International Journal of Tourism Research

WILEY

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

A Scale to Measure Destination Social Responsibility Perceived by Residents and Government

Yuan Lee[1] | Bishnu Sharma[2] | Aaron Tham[2]

[1]Department of Future Convergence Track, Silla University, Busan, South Korea | [2]School of Business and Creative Industries, University of the Sunshine Coast, Sunshine Coast, Australia

Correspondence: Aaron Tham (mtham@usc.edu.au)

Received: 27 November 2024 | **Revised:** 25 June 2025 | **Accepted:** 28 June 2025

Funding: The authors received no specific funding for this work.

Keywords: destination residents | destination social responsibility | local government governance | scale development

ABSTRACT

With a growing emphasis on responsible destination management and sustainable tourism, the tourism sector recognizes the need to measure destination social responsibility (DSR), which reflects the collective efforts of multiple stakeholders to fulfill social responsibilities at the entire destination level. Although academic interest in DSR studies has steadily increased, the multidimensional nature of DSR is often simplified into a single dimension, assessed utilizing CSR measures, or measured as DSR perceived by a single stakeholder group. A comprehensive DSR scale capturing both residents' and government perceptions, however, remains undeveloped. This study develops a 21-item DSR scale perceived by residents and government, identifying four key dimensions—governance, economic, environmental, and cooperative responsibilities. This scale enables destination managers to evaluate their overall DSR performance, including specific domains and related attributes, while also serving as a tool to identify gaps in DSR practices.

1 | Introduction

Sustainable tourism practices have become a central concern for organizations and stakeholders, as destinations' reliance on fragile environmental resources necessitates socially responsible actions among multiple stakeholders to ensure long-term sustainability (Su et al. 2020). The cumulative impact of tourism development and activities highlights the need for socially responsible, collective efforts from all stakeholders across the destination. These collective responsible efforts and coordinated actions of tourism stakeholders, beyond isolated responsible activities by individual organizations, have given rise to the concept of destination social responsibility (DSR), emphasizing the need for a holistic approach to overall responsible efforts for sustainable tourism destinations viewed as a whole. While corporate social responsibility (CSR) research in the tourism sector offers valuable insights into organizational practices, it often overlooks the shared roles and contributions of non-corporate stakeholders, which play a significant role in supporting responsible tourism practices. Moreover, limited research exists on how destination-level social responsibility initiatives are perceived by residents and governments.

CSR denotes a business management approach that goes beyond profit-driven objectives and shareholder concerns to meet societal and environmental expectations (Coles et al. 2013; Dahlsrud 2008). Previous research has demonstrated that CSR enhances company image and reputation, motivates employees, and increases sales and market share based on consumer preferences (Coles et al. 2013; Farmaki and Stergiou 2021). However, focusing solely on the social responsibility of specific organizations, as in most CSR studies, may not be sufficient to achieve sustainability in tourism destinations. As such, recognizing the need for joint efforts to address sustainability issues has raised

awareness of shared responsibility among multiple tourism stakeholders aligned with the broader interests of tourism destinations (Chang et al. 2024). This has led to the emergence of DSR, which reflects a collective perspective on social responsibility, encompassing the efforts and initiatives of tourism stakeholders and extending beyond individual organizational actions.

The term DSR reflects the collective responsible efforts of various stakeholders to manage negative impacts and maximize positive outcomes within a tourism destination. The summative effects of the tourism industry highlight the need for a multidimensional DSR scale that comprehensively captures the collective responsibilities and coordinated actions of stakeholders to ensure destination-wide sustainability (Su et al. 2020). However, current DSR scales often rely on CSR indicators, which primarily focus on the isolated responsible efforts of individual organizations and have limited capacity to capture the broad range of overall responsible practices required for destination-wide sustainability (Yu and Hwang 2019). Moreover, existing DSR research has primarily examined socially responsible practices perceived by a single stakeholder group, such as residents or tourists (Tran et al. 2018). Consequently, current DSR scales may not adequately reflect the interactions, cooperation, and coordination required between multiple stakeholder groups in decision-making processes to implement DSR practices.

Despite the growing attention to responsible tourism management, a standardized and multidimensional scale to measure DSR from the perspectives of key local stakeholders, residents, and governments, remains underdeveloped. The absence of such a scale hinders both theoretical advancement and the practical assessment of collective responsibility efforts essential for sustainable destination management. This research gap underscores the need for a DSR scale that captures socially responsible efforts and initiatives aimed at achieving long-term sustainability and fostering cooperative decision-making among multiple stakeholder groups in tourist destinations.

More importantly, it should be noted that effective implementation of social responsibility initiatives at the destination level requires cooperation and coordination between residents and governments. This necessitates the development of a multidimensional DSR scale perceived by residents and governments, reflecting the cooperation and coordination efforts between these two groups. Both local residents and governments are key stakeholders in implementing social responsibility at the destination level, as they are involved in and impacted by tourism development. While destination residents are affected by tourism development (Nunkoo 2017), local governments play a significant role in shaping tourism development (Byrd et al. 2009). Despite the importance of both groups, most DSR studies have focused on tourists or residents, leaving the perspective of local governments unexplored (Agapito et al. 2023; Su, Huang, and Pearce 2018; Su and Swanson 2017). Current DSR measurement items fall short in assessing how these two key groups perceive the collective efforts toward responsible practice at the destination level.

Given the critical role of both residents and governments in DSR, this study aims to develop a DSR scale perceived by these two key stakeholder groups. The collective efforts to achieve destination sustainability prioritize a holistic approach to social responsibility, emphasizing cooperation in execution and governance in decision-making among various stakeholders to enhance destination sustainability (Melane-Lavado and Alvarez-Herranz 2020). The tourism effects cannot be attributed solely to individual enterprises but are rather the result of the cumulative efforts of multiple actors (Su, Huang, and Huang 2018). The development of such a scale would improve the conceptual understanding of DSR and serve as an essential tool for assessing the perceptions of residents and governments. The measurement items of DSR offer a potentially viable strategy for destination marketing professionals to implement socially responsible practices. Thus, developing a DSR a scale is crucial for both advancing academic research and enhancing practical applications for improving sustainable tourism practices.

The anticipated contributions of this study are twofold: Theoretically, it clarifies the conceptual structure of DSR and expands the notion of social responsibility beyond firm-centered CSR to include destination-level collective efforts to achieve long-term sustainability (Agapito et al. 2023). Practically, it provides a useful tool for tourism marketers and destination management organizations to design and assess prioritized sustainability strategies in collaboration with stakeholders (Su and Swanson 2017). The scale enables local governments and tourism practitioners to better align planning and policy development with residents' expectations and improve participatory governance essential for sustainable destination management (Su, Huang, and Huang 2018).

2 | Literature Review

2.1 | Stakeholder Theory

Just as stakeholder theory has been established as a theoretical foundation for CSR research, it also serves as a theoretical basis of DSR. The function of stakeholder theory in CSR research is to elucidate who the key stakeholders are and articulate how companies should conduct responsible performance (Su et al. 2020). Freeman (1984), a leading scholar in stakeholder theory, defines stakeholders as any individual or group that can influence or be influenced by the achievement of an organization's objectives. In line with Freeman's stance, stakeholders of DSR include local governments and residents, who not only affect but are also impacted by the tourism industry. Numerous tourism studies have confirmed that local governments and residents are essential tourism stakeholders (Byrd et al. 2009; Lee et al. 2024; Wang and Xu 2014) and support the view that these two groups play a vital role in fulfilling DSR activities (Pai et al. 2024; Su and Swanson 2017). Previous studies recognizing the importance of these two groups of tourism stakeholders indicate the need for research to develop a DSR scale that reflects their perceptions.

