

Research Article

Teresa Costa, Jorge Umbelino*, Maria de Lurdes Calisto, Sandra Nunes, Victor Alves Afonso

Impacts of Tourism and Residents' Perceptions: A Study in the Regional Tourism Area of Lisbon

<https://doi.org/10.2478/ejthr-2020-0003>

received January 7, 2020; accepted April 20, 2020

Abstract: Tourism shows a significant transformation. Therefore, knowing the perception of residents regarding its impacts can conduce to more adequate public policies, strategies, decisions and actions, more adapted to residents' expectations, involving these stakeholders and deepening their engagement in tourism development. This study is a work in progress¹. Its main objective is to identify the perceptions of residents of the Lisbon region regarding the impacts of tourism. A quantitative methodology was used to analyse respondents' perceptions based on descriptive statistical techniques and non-parametric tests. The results of this research indicate that residents have a positive attitude concerning economic, as well as cultural, social and environmental impacts. The study also reveals differences in attitude depending on age, gender and professional activity.

Keywords: Impacts of tourism; Perceptions of residents; Tourism development; Regional Tourism Area of Lisbon

*Corresponding author: **Jorge Umbelino**, Estoril Higher Institute for Tourism and Hotel Studies, Center for Tourism Research, Development and Innovation, Av. Condes de Barcelona 808, 2769-510, Estoril, E-mail: jorge.umbelino@eshte.pt, ORCID 0000-0003-2453-8692

Teresa Costa, Sandra Nunes, Setúbal Polytechnic Institute, Center for Tourism Research, Development and Innovation, Address: Campus do IPS - Estefanilha, 2910-761 Setúbal

Maria de Lurdes Calisto, Victor Alves Afonso, Estoril Higher Institute for Tourism and Hotel Studies, Center for Tourism Research, Development and Innovation, Address: Av. Condes de Barcelona 808, 2769-510, Estoril

1 Introduction

It is consensual that the economic benefits of tourism are significant. The field of tourism has gained considerable attention due to its economic benefits as referred in several studies focusing on the performance and the economic impact of tourism (Balaguer & Cantavella-Jorda, 2002; Lee & Chang, 2008). Besides, international and national tourism organisations reinforce and support the economic activity of tourism (WTTC, 2004; UNWTO, 2008). However, the impacts of tourism are not only related to the economic aspects, but also to the social, cultural and environmental factors.

Sustainable tourism development began to gain ground due to an increased awareness of the environmental impact of tourism (Collins et al., 2007; Hunter & Shaw, 2007; Jones & Munday, 2007). Issues like spatial changes and resource consumption by the tourism activity, rapid urbanisation and land-use practices start to be considered as extremely relevant, together with economic issues, and determinant for the longevity of destinations and the welfare of future generations (Fletcher et al., 2017; Huijbregts et al., 2008; Hunter, 2002). Numerous challenges, including global warming, economic recession, political conflict, population growth and the need of an alternative source of energy, demand a new paradigm for planning and marketing tourism products worldwide (Aricak, 2015; Cetin et al., 2010, 2016; Yucedag et al., 2018).

Recently, the increase in tourist arrivals in popular destinations and the related problems of crowding, the pressure on residential housing and localised and seasonal inflation demand a new approach to the tourism system based on a growth model (Oklevik et al., 2019). Consequently, crowding, or over-tourism, has become an issue for residents as well as tourists in some destinations (UNWTO, 2017), namely New York City, Amsterdam, the Isle of Skye, Thailand or the Philippines. Trying to answer to crowding problems, the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) invited destinations to manage tourism better. However, without discarding the importance of a continuous growth strategy, the UNWTO

¹ This study is one of the components of a project financed by national funds through the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT), I.P., under the LISBOA-01-0145-FEDER-024093 TARGET project.

states regarding over-tourism, "...growth is not the enemy, it is how we manage it" (UNWTO, 2017).

Tourism has been going through an evolutionary transformation (Alipour, Vaziri & Ligay, 2011). Therefore, the traditional triple bottom line approach to sustainability has been enhanced, adding two more domains. These new domains are public policy (i.e., government or public rules/regulations) and technology (i.e., appropriate, sustainable) (Steward & Kuska, 2010). However, the public policy domain needs crucial information to understand how residents perceive tourism impacts and its development. This knowledge is essential for policymakers, local authorities, public and private organisations. This knowledge will support these stakeholders in developing policies, strategies, in making decisions and taking actions that can contribute to the correct development of tourism, maximising its benefits for both tourists and residents. The relationships between residents' perceived impacts of tourism and their support for tourism development has been studied by several authors (e.g., Amuquandoh, 2009; Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010; Gursoy et al., 2010; Ramkissoon et al., 2012).

This study focuses on the perceptions of residents of the Lisbon region regarding the impacts of tourism, thus providing decision-makers with relevant information. Specifically, the study aims to describe tourism impacts from the perspective of residents and to characterise the differences in the perception of tourism impacts across different sociodemographic groups.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Residents: An Important Stakeholder

Frequently, tourism is associated with destruction of the environment, devastation of resources (Kousis, 2000) and conflicts of interest among various stakeholders involved in this activity (Kuvan & Akan, 2005). Several authors have emphasised the need to manage the conflict of interest between the multiple stakeholders and the importance of social capital concerning this issue (Park et al., 2007, 2012; Zhao et al., 2011). The most conventional tourism development models focus mainly on the expectations and interests of various stakeholders; nevertheless, other alternative models value the involvement and collaboration of the population. Regarding the development of tourism, several studies have analysed the residents' reactions to the tourism activity (e.g., Akis et al., 1996; Cho,

2003; Lankford & Howard, 1994; Park & Kerstetter, 2002; Park et al., 2007, 2012).

