

TAYA ROBERTS

**Residents' Perceptions on Tourism Impacts
and Quality of Life: The Case of Faro**

Masters in Business Management – Tourism

Dissertation made under the supervision of:

Prof. Patrícia Susana Lopes Guerrilha dos Santos Pinto

Prof. Ana Isabel da Silva Aço Renda

UNIVERSITY OF ALGARVE

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS



2021

**Residents' Perceptions on Tourism Impacts
and Quality of Life: The Case of Faro**

AUTHORSHIP COPYRIGHT

Work Authorship Declaration

I declare to be the author of this work, which is unique and unprecedented. Authors and works consulted are properly cited in the text and are in the listing of references included.

TAYA ROBERTS

.....

Copyright

© Copyright: Taya Roberts

The University of Alagrve reserves the right, in accordance with the provisions of the Portuguese Copyright and Related Rights Code, to archive, reproduce and make public this work, regardless of means used, as well as to broadcast it through scientific repositories and allow its copy and distribution with merely educational or research purposes and non-commercial purposes, provided that credit is given to the respective author and Publisher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This dissertation was a collaborative work in the sense that it was driven by the support of my supervisors, Professor Patrícia Pinto and Professor Ana Renda, whose patience, guidance and consistent support were vital towards this paper. Their kindness and generosity in giving guidance, and their knowledge and ease and professionalism made the process pleasant and rewarding. I aspire to achieve their understanding and critical thinking in my future professional endeavours.

I would also like to acknowledge to the European Regional Development Fund by CRESC Algarve 2020, through the project SAICT-ALG/39584/2018 (RESTUR - Residents' attitudes and Behaviours towards Sustainable Tourism Development in the Algarve), which provided the data for this study regarding the city of Faro.

I am also grateful to my father, Anthony Cyril Roberts, my brother Jade Roberts, and his wife Capucine Chausinand, for helping me towards achieving my goal of obtaining my Masters degree.

Last, but most of all, I would like to thank my daughter, Lee, for her patience and support throughout my academic pursuits.

ABSTRACT

This work addresses the problem of resident's perceptions of tourism impacts and their perceptions of quality of life. Although there is a growing bank of tourism research available on these topics, specific tourism locations still need to be studied. The main goal of this research was to determine the tourism impacts in Faro, Algarve and whether links could be established between tourism impacts (positive and negative) and residents' perceptions of quality of life, globally, and within four domains, namely: material domain, community domain, health and safety domain and emotional domain. A sample of 300 residents was utilised to collect data from Faro residents on their perceptions of tourism impacts in their location, as well as the residents' perceptions of their quality of life in the four domains. The results contribute to the literature on tourism impacts with the perspective of the host community in a tourism destination. In addition, the study provides preliminary data on the research topic in a specific location, Faro, which was not previously studied regarding the relationship between tourism and residents. The results indicate a correlation between perceptions about tourism impacts and residents' perceptions of quality of life within the four domains and globally. These findings open the way for a more holistic understanding of the location's tourism environment and the interplay of tourism and the residents of the tourist location. These findings are beneficial to residents, policy planners, governing bodies and tourism operators.

Keywords: quality of life, residents' perceptions, tourism impacts, life domains, Faro, Algarve, Portugal.

RESUMO

Este trabalho aborda o problema das percepções dos residentes sobre os impactos do turismo, bem como as percepções dos residentes sobre sua qualidade de vida e visa determinar se existe uma conexão entre elas. O estudo empírico incide sobre Faro, capital da região do Algarve, em Portugal. A cidade de Faro e o Algarve são destinos turísticos muito procurados turisticamente, com diversas ofertas, desde atividades associadas ao sol e praia a atrações arquitetónicas e históricas, assim como percursos pedestres, desportos náuticos e muito mais. A revisão de literatura permitiu verificar um aumento de pesquisas relacionadas com as percepções dos residentes sobre os impactos do turismo na última década, o que evidencia a relevância das percepções dos residentes nos estudos de turismo. Contudo, existe ainda necessidade de melhor compreender as percepções dos residentes em diferentes destinos turísticos.

O principal objetivo desta pesquisa é determinar os impactos do turismo em Faro, Algarve e perceber se poderiam ser estabelecidas ligações entre os impactos do turismo (positivos e negativos) e as percepções dos residentes sobre a sua qualidade de vida em quatro domínios, a saber: domínio material, domínio comunitário, domínio da saúde e segurança e domínio do meio ambiente. Assim, o foco do estudo é compreender como os residentes percebem os impactos do turismo e como esses impactos se correlacionam com a forma como estes percebem a sua qualidade de vida. Para a recolha de dados, utiliza-se uma amostra de 300 residentes, caracterizada por 51,7% do sexo feminino e 48,3% do sexo masculino sendo a maioria com idades compreendidas entre os 25 e os 64 anos maioritariamente no mercado de trabalho ou frequentando o ensino superior. Os resultados são obtidos pela aplicação de um questionário aos residentes, incluindo perguntas sobre percepções sobre os impactos do turismo no local de residência e impactos do turismo na sua qualidade de vida nos quatro domínios. Os impactos e a satisfação com a vida são organizados pela sua natureza positiva e negativa e utiliza-se uma escala Likert de 5 pontos para avaliar a concordância com os itens apresentados. Também para as questões sobre se recorre uma escala de satisfação de Likert de 1-5.

Essas escalas determinam o grau de concordância dos respondentes permitindo quantificar o valor médio da opinião ou percepção média. Escalas nominais ou ordinais

são utilizadas para identificar fatores como estado civil, nível de escolaridade e situação de emprego. Além disso, o questionário inclui questões de resposta aberta que permitem recolher dados sobre idade, concelho de residência e tempo de residência no concelho e freguesia.

Na análise dos dados, cada item é caracterizado com média e desvio padrão, com escalas validadas pelo valor de confiabilidade Alfa de Cronbach. As correlações de Pearson R e sua significância são utilizadas para avaliar o grau de correlação entre as percepções positivas ou negativas sobre os impactos do turismo e a satisfação com a vida.

Os resultados mostram que as percepções sobre os impactos económicos são percebidas como tendo impactos positivos e negativos elevados em Faro, nomeadamente em relação ao aumento das oportunidades de emprego, criação de negócios, oportunidade ao nível do empreendedorismo. As percepções sobre os impactos socioculturais revelam-se altamente positivas em particular ao reconhecer que o turismo contribui para a hospitalidade dos residentes relativamente aos turistas, bem como quanto às percepções dos residentes sobre o reconhecimento e prestígio de seu município. As percepções sobre os impactos ambientais são identificadas como associadas a impactos negativos principalmente relacionados ao aumento de ruído, poluição, lixo, deterioração da paisagem natural, congestionamento de tráfego e assim por diante.

