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**Abstract**

In recent years peripheral regions, such as Guimarães, in the Northwest of Portugal, has been experiencing the expansion of its tourism industry. This occurred, may be, as part of the wish felt by a large number of tourists of reaching “unspoilt” landscapes and more “authentical” experiences (Nepal, 2008). After the nomination by U.N.E.S.C.O., in 2001, of its historical centre as world heritage, the city of Guimarães is now in the process of hosting the 2012 European Capital of Culture. These recent facts helped to reinforce its
external visibility and cultural significance and put it in the trail to become a more consolidated cultural tourism destination.

This paper aims presenting a few results of a survey that envisaged capturing the Guimarães residents’ perceptions of tourism effects and attitudes regarding the tourists. The survey was implemented between January and March 2010 to a convenience sample of 540 inhabitants of the municipality of Guimarães. The results show that the Guimarães’ residents keep a strong positive perception of the tourism benefits. The more or less favourable perception of tourism impacts the survey respondents kept are strongly correlated with some demographic features, such as age, gender and level of education. As expected, we got a more positive perception among the younger cohorts of age and the ones endowed with a higher level of education.
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Introduction
The city of Guimarães, in the northwest of Portugal, is a place of strong symbolic and cultural significance. The nomination by U.N.E.S.C.O. of its historical centre as world heritage, in December 2001, enlarged its tourism potential. Mostly since that date, as an emergent tourism destination, the city is attracting an increasing amount of visitors.

This paper aims presenting a few results of a survey that envisaged capturing the Guimarães residents’ perception of tourism impacts and their attitudes vis-à-vis the tourists. The survey was implemented between January and March 2010 to a convenience sample of 540 inhabitants of the municipality of Guimarães. Going on with the survey process, we chose four local secondary schools and one professional school to use has a basis to reach the goal of completely covering the 69 parishes which, administratively, constitute the municipality and, in theory, to include three generations of inhabitants in the survey: the 15-24 years old; the 25-64 years old; and the 65 or more years old residents. The questionnaire was designed based on a list of issues compiled from the literature on residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts.

Generally speaking, results attained tell us that the Guimarães municipality residents have more propensities to contact with tourists when have more positive perception of
tourism impacts, have higher education and live in more urban parishes, as expected. The more surprising result was that residents with non-tourism related jobs have more propensities to contact with tourists than those with tourism related jobs.

In the present paper, we will evaluate some perceptions collected (according to Ap, 1992, as the meaning attributed to an object) and attitudes (according to Ap, 1992, as a person’s continuing predisposition or action tendencies to some objects). Regarding the issue, lately, Nepal (2008) subscribing Eagly and Chaiken point of view (1993), considered attitude as a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degrees of favour or disfavour (Nepal, 2008: 46).

This paper has to do with a research project that began in October 2009 and will be implemented until 2012, the year Guimarães will host the European Capital of Culture. The main objectives of that research project are: i) to identify the Guimarães residents’ perception of the benefits of the tourism industry; ii) to identify the tourists’ preferences and their image of Guimarães as a tourism destination; iii) to produce a package of recommendations in terms of local tourism planning and tourism promotion and management that allow the town and its tourism agents to take better profit from tourism development and prevent or minimize tourism negative impacts; and iv) to induce Guimarães authorities and local tourism agents to develop a greater level of partnership with neighbour municipalities in terms of cultural programming and external tourism promotion. This paper is the second effort (see previous papers of Vareiro, Cadima Ribeiro, Remoaldo and Marques, 2010; Cadima Ribeiro and Remoaldo, 2011) to accomplish these goals and it is centred in the first and third aims.

The first section of the paper provides a review of the literature on residents’ perception of tourism benefits and their attitudes regarding tourism and tourists. In section 2, we present a few characteristics of the municipality of Guimarães; in section 3 we clear the methodology used; and, in section 4, we discuss the results we got from the residents’ survey, implemented between January and March 2010. The last section of the paper offers the concluding remarks and some policy recommendations.

