

# Perceived impacts of tourism by shop owners: the case of Porto, Portugal

*Luís Pacheco*  
*Cristiana Tavares*  
*Mara Madaleno*

luisp@upt.pt  
cftavares@ua.pt  
maramadaleno@ua.pt

## ABSTRACT

This paper proposes to disclose the perceived impacts of Tourism for a specific group of stakeholders, namely the owners of shops located in the historical center of Porto, in Portugal, a city which witnessed a significant increase in Tourism in recent years. Shop owners' perceptions about tourism have been practically ignored by the existent literature, despite the significant impacts felt by them. A questionnaire is applied to shop owners and a statistical analysis is performed, presenting and discussing the obtained results. The results evidence that shop owners tend to support the benefits of Tourism, even though they feel some reserves regarding its potentially negative impacts. Some policy directions and possibilities for further research are evidenced through this analysis.

**Keywords:** Porto, Tourism, Perception of impacts, Shop owners, Historical shops

## INTRODUCTION

The role of Tourism as a significant economic activity has been much discussed. According to the World Travel and Tourism Council annual report, the tourism sector currently accounts for 10.4% of world GDP and 313 million jobs and, in 2017, the travel and tourism sector achieved 4.6% growth over world economic growth (WTTC, 2018). Tourism has direct impacts in economic, social, cultural, environmental and political terms, impacting society's daily life and making it dependent on the goodwill of the inhabitants, due to the importance of their support for the development and sustainability of the activity (Jurowski, 1994).

The number of low-cost air travel has significantly increased, expanding accessibility to a wide variety of destinations and leveraging the rapid development of different types of accommodation such as hotels and short-term apartments, among others. This evolution of the activity has potentiated, on a large scale, the visit of other cities and, currently, a growing share of world tourists opt for short-term travel over long vacations (Dunne et al., 2010), seeking to experience the region's authenticity in those travels (MacCannel, 2013).

Research on urban tourism emerged in the 1990s and, according to Castela (2018), the most recent studies have focused on the cultural tourist center of cities. However, there is little research on the sociocultural impacts on these centers. By assessing the Tourism impacts on the cities and local communities, it is possible to foresee disparities due, for example, to the different interpretation that residents have about their effects. In addition, the inconveniences associated with tourism may lead the population to develop and express negative behaviors and attitudes towards it, being this a stream of research of special interest since this may influence the entire tourist destination environment. Most of the studies are based on psychological and anthropological perspectives, assuming that communities are not homogeneous groups and may or may not support the tourism sector (Gursoy et al., 2002), frequently resulting in contradictory conclusions.

According to Timur and Getz (2008), understanding the perceptions of stakeholders (local authorities, government agencies, companies, and communities) can contribute to the development and implementation of policies that minimize the negative impacts of tourism growth and maximize its benefits. Ven (2016) states that stakeholders' attitudes evolve over time in a continuum that varies from homogeneity to heterogeneity. In this context, different studies analyze the residents' attitudes regarding the development of the sector and how that affects their behavior. However, the literature presents a substantial gap in the perception of shop owners in relation to the impacts of Tourism. So, the main objective of this paper is to study the perceptions of the shop owners of Porto towards the evolution of Tourism, clarifying which impacts they identify at the level of the community and, more specifically, those that affect their business. Thus, it is intended to contribute to the development of knowledge about Tourism in an area where it is clearly emerging.

The rest of the paper develops as follows. The second section comprises the literature review, where the different categorizations of factors and the different approaches and models of measurement of the social impacts of Tourism are mentioned. The third section begins with the presentation of the methodology, which briefly summarizes the analyzed territory, including the justification of the measurement instruments used for the collection and analysis of the results and the sample design. In section four we proceed to an analysis and discussion of the results obtained, interconnecting the theoretical to the empirical component. Finally, section five presents the main conclusions obtained, presenting the contributions of the present study in the selected area, as well as its main limitations and suggestions for future studies.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Attitudes and reactions to tourism have been studied exhaustively in the literature, with the results showing that the host population is influenced by the perceived impacts of tourism. Luštický and Musil (2016) presented a summary of the findings found by different authors, classifying the impacts of tourism into three categories: (1) economic, (2) physical, and (3) social. At the same time, they also grouped these same impacts into four dimensions: (1) physical/

environmental; (2) sociocultural; (3) psychological, and (4) political / administrative. Currently, the use of three basic categories of economic, environmental, and sociocultural factors is consensual (Gursoy et al., 2000; Murphy, 1985). Researchers such as Styliadis et al. (2014) found that it was possible to distinguish the impacts of tourism through three approaches: i) the cost-benefit approach - which assumes that there is a direct negative relationship between stakeholder support for the development of tourism and the costs they perceive, and vice versa that there is a positive direct relationship between benefits and support of stakeholders; ii) the approach that relates impact factors and their cost-benefits - this approach takes into account the nature of the impacts (positive / negative and benefit / cost) and the existing factors (economic, environmental and sociocultural), following the same rationale of the cost benefit approach; iii) the non-forced approach - this approach focuses on the relationship between identified impacts and support for tourism development, through direct questions to stakeholders, among which is the collection of their perceptions of the importance of impact ( positive / negative) that Tourism has in the life of the community. This approach assumes the interdependence between the perceptions of impacts by stakeholders and their willingness to support the development of Tourism.

Several researchers analyze different links between impacts and behaviors before tourism, comparing the different levels of participation of each resident (Keogh, 1990; Perdue et al., 1987). Thus, it was possible to identify that, in this dynamic relation, decisive factors are: the connection with the community or the length of residence on the spot (Um & Crompton, 1987); knowledge about the industry (Davis et al., 1988); contact with tourists; the proximity to the commercial zone (Sheldon & Var, 1984); the sociodemographic characteristics (Ritchie, 1988); the type and form of tourism (Murphy 1985; Ritchie 1988), and the economic benefits derived from industry (Ap, 1992).

#### *Methodological approaches to measure attitudes*

The Social Exchange Theory (SET) has been used by several researchers (Ap, 1992; Jurowski et al., 1997; Gursoy et al., 2002) to study the different attitudes of residents. This theory is related to the “interpretation of resource exchanges between individuals or groups during an interaction” where each actor “offers a resource of great value” (Ap, 1992, p.668). According to Moore and Cunningham (1999), SET specifies the exchange of tangible and intangible resources that residents and tourists receive or give in a specific tourist region. Residents are willing to exchange resources with tourists if they receive more benefits than costs (Jurowski, et al., 1997). The interactions will continue if both parties perceive that they have more benefits in what they receive than in what they are giving away (Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; Nunkoo, 2016). As such, depending on the nature of the impact, the residents support may be adjusted. A positive impact induces residents to support politicians and public initiatives that seek to strengthen tourism development, whereas, on the other hand, when the impact is negative, this may lead residents to withdraw their support (Woo et al. , 2018). It should be noted that tourism support by residents is essential for competitiveness, sustainability and tourism development (Gursoy et al., 2002).

#### *Sociocultural factors, benefits and costs*

Teo (1994) defines social and cultural impacts as the way in which Tourism contributes to a

change in the system of moral values, individual behaviors, family relationships, lifestyle, traditions and community organization. On one hand, at the sociocultural level, tourism provides new opportunities for change (Harrison, 1992), new leisure and business alternatives and improved access to services (McCaughy et al., 2018), fosters the preservation of monuments and archaeological places, enhances business networks between regions (Andereck et al., 2005; Almeida-García et al., 2016) and contributes to the preservation of the region's identity and culture (Andereck et al., 2005). In addition, the increase in tourism strengthens the demand for local art and cultural traditions (Meimand et al., 2017).

