

The impact of green tourism on the Hmong community in Vietnam



Trinh Thi Thuy Anh^a | Trinh Thi Lan Anh^a | Nguyen Nghi Thanh^a ^[5]

^aNational Academy of Public Administration, Vietnam.

Abstract This study investigates how green tourism affects the Hmong community in Lao Cai province, Vietnam. The results indicate that the environmental and sociocultural advantages of green tourism have a positive and noteworthy influence on the community's understanding of sustainable tourism practices. This increased awareness, in turn, encourages their dedication to sustainable tourism practices. However, the study did not establish a significant link between economic benefits and public perception, implying that the Hmong community places a higher value on cultural heritage conservation than financial gain. These findings underscore the importance of involving local communities in decision-making processes and ensuring that they obtain tangible benefits from participating in sustainable tourism initiatives. This study makes two significant contributions to knowledge. First, it provides a comprehensive understanding of how green tourism impacts local communities, specifically the Hmong community in Vietnam. Second, it highlights the critical role of community participation in sustainable tourism development. Local communities are essential in promoting and maintaining sustainable tourism practices. This research suggests that policymakers involve local communities in decision-making and ensure that they receive tangible benefits from engaging in sustainable tourism practices.

Keywords: sustainable tourism practices, community participation, environmental conservation, cultural heritage preservation, Hmong people

1. Introduction

Tourism contributes significantly to global economic growth, job creation, and infrastructure development (Mishra et al 2011). However, its rapid expansion has led to negative environmental and social impacts, prompting the emergence of green tourism (Manzoor et al 2019). Green tourism emphasizes responsible travel practices that prioritize environmental conservation, social and cultural sensitivity, and economic sustainability (Mishra et al 2011).

Local communities are increasingly recognized for their role in promoting green tourism (Manzoor et al 2019). Their active participation and commitment to sustainable practices are crucial (McCombes et al 2015). Engaging local communities in planning and management is essential for successful implementation (Manyara and Jones 2007). Equitable distribution of benefits, economic incentives, and preservation of cultural heritage strengthen community involvement (Cole, 2006; Mydland and Grahn 2012; Lordkipanidze 2005). Training and capacity-building initiatives empower communities to engage in sustainable tourism (Reggers et al 2016).

The Vietnamese government prioritizes green tourism for the Hmong community to preserve culture, protect the environment, and foster economic growth (Davison et al 2005; Gerdner 2015). It safeguards traditions while generating job opportunities and increased income (Nepal 2002; Cahill 2018). Responsible tourism practices are essential for preserving natural resources and diversifying the region's economy (Mallick 2019; Davison et al 2005). Local community participation depends on awareness, economic and social benefits, and involvement in decision-making (Berry and Ladkin 1997; Guttentag 2009). Information sharing, community engagement, and education are crucial to encourage participation (Saufi et al 2014; Chan et al 2021).

The Hmong people, comprising over a million individuals, are one of Vietnam's major ethnic minority groups residing primarily in the mountainous regions of northern provinces, particularly Lao Cai (Turner 2012; Turner et al 2015; Tugault-Lafleur and Turner 2009). Their culture is vibrant and diverse, encompassing their own language, traditions, and beliefs (Turner 2012). Despite encountering various obstacles such as poverty, illiteracy, and discrimination, the Hmong community has opportunities to maintain and promote their cultural heritage through education, tourism, and collaboration with other ethnic groups (Briain 2013). To that end, the Vietnamese government recognizes the importance of developing green tourism in the Hmong community in Lao Cai province as a means of promoting green growth and poverty alleviation (Turner 2012). Green tourism has the potential to generate income, create green jobs, and lay the foundation for eco-friendly economic



development (Turner and Michaud 2008). Furthermore, the Hmong community's diverse culture, colorful costumes, intricate embroidery, and skillful farming can attract tourists from nearby countries like China, Thailand, Vietnam, and Malaysia (Ó Briain 2014; Turner and Michaud 2008).

Developing green tourism in the region would also help to safeguard the natural landscape and biodiversity of protected areas (Eagles et al 2002; Job et al 2017). Nonetheless, it remains unclear whether the Hmong community's awareness and commitment to sustainable tourism practices affect their involvement in green tourism (Chen et al 2017). This study aims to examine the relationship between awareness and commitment and green tourism participation in the Hmong people community of Lao Cai province, Vietnam. The findings of this research will aid in comprehending the factors that influence local communities' participation in green tourism and provide insight into how to encourage sustainable tourism practices in local communities

2. Literature Reviews

2.1. Green tourism

Green tourism, which is also referred to as sustainable tourism, is a type of tourism that aims to decrease the negative impact of tourism on the environment (Budeanu 2007), while simultaneously generating economic benefits for local communities and promoting cultural preservation (Mihalic 2016; Hudson and Miller 2005). Green tourism practices involve being environmentally responsible, culturally and socially sensitive, and economically feasible (Kiper 2013). The types of green tourism practices that can be implemented vary depending on the location and context (Garrod and Fyall 1998). Examples of such practices include utilizing renewable energy sources like solar or wind power to operate accommodations and facilities, reducing waste and conserving water through recycling and composting programs (Kasavana 2008), promoting local food and agriculture to minimize the carbon footprint of food transportation while supporting the local economy (Bruns-Smithet al 2015), promoting conservation efforts and responsible wildlife tourism practices, encouraging low-impact activities such as hiking, biking, and kayaking, and engaging and empowering local communities through responsible tourism practices that involve and benefit them (Poponi et al 2020). Ultimately, the goal of green tourism is to strike a balance between the economic benefits of tourism and the need to preserve the environment (Hunter 1997), as well as local cultures and communities, for future generations (Hui-Chun et al 2003).