The main output we intend to get from this research is contributing to the implementation of a more sustainable tourism strategy, able to preserve the cultural heritage and creating new jobs benefiting the local population. For that, we strong
believe political tourism policies have to take into account the perception of residents about tourism, as they are important and irreplaceable stakeholders of the industry.

1-Tourism impacts and the host-tourist interaction

The implementation of a sustainable tourism strategy has to take into account the study of the economic, environmental and social impacts of tourists’ presence (Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Williams and Lawson, 2001; Besculides, Lee and McCormick, 2002; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Ritchie and Inkari, 2006). But, if we face tourism as a source of employment creation and of economic growth, we must be aware of the perception and attitudes of host communities and to do its follow up on a frequent basis (Jackson, 2008).

This means that the general planning policy must be aware of the opportunity to reinforce the positive impacts (optimization of the benefits) of the tourism industry and of mitigating or minimize the negative ones felt by host communities (Ritchie and Inkari, 2006). This approach implies to listen to the host communities regarding their concerns about the industry development and to really make residents part of decision making process (Brunt and Courtney, 1999).

The idea that residents must be taken as important stakeholders of the touristic activity, comes from the fact that they are an integrant part of the cultural tourism phenomenon and, being so, can be decisive for the success of tourism destinations (Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Nepal, 2008; Souza, 2009; Cadima Ribeiro and Remoaldo, 2011; Eusébio and Carneiro, 2010). This general idea could already be found in papers regarding the issue produced in the first half of the nineties of the past century, like the ones of Ap (1992) and Lankfort (1994), as underlined by Brunt and Courtney (1999).

The socio-cultural effects of tourism (seen as contributes toward change in value systems, individual behaviour, family relationships, collective life styles, safety levels and so forth - Ritchie and Inkari, 2006) are better documented in developing countries or at a more general level than in developed countries, even if the social impacts should be studied in first place (Brunt and Courtney, 1999). The truth is that social and cultural impacts of tourism have not been investigated until present following a consistent way, even if this type of impacts regard people (people impacts), that is the effects on host
communities of their direct and indirect association with tourists (Ritchie and Inkari, 2006).

Besculides, Lee and McCormick (2002) consider socio-cultural benefits (learning, awareness, appreciation, family bonding, community pride, a firmer sense of ethnic identity, increased understanding and tolerance) as one of the fourth types of benefits of tourism activity. The other categories are the personal (physical and psychological), the economic and the environmental benefits.

It is well known that, for long time, most of the investigation undertaken has been concerned with the profile of tourists (their motivations and behaviours) and its impact to the host population. This has been a fact in almost all social sciences (e.g., psychology, sociology, geography, economy). Nevertheless, since the nineties of the twentieth century several studies have investigated the residents’ attitudes regarding tourists and tourism development (Brunt and Courtney, 1999). Between the authors that conducted this kind of research we can find Ap and Crompton (1993), Lankford and Howard (1994), Ryan and Montgomery (1994), Hernandez, Cohen and Garcia (1996) and Lankford, Williams and Knowles-Lankford (1997). Before them, remarkable by the pioneer work in this field, we should mention Murphy (1985).

Besides the authors previously mentioned, from the last ten to twelve years, we can retain the investigations envisaging this same issue held by Lawson, Williams, Young, and Cossens (1998), Besculides, Lee and McCormick (2002), Kuvan and Akan (2005), Sharma and Dyer (2009), McDwall and Choi (2010), among several others.

Recent literature (e.g., McDwall and Choi, 2010) tell us that, when residents have a positive perception about the benefits of tourism, they tend to develop more favourable attitudes concerning tourism, and that contributes to a more interaction with visitors. This interaction can be important to achieve an increase of satisfaction of the tourists and to the developing of costumer loyalty (Eusébio and Carneiro, 2010). From here, we can also conclude that “work with people” and not only “work to the people” must be a central concern in any strategy of touristic development (Eusébio and Carneiro, 2010).