Os resultados contribuem para a literatura sobre os impactos do turismo na perspectiva da comunidade anfitriã num destino turístico. Além disso, o estudo fornece dados preliminares sobre o tema da pesquisa em Faro, o que até ao momento não tinha sido feito no que diz respeito à relação entre turismo e residentes. Os resultados indicam uma correlação entre as percepções sobre os impactos do turismo e as percepções dos residentes sobre a qualidade de vida nos quatro domínios. Estes resultados abrem o caminho para uma compreensão mais holística do ambiente turístico do local e da interação do turismo com os residentes do destino turístico.

Compreender os impactos do turismo e como estes afetam as percepções dos residentes sobre a qualidade de vida é um processo complexo que requer uma visão dos domínios da vida dos residentes para contextualizar os resultados. Como os residentes vivenciam os impactos do turismo de maneiras diferentes e não é possível fazer generalizações, a

compreensão de cada destino do ponto de vista do residente oferece uma visão relevante do ponto de vista do turismo. Os resultados do estudo pode ser benéfico para a gestão e desenvolvimento turístico, para os residentes, planeamento e políticas de gestão definidas para os territórios, nomeadamente associadas ao papel dos órgãos governamentais e às empresas turísticas. Este estudo contribui, do ponto de vista científico, para o conhecimento da ligação entre o turismo e os residentes em Faro, no Algarve.

O estudo apresenta algumas limitações, pois os dados foram recolhidos antes do primeiro confinamento devido ao COVID 19 o que pode afetar os resultados obtidos. Para além disso, outros critérios poderiam ser definidos para melhorar os resultados obtidos, representando melhor os diferentes grupos etários e a dependência do turismo bem como comparando com o estudo de outras áreas circundantes uma vez que cada local tem um ambiente único de fatores que afetam as percepções dos residentes.

A percepção da qualidade de vida dos residentes em Faro, no domínio da vida material indicou que os estes se preocupam com este aspeto, especialmente com os impostos associados ao setor imobiliário e com ao custo de vida, segurança económica e a rendimento familiar.

As percepções no domínio da vida em comunidade indicaram percepções negativas relacionadas com as condições ambientais, transportes públicos, serviços em geral.

No domínio da vida emocional o estudo mostrou que os residentes se sentem neutros em relação a aspectos como atividades de lazer, serviços religiosos, atividades espirituais.

Quanto à saúde e segurança os resultados mostram visões neutras em relação à segurança e proteção, limpeza ambiental, congestionamento de tráfego e taxas de criminalidade.

Opiniões negativas são encontradas em relação às unidades de saúde e seus serviços. Uma análise da satisfação geral relativamente à qualidade de vida mostra que os residentes em Faro são geralmente felizes e têm respostas moderadas semelhantes que revelam estarem satisfeitos com a sua vida.

Por fim, as correlações mostraram que todos os aspectos dos impactos do turismo estão

relacionados com a qualidade de vida dos residentes na cidade de Faro.

Palavras-chave: qualidade de vida, perceções dos residentes, impactos do turismo, domínios da qualidade de vida, Faro, Algarve, Portugal.

GENERAL INDEX

	Page
INDEX OF FIGURES.....	xi
INDEX OF TABLES.....	xii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
2.1 Residents perceptions of tourism impacts.....	4
2.2 Tourism impacts on residents' quality of life.....	9
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY.....	16
3.1 Study Site.....	16
3.2 Sampling and Data Collection.....	17
3.3 Survey Instrument and Measures.....	18
3.4 Data Analysis.....	20
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS.....	22
4.1 Sample Characteristics.....	22
4.2 Perceptions about Tourism Impacts.....	24
4.2.1 Economic Impacts.....	24
4.2.2 Socio-Cultural Impacts.....	25
4.2.3 Environmental Impacts.....	27
4.3 Perceptions about tourist residents' quality of life.....	28

4.3.1 Satisfaction with material life domain quality of life.....	29
4.3.2 Satisfaction with community life domain quality of life.....	29
4.3.3 Satisfaction with emotional life domain quality of life.....	30
4.3.4 Satisfaction with health & safety life domain quality of life.....	30
4.3.5 Overall satisfaction with quality of life.....	31
4.4 Impacts of tourism and perceptions toward quality of life.....	32
CHAPTER 5 DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION.....	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	40
ANNEX	
Annex – RESTUR Survey Questionnaire	

INDEX OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 3.1 Algarve Map – Faro	16

TABLES INDEX

	Page
Table 3.1 Resident population Faro - 2017, older than 18, by gender & age category...	18
Table 3.2 Questionnaires collected in Faro - 2020, by gender & age, during low season	18
Table 3.3 Questionnaire theoretical foundation.....	20
Table 4.1 Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample.....	23
Table 4.2 Perceptions regarding positive economic impacts of tourism.....	24
Table 4.3 Perceptions regarding negative economic impacts of tourism.....	25
Table 4.4 Perceptions regarding positive socio-economic impacts of tourism.....	26
Table 4.5 Perceptions regarding negative socio-economic impacts of tourism.....	27
Table 4.6 Perceptions regarding positive environmental impacts of tourism.....	28
Table 4.7 Perceptions regarding negative environmental impacts of tourism.....	28
Table 4.8 Satisfaction with material life domain quality of life.....	29
Table 4.9 Satisfaction with community life domain quality of life.....	30
Table 4.10 Satisfaction with emotional life domain quality of life.....	30
Table 4.11 Satisfaction with health and safety life domain quality of life.....	31
Table 4.12 Overall life satisfaction.....	31
Table 4.13 Correlation matrix of economic tourism impacts (positive and negative) and the life domains.....	33

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This work addresses the problem of resident's perceptions of tourism impacts, as well as residents' perceptions of their quality of life in Faro, in the Algarve, Portugal. The focus is on what links can be determined between both positive and negative tourism impacts within the four life domains (material domain, community domain, health and safety domain and emotional domain) and within overall life satisfaction.

People and organisations can have differing definitions on what tourism is. UNWTO (2021) defines tourism as “a social, cultural and economic phenomenon which entails the movement of people to countries or places outside their usual environment for personal or business/professional purposes.” Walton (2020), in turn, defines tourism as “the act and process of spending time away from home in pursuit of recreation, relaxation, and pleasure, while making use of the commercial provision of services.” Although they provide different perspectives, both definitions infer that tourism is identified by the context of what the tourist seeks from the destination and their interaction with the destination environment, whether recreational, professional or for other reasons.