2.2. Some potential benefits of green tourism

Economic benefits: Green tourism provides employment opportunities and boosts the local economy (Amerta et al 2018; Niedziółka 2014). It offers diverse jobs, including hospitality services, ecotourism guides, and environmental educators (Amerta et al 2018). By creating environmentally responsible employment, green tourism stimulates economic growth (Goodwin 1996). It also supports local businesses and agriculture by promoting local food and reducing carbon emissions in food transportation (Lordkipanidze et al 2018; Pan et al 2018), preserving culinary traditions and cultural heritage while fostering economic development (Sims 2009).

Environmental benefits: Green tourism preserves natural and cultural resources and supports conservation (Amerta et al 2018; Niedziółka 2014). Through sustainable practices and low-impact activities, it minimizes the negative environmental impact of tourism (Isaacs 2000; Olszewski-Strzyżowski 2022). By engaging in responsible tourism, green tourism safeguards forests, rivers, and wildlife habitats while offering authentic experiences (Eagles et al 2022). It also promotes cultural heritage and protects historic sites and monuments (Niedziółka 2014; Skanavis and Giannoulis 2009), raising awareness about environmental conservation (Edgell 2019).

Social and cultural benefits: Green tourism fosters cultural exchange, respect for traditions, and understanding between tourists and local communities (Amerta et al 2018; Niedziółka 2014). Community-based tourism initiatives enable direct engagement, cultural learning, and participation in local activities (Polnyotee and Thadaniti 2015), promoting diversity and bridging cultural gaps (Lordkipanidze et al 2005). Green tourism preserves traditional knowledge and cultural heritage through responsible practices and support for cultural tourism (Prasetyo et al 2021). By respecting local cultures, promoting local products, and supporting traditional practices, it contributes to sustainable tourism benefiting both tourists and local communities (Barna et al 2021).

2.3. The local communities' awareness of green tourism

The level of awareness of the green tourism model among local communities varies based on factors such as education, exposure to tourism, and cultural and social norms (Hassan 2000; Stem et al 2003). Some communities actively participate in sustainable tourism practices, recognizing the importance of environmental protection and cultural heritage preservation (Hassan 2000; Polnyotee and Thadaniti 2015). However, other communities may have limited awareness due to lack of information, education, or involvement in tourism development (Cole 2006; Aref 2011). Cultural and social norms prioritizing economic development can also hinder sustainable tourism promotion (Tosun 2001). Raising awareness through education, outreach programs, and community involvement is crucial for promoting sustainable tourism (Frey and George

2010; Lordkipanidze et al 2005). Empowering local communities encourages commitment and advocacy for sustainable tourism practices (Cole 2006)

2.4. The commitment to participate in the green tourism model of local communities

The commitment of local communities to green tourism is influenced by factors such as awareness of sustainable tourism benefits and drawbacks of traditional practices (Lee 2011; Ritchie and Crouch 2003). Active involvement in decision-making processes and ownership of sustainable tourism initiatives increase commitment (Marzuki 2008; Beaumont and Dredge 2010). Economic benefits, including job opportunities and support for local businesses, also contribute to commitment (Hassan 2000; Frey and George, 2010). Cultural and social values alignment further enhances commitment (Aman et al 2019; Li and Hunter 2015). Overall, involving local communities, considering their values, and providing tangible benefits promote commitment to green tourism (Gamble and Gibson 1999; Barbieri et al 2020)

2.5. The relationship between awareness and commitment to participate in the green tourism

The relationship between awareness and commitment to participate in the green tourism model of local communities is a complex one (Frey and George, 2010). On the one hand, greater awareness of the benefits of sustainable tourism practices can lead to increased commitment among local communities to participate in such initiatives (Garrod, 2003). For example, if a community understands the economic, environmental, and cultural benefits of green tourism, they may be more likely to actively participate in sustainable tourism activities (Wheeller 1991).

On the other hand, even if local communities have a high level of awareness of green tourism practices, their level of commitment may still vary depending on other factors such as their level of involvement in decision-making processes and their economic and social circumstances (Tzschentke et al 2004). For example, if a community perceives that their participation in sustainable tourism practices will not result in significant economic benefits or if they are facing other economic challenges, they may be less committed to participating in green tourism initiatives (Frey and George 2010).

Therefore, it is important to not only raise awareness among local communities about the benefits of green tourism but also to involve them in the decision-making process and ensure that they see tangible benefits from their participation (Scheyvens, 2000). This can help increase their level of commitment to sustainable tourism practices and ensure that they are actively engaged in promoting and supporting these initiatives within their community (Li et al 2015).

Based on literature reviews, we propose the following research hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). The economic benefits of green tourism have a positive and meaningful impact on local communities' awareness of green tourism.

Hypothesis 2 (H2). The environmental benefits of green tourism have a positive and meaningful impact on local communities' awareness of green tourism.

Hypothesis 3 (H3). The social and cultural benefits of green tourism have a positive and meaningful impact on local communities' awareness of green tourism.