On the other hand, researchers also explored the existence of negative effects (Gursoy et al., 2000; Jurowski et al., 1997; Keogh, 1990; Milman & Pizam, 1988). Among them, we have impacts on family traditions and values (Kousis, 1989), the possible creation of immoral behaviors (Andereck et al., 2005) and cultural differences in the welcoming region (Tosun, 2002). However, in addition to these negative effects, the most recognized impacts by stakeholders are the increase in traffic congestion and crime (Jurowski et al., 1997; Keogh, 1990; Milman & Pizam, 1988). Other researchers such as Lindberg & Johnson (1997) and Muler Gonzalez, Coromina & Galí (2018) also include overcrowding of public and leisure spaces; the increase of parking problems and an excess number of people using the same services. Another impact that has been identified in more recent studies is gentrification (Gant, 2016), which includes the replacement of the residents by the tourists and the changes in the neighborhoods' lifestyle and typical essence. We can also refer commercial gentrification, in which traditional shops disappear and are replaced by new spaces and services designed to attract tourists (McCaughy et al., 2018; Castela, 2018). Thus, whether negative or positive, social impacts are related to changes in people's daily live in the community of the tourist region, leading to an immediate impact on quality of life, while cultural impacts lead to a gradual long-term change in values, cultural practices, habits and architecture of the welcoming region.

#### *Knowledge about tourism*

One of the sociocultural factors studied in the literature is the knowledge that communities have about Tourism and its effects on its perceptions of cost-benefit. The Social Exchange Theory behind this issue is centered on ideas and perceptions and the way communities think. Davis et al. (1988) show that residents' knowledge of the economy and local tourism allows them to predict their attitudes toward development. Caneday and Zeiger (1991) conclude that the higher the individuals' levels of education, the more easily the negative impacts are detected. Meimand et al. (2017) mention that the greater the knowledge degree that people have on the subject more apologists will be of Tourism growth. Additionally, Muler Gonzalez et al. (2018) state that education is an important variable associated with tourism perceptions. Still, it is widely agreed that individuals with a lower level of education are more dependent on tourism than those with a university degree and people working in the industry more easily recognize the negative impacts.

#### *Intrinsic motivation*

Theoretically, motivation represents the reasons for people's actions, desires, and needs. It can also be defined as a behavioral direction or cause of a person wanting to repeat a behavior (Elliot,

Gable & Mapes, 2006). Several authors relate the social benefits and the intrinsic motivation regarding the support for Tourism development (Correia, Kozak & Ferradeira, 2013). However, these studies have been centered on tourists' opinions regarding factors such as knowledge, achievement, self-satisfaction and adventure, with few referring to residents or shop owners in the studied places.

Meimand et al. (2017) mention some intrinsic factors for the motivation of the residents, such as the opportunity to be a host and play a role in Tourism, the opportunity to create a relationship, the feeling of being necessary to work together with the community and gain respect for oneself. It should be noted that intrinsic motivation has not yet been addressed at the level of shop owners, who have a preponderant role in the industry, so it is important to consider their desires, needs and interests in Tourism development.

#### *Relation with the community*

From a sociocultural perspective, the link between people and their community is an important factor in their perception of the impacts of tourism and their support (Um & Crompton, 1987). Some studies show that individuals living in a community for a long period of time are more likely to have negative attitudes towards tourism (Huttasin, 2008). In contrast, Davis et al. (1988) suggest that the native population has more positive attitudes toward tourism than short-lived residents. Jurowski et al. (1997) argue that community dwellers are more likely to form positive perceptions of economic and social impacts, showing that they are more concerned about the potential benefits. However, in the study by Gursoy et al. (2002), it was not possible to prove a direct link between the relationship with the community and the community's perceptions about the impacts of tourism, even if they argue, theoretically, that a greater connection with the community should lead to the residents' best understanding of the costs and benefits of Tourism. Nonetheless, the literature remains somewhat contradictory as the link with the community constitute a significant factor in the perception of the impacts of Tourism and in the support for its growth.

#### *Economic dependence*

Most residents see Tourism as a tool for economic development (Keogh, 1990; Walpole & Goodwin, 2000), with economic benefits being the most prominent (Muler Gonzalez et al., 2018). Thus, there is an interest in research on the relationship between perceived economic benefits and existing positive attitudes (Keogh, 1990; Gursoy et al., 2000; Jurowski et al., 1997). The Social Exchange Theory is also widely used to explain the psychological and material influence on individuals' perceptions. This theory allowed researchers to formulate the hypothesis that the more an individual or community is dependent on the money provided by Tourism the more positive attitudes they will have for their development.

Tourism progress can result in a number of benefits such as increased family income, living standards and / or tax receipts for a destination (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2018). In addition, it can also bring advantages by creating job opportunities, especially in the service sector (Jaafar et al., 2015); of investment in housing and construction with the intention of receiving the largest

number of tourists (McCaughey et al., 2018); and in creating the demand for local products (Aljohani, 2018). In rural areas, Tourism creates diversification in the local economy, reducing community dependence on a particular source of income (Aljohani, 2018).

On the negative side, Tourism can lead to an increase in the cost of living (Rasoolimanesh et al., 2018); an increase in house prices and an increase in rental prices and short-term contracts (Castela, 2018). Other identified negative impacts deriving from tourism growth have been the low wages in the sector, long working hours and seasonal and precarious employment (Boley et al., 2018; McCaughey et al., 2018; Almeida-García et al., 2016), the increases in land values (Dimitriadis et al., 2013, Aljohani, 2018), in the price of goods and services (Haley et al., 2005), in taxes (Dimitriadis et al., 2013), and inequality in the distribution of economic benefits among communities (Aljohani, 2018).

#### *Use of touristic resources by the community*

Residents' perceptions can also be influenced by the impact that tourism growth has on the availability and possibility of residents to use the resources created for tourists. They may react positively if they believe that Tourism improves the recreational infrastructure they enjoy, or lead to the creation of new leisure facilities for the community (Gursoy et al., 2002). However, this creation can generate negative impacts if residents are of the opinion that it has attracted too many people (O'Leary, 1976).

The users of leisure activities and infrastructures have a greater perception of the negative impacts that the development of tourism brings, since they understand the changes in the associated costs due to the use by tourists (Perdue et al., 1987). Authors such as Gursoy et al. (2002) found an inverse but not significant relationship between tourism resources and the benefits of tourism. In the study by Muler Gonzalez et al. (2018) it is showed that residents do not want an increase in the number of tourists due to the negative impact of the lack of space that exists in the areas shared with them, however, those who do not frequent the tourist areas tend to disagree.

#### *Environmental concerns*

In the literature it is mentioned that the support of the residents to the growth of Tourism can also be influenced by the perceived impacts on the environment (Sinclair-Maragh et al., 2015). The perceptions of each individual are different because they are influenced by their values and preferences in the preservation of the environment and in the use of environmental resources, as well as by the relationship that each establishes with the environment.