2.2 | Social Exchange Theory

Stakeholder theory identifies residents and local governments as central stakeholders in DSR, as they both influence and are influenced by the tourism industry. Building on this, social exchange theory offers a relevant conceptual foundation for

understanding their engagement in DSR. Social exchange theory posits that stakeholders act based on a perceived balance between benefits and costs arising from social interactions (Cropanzano and Mitchell 2005; Homans 1958). For instance, if residents perceive that DSR activities improve the environment and quality of life, they are more likely to support and participate in them. Likewise, local governments may view DSR as a way to enhance residents' understanding and acceptance of tourism policies, facilitating smoother implementation and yielding social rewards (Gautam and Bhalla 2024). When both groups recognize the meaningful returns of DSR, they are more likely to adopt positive attitudes and engage in DSR initiatives, which is consistent with the assumptions of social exchange theory. Moreover, when tourism stakeholders perceive that DSR enhances destination identity and brand image, their intrinsic motivation for community-focused action strengthens. In such cases, psychological rewards play a vital role in the perceived exchange process.

2.3 | CSR and DSR

CSR refers to a firm's voluntary consideration of ethical, social, and environmental issues in management, engaging corporate stakeholders beyond profit motives (Farmaki and Stergiou 2021). This CSR rationale has been applied to entire tourism destinations, serving as a foundational element of DSR. In this regard, both CSR and DSR share a similarity in emphasizing the integration of sustainability into operational strategies. DSR scales incorporate sustainability elements derived from CSR's Triple Bottom Line principle, which underscores the importance of balancing social, environmental, and economic responsibilities (Elkington 1998). Rather than being abstract theories, CSR and DSR represent practice-driven concepts that assess how stakeholders perceive and actively participate in social responsibility initiatives (Moon et al. 2024).

The primary distinction between CSR and DSR is their stakeholder scope (Agapito et al. 2023; Su et al. 2020). DSR focuses on collective social responsibilities among multiple tourism stakeholders at the destination level, while CSR relates to individual companies, such as hotels and casinos (Coles et al. 2013; Dahlsrud 2008). DSR involves the shared responsibilities of extended responsible entities for sustainable destination management, addressing the social and environmental impacts of tourism and its related industries within the destination (Su and Swanson 2017). Developed from organizational behavior, CSR may not fully apply to the broader destination-level context. Given DSR's emphasis on collective stakeholder efforts, cooperation and joint decision-making between residents and government may be vital for implementing DSR initiatives and practices, underscoring the need to understand their perspectives on DSR (Su, Huang, and Pearce 2018).

2.4 | DSR For Sustainability

Research on sustainable tourism provides a theoretical foundation for identifying key elements in the perception of a DSR scale (Su and Swanson 2017). For example, in the context of environmental sustainability, previous studies on sustainability offer guidance on essential elements for DSR initiatives and activities, such as waste reduction, energy conservation, eco-friendly programs, and awareness campaigns (Boley et al. 2017; Hsu et al. 2022; Iniesta-Bonillo et al. 2016). Initial DSR scales, measured as a single dimension, reflect the sustainable tourism paradigm, encompassing both economic and environmental responsibilities (Su, Huang, and Huang 2018). Like CSR's Triple Bottom Line, which encapsulates responsibilities for sustainable development, the DSR scale has incorporated economic and environmental responsibilities, with some studies suggesting the addition of socio-cultural factors (Gursoy et al. 2019; Mathew and Sreejesh 2017; Venu and Goodwin 2008).

The shift from a value-based Sustainable Tourism Development paradigm to behavior-based responsible tourism has laid the foundation for DSR by including the behavioral commitment of multiple stakeholders, inherent in the concept of responsibility, extending beyond mere value statements. As challenges in implementing sustainable practices grow, the term responsibility has guided the discussion toward urging the involvement of multiple stakeholders acting sustainably. Consequently, recent research is moving from theoretical discussions of sustainability to a greater focus on responsibility (Agapito et al. 2023; Cape Town Declaration on Responsible Tourism 2002).

In this context, specifying the DSR scale requires careful incorporation of sustainability, along with economic, environmental, and the active involvement of stakeholders in responsible practices (Su et al. 2020). The scope of DSR may range from short-term, reactive measures to long-term, proactive commitments to ensure destination sustainability. Sustainable tourism research provides the theoretical basis for defining the scope of the DSR scale, highlighting stakeholder-driven efforts and their active participation in practices to meet a destination's economic needs and improve social and environmental quality.

2.5 | DSR For Governance

Tourism governance refers to a joint decision-making process among multiple stakeholders, facilitated by self-organized networks within a destination (Spyriadis et al. 2011). Local government policies alone cannot address sustainability issues (Wang and Xu 2014); thus, governance—joint decision-making between residents and governments—becomes essential in managing social responsibility concerns and issues. The effectiveness of stakeholder-inclusive governance (Bramwell and Lane 2011) lies in its ability to attract diverse stakeholder attention, foster consensus in decision-making processes, and ultimately lead to broader participation in sustainable tourism practices. Similarly, effective DSR initiatives rely on stakeholders to build a shared understanding, demonstrate interest and effort, actively engage, and take concrete actions to foster responsible tourism practice. Thus, given DSR's connection to sustainability, governance emerges as a crucial component of DSR, driving socially responsible tourism practices essential for achieving sustainability.

Governance, as an essential dimension in the DSR scale, is supported by self-organized tourism networks, a core aspect

of governance that forms the backbone of DSR practices (Chhotray and Stoker 2009). These networks, established through interactions, dialogs, and norms that underpin governance structures (Spyriadis et al. 2011), enable the coordination of diverse stakeholder interests and foster joint decision-making to address common issues that require socially responsible approaches (Beaumont and Dredge 2010). Network-based governance, formed through interactive linkages among diverse stakeholders, helps resolve socially shared issues like DSR that governments alone cannot address (Erkuş-Öztürk and Eraydın 2010; Park et al. 2020). By enhancing consensus-building and coordination, network-based governance is essential for fulfilling DSR activities and fostering socially responsible practices.

Governance characterized by broad stakeholder input and responsible decision-making has been extensively discussed in relation to accountability and responsibility (Beaumont and Dredge 2010). For joint decision-making to be effective, it is crucial that stakeholders feel their contributions are valued and that decisions are made responsibly through fair and transparent procedures (Beaumont and Dredge 2010). Research on DSR embraces a broader stakeholder orientation, aligning with the growing emphasis on inclusive, multi-stakeholder governance highlighted in recent studies. This approach also aligns with the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals, reflecting the prevailing paradigm (Agapito et al. 2023; Chang et al. 2024), and supports governance's critical role as a fundamental component of DSR scales.

2.6 | DSR For Cooperation

Cooperation among stakeholders is essential to achieving shared goals of social responsibility for sustainability, making it a critical aspect of DSR (Jamal and Stronza 2009). Cooperation refers to the process by which individuals and organizations work together to discuss shared concerns, establish common positions, and act collectively for mutual benefits (Wang and Krakover 2008). The necessity for cooperation in the DSR framework arises from the interdependent nature of tourism systems and the formation of an integrated destination image (Beritelli 2011). The complexity of the tourism system, with interdependent actors responsible for various components, necessitates collaboration, as the success of the overall product relies on effective stakeholder cooperation (Buhalis 2000). Furthermore, responsibility for cooperation among stakeholders is essential for managing shared tourism resources.

Information sharing and cooperative networks are critical elements of cooperation within DSR. Prior studies have examined cooperative networks formed through stakeholder interactions (Wang et al. 2021), with cooperative communication, such as knowledge transfer, shown to be vital for achieving shared goals in tourism-dependent areas (Czernek 2017). Such cooperative networks play a key role in the long-term success of tourist destinations (Cehan et al. 2021). Conversely, elements that limit knowledge exchange and communication, such as the ownership structure of small and medium-sized tourism enterprises, may negatively impact cooperation among tourism businesses.

Public-private cooperation is a vital form of collaboration in tourism, leveraging the strengths of both sectors to manage sustainable destinations. For instance, hotels in Matsushima, Japan, worked with local governments to manage disaster risks (Nguyen et al. 2017), where the public sector provided regulatory support, and the private sector contributed resources. This case illustrates that public and private tourism stakeholders can generate synergy through shared goals and collaboration based on social responsibility. Thus, public-private cooperation and the establishment of shared goals, as key elements within the cooperation dimension, are crucial for the effective implementation of DSR initiatives.