Hypothesis 4 (H4). Local communities' awareness of green tourism has a positive and meaningful impact on a commitment to participate in the green tourism model of local communities.

From the above research hypotheses, we propose the following research model (Figure 1):



3. Method

3.1. Instrument and participant

The questionnaire was constructed in two parts, based on literature reviews and references to two public policy professors, three tourism studies professors, and one psychology professor. Part one collects demographic information, while part two gathers information related to the economic, environmental, and social/cultural benefits of green tourism, as well as local communities' awareness of green tourism and their commitment to participate in the green tourism model. Each factor is measured by four questions on a 5-point Likert scale.

Before the formal research began, a pilot survey was conducted with 40 volunteers to test the questionnaire. Minor corrections were made to the questionnaire based on the analysis of the survey data, and a language expert edited and translated the final version into Hmong for use in the official study. The study was conducted in January 2023, during the traditional Hmong New Year when demand for green tourism services is high. The study utilized the purposeful sampling method, and 200 Hmong individuals from Lao Cai province volunteered to participate. The questionnaire was administered directly to participants in Hmong, and they marked their answers with a pencil. All 200 answer sheets were collected, resulting in a 100% response rate. Table 1 presents the demographic information of the survey subjects. SPSS 20 and AMOS 20 software were used to analyze the research data.

		Age							
		18 24 years old		25 34 years old		45 54 years old		56 or older	
		Count	Row N	Count	Row N	Count	Row N	Count	Row N
			%		%		%		%
Gender	Female	10	13.2%	32	42.1%	26	34.2%	8	10.5%
	Male	15	12.1%	52	41.9%	41	33.1%	16	12.9%
Education	Bachelor's degree	3	8.1%	17	45.9%	16	43.2%	1	2.7%
	High school diploma	7	14.0%	19	38.0%	18	36.0%	6	12.0%
	Less than high school	6	18.8%	12	37.5%	10	31.2%	4	12.5%
	Some college/Associate's degree	9	11.1%	36	44.4%	23	28.4%	13	16.0%

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of survey participants.

Source: Prepared by the authors (2023).

3.2. Reliability analysis

Cronbach's alpha is used to assess the positive correlation among survey questions, indicating their measurement of the same construct. A high alpha score signifies questionnaire reliability, while a low score suggests the need for revision. Interpretation depends on factors like research purpose, data type, and target population (Fornell and Larcker 1981). Generally, an alpha score of 0.7 or higher is acceptable, indicating high internal consistency and reliability (Considine et al 2005). Scores between 0.6 and 0.7 may also be acceptable, but some questions might require revision (Hair et al 2006). Scores below 0.6 are generally low, indicating the need for question revision or refinement (Cortina 1993).

Composite reliability (CR) is commonly used to assess the internal consistency or reliability of a scale or questionnaire (Hair et al., 2006; Henson & Roberts, 2006). It determines if a set of items consistently measures a single construct (Zucoloto et al., 2014). CR is calculated as the ratio of the total variance of observed scores to the total variance of actual scores (Sijtsma, 2009). It indicates the proportion of variance in observed scores attributable to the measured construct, rather than measurement error or other sources of variability (Hair et al., 2010). A CR value of 0.70 or higher is generally considered acceptable, indicating reasonable internal consistency (Zucoloto et al., 2014; Zinbarg et al., 2005). However, the threshold may vary based on research context and scale usage (Henson & Roberts, 2006).

Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is a statistic used to measure the amount of variance explained by a construct or latent variable (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). AVE is calculated based on the shared variance between items and is commonly used in confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM). It is computed as the average of squared correlations between the construct and its indicator items (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Specifically, AVE is the sum of squared loadings divided by the sum of variances and measurement error (Hair et al., 2006). AVE ranges from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater variance explained by the construct. AVE values of 0.5 or higher are generally considered acceptable, indicating reasonable reliability (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2010; Kline, 2015). However, the threshold may vary depending on research context and scale usage (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012; Schreiber et al., 2006). Table 2 presents the results of the reliability and validity tests for the research questionnaire (Hair et al 2019; Henseler et al 2015). The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for all items were found to be greater than 0.7, indicating satisfactory internal consistency and reliability of the guestionnaire (Henseler et al 2015). The CR of all items met the minimum threshold of 0.70 (Fornell and Larcker, 1981), indicating good convergent validity (Hair et al 2019; Henseler et al 2015). The AVE of all items was approximately 0.50, which is an acceptable threshold for further analysis (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Overall, these results demonstrate that the questionnaire items have satisfactory reliability and validity for analyzing the proposed research model.

Table 2 Summary of Reliability.						
Scales	Number of variables observed	Reliability coefficients (Cronbach Alpha)	Composite Reliability (CR)	Average variance extracted (AVE)		
Economic	4	0.778	0.779	0.468		
Environmental	4	0.755	0.756	0.437		
Social	4	0.753	0.754	0.435		
Awareness	4	0.751	0.751	0.431		
Participate	4	0.793	0.793	0.489		

Table 2 Summary of Reliability.

Source: Prepared by the authors (2023).