Authors such as Uysal et al. (1994) argue that residents and tourists with environmentally friendly values have a higher preference for resources to be used while preserving the environment, while others prefer that resources be used for a transformation in the environment to meet the needs and desires of the population (Jones et al., 2000). On one hand, tourism growth can be seen as a mechanism for reducing pollution and decreasing pressure on resources, leading to improvements in infrastructure and facilities for the community (Dyer et al., 2007; Nunkoo & Ramkisson, 2011; McCaughey et al., 2018); creation of natural reserves, environmentally-friendly

infrastructures, conservation of natural resources, increased resource management (Aljohani, 2018), and increased concern of residents to preserve the environment (Hall, 2008; Mason, 2008). On the other hand, tourism activities also have a negative impact on natural resources and the environment (Choi & Sirakaya, 2005), with noise and air pollution (Andereck et al., 2005; Aljohani, 2018), the destruction of beaches and soil erosion, the increase of garbage, the destruction of natural habitats, the destruction of wildlife due to fishing and hunting (Andereck et al., 2005; Hall, 2008; Mason, 2008), or increased drug and alcohol problems (Diedrich & García-Buades, 2009). There are also environmental impacts that cause disturbances in humans, as inadequate architectural styles, vandalism and graffiti (Andereck et al., 2005; Aljohani, 2018).

#### *Models to measure the social impacts of tourism*

With the development of tourism it is inevitable that a series of impacts will arise for the welcoming communities, both positive and negative. An activity such as tourism cannot take place without a sustainable, scientific, and responsible planning that seeks to reduce negative impacts and increase the quality of life of current and future communities. It is therefore necessary to rely on more specific models, theories and concepts.

#### *Irridex model*

The “Irridex Model” which was first developed by Doxey (1975) evaluates attitudes towards Tourism, seeking to identify and explain the cumulative effects of tourism development on social relations and the evolution of the community residents’ attitudes toward tourists. Doxey’s model implies four behavioral phases of the population in a tourist region and its main idea is that the increase in the number of tourists and the growth of tourism in a given destination will result in the “irritation” of the local community.

In the first state of tourism growth, residents have a better acceptance of new tourists and the money they can spend on their business, and this phase is called euphoria. Over time, the community will have more tourists and some individuals begin to have more commercial advantages with this growth. This phase is called apathy, with the presence of tourists being no more a novelty. The continued growth of tourism leads some residents of the community to become dissatisfied – the irritation phase - with the number of tourists and become concerned about the impacts they can generate. At this stage, public and private entities continue to create more facilities to meet the needs of tourists and expand accommodation infrastructures, increasing the real estate pressure. In the final stage, called the antagonism phase, the locality has already become a mass destination for tourists, creating a situation where residents do not want more tourists, assume positions of hostility and indifference and create negative stereotypes about tourists.

However, this model has some limitations, because it assumes that the whole community goes through these 4 phases, which will not always be true (Scholtz, 2014). Few communities are homogeneous, and individuals have different opinions about the various factors. Moreover, the model does not take into account the diversity of cultures and types of tourists, aspects that will affect the perceived impacts.

*Butler model: the life-cycle theory of the touristic area*

Butler (1980) adapted the product lifecycle model to the tourism lifecycle. This model is translated by an “S” shaped curve that establishes the relationship between the number of tourists and the stage in which Tourism is located, albeit not all regions go through all phases of this cycle, as clearly as others. The phases are: “exploration”, “involvement”, “development”, “consolidation”, “stagnation”, “decline” and “rejuvenation”.

According to Butler (1980), the exploration phase is characterized by the reduced number of tourists, attracted by the unique culture and landscape of the region. The social environment is not changed by tourism and these flows of tourists have a reduced impact on the residents’ economic and social life. With the increase in the number of tourists, some of the residents move on to the involvement phase, since they are now providing the essential services, which will allow their relationship with tourists to continue growing. In this phase, the seasonal periods begin to appear, as well as the promotion of the region to attract more tourists. The development phase reflects a period in which there is an increasing promotion of the region.

Traditional and cultural attractions will be developed and commercialized, which will lead to physical changes in the region, which may be not well accepted by the resident population. In the consolidation phase, the growth rate of the number of visitors will decrease but the total number will continue to increase, until the number of visitors will eventually exceed the number of residents, causing a part of the local economy to become dependent of Tourism. With the increase in tourists, the number of infrastructures will continue to grow, which will lead to an increase of opposition and discontent among residents, especially those who are not involved in the sector. As the region is entering the stagnation phase the number of tourists will have reached its peak. Capacity levels may already have reached or even exceeded their maximum, leading to social, environmental and economic problems. The region will cease to be fashionable and great efforts will be required to maintain the high number of visitors, with the city’s genuine cultural attractions probably replaced by imported or artificial structures.

In the declining phase, the region will not be able to compete with the new existing attractions, entering in a phase of decline in the area’s economic activity. Properties begin to change from activities aimed at tourists to activities for non-tourists and buildings that once were hotels are now apartments or retirement homes, because the attractiveness that in the past has brought tourists is equally attractive for, for example, retired people. In the extreme phase, the region can continue with a low level of Tourism or completely lose the tourist function. Alternatively, the region can move to the rejuvenation phase, however, according to Butler (1980) this will only happen if it undergoes a radical change. Alternatives presented by Butler (1980) are the construction of casinos or the use of natural resources of the region that have not yet been explored. However, the author points out that in order to really have a continuation of tourism in the region it is necessary to have something unique that continues to arouse the interest of tourists, over time, as for example with Disneyland.

Like the Doxey model, Butler’s model was also criticized, since the pace of transition from

phase to phase is different depending on the region, reflecting different variables such as development rate, number of tourists, accessibility, government policies, and the number of similar competing regions.

### *Typologies*

From the models described earlier, other researchers sought to construct different classifications or typologies. Rothman (1978), using the Irridex model, classified three groups living on the coast of Delaware, USA, through their behavior towards tourism development in the region: 1) the community would be better off without tourism in the region; 2) those who support tourism; 3) a majority group that has no definite idea, being ambiguous towards the industry. From the classification of Rothman (1978) researchers like Davis et al. (1988) segmented the residents into five categories: “tourism haters”, “lovers”, “in-between”, “cautions romantics”, and “love for a reason”. Other researchers like Ap and Crompton (1993) defined four strategies that were used by a community in Texas, USA, in response to the impacts of Tourism being these “acceptance”, “tolerance”, “adjustment” and finally “withdrawal”. The acceptance phase is known to be the favorable phase of tourism promotion, which is more likely to occur when individuals receive direct benefits from the industry; tolerance is described as the stage where there is slight acceptance, meaning that residents pay more attention to the costs and drawbacks of the industry’s impacts. Residents who reach the adjustment stage are those who accept the reality of living with Tourism in their daily lives and do not express any opinion what they think about Tourism. Finally, Ap and Crompton (1993) characterize the withdrawal phase with silent acceptance.

Other authors have sought to construct a rigorous instrument to measure perceptions at a global level or in a specific aspect. Lankford and Howard (1994) developed a multiple-item attitudinal scale for the measurement of residents’ attitudes in order to analyze the effects of certain variables that are being identified in the literature. The scale developed and tested was designated by TIAS (Tourism Impact Assessment Scale), consisting of the evaluation of 28 items. The authors summarized these items in 2 factors, with the first factor referring to the concern with local Tourism, which includes the impacts of the quality of the recreation of the city; the time residents live in the area; if they work in a tourism-related job; the knowledge of the local economy and the level of contact with Tourism. The second factor refers to personal and community benefits. Besides, Ap and Crompton (1998) argue that these two factors are not in accordance with the literature, which led them to develop a scale of perceived impacts consisting of: (1) identifying a component by classifying the level of change associated with 35 items by respondents, and (2) a component in which residents are asked to rate the level of content on each item.