According to Muresan et al. (2016), sustainable tourism development emerged in the last several decades as a necessity to ensure the efficiency of the tourism activity based on three main components: environmental interest, and the socio-cultural and economic needs of the communities involved. Consequently, for those authors, there is a need for balancing the positive and negative impacts that these three factors could generate. To understand the impacts of tourism and to establish this balance, it is essential to take into consideration the local community, a core element within the tourism development process and the most crucial stakeholder (Min, Xiaoli & Bihu, 2012). Analysing local communities' perceptions regarding tourism impact becomes a significant concern because it is strongly connected to their will to support tourism development (Bestard & Nadal, 2007; Huh & Vogt, 2008). Generally, tourism is perceived by residents as having substantial economic benefits, which outweigh any other possible negative impact, encouraging residents to perceive tourist activity positively and resulting in strong involvement and support.

2.2 Perceptions of Residents about the Impacts of Tourism

Some studies show that residents' expectations regarding the economic benefits of tourism have a positive effect on the assessment of impacts. Residents receiving higher economic returns from tourism, through job creation and other opportunities (Andereck et al., 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; Chen, 2000; Haralam-bopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Korca, 1996; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Waitt, 2003) are more natural supporters of tourism. Also, some residents believe that tourism produces significant opportunities and consequently contributes to the development of the local business environment (Aguiló et al., 2004; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; Chen, 2000; Dyer et al., 2007; Liu & Cheung, 2016; Liu et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Yoon et al., 2001). Other studies have emphasised the economic benefits of tourism for the population (Kim & Petrick, 2005; Liu & Cheung, 2016; Liu et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Waitt, 2003), referring to the economic development of communities as a result of increased tax revenues and job creation. Also, the contribution of tourism to attracting investment and developing businesses, and the consequent increase in commercial activity was pointed

out by Ritchie (1984) as a relevant benefit for the receiving communities.

Residents also find some negative economic impacts of tourism, namely the irregularity of labour income related to seasonality (Cerezo & Lara de Vicente, 2005). However, the economic benefits are an important influence on residents' attitudes towards tourism (Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; King *et al.*, 1993; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997) since tourism improves, benefits or increases the local economy (Gursoy *et al.*, 2002). Notwithstanding, residents realise that tourism increases the cost of living (Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Saveriades, 2000) and the price of goods and services (Aguiló *et al.*, 2004; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Korca, 1996). They also recognise that property value and housing prices grow (Aguiló *et al.*, 2004; Brida *et al.*, 2011; Korca, 1996, 1998) and this consequently prevents the population from buying their first home (Antón & González, 2008).

Residents also consider that tourism contributes to the improvement of the living standards (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Korca, 1996; Liu & Cheung, 2016; Liu *et al.*, 2016; Liu *et al.*, 2017; Saveriades, 2000; Sebastian & Rajagopalan, 2009).

Other studies focused on residents' attitudes towards the social and cultural impacts of tourism. Residents appreciate the fact that tourism has a positive influence on the services offered by the community (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Andereck *et al.*, 2005). Among these services, some authors refer leisure activities (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; Gursoy *et al.*, 2002; Yoon *et al.*, 2001) and other cultural activities (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Chen, 2000; Yoon *et al.*, 2001).

Other authors refer the positive effects of tourism including the maintenance and preservation of historic buildings and archaeological sites (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Oviedo *et al.*, 2008; Yoon *et al.*, 2001), the increasing pride and cultural identity (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Besculides *et al.*, 2002; Yoon *et al.*, 2001) and the preservation of cultural values (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Oviedo *et al.*, 2008). McGehee and Andereck (2004) find positive impacts on the quality of life of the residents. Furthermore, other authors argue that tourism stimulates cultural exchange and the enrichment of local people (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010; Besculides *et al.*, 2002; Dyer *et al.*, 2007; Uysal *et al.*, 2012; Yoon *et al.*, 2001). Ritchie (1984) and Hall (1992) identify other positive social impacts associated with tourism, such as strengthening community identity, tradition and values and increasing community participation. Stein and Anderson (1999) state the contribution of

tourism to social cohesion, greater sharing of ideas and increased knowledge of the culture of the regions.

Some studies describe the negative aspects perceived by residents, such as traffic congestion (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; Dyer *et al.*, 2007; Mason & Cheyne, 2000; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001) and parking problems (Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001). Other studies refer a negative perception of residents regarding the possible increase in delinquency, vandalism and crime (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Diedrich & García, 2009; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997), or increased drug or alcohol use, breakdown of codes of conduct and customs, and prostitution (Diedrich & García, 2009; Saveriades, 2000; Sebastian & Rajagopalan, 2009).

Concerning the environmental impact of tourism, tourism can protect and preserve resources or may damage or destroy them. Some residents believe that tourism helps to preserve natural resources (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2011; Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Liu *et al.*, 2017) and improves the appearance of cities (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Liu & Cheung, 2016; Oviedo *et al.*, 2008). Yet in other studies, some negative perceptions on tourism impacts are referred, namely pollution (Yoon *et al.*, 2001), overcrowding and congestion (Andereck *et al.*, 2005; Yoon *et al.*, 2001) and accumulation in public facilities (Aguiló *et al.*, 2004; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007).

Some authors analyse the influence of sociodemographic factors of the resident population on their perception of the impacts of tourism for the development of the region (Mason and Cheyne, 2000; Teye *et al.*, 2002; Tomljenovic and Faulkner, 2000). Age seems to influence the perception of these impacts and, according to Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), young residents tend to have a more positive attitude towards the effects of the tourism activity, compared to the older ones. Regarding gender, Harill and Potts (2003) conclude that women have a more negative perception of the impacts of tourism than men. Other studies have analysed the influence of the education level. According to Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), the population with a higher education level has a more positive attitude towards the impacts of tourism.

However, the evidence regarding the influence of sociodemographic factors is not corroborated by other authors. Sharma and Dyer (2009), considering the factors age, gender and level of education, conclude that these factors have no influence on the perception of residents regarding the impacts of tourism. Finally, other studies were not conclusive, since they detected a shallow influence of sociodemographic factors on the perception of residents (Mensah, 2012; Perdue, Long & Allen, 1990).

