowerment has been presented as a tool that questions the unbalanced structure in tourism communities by means of power transfer with the end goal to develop a more sustainable tourism sector.

Table 9
 Estimated Path Coefficients, Effect Size ($n = 509$)
 Note: ns = not significant, *** $p < 0.001$, SSTD = Support for Sustainable Tourism Development.

Paths	Coefficients	T Statistics	BC Confidence Intervals		Effects Sizes (f^2)	Coefficient Determination (R^2)
			2.5%	97.5%		SSTD
Economic Empowerment → SSTD	0.135***	2.065	0.008	0.262	0.014	0.254
Environmental Empowerment → SSTD	0.159***	2.215	0.011	0.292	0.018	
Political Empowerment → SSTD	-0.038	0.653	-0.201	0.058	0.001	
Psychological Empowerment → SSTD	0.362***	7.098	0.252	0.455	0.121	
Social Empowerment → SSTD	-0.034	0.479	-0.165	0.110	0.001	

The study attempted to contribute to the theoretical underpinnings of the Empowerment Theory by expanding our collective understanding of residents' attitude toward tourism in the sustainable tourism development process. Using Foucault's (1978, 1980) conceptualization of power and Empowerment Theory underpinnings, this study highlights power as fluid and a mechanism for capacity building and how power places residents at the center of such development (Zimmerman & Warschausky, 1998). This study also emphasizes the functions of complex tourism network relations and how sustainable efforts should be galvanized to view residents as "vehicles of power" (Foucault, 1980). Moreover, considering this central role residents play in sustainable development, power "inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourse, learning processes and everyday lives" (Foucault, 1980, p. 39). Such views postulates the notion of power to be inherently positioned within the development of tourism and community empowerment (Cheong & Miller, 2000)

The sense of pride demonstrated by residents when visitors show interest in their culture and community (psychological empowerment), the motivation to politically engage in tourism policies (political empowerment), and the cohesiveness of collective efforts promoted in the community (social empowerment) are the foundations for individual, organization, and community structures introduced in the Empowerment Theory perspectives (Zimmerman, 2000). Additionally, advancements in this study found that residents' perception of environmental empowerment – natural surrounding protection, environmental-friendly behavior and conservation of natural resources – and economic empowerment – improve standard of living, secure family income, and long-term economic prosperity – also play a key role in this process. These factors are the grassroots for fundamental social change and justice in tourism destinations. In this context, residents are viewed as agents of change engaged in the planning and development rather than just beneficiaries or bystanders of tourism development.

For the past ten years, the centrality of residents' perception of empowerment research (operationalization) has been the examination of psychological, social, and political psychometric. Other studies have included the economic benefits from tourism measurement. However, this study was able to demonstrate that short or temporary economic benefits, as previously measured in other studies (Boley et al., 2014; Mody et al., 2020; Yeager et al., 2020), from tourism do not provide the means for residents to "gain mastery" over their finance and guarantee long-term stability to become economically empowered. The study also showed that, through protection of natural surroundings and environmentally friendly initiatives, residents are in a better positioned to become environmentally empowered.

Findings also suggest that through the process of empowerment, residents are more likely to demonstrate their support for sustainable tourism development. This outcome promotes a balanced relationship of power through the engagement and involvement of local communities.

With the operationalization of the new empowerment measurement, the study was able to establish a more solid link between the theoretical frameworks of empowerment and sustainable tourism development.

5.2. Managerial implications

Sustainable tourism development presents many challenges for policymakers and destination organizations. One way to overcome these challenges is through the implementation of local community empowerment. This approach provides residents with the opportunity to express and use their power to share local knowledge, take part in community matters, and become financially stable through tourism related activities. Additionally, these initiatives also contribute to the planning and development of sustainable tourism.

The newly developed empowerment framework, the RETS 2.0, is a new tool to assist destination managers in achieving UNSDG. By creating structural avenues to engage local communities in tourism, local governments provide residents with the ability to exercise their psychological, social, political, economic, and environmental empowerment and contribute to sustainable tourism development. This is especially important considering the lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic, which brought tourism to a standstill (Scheyvens, Movono, & Auckram, 2021). The implementation of radical economic and political change anchored by initiatives that empower local communities to take control of the direction of tourism development is a pathway toward achieving sustainable tourism development (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2022; Scheyvens & Van der Watt, 2021) and overcome future uncertainties.