2.7 | Destination-Level Social Responsibility

The concept of DSR emerged from the recognition that cumulative tourism impacts reflect the shared responsibility of multiple stakeholders rather than a single entity. Previous DSR studies have primarily examined its positive outcomes from the perspectives of residents and tourists, often using the Stimulus-Organism-Response model. Research on tourists' perspectives has explored DSR's influence on environmentally responsible behavior and revisit intentions. Su and Swanson (2017) found that DSR affects tourists' ERB, with positive and negative emotions and tourist-destination identification as mediators. During COVID-19, Hassan and Soliman (2021) observed that DSR positively influenced tourists' revisit intentions and trust, though fear arousal negatively moderated these relationships.

On the other hand, from the perspective of residents, the positive outcomes of DSR also have been examined. Su, Huang, and Pearce (2018) found that DSR increases residents' support for tourism and improves their perception of quality of life. Su et al. (2020) found that DSR has significant direct or indirect effects on residents' community satisfaction, community identification, and support for tourism development. Nasr et al. (2022) found that DSR strengthens community attachment and has a positive impact on ERB in Ghana. These studies help elucidate the structural influence relationships between DSR and its positive outcomes from the perception of tourists or residents (e.g., ERB, revisit intentions, support for tourism development), highlighting the mediating role of psychosocial factors (e.g., community attachment, destination identification, positive/negative emotions).

Much of the CSR literature focuses on individual organizations, overlooking the collective responsible efforts of non-corporate stakeholders within tourism destinations. However, sustainable destination development requires a shared understanding and coordinated action among all stakeholders. While DSR's multidimensional nature is recognized, it is often reduced to a single dimension or measured using CSR items (Tran et al. 2018; Yu and Hwang 2019). Recently, interest in DSR studies has grown, but an empirically grounded measure clarifying DSR dimensions for residents and government remains undeveloped (Nasr et al. 2022; Su et al. 2020). This study addresses this gap by developing a multidimensional DSR scale perceived by two stakeholder groups. The following section outlines the procedures for creating scale items to ensure comprehensive measurement of DSR.

2.8 | Summary of the Literature Review

Building on stakeholder theory and prior research, this study proposes an initial DSR framework, perceived by residents and government, that includes responsibilities for economic, environmental, and socio-cultural sustainability, alongside governance and cooperation as key sub-components. A definition of each dimension is provided in Table 1. Nonetheless, there are variations in sustainability priorities across tourism-dependent regions, and socio-cultural sustainability dimensions may not be fully integrated into DSR frameworks. For instance, in some areas, the adverse socio-cultural effects of tourism—such as cultural erosion or heightened crime rates—might not be widely recognized as tourism issues. The regional differences suggest that certain aspects of sustainability could be omitted from DSR frameworks, contingent on the relative emphasis on sustainability priorities at each destination.

3 | Methodology

Identification of DSR dimensions establishes an initial framework guiding the next phase of this study in developing a context-specific scale to more accurately measure DSR. Scale development was conducted following previously identified guidelines (Churchill Jr. 1979; Ju et al. 2025). The measurement items were generated grounded in literature review and in-depth interview. Then, the collected scale items were purified, and the latent structure was evaluated and confirmed. Table 2 provides an overview of the research phases and steps.

3.1 | Research Settings

The target population included destination residents and public authorities in Busan, South Korea. During the quantitative phase, purposive sampling selected residents and officials knowledgeable in DSR and tourism governance to ensure valid responses. Data was collected over 3 months by over 10 trained collectors. Respondents were confirmed as Busan residents or officials, with the questionnaire covering DSR, governance, and respondents' awareness of DSR. Given tourism governance items, data collectors obtained contact details from district offices for governance committee members and conducted face-to-face surveys with residents involved in tourism committees. The total number in the preliminary survey was 99, and in the main study, a total of 400 questionnaires were distributed, with 388 valid responses retained for analysis after excluding incomplete or insincere responses.

3.2 | In-Depth Interviews

The interview sample included residents, government officials, and tourism practitioners from Busan, recruited through convenience and snowball sampling ($n = 12$). Participants, all with tourism-related experience, shared DSR perspectives from resident or government viewpoints. A literature review informed DSR constructs organized into dimensions, as shown in Table 1. Based on these dimensions, open-ended interview questions explored their perceptions, such as: "What responsible activities are tourism stakeholders currently undertaking or consider necessary to strengthen sustainability? Do you view governance practices as part of social responsibility, and have you observed examples of this?"

To enhance data credibility, interviewers followed a set of interview protocols and transcribed interview responses. Then the transcribed interview data was carefully classified for drawing valid inferences. Each response was reviewed word-by-word to capture key ideas to organize them into mutually exclusive and independent categories. The researcher

TABLE 1 | The initial dimensions of DSR defined.

Dimension	The definition of dimensions	Source
DSR for economy	The destination meets the economic needs of the community and makes contributions to its economic development, thereby promoting sustainable economic growth that aligns with the community's long-term prosperity.	Cape Town Declaration 2002; Iniesta-Bonillo et al. 2016; Mathew and Sreejesh 2017; Su and Swanson 2017
DSR for environment	The destination engages in protecting the natural environment and promoting sustainable development by minimizing environmental damage, conducting environmental campaigns, and protecting flora and fauna.	Boley et al. 2017; Cape Town Declaration 2002; Mathew and Sreejesh 2017; Su, Huang, and Huang 2018
DSR for socio-culture	The destination considers the management of tourism negative effects on local socio-culture with positive impacts within the community.	Song 2003; Su and Swanson 2017; Su, Huang, and Pearce 2018; Mathew and Sreejesh 2017
DSR for governance	The destination fosters a joint decision-making process within a stakeholder network that ensures democratic participation, addressing collective tourism challenges and pursuing common goals.	Beaumont and Dredge 2010; Bramwell and Lane 2011; Chhotray and Stoker 2009; Kang and Lee 2016
DSR for cooperation	The destination engages in working together in discussions and collective actions for mutual benefits, taking common stance through public-private partnerships, information sharing, goal alignment, and cooperation networks.	Cehan et al. 2021; Czernek 2017; Nguyen et al. 2017; Wang and Krakover 2008

TABLE 2 | Overview of the research process phases.

Research phase	Research process	Objectives	Results
Phase 1 Generating a sample of initial measurement items	Step 1 Specification of constructing domains through literature review	-Identify DSR dimensions	5 DSR dimensions
	Step 2 In depth interview Reviewed by experts	-Identify DSR indicators	-Interviewed 9 residents & 3 public officials
	Step 3 Initial item generation Content analysis	-Find consensus on DSR dimensions and indicators	-43 indicators identified -3 experts reviewed
Phase 2 Purification of measures in a pilot study	Step 4 Pilot study and questionnaire survey Sentence purification and measurement items refinement	-Survey instrument developed to assess the initial indicators	-98 complete questionnaires—42 indicators retained
	Step 5 Exploratory factor analysis Coefficient alpha and content validity		
Phase 3	Step 6	-Survey instrument to assess the retained indicators	-388 complete questionnaires.
Reanalysis of measures in a main study	Questionnaire for the main survey	-Reducing items	-21 indicators removed.
Assessment of reliability and validity	Data collection of the main study	-Validation of measurement instrument	-Validated 4 DSR dimensional items
	Step 7 Exploratory factor analysis Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability		
	Step 8 Confirmatory factor analysis Discriminatory and convergent validity		

organized interview responses into predefined categories and created new categories as needed. Similar or overlapping content was consolidated within DSR subcategories. However, certain responses reflected descriptive items of local contexts, and it was necessary to simplify details to create generalized items (Alp and Yılmaz 2024; Yen et al. 2018). To support the content validity, the researcher used debriefing sessions with experts with reference materials. Duplicate contents were eliminated, and the items generated from interviews were aligned with the theoretical dimensions identified through the literature review to ensure consistency.