3.3. Factor analysis

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is a statistical technique used in the social sciences to identify underlying latent factors or dimensions in a set of variables (Fabrigaret al 1999). The goal of EFA is to reduce the number of variables in a dataset by identifying patterns of inter-correlation among them and grouping them into a smaller set of underlying factors. In an EFA, a correlation matrix of the variables is created, and factor scores are generated through a series of mathematical operations (Costello and Osborne 2005). The number of factors to be extracted is often determined through the examination of scree plots and eigenvalues, which represent the magnitude of the factors and their relative importance (Kaiser 1960). The results of an EFA can help researchers identify the key factors that explain the relationships among the variables in a dataset (Brown 2006). This information can then be used to guide the development of more refined and focused research questions, hypotheses, and models (Hair 2006).

Table 3 presents the results of the factor analysis for the research questionnaire. The Bartlett test was statistically significant (Sig. = 0.000), and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient was 0.870 (>0.5), indicating that the observed variables are correlated with each other in the population and, thus, the variables are valid for factor analysis.

Table 3 Exploratory factor analysis.							
Rotated Component Matrix ^a							
	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5		
Participate3	.752						
Participate1	.723						
Participate4	.723						
Participate2	.706						
Awareness4		.740					
Awareness1		.728					
Awareness3		.714					
Awareness2		.651					
Economic2			.743				
Economic1			.732				
Economic3			.725				
Economic4			.686				
Environmental1				.743			
Environmental2				.711			
Environmental4				.709			
Environmental3				.651			
Social3					.740		
Social2					.735		
Social4					.718		
Social1					.693		

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

b. KMO =0.870; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Chi-Square = 1285.245; df = 190; Sig.=0.000)

c. Initial Eigenvalues =1.192; Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings = 60%.

Source: Prepared by the authors (2023).

The factor loading of all variables was greater than 0.5, which means that the factor analysis is valid. Factor loading is the criterion used to ensure the practical significance of factor analysis, where a factor loading greater than 0.3 is considered the minimum, greater than 0.4 is considered important, and greater than 0.5 is considered to be of practical significance. Table 3 shows that all variables have a factor loading greater than 0.5, indicating that the factor analysis is valid. The Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings of seven factors were 60% (>50%), indicating that the factors extracted can explain a significant amount of the variance in the data. The initial eigenvalues of six factors were 1.192 (>1.00), indicating that the

factors extracted have eigenvalues greater than one and thus are valid. Overall, these results demonstrate the validity and suitability of the factor analysis for the proposed research model.

3.4. Structural equation modeling

Structural equation modeling (SEM) is a widely used statistical method in the social sciences to analyze the relationships between variables in a complex system (Byrne 2016). It is a type of multivariate analysis that combines parts of regression analysis, factor analysis, and causal modeling (Kline 2015). In SEM, a set of equations are made to show how the variables in a system relate to each other. These equations can be used to estimate the strength and direction of the relationships between the variables and the degree to which underlying latent factors influence the associations (Zaslow et al 2006). The equations in SEM can also predict changes in one variable based on changes in other variables, which is one of the key advantages of the method (Fornell and Larcker 1981). SEM can be used to test theories about the relationships between variables in a system. Joreskog and Sorbom (1993) found that the results of SEM can give important insights into the mechanisms that drive complex systems and can be used to guide the development of theories and models for these systems. SEM can also help researchers identify indirect and mediating effects between variables as well as direct effects (Kenny 2015).

To evaluate the goodness of fit of the structural equation model (SEM), several fit indices were utilized, including the Chi-Square (χ 2) test, Root-Mean-Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), standardized-root-mean square residual (SRMR), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI). A well-fitted model should have values of CFI and TLI >= 0.980, and RMSEA and SRMR <= 0.024. The analysis results, as shown in Figure 2, indicate that the SEM model satisfies the standard requirements. The Chi-square statistic = 181.251 with 162 degrees of freedom (P-value = 0.024, < 0.05), Chi-square/df ratio = 1.119, Goodness of Fit Index (GIF) = 0.916 (approximately equal to 0.9), TLI = 0.980, and RMSEA =0.024. The results of the SEM analysis are presented in Table 4, which shows the statistically significant relationship between the independent variables Environmental, Social, Awareness and dependent variables Participate (P-value < 0.050). The remaining variable Economic are not statistically significant (P-value =0.238>0.050). Overall, the results suggest that the SEM model fits well with the data and provides a good representation of the proposed research model.

Table 4 Regression We	eights.
-----------------------	---------

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	Р	
Awareness	<	Economic.	.124	.105	1.179	.238	not supported
Awareness	<	Environmental.	.249	.118	2.109	.035	supported
Awareness	<	Social	.234	.093	2.523	.012	supported
Participate.	<	Awareness	.589	.146	4.028	***	supported
Participate.	<	Social	.333	.115	2.905	.004	supported



Source: Prepared by the authors (2023).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Results

Firstly, The SEM analysis in Table 4 confirms H2, indicating a statistically significant positive impact of green tourism's environmental benefits on local community awareness of green tourism (Niedziółka 2014). The Hmong community's commitment to sustainable tourism development stems from their long-standing tradition of protecting the environment from external influences. This aligns with previous research highlighting how green tourism can preserve cultural heritage and support local communities (Medina, 2005). Sustainable tourism practices also contribute to the safeguarding of historic sites and monuments, raise awareness about environmental conservation, and promote overall environmental sustainability (Pan et al 2018; Skanavis & Giannoulis 2009; Edgell 2019; Neto 2003). Green tourism initiatives focus on waste reduction, energy conservation, water resource preservation, and the promotion of renewable energy sources in tourism operations (Bohdanowicz et al 2001).