With the RETS 2.0 managers are in a position to break from traditional top-down practices to bring about positive and transformative change to the community as well as identify key factors that influence residents to support future tourism development. Gaining local support for tourism development is essential for managers because residents have the power to sabotage tourism plans. The RETS 2.0 also equips managers with the knowledge on how to involve local residents in diverse tourism activities such as: festivals, mega events and implementation of different types of tourism products in order to gain their support, which in turn can create "sustainable empowerment cycles" (Shafieisabet & Haratifard, 2020).

Taking into account the current global events – COVID-19, political conflict, increase inequality, and climate change – that has brought hardship to communities and derailed significant progress obtain in the Agenda 2030, especially in the Global South, in addition to sustainability alignment, the RETS 2.0's timely arrival can assist UNWTO with standardized measurement in the pursuit to reposition UNSDG. International entities and national governments can benefit from the RETS 2.0 objective measurements during the implementation of social protection programs. Additionally, RETS 2.0 is a tool that can be used to

trigger more effective responses, anticipate future challenges, and hone the design of immediate social, economic, and environmental actions. Further, in the quest to find an equilibrium for sustainable development, the newly proposed scale can assist local authorities in the mitigation of negative impacts, while optimizing sustainable efforts aimed to protect the wellbeing of tourism communities.

5.3. Limitations and future research

The study successfully tested and validated a holistic measurement of the psychometrics properties of the RETS 2.0 in a small island destination context. Although the study answered Boley and McGehee’s (2014) call to test the scale in developing countries and expanded the measurement by integrating two new dimensions, some limitations are worth noting. The data analyzed in the pilot and primary study were collected on two islands: Boa Vista and Sal. As a means to obtain more satisfactory results it would be interesting to include data from other islands as well as in other destinations that are highly dependent on tourism. Researchers should also test the newly developed scale within different cross-cultural contexts to compare the psychometrics results.

The study developed the RETS 2.0 taking into account Kock’s et al. (2019) recommendation to test the scales’ ability to explain residents’ support for sustainable tourism development. However, within the power dynamics and economic and political structure, other nomological networks such as imperialism, colonialism, trust in tourism institutions, and emotional solidarity should also be tested. These approaches will better position the RETS 2.0 within the sustainable tourism development nomological network.

Finally, considering the value of using the RETS 2.0, longitudinal research to continually assess resident perceptions of empowerment through tourism as a means to identify progression is equally important. This will serve as a baseline for future research comparison of resident perception and attitude study.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2024.104915>.

Appendix 1

Table 10
Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Primary Study (N = 509)

	Factor Loading	Item to Total Correlation	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
Environmental Empowerment (α = 0.903)			9.847	41.028
Reminds me that I have the obligation to protect my natural surrounding	0.822	0.678		
Makes me want to adopt reuse, reduce, and recycle practices	0.815	0.637		
Provides ways for me to promote environmentally friendly initiatives	0.795	0.671		
Makes me want to protect Cape Verde’s biodiversity	0.833	0.651		
Reminds me that I have the obligation to preserve our natural heritage	0.812	0.608		
Makes me feel I can contribute to my community’s wellbeing through preservation of physical surrounding	0.838	0.696		
Economic Empowerment (α = 0.886)			2.913	12.139
Provides ways for me to use funds allocated from tourism to improve my community	0.733	0.621		
Makes me want to control my available income	0.788	0.628		
Makes me feel I can benefit economically long-term	0.834	0.666		
Provides ways for me to support my family	0.847	0.620		
Makes me feel I can improve my standard of living	0.814	0.654		
Makes me feel I can benefit from tourism even if I am not employed in tourism	0.764	0.586		
Psychological Empowerment (α = 0.878)			1.580	6.585
Makes me proud to be a Boa Vista resident	0.824	0.381		
Makes me feel special because people travel to see my country’s unique feature	0.772	0.539		
Makes me want to tell others about we have to offer in Boa Vista	0.792	0.501		
Reminds me that I have a unique culture to share with visitors	0.818	0.493		
Makes me want to work to keep Boa Vista special	0.847	0.442		