Through this disagreement between the authors we can see that the literature, depending on the impacts and the scales of development, reach different conclusions. This illustrates the difficulty to develop a tool capable of providing sufficient information about residents’ attitudes that can be applied to different destinations in order to assist in Tourism management.

## METHODOLOGY

### *Area of study*

The city of Porto was chosen as the focus of this study due to the strong growth it has registered in the tourism sector and because it is the second largest tourist destination in Portugal. According to the *Tourism Marketing Strategy of Porto and Northern Portugal*, Tourism in Porto is centered on city short breaks, low cost stays and cultural and landscape touring, attracting senior tourists (over 45 years old), couples with children and young travelers aged 20 to 29. The city of Porto receives about 8 tourists per resident and, according to data presented by the “Profile of Tourists”, it is estimated that each tourist has an average consumption per visit of € 568, staying an average of 6.37 nights.

The city has witnessed a strong real estate investment, with data from *Confidencial Imobiliário* showing in 2017 a rise of 10.3% compared to 2016 in house prices in the city. Rent values reached a peak in the third quarter of 2017. In 2017, the parish union of *Cedofeita, Santo Ildefonso, Sé, Miragaia, São Nicolau and Vitória* registered a rent value of €6.98 / m<sup>2</sup>, above the average value of the municipality of Porto (€6.77 / m<sup>2</sup>). On the other hand, the parish of *Campanhã* (€5.78 / m<sup>2</sup>) presented the lowest value of new lease contracts among the parishes of the municipality of Porto.

### *Objective and design of the sample*

The objective of this work is to study the perceptions that the shop owners of the city of Porto have about Tourism growth. In order to carry out this study, a questionnaire was distributed to a sample of shop owners, distributed in 3 zones of the city center, between July and October 2018. Zone 1 (East zone) comprises the zone north of *São Bento* railway station and east of *Aliados* Avenue; zone 2 (South zone) covers the zone to the west of that station and south of the *Clérigos* Street and zone 3 (North zone) covers the zone to the north of the *Clérigos* Street and to the west of the *Aliados* Avenue.

The questionnaire was delivered directly to the selected shop owners from an initial list of own elaboration that consisted of fifty-eight shops. These shops were selected based on the antiquity of the business and due to being covered by a program of the Porto City Council, designated “Porto Tradição”. However, in order to increase the number of responses, shops not included in this program were added, obtaining in the end a total of 46 valid questionnaires. Despite the reduced number, we consider that the sample is representative of the population studied, that is, the traditional shops located in the center of the city of Porto.

The questionnaire was organized in 3 sections. The first section consisting of 7 questions regarding demographic factors: gender; age; type of business; education; residence; year of foundation of the establishment and also a question as to whether the owners have any other business outside the municipality of Porto. The second section was composed of two questions (8 and 9) where the respondent could choose between 5 options according to the Likert scale, 1 = “Strongly disagree”; 2 = “Disagree”; 3 = “Neither disagree nor agree”; 4 = “I agree”; 5 = “Totally Agree”.

Question 8 was divided into 29 statements with each one intended to study the different factors listed in the literature review, and question 9 referred specifically to the respondents' business, being assessed their perceived impacts from the direct and indirect contact with Tourism. This question was divided into 11 statements and respondents had the same five options to answer.

### *Measuring instruments*

Prior to the statistical analysis, a univariate analysis was performed for items related to demographic factors. Then, these same factors were used as independent variables and questions 8 and 9 as dependent variables. Since the sample size comprises 46 respondents we can assume, by the Central Limit Theorem, that they follow a normal distribution (Pereira, 2006). However, when we want to assess the impacts in the different zones, our sample is divided, respectively, into twenty-six, fifteen and five individuals. The same happens when the variables education and age are studied, in which the sample is also divided into small subgroups. In this case, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) and Shapiro-Wilk test were performed for both questions 8 and 9 for each variable to be tested to determine if the samples had a normal distribution. According to Marôco (2011), the Shapiro-Wilk test is preferable to the K-S test for small samples ( $n < 30$ ).

When tested for normality for the independent variables (zone, education and age) in relation to the dependent variable (Question 8) it is verified by the Shapiro-Wilk test that parameters are recorded where p-values are higher than the usual levels of significance (10%, 5%, 1%). For example, in the question about the quality of life in zone 3, a p-value (0,314)  $> \alpha$  is obtained, so that the null hypothesis of normality of the evaluations carried out by the shop owners is not rejected. The same applies to the independent variable (education) in the question related to the creation of new infrastructures, with p-value (0,217)  $> \alpha$ ; for the secondary level studies, with the same conclusion being drawn that this variable follows a normal distribution. We can also find the same situation with the independent variable (age), in the question related to whether Tourism improved public services, with p-value (0,364)  $> \alpha$  having the same conclusion as the previous variables. However, it is also possible to verify the existence of parameters in which p-values are lower than the usual significance levels (10%, 5%, 1%), in the dependent variables leading to rejection of the hypothesis for example, whether the city of Porto was to become an even more attractive destination in zone 1, to a level of secondary education, and to the ages between forty-five and sixty-four, obtaining all a p-value (0.000)  $> \alpha$ .

The same test was performed with the independent variable (education, type of business, and age) but with question 9 as dependent variable. It arises a situation similar to question 8, where for certain parameters the p-values obtained confirm the rejection of the null hypothesis of normality, while others confirm the non-rejection. Since the scales are ordinal and the results of the Shapiro-Wilk test gave the rejection of normality, the most indicated test to apply is the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test. The level of significance chosen for the rejection of the null hypothesis, in which the dependent and independent variables were not related, was 10% for all tests.

The value of Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was calculated to ascertain the fidelity of the scale referring to

question 8 of the survey being the result of 0.695, showing a satisfactory consistency of the scale to study the different factors of Tourism impact. In general, an instrument or test is classified as having adequate reliability when  $\alpha$  is at least 0.70 (Marôco, 2011). However, according to Malhotra et al. (1996) values greater than 0.6 can ensure reliability and consistency of the scale. However, the value obtained for Cronbach's  $\alpha$  from question 9 of the survey was 0.503 for the 11 items, thus considering that this scale does not have adequate reliability.

To summarize, through question 8, the main objectives are to understand the perceptions that shop owners in different zones have of the impact of tourism and how age and education can influence this perception. With question 9 we will understand the perceptions of impacts in the various businesses, specifying the five types of business with the most respondents and how education and age affect their perception of the Tourism effects. Throughout the analysis will be added some perceptions obtained from the shop owners' personal comments expressed while answering the questionnaire. Demographic factors such as gender, residence, and whether the respondents had any other business outside Porto were not investigated due to the large discrepancies among the respondents.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Sample analysis*

The final sample consisted of 46 shop owners, of which 14 (30.4%) of the respondents were female and 32 (69.6%) were male. In terms of activities, we have 7 Food Products shops; 3 of Accommodation and catering; 6 Goldsmiths; 4 Bookstores; 8 Clothing, Accessories or Footwear; 2 of Religious Articles and a shop classified as "other business areas".