As mentioned, residents can give an important contribution to the identification and measuring of tourism impacts (Getz, 1994; Zhang et al., 2006), this way, allowing the authorities to adjust their policies towards tourism. By another side, the identification and measurement of these impacts allows them to identify the quality of life felt by the
host community. This is quite relevant as we must consider that not only tourism can be a major contributor to global prosperity, but also the phenomenon “will shape the lifestyles, societal structures, and inevitably the quality of life” of the host communities” (Crouch and Ritchie, 1999: 138).

The residents’ perception of tourism impacts is a quite recent field of research in Portugal. Until now, just a few empirical studies were produced, namely the ones of Monjardino (2009), Souza (2009), and Eusébio and Carneiro (2010). As mentioned, this was not the case in the international context, where several studies dealing either with residents’ perceptions or with residents’ attitudes towards tourism and associated impacts were conducted since the eighties and nineties of the last century. Nevertheless, not long ago, some authors pointed out that limited research has been conducted on residents’ attitudes toward the special case of cultural tourism development (Ritchie and Inkari, 2006).

Taking different approaches, most of the research conducted explores residents’ socio-demographic characteristics, trying to establish a link between that and their perceptions and attitudes regarding the tourism industry (e.g., Lawson, Williams, Young, and Cossens, 1998; Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Besculides, Lee and McCormick, 2002; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Sharma and Dyer, 2009).

The host communities’ perceptions should be taken into account in planning and in daily management of the tourism industry, specifically if a sustainable development of the tourism destination is envisaged. One of the most valuable outcomes one can get from the evaluation of the perceptions and attitudes of the residents’ is the minimization of the friction between tourists and residents (Lankford and Howard, 1994), this way contributing to the before mentioned sustainable tourism development project.

There are several factors that can influence residents’ attitudes towards tourism and tourists (Mason and Cheyne, 2000). The major difficulty regarding the issue is that the relationship between those factors and the perceptions of the tourism impacts has largely revealed to be inconsistent from research to research (Pearce, Moscardo and Ross, 1996; Lawson, Williams, Young and Cossens, 1998). Saying this, the objective is to underline that some contradictory findings were found. Even so, some empirical research suggest that socio-demographic variables, such as “gender”, “age”, 
“birthplace” and “level of community attachment”, “ethnicity”, “education level” and “length of residence” can affect it.

Other variables that can also influence the residents’ perceptions are: tourist-resident contact; proximity to resorts; economic dependency; economic and tourism development; level of knowledge about tourism; and involvement of residents in tourism decision making (Cordero, 2008; Sharma and Dyer, 2009). Some of those variables do not have been taken into account by several of the researchers. Recently, in a critical theoretical and methodological review of the published investigations since the seventies of the XX\textsuperscript{th} century, Cordero (2008) related that to the considerable variety in theoretical and methodological approaches that have been followed. That would tend to difficult the academic progress in the study of host communities’ tourism perceptions. From there, also, would come the lack of theoretical foundations of the approaches to the issues that have been taken (Cordero, 2008).

Explicitly, the contradictions in the findings about residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism can result from circumstances such as: the “variation of instruments, sampling techniques, methodologies and theoretical frameworks perceptions” (Cordero, 2008: 39). Additionally, according the before mentioned author (Cordero, 2008: 39), most of the findings “cannot be generalisable outside of the sampling frame”. Being so, the only thing we can conclude is that the empirical literature indicates mix findings when the relationship between the residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism and their socio-demographic features is approached.

This is not a new problem as, at least since the eighties of the XX\textsuperscript{th} century, investigation done showed mix findings in that relationship (e.g., Ritchie, 1988; Haralambopoulos and Pizam, 1996; Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Chen, 2000; Jones, Jurowski and Uysal, 2000; Teye, Sönmez and Sirakaia, 2002; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Cordero, 2008). Aware of that, research to be conduct need to take into account the particular characteristics of the residents’, mainly, their social and demographic background. This can influence perceptions. Also, the existing values and moral principles can help understanding this issue (Cordero, 2008).

There are different types of studies dealing with the host-tourist interaction: the ones that make the analysis of the interaction between visitors; the ones that analyse the interaction between residents’ and visitors from the visitors’ perspective; and, finally,
the ones that make the analysis of the interaction between residents’ and visitors from the residents’ perspective. The studies conducted by Brunt and Courtney (1999), Besculides, Lee and McCormick (2002), Nepal (2008), Eusébio and Carneiro (2010), as the one conducted in the aim of our research project are part of this last group.