Secondly, the SEM analysis results presented in Table 4 indicate that the local community's perception of the sociocultural benefits of green tourism has a positive and significant impact on their understanding of green tourism, supporting H3. This finding highlights the crucial role that socio-cultural benefits play in fostering the Mong people's commitment to participate in the green tourism model in Lao Cai province. This result is consistent with previous research conducted in other cultures by Polnyotee and Thadaniti (2015), suggesting that sustainable tourism practices, such as community-based tourism initiatives, enable visitors to directly engage with local communities, learn about their customs, and participate in local cultural traditions and activities (Reisinger 1994). This cultural exchange can be mutually beneficial, allowing visitors and local communities to learn from each other, share experiences, and gain a better understanding of each other's cultures (Brislin et al 2006).

Thirdly, the SEM analysis results in Table 4 demonstrate that the Hmong community's awareness of green tourism has a positive and significant impact on their commitment to participate in the green tourism model in Lao Cai province, supporting H4. This finding is consistent with previous research in other cultures, such as Thais and Laotians, which also suggests that local communities' perception of green tourism positively influences their commitment to it. Therefore, it is crucial to increase local communities' awareness of the benefits of green tourism and involve them in decision-making processes, ensuring they experience tangible benefits from their participation (Scheyvens 2000). Doing so can enhance their commitment to sustainable tourism practices and promote and support these initiatives in their communities actively (Li et al 2015).

Finally, The SEM analysis results (Table 4) indicate no statistically significant evidence of the economic benefits of green tourism impacting the local community's awareness of green tourism, leading to the non-acceptance of H1. This finding suggests that the Hmong community in Lao Cai province prioritizes the preservation of their cultural heritage over economic benefits, potentially reacting positively to threats against their cultural values. It differs from studies in other cultures that consistently demonstrate the job opportunities and economic boost provided by green tourism (Amerta et al., 2018; Niedziółka, 2014). Green tourism offers diverse employment prospects, including hospitality, ecotourism guides, park rangers, and environmental educators (Amerta et al., 2018). By generating environmentally and socially responsible jobs, green tourism can contribute to local economic growth (Goodwin, 1996). Engaging the local community in decision-making processes and ensuring tangible benefits are crucial for strengthening their commitment to sustainable tourism practices and promoting these initiatives within their community (Li et al., 2015).

4.2. Discussion

Firstly, the research confirms that the environmental benefits of green tourism significantly influence the Hmong community's awareness of green tourism, reinforcing their commitment to sustainable tourism development. This aligns with earlier research highlighting how green tourism can aid in preserving cultural heritage and supporting local communities. Responsible tourism practices that involve and benefit the community can promote cultural tourism, support local businesses, and contribute to the protection of natural resources and environmental sustainability (Medina 2005; Skanavis and Giannoulis 2009).

Furthermore, the study emphasizes the crucial role of socio-cultural benefits in fostering the Hmong community's commitment to green tourism. The perception of socio-cultural benefits positively influences their understanding of green tourism, enabling visitors to engage with local communities, learn about customs, and participate in cultural traditions. This cultural exchange benefits both visitors and locals, fostering mutual understanding and appreciation of different cultures (Amerta et al 2018; Niedziółka 2014).

Moreover, the research demonstrates that the Hmong community's awareness of green tourism positively impacts their commitment to participate in sustainable tourism initiatives. It aligns with findings in other cultures, highlighting the importance of increasing community awareness and involving them in decision-making processes. Tangible benefits and active participation can strengthen their commitment to sustainable practices and support the development of green tourism within their community (Li et al 2015).

However, the study did not find statistically significant evidence of the impact of economic benefits on the community's awareness of green tourism. This suggests that the Hmong community prioritizes the preservation of their

cultural heritage and customs over economic gains. It highlights the importance of engaging the community in decisionmaking processes and ensuring that they receive tangible benefits from their participation. By doing so, their commitment to sustainable tourism practices can be enhanced, leading to the promotion and support of these initiatives within the community.

In conclusion, this research contributes to understanding the impact of green tourism on the Hmong community in Lao Cai province, Vietnam. The findings underscore the importance of environmental and socio-cultural benefits in shaping community awareness and commitment to sustainable tourism. They emphasize the need for responsible tourism practices that involve and benefit local communities, support cultural heritage preservation, safeguard natural resources, and promote environmental sustainability. The study's insights can inform policymakers and tourism stakeholders in developing strategies that actively engage the Hmong community, ensuring their active participation and mutual benefits in the context of green tourism.

This study confirms the significant positive impact of green tourism on local communities, specifically in terms of environmental and socio-cultural benefits (Tugault-Lafleur and Turner 2009). The findings support the importance of environmental benefits, socio-cultural benefits, and awareness of green tourism in driving the Hmong community's commitment to sustainable tourism development in Lao Cai province (Turner 2012; Turner et al 2015). It is crucial to involve the local community in decision-making processes and ensure tangible benefits to foster their commitment to sustainable tourism processes and ensure tangible benefits may not be the primary motivating factor for the Hmong community's participation in green tourism. The research has limitations in terms of generalizability, the use of a quantitative approach, and the focus on the local community's perspective without considering tourists' viewpoints and potential negative impacts of green tourism. Future research should explore these aspects in more depth (Turner 2012; Turner et al 2015). These insights can inform sustainable tourism development strategies in the region, taking into account potential negative impacts and ways to mitigate them.