Regardless of its motivations, tourism has consequences on the destination, and these can be distinguished as impacting economic, socio-cultural and environmental contexts in either (or both) beneficial or detrimental ways (Williams & Lew, 2015). The host community is the recipient of these impacts and develops perceptions based on their dynamic within the destination.

Economic tourism impacts are at the fore of research. Telfer and Sharpley (2008:180) stated that the “potential contribution” to the locations' economy is the motivator for tourism development. Yet, the authors also state that there are economic and noneconomic costs associated to tourism that limit these net economic benefits. They list some of the impacts as income generation, employment generation and the generation of entrepreneurial opportunities for the host community, amongst others. These positive impacts are countered with the negative impacts of, for example, economic costs, overdependency on tourism and the seasonal inflation of prices in the tourism destination. Either positive or negative, these impacts affect the quality of life of residents of the host community in many ways (Andereck and Nyaupane, 2010).

Socio-cultural impacts include those that tourism has on healthcare, law enforcement, sports events and facilities, cultural aspects, such as cultural preservation and cultural exchange between residents and tourists. These impacts can be negative or positive, or both can exist simultaneously at the destination- as evidenced in Gran Canaria by Tovar *et al.* (2020) and discussed further in Chapter 2.

Williams and Lew (2015) determine environmental impacts to include, amongst others, positive impacts on conservation, infrastructure improvement, improved cleanliness of the destination, impacts on biodiversity, regeneration of the built environment and landscape improvement. The authors list negative impacts as disruptions to biodiversity, erosion of sites, pollution, depletion of natural resources, changes to the urban landscape and so on. These tourism impacts affect the host community and their perceptions of their quality of life in the life domains (Uysal, *et al.*, 2016).

The life domains categorise aspects of an individuals' life as: the material domain, and the non-material domains of community, emotional, and health and safety (Lai, Pinto and Pintassilgo, 2020). Material domains relate to income, and standard of living, community domains relate to public facilities and services, emotional domains relate to spiritual and other areas of personal fulfilment, and health and safety domains relate to personal perceptions of tourism's impact on health and safety (Lai, Pinto and Pintassilgo, 2020).

Previous research demonstrates that conclusions on residents' quality of life in tourism locations are subjective to the location, not allowing generalisations (Garcia *et al.*, 2015). This necessitates research that is location specific as residents' perceptions of the impact of tourism and how they perceive their quality of life holds valuable indicators for further research and planning in host destinations. This dissertation aims to determine residents' perceptions of tourism impacts as well as their perceptions toward quality of life in Faro, Algarve. This municipality was chosen because it is the capital of Algarve, the most significant and well-known Portuguese destination, yet not previously studied in the residents' perspective. The research is valuable toward gaining a holistic view of tourism in Faro, complementing ongoing studies on the tourists' perspective, such as the TurExperience (Cinturs.pt (a), 2021) and Monitur (Cinturs.pt (b), 2021).

This dissertation is integrated in the RESTUR project (RESTUR, 2019) and uses data collected in Faro during 2020 to respond to the following research question: which aspects of tourism impacts are related to resident's quality of life in the capital of Algarve, Faro?

The study has the following objectives:

- Determine the positive and negative impacts of tourism - economic, socio-cultural and environmental - perceived by the residents in Faro;
- Determine how residents in Faro perceive their quality of life regarding the following domains: material, community, emotional, health & safety, and overall life satisfaction;
- Determine the relationship (if any) between residents' perceptions of tourism impacts and their evaluation of quality of life in the city of Faro;
- Determine commonalities (if any) between the findings of this study in relation to prior literature on the impacts of tourism and quality of life.

Previous and supportive literature is revised in Chapter 2, providing a foundation for this research, giving insights on residents' perceptions on tourism impacts, on residents' perceptions on their quality of life, and into the need for location specific research in tourism destinations.

Chapter 3 discusses the research methods, including the presentation of the study site - Faro, the sample and data collection procedures, and the survey instrument and measures. It establishes the theoretical foundation for the questionnaire and informs about the data analysis method.

Chapter 4 provides the results of the data analysis, namely the sample characteristics, perceptions on tourism impacts according to positive and negative perceptions for economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts. It then discusses the results of residents' perceptions of quality of life according to the four domains, namely material life domain, community life domain, health and safety life domain, the environmental domain and overall life satisfaction.

Chapter 5 provides a discussion on the findings and the conclusions determined by the research.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This dissertation aims to build on existing research and contribute to understanding the impact of tourism on resident's quality of life in the capital of Algarve, Faro. The focus is on how residents perceive tourism impacts and how it correlates with the way residents perceive their quality of life. This chapter revises important previous studies on these two topics: residents' perceptions on tourism impacts and residents' perceptions on their quality of life.

2.1 Residents perceptions of tourism impacts

Research towards residents' perceptions of tourism impacts has steadily grown in the last decade, indicating a need for more research in this area. This can be verified by the increased number of journals and books available from academic publishers. For instance, a search in the beginning of 2021 on the ScienceDirect database, for journals and books by publisher Elsevier yielded the following results for the keywords' resident's perceptions of tourism impacts - 1990-2010: 2, 628 results, and 2011-2021: 7, 269 results. This shows a 276% increase in research related to the topic.

A recent study determined that when tourism development remains at low to moderate levels, residents tend to perceive tourism impacts positively. Yet, when tourism grows in an area, these views shift, and tourism impacts are perceived unfavourably (Woo *et al.*, 2018). However, the relevant literature demonstrates that tourism impacts, and residents' perceptions of tourism impacts rely on local context and are often location-specific. This view is supported by Garcia *et al.* (2015), who examined the positive and negative effects of tourism on resident's attitudes and attempted to define a theoretical base with models and theories that could then generalise findings. The authors concluded that this was not feasible as different locations provided contrasting data. It is therefore valuable to gather research at different tourism destinations.

It is widely recognised that tourism has important economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts which can be either positive or negative. Tourism offers

experiences to tourists and economic opportunities to locations, yet as outlined further on, economic impacts in tourist destinations are not limited to economic opportunities and the context of the location determines how and why these impacts are either negative or positive. Sharpley (2014:37) frames this idea as follows: "the destination communities face something of a 'development dilemma (Tefler and Sharpley, 2008)' because they are, in a sense, required to engage in a trade-off between the benefits they perceive to receive from tourism and the negative social and environmental consequences of its development." For example, in Trujillo, Honduras, a cruise tourism port was established to boost economic opportunities for residents, the port brought the residents better cultural capital and security, but the resultant rise in corruption negated these benefits and further reduced residents' ability to afford basic necessities (MacNeill and Wozniak, 2018).