The social contact (as the personal contact between a visitor and a resident) can occur in many situations. In the case of a cultural destination, it can happen when the visitor is: buying some products to the residents; using some services (e.g., hotels, restaurants); visiting a monument or using public transportation (Bus, taxi); participating in some cultural activities (e.g., concerts, festivals or fairs); asking for some information or in exchanging ideas.

Even if there are several opportunities for the host-visitor interaction, this type of contact is generally temporary, brief, superficial, commercial and formal in some occasions, as well as asymmetric from the point of view of the visitor or one of the residents (De Kadt, 1979; Reisinger and Turner, 2003, in Eusébio and Carneiro, 2010). The asymmetric relationship results from the fact that the resident is generally working, trying to satisfy his need of survival, while the visitor is trying to benefit from his/her leisure time, satisfying his/her recreation needs, dealing with moments that can give him/her pleasure (Eusébio and Carneiro, 2010).

In the case of Guimarães, as the visitors are in the majority of cases from countries very similar of the Portuguese one, one must assume that the values systems of tourists and residents should not be very different.

Brunt and Courtney (1999) used the frequency and the type of contact to evaluate the interaction between host and visitor. Some limitations of that methodological approach can pointed out, namely, the ones that result from the impossibility of taking into account the plurality of spaces existing in the destination, and of acknowledging the kind of interaction verified, that surely can be quite different (Eusébio and Carneiro, 2010).

Taking that in account, in our questionnaire, we made appeal to the frequency of the interaction (question 5 of the questionnaire) and also to the kind of interaction that occurred, namely if it took place in the aim of a job (question 6). We also asked the residents if their ever modified his/her life habits to avoid the contact with visitors (question 7) or the places where the residents’ like to visit (questions 8 and 9).
As emphasised, we realize that there are few studies dealing with the interaction host-visitor and that there are even fewer dealing with the factors that command that interaction. This took us of paying a special attention to those research issues in the aim of our empirical research.

2-Some data about the territory

Guimarães is located in the Ave Valley, in the northern part of Portugal, and is at present one of the most important towns in that territory, after Oporto, Vila Nova de Gaia and Braga. The Ave Valley has been identified for centuries as an industrial district, marked by the presence of a few traditional manufacturing sectors, like textile, clothes and footwear. Until present, the tourism sector is mostly a complementary industry of the local economy. Within the Valley, due to its patrimonial heritage, Guimarães is the most promising municipality in what the tourism industry development regards. Guimarães has revealed a sustainable population increase (162636 inhabitants in 2008 – Instituto Nacional de Estatística, 2009a), being one of the youngest municipalities in the northern part of the country. It has a central geographical location, as results from being just 50 km far from the most important cities in north of Portugal (Oporto and Vila Nova de Gaia) and Oporto Airport and 160 km from the Vigo-Peinador Airport (in Galicia - Spain). Besides, it is well connected by motorways to these and other main towns of Portugal and Galicia. The development of the University of Minho (campus de Azurém) in the last three decades is another important factor to consider in order to understand its importance in the regional context.

On the other hand, the hosting of the 2012 European Capital of Culture and its certification by U.N.E.S.C.O., in 2001, as World Heritage Site by U.N.E.S.C.O. are being facilitating factors of its external visibility in the way to capturing an increasing amount of visitants. A sustainable growth in the number of visitors is reached since 2000. Despite the increase of number of visitors, in 2008, the average stay of foreign guests at Guimarães was only of 1.8 nights (Instituto Nacional de Estatística, 2009b), quite less than the Portugal main-land average (3.3), and even slightly less the northern region, as a whole (2.1), or the Ave Valley (1.9). When we look just to the eight NUTS III which belong to the northern part of the country, only Douro (1.7) and Alto Trás-os-Montes (1.5) have been facing a lower number of nights of stay. Considering the eight
municipalities that belong to the Ave Valley (even if there are no recent statistics for four of them), Guimarães is the one that has a lower average stay of foreign guests, similar to the one of Vieira do Minho.