3 Methodology

The present study is based on a quantitative approach in the form of a questionnaire applied to a convenience sample, following a non-probability sampling method and using a group of residents easy to contact or to reach in the Regional Tourism Area of Lisbon (Table 1).

The questionnaire had two sections. The first section referred to the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents, namely age, gender, education level and professional activity. The second part of the questionnaire evaluated the perception of respondents regarding the economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts of tourism. The second section consisted of 10 statements on economic impacts (Q1–Q10), seven statements on social impacts (Q11–Q17), seven statements on cultural impacts (Q18–Q24) and, lastly, eight statements on environmental impacts (Q25–Q32). For the 32 statements (Table 1), a 5-point Likert scale was used, in which “1” meant “totally disagree” and “5” meant “totally agree”. The questionnaire was based on the literature, but the final version was specially designed for this study. Ten respondents were used for testing reasons, and subsequently, the questionnaire was fully approved.

Data collection was carried out between March and September 2018. The questionnaire was sent to the residents of the Regional Tourism Area of Lisbon through the municipal councils and higher education institutions involved in the study. The choice of electronic means for data collection was related to a set of advantages enumerated by Aaker (2007). These were: (1) the possibility of sending the questionnaires the number of times that the investigator considers necessary; (2) higher speed in sending and receiving responses and (3) the possibility of the questionnaires being answered according to the convenience and time of the interviewees.

After data collection, statistical treatment was performed using the IBM SPSS software. Firstly, descriptive statistical techniques were used to characterise the collected sample and to describe the perceptions of the respondents. Some of the answers (Q9, Q10, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q17, Q24, Q25, Q27, Q28, Q30, Q32) were recoded (inverting the responses on the scale) to homogenise the use of the Likert scale, since on these specific cases, without recoding, a higher point in the scale would not mean a positive attitude regarding tourism. In the second stage, non-parametric tests were used, namely Mann–Whitney and Kruskal–Wallis tests, to identify eventual, statistically significant differences in the perceptions of the respondents, considering their gender, age group and professional activity (linked, or not, to tourism).

Non-parametric methods provide an alternative series of statistical methods that require no, or very limited, assumptions to be made about the data. Non-parametric, or distribution-free tests, are so called because the assumptions underlying their use are “fewer and weaker than those associated with parametric tests” (Siegel & Castellan, 1988, p.34). These tests are most often used to analyse data which do not meet the distributional requirements of parametric methods. One of their advantages is that the data need not be quantitative, but can be categorical or rank data.

The *Mann–Whitney* test is a non-parametric test that is used to analyse data from two independent groups when the measurement is at least ordinal. It analyses the degree of separation between the two groups. The null hypothesis assumes that the two sets of scores are samples from the same population. The *Kruskal–Wallis* test is a non-parametric test that is used with $k > 2$ independent groups and when the measurement is at least ordinal. Because the samples are independent, they can be of different sizes. The null hypothesis is that the k samples come from the same population or populations with identical medians.

4 Discussion of Results

4.1 Sociodemographic Characteristics of Respondents

The study has collected data from a sample of 350 individuals, whose mean age is approximately 35 years, and of which 62% are males and 38% are females. Almost 50% of respondents have a degree, and more than 60% have a higher education level. The municipality with the highest representativeness in the sample is Setúbal, with more than 30% of respondents. The majority of respondents are working and 46% are employees. Also, 72% stated that their professional activity is not related to tourism.

4.2 Perception of Respondents on the Impacts of Tourism in the Regional Tourism Area of Lisbon

Respondents were asked to comment on a set of 32 statements about the economic, social, cultural and environmental impacts of tourism to analyse the perception of the residents in the Regional Tourism Area of Lisbon regarding the impacts of tourism in the community. Table 2 summa-

Table 1: Thirty-two statements in the questionnaire

Q1	Tourism brings important economic benefits for residents and the community
Q2	Tourism creates employment opportunities for community residents
Q3	One of the important aspects of tourism is the creation of a variety of jobs for community residents
Q4	Tourism helps to improve the economic situation for many residents of this community
Q5	Local businesses benefit from tourists
Q6	Tourism brings more investments to the economy of the community
Q7	Tourism generates tax revenues for local governments
Q8	Tourism tax revenues are used to improve infrastructure
Q9	The price of many goods and services has increased due to tourism
Q10	Real estate prices have increased due to tourism
Q11	Because of tourism, roads and local services are in good condition
Q12	Tourism is one of the main reasons for the variety of entertainment in the community
Q13	During the high season of tourism, it is harder to get tickets to the theatre, movies, concerts or sporting events
Q14	Tourism leads to undesirable overload in pedestrian pathways for residents
Q15	Tourism leads to undesirable overload in parks for residents
Q16	Tourism leads to overload of commercial spaces for residents
Q17	Tourism contributes to increasing social problems in the community (e.g., crime, the use of drugs, among others)
Q18	Meeting tourists from all over the world is definitely an enriching life experience
Q19	I would like to meet tourists from as many countries as possible to learn about their cultures
Q20	Cultural exchanges between residents and tourists are important for residents
Q21	Tourism has increased the pride of residents in the local community culture
Q22	Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities for residents
Q23	Tourism helps keep the culture alive and helps maintain the ethnic identity of residents
Q24	Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behaviour of tourists and to abandon cultural traditions
Q25	Hotels, airlines and other tourism-related companies that serve tourists produce tons of waste
Q26	Tourism does not contribute to the negative effect of vegetation and the loss of meadows and green spaces
Q27	Tourism leads to constraints at the level of automobile traffic
Q28	Tourist activities, such as recreational boating, produce problems of water pollution in lakes, bays, rivers or the ocean
Q29	Tourism contributes to preservation of the natural environment and protection of wildlife in the community
Q30	The waste caused by tourists destroys the beauty of the landscape
Q31	Tourism has improved the ecological environment of the community in many ways
Q32	Tourism produces noise that disturbs residents

raises the results of the descriptive statistics related to the perception of the respondents against the 32 statements.