In terms of the distribution of the sample by the city zones, zone 1 (East) comprises 26 shops (56.5% of respondents); zone 2 (South) consists of 15 (32.6%) and zone 3 (North) has 5 respondents (10.9%). Zone 1 is the one that presents a greater diversity in the business activity of respondents. Most respondents are between 45 and 64 years of age, and the age groups between the ages of 30 and 44 and over 65 also have some weight in the response rate. The average respondent age was approximately 56 years. Regarding the education variable, it is verified that the majority of respondents have secondary studies (43.5%). Of the remainder, 30.4% had higher studies, 23.9% had the basic level and, lastly, 2.2% of the respondents had only the primary studies. It should also be noted that 65% of the surveyed shop owners live in the municipality and 85% only possess one commercial establishment. There is also a great discrepancy in the longevity of different businesses. Most businesses are between 50 and 150 years old, reflecting the familiar and historical character of the commercial sites surveyed. From the direct contact with the shop owners it was possible to verify that some of the most recent businesses that were interviewed had to leave their old location due to the sale of the buildings or the high rents, having to reopen elsewhere.

*Perceived impacts in Porto*

Table 1 shows the results obtained albeit due to space limitations the specific results for each zone are not presented. Regarding the statements with respect to socio-cultural impacts, 39% of the respondents disagree with the statements and 37% agree with them, while 17% of the respondents do not have a concrete opinion. Each statement is about negative or positive impacts, with the purpose of ascertaining if the shop owners of the city of Porto identify these impacts as such.

Forty-five percent of respondents believe that Tourism has led to an increase in the quality of life in the city of Porto, while 26% disagree with this statement, and 28% do not have the perception. When we talk about an improvement in public services, we see that 59% of the shop owners think that there has not been an improvement in public services, as opposed to 15% of the respondents.

Shop owners are aware that there has been an increase in the number of festivals because of tourism (52%), however 37% of respondents do not agree, stating that although there is an increase in festivals, theaters and exhibitions (in terms of quantity) remain the same. When we talk about traditional festivals, 45% agree that there is a stimulus for the festivals to be held because of tourism, however, 35% disagree that it is because of tourism and 17% do not perceive this social benefit. But when it is stated that Tourism generates the loss of the cultural traditions of the city, 72% of the shop owners have the opinion that Tourism does not generate this negative impact in the community.

According to the literature, Tourism can generate an increase in alcohol and drug consumption as well as an increase in crime. According to the shop owners' perceptions, 56% agree with the increase in crime, while 32% disagree and 11% do not have the perception. Regarding alcohol and drug consumption, 41% agree, and 11% fully agree that there is an increase caused by Tourism, but 33% do not have the perception of this impact and 15% think that the increase is not related to Tourism. Congestion and difficulty in parking is also seen by the majority of shop owners as one of the negative causes of Tourism.

**Table 1: Frequency table (in percentage points)**

Questions	Likert scale	Porto city				
		1	2	3	4	5
<b>Sociocultural</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>4</b>
Tourism has increased the quality of life	4	22	28	43	2	
Tourism has improved public services (places for sports, health centers, ...)	2	57	26	15	0	
There are more theaters, exhibitions and festivals because of tourism	2	37	7	52	2	
Tourism stimulates the traditional festivities of the region (fairs, ...)	2	35	17	43	2	
Tourism generates the loss of cultural festivals and traditions	0	72	7	17	4	
Tourism increases drug and alcohol consumption	2	13	33	41	11	
Tourism causes greater crime	2	30	11	54	2	

PERCEIVED IMPACTS OF TOURISM IN PORTO

Access facilities are better because of Tourism	2	48	22	28	0
Tourism produces greater congestion, accidents and parking problems	0	35	17	41	7
The expansion of Tourism leads to a decrease in the number of people who have to leave the cities	24	46	11	17	2
Tourism has led to greater creation of roads / streets and urbanizations	4	39	9	46	2
<b>Economic</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>17</b>
Tourism is today the main economic activity in Porto	0	20	15	61	4
Tourism has increased the number of job opportunities	0	9	7	76	9
There has been an increase in the prices of goods and services due to Tourism	0	2	9	59	30
The government / autarchy has spent more money in the city due to the increase in Tourism	7	26	17	48	2
Tourism generates instability in employability	0	30	20	39	11
Tourism attracts more investment to the city of Porto	0	2	4	85	9
Tourism leads to a rise in the price of homes and rents	0	0	2	43	54
<b>Environment</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>14</b>
New infrastructures have been created to attract more tourists	0	7	15	67	11
There are more public gardens and parks due to Tourism	2	74	20	4	0
Tourism encourages the restoration of historic buildings	7	9	4	63	17
Tourism increases pollution, noise, waste, etc.	0	15	7	63	15
The construction of hotels / local accommodation has destroyed the city environment	2	15	22	35	26
<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>2</b>
Tourism provides more incentives for the protection of natural resources and preservation of local culture and tradition	4	41	11	43	0
The increase in the number of tourists in a certain area will boost this economy	0	13	17	70	0
The experience of our culture and traditional lifestyle is the reason why tourists visit the city of Porto	0	17	4	72	7
Government / autarky investment in tourism development is money well spent	0	17	20	61	2
Tourism Support	0	11	9	70	11
The city of Porto should become an even more attractive destination	0	20	11	61	9
Tourism will continue to play an important role in the city of Porto	0	2	7	78	13

Note: Likert scale 1="Strongly disagree"; 2="Disagree"; 3="Neither disagree nor agree"; 4="I agree"; 5="Totally Agree".

Source: Own elaboration

One of the negative impacts generated by tourism is the displacement of residents out of the city and, according to the shop owners' perception, 46% agree, and 24% fully agree with this negative impact. When asked if shop owners had the perception that tourism led to greater creation of roads / urbanizations and streets, 46% agree while 39% disagree.

Now on the impacts on economic factors, 71% of shop owners agree with the statements, whereas 19% disagree and 11% have no opinion. For most shop owners in the city (65%), Tourism is the main economic activity of the city, however with that came negative effects, some of which were selected to study if shop owners had the perception if they were present in the city, such as: the increase in the price of rent and housing (43% agree and 54% totally agree), the increase in prices of goods and services (59% agree and 30% totally agree) and instability in employability (39% agree and 11% totally agree). However, they also identify positive effects caused by tourism as: increased job opportunities (76% agree), the larger investment by the municipality in the city (48% agree, but 26% disagree), an increase in investment in the city from private or foreign sources (85% agree and 9% totally agree).

As for environmental impacts, it was possible to analyze that the majority of respondents (46%) perceived that Tourism led to the creation of new infrastructures to attract more tourists and the restoration of historical buildings, in which 63% agree, with 17% totally agreeing. However, regarding the benefits that are identified in the literature, the shop owners realize that they have had no effect in Porto, such as the creation of gardens and public parks, representing 74% of the respondents. As negative impacts we have increased pollution, waste and noise (63% agree) and destruction of the “traditional” environment of the city because of hotel construction (35% agree and 26 totally agree).

When the shop owners’ knowledge about Tourism was approached, it was possible to conclude that 43% have a positive perception regarding Tourism to provide incentives for the protection of natural resources and preservation of local culture and tradition and that the increase in the number of tourists helps to boost the economy (70% agree). The majority of shop owners (72%) have the opinion that it is due to the lifestyle of the Porto and the experience of their culture that tourists come to the city of Porto. However, some respondents claim that tourists visit the city due to low prices and the low-cost flights and the sense of security conveyed by the city and the country. Others claim that due to this increase in tourism many things have been tampered with, such as typical products.