Ethical considerations

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research did not receive any financial support.

References

Aman J, Abbas J, Mahmood S, Nurunnabi M, Bano S (2019) The influence of Islamic religiosity on the perceived socio-cultural impact of sustainable tourism development in Pakistan: a structural equation modeling approach. Sustainability 11:3039.

Amerta IMS, Sara IM, Bagiada K (2018) Sustainable tourism development. International research journal of management, IT and social sciences 2:248-254. Aref F (2011) Barriers to community capacity building for tourism development in communities in Shiraz, Iran. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 3:347-359. Asker SA, Boronyak LJ, Carrard NR, Paddon M (2010) Effective community based tourism: A best practice manual.

Bagozzi RP, Yi Y (2012) Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. Journal of the academy of marketing science 40:8-34. Barbieri C, Sotomayor S, Gil Arroyo C (2020) Sustainable tourism practices in indigenous communities: The case of the Peruvian Andes. Tourism Planning and Development 2:207-224.

Barna C, Epure M, Vasilescu R (2011) Ecotourism–conservation of the natural and cultural heritage. Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research 1:87-96. Bartholomew KJ, N toumanis, N Ryan, RM Bosch JA, Thøgersen-Ntoumani C (2011) Self-determination theory and diminished functioning: The role of interpersonal control and psychological need thwarting. Personality and social psychology bulletin 11:1459-1473.

Beaumont N, Dredge D (2010) Local tourism governance: A comparison of three network approaches. Journal of sustainable tourism 1:7-28.

Berry S, Ladkin A (1997) Sustainable tourism: A regional perspective. Tourism Management 18:433-440.

Bohdanowicz P , Churie-Kallhauge A, Martinac I, Rezachek D (2001) Energy-efficiency and conservation in hotels-towards sustainable tourism. In 4th International Symposium on Asia Pacific Architecture 21.

Booyens I (2010) Rethinking township tourism: Towards responsible tourism development in South African townships. Development Southern Africa 2:273-287.

Boyne S, Williams F, Hall D (2003) On the trail of regional success: Tourism, food production and the Isle of Arran Taste Trail. In Tourism and gastronomy. Routledge 105-128.

Briain LÓ (2015) "Happy to Be Born Hmong" The Implications of a Transnational Musical Network for the Vietnamese-Hmong People. Journal of Vietnamese Studies 2:115-148.

Brislin R, Worthley R, Macnab B (2006) Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. Group and Organization Management 1:40-55.

Brown D, Warschauer M (2006) From the university to the elementary classroom: Students' experiences in learning to integrate technology in instruction. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education 3:599-621.

8

Bruns-Smith A, Choy V, Chong H, Verma R (2015) Environmental sustainability in the hospitality industry: Best practices, guest participation, and customer satisfaction.

Budeanu A (2007) Sustainable tourist behaviour-a discussion of opportunities for change. International journal of consumer studies 5:499-508.

Cahill A (2018) Sustainable tourism practices in Vietnam: the influence of institutions and case study of sapa's growing tourism industry.

Catibog-Sinha C (2010) Biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism: Philippine initiatives. Journal of Heritage Tourism 4:297-309.

Chan JKL, Marzuki KM, Mohtar TM (2021) Local community participation and responsible tourism practices in ecotourism destination: A case of Lower Kinabatangan, Sabah. Sustainability 23:13302.

Chen Z, Li L, Li T (2017) The organizational evolution, systematic construction and empowerment of Langde Miao's community tourism. Tourism Management 58:276-285.

Cole S (2006) Cultural tourism, community participation and empowerment. Cultural tourism in a changing world: Politics, participation and (re) presentation 89-103.

Considine J, Botti M, Thomas S (2005) Design, format, validity and reliability of multiple choice questions for use in nursing research and education. Collegian 1:19-24.

Cortina JM (1993) What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. Journal of applied psychology 1:98.

Costello AB, Osborne J (2005) Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. Practical assessment, research, and evaluation 1:7.

Davison RM, Harris RW, Vogel DR (2005) E-commerce for community-based tourism in developing countries. In Proceedings of the 9th Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems, Bangkok.

Eagles PF, McCool SF, Haynes CD (2002) Sustainable tourism in protected areas: Guidelines for planning and management (No. 8). lucn.

Edgell Sr DL (2019) Managing sustainable tourism: A legacy for the future. Routledge.

Fabrigar LR, Wegener DT, MacCallum RC, Strahan EJ (1999) Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. Psychological methods 3:272.

Fornell C, Larcker DF (1981) Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics.

Frey N, George R (2010) Responsible tourism management: The missing link between business owners' attitudes and behaviour in the Cape Town tourism industry. Tourism management 5: 621-628.

Gamble PR, Gibson DA (1999) Executive values and decision making: The relationship of culture and information flows. Journal of Management Studies 2:217-240.

Garrod B (2003) Local participation in the planning and management of ecotourism: A revised model approach. Journal of Ecotourism 1:33-53.

Garrod B, Fyall A (1998) Beyond the rhetoric of sustainable tourism?. Tourism management 3:199-212.