To summarise, of the 32 questions, nine questions had an average higher than 4, and in these, about 80% of respondents agreed with the statements (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q5, Q6, Q7, Q18, Q19, Q20). These results indicate positive attitudes towards tourism, particularly in economic and cultural dimensions (questions from Q1 to Q7 refer to economic impacts and from Q18 to Q20 refer to cultural aspects). Also, five questions from economic and cultural

dimensions had an average close to 4 (Q4, Q21, Q22, Q23, Q24). Finally, 15 questions had an average close to 3 (Q8, Q11, Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16, Q25, Q26, Q27, Q28, Q29, Q30, Q31, Q32). These questions belong mainly to social (Q11–Q16) and environmental (Q25–Q32) dimensions.

These results confirm the findings of several studies referred in the literature review, namely the ones that establish the economic benefits of tourism for the population (Kim & Petrick, 2005; Waitt, 2003) and the contribution of tourism to the attracting investment and develop-

Table 2: Results of descriptive statistics

	Questions	Results
Economic impacts	Q1: Tourism brings significant economic benefits to community residents	More than 80% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale 1–5) was greater than 4
	Q2: Tourism creates job opportunities for community residents	More than 80% of the respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was greater than 4
	Q3: One of the important aspects of tourism is the creation of a variety of jobs for community residents	More than 80% of the respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was greater than 4
	Q4: Tourism helps improve the economic situation for many residents of this community	More than 50% of the respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was approximately 4
	Q5: Local businesses benefit from tourists	More than 80% of the respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was greater than 4
	Q6: Tourism brings more investment into the economy of the community	More than 80% of the respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was greater than 4
	Q7: Tourism generates tax revenues for local governments	More than 80% of the respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was greater than 4
	Q8: Tourism tax revenues are used to improve infrastructure (roads, highways and public services for residents)	In this case, 43% did not agree or disagree and 32% of respondents disagreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was less than 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q9: The price of many goods and services has increased due to tourism	More than 75% of respondents disagreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 2
	Q10: Real estate prices have increased due to tourism	Approximately 85% of respondents disagreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was around 2
Social impacts	Q11: Because of tourism, roads and local services are in good condition	In this case, 34% did not agree or disagree and 42% of respondents disagreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was close to 3, the midpoint of the scale, although lower
	Q12: Tourism is one of the main reasons for the variety of entertainment in the community	In this case, 32% did not agree or disagree and 48% of respondents agreed; the average (on the Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q13: During the high season of tourism, it is harder to get tickets to the theatre, movies, concerts or sporting events	In this case, 38% did not agree or disagree and 42% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q14: Tourism leads to undesirable overload in pedestrian pathways for residents	In this case, 28% did not agree or disagree and 41% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q15: Tourism leads to an undesirable overload in parks for residents	In this case, 33% did not agree or disagree and 40% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q16: Tourism leads to overload of commercial spaces for residents	In this case, 34% did not agree or disagree and 38% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q17: Tourism contributes to increasing social problems in the community (e.g., crime, the use of drugs, among others)	Approximately 60% of respondents disagreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was around 2

Table 2 continued: Results of descriptive statistics

	Questions	Results
Cultural impacts	Q18: Meeting tourists from all over the world is definitely an enriching life experience	About 87% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was higher than 4
	Q19: I would like to meet tourists from as many countries as possible to learn about their cultures	About 79% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was higher than 4
	Q20: Cultural exchange between residents and tourists is important for residents	About 77% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was over 4
	Q21: Tourism has increased the pride of residents in the local community culture	In this case, 30% did not agree or disagree and 57% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was approximately 4
	Q22: Tourism encourages a variety of cultural activities for residents	About 60% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was approximately 4
	Q23: Tourism helps keep the culture alive and helps maintain the ethnic identity of residents	About 51% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was approximately 4
	Q24: Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behaviour of tourists and to abandon cultural traditions	About 58% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 4
Environmental impacts	Q25: Hotels, airlines and other tourism-related companies that serve tourists produce tons of waste	About 50% of the respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was higher than 3
	Q26: Tourism does not contribute to the negative effect of vegetation and the loss of meadows and green spaces	In this case, about 43% did not agree or disagree, about 29% disagreed and about 29% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q27: Tourism leads to constraints at the level of automobile traffic	In this case, 31% did not agree or disagree and 37% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q28: Tourism activities, such as recreational boating, produce problems of water pollution in lakes, bays, rivers or the ocean	In this case, 41% did not agree or disagree and about 32% of respondents agreed; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q29: Tourism contributes to preservation of the natural environment and protection of wildlife in the community	In this case, 31% did not agree or disagree and about 43% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q30: The waste caused by tourists destroys the beauty of the landscape	In this case, 35% did not agree or disagree and about 34% of respondents agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q31: Tourism has improved the ecological environment of the community in many ways	In this case, 47% did not agree or disagree and about 27% of respondents disagreed with the statement; the average (on the Likert scale) was close to 3, the midpoint of the scale
	Q32: Tourism produces noise that disturbs residents	In this case, about 31% did not agree nor disagree and about the same percentage of respondents agreed or totally agreed with the statement; the average (on the inverted Likert scale) was approximately 3, the midpoint of the scale