3.3 | Item Generations

An extensive review of prior studies led to the proposal of a multidimensional construct of DSR. The initial item generation process yielded a preliminary set of 43 items based on a comprehensive literature review: nine items on DSR's economic aspect, nine on environmental, 10 on cultural, 10 on tourism governance, and five on cooperation. This initial set of items is displayed in Table 3. To reduce redundancy and improve clarity, two professors and two graduate students were consulted. A tourism professor and a physical education professor in Korea reviewed the items' relevance, and two tourism graduate students contributed further comments. This expert consultation supported the content validity of the DSR items, which were refined accordingly. Finally, each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

4 | Results

4.1 | Initial Purification in a Pilot Study

4.1.1 | Characteristics of Data in a Pilot

The total number in the preliminary survey was 99, consisting of 50.7% males and 49.3% females. The pilot survey respondents were chosen from among people who have worked in the tourism and hospitality industry through face-to-face survey. The survey showed that 20.9% of those selected were in their 20s, 26.5% in their 30s, 27.1% in their 40s, and 25.7% in their 50s. Also, 66.4% of the respondents said they had graduated from college. During the preliminary survey phase, the validity and reliability of the initial questionnaire were verified to determine its applicability.

TABLE 3 | Initial constructs and DSR scale items.

Constructs and item meaning	Scale item descriptions
DSR for governance	
DSR1 (democratic decision-making)	The destination (ex. Busan) makes decisions related to destination management in accordance with democratic procedures.
DSR2 (information transparency)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility for transparent disclosure of information in managing the tourist destination (e.g., budget release).
DSR3 (information provision)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility to provide tourism information for people in managing the tourist destination.
DSR4 (opportunities for participation)	The destination (ex. Busan) guarantees its members' opportunities to participate in the decision-making process in managing the tourist destination.
DSR5 (conflict resolution networks)	The destination (ex. Busan) resolves conflicts through a network (e.g., meeting, conversation) in managing the tourist destination.
DSR6 (horizontal networks)	The destination (ex. Busan) forms a horizontal network (e.g., meeting, conversation) in managing the tourist destination.
DSR7 (network stability)	The destination (ex. Busan) builds a stable network (e.g., meeting, conversation) in managing the tourist destination.
DSR8 (trust based network)	The destination (ex. Busan) manages a trust-based network (e.g., meeting, conversation) in managing the tourist destination.
DSR9 (increased interactions)	The destination (ex. Busan) makes efforts to increase interactions with each other in managing the tourist destination (e.g., formation of a tourism advisory committee, financial assistance).
DSR10 (Regulatory meetings)	The destination (ex. Busan) holds regular meetings in accordance with laws or rules in managing the tourist destination
DSR for cooperation	
DSR11 (collaborative networks)	The destination (ex. Busan) manages the network based on cooperative relations in managing the tourist destination
DSR12 (public-private partnership)	The destination (ex. Busan) cooperates between the public and private sectors in managing the tourist destination.
DSR13 (cooperative information sharing)	The destination (ex. Busan) cooperates with each other by sharing information on tourism development.
DSR14 (shared goals with community)	The destination (ex. Busan) shares the objectives of local government's projects with residents in managing the tourist destination.
DSR15 (mutual cooperation)	The destination (ex. Busan) cooperates with each other in managing the tourist destination.
DSR for economy	
DSR16 (tourism marketing)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility for destination marketing and promotion to attract tourists (e.g., advertising the destination brand)
DSR17 (tourism Revenue generation)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility to create revenue in the tourism sector.
DSR18 (attractive tourism products)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility to provide attractive tourism products.
DSR19 (increasing number of tourists)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills responsibility to increase the number of tourists.
DSR20 (local economic development)	The destination (ex. Busan) develops the local economy through tourism.
DSR21 (local job creation)	The destination (ex. Busan) is expanding employment opportunities for residents through tourism.

(Continues)

TABLE 3 | (Continued)

Constructs and item meaning	Scale item descriptions
DSR22 (returning to the local economy)	The destination (ex. Busan) makes efforts to make tourism companies (e.g., global hotel chain) return their revenues created in this region to local communities (e.g., establishment of tax avoidance measures).
DSR23 (price fairness)	The destination (ex. Busan) provides tourism experience at a fair price in managing the tourism destination.
DSR24 (protecting local business)	The destination (ex. Busan) protects local merchants in managing the tourist destination (e.g., fostering local businesses in local culture village).
DSR for environment	
DSR25 (environmental protection)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility to protect the natural environment in managing the tourist destination (e.g., separate garbage collection).
DSR26 (minimizing adverse impact)	The destination (ex. Busan) minimizes the damage to the natural environment caused by tourism development (e.g., management of wastewater from hotels and development facilities).
DSR27 (environmental campaigns)	The destination (ex. Busan) conducts public campaigns to protect the natural environment in managing the tourist destination (e.g., recommendation of energy and water conservation).
DSR28 (wildlife conservation)	The destination (ex. Busan) protects wild animals and plants in managing the tourist destination.
DSR29 (eco-friendly facilities)	The destination (ex. Busan) considers ecological capacity in managing the tourist destination (e.g., limits on the number of visitors and time, establishment of designated nature reserves).
DSR30 (environmental capacity)	The destination (ex. Busan) manages tourism facilities in consideration of protecting the natural environment (e.g., the construction of eco-friendly energy facilities, and a resource-saving system).
DSR31 (pro-environmental programs)	The destination (ex. Busan) provides tourism programs for environmental preservation (e.g., ecotourism experience programs) in managing the tourist destination.
DSR32 (visitor management)	The destination (ex. Busan) encourages visitors to protect the natural environment in managing the tourist destination (e.g., encouraging the use of pro-environmental transportation).
DSR33 (esthetic management)	The destination (ex. Busan) manages the aesthetic environment in managing the tourist destination.
DSR for socio-culture	
DSR34 (preservation of cultural heritage)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility to preserve its cultural heritage in managing the tourist destination (e.g., protecting its architectural heritage, cultural assets).
DSR35 (mitigating conflicts)	The destination (ex. Busan) makes efforts to reduce conflicts between tourists and residents.
DSR36 (mutal Respect)	The destination (ex. Busan) forms a culture of mutual respect between tourists and residents (e.g., tourist etiquette).
DSR37 (historic preservation)	The destination (ex. Busan) fulfills its responsibility to restore historical resources in managing the tourist destination (e.g., restoring historical resources).
DSR38 (congestion management)	The destination (ex. Busan) manages the congestion of the living environment in managing the tourist destination.
DSR39 (mutual understanding)	The destination (ex. Busan) increases exchange and understanding between tourists and residents

(Continues)

TABLE 3 | (Continued)

Constructs and item meaning	Scale item descriptions
DSR40 (culturally distinctive events)	The destination (ex. Busan) hosts unique cultural events of the region in managing the tourist destination (e.g., festivals).
DSR41 (unique experiences)	The destination (ex. Busan) provides people with a unique experience of local appeal in managing the tourist destination.
DSR42 (enhancing destination image)	The destination (ex. Busan) improves its unique image of the region in managing the tourist destination (e.g., promoting representative tourist attractions).
DSR43 (cultural distinctiveness)	The destination (ex. Busan) develops its own local culture in managing the tourist destination (e.g., promoting traditional food, fostering tourism guides for cultural interpretation).

Note: The final EFA and CFA items were highlighted in bold.

4.1.2 | EFA Analysis and Purification in a Pilot Study

The reliability analysis showed Cronbach's α coefficients ranging from 0.729 to 0.946, exceeding the acceptable exploratory research threshold of 0.6 (Shrestha 2021), with an overall reliability of 0.954. DSR 37 (preservation of historical resources) was removed due to low reliability. Descriptive statistics were used to eliminate items with poor psychometric properties, and item-to-total correlation analysis indicated that 42 DSR items met the 0.30 criterion (Churchill Jr. 1979). An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using the principal component method with varimax rotation. The EFA's validity was supported by a significant Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 2833.006$, d$f = 903$, $p < 0.001$) and a KMO value of 0.875, indicating adequate data factorability (Hair et al. 2010).

The initial exploratory factor analysis identified seven factors, accounting for 62.093% of the variance, exceeding the 50% threshold (Hair et al. 2010). The factors include governance responsibility (10 items, 33.855%), environmental responsibility (8 items, 14.501%), governance structure responsibility (7 items, 6.135%), economic responsibility (6 items, 5.099%), economic fairness (5 items, 3.388%), unique cultural events (1 item, 2.885%), and historical restoration (1 item, 2.446%). One factor with an eigenvalue below 1 was discarded. All factors showed acceptable internal consistency via Cronbach's alpha. Following EFA pretesting and expert panel evaluation, 43 items were retained for the main study. Although the results differed from the anticipated dimensional structures of DSR derived through the literature review, the limitation of the sample size and feedback from experts led to the decision to retain these 43 items for the main study.