This does not match with its tourism potential neither with its lodging capacity, as Guimarães municipality is the second one in hotel rooms per 1000 inhabitants (7.4). The similar figure for the Ave Valley is 4.7, while the northern region of Portugal one, as a whole, is 10.4. The national correspondent average is 25.8.

The net bed-occupation rate registered in the year 2008 was 34.4%, which should be compared with the 41.3% national one. Even in the proportion of foreign guests (37.9%), Guimarães has to improve as it is far from the national average (52.8%). The suitable position it succeeds to have in the Ave Valley (first position) only means that the Ave Valley, besides Guimarães, is not a tourism destination.

From the 148565 total number of nights of hotel bed-occupation, in 2008, 134998 concerned people from countries of the EU 27 (Portugal, in first place, with 84648 nights, followed by Spain with 19327, France with 9345 and German with 4934).

As a last remark, one must emphasize that we are facing a place of deep symbolic meaning as well of strong cultural identity. That is related with the fact that Guimarães is faced by Portuguese people as the cradle of the nation. Of course, its sense of cultural identity was reinforced by its certification as a World Heritage Site.

### 3-Methods

**Main objectives**

As told before, the main objectives of this study are: i) to identify the Guimarães residents’ perception of the impacts of the tourism industry; ii) to synthesize the impacts perceived of the tourism industry, via factor analyses, and, then, to examine the major differences that we could find in terms of sensitivity to those impacts by socio-demographic subgroup.

From the empirical results obtained, we will attempt to extract a first set of policy recommendations.

**Questionnaire design**
In the context of this investigation, based on previous studies concerning economic, socio-cultural and environmental tourism impacts (Besculides, Lee & McCormick, 2002; Jackson, 2008; Kuvan & Akan, 2005; Ritchie, Shipway & Cleeve, 2009; Sharma & Dyer, 2009; Williams & Lawson, 2001) a total of 14 items encompassing residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts were selected. Additionally, we followed and adapted a questionnaire applied by Monjardino (2009) to Azores, dealing with the issue of residents’ perception of its tourism development.

Since Guimarães is a cultural destination, we decide to approach the socio-cultural impacts: 6 items were used to measure the perceived positive socio-cultural impacts and 3 items the negative socio-cultural impacts; 3 items were used to measure economic benefits and 1 item tried to capture the perceived economic problems; and, finally, 1 item addressed the perceived negative environmental impacts. Responses to the items were all measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = “completely disagree” and 5 = “completely agree”). Respondents’ socio-demographic information (age, gender, education level, household income, occupation, link to the industry) was also included in the questionnaire. A few geographic variables, such as being born in the municipality, the length of time the person had been living in the municipality of Guimarães and the parish where he/she was living were also included.

Data collection

Taking into account the objectives underlined, we based the research on primary and secondary data. As primary data, we conducted a survey with the residents on their perceptions of the impacts of tourism. The questionnaire was applied to a convenience sample of 540 residents from the municipality of Guimarães, between January and March 2010.

In order to create the sample, we contacted four public local secondary schools and one public professional school. Three of the schools involved in are situated nearby the historical centre (Martins Sarmento High School, Francisco de Holanda High School and the CISAVE Professional School), one is located two kilometres from the centre (Santos Simões High School) and another is in Caldas das Taipas (Caldas das Taipas High School), which is the second most important urban centre in the municipality. This
allowed us to almost cover the 69 parishes which, administratively, constitute the municipality.

We chose the High Schools as a way to include in our survey, in theory, three generations of inhabitants: the 15-24 years old; the 25-64 years old; and the 65 or more years old residents. With that aim, we established contact with the Head of each school and asked for the assistance of teachers who could hand out the questionnaires to their pupils. Following that process, in a second moment, the students who were over 16 years old were asked to include their brothers/sisters, parents and grandparents in the study by asking them to also answer the survey. Each teacher gave three questionnaires to each student over 16 and asked them to return them within a two weeks time schedule. As the sample revealed itself to be biased, under-representing the 25-64 year old section of Guimarães residents, in a second phase, we asked adults that were making use of the services of the municipal council to fill in the same questionnaire. That took place during the month of March.