ing businesses and the consequent increase in commercial activity (pointed out by Ritchie, 1984). The results also confirm other relevant evidence in the literature. This evidence refers to economic returns from tourism through job creation and other opportunities (Andereck et al., 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; Chen, 2000; Haralambopoulos & Pizam, 1996; Kim & Petrick, 2005; Korca, 1996; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Waitt, 2003) and more commercial opportunities to negotiate and consequently develop the local business environment (Aguiló et al., 2004; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; Chen, 2000; Dyer et al., 2007; Yoon et al., 2001). The results regarding the positive attitude towards cultural impacts are also consistent with the literature. These impacts are related to the positive influence on the services offered by the community (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Andereck et al., 2005; Bujosa & Rosselló, 2007; Gursoy et al., 2002; Liu & Cheung, 2016; Liu et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Yoon et al., 2001) and other cultural activities (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Chen, 2000; Yoon et al., 2001), its contribution to the maintenance and preservation of historic buildings and archaeological sites (Andereck et al., 2005; Oviedo et al., 2008; Yoon et al., 2001), the increasing pride and cultural identity (Andereck et al., 2005; Besculides et al., 2002; Yoon et al., 2001) and the preservation of cultural values (Andereck et al., 2005; Oviedo et al., 2008). The same can be said about social impacts, in particular, aspects concerning the improvement on the quality of life of residents (Liu & Cheung, 2016; Liu et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2017; McGehee & Andereck, 2004).

The perception concerning the overload (Q14–Q16) was neutral. However, other studies describe negative aspects perceived by residents, such as traffic congestion (Mason & Cheyne, 2000; McGehee & Andereck, 2004; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001) and parking problems (Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001). Concerning environmental impacts, literature also confirms the positive results (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010; Andereck et al., 2005; Liu & Cheung, 2016; Liu et al., 2017; Oviedo et al., 2008).

Concerning negative attitudes, six questions had an average lower than 3. Only three of these questions had an average of approximately 2 (Q9: The price of many goods and services increased due to tourism; Q10: Real estate prices have increased in the community due to tourism and Q17: Tourism contributes to increasing social problems in the community). These results are consistent with the literature. Several studies refer to residents' negative attitude towards a possible increase in delinquency and vandalism or crime (Andereck et al., 2005; Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Diedrich & García, 2009; Haralambopoulos

& Pizam, 1996; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997), or increased drug or alcohol use (Diedrich & García, 2009; Saveriades, 2000).

4.3 Differences in the perception of respondents by gender, professional activity and age

In the second stage, to detect the existence of significant differences in the perceptions of respondents considering some sociodemographic categories, following the line of investigation of several studies (e.g., Amin & Roy, 2016; Dale, 2019), non-parametric tests were used, namely Mann–Whitney and Kruskal–Wallis tests. Table 3 shows the main results of the Mann–Whitney and Kruskal–Wallis tests. In this table, it was decided to present only the results of sociodemographic variables where significant differences were observed.

Results reveal that men are more optimistic concerning the use of tourism tax revenues to improve infrastructures (Q8: Tourism tax revenues are used to improve infrastructure – roads, highways and public services for residents). On the other hand, women are more optimistic concerning social and cultural issues (Q13: During the high season of tourism, it is more difficult to get tickets for the theatre, movies, concerts or sporting events; Q18: Meeting tourists from all over the world is definitely an enriching life experience and Q24: Tourism encourages residents to imitate the behaviour of tourists and to abandon cultural traditions).

Results reveal that those who have a professional activity related to tourism are optimistic towards tourism and its economic impacts (Q1: Tourism brings significant economic benefits to community residents; Q3: One of the important aspects of tourism is the creation of a variety of jobs for community residents and Q5: Tourism brings more investment into the community economy). The optimism extends to the environmental impacts (Q28: Tourist activities, such as recreational boating, produce problems of water pollution in lakes, bays, rivers or ocean). Also, they are more optimistic about the opportunities that the interaction with tourists can provide to the residents (Q22: Meeting tourists from all over the world is definitely an enriching life experience and Q24: I would like to meet tourists from as many countries as possible to learn about their cultures).

Finally, older respondents are more optimistic about the economic impacts of tourism (Q5: Local businesses benefit from tourists; Q8: Tourism tax revenues are used to improve infrastructure; Q9: The price of many goods and services increased due to tourism and Q19: I would like to

Table 3: Results of non-parametric tests

	Question	Gender		Professional activity linked to tourism		Age group	
		Significance	Rank average	Significance	Rank average	Significance	Rank average
Economic impacts	Q1	--	--	**	>yes	--	--
	Q3	--	--	*	>yes	--	--
	Q5	--	--	**	>yes	**	>(51–65)
	Q8	**	>M	--	--	*	>(66)
	Q9	--	--	--	--	*	>(66)
Social impacts	Q12	--	--	--	--	*	>(–35)
	Q13	**	>F	--	--	*	>(–35)
	Q14	--	--	--	--	*	>(–35)
	Q17	--	--	--	--	*	>(–35)
	Q18	**	>F	--	--	--	--
Cultural impacts	Q19	--	--	--	--	*	>(51–65)
	Q22	--	--	*	>yes	--	--
	Q24	***	>F	***	>no	--	--
Environmental impacts	Q28	--	--	*	>yes	--	--
	Q29	--	--	--	--	*	>(–35)

*Significant for 0.01

**Significant for 0.05

***Significant for 0.1

meet tourists from as many countries as possible to learn about their cultures). Younger respondents are more optimistic about the social and cultural impacts (Q12: Tourism is one of the main reasons for the variety of entertainment in the community; Q13: During the high season of tourism, it is harder to get tickets to the theatre, movies, concerts or sporting events; Q14: Tourism leads to undesirable overloads in pedestrian pathways for residents; Q17: Tourism contributes to increasing social problems in the community, such as increase in crime, the use of drugs, among others and Q29: Tourism contributes to preservation of the natural environment and protection of wildlife in the community). Literature does not confirm these results. Some authors, like Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), who argue that age seems to influence the perception of tourism impacts have concluded that the young residents tend to have a more positive attitude about the effects of this activity, compared with older ones. However, in this study, the differences in perception, based on the age of residents, depend on the issue considered. In essence,

the oldest respondents are more optimistic about the economic benefits of tourism and the younger ones seem to be more optimistic about the social and cultural impacts.