4.2 | Refinement of Scale Items

4.2.1 | Study Sample and Respondents in a Main Study

A questionnaire was used for collecting the data of 291 local residents and 97 local government officials; those questionnaires that were missing responses were excluded. A questionnaire was distributed to the above-mentioned in Busan, South Korea. Table 4 contains specifics of the sample characteristics in a main study.

4.2.2 | Item Reduction Process

The reliability analysis of an initial sample of 43 items showed that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.849–0.942, which is acceptable in exploratory research, and the overall Cronbach's alpha exceeds the standard threshold of 0.6, indicating adequate reliability (Shrestha 2021). During the EFA process, varimax rotation using the maximum likelihood method was employed to determine the dimensionality of the observed items and the structure of the variables. The KMO value was found to be 0.872, exceeding the minimum acceptable standard of 0.6 (Hair et al. 2010), while the Bartlett test result was significant at the 0.001 level ($p < 0.001$) (Shrestha 2021). Item-total score correlations for the 43 items were calculated, and it was found that all items in this study met the 0.30 standard (Churchill Jr. 1979), after reviewing items with correlation values less than 0.3 according to the exclusion criteria.

After refinement, 21 items with high factor loadings remained in the EFA analysis, while 22 items were removed based on criteria such as eigenvalues below 1.0, low communalities, or factor loadings under 0.50. DSR23 (price fairness) was excluded because a single-item dimension is not acceptable. Items DSR34 (preserving cultural heritage), DSR37 (historic preservation), DSR21 (local job creation), and DSR3 (information provision) were also removed due to low factor loadings. Dimensionality was evaluated to ensure alignment with the factor structure, leading to the removal of items lacking theoretical justification, including DSR22 (giving back to the local economy), DSR24 (protecting local business), DSR38 (congestion management), DSR39 (promoting mutual understanding), DSR40 (culturally distinctive events), DSR41 (unique tourism experiences), DSR42 (enhancing destination image), and DSR43 (cultural distinctiveness). The final 21 items met both theoretical justification and a factor loading criterion of 0.50 or higher, ensuring they effectively represent the underlying construct of DSR.

The reiterated EFA results revealed four distinct factors, each item well-aligned with the study's constructs. The KMO value of 0.950 and a significant Bartlett's test ($\chi^2 = 5454.870$, d$f = 210$, $p < 0.001$) indicated the dataset's suitability for factor analysis. The final analysis identified four factors with

TABLE 4 | Sample characteristics in a main study.

		Total ($n=388$)		Local government ($n=97$)		Local residents ($n=291$)	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Gender	Male	161	41.5	42	43.3	119	40.9
	Female	227	58.5	55	56.7	172	59.1
Age	20–29	27	7	6	6.2	21	7.2
	30–39	114	29.4	21	21.6	93	32
	40–49	162	41.8	46	47.4	116	39.9
	50–59	63	16.5	24	24.7	40	13.7
	60 or over	21	5.4	0	0	21	7.2
Education	High school	43	11.1	2	2.1	41	14.1
	Two years college	57	14.7	5	5.2	52	17.9
	University	248	63.9	79	81.4	169	58.%
	Graduate school	40	10.3	11	11.3	29	1%

Eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1, which accounted for 69.854% of the total variance. The first factor, "DSR for governance" (nine items), accounted for 49.103% of the variance. The second factor, "DSR for economy" (four items), explained 8.484%, the third, "DSR for cooperation" (four items), explained 6.948%, and the fourth, "DSR for environment" (four items), explained 5.319% of the variance. Internal consistency of repeated EFA results was assessed using Cronbach's alpha values, with all dimensions exceeding 0.70 ($\alpha=0.938$ for governance, $\alpha=0.873$ for economy, $\alpha=0.855$ for cooperation, and $\alpha=0.860$ for environment), confirming the reliability of the items associated with each dimension as shown Table 5 (Nunnally and Bernstein 1994).

4.2.3 | Assessment of the Latent Structure of the DSR Scale

Further validation of the latent structure identified in the EFA analysis was performed by carrying out confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) based on the covariance matrix. The four-dimensional twenty-one items of DSR showed acceptable model fit indices ($\chi^2=409.012$, d$f=183$, $p<0.05$, $\chi^2/df=2.235$, GFI$=0.902$, RMR$=0.028$, RMSEA$=0.056$, NFI$=0.927$, CFI$=0.958$, and IFI$=0.958$) in CFA. All factor loadings of 21 items in the model ranged from 0.722 to 0.851 and were statistically significant ($p<0.001$) in all items and greater than the recommended value of 0.7 (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Composite reliability (0.882–0.949) suggests that scale reliabilities exceeded 0.7 and are satisfactory (Fornell and Larcker 1981). These outcomes are presented in Table 6.

The average variance extracted (AVE) of all DSR dimensions was greater than 0.500 (0.652–0.695), thereby exceeding the recommended cut-off value of 0.5 (Fornell and Larcker 1981) and confirming the convergent validity of DSR. Discriminant validity was confirmed by examining if the square roots of the AVE values are greater than the correlation coefficients of the constructs. The square roots of the AVE ranged from 0.652 to 0.695, relative to the squared value of correlation coefficients of the constructs (0.229–0.534). The AVE for each of the latent variables was higher than the squared correlation coefficients of constructs. The indicators for all the constructs met this requirement of sufficient convergent and discriminant validity. These findings are illustrated in Table 7.

4.2.4 | Assessing Validation of Resident and Government DSR Scale

Following suggested procedures to validate the DSR scale (Chen et al. 2014), the validation sample ($n=388$) was used to validate the identified latent model through CFA by using AMOS 21.0. The overall model fit indices of the validation sample indicate acceptable fit for the four-factor model evaluated by chi-square (χ^2) test (CMIN/DF$=2.235$, $p<0.001$, RMR$=0.028$) and several goodness-of-fit measures. The χ^2/df value was $2.235(1<\chi^2/df<3)$ and other goodness-of-fit measures (i.e., RMSEA$=0.056$; GFI$=0.902$; CFI$=0.958$; TLI$=0.952$; IFI$=0.958$; NFI$=0.927$; TLI$=0.952$) with a good fit of the four-factor model to the data.

5 | Discussion and Conclusions

5.1 | Discussion

Drawing on stakeholder theory and existing literature, this study developed a resident and government perceived DSR scale encompassing governance, cooperation, economic, and environmental dimensions. This study differs from previous DSR studies that adapted CSR items for customers or employees in specific industries, measured overall DSR perception within a single dimension, or developed DSR scales based on a single group's perspective. In accordance with the established scale development procedure, initial measurement items for a context-specific DSR scale were proposed through a review

TABLE 5 | The final EFA results and reliability in a main study.

	Factor loadings	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Cronbach α
Factor 1: DSR for governance				
A horizontal network (DSR6)	0.740	10.312	49.103	0.938
Network stability (DSR7)	0.729			
Increasing interactions (DSR9)	0.704			
Trust-based network (DSR8)	0.703			
Resolving conflicts via network (DSR5)	0.668			
Public participation opportunities (DSR4)	0.667			
Information transparency (DSR2)	0.645			
Providing tourism information (DSR3)	0.631			
Democratic decision making (DSR1)	0.613			
Factor 2: DSR for economy				
Increasing the number of tourists (DSR19)	0.715	1.782	8.484	0.873
Attractive tourism products (DSR18)	0.711			
Generating tourism revenue (DSR17)	0.710			
Destination marketing and promotion (DSR16)	0.651			
Factor 3: DSR for cooperation				
Collaborative information sharing (DSR13)	0.780	1.459	6.948	0.855
Cooperative network (DSR11)	0.708			
Sharing goals with local residents (DSR14)	0.667			
Public and private collaboration (DSR12)	0.649			
Factor 4: DSR for environment				
Minimize environmental damage (DSR26)	0.703	1.117	5.319	0.860
Pro-environmental campaign (DSR27)	0.691			
Animal and plant conservation efforts (DSR28)	0.676			
Environmental protection (DSR25)	0.568			

Note: KMO = 0.950, Bartlett's test of sphericity $p < 0.001$ Approx. Chi-square = 5454.870 $df = 210$.

of the literature and interviews, followed by assessments of validity and reliability. Four DSR dimensions were confirmed, with 21 items ultimately retained in the refined scale, and CFA findings were validated. All fit indices indicated that the model fits the data well, confirming the factor structure and scale properties.