Economic impacts include 'cost of living, cost of housing and cost of basic necessities' (Lai *et al.* 2020), the impetus for urban development, employment opportunity and employment stability (García *et al.*, 2016), the 'standard of living', quantity of jobs, infrastructure and 'revenue in the economy' (Stylidis *et al.*, 2014), a destinations dependency on tourism, a deterrent to other economic industry development, an increase in demand for foreign labour, an increase in the manufacture and sale of local produce, and the impetus to attracting investment in the destination (Šegota, Mihalič and Kuščer, 2017).

While experiencing economic impacts, tourist destinations experience seasonal peaks of tourism activity and therefore, the effect of seasonality on these economic impacts must also be considered. Residents may perceive economic impacts positively or negatively, and sometimes these views may be held simultaneously. For example, residents in Gran Canaria negatively perceive the tourist season due to rising prices and the insecurity of seasonal employment, yet, at the same time, many residents positively perceived the availability of seasonal employment (Tovar *et al.*, 2020). This duality arises from the positive economic opportunity of seasonal employment that is contrasted by the economic instability of having months of unemployment out of tourist season. How residents perceive these impacts, and how they weigh the negative impacts against the positive impacts will affect their perceptions of tourism impacts on their quality of life. This is demonstrated by Gonzalez *et al.* (2018), who concluded that residents appreciated both the

positive and negative impacts of tourism on the economy, which perpetuated positive perceptions of tourism overall, despite awareness of the negative aspects.

Tourism economic impacts extend to the improved availability of services and goods in the area. This is often experienced as a positive impact, yet these positive effects can be negated during tourism seasons. For instance, researchers in Macau found that negative economic perceptions of tourism impacts arose due to shortages of goods and services related to an influx of tourists (Lai and Hitchcock, 2017). Further afield, in the tourist destination of Bahia, Brazil, residents expressed positive perceptions and gratitude for the economic effects of tourism, stating that assets such as their homes and bicycles would not be within their reach if not for tourism (Winter and Adu-Ampong, 2021). The disparity in perception between Macau and Bahia may arise from differences between the two locations, as each offers a different type of tourist experience, the residents have different cultural ideologies and experience contrasting socio-economic circumstances, their locations have developed different infrastructure models and have varying environmental, social and economic needs amongst other factors. These differences allow residents to contextualise the impacts of tourism toward distinct criteria and create perceptions on quality of life that are unique to their location. A balance between positive and negative perceptions of tourism impacts exists, where the same factors – such as seasonal employment – can produce conflicting perceptions for residents. Study into these sometimes-ambiguous impacts will contribute to understanding resident perceptions of quality of life, and why these impacts produce these perceptions.

Socio-cultural impacts arise when resident's ways of life, their social and cultural expectations and their personal experiences, amongst other factors are interrupted by tourism (Soontayatron, 2013). These impacts encompass social behaviours in public and private contexts and a multitude of other factors that arise in specific locations due to cultural norms, practices, and expectations. In a study of tourism impacts in Macau, Lai and Hitchcock (2017), found that residents negatively viewed tourists' disregard for local smoking laws. Yet, in another study, residents in Gran Canaria, Spain, had positive perceptions of shops being open on Sundays and holidays due to tourism, with only some concern for the negative affect of this on other businesses (Tovar *et al.*, 2020). Tourism

produces further inherent socio-cultural impacts at destinations that affect public services such as healthcare, law enforcement, sports facilities, etc. For example, Agovino *et al.* (2021) state that 'during the tourist season, residents witness a deterioration in their general quality of life, and specifically in health services.' Further, Godovykh and Ridderstaat, (2020) determined that tourism impacted resident's health with short and long-term effects –they found a tourism growth lowered health in the short term and increased resident's health over the long term. Socio-cultural impacts also encompass cultural issues such as whether tourism promotes local cultural preservation, cultural exchange between residents and tourists, and how tourism affects cultural identity and respect towards other cultures. These impacts can be positive or negative. For instance, in Bahia, Brazil the impacts of tourism created better schools, improved healthcare and improved opportunities for residents to participate in leisure activities. Although still basic, these facilities were better than those in other rural non-tourist destinations in Brazil (Winter and Adu-Ampong, 2021). In addition, the authors determined that these residents had positive perceptions that tourism created the impetus for better infrastructure in their area. This is due to roads linking their (now) expensive town to more affordable neighbouring areas and connecting their location to other areas which expands employment opportunities.

Socio-cultural contexts include the impact on residents' perception of how their location is viewed by themselves and tourists. Perceptions of prestige, recognition and image of a destination are important to some residents. In Gran Canaria, residents feel that cruise ship tourism positively impacts the image and prestige of the destination (Tovar *et al.*, 2020). Yet if we look at Bahia, Brazil, socio-cultural impacts and perceptions of prestige seem to be of less importance, and the focus is centred on economic impacts that improve quality of life.

Environmental impacts on tourism destinations play a large role for residents. These impacts include those that affect the protection of the environment, the cleanliness of public spaces, pollution, noise and garbage. Styliadis *et al.* (2014) describe environmental impacts as 'crowding, traffic congestion, noise levels and environmental pollution'. An example of environmental impacts can be found in a study by Hayati *et al.* (2020) who concluded that tourism in Jakarta, Indonesia, produced the highest percentage of waste on the island and

that this waste concentrated in coastal areas with the majority of the waste being plastic packaging from food and drink consumption. This study highlights how tourism environmental impacts can deteriorate the natural environment and contribute to de-characterise the natural landscape – in this case with litter. High levels of tourism can have other potential adverse effects on the environment, such as the noise pollution reported by residents of Venice, stemming from travellers wheeling suitcases along the city's cobbled streets (Yeomans and Slater, 2021). Or, in Gran Canaria, negative perceptions of cruise ship tourism were experienced due to the consequent increase in air and noise pollution and city congestion (Tovar *et al.*, 2020). Environmental impacts also relate to public spaces such as parks and gardens, city streets, local wildlife and natural surroundings, and even natural resources found in tourism destinations. The context of the location determines which environmental aspects are most at risk. In cities, pollution and overcrowding could be of concern, while in rural destinations, maintaining the natural environment and the untouched look of the destination becomes more of a focus. In sea-side destinations the beaches are at risk for pollution and over-crowding. In Gran Canaria, the beach water and the local town of Las Palmas were jointly considered by residents to be 'dirtier' when tourists arrived (Tovar *et al.*, 2020).