5 Conclusions

The research objectives of this study were to describe the tourism impacts from the perspective of residents and to characterise the differences in the perception of tourism impacts across different sociodemographic groups.

The results of this research suggest that residents have a positive perception concerning economic, as well as cultural, social and environmental impacts. The most positive attitudes concerning tourism impacts refer to the economic and cultural dimensions. However, in some aspects, residents have a more negative attitude, namely “possible increase in delinquency and vandalism or crime or the increased drug or alcohol use” and “encourage-

ment of residents to imitate the behaviour of tourists and to abandon cultural traditions”.

Results also suggest that men are more optimistic about the use of tourism tax revenues to improve infrastructure and women are more optimistic about the social and cultural aspects. Residents who have professional activity related to tourism are more optimistic about the contribution of tourism to economic benefits as well as to environmental impacts. Also, they are more optimistic about the opportunities that interaction with tourists can provide to residents. Finally, the oldest residents are more optimistic about the economic impacts/benefits of tourism and younger ones are more optimistic about the social and cultural impacts.

This study highlights the importance of the inclusion of not only environmental, economic and social dimensions concerning sustainable tourism, but also other domains like public policy.

This study has some limitations. Firstly, the fact that a convenience sample was used. Secondly, it is a study based on the perception of residents. Therefore, it is difficult to establish how their opinions are based on reality/experience or expectations.

In any case, we believe that the results of this study can provide useful clues about the perceptions of different resident profiles allowing the adjustment of policies and strategies concerning the sustainable development of tourism in the Lisbon region.

Although the Lisbon region, as a whole, is one of the regions in Portugal with the highest levels of tourism activity, it has significant differences within it, concerning demand, supply and the tourism products offered. Destination maturity levels might influence residents' perceptions. Future research should focus on how those differences might predict the perception and attitudes of residents towards tourism. In the same line of ideas, another stream of research is the study of differences in the perception of residents from urban areas, such as Lisbon, and those from rural/interior regions.

Teresa Costa holds a PhD in Management and developed her Post PhD in Entrepreneurship and Social Capital in Tourism at the University of São Paulo. She is an assistant professor in the Department of Economics and Management at the School of Business Sciences at the Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal, Director of the Master in Hospitality Management in Health & Wellness and is responsible for several curricular units. She is an invited professor at several national and international universities where she collaborates in the teaching and responsibility of curricular units in masters and doctoral programs. She has

published widely in the areas of entrepreneurship, innovation, governance and sustainability in tourism. She is a researcher at the Centre for Tourism Research, Development and Innovation (CiTUR). Teresa participates as a researcher in several international and national projects, and she is an editor of international journals and books.

Jorge Umbelino holds a PhD and is “Agregado” in Geography and Territorial Planning. He is currently a full professor at Estoril Higher Institute for Tourism and Hotel Studies (ESHTE) and an integrated researcher at CiTUR. He has presented over a hundred oral communications at scientific and professional meetings, and he regularly publishes in the areas of tourism planning and destination management, accessible and inclusive tourism. Jorge has held several academic roles, such as Director for CiTUR, Chairman of the Technical-Scientific Council (ESHTE) and Director of a Scientific Journal (GeoINova). Outside the Academy, he had the opportunity to be, among other duties, President of the Institute for Tourism Training and Member of the Board of the National Authority for Tourism.

Maria de Lurdes Calisto has a PhD in management. She is an assistant professor at ESHTE, where she is a member of the Executive Committee of the Master in Hotel Management and the Center for Entrepreneurship and Business Development. She collaborates with the CEFAGE at the University of Évora, and is a member of CiTUR. She has published widely in the areas of management and business studies. Her research interests are business strategy, intrapreneurial behaviour and corporate entrepreneurship, human resources strategic management and innovation in services, particularly in the context of tourism, hotel and food service companies.

Sandra Nunes holds a PhD in Mathematics, with a specialisation in Statistics, from the Faculty of Science and Technology, New University of Lisbon. She is a coordinator professor in the area of quantitative methods in the Department of Economics and Management, Higher School of Business Sciences, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal. She investigates in areas of multivariate statistics applied to business sciences (linear and logistics regression, factor analysis, cluster analysis, forecasting, etc.). She is a member of the Center for Mathematics and Applications of the Faculty of Science and Technology of the New University of Lisbon.

Victor Alves Afonso has an MBA from ISEG-University of Lisbon. He is an assistant professor at the ESHTE, where

he is the coordinator of the Executive Master in Management of Rural Tourism and a member of the Center for Entrepreneurship and Business Development. He is also a researcher and member of Center for Advanced Studies in Management and Economics in Management and Economics (CEFAGE) at the University of Évora. His research interests are strategic management, marketing, innovation and entrepreneurship, business plans, tourism and hospitality.

Acknowledgements: The authors wish to thank the survey respondents. The research was financed by national funds through the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) | TARGET Project LISBOA-01-0145-FE-DER-024093.