Gerdner LA (2015) Hmong story cloths: preserving historical and cultural treasures. Schiffer Publishing.

Giampiccoli A, Hayward Kalis J (2012) Community-based tourism and local culture: the case of the amaMpondo.

Goodwin H (1996) In pursuit of ecotourism. Biodiversity and Conservation 5:277-291.

Goodwin H (2011) Taking responsibility for tourism, pp. 1-256. Woodeaton: Goodfellow Publishers Limited.

Guttentag DA (2009) The possible negative impacts of volunteer tourism. International journal of tourism research 6:537-551.

Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE, Tatham RL (2006) Multivariate data analysis 6th Edition.

Hair JF, Gabriel M, Patel V (2014) AMOS covariance-based structural equation modeling (CB-SEM): Guidelines on its application as a marketing research tool. Brazilian Journal of Marketing 2:44-55.

Hair JF, Risher JJ, Sarstedt M, Ringle CM (2019) When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. European business review 1:2-24.

Hassan SS (2000) Determinants of market competitiveness in an environmentally sustainable tourism industry. Journal of travel research 3:239-245.

Henseler, J, Ringle CM, Sarstedt M (2015) A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. Journal of the academy of marketing science 43:115-135.

Henson R K, Roberts JK (2006) Use of exploratory factor analysis in published research: Common errors and some comment on improved practice. Educational and Psychological measurement 3:393-416.

Hoang KV (2021) The benefits of preserving and promoting cultural heritage values for the sustainable development of the country. In E3S Web of Conferences 234:00076. EDP Sciences.

Hudson S, Miller GA (2005) The responsible marketing of tourism: the case of Canadian Mountain Holidays. Tourism Management 2:133-142.

Hui-Chun, Yu, Miller P (2003) The generation gap and cultural influence-a Taiwan empirical investigation. Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal 3:23-41.

Hunter C (1997) Sustainable tourism as an adaptive paradigm. Annals of tourism research 4:850-867.

Iftikhar H, Pinglu C, Ullah S, Ullah A (2022) Impact of tourism on sustainable development in BRI countries: The moderating role of institutional quality. Plos one 4:e0263745.

Isaacs JC (2000) The limited potential of ecotourism to contribute to wildlife conservation. Wildlife society bulletin 1:61-69.

Job H, BeckenS, Lane B (2017) Protected Areas in a neoliberal world and the role of tourism in supporting conservation and sustainable development: an assessment of strategic planning, zoning, impact monitoring, and tourism management at natural World Heritage Sites. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 12:1697-1718.

Jöreskog KG, Sörbom D (1993) LISREL 8: Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language. Scientific software international.

KaiserJ (1960) The Archimedean two-wire spiral antenna. IRE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation 3:312-323.

Kasavana ML (2008) Green hospitality. Hospitality upgrade, summer 140-148.

Kenny DA , Kaniskan B, McCoach DB (2015) The performance of RMSEA in models with small degrees of freedom. Sociological methods and research 3:486-507.

Kiper T (2013) Role of ecotourism in sustainable development. InTech.

Kline RB (2023) Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. Guilford publications.

Kusworo (2023) Government Functions Acceleration in Tourist Village Development: a Case Study of Dermaji Village. International Journal of Professional Business Review. DOI: 10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i3.1296

Lansing P, Vries PD (2007) Sustainable tourism: ethical alternative or marketing ploy?. Journal of Business Ethics 72:77-85.

Lee TH (2011) How recreation involvement, place attachment and conservation commitment affect environmentally responsible behavior. Journal of Sustainable tourism 7:895-915.

Li Y, Hunter C (2015) Community involvement for sustainable heritage tourism: a conceptual model. Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development 3: 248-262.

Lordkipanidze M, Brezet H, Backman M (2005) The entrepreneurship factor in sustainable tourism development. Journal of cleaner production 8:787-798.

Mallick U (2019) Sustainable tourism: tool for sustainable forest management, natural resource and community based natural resource management. Editorial Board and Paper Review Committee.

Manyara G, Jones E (2007) Community-based tourism enterprises development in Kenya: An exploration of their potential as avenues of poverty reduction. Journal of sustainable tourism 6:628-644.

Manzoor F, WeiL, Asif M, Haq MZU, Rehman HU (2019) The contribution of sustainable tourism to economic growth and employment in Pakistan. International journal of environmental research and public health 19:3785.

Marzuki A (2008) Decision making and community participation: A case study of the tourism industry in Langkawi. Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal 3:227-241.

McCombes L, Vanclay F, Evers Y (2015) Putting social impact assessment to the test as a method for implementing responsible tourism practice. Environmental Impact Assessment Review 55:156-168.

Medina LK (2005) Ecotourism and certification: Confronting the principles and pragmatics of socially responsible tourism. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 3:281-295.

Mihalic T 2016. Sustainable-responsible tourism discourse–Towards 'responsustable' tourism. Journal of cleaner production 111:461-470.

Mishra PK , Rout HB, Mohapatra SS (2011) Causality between tourism and economic growth: Empirical evidence from India. European Journal of Social Sciences 4:518-527.

Mukherjee S, Singh M, Mukherjee M, Suvojit G, Pawan A (2023) Showcasing New Tourism Destination by Using Gis: a Study of Sikkim. International Journal of Professional Business Review 8:e01086. DOI: 10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i3.1086

Munt I (1994) Eco-tourism or ego-tourism?. Race and Class 1:49-60.