Environmental impacts on infrastructure often produce conflicting views. This is due to how infrastructure improvements can often cause negative impacts on local wildlife, natural landscapes and increase traffic or crime. Yet, they can improve various economic factors, such as those created by improved transport opportunities. For instance, the building of a highway in Bahia, Brazil represents this duality. The highway was seen as damaging to the environment, economically frivolous and unnecessary by a resident who was not reliant on tourism for income, yet residents who relied on tourism for income viewed the highway positively (Winter and Adu-Ampong, 2021). Interestingly, Winter and Adu-Ampong (2021) found that positive perceptions of tourism impacts mainly were related to economic, community health and well-being, and negative perceptions mainly were related to the environmental effects. In another study, Saenz-de-Miera and Rosselló (2012), concluded that an increase in tourists has the potential to lower speeds and increase traffic congestion and volume. The authors also determined that congestion can have a negative effect on the destination's image to tourists, thereby reducing tourism to the area.

2.2 Tourism impacts on residents' quality of life

Tourism affects resident's quality of life, and these impacts can be researched from a broad perspective, regarding overall life satisfaction (Meeberg, 1993) and they can be considered with regard to life domains (Sirgy et al, 1995). Lai, Pinto and Pintassilgo (2020) researched satisfaction according to life domains in four areas: i) material domains, and non-material domains of ii) community, iii) emotional, and iv) health and safety. The authors considered how satisfaction with quality of life correlated to residents' perceptions of how tourism affects that quality of life and how their satisfaction with the individual domains aligned with their overall perceptions of quality of life. In their study, the authors defined material domains as economic factors related to income and standard of living. Community domains were related to public facilities, services and spaces. Emotional domains were classified in relation to personal fulfilment on spiritual and personal levels. Health and safety domains aligned with personal perceptions of how health and safety are affected by tourism.

In a study in India, it was discovered that negative perceptions of tourism impacts arose due to varying levels of exploitation of local workers, nepotism, corruption, government legislation, scarce availability of job opportunities and other factors (Rao and Saksena, 2021) – discussed in more detail further on. When considering areas where corruption, exploitation, and other hindering or contextual factors are not present, the same type of tourism can have very different economic and other life domain impacts on quality of life and residents' perceptions of quality of life. While Rao and Saksena (2021) provide research that leaves a gap for further study related to governing bodies obligation to residents in terms of boosting tourism, creating more genuine tourism experiences, benefiting local communities, and increasing quality of life in their countries, their study also validates research centred around location-specific factors, and highlights the importance of understanding local resident's perceptions of tourism impacts. Identifying residents' perceptions and contextualising them to a location reveals underlying issues that affect tourism and the intricacies of what is important to residents, their tolerance levels on the impacts of tourism, and their interpretation of those impacts in response to the circumstances of their particular environment.

In 2020, Lai, Pinto and Pintassilgo researched understanding residents' perceptions of how tourism impacts quality of life in Macau and understanding residents' 'emotional solidarity' towards tourists. Woosnam (2011), defines 'emotional solidarity' as 'the feeling of identification a person has with another person that serves to strengthen bonds between individuals.' This includes the welcoming nature, emotional closeness and sympathetic understanding (Lai *et al.*, 2020) experienced between residents and tourists. How residents act towards tourists will be determined by their perceptions and overall satisfaction of quality of life across life domains. Lai *et al.* (2020), studied the link between emotional solidarity and quality of life, showing a positive correlation between the two when considering the four domains of material, emotional, health and safety, and community. In their study on Macau, these authors collected data from persons over 18 years of age who had been residents of Macau for 7 years or longer. A questionnaire was developed and then accurately translated into Traditional Chinese. The form was distributed on social media and other online forums and an online survey tool was utilised. 407 usable samples were collected for data analysis. The four life domains were assessed according to residents' emotional solidarity, their perceptions of how tourism has affected these domains, their satisfaction with the domains, and their overall satisfaction with their quality of life. The data was then analysed for significant differences in sociodemographic factors, and differences in characteristics related to tourism. Analysis of this data showed resident's derived satisfaction from the impact of tourism regarding the four domains. The authors also determined that overall quality of life impacted the resident's emotional solidarity towards tourists in Macau. The study offers preliminary insights into resident motivations for welcoming or unwelcome attitudes towards tourists. These correlate with perceptions on quality of life and offer insights into the data collection methods utilised, which are similar to those of this dissertation. Lai *et al.* (2020) concluded that residents with positive perceptions of tourism impacts on quality of life were more satisfied with their quality of life. The converse is also true, meaning residents with negative perceptions were dissatisfied with their quality of life-related to tourism and had less emotional solidarity with tourists. An interesting aspect of findings in another study by Garcia *et al.* (2015) was that residents who were not associated with the economic factors of tourism were less positive and more neutral, sometimes even negative regarding the impacts of tourism in their location. This finding alludes to the idea that dependency on tourism creates more positive attitudes toward tourism. Garcia *et al.* (2020) further determined that the attitudes of residents were affected by the following factors:

- developmental stages that tourism undergoes, and that they were more inclined to ignore negative aspects of tourism;
- residents expressed that tourism in their location was often insufficient to their economic needs;
- the level of residents' knowledge on tourism affected their perceptions and superior knowledge formed better perceptions;
- sociodemographic variables determined women were more inclined to perceive tourism negatively and show less support for tourism, while older persons were more in favour of tourism – yet the opposite was found as well.
- younger adults had positive perceptions of job creation, and persons with higher education showed greater support for tourism.
- large income households were also found to have optimistic perceptions of tourism.

In their previous study, Garcia *et al.* (2015) concluded that residents were inclined to interchange with tourists if the exchange produced benefits aligned to specific factors: 1) the benefits had to be free from undesirable costs, 2) the outcome of residents' perceptions had to be that positive factors outweighed negative factors, and 3.) the interchange between residents and tourists had to have a positive impact on future tourism development. Their findings also determined that generalising data produced inconsistent results and therefore data should be determined by 'the characteristics of the destination.' These findings validate the need for tourist destinations to be studied according to location as generalisations fail to provide consistent or broadly measurable data. This lends importance to this dissertation's research aims of contributing to data on the Algarve region and further identifying areas of location-specific research regarding resident perceptions on quality of life resulting from impacts of tourism.