References

- [1] Aaker, D. (2007). Innovation: Brand it or lose it. *California Management Review*, 50(1), 8-24.
- [2] Aguiló, E., Barros, V., García, M. A., & Rosselló, J. (2004). *Las actitudes de los residentes en Baleares frente al turismo*. Palma: Universidad de las Islas Baleares. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2010.08.040>.
- [3] Akis, S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: the case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 17(7), 481-494.
- [4] Alipour, H., Vaziri, R., & Ligay, E. (2011). Governance as Catalyst to Sustainable Tourism Development: Evidence from North Cyprus. *Journal of Sustainable Development* 4(5), DOI:10.5539/jsd.v4n5p32.
- [5] Amin, M. R., & Roy, B. (2016). Factors influencing tourists' perception towards Bangladeshi foods. *European Journal Of Business And Management*, 8(20), 63-74.
- [6] Amuquandoh, F. E. (2009). Residents' perceptions of the environmental impacts of tourism in the Lake Bosomtwe Basin, Ghana. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 18(2), 223-238.
- [7] Andereck, K. L., & Nyaupane, G. P. (2010). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3), 248-260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287510362918>.
- [8] Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., & Vogt, C. A. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 1056-1076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.03.001>.
- [9] Andereck, K. L., & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39, 27-36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728750003900104>.
- [10] Antón, S., & González, F. (Eds.). (2008). *A propósito del turismo*. Barcelona: Editorial UOC.
- [11] Aricak, B. (2015). Using remote sensing data to predict road fill areas and areas affected by fill erosion with planned forest road construction: a case study in Kastamonu Regional Forest Directorate (Turkey). *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 187(7), 417. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-015-4663-7>.
- [12] Balaguer, J., & Cantavella-Jorda, M. (2002). Tourism as a long-run economic growth factor: the Spanish case. *Applied Economics*, 34, (8), 877-884. DOI:10.1080/00036840110058923.
- [13] Besculides, A., Lee, M. E., & McCormick, P. J. (2002). Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(2), 303-319. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(01\)00066-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00066-4).
- [14] Bestard, A.B. & Nadal, R.J. (2007). Attitudes toward tourism and tourism congestion. *Regional Development*, 193-207.
- [15] Brida, J. G., Osti, L., & Faccioli, M. (2011). Residents' perception and attitudes towards tourism impacts: A case study of the small rural community of Folgaria (Trentino-Italy). *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 18(3), 359-385.
- [16] Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493-515. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00003-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00003-1).
- [17] Bujosa, A., & Rosselló, J. (2007). Modelling environmental attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28, 688-695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.04.004>.
- [18] Cerezo, J. M., & Lara de Vicente, F. (2005). El turismo como industria de España y de la Unión Europea. In G. López, J. Tomás & F. Lara de Vicente (Eds), *Turismo sostenible: un enfoque multidisciplinar internacional* (pp. 255-287). Córdoba, Universidad de Córdoba.
- [19] Cetin, M., Adiguzel, F., Kaya, O., & Sahap, A. (2016). Mapping of bioclimatic comfort for potential planning using GIS in Aydin. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 1-16, In press, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-016-9885-5>.
- [20] Cetin, M., Topay, M., Kaya, L. G., & Yilmaz, B. (2010). Efficiency of bioclimatic comfort in landscape planning process: case of Kutahya. *Turkish Journal of Forestry*, 1(1), 83-95.
- [21] Chen, J. S. (2000). An Investigation of urban residents' loyalty to tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 24, 5-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109634800002400101>.
- [22] Cho, L.-H. (2003). *The effects of social capital of green tourism project areas on community people's participation in the project in rural Korea*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Seoul National University.
- [23] Collins, A., Flynn, A., Munday, M., & Roberts, A. (2007). Assessing the Environmental Consequences of Major Sporting Events: The 2003/04 FA Cup Final. *Urban Studies*, 44 (3), 457-476. DOI:10.1080/00420980601131878.
- [24] Dale, N. F. (2019). Gender and other factors that influence tourism preferences. In *Gender Economics: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 454-471). IGI global.
- [25] Diedrich, A., & García, E. (2009). Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management*, 30, 512-521. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.10.009.
- [26] Dyer, P., Gursoy, D., Sharma, B., & Carter, J. (2007). Structural modelling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 28, 409-422. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2006.04.002.
- [27] Fletcher, J., Fyall, A., Gilbert, D., & Wanhill, S. (2017). *Tourism: Principles and Practice*, Person, UK; sixth edition.