The EFA results indicated that socio-cultural aspects were either dispersed across multiple factors or had low factor loadings, leading to a determination of insufficient theoretical justification. This may be attributed to the interrelation between socio-cultural aspects and other aspects, such as economic sustainability or governance, making it conceptually complex. Furthermore, some cultural items exhibited associations with economic or governance dimensions, making it difficult to isolate cultural responsibility as a separate construct. Respondents from the Busan region seem to place greater emphasis on economic benefits and environmental concerns, resulting in cultural items being relatively overlooked. Consequently, items related to socio-cultural responsibility were not deemed an independent valid dimension and were subsequently excluded.

This study's tailored DSR scale highlights that DSR responsibilities encompass not only economic and environmental dimensions but also governance and cooperation obligations, reflecting shared social responsibility at the destination level. Findings emphasize the importance of economy, environment, cooperation, and governance as DSR sub-components, advocating governance within the resident-government relationship based on a structural approach. Tourism networks, as a core governance element, strengthen DSR perception. In addition, expanding social responsibility to multiple entities of DSR, including residents and governments, highlights cooperation for sustainable practices benefiting society and the environment.

TABLE 6 | DSR scale confirmatory factor analysis results.

	Standardized coefficients	S.E.	C.R.	AVE	CR
Factor 1 DSR for governance				0.675	0.949
DSR1 (Democratic decision making)	0.722	0.347			
DSR3 (Providing information)	0.747	0.352	14.584		
DSR2 (Information transparency)	0.729	0.415	14.223		
DSR5 (Conflict resolution network)	0.787	0.287	15.408		
DSR4 (Participation Opportunities)	0.781	0.308	15.285		
DSR9 (Increased interactions)	0.813	0.266	15.930		
DSR7 (Network stability)	0.851	0.236	16.705		
DSR6 (A horizontal network)	0.844	0.261	16.563		
DSR8 (Trust based network)	0.851	0.252	16.715		
Factor 2 DSR for cooperation				0.652	0.882
DSR14 (Sharing goals with residents)	0.765	0.328			
DSR12 (Public and private cooperation)	0.740	0.341	14.298		
DSR13 (Cooperative information sharing)	0.787	0.314	15.239		
DSR11 (Cooperation based network)	0.803	0.295	15.537		
Factor 3 DSR for economy				0.695	0.901
DSR17 (Increasing tourism revenues)	0.806	0.260			
DSR18 (Providing attractive tourism products)	0.807	0.295	17.065		
DSR16 (Tourism marketing and promotion)	0.764	0.291	15.977		
DSR19 (Increasing the number of tourists)	0.807	0.265	17.068		
Factor 4 DSR for environment				0.657	0.884
DSR25 (Protecting natural environment)	0.758	0.346			
DSR28 (Protecting animals and plants)	0.758	0.357	14.725		
DSR27 (Public campaign for environment)	0.801	0.268	15.604		
DSR26 (Minimizing environmental impact)	0.800	0.297	15.591		

Abbreviations: AVE, average variance extracted, C.R., critical ratio; CR, composite reliability; S.E., standard error.

TABLE 7 | Inter-factor correlation from the confirmatory factor analysis ($n = 388$).

	DSR for governance	DSR for cooperation	DSR for economy	DSR for environment	AVE
DSR for governance	1.00				0.675
DSR for cooperation	0.677 (0.458)	1.00			0.652
DSR for economy	0.660 (0.283)	0.532 (0.283)	1.00		0.695
DSR for environment	0.731 (0.534)	0.479 (0.229)	0.683 (0.466)	1.00	0.657

Note: ()= The square value of the correlation coefficient; AVE = average variance extracted. Fit statistics: $\chi^2 = 409.012$, $p < 0.001$, $\chi^2/df = 2.235$, CFI = 0.958, TLI = 0.952, RMSEA = 0.056.

5.2 | Theoretical Contribution

When developing a scale to assess overall perceptions of DSR, a thorough understanding of its sub-components is essential; without it, the construct's accurate measurement may be compromised. Many studies on DSR have measured it as a single dimension or utilizing the CSR indicators in the DSR context; yet this study contributes to understanding of a multidimensional view of DSR, encompassing distinct dimensions of DSR for economy, environment, cooperation, and governance. In this regard, this study differs from Lee et al. (2021)'s study, which incorporates DSR from environmental, economic, and social

perspectives. The positive effects of DSR are well acknowledged in prior studies yet the shared responsibilities and roles of public stakeholders are unexplored. The multidimensional DSR scale perceived by residents and government allows researchers to address both the overall DSR and its subdivisions, facilitating a deeper exploration of the collaborative efforts between residents and governments. Consequently, the DSR scale developed in this study may serve as a useful tool for future quantitative DSR research.

This study is academically significant for identifying DSR scale perceived by residents and governments as interconnected stakeholders, contrasting with existing CSR and DSR scales. CSR indictors may not adequately capture the complexities inherent in measuring DSR, as the definitions of CSR and DSR differ significantly. In this regard, this study differs from Tran et al. (2018) and Yu and Hwang (2019), which utilized Carroll (1991) CSR frameworks, focusing on economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic responsibilities. Furthermore, while previous studies have explored DSR perceived by residents or tourists, this study enhances understanding by focusing on the DSR scale perceived by residents and government officials, addressing aspects that were previously overlooked. While Su et al. (2020)'s resident perceived DSR scale applies Dahlsrud (2008)'s CSR framework to the DSR context, revealing dimensions of economy, environment, society, stakeholders, and voluntariness, it particularly acknowledges the stakeholder dimension with a focus on interaction improvement; however, this dimension warrants further elaboration. This study highlights governance and cooperation as essential dimensions of DSR, rooted in building interactive relationships between the government and residents.

5.3 | Managerial Implications

The government and residents perceived the DSR scale proposed in this study serves as a diagnostic tool, enabling Destination Management Organizations (DMOs) to gain a nuanced understanding of both the overall level of DSR and specific sub-divisions. This measurement scale guides DMOs in developing public education initiatives to engage residents in social responsibility efforts. It also allows local government tourism departments to collect baseline DSR data and track changes over time. Additionally, it provides destination managers and policymakers with a tool to identify areas needing improvement in social responsibility. The four organized DSR sub-divisions offer a structured framework for assessing DSR implementation.

Insights on cooperation provide practical guidance for advancing destination sustainability, highlighting that stakeholder collaboration is crucial for effective DSR implementation. While cooperation is essential for addressing shared tourism challenges, it remains challenging to implement. The proposed cooperation elements—knowledge transfer, information sharing, shared goals, cooperative networks, and public-private partnerships—offer strategic routes to strengthen stakeholder relationships to address DSR-related challenges and achieve sustainable outcomes. By incorporating these elements, DMOs and local governments can craft effective cooperation strategies, aligning efforts toward the realization of DSR goals.

Findings related to the governance dimension of resident and government-perceived DSR highlight the potential of governance-focused strategies for DMOs and local authorities to advance DSR activities. Governance aspects like self-organized networks, transparent communication, and democratic decision-making support structured DSR efforts. To foster effective communication and joint decision-making, DMOs and local authorities could enhance stakeholder feedback channels, such as public hearings or workshops, to strengthen DSR practices and collective responsibility for destination sustainability. As destinations grow and challenges intensify, coordinated governance appears essential, as isolated stakeholder actions may fall short in addressing sustainability within the DSR framework.