When asked if the money that the municipality spends in the city is well spent, 70% agree and 11% fully agree. When analyzing the support to Tourism, it was possible to find out that 91% of the shop owners support and believe that Tourism will continue to grow and play an important role in Porto and that this will continue to be an even more attractive destination (70%). However, although in statistical terms the shop owners show a positive opinion about Tourism, most of them verbally transmit a totally different picture, speaking in a “Barefoot Tourism”. However, since there was a decrease in the number of city residents, they report that they now need the tourists to survive.

#### *Impact of independent variables on perceptions*

In order to evaluate whether there are significant differences between the three areas surveyed, education and age of respondents with the factors to be studied, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used. Considering the variable “zone”, Table 2 presents only the seven impacts, among the five factors analyzed, for which statistically significant results were found.

In terms of sociocultural factors, the improvement in access facilities due to tourism (p-value (0.086) <0.10) and the decrease in people leaving the city (p-value (0.032) <0.10) present a statistically significant difference between the different zones. The same happened with regard to economic factors when it was affirmed that Tourism is today the main economic activity of Porto (p-value (0.079) <0.10) and if that leads to an increase in the price of housing and rents (p-value (0.053) <0.10). There are also statistically significant differences between the three zones in relation to the increase in pollution (p-value (0.037) <0.10); to if tourism will continue to play an important role in the city (p-value (0.056) <0.10) and also regarding the knowledge, there were differences in relation to the perception if the increase of the number of tourists in a certain area will turn this economy more dynamic (p-value (0.032) <0.10).

**Table 2: Kruskal-Wallis test: variable “zone”**

Factors	Kruskal – Wallis H	Degrees of freedom	Assymptotic significance
<b>Sociocultural</b>			
Access facilities are better because of Tourism	4.913	2	0.086
The expansion of Tourism leads to a decrease in the number of people who have to leave the cities	6.898	2	0.032
<b>Economic</b>			
Tourism is today the main economic activity in Porto	5.066	2	0.079
Tourism leads to a rise in the price of homes and rents	5.871	2	0.053
<b>Environment</b>			
Tourism increases pollution, noise, waste, etc.	6.599	2	0.037
<b>Knowledge</b>			
The increase in the number of tourists in a certain area will boost this economy	6.907	2	0.032
<b>Tourism Support</b>			
Tourism will continue to play an important role in the city of Porto	5.775	2	0.056

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

Tables 3 and 4 present statistically significant results in the perception of Tourism impacts in the city of Porto, when considering, respectively, the variables education and age. We can see that in relation to education there are only 4 factors where there are statistically significant differences, of which the impact referring to the knowledge factor also had statistically significant results in the test performed allusive to the zones. The education variable had no impact on environmental factors. The education variable is important for the perception of cultural impacts as the greatest existence of theaters and exhibitions (p-value (0.027) <0.10); in the perception of the investment that the Tourism has brought to the city (p-value (0.088) <0.10). It is also influential in the perception of whether Porto should become an even more attractive destination (p-value (0.025) <0.10).

**Table 3: Kruskal-Wallis test: variable “education”**

Factors	Kruskal – Wallis H	Degrees of freedom	Assymptotic significance
<b>Sociocultural</b>			
There are more theaters, exhibitions and festivals because of tourism	7.191	2	0.027
<b>Economic</b>			
Tourism attracts more investment to the city of Porto	4.850	2	0.088
<b>Knowledge</b>			
The increase in the number of tourists in a certain area will boost this economy	5.275	2	0.072
<b>Tourism Support</b>			
The city of Porto should become an even more attractive destination	7.389	2	0.025

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

**Table 4 - Kruskal-Wallis test: variable “age”**

Factors	Kruskal – Wallis H	Degrees of freedom	Assymptotic significance
<b>Sociocultural</b>			
Tourism stimulates the traditional festivities of the region (fairs, ...)	6.085	2	0.048
Access facilities are better because of Tourism	6.050	2	0.049
Tourism has led to greater creation of roads / streets and urbanizations	6.650	2	0.036
<b>Economic</b>			
Tourism attracts more investment to the city of Porto	6.654	2	0.036
<b>Environment</b>			
Tourism encourages the restoration of historic buildings	8.083	2	0.018

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

Through the analysis of Table 4, we see that age is a factor that creates statistically significant differences in relation to sociocultural, economic and environmental factors. These differences were related to the statements about whether Tourism stimulates the traditional festivals of the region (p-value (0.048) <0.10); the improvement of access facilities (p-value (0.049) <0.10); the greater creation of roads / streets and urbanizations (p-value (0.036) <0.10); the perception of the investment in the city (p-value (0.036) <0.10) and in the restorations of historical buildings (p-value (0.018) <0.10).

*Perception of the impacts in commerce*

As we can see in Table 5, when shop owners are asked if they are satisfied with where they are and if they preferred to have their business in the city of Porto, on average more than four in five, shop owners agree with these statements. When asked if it is an excellent zone to have a business 79% say yes, however in zone 3, forty percent of respondents disagree with the statement.

As we could see earlier, shop owners agree that there has been an increase in investment in the city, but when asked if this investment was beneficial to their business, 48% of them have a positive perception, while 24% disagree. This disagreement is more noticeable in zone 2 (27%) and zone 3 (60%), in which 53% and 20%, respectively, agree that it was beneficial.

The majority of shop owners agree that the price hike has been impacted by tourism growth, but when questioned about that impact on their business 52% of the respondents disagree with this negative effect. Another impact studied above was the creation of roads and streets where there was proximity in the responses' percentages. In this case, with regard to the impact on their business, 48% of the shop owners have the perception that in no way affected its shop.

As for the increase in spending by consumers caused by tourism, 57% felt this benefit in their shop, as opposed to 30% who disagree, and 13% who do not have any perception. In zones 3 and 1 it was where a greater percentage of discord was registered, being of 60% and 31% respectively. Due to the increasing opening / creation of hotels, one of the statements was if these have been damaging the commerce in the city of Porto, nevertheless, the majority answer from shop owners (66%) was that they have not been harmed.

**Table 5: Respondent answers about perception of business (percentage points)**

Questions	Zone1					Zone 2					Zone 3					City of Porto				
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
I'd rather have my business in the historic center than elsewhere	0	4	4	69	23	0	13	0	67	20	0	0	20	60	20	0	7	4	67	22
I am satisfied with where I am	0	8	4	62	27	0	7	0	80	13	0	0	0	80	20	0	7	2	70	22
The investment made in Porto has been beneficial to my business	0	19	19	50	12	0	27	20	53	0	20	40	20	20	0	2	24	20	48	7
The city of Porto is a great area to have a business	0	0	8	85	8	0	7	27	60	7	0	40	20	40	0	0	7	15	72	7
The improvement of roads / streets and urbanization has been essential for the growth of my business	0	27	27	46	0	7	67	7	20	0	0	100	0	0	0	2	48	17	33	0
Tourism stimulates higher spending by consumers	0	31	19	50	0	0	20	7	73	0	0	60	0	40	0	0	30	13	57	0
The price increase has negatively affected my business	4	38	23	31	4	0	67	13	13	7	0	80	0	20	0	2	52	17	24	4
The construction of hotels / local accommodation has hampered my business	12	46	23	8	12	0	80	0	13	7	0	60	0	20	20	7	59	13	11	11
Tourism creates more job opportunities for outsiders than for city residents	0	19	46	31	4	0	40	13	47	0	0	60	40	0	0	0	30	35	33	2
Tourism encourages the preservation of traditional trade	12	23	4	54	8	20	20	0	53	7	20	60	0	20	0	15	26	2	50	7
Tourism has increased my quality of life	4	50	23	23	0	13	47	20	20	0	20	60	0	20	0	9	50	20	22	0

Note: Likert scale 1="Strongly disagree"; 2="Disagree"; 3="Neither disagree nor agree"; 4="I agree"; 5="Totally Agree".