A pre-test involving 19 Guimarães residents had been conducted between 30th November and 4th December 2009. The time estimated to fill in the questionnaire, of almost four pages, was 10 minutes.

A total of 540 usable surveys were returned, which constituted a response rate of 67.1% of the questionnaires handed out. Examination of missing data indicated that this occurred completely at random.

The simplest and most direct approach for dealing with missing data is the complete case approach, considering only those questionnaires with complete data (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). After eliminating incomplete answers, 400 with complete data were retained for analysis.

Data analysis

Since we have several variables (14) to measure perceived impacts of tourism in Guimarães, one decide making use of factor analysis (with varimax rotation and using principal components as extraction method) to reduce data, transforming the original set of 14 variables into a smaller set of representative factors. The use of factorial analysis in this study relies on a previous diagnosis based on the computation of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistics and on the Bartlett test. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients evaluate
the reliability of the obtained factors. Further, the impact factors output were then used as dependent variables to examine differences between socio-demographic subgroups, using independent sample t tests or ANOVA tests (depending on the type of independent variables).

4-Results

Profile of respondents

Table 1 summarizes the socio-demographic profile of the survey sample. Over one half of the respondents (53.2%) were female. This result is close to the one of other studies, such as the one of Sharma and Dyer (2009). The sample was compared with municipality figures to check its representativeness. Regarding the gender characteristics of the municipality of Guimarães, following the 2008 forecasts from the National Institute of Statistics, we found that 50.8% of its residents were females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 – Some respondents’ characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th - 9th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th - 12th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ own survey data.

The largest age cohort of respondents was the one aged between 25-64 years old (53.2%), followed by the 15-24 years old (31.5%) and the 65 or more years old (15.2%) ones. Despite the effort made to insure a better representativeness of Guimarães’ population, the cohort of the 25-64 years old respondents remained under-represented in the sample (69.5% was the corresponding municipality proportion).

A total of 31.7% the survey respondents was endowed with a secondary education and 18.0% with a higher education level. Taking the population universe, the most represented education level in the municipality in 2001 was that having a primary (6
years) education level (55.7%) and only 6.6% of Guimarães’ residents had a higher education level. We can, of course, admit some change in those figures occurred after 2001, but the improvement attained in the level of education rates would not be enough to insure the representativeness of the respondents of our sample.

According to the empirical literature review, residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts and their attitudes towards tourists is also influenced by several other factors, like the contact they establish with them, their economic dependence from the sector, the place of residence, and the level of income. Since the majority of the parishes in the municipality are not endowed with any tourism equipment, we found not strange that the majority of respondents (60.5%) lived in a parish with very low or no tourism potential (in order to be classified has a parish with tourism potential, the parish should have, at least, two specific tourism infrastructures). On the other hand, 79.8% live in “Predominantly Urban Areas” (APU).

Perceptions toward tourism impacts

The tourism impact statements shown in Table 2 illustrate that promotion of contact with other cultures is the principal perceived effect (48.2% agree and 45.2% completely agree with that), followed by the encouragement to preserve local culture and handicrafts (53.2% agree and 37.2% completely agree). Although the results expressed a fairly positive opinion about tourism industry, some of Guimarães’ inhabitants did express concerns about some issues, such as the following: 39.0% agree and 10.8% completely agree that tourism increases prices and, additionally, 17.0% were concerned with the increasing of the crime rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects of Tourism in Guimarães:</th>
<th>Completely disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Completely agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotes contact with different cultures</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages local culture and handicrafts</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids the conservation and restoration of historic buildings</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates jobs for residents</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps supply new services for residents</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of services (e.g., restaurants, cafes, bars, shops) in</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guimarães is now better due to tourism.
Residents have easy access to services used by tourists.
Money spent by tourists is kept by municipality agents and residents.
Increases prices.
Guimarães has control on tourism management and planning.
Increases crime rates.
Generates excessive noise in the Historical Center.
Local people change their behavior in an attempt to mimic the behavior of tourists.
Tourism limits the access of residents to leisure sites and equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.8</th>
<th>8.5</th>
<th>28.5</th>
<th>52.8</th>
<th>8.5</th>
<th>3.58</th>
<th>0.831</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents have easy access to services used by tourists</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money spent by tourists is kept by municipality agents and residents</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimarães has control on tourism management and planning</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases crime rates</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generates excessive noise in the Historical Center</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local people change their behavior in an attempt to mimic the behavior of tourists</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism limits the access of residents to leisure sites and equipment</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD = standard deviation.
Source: authors’ own survey data.