(continued on next page)

Impact statement

Building on the success of the original Resident Empowerment through Tourism Scale and Empowerment Theory, the RETS 2.0 offers new avenues to overcome obstacles of income inequality and environmental and social injustices in tourism communities. Current global events – COVID-19, political conflict, increase inequality, and climate change – have brought great hardship to communities and derailed significant progress in obtaining Agenda 2030. The RETS 2.0’s timely arrival can assist UNWTO with standardized measurement in the pursuit to reposition UN’s Sustainable Development Goals. Additionally, RETS 2.0 mechanisms can be used to trigger more effective responses, anticipate future challenges, develop social protection programs, and hone the design of immediate social, economic, and environmental actions. Further, in the quest to find an equilibrium for sustainable development, the newly proposed scale can assist local authorities in the mitigation of tourism’s negative impacts, while optimizing sustainable efforts aimed to protect the wellbeing of tourism communities.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Edson Redy Moreira dos Santos: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft. **Luís Nobre Pereira:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing, Supervision. **Patricia Pinto:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing, Supervision. **B. Bynum Boley:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

Acknowledgments

This paper is financed by National Funds provided by FCT - Foundation for Science and Technology (Portugal) through grant number UI/BI/150802/2020. Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being.

Table 10 (continued)

	Factor Loading	Item to Total Correlation	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
Social Empowerment ($\alpha = 0.833$)			1.521	6.336
Makes me feel more connected to my community	0.868	0.614		
Fosters the sense of community spirit within me	0.828	0.666		
Provides ways for me to get involved in my community	0.857	0.647		
Political Empowerment ($\alpha = 0.880$)			0.958	3.992
I have a voice in Boa Vista tourism development decisions	0.875	0.560		
I have access to decision-making process when it comes to tourism in Boa Vista	0.865	0.584		
My vote makes a difference on how tourism is developed in Boa Vista	0.827	0.533		
I have an outlet to share my concerns about tourism development in Boa Vista	0.849	0.582		
Total variance explained				70.081

Note: α = Cronbach's alpha.