The governance and cooperation components of DSR offer several practical implications for policy design. First, in terms of democratic decision-making structures and stakeholder participation, it is essential to establish institutional foundations that enable meaningful engagement. This includes the expansion of resident committee systems and the operation of tourism advisory councils. Second, regarding information disclosure and transparency, the findings highlight the importance of building digital platforms that provide public access to key policy information such as tourism budgets and development plans and of organizing regular briefing sessions for residents. Finally, the development of cooperative governance networks is emphasized as a strategic approach to institutionalizing DSR practices. This involves forming public-private consultative bodies, implementing joint funding schemes, and maintaining ongoing communication channels to foster sustained collaboration among stakeholders.

The components of DSR in the economic dimension emphasize the responsibilities of institutions and stakeholders in achieving key goals such as enhancing the attractiveness of tourism products, attracting tourists, generating tourism revenue, and revitalizing the local economy. This underscores that both the development of tourism content based on local resources and strategic marketing efforts are increasingly recognized as integral aspects of social responsibility within the tourism sector.

The environmental dimension of DSR offers important policy implications for the practical implementation of environmental protection in the operation and development of tourist destinations. First, fulfilling the responsibility of biodiversity conservation requires the designation of protected zones within tourist areas and the development of ecotourism programs aligned with endangered species protection policies. Additionally, raising tourist awareness of energy conservation and resource protection necessitates action-oriented environmental campaigns that also encourage active participation from local residents. Finally, environmental damage from tourism development could be minimized through thorough pre-development environmental assessments and systematic post-development monitoring. Taken collectively, these measures contribute to institutionalizing environmental responsibility as a core component of DSR.

5.4 | Limitation of the Current Study and Suggesting Further Research

Future research could investigate the causal relationships between DSR-related variables by incorporating data from a broader spectrum of tourism stakeholders. In addition, qualitative case studies are needed to identify effective DSR practices in real-world contexts. Studies that explore the motivations for, and barriers to, stakeholder participation in DSR initiatives would also be valuable in bridging the gap between intention and action. Given that the present study focused on a sample from a specific region, future research should aim to enhance the generalizability of findings by including more diverse geographical areas and demographic groups. Moreover, recent empirical studies have shown that stakeholder perceptions of tourism responsibilities can shift significantly in response to external factors such as pandemics or cultural orientations (Kim and Hyun 2024; Li et al. 2024). These findings reinforce the importance of contextual, adaptive, and stakeholder-centered approaches in developing DSR strategies. Lastly, grounded in the Design Science Research framework (Hevner et al. 2004; vom Brocke et al. 2020), future research could further explore how key environmental elements—such as stakeholder roles and capabilities, organizational strategies, and supporting technologies—affect the implementation of socially responsible practices at the destination level. Approaches such as case-based research, experimental studies, or in-field investigations could contribute to a more nuanced understanding of stakeholder-specific responsibilities within DSR contexts.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the reviewers for their valuable comments on this manuscript, which is based on my Ph.D. dissertation completed at the University of the Sunshine Coast. I also extend my appreciation to other researchers, including Dr. Insin Kim and Dr. Joongsuk Lee, for their remarks during the sentence revision of the measurement items. Open access publishing facilitated by University of the Sunshine Coast, as part of the Wiley - University of the Sunshine Coast agreement via the Council of Australian University Librarians.

Ethics Statement

Ethics approval was sought and obtained from the University in accordance with the national guidelines for undertaking research with human participants.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

Research data are not shared.

References

Agapito, D., R. Kronenburg, and P. Pinto. 2023. "A Review on Destination Social Responsibility: Towards a Research Agenda." *Current Issues in Tourism* 26, no. 4: 554–572. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2022.20914.

Alp, G., and Y. Yılmaz. 2024. "Medical Tourism Destination Image: Scale Development." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 26, no. 4: e2723. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2723.

Beaumont, N., and D. Dredge. 2010. "Local Tourism Governance: A Comparison of Three Network Approaches." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 18, no. 1: 7–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580903215139.

Beritelli, P. 2011. "Cooperation Among Prominent Actors in a Tourist Destination." *Annals of Tourism Research* 38, no. 2: 607–629. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.11.015.

Boley, B. B., N. G. McGehee, and A. T. Hammett. 2017. "Importance-Performance Analysis of Sustainable Tourism Initiatives: The Resident Perspective." *Tourism Management* 58: 66–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.10.0022017.

Bramwell, B., and B. Lane. 2011. "Critical Research on the Governance of Tourism and Sustainability." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19, no. 4–5: 411–421. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.580586.

Buhalis, D. 2000. "Marketing the Competitive Destination of the Future." *Tourism Management* 21, no. 1: 97–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00095-3.

Byrd, E. T., H. E. Bosley, and M. G. Dronberger. 2009. "Comparisons of Stakeholder Perceptions of Tourism Impacts in Rural Eastern North Carolina." *Tourism Management* 30, no. 5: 693–703. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.10.021.

Cape Town Declaration on Responsible Tourism. 2002. "Cape Town Declaration on Responsible Tourism." Accessed July 16, 2021. http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/tourism/Documents/Responsible%20Tourism/Toruism_RT_(2002)_Cape_Town_Declaration.pdf; https://responsibletourismpartnership.org/cape-town-declaration-on-responsible-tourism/.

Carroll, A. B. 1991. "The Pyramid of Corporate Social Responsibility: Toward the Moral Management of Organisational Stakeholders." *Business Horizons* 34, no. 4: 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(91)90005-G.

Cehan, A., M. Eva, and C. Iațu. 2021. "A Multilayer Network Approach to Tourism Collaboration." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 46: 316–326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2021.01.006.

Chang, J. Y., X. Lim, X. Luo, J. Cheah, A. M. Morrison, and C. M. Hall. 2024. "Modelling Generation Z Tourists' Social Responsibility Toward Environmentally Responsible Behaviour: The Role of Eco-Travel Cravings." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 26, no. 4: e2695. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2695.

Chen, G., J. Bao, and S. S. Huang. 2014. "Developing a Scale to Measure Backpackers' Personal Development." *Journal of Travel Research* 53, no. 4: 522–536. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513500391.

Chhotray, V., and G. Stoker. 2009. "Governance: From Theory to Practice." In *Governance Theory and Practice*, 214–247. Palgrave Macmillan.

Churchill, G. A., Jr. 1979. "A Paradigm for Developing Better Measures of Marketing Constructs." *Journal of Marketing Research* 16, no. 1: 64–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224377901600110.

Coles, T., E. Fenclova, and C. Dinan. 2013. "Tourism and Corporate Social Responsibility: A Critical Review and Research Agenda." *Tourism Management Perspectives* 6: 122–141. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2013.02.001.

Cropanzano, R., and M. S. Mitchell. 2005. "Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review." *Journal of Management* 31, no. 6: 874–900. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602.

Czernek, K. 2017. "Tourism Features as Determinants of Knowledge Transfer in the Process of Tourist Cooperation." *Current Issues in Tourism* 20, no. 2: 204–220. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2014.944107.

Dahlsrud, A. 2008. "How Corporate Social Responsibility Is Defined: An Analysis of 37 Definitions." *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 15, no. 1: 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.132.

Elkington, J. 1998. *Cannibals With Forks: The Triple Bottom Line of 21st Century Business*. Capstone.

Erkuş-Öztürk, H., and A. Eraydın. 2010. "Environmental Governance for Sustainable Tourism Development: Collaborative Networks and Organisation Building in the Antalya Tourism Region." *Tourism Management* 31, no. 1: 113–124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.01.002.

Farmaki, A., and D. P. Stergiou. 2021. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Moral Identity: A Practice-Based Approach." *Current Issues in Tourism* 24, no. 18: 2554–2572. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2020.1850654.

Fornell, C., and D. Larcker. 1981. "Evaluating Structural Equations Models With Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error." *Journal of Marketing Research* 18, no. 1: 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104.

Freeman, R. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman Publishing.

Gautam, V., and S. Bhalla. 2024. "How Tourism Development Leads to Residents' Subjective Happiness Through Their Quality of Life: A Social Exchange Theory Perspective." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 26, no. 5: e2771. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2771.