The support of residents for tourism in their area is an important aspect of tourism development. Woo *et al.* (2015) conducted a study in five different areas, namely: New York City, Hawaii, Orlando, Las-Vegas, and Virginia. The study researched local resident life satisfaction and their support for tourism. The authors utilised theoretical and empirical

evidence to focus on residents perceived value of tourism development, their material and non-material life domain satisfaction and the quality of life in their area. The authors expand on Social Exchange Theory by applying the concept of perceived value to the study. They do this in material domains, and non-material domains of community, emotional life, and health and safety. A unique aspect of this study is that the authors identify quality of life as a precursor to resident support for further development in tourism, and not only as an outcome for residents. To facilitate the study, Woo *et al.* (2015), used an online questionnaire which measured the indicators of material life satisfaction with regard to 3 factors: overall material life, financial status and standard of life. The response scales offered were (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree, which are similar to the response scales of the questionnaire utilised for this dissertation. Non-material life factors were measured according to community life, emotional life and health and safety life. Health factors addressed well-being and safety factors addressed 'security, privacy and residence stability. The results of the study showed that residents had positive perceptions of tourism development that were closely related to their perceptions of the material and non-material value of tourism development. The authors concluded that residents' perceptions of quality of life affect their support for further tourism development. Both economic and non-economic benefit are important to residents. Further, a direct relationship exists between residents' material and non-material life domain satisfaction and their perceived value of tourism development. This means that support for ongoing or future tourism development is affected by how residents evaluate their perception of the value of tourism development towards their life domains. (Woo *et al.*, 2015).

Material life domain impacts create perceptions of quality of life which affect views on life satisfaction. Lai *et al.* (2020) found that, in general, residents perceived modest positive effects on quality of life due to tourism. These effects were related to material domain factors of income, job security and government benefits. At the same time, these residents perceived negative impacts related to living costs, housing costs and basic necessity costs. Yet, overall the residents perceived greater negative impacts from tourism on their quality of life and showed low emotional solidarity with tourists. The implications of these findings are important for tourism development as they positively correlate the link between residents' emotional solidarity toward tourists and their perceptions of quality of life. It gives insight into the value of tourism for residents and locations.

Perceptions on job availability such as feelings of gratitude for seasonal opportunities or feelings of frustration at the lack of economic security due to seasonal work opportunities are viewed differently in different locations. Garcia *et al.* (2015) show that positive economic impacts result from employment generation and thus income, an increase in the negotiating power of residents, and improved infrastructure and facilities that improve the quality of life and living standards of residents. Garcia *et al.* (2015), determined negative impacts were related to the seasonal nature of tourist activities, the low-quality jobs available with low salaries and the consequent increase in the cost of living. The authors determined that economic impacts were generally perceived as positive because of the benefits received from tourism. Negatively perceived impacts were low wages and low-quality employment opportunities – yet, at the same time, these are perceived as positive due to the benefit of income.

In a similar context, Rao and Saksena (2021), explored tourism impacts on sustainable livelihood for residents of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve in India and looked deeply at resident's perceptions on economic, social and environmental tourism impacts. The researchers used a qualitative method and implemented a household survey questionnaire to gather demographic information and determine which households derived income from tourism. In addition, interviews with stakeholders were conducted. Rao and Saksena (2021), broadly concluded that a majority of residents felt tourism had negative economic outcomes – with high local prices and an unfair distribution of economic gains related to the tourism sector. Residents felt they were given the low-paying and seasonal employment opportunities, while non-seasonal jobs with higher pay were given to outsiders. Residents revealed that they perceived most economic activity in the area to be monopolised by larger companies, from transport and tourist activities to even local handicraft businesses which were run by larger private companies who paid low wages to locals to create their products. Further to the economic disadvantages, locals were not given the possibility to interact with tourists, as large companies created tour packages that didn't provide opportunities to local traders for positive cultural interaction and exchange. It was concluded that local tourism did not contribute towards higher salaries or higher spending potential for resident households. From this example, a variety of material life impacts exhibit and uncover local

perceptions, insufficiencies, and expectations. Understanding these perceptions puts tourism impacts in the area into context and directs the way for further research.

Tourism impacts also affect community life domains which are the socio-cultural and environmental impacts. When residents have access to leisure activities, when there is communication between locals and tourists, when cultural awareness and activities are promoted, and when historical sites are preserved, these are considered by residents to be positive impacts (Garcia *et al.*, 2015), and these can increase feelings of cultural identity and pride for an area. Negative impacts are often perceived as distress, the creation of high-pressure environments and overcrowding which compromises cultural identity and endangers social reality through an increase in crime in certain areas (Garcia *et al.*, 2015).

In environmental contexts, Garcia *et al.* (2015) found that residents were appreciative of preserving their infrastructure and preserving their natural resources due to tourism impacts. Conversely, tourism also contributes toward an increase in litter, pollution and overcrowding of these resources. Therefore, as tourism grows in an area, positive views may gradually shift to negative views (Woo *et al.*, 2018).

Emotional domain impacts include feelings of solidarity towards tourists, a sense of pride in the area of residence and having either positive or negative feelings and perceptions of tourism and tourism activity and its impacts. An emotional connection to one's home city or city of residence can be affected by the influx of tourists to an area. Although not immediately determinable, the emotional life of residents has a strong effect on their perceptions of tourism impacts. In Bama, China residents feel strong negative associations to tourism and tourists due to the negative effects on their local environment (Huang *et al.*, 2021). This is predominant at the Panyang River which, once clear, is now polluted due to the rapid tourist development in the area and the environmental effects this has had. Huang *et al.* (2021) cite residents feel 'worry, helplessness and disappointment' in relation to the Panyang river, some residents feel blame towards tourists for the damage caused to the environment by the influx of tourists and frustration is also felt by residents towards the noise and air pollution caused by construction related to tourist development, Yet in a

broader view, these residents choose to endure the negative aspects of tourism in the hope of better living conditions and improved economic opportunities in the area, showing that feelings of hope and optimism towards the future of tourism can boost positive perceptions and prompt residents to accept the negative impacts, in the hope of a better life. Emotional responses and impacts from tourism are related to the types of tourism an area experiences, such as health and well-being tourism or tourism where visitors want authentic experiences from a location and these different types of tourism bring very different experiences and impacts for residents.

Joo *et al.* (2021), considered how health and safety is affected by tourism impacts, how tourism contributes to increase security, whether tourism increases stress for residents, and whether residents are likely to suffer from living in a specific tourism destination. This research was motivated by the Covid-19 pandemic, which has prompted researchers to study tourism impacts from the perspective of how resident's perceive risk and as a result, how they feel their quality of life is affected by tourists regarding their feelings of safety versus risk from the virus. Joo *et al.* (2021) determined that residents viewed domestic tourists as a risk, and this caused a lack of support for those tourists – who, before, under different circumstances, residents may have felt stronger emotional solidarity towards and for whom they may have had positive perceptions. While this study is relevant towards future research, it also highlights the importance of residents' perceptions towards health and safety and how these can change when they view themselves at risk from tourists and the impacts of tourism.