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

The increase in tourism results in the creation / opening of new commercial spaces, which may negatively impact traditional commerce. From Table 5, we see that 57% of shop owners agree that the increase in tourism has led to the preservation of traditional commerce, but 41% disagree. In zone 3, 80% of shop owners answered in the range of 1 and 2 of the Likert scale. When questioned if tourism had led to an increase in the quality of life in the city of Porto, we see that most shop owners have a positive perception. It should be noted that when questioned about the increase in their quality of life, 59% disagree that there was a positive impact.

#### *Impacts of independent variables on perceptions in each business landscape*

In order to study whether there is a statistically significant effect on the perception of the impacts on each shop activity relative to the independent variables (business type, education and age), the Kruskal-Wallis test was performed again. It is necessary to take into account the reliability result of the scale, which had a low value.

**Table 6: Impact on perceptions by type of business**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Kruskal – Wallis H</b>	<b>Degrees of freedom</b>	<b>Asymptotic significance</b>
The investment made in Porto has been beneficial to my business	14.739	2	0.005
The city of Porto is a great area to have a business	11.393	2	0.022
The construction of hotels / local accommodation has hampered my business	9.895	2	0.042
Tourism encourages the preservation of traditional trade	11.096	2	0.026

Source: Own elaboration using SPSS

Table 6 shows the statistically significant results for the five types of businesses with the most respondents (Accommodation and Catering, Food Products, Jewelry, Bookstores and Clothing / Accessories / Footwear). It should be noted that there is a statistically significant difference in relation to the incentives for traditional commerce preservation (p-value (0.026) <0.10); to the negative impact of housing construction (p-value (0.042) <0.10); to the positive effect in business caused by the investment realized in the city (p-value (0.005) <0.10) and if the Porto area is good for a business (p-value (0.022) <0.10). As mentioned above, it was also tested whether the level of education and the age of shop owners in the city of Porto would influence the perception of the impacts on their business, however, no statistically significant results were found.

## CONCLUSION

The main objective of this paper was to gather, through the implementation of a questionnaire, the shop owners' perceptions about the impact of Tourism in the city of Porto. That is the main contribution of this paper since this is an issue practically ignored in the literature.

Data collection proved to be a more difficult process than expected. Due to the low level of adherence by shop owners throughout the inquiry process, it became necessary to widen the range of respondents. After the data collection, a sample of 46 respondents was statistically analyzed.

Faced with cultural factors, according to Andereck et al. (2005), Tourism helps to preserve culture and traditions. The general perception of shop owners is that tourism has led to more exhibitions and festivals and traditional fairs although many have the opinion that nothing has changed. When we talk about the economic factors, although most realize that there was a greater investment by the local authorities and foreigners, creating more job opportunities (Jaafar et al., 2015), they have the opinion that costs are more relevant, as the instability in employability (Boley et al., 2018; McCaughey et al., 2010), often caused by seasonality (García-Almeida et al., 2016), increases in house prices and rents (Castela, 2018) and in the prices of goods and services (Haley et al., 2005). However, when specifically analyzing their business, most shop owners did not feel this negative effect. Many of the benefits mentioned in the literature have not been recognized by shop owners, such as the creation of more parks and public gardens (Aljohani, 2018) with the majority of shop owners agreeing that there were no improvements at that level. In relation to environmental factors, shop owners consider that tourism growth has been beneficial because it has led to the restoration of historic buildings (Andereck et al., 2005).

However, they consider that the city environment has been destroyed (Choi & Sirakaya, 2005) due to the construction of hotels, ceasing to be the typical city that it was. Another negative impact is the increase of pollution, waste and noise (Andereck et al., 2005) that was perceived by most shop owners. As for social impacts, respondents agree that there was an increase in the quality of life in the city but when questioned if it had a positive impact on them, the majority answered negatively. It was identified that there was a greater creation of infrastructures for tourists and that many shop owners were dissatisfied not only by the increase of competition but also because this is one of the reasons that sometimes imply the expulsion of people from these places (Castela, 2018), identifying thus a further negative impact. Other negative impacts were congestion (Muler Gonzalez et al., 2018); the increase in crime (Jurowski et al, 1997; Keogh, 1990) and the increase in drug and alcohol consumption (Diedrich & García, 2009). Factors in the literature considered as benefits, such as road building and urbanization (García-Almeida et al., 2016) recorded almost as many respondents agreeing that it had a positive effect as negative opinions. As for improving access facilities (McCaughy et al., 2018), this was not recognized by shop owners. When questioned regarding the effect on their business, most have an opinion that did not have any impact.

The age factor also showed statistically significant impacts on sociocultural, economic and environmental factors. As for the individual business scenario in the test carried out for the five types with the highest number of respondents, it was possible to verify that there are statistically significant effects on the investment made in the city having a beneficial impact on the business; preservation of traditional trade; the city of Porto is a great area to have a business and if the construction of hotels has hampered their particular business.

Although the statistical results show that shop owners support the increase in tourism, due to the questionnaire's closed questions they could not truly express their opinion. That is, even identifying the positive impacts of Tourism, they are dissatisfied with the negative impacts, showing that the benefits do not cover the existing costs.

The present paper presents some limitations that end up being opportunities for future research. As future research it is proposed to conduct open-ended interviews with a larger number of shop owners, allowing them to truly explain their opinions. It would also be interesting to expand this study to other geographic areas of the country, allowing comparisons and evaluating the main differences between regions or major tourist destinations. Conducting the study with a larger sample would allow an in-depth statistical analysis to identify the inequalities between different zones, types of business, education levels and others, also allowing the identification of other positive and negative impacts that have not been considered. This analysis could also allow better management and planning of the tourism sector and the creation of public policies to better protect the traditional commerce and the traditions and culture of the regions.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been in part financially supported by the Research Unit on Governance, Competitiveness and Public Policy - GOVCOPP (project POCI-01-0145-FEDER-008540), funded by FEDER funds through COMPETE2020 - Programa Operacional Competitividade e Internacionalização (POCI) – and by national funds through FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia.

## REFERENCES

- Aljohani, M. (2018). *A study of the impact of tourism on the environment and Jeddah citizen's perceptions toward tourism in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*. Electronic Theses & Dissertations Collection for Atlanta University & Clark Atlanta University, 140.
- Almeida-García, F., Peláez-Fernández, M. Á., Balbuena-Vazquez, A., & Cortes-Macias, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54, 259-274.
- 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.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665-690.
- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1993). Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(1), 47-50.