Before approaching the factor analysis results, the factorability of the 14 impact statement items was examined. Firstly, applying the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, we got the result 0.806, that is, a figure above the recommended value of 0.6, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity turn to be significant (p<0.000). Finally, the communalities were all above 0.4, except one, further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was conducted with all 14 items.

To examine the dimensions underlying the residents’ impact statements, a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was undertaken. During several steps, one item was eliminated because it was not correlated at least 0.3 with at least one other item and failed to meet a minimum criteria of having a primary factor loading of 0.4 or above. In those circumstances, it was removed from further analysis and the factors analysis was undertaken again. Thereafter, a principal components factors analysis with varimax rotation was conducted again with the remaining items.

The factor loading matrix for this final solution is presented in Table 3. A total of 13 items were loaded on three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. These factors explained 52.3% of the variance and were labeled ‘positive impacts’, ‘negative impacts’ and ‘governance’.

Factor 1 is related with the positive economic and social impacts of tourism development in Guimarães, and is responsible for explaining 26.3% of the total variance found. It is followed by Factor 2 (16.2% of total variance), which comprises items related to the
negative economic and social impacts, including attributes related to noise, social behavior, crime and access to recreational sites. The final factor represents 9.8% of the statistical variance found and is associated with the governance of the territory and the impacts related to the tourism equipment available and its use.

Table 3 – Factor Analysis Results with Varimax Rotation of Residents’ Perceptions of Tourism Impacts in Guimarães

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Item means</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Reliability Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Positive Impacts</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td>26.289</td>
<td>26.289</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages local culture and handicrafts</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates jobs for residents</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps supply new services for residents</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes contact with different cultures</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids the conservation and restoration of historic buildings</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of services (e.g., restaurants, cafes, bars, shops) in Guimarães is now better due to tourism</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Negative Impacts</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>2.112</td>
<td>16.247</td>
<td>42.537</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism limits the access of residents to leisure sites and equipment</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generates excessive noise in the Historical Center</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local people change their behavior in an attempt to mimic the behavior of tourists</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases crime rates</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Governance</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>3.453</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>9.809</td>
<td>52.345</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimarães has control on tourism management and planning</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money spent by tourists is kept by municipality agents and residents</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents have easy access to services used by tourists</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Extraction Method - Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method - Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

a. Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Source: authors’ own survey data.

The internal consistency of the items within each dimension was measured by examining the Cronbach reliability alphas. Nunnally (1978) suggests that reliability alphas close to 0.70 indicate a high level of internal consistency between the individual scale items and the related factors. These were high for factors 1 and 2 but lower for factor 3, suggesting lower reliability.

Comparison of residents’ perceptions on tourism impacts factors for different socio-demographic groups
Table 4 indicates the type of difference and direction of the differences between respondent socio-demographics and the two first factors (principal components). It illustrates that significant differences (p < 0.05) were found based on age, gender, education, income, place of residence and work link to the sector. The factor which shows greatest differences is the one of the ‘negative impacts’, which was less perceived by females, by those aged between 15 and 24 years old, with a higher level of education, with a higher level of income and living in predominant urban areas. Those employed in the tourism sector were more likely to perceive the ‘negative impacts’ of tourism in Guimarães, compared with those that were not employed in the industry. Commenting briefly this (surprisingly?) last result, one can perhaps relate it with the low level of wages prevailing in the industry. Other explanations can be raised, any way.