Mydland L, Grahn W (2012) Identifying heritage values in local communities. International Journal of Heritage Studies 18:564-587.

Nepal SK (2002) Involving indigenous peoples in protected area management: Comparative perspectives from Nepal, Thailand, and China. Environmental management 30:0748-0763.

Neto F (2003) A new approach to sustainable tourism development: Moving beyond environmental protection. In Natural resources forum 27:212-222. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Niedziółka I (2014) Sustainable tourism development. Regional formation and development studies 3:157-166.

Ó Briain L (2014) Minorities onstage: Cultural tourism, cosmopolitanism, and social harmony in Northwestern Vietnam. Asian Music 32-57.

Olszewski-Strzyżowski DJ (2022) Promotional Activities of Selected National Tourism Organizations (NTOs) in the Light of Sustainable Tourism (Including Sustainable Transport). Sustainability 5:2561.

Pan SY, Gao M, Kim H, Shah KJ, Pei SL, Chiang, PC (2018) Advances and challenges in sustainable tourism toward a green economy. Science of the total environment 635:452-469.

Polnyotee M, Thadaniti S (2015) Community-based tourism: A strategy for sustainable tourism development of Patong Beach, Phuket Island, Thailand. Asian Social Science 27:90.

Poponi S, Palli J, Ferrari S, Filibeck G, Franceschini C, Ruggieri A, Piovesan G (2020) Toward the development of sustainable ecotourism in Italian national parks of the Apennines: insights from hiking guides.

Prasetyo N, Filep S, Carr A (2021) Towards culturally sustainable scuba diving tourism: an integration of Indigenous knowledge. Tourism Recreation Research 1-14.

Reggers A, Grabowski S, Wearing SL, Chatterton P, Schweinsberg S (2016) Exploring outcomes of community-based tourism on the Kokoda Track, Papua New Guinea: a longitudinal study of Participatory Rural Appraisal techniques. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 24:1139-1155.

Reisinger Y (1994) Tourist—host contact as a part of cultural tourism. World Leisure and Recreation 2:24-28.

Ritchie JB, Crouch GI (2003) The competitive destination: A sustainable tourism perspective. Cabi.

Saufi A, O'Brien D, Wilkins H (2014) Inhibitors to host community participation in sustainable tourism development in developing countries. Journal of Sustainable Tourism 5:801-820.

Scheyvens R (2000) Promoting women's empowerment through involvement in ecotourism: Experiences from the Third World. Journal of sustainable tourism 3:232-249.

Schreiber JB, Nora A, Stage FK, Barlow EA, King J (2006) Reporting structural equation modeling and confirmatory factor analysis results: A review. The Journal of educational research 6:323-338.

Shasha ZT, Geng Y, Sun HP, Musakwa W, Sun L (2020) Past, current, and future perspectives on eco-tourism: A bibliometric review between 2001 and 2018. Environmental Science and Pollution Research 27:23514-23528.

Sijtsma K (2009) Reliability beyond theory and into practice. Psychometrika 74:169-173.

Skanavis C, Giannoulis C (2009) Improving quality of ecotourism through advancing education and training for eco-tourism guides.

Stem CJ, Lassoie JP, Lee DR, Deshler DD, Schelhas JW (2003) Community participation in ecotourism benefits: The link to conservation practices and perspectives. Society andNatural Resources 5:387-413.

Suansri P (2003) Community based tourism handbook . Bangkok: Responsible Ecological Social Tour-REST.

Tosun C (2001) Challenges of sustainable tourism development in the developing world: the case of Turkey. Tourism management 3:289-303.

Tugault-Lafleur C, Turner S (2009) The price of spice: Ethnic minority livelihoods and cardamom commodity chains in upland northern Vietnam. Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography 3: 388-403.

Turner S (2012) "Forever Hmong": Ethnic minority livelihoods and agrarian transition in upland northern Vietnam. The Professional Geographer 4:540-553. Turner S, Michaud J (2008) Imaginative and adaptive economic strategies for Hmong livelihoods in Làào Cai Province, Northern Vietnam. Journal of Vietnamese Studies 3:158-190.

Turner S Bonnin C, Michaud J (2015) Frontier livelihoods: Hmong in the Sino-Vietnamese borderlands. University of Washington Press.

Tzschentke N, Kirk D, Lynch PA (2004) Reasons for going green in serviced accommodation establishments. International journal of contemporary hospitality management 2:116-124.

Wheeller B (1991) Tourism's troubled times: Responsible tourism is not the answer. Tourism management 2:91-96.

Wood M (2002) Ecotourism: Principles, practices and policies for sustainability. UNEp.

Zaslow MJ, Weinfield NS, Gallagher M, Hair EC, Ogawa JR, Egeland B, De Temple JM (2006) Longitudinal prediction of child outcomes from differing measures of parenting in a low-income sample. Developmental psychology 1:27.

Zinbarg RE, Revelle W, Yovel I, Li W (2005) Cronbach's α , Revelle's β , and McDonald's ω H: Their relations with each other and two alternative conceptualizations of reliability. Psychometrika 70:123-133.

Zucoloto ML, Maroco J, Campos JADB (2014) Psychometric properties of the oral health impact profile and new methodological approach. Journal of Dental Research 7:645-650.