Gursoy, D., E. Bogan, B. B. Dedeoglu, and C. Çalışkan. 2019. "Residents' Perceptions of Hotels' Corporate Social Responsibility Initiatives and Its Impact on Residents' Sentiments to Community and Support for Additional Tourism Development." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 39: 117–128.

Hair, J. J. F., W. C. Black, B. J. Babin, and R. E. Anderson. 2010. *Multivariate data analysis*. 7th ed. Pearson.

Hassan, S. B., and M. Soliman. 2021. "COVID-19 and Repeat Visitation: Assessing the Role of Destination Social Responsibility, Destination Reputation, Holidaymakers' Trust and Fear Arousal." *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management* 19: 100495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2020.100495.

Hevner, A. R., S. T. March, J. Park, and S. Ram. 2004. "Design Science in Information Systems Research." *MIS Quarterly* 28, no. 1: 75–105. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148625.

Homans, G. C. 1958. "Social Behavior as Exchange." *American Journal of Sociology* 62, no. 6: 597–606. https://doi.org/10.1086/222355.

Hsu, F. C., S. Zhang, Y. Zhang, and T. J. Lee. 2022. "Decision-Making Behavior in the Sustainable Development of Intangible Cultural Heritage Tourism." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 24, no. 6: 800–812. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2546.

Iniesta-Bonillo, M. A., R. Sánchez-Fernández, and D. Jiménez-Castillo. 2016. "Sustainability, Value, and Satisfaction: Model Testing and Cross-Validation in Tourist Destinations." *Journal of Business Research* 69, no. 11: 5002–5007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.071.

Jamal, T., and A. Stronza. 2009. "Collaboration Theory and Tourism Practice in Protected Areas: Stakeholders, Structuring and Sustainability." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 17, no. 2: 169–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580802495741.

Ju, H., T. J. Lee, H. L. Kim, and S. S. Hyun. 2025. "Negative Memories Toward Airlines: Scale Development and Validation." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 27, no. 2: e70017. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.70017.

Kang, H., and S. G. Lee. 2016. "Stakeholders' Assessment of the Operation of Collaborative Governance in the Convention Industry: Focussed on Seoul MICE Alliance." *International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 30, no. 8: 119–136. https://doi.org/10.21298/IJTHR.2016.08.30.8.119.

Kim, H. L., and S. S. Hyun. 2024. "Paradoxical Effects of Tourism Ethnocentrism on Domestic Tourism: The Moderating Effect of Pandemic Anxiety Travel." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 26, no. 1: e2628. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2628.

Lee, S., N. Lee, T. J. Lee, and S. S. Hyun. 2024. "The Influence of Social Support From Intermediary Organizations on Innovativeness and Subjective Happiness in Community-Based Tourism." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 32, no. 4: 795–817. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2023.2175836.

Lee, S., H. J. Park, K. H. Kim, and C. K. Lee. 2021. "A Moderator of DSR for Tourists' Pro-Environmental Behaviors in the VIP Model." *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management* 20: 100610. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100610.

Li, X., S. S. Hyun, and H. Kim. 2024. "Perception of Medical Practitioners on the Importance of Medical Tourism Services." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 26, no. 1: e2617. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2617.

Mathew, P. V., and S. Sreejesh. 2017. "Impact of Responsible Tourism on Destination Sustainability and Quality of Life of Community in Tourism Destinations." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 31: 83–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.10.001.

Melane-Lavado, A., and A. Alvarez-Herranz. 2020. "Cooperation Networks as a Driver of Sustainability-Oriented Innovation." *Sustainability* 12, no. 7: 2820. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072820.

Moon, J., J. Hwang, and W. S. Lee. 2024. "Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Brand Trust and Brand Loyalty: Case of Uber." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 26, no. 1: e2629. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2629.

Nasr, E., O. L. Emeagwali, H. Y. Aljuhmani, and S. Al-Geitany. 2022. "Destination Social Responsibility and Residents' Environmentally Responsible Behavior: Assessing the Mediating Role of Community Attachment and Involvement." *Sustainability* 14, no. 21: 14153. https://doi.org/10.3390/su142114153.

Nguyen, D. N., F. Imamura, and K. Iuchi. 2017. "Public-Private Collaboration for Disaster Risk Management: A Case Study of Hotels in Matsushima, Japan." *Tourism Management* 61: 129–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.02.003.

Nunkoo, R. 2017. "Governance and Sustainable Tourism: What Is the Role of Trust, Power and Social Capital?" *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management* 6, no. 4: 277–285. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2017.10.003.

Nunnally, J. C., and I. H. Bernstein. 1994. *Psychometric Theory*. 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill.

Pai, C. K., H. Chen, T. J. Lee, S. S. Hyun, Y. Liu, and Y. Zheng. 2024. "The Impacts of Under-Tourism and Place Attachment on Residents' Life Satisfaction." *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 30, no. 4: 694–712. https://doi.org/10.1177/13567667231164807.

Park, K., S. Park, and T. J. Lee. 2020. "Analysis of a Spatial Network From the Perspective of Actor-Network Theory." *International Journal of Tourism Research* 22, no. 5: 653–665. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2363.

Shrestha, N. 2021. "Factor Analysis as a Tool for Survey Analysis." *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics* 9, no. 1: 4–11. https://doi.org/10.12691/ajams-9-1-2.

Song, J. H. 2003. "Development and Validation of the Theoretical Structural Model for the Sustainability of Tourism." *Journal of Tourism and Leisure Research* 15: 23–38.

Spyriadis, T., D. Buhalis, and A. Fyall. 2011. "Dynamics of Destination Governance: Governance and Metagovernance in the Composite Industrial Environment of Destinations." In *Tourist Destination Governance: Practice, Theory and Issues*, 187–202. CABI.

Su, L., S. Huang, and J. Huang. 2018. "Effects of Destination Social Responsibility and Tourism Impacts on Residents' Support for Tourism and Perceived Quality of Life." *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research* 42, no. 7: 1039–1057. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348016671395.

Su, L., S. S. Huang, and J. Pearce. 2018. "How Does DSR Contribute to Environmentally Responsible Behaviour? The Tourist Destination Resident Perspective." *Journal of Business Research* 86: 179–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.02.011.

Su, L., and S. R. Swanson. 2017. "The Effect of DSR on Tourist Environmentally Responsible Behaviour: Compared Analysis of First-Time and Repeat Tourists." *Tourism Management* 60: 308–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.12.011.

Su, L., S. R. Swanson, and X. He. 2020. "A Scale to Measure Residents' Perceptions of Destination Social Responsibility." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 28, no. 6: 873–897. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1708372.

Tran, H. A. T., Y. S. Hwang, C. Yu, and S. J. Yoo. 2018. "The Effect of DSR on Tourists' Satisfaction: The Mediating Role of Emotions." *Sustainability* 10, no. 9: 3044. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10093044.

Venu, V., and H. Goodwin. 2008. "The Kerala Declaration on Responsible Tourism." In *Incredible India, Second International Conference on Responsible Tourism in Destinations*. Elgar online.

vom Brocke, J., A. Hevner, and A. Maedche. 2020. "Introduction to Design Science Research." In *Design Science Research. Cases*, edited by J. vom Brocke, A. Hevner, and A. Maedche, 1–16. Springer.

Wang, C., and H. Xu. 2014. "The Role of Local Government and the Private Sector in China's Tourism Industry." *Tourism Management* 45: 95–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.03.008.

Wang, Y., H. Chen, and X. Wu. 2021. "Spatial Structure Characteristics of Tourist Attraction Cooperation Networks in the Yangtze River Delta Based on Tourism Flow." *Sustainability* 13, no. 21: 12036. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132112036.

Wang, Y., and S. Krakover. 2008. "Destination Marketing: Competition, Cooperation or Coopetition?" *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 20, no. 2: 126–141. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110810852122.

Yen, C. H., S. H. Tsaur, and C. H. Tsai. 2018. "Tour Leaders' Job Crafting: Scale Development." *Tourism Management* 69: 52–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.05.017.

Yu, C., and Y. S. Hwang. 2019. "Do the Social Responsibility Efforts of the Destination Affect the Loyalty of Tourists?" *Sustainability* 11, no. 7: 1998. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11071998.