Understanding tourism impacts, and how these affect resident's perceptions of quality of life is a complex process that requires insight into the life domains of residents in order to contextualise findings. While locations might experience tourism impacts differently, and generalisations cannot be made, the understanding of each location and its tourism environment from the resident's point of view offers invaluable insight into tourism. This understanding can then be applied to a variety of research fields and business and entrepreneurial contexts, as well as future tourism development, tourism management, municipal and other governing bodies policies and plans.

concentrated in the region (INE, 2017). At this time, the Algarve region mainly attracted guests from domestic markets (28.1%) and Britain (27,6%), while Germany (8,3%), Spain (7.4%), Netherlands (5.7%), Ireland (5.0%) and France (4,9%) made up the rest of the recorded and significant market (INE, 2017).

According to UK Holiday Cost Barometer reports, the Algarve was ranked second as the cheapest 'sun and beach' destination (Post Office Travel Money, 2019), which drew public attention to this destination, demonstrating that it is attractive and affordable for tourists looking for sun and beach getaways. Tourists spent an average of 4.6 nights in the Algarve and were attracted to the region for its climate, beaches, dining, affordability, hospitality and safety (Correia & Águas, 2017).

In the last decade, Faro has become a popular tourism area due to this attraction of the Algarve. In addition, it has a balance of vibrant nightlife and outdoor tourist activities, including high-quality beaches and surfing and other water sport activities. Tourism in Faro is benefited by the Faro International Airport, which makes Faro accessible and convenient.

According to the available data from the Census 2011, Faro municipality had a population estimated at 64, 560 in 2011, and a balanced distribution of male to female of 47,9% to 52.1%, respectively, in the same year ((PORDATA - Search Environment, 2021)). The target population for this study were residents in Faro parishes of Conceição e Estoi, Montenegro, Santa Bárbara de Nexe, and Sé and São Pedro.

3.2 Sampling and Data Collection

This study benefits from data collected through a survey questionnaire developed for the RESTUR low season report (2021). This project collected data in the 16 municipalities of the Algarve using stratified sampling by municipality, gender and age group, proportional to the resident population in each municipality. However, for this dissertation, only data from residents living in Faro will be considered. Table 3.1 shows the distribution of the resident population in Faro in 2017 (INE, 2018a) and table 3.2 shows the questionnaires collected (300). This sample size represents 90,1% of the

original sample size (333). Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the remaining 33 (9,9%), who were senior residents, were no longer willing to participate in the study.

Table 3.1 Resident population Faro - 2017, older than 18, by gender & age category.

Council	18-24 years of age			25-64 years of age			65 and older			18 and older
	M/F	Male	Female	M/F	Male	Female	M/F	Male	Female	M/F
Faro	4 057	2 112	1 945	32 724	15 439	17 285	12 979	5 578	7 401	49 760

Source: RESTUR Report (2021).

Table 3.2 Questionnaires collected in Faro - 2020, by gender & age, during low season.

Council	18-24 years of age			25-64 years of age			65 and older			18 and older	% Utilised
	M/F	Male	Female	M/F	Male	Female	M/F	Male	Female	M/F	
Faro	27	14	13	219	103	116	54	28	26	300	90,1

Source: RESTUR Report (2021).

The questionnaire was applied in 2020 from February to March, and October to November, during the Algarve tourism low season. The sample consisted of Portuguese residents in the city, aged 18 years and older. An inquiry team randomly approached residents in public spaces such as parks, shops, restaurants, places of residence, streets, etc. The residents then filled out the questionnaires in their own capacity. Questionnaires that were returned incomplete or with non-response rates over 10% were discarded.

3.3 Survey Instrument and Measures

Previous literature provided foundational information on which to build the survey questions. As focused on in chapter 2, earlier studies identified tourism impacts according to economic, socio-cultural and environmental factors, as well as life satisfaction with regards to the life domains of material, community, emotional, and health and safety. These dimensions were used to structure and form the questions and to organise the data. The full questionnaire used in the RESTUR project is in annex (Annex 1). This

dissertation explores some questions of this questionnaire, namely: 5 to 7 (perceptions towards tourism impacts); 36 and 37 (perceptions towards quality of life); 38-39 and 41-43 (sociodemographic variables); 21 to 23 (questions that measure dependence from the tourism activity).

The survey questionnaire provided 5-point Likert scales for resident responses. Tourism impacts were measured using a Likert scale of agreement ranging from 1 to 5, where 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree. Questions of life satisfaction had a Likert scale of satisfaction ranging from 1-5 where 1=very unsatisfied, 2=unsatisfied, 3= Neutral, 4=satisfied, 5=very satisfied. These scales were used to determine the degree of agreement between respondents, and this was quantified as a mean value that determined the average opinion or perception according to the scale options. Nominal or ordinal scales were used to identify marital status, education level and employment situation. Open answer questions were used to identify age, municipality of residence, parish of residence and length of residence in their municipality. Two options (male and female) were given to identify gender.

The research question and objectives provided the analytical framework for analysis.

Table 3.3 below shows the studies used to inform the items chosen to assess the tourism impacts and quality of life dimensions in this dissertation.

Table 3.3 Questionnaire theoretical foundation.