Table 4 – Factor statistical differences by socio-demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number and Label</th>
<th>Differences by</th>
<th>F/T-value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Positive Impacts</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negative Impacts</td>
<td>age</td>
<td>8.483</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Positive Impacts</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>2.621</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negative Impacts</td>
<td>education</td>
<td>3.026</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Positive Impacts</td>
<td>income</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negative Impacts</td>
<td>income</td>
<td>2.878</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negative Impacts</td>
<td>gender</td>
<td>4.552</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negative Impacts</td>
<td>linksector</td>
<td>-2.402</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Negative Impacts</td>
<td>urbparish</td>
<td>2.209</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors’ own survey data.

Those aged between 25 and 64 years old were more likely to agree with the positive impacts, compared with those aged over 65 years old. Respondents with a higher level of education were more likely to perceive the positive impacts, compared with those with the lower level of education. Finally, those respondents that had a month income level between 1001 euros and 2500 euros were more likely to be represented within factor 1, that is, tended to perceive positive impacts, than those who had a budget under the 500 euros.

No other statistical differences were found between socio-demographics attributes and these two factors and no statistical differences were found between socio-demographics residents’ features and factor 3.
5-Concluding remarks and some policy recommendations

In recent years, peripheral regions have been profiting of the expansion of the tourism industry. In fact, a significant amount of tourists are now seeking other types of tourism destination than the mass ones, this way trying to reach “unspoilt” landscapes and “authentic” experiences (Nepal, 2008).

In what regards Guimarães, we know that the city experienced a continuous increase of visitors in the last ten years, mostly after the nomination by U.N.E.S.C.O. of its historical centre as world heritage. The same way, the hosting of the 2012 European Capital of Culture will certainly contribute to give the destination a more suitable position as cultural tourism destination, through the general visibility that such an event gives to the hosting cities. In this sense, its geographical centrality within the northern part of Portugal and the circumstance of being quite close to the border with Galicia act as facilitating factors.

The sample we made use in our investigation follows the socio-demographic characteristics of other ones undertaken in similar empirical researches (see, for example, Sharma & Dyer, 2009), even if one must take into account a few differences in the social and economics status of the survey respondents.

Using a factorial analysis and taking into account 13 items loaded on three factors (labelled “positive impacts”, “negative impacts” and “governance”), we can conclude that these three factors explain 52.3% of the variance contained in the original variables obtained from the survey.

In future investigations we envisage to go deep in the evaluation of the influence of birthplace, length of residence and community attachment in the perception kept by residents of the impacts of the tourism industry. We collected some evidence that those can be relevant factors under the attitude of residents toward tourists and cultural tourism. As far as we know, just a few empirical studies have centred their approach on these variables. More commonly, researchers have centred their attention on “traditional” demographic variables, as gender, age, education or income.

As said, the 2012 European Capital of Culture will be a good opportunity for Guimarães to get a positioning as a relevant cultural tourism destination. Anyway, more than in common circumstances, in order to reach that goal there is the need to induce the
residents accepting to be part of the envisaged tourism project, as they are an essential part of the cultural tourism experience that a city can offer to its visitors. So, if that should be the case, there is no other option to be followed by the local authorities and tourism agents than to take into account residents’ opinions about the issue in all planning and management process.

A clear indication that the Guimarães residents claim to be listen and to participate in the tourism options to be taken and in the programming of the cultural events could be found not long ago (1st February 2011) in an article published in a national newspaper (Jornal de Noticias). The title of the article (Guimarães 2012, capital of silence) said almost everything about the issue. Going deep in the article, one could find the claiming of several heads of local cultural associations of getting answers from the Guimarães City Foundation (the structure in charge of the planning of the event) about the proposals they had submitted. In some cases, one and a half year had passed without getting any answer to their proposals.

We are aware of the multiple ways the issue of residents’ perceptions and attitudes towards tourism can be approached and of the difficulties to get useful policy oriented insights. This paper is a first step in that trail. Further steps should be given, learning from the experience aquired.
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