References

- Aghazamani, Y., & Hunt, C. A. (2017). Empowerment in tourism: A review of peer-reviewed literature. *Tourism Review International*, 21(4), 333–346. <https://doi.org/10.3727/154427217X15094520591321>
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners. Journal of The American Institute Of Planners*, 35(November 2012), 37–41. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01944366908977225>.
- Beall, J., & Boley, B. B. (2021). An ecotourist by whose standards? Developing and testing the ecotourist identification scale (EIS). *Journal of Ecotourism*, 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14724049.2021.1919126>. April.
- Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A primer. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 6(June), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149>
- Boley, B. B., Ayscue, E., Maruyama, N., & Woosnam, K. M. (2017). Gender and empowerment: Assessing discrepancies using the resident empowerment through tourism scale. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(1), 113–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1177065>
- Boley, B. B., Maruyama, N., & Woosnam, K. M. (2015). Measuring empowerment in an eastern context: Findings from Japan. *Tourism Management*, 50, 112–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.01.011>
- Boley, B. B., & McGehee, N. G. (2014). Measuring empowerment: Developing and validating the resident empowerment through tourism scale (RETS). *Tourism Management*, 45, 85–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.04.003>
- 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>
- Boley, B. B., Strzelecka, M., & Woosnam, K. M. (2018). Resident perceptions of the economic benefits of tourism: Toward a common measure. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 42(8), 1295–1314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348018759056>
- Boley, B. B., Strzelecka, M., Yeager, E. P., Ribeiro, M. A., Aleshinloye, K. D., Woosnam, K. M., et al. (2021). Measuring place attachment with the abbreviated place attachment scale (APAS). *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 74(July 2020), Article 101577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2021.101577>
- Borsboom, D., Mellenbergh, G. J., & Van Heerden, J. (2004). The concept of validity. *Psychological Review*, 111(4), 1061–1071. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.111.4.1061>
- Brown, T. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. THE GUILFORD PRESS. <https://doi.org/10.1198/tas.2008.s98>
- Butler, C., & Menzies, C. (2007). Traditional ecological knowledge and indigenous tourism. In R. Butler, & T. Hinch (Eds.), *Tourism and indigenous peoples: Issues and implications* (2nd ed., pp. 15–27). Elsevier Ltd.
- Cheng, T. M., Chen, M. T., & Wu, C. H. (2021). Tour conductor playfulness: Conceptualizing and scale development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(1), 197–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519888284>
- Cheong, S., & Miller, M. L. (2000). Power and tourism: A foucauldian observation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 371–390.
- Chinyele, B. J., & Lwoga, N. B. (2019). Participation in decision making regarding the conservation of heritage resources and conservation attitudes in Kilwa Kisiwani, Tanzania. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-05-2017-0019>
- Choi, H. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(4), 380–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287505274651>
- Churchill, G. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64–73. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/3150876%5Cnpapers2://publication/uuid/633C626A-7CB0-4A7B-B2E4-7F76C5CCBAEE>
- Cole, S. (2006). Information and empowerment: The keys to achieving sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14(6), 629–644. <https://doi.org/10.2167/jost607.0>
- Di Castri, F. (2004). Sustainable tourism in small islands - local empowerment as the key factor. *International Journal of Island Affairs*, 13(1), 49–55.
- Drolet, A. L., & Morrison, D. G. (2001). Do we really need multiple-item measures in service research? *Journal of Service Research*, 3(3), 196–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109467050133001>
- Eluwole, K. K., Banga, C., Lasisi, T. T., Oztüren, A., & Kiliç, H. (2022). Understanding residents' empowerment and community attachment in festival tourism: The case of Victoria Falls. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 23(March), Article 100674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100674>
- Esfandiari, K., Pearce, J., Dowling, R., & Goh, E. (2022). Pro-environmental behaviours in protected areas: A systematic literature review and future research directions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 41(January 2021), Article 100943. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tump.2022.100943>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. https://www.fairportlibrary.org/images/files/RenovationProject/Concept_cost_estimate_accepted_031914.pdf
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: Volume 1: An introduction*. Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/knowledge: Selection interview and other writing* (pp. 78–108). Pantheon.
- Freira, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness. *Continuum* (Vol. 1973). <https://doi.org/10.1177/074171367402400405>
- Fuller, C. M., Simmering, M. J., Atinc, G., Atinc, Y., & Babin, B. J. (2016). Common methods variance detection in business research. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(8), 3192–3198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.12.008>
- Gaventa, J. (2006). Finding the spaces for change: A power analysis. *Institution of Development Studies Bulletin*, 37(6), 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.1896.02430960015001d>
- Gohori, O., & Van der Merwe, P. (2021). Tourism and community empowerment: The perspectives of local people in Manicaland province, Zimbabwe. *Tourism Planning and Development, January*, 81–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2021.1873838>, 2021.
- Grilli, G., Tyllianakis, E., Luisetti, T., Ferrini, S., & Turner, R. K. (2021). Prospective tourist preferences for sustainable tourism development in Small Island Developing States. *Tourism Management*, 82(July 2020), Article 104178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104178>
- Gursoy, D., & Rutherford, D. (2004). Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 495–516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2003.08.008>
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*. Boston: Cengage. <https://doi.org/10.3390/polym12123016>
- Hair, J., Risher, J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2022). The ongoingness of imperialism: The problem of tourism dependency and the promise of radical equality. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 94, Article 103382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2022.103382>
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55.
- INE. (2021). *V Recenseamento Geral Da População E Habitação (RgpH – 2021). Resultados Preliminares*.
- Joo, D., Woosnam, K. M., Strzelecka, M., & Boley, B. B. (2020). Knowledge, empowerment, and action: Testing the empowerment theory in a tourism context. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 28(1), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1675673>
- Kamath, V., Ribeiro, M. A., Woosnam, K. M., Mallya, J., & Kamath, G. (2023). Determinants of visitors' loyalty to religious sacred event places: A multigroup measurement invariance model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 62(1), 176–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875211057600>
- Khalid, S., Ahmad, M. S., Ramayah, T., Hwang, J., & Kim, I. (2019). Community empowerment and sustainable tourism development: The mediating role of community support for tourism. *Sustainability*, 11(22). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226248>