- [28] Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2010). Local's attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: The case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 381–394.
- [29] Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes. A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287513506295>.
- [30] Hall, C. (1992). *Hallmark Tourist Events: Impacts: Management and Planning*, Chichester: John Wiley.
- [31] Haralambopoulos, N. & Pizam, A. (1996). Perceived impacts of tourism: The case of Samos, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 503–526. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(95\)00075-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(95)00075-5).
- [32] Harrill, R., & Potts, T. (2003). Tourism planning in historic districts: Attitudes toward tourism development in Charleston. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 69(3), 233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944360308978017>.
- [33] Huh, C.; Vogt, C.A. (2008). Changes in residents' attitudes toward tourism over time: A cohort analytical approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46, 446–455.
- [34] Huijbregts, M.A.J., Hellweg, S., Frischknecht, R., Hungerbühler, K.A. & Hendriks, J. (2008). Ecological footprint accounting in the life cycle assessment of products. *Ecological Economics*, 64 (4), 798–807. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.04.017.
- [35] Hunter, C. (2002). Aspects of the sustainable tourism debate from a natural resources' perspective. In R. Harris., T. Griffin., & P. Williams (Eds.), *Sustainable Tourism* (pp.3–23). Burlington: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- [36] Hunter, C. & Shaw, J. (2007). The ecological footprint as a key indicator of sustainable tourism. *Tourism Management*, 28(1), pp. 46–57. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2005.07.016, 016.
- [37] Jones, C., & Munday, M. (2007). Exploring the Environmental Consequences of Tourism: A Satellite Account Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(2), 164–172. DOI:10.1177/0047287507299592.
- [38] Kim, S., & Petrick, J. (2005). Residents' perceptions on impacts of the FIFA 2002 World Cup: The case of Seoul as a host city. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 25–38.
- [39] King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, A. (1993). Social Impacts of Tourism: Host Perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(4), 650–665. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(93\)90089-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(93)90089-L).
- [40] Korca, P. (1998). Resident perceptions of tourism in a resort town, *Leisure Science*, 20(3), 193–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.1999.tb00382.x>.
- [41] Korca, P. (1996). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 695–726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2014.11.002>.
- [42] Kousis, M. (2000). Tourism and the Environment. A Social Movements Perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 2 (29), 468–489.
- [43] Kuvan, Y., & Akan, P. (2005). Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: The case of Belek, Antalya. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 691–706.
- [44] Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 121–139.
- [45] Lee, C. C., & Chang, C. P. (2008). Tourism development and economic growth: A closer look at panels. *Tourism Management*, 2 (1), 180–192. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2007.02.013.
- [46] Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modelling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 402–424. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)80009-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)80009-6).
- [47] Liu, S., Cheng, I. & Cheung, L. (2017). The roles of formal and informal institutions in small tourism business development in rural areas of South China. *Sustainability*, 9, 1194.
- [48] Liu, S. & Cheung, L.T.O. (2016). Sense of place and tourism business development. *Tourism Geographies*, 18, 174–193.
- [49] Liu, W. Vogt, C.A., Lupi, F. He, G. Ouyang, Z. & Liu, J. (2016). Evolution of tourism in a flagship protected area of china. *J. Sustainable Tourism*, 24, 203–226.
- [50] Mason, P., & Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391–411.
- [51] McGehee, N., & Andereck, K. (2004). Factors predicting rural residents' support of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 131–140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268234>.
- [52] Mensah, C. (2012). Residents' Perception of Socio-economic Impacts of Tourism in Tafi Atome, Ghana. *Asian Social Science*, 8(15), 274–289.
- [53] Min, Z., Xiaoli, P. & Bihu, W. (2012). Research on residents' perceptions on tourism impacts and attitudes: A case study of Pingyao ancient city. In *Proceedings of the 6th Conference of the International Forum on Urbanism (IFoU)*, Tourbanism, Barcelona, 25–27 January 2012; pp. 1–10.
- [54] Muresan I.C., Oroian, C.F., Harun, R., Arion, F.H., Porutiu, A., Chiciudean, G.O., Todea A., Lile, R. (2016). Local Residents' Attitude toward Sustainable Rural Tourism Development, *Sustainability*, 8 (1), 100, DOI:10.3390/su8010100.
- [55] Oklevik, O., Gössling, S., Hall, C.M., Jacobsen, J.K.S., Grøtte, I.P. & McCabe, S. (2019) Overtourism, optimisation, and destination performance indicators: a case study of activities in Fjord Norway, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27:12, 1804–1824, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2018.1533020.
- [56] Oviedo, M. A., Castellanos, M., & Martin, D. (2008). Gaining residents' support for tourism and planning. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 10, 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.644>.
- [57] Park, D., Lee, K., Choi, H., & Yoon, Y. (2012). Factors influencing social capital in rural tourism communities in South Korea. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1511–1520. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2012.02.005.
- [58] Park, D., Yoon, Y.-S., & Lee, M.-S. (2007). A multinomial logistic regression model on residents' social capital in rural tourism villages in Korea. *Journal of Tourism and Leisure Research*, 19(4), 27–46.
- [59] Park, K. S., & Kerstetter, D. L. (2002). Social network approach in leisure and tourism research. *The Journal of Tourism and Cultural Research*, 4(1), 349–371.
- [60] Perdue, R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586–599.
- [61] Ramkissoon, H.; Weiler, B. & Smith, L. D. G. (2012): Place attachment and pro-environmental behaviour in national parks: the development of a conceptual framework, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI:10.1080/09669582.2011.602194.

- [62] Ritchie, J. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(1), 2-11.
- [63] Saveriades, A. (2000). Establishing the social tourism carrying capacity for the tourist resorts of the east coast of the Republic of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 21, 147-156. DOI: 10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00044-8.
- [64] Sebastian, L.M. & Rajagopalan, P. (2009) Socio-cultural transformations through tourism: a comparison of residents' perspectives at two destinations in Kerala, India, *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 7, 5-21.
- [65] Sharma, B. & Dyer, P. (2009), Residents' involvement in tourism and their perceptions of tourism impacts, *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 16/(3), 351-371. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14635770910961371>.
- [66] Sheldon, P. J., & Abenoja, T. (2001). Resident attitudes in a mature destination: The case of Waikiki. *Tourism Management*, 22, 435-443. DOI: 10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00009-7.
- [67] Siegel, S., & Castellan, N. J. (1988). *The case of k related samples. Nonparametric statistics for behavioral sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 170-4.
- [68] Stein, T. & Anderson, D. (1999). *Community Benefits Summary: Ithasca and Tettegouche State Parks, Final Report*. St. Paul MN: Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota.
- [69] Steward, C.W., & Kuska, S. (2010). Developing and Sustaining Creative Cities: a sustainable tool for designers, planners, and public administration. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 13 (1/2), 6-16. DOI:10.1504/IJSD.2010.035095.
- [70] Teye, V., Sonmez, S. F., & Sirakaya, E. (2002). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668-688.
- [71] Tomljenovic, R., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Tourism and older residents in a Sunbelt Resort. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), 93-114.
- [72] UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) (2017). *Yearbook of Tourism Statistics*. Madrid, UNWTO.
- [73] UN World Tourism Organization (UNWTO). (2008). *World Tourism Barometer*. Retrieved from www.unwto.org/infoship.
- [74] Uysal, M., Perdue, R. & Sirgy, R. (2012). *Handbook of Tourism and Quality-of-Life Research: Enhancing the Lives of Tourists and Residents of Host Communities*. Springer: Dordrecht, The Netherlands; New York, NY, USA.
- [75] Waitt, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 194-215. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(02\)00050-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00050-6).
- [76] World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC). (2004). *World travel & tourism: A world of opportunity*. The 2004 travel & tourism economic research. London: WTTC.
- [77] Yoon, Y., Gursoy, D., & Chen, J. S. (2001). Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation modelling. *Tourism Management*, 22, 363-372. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(00\)00062-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00062-5).
- [78] Yucedag, C., Kaya, L.G. & Cetin, M. Environ Monit Assess (2018). *Identifying and assessing environmental awareness of hotel and restaurant employees' attitudes in the Amasra District of Bartin*, 190: 60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-017-6456-7>.
- [79] Zhao, W., Ritchie, J., & Echtner, C. (2011). Social capital and tourism entrepreneurship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), 1570-1593.