- Ap, J., & Crompton, J. L. (1998). Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 120-130.
- Boley, B. B., Strzelecka, M., & Woosnam, K. M. (2018). Resident perceptions of the economic benefits of tourism: toward a common measure. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 2(8), 1295-1314.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of a tourist area cycle of evolution: implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe canadien*, 24(1), 5-12.
- Caneday, L., & Zeiger, J. (1991). The social, economic, and environmental costs of tourism to a gaming community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2), 45-49.
- Castela, A. (2018). Impacts of tourism in an urban community: The case of Alfama. *Athens Journal of Tourism*, 5(2), 1-16.
- Choi, H. S. C., & Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: Development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(4), 380-394.
- Correia, A., Kozak, M., & Ferradeira, J. (2013). From tourist motivations to tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7(4), 411-424.
- Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. M. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests, and opinions toward tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(2), 2-8.
- Diedrich, A., & García-Buades, E. (2009). Local perceptions of tourism as indicators of destination decline. *Tourism Management*, 30(4), 512-521.
- Dimitriadis, E., Papadopoulos, D., & Kaltsidou, D. (2013). Attitudes towards tourism development: Residents' perceptions in the islands of Lemnos and Hydra. *Tourismos*, 8(1), 133-151.
- Doxey, G.V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants: Methodology and research inferences. In *Travel and Tourism Research Associations Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings*. San Diego, September, 195-198.
- Dunne, G., Flanagan, S., & Buckley, J. (2010). Towards an understanding of international city break travel. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(5), 409-417.
- 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(2), 409-422.
- Elliot, A. J., Gable, S. L., & Mapes, R. R. (2006). Approach and avoidance motivation in the social domain. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(3), 378-391.
- Gant, A. C. (2016). Holiday rentals: The new gentrification battlefront. *Sociological Research Online*, 21(3), 1-9.
- Gursoy, D., Chen, J. S., & Yoon, Y. (2000). Using structural equation modeling to assess the effects of tourism impact factors and local residents support for tourism development. In *Annual conference proceedings of the Travel and Tourism Research Association*, 243-250.

- Gursoy, D., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2002). Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 79-105.
- Haley, A.J., Snaith, T., & Miller, G. (2005). Os impactos sociais do Turismo: Um estudo de caso de Bath, no Reino Unido. *Anais de Pesquisa em Turismo*, 32(3), 647-668.
- Hall, C. M. (2008). *Tourism Planning: Policies, Processes and Relationships*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Harrison, D. (1992). Tourism to less developed countries: the social consequences. In Harrison, D. (ed.). *Tourism to less developed countries*. London: Bellhaven Press, 19-34.
- Huttasin, N. (2008). Perceived social impacts of tourism by residents in the OTOP tourism village, Thailand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(2), 175-191.
- Jaafar, M., Ismail, S., & Rasoolimanesh, S. M. (2015). Perceived social effects of tourism development: A case study of Kinabalu National Park. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 10(2), 5-20.
- Jones, D. L., Jurowski, C., & Uysal, M. (2000). Host community residents' attitudes: A comparison of environmental viewpoints. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2(2), 129-156.
- Jurowski, C. (1994). *The Interplay of Elements Affecting Host Community Resident Attitudes toward Tourism: A Path Analytic Approach*. PhD dissertation in Hospitality and Tourism, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(2), 3-11.
- Keogh, B. (1990). Resident recreationists' perceptions and attitudes with respect to tourism development. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research*, 15(2), 71-83.
- Kousis, M. (1989). Tourism and the family in a rural Cretan community. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(3), 318-332.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 121-139.
- Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modeling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 402-424.
- Luštický, M., & Musil, M. (2016). Towards a theory of stakeholders' perception of tourism impacts. *Czech Journal of Tourism*, 5(2), 93-110.
- MacCannell, D. (2013). *The tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. EUA: University of California Press.
- Malhotra, N. K., Agarwal, J., & Peterson, M. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research: A state-of-the-art review. *International Marketing Review*, 13(5), 7-43.
- Marôco, J. (2011). *Análise Estatística com Utilização do SPSS*. Lisboa: Sílabo.

- Mason, P. (2008). *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- McCaughey, R., Mao, I., & Dowling, R. (2018). Residents' perceptions towards cruise tourism development: the case of Esperance, Western Australia. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 43(3), 403-408.
- Meimand, S. E., Khalifah, Z., Zavadskas, E. K., Mardani, A., Najafipour, A. A., & Ahmad, U. N. U. (2017). Residents' attitude toward tourism development: A sociocultural perspective. *Sustainability*, 9(7), 1170.
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 191-204.
- Moore, K. R., & Cunningham, W. A. (1999). Social exchange behavior in logistics relationships: A shipper perspective. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 29(2), 103-121.
- Muler Gonzalez, V., Coromina, L., & Galí, N. (2018). Overtourism: residents' perceptions of tourism impact as an indicator of resident social carrying capacity-case study of a Spanish heritage town. *Tourism Review*, 73(3), 277-296.
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Nunkoo, R. (2016). Toward a more comprehensive use of social exchange theory to study residents' attitudes to tourism. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 39, 588-596.
- Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Residents' satisfaction with community attributes and support for tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 35(2), 171-190.
- O'Leary, J.T. (1976). Redefinição do uso da terra e comunidade rural: Ruptura do espaço de lazer da comunidade. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 8(4), 263-274.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1987). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 420-429.
- Pereira, A. (2006). *SPSS - Guia Prático de Utilização: Análise de Dados para Ciências Sociais e Psicologia*. (7ª Ed.). Lisboa: Sílabo.
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Ali, F., & Jaafar, M. (2018). Modeling residents' perceptions of tourism development: Linear versus non-linear models. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 10, 1-9.
- Ritchie, J. B. (1988). Consensus policy formulation in tourism: Measuring resident views via survey research. *Tourism Management*, 9(3), 199-212.
- Rothman, R. A. (1978). Residents and transients: Community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(3), 8-13.
- Scholtz, M. (2014). *A critical assessment of the social impacts of tourism in selected South African Communities*. Doctoral dissertation, North-West University, Potchefstroom Campus.

- Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40-47.
- Sinclair-Maragh, G., Gursoy, D., & Vieregge, M. (2015). Residents' perceptions toward tourism development: A factor-cluster approach. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 4(1), 36-45.
- Styliadis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J., & Szivas, E. M. (2014). Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tourism Management*, 45, 260-274.
- Teo, P. (1994). Assessing socio-cultural impacts: The case of Singapore. *Tourism Management*, 15(2), 126-136.
- Timur, S., & Getz, D. (2008). A network perspective on managing stakeholders for sustainable urban tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 20(4), 445-461.
- Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 231-253.
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring resident's attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(1), 27-29.
- Uysal, M., Jurowski, C., Noe, F. P., & McDonald, C. D. (1994). Environmental attitude by trip and visitor characteristics: US Virgin Islands National Park. *Tourism Management*, 15(4), 284-294.
- Ven, S. (2016). Residents' participation, perceived impacts, and support for community-based ecotourism in Cambodia: A latent profile analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(8), 836-861.
- Walpole, M. J., & Goodwin, H. J. (2000). Local economic impacts of dragon tourism in Indonesia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 559-576.
- Woo, E., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2018). Tourism impact and stakeholders' quality of life. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 42(2), 260-286.
- WTTC (2018). *Travel & Tourism Economic Impact 2018 World*. World Travel & Tourism Council. URL: <https://www.wttc.org/-/media/files/reports/economic-impact-research/regions-2018/world2018.pdf>.