- Kieffer, C. H. (1984). Citizen empowerment. *Prevention in Human Services*, 3(2–3), 9–36. https://doi.org/10.1300/j293v03n02_03
- Kim, Y., Ribeiro, M. A., & Li, G. (2021). Tourism memory characteristics scale: Development and validation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(6), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875211033355>
- Kline, R. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Knight, D. W., & Cottrell, S. P. (2016). Evaluating tourism-linked empowerment in Cuzco, Peru. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 56, 32–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.11.007>
- Kock, F., Josiassen, A., & Assaf, A. G. (2019). Scale development in tourism research: Advocating for a new paradigm. *Journal of Travel Research*, 58(7), 1227–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287518800391>
- Lee, T. H. (2013). Influence analysis of community resident support for sustainable tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 34, 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.03.007>
- Lee, T. H., & Jan, F. H. (2019). Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. *Tourism Management*, 70(September 2017), 368–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.09.003>
- Leslie, D., Holzhib, C., & Holland, T. (1998). Measuring staff empowerment: Empowerment scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 8(2), 212–222.
- Li, X., Boley, B. B., & Yang, F. X. (2022a). Empowerment and its divergent influence over mass and alternative tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 24(6), 786–799. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijtr.2545>
- Li, X., Boley, B. B., & Yang, F. X. (2022b). Resident empowerment and support for gaming tourism: Comparisons of resident attitudes pre- and amid-covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480221076474>, 0(0).
- Lin, H., Shi, S., & Gursoy, D. (2022). Destination experiencescape: Conceptualization and scale development amid COVID-19 pandemic. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 25(24), 4047–4074. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2022.2075716>
- Lwoga, N. B. (2017). Factors influencing local residents' intentions to conserve the built heritage in Tanzania. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 12(4), 394–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2016.1213846>
- Magno, F., & Dossena, G. (2020). Pride of being part of a host community? Medium-Term effects of mega-events on citizen quality of life: The case of the world expo 2015 in milan. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 15(January), Article 100410. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100410>
- Malhotra, N. K., Agarwal, J., & Peterson, M. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research: A state-of-the-art review. *International Marketing Review*, 13(5), 7–43. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02651339610131379>
- Malhotra, N. K., Mukhopadhyay, S., Liu, X., & Dash, S. (2012). One, few or many? An integrated framework for identifying the items in measurement scales. *International Journal of Market Research*, 54(6). <https://doi.org/10.2501/IJMR-54-6-835-862>
- Man Cheng, E. N., So, S. I., & Nang Fong, L. H. (2021). Place perception and support for sustainable tourism development: The mediating role of place attachment and moderating role of length of residency. *Tourism Planning and Development*, 19(4), 279–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2021.1906740>
- Maruyama, N. U., Woosnam, K. M., & Boley, B. B. (2016). Comparing levels of resident empowerment among two culturally diverse resident populations in Oizumi, Gunma, Japan. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 24(10), 1442–1460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2015.1122015>
- Mitchell, R. E., & Reid, D. G. (2001). Community integration: Island tourism in Peru. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1), 113–139. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(00\)00013-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(00)00013-x)
- Mody, M., Woosnam, K. M., Suess, C., & Dogru, T. (2020). Hapless victims or empowered citizens? Understanding residents' attitudes towards airbnb using weber's theory of rationality and foucauldian concepts. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(2), 284–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1834567>
- Mowen, J., & Voss, K. (2008). Understanding the acceptance of mobile SMS advertising among Young Chinese consumers. *Psychology and Marketing*, 25(6), 485–505. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar>
- Moyle, B., Moyle, C. Lee, Ruhanen, L., Weaver, D., & Hadinejad, A. (2020). Are we really progressing sustainable tourism research? A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(1), 106–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1817048>
- Nesticò, A., & Maselli, G. (2020). Sustainability indicators for the economic evaluation of tourism investments on islands. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 248(March). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119217>
- Neuts, B., Kimps, S., & van der Borg, J. (2021). Resident support for tourism development: Application of a simplified resident empowerment through tourism scale on developing destinations in flanders. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6934. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126934>
- Nguyen, D. T. N., D'Hautesserre, A. M., & Serrao-Neumann, S. (2021). Intrinsic barriers to and opportunities for community empowerment in community-based tourism development in Thai Nguyen province, Vietnam. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(4), 723–741. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1884689>
- Nicholas, L. N., Thapa, B., & Ko, Y. J. (2009). Residents' perspectives of a world heritage site: The pitons management area, st. Lucia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 390–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.03.005>
- Obradović, S., & Stojanović, V. (2021). Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism development: A case study of the gradac river gorge, valjevo (Serbia). *Tourism Recreation Research*, 47(5–6), 499–511. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2020.1870073>
- Otoo, F. E., Kim, S. S., & Choi, Y. (2021). Developing a multidimensional measurement scale for diaspora tourists' motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(2), 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519899990>
- Petrić, L. (2007). Empowerment of communities for sustainable tourism development: Case of Croatia. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 55(4), 431–443. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/24673>
- Phuc, H. N., & Nguyen, H. M. (2020). The importance of collaboration and emotional solidarity in residents' support for sustainable urban tourism: Case study Ho chi minh city. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(2), 245–264. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1831520>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879–903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2016). Recommendations for creating better concept definitions in the organizational, behavioral, and social sciences. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(2), 159–203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428115624965>
- Qin, X., Shen, H., Ye, S., & Zhou, L. (2021). Revisiting residents' support for tourism development: The role of tolerance. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 47(March), 114–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.02.010>
- Ramos, A. M., & Prideaux, B. (2014). Indigenous ecotourism in the mayan rainforest of palenque: Empowerment issues in sustainable development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(3), 461–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2013.828730>
- Rappaport, J. (1984). Studies in empowerment: Introduction to the issue. *Prevention in Human Services*, 3(2–3). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315804385>
- Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/exemplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 15(2), 121–148. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00919275>
- Rhee, Y. W., & Choi, J. N. (2016). Knowledge management behavior and individual creativity: Goal orientations as antecedents and in-group social status as moderating contingency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 813–832. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2168>
- Rossiter, J. (2002). The C-OAR-SE procedure for scale development in marketing. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19(4), 305–335. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116\(02\)00097-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8116(02)00097-6)
- Rowlands, J. (1995). Empowerment examined. In D. Eade (Ed.), *Development and social diversity*. Oxfam (UK and Ireland). <https://doi.org/10.1080/0961452951000157074>
- Santos, E. (2014). Destination mutant brands: An empirical perspective of tourism professionals and host community to create Mutant Brand Cape Verde. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 3(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2013.12.008>
- Scheyvens, R. (1999). Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management*, 20, 245–249. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(98\)00069-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(98)00069-7)
- Scheyvens, R., Movono, A., & Auckram, S. (2021). Pacific peoples and the pandemic: Exploring multiple well-beings of people in tourism- dependent communities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(1), 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1970757>
- Scheyvens, R., & Van der Watt, H. (2021). Tourism, empowerment and sustainable development: A new framework for analysis. *Sustainability*, 13(22), Article 12606. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212606>
- Schmidt, J., & Uriely, N. (2019). Tourism development and the empowerment of local communities: The case of Mitzpe Ramon, a peripheral town in the Israeli Negev Desert. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27(6), 805–825. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2018.1515952>
- Šegota, T., Mihalić, T., & Kušćer, K. (2017). The impact of residents' informedness and involvement on their perceptions of tourism impacts: The case of Bled. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6(3), 196–206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2016.03.007>
- Shafieisabet, N., & Haratifard, S. (2020). The empowerment of local tourism stakeholders and their perceived environmental effects for participation in sustainable development of tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 45(October), 486–498. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.10.007>
- Soulard, J., McGehee, N., & Knollenberg, W. (2021). Developing and testing the transformative travel experience scale (TTES). *Journal of Travel Research*, 60(5), 923–946. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287520919511>
- Stoddard, J. E., Pollard, C. E., & Evans, M. R. (2012). The triple bottom line: A framework for sustainable tourism development. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 13(3), 233–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2012.698173>
- Strzelecka, M., Boley, B. B., & Strzelecka, C. (2017). Empowerment and resident support for tourism in rural central and eastern europe (CEE): The case of pomerania, Poland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(4), 554–572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2016.1224891>
- Strzelecka, M., Boley, B. B., & Woosnam, K. M. (2017). Place attachment and empowerment: Do residents need to be attached to be empowered? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 66, 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2017.06.002>
- Strzelecka, M., Prince, S., & Boley, B. B. (2021). Resident connection to nature and attitudes towards tourism: Findings from three different rural nature tourism destinations in Poland findings from three different rural nature tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 31(2), 664–687. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1995399>
- Timothy, D. (2002). Tourism and community development issues. In R. Sharpley, & D. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues*. Channel View Publications.

- Timothy, D. (2007). Empowerment and stakeholder participation in tourism destination communities. In A. Church, & T. Coles (Eds.), *Tourism, power and space*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203392096>.
- TradelInvest, C. V. (2019). Infografia sobre Turismo em Cabo Verde. In *Cabo Verde TradeInvest*.
- UNWTO. (2021). *UNWTO Commission for Africa (Issue September)*. http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/cme42_4b_gpww_16-17_reg_activities_iadd.1_e.pdf.
- Weaver, D. B., Moyle, B., McLennan, C., & Lee, J. (2021). The citizen within: Positioning local residents for sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(4), 897–914. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1903017>
- Woosnam, K. M., & Norman, W. C. (2010). Measuring residents' emotional solidarity with tourists: Scale development of durkheim's theoretical constructs. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287509346858>
- WorldBank. (2021). *Cabo Verde economic update: Rebounding from the crisis restoring fiscal Sustainability and Leveraging the private Sector for a more Resilient and sustainable recovery (issue April)*.
- Wu, M., Wu, X., Li, Q., & Tong, Y. (2022). Community citizenship behavior in rural tourism destinations: Scale development and validation. *Tourism Management*, 89 (April). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2021.104457>
- Xu, S., & Hu, Y. (2021). How do residents respond to negative environmental impacts from tourism? The role of community participation in empowering residents' environmentally responsible behavior. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2471>. May.
- Yeager, E. P., Boley, B. B., Woosnam, K. M., & Green, G. T. (2020). Modeling residents' attitudes toward short-term vacation rentals. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(6), 955–974. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287519870255>
- Zimmerman, M. (1995). Psychological empowerment: Issues and illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23(5), 581–599. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4028/www.scientific.net/AMM.556-562.2940>.
- Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory. In J. Rappaport, & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (1st ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4193-6_2.
- Zimmerman, M. A., Israel, B. A., Schulz, A., & Checkoway, B. (1992). Further explorations in empowerment theory: An empirical analysis of psychological empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 20(6).
- Zimmerman, M. A., & Warschausky, S. (1998). Empowerment theory for rehabilitation research: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 43(1), 3–16.



Edson Redy Moreira dos Santos is a Ph.D. Candidate in Tourism at the Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs), Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Campus de Gambelas, FE, Edifício 9, 8005-139 - Faro - Portugal, and an Associate Professor at Faculty of Social Science, Humans, and Arts, and School of Business and Governance, University of Cape Verde, Cape Verde, Email: a70500@ualg.pt, Tel: +351 289 800 900



Luís Nobre Pereira, Ph.D. is a Professor and President of the Scientific Council of the School of Management, Hospitality and Tourism and Co-coordinator of the Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs) of the University of Algarve, Portugal. His research interests include measuring consumer behavior, market segmentation, revenue management, demand modeling and forecasting, Email: lmpeir@ualg.pt, Phone: +351 289 800 137.



Patrícia Pinto, Ph.D. is a Full Professor at the Faculty of Economics and Coordinator of the Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-Being (CinTurs) of the University of the Algarve, Campus de Gambelas, FE, Edifício 9, 8005-139 - Faro - Portugal, Email: pvalle@ualg.pt, Tel: +351 289 800 900



B. Bynum Boley, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources, 180 East Green Street, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602-2152, Email: bboley@uga.edu, Tel: phone: +706-389-0226