Analysis Dimensions	Questions of the Questionnaire	References
Perceptions about the economic, environmental and sociocultural impacts of tourism	1 - How do you evaluate the present state of tourism development in your community/municipality?	Vargas-Sánchez, A., Valle, P., Mendes, J. & Silva, J. (2015). Residents' attitude and level of destination development: an international comparison. <i>Tourism Management</i> , 48, 199-210.
		Sánchez, A., Bueno, N. & Mejía, M. (2014). Residents' attitude to tourism and seasonality. <i>Journal of Travel Research</i> , 53(5), 581-596.
	2 - Considering the state of tourism development in your community/municipality, to what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?	García, F., Fernández, M., Vázquez, A. & Macías, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). <i>Tourism Management</i> , 54, 259-274.
		Vareiro, L., Remoaldo, P. & Ribeiro, J. (2013). Residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in Guimarães (Portugal): a cluster analysis. <i>Current Issues in Tourism</i> , 16(6), 535-551.
		Nunkoo, R. & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism: an identity perspective. <i>Annals of Tourism Research</i> , 39(1), 243-268.
		Jordan, E., Spencer, D. & Prayag, G. (2019). Tourism impacts, emotions and stress. <i>Annals of Tourism Research</i> , 75, 213-226.
		Segota, T., Mihalic, T. & KusCer, K. (2017). The impact of residents' informedness and involvement on their perceptions of tourism impacts: the case of Bled. <i>Journal of Destination Marketing & Management</i> , 6, 196-206.
		Rasoolimanesh, S., Jaafar, M., Kock, N. & Ramayah, T. (2015). A revised framework of social exchange theory to investigate the factors influencing residents' perceptions. <i>Tourism Management Perspectives</i> , 16, 335-345.
		Choi, H-S. & Sirakaya, E. (2005). Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. <i>Journal of Travel Research</i> , 43, 380-394.
		Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: a comparative tourism study. <i>Annals of Tourism Research</i> , 29(1), 231-253.
		Wang, W. (2019). The effect of early-life outdoor experiences on residents' attitudes towards sustainable tourism within an urban context. <i>Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism</i> , 25, 1-9.
		Lin, Z., Chen, Y. & Filieri, R. (2017). Resident-tourist value co-creation: the role of residents' perceived tourism impacts and life satisfaction. <i>Tourism Management</i> 61, 436-442.
		Lee, T. & Jan, F. (2019). Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. <i>Tourism Management</i> , 70, 368-380.
		Liang, Z. & Hui, T. (2016). Residents' quality of life and attitudes toward tourism development in China. <i>Tourism Management</i> , 57, 56-67.
		Kim, K., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? <i>Tourism Management</i> , 36, 527-540.
Woo, E., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. (2018). Tourism impact and stakeholders' quality of life. <i>Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research</i> , 42(2), 260-286.		
Perceptions about tourism impacts on the quality of life	Measured with some items in questions 2 and 3	Suess, C., Baloglu, S. & Busser, J. (2018). Perceived impacts of medical tourism development on community wellbeing. <i>Tourism Management</i> , 69, 232 - 245.
		Andereck, K. & Nyaupane, G. (2011). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. <i>Journal of Travel Research</i> , 50(3), 248-260.
		Lee, T. & Jan, F. (2019). Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. <i>Tourism Management</i> , 70, 368-380.
		Kim, K., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? <i>Tourism Management</i> , 36, 527-540.
		Woo, E., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. (2018). Tourism impact and stakeholders' quality of life. <i>Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research</i> , 42(2), 260-286.
Personal characteristics	Questions 20 to 26	Used by all the researches.
	27 - How long have you been living in this place?	Liang, Z. & Hui, T. (2016). Residents' quality of life and attitudes toward tourism development in China. <i>Tourism Management</i> , 57, 56-67.

3.4 Data Analysis

Once collected, data from the questionnaires were entered into the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 software for analysis. Frequencies for relevant sociodemographic and tourism dependence variables were calculated and presented as tables. These tables characterised the sample residents and organised their responses according to the thematic framework created by the survey questionnaire. The tourism impacts were divided by positive and negative impacts, allowing each to be presented independently and also in relation to the

other. Accordingly, the analysis was separated, considering first the positive and negative economic impacts; then, the positive and negative socio-cultural impacts; and the positive and negative environmental impacts. The same rationale was used to analyse satisfaction with the four life domains (material, community, emotional, and health & safety) and overall life satisfaction.

Each item analysed was characterised with a mean and standard deviation. Overall means were also provided. Each scale was validated using the Cronbach Alpha reliability value. As a general rule, a Cronbach's alpha value below 0,7 indicates low internal consistency (Bryman, 2012). Values between 0,80 and 0,90 suggest high reliability, and higher than 0,9, an excellent reliability. Pearson R correlations and their significance were used to assess the degree of correlation between positive or negative perceptions on tourism impacts, and life satisfaction.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

4.1 Sample characteristics

The sample consisted of 300 residents in Faro, with slightly more female (51,7%) respondents than male (48.3%) (Table 4.1). This gives a good representation of this demographic for Faro's residents as it is very close to the distribution reported on www.citypopulation.de (Faro District, Portugal) - Population Statistics, Charts, Map and Location, 2021), which cites 52.6% female residents in Faro and 47.4% male residents. Respondents' age varied from 18 to 86 years old. The average age was 43 years old, with a standard deviation of over 16 years. Additional age demographics showed that most respondents (73%) were between 25-64 years old and potentially in the workforce, entrepreneurs or business owners. The remaining age demographic was 9% aged 18-24 - who were potentially either in the workforce or studying towards higher education - and 18% aged 65 or older who were potentially still running businesses, working or retired.

The highest percentage of respondents were single (43,7%), followed closely by 42,3% being married or living together, and the remaining sample was divided as 10,9% divorced and 3.1% widowed. Regarding education, 18,5% of the sample had completed elementary school until 9 years, 47,3% had completed secondary school, and 34,2% had completed a form of higher education.

Responses from 291 of the 300 residents on how long they had lived in the municipality indicated an average term of approximately 28 years of residency in the council of Faro, yet a deviation of over 18 years implies that a diverse residency term in fact exists. Residents came from several parishes, but Sé e São Pedro residents delivered around 83% of responses from 245 of 300 responses received.

Regarding a connection to the tourism sector, 55% of respondents had professional activity related to the tourism sector, with 38,6% having a member of their household working in the tourism sector, and 66,4% of respondents declared that either part or totality of their income was derived from tourism.

Of the 300 responses to this question, it was determined that 77,6% were employed and only 2,4% were unemployed. Further, 6,4% were students, 11,5% were retired and 2% were maintaining a household. The high percentage of employed respondents has the potential to contribute a good indication of tourism economic impacts.

Table 4.1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample.

Characteristics of the Sample		
Variables	<i>n</i>	percentage
Gender		
Male	145	48,30
Female	155	51,70
Age		
18-24	27	9,00
25-64	219	73,00
≥ 65	54	18,00
Marital Status		
Single	128	43,70
Married/Living Together	124	42,30
Divorced	32	10,90
Widowed	9	3,10
Education Level		
Elementary (until 9 years)	55	18,50
High School	141	47,30
Higher Education	102	34,20
Income Related to Tourism		
Professional activity related to the tourism sector	198	55,00
Professional activity not related to tourism sector	162	45,00
A member of the household works in the tourism sector	139	38,60
A member of the household does not work in the tourism sector	218	60,60
Household income (part or totality) comes from tourism	239	66,40
Household income (part or totality) does not come from tourism	119	33,10
Employment Status		
Employed	229	77,60
Unemployed	7	2,40
Student	19	6,40
Retired	34	11,50
Housekeeper	6	2,00
Parish of Residence in the Algarve		
Conceição e Estoi	14	4,70
Montenegro	24	8,10
Santa Bárbara de Nexe	13	4,40
Sé e São Pedro	245	82,80

4.2 Perceptions about tourism impacts

This section is dedicated to describe how residents in Faro perceive the impacts of tourism in the municipality. The analysis will be disaggregated by considering the different type of impacts: economic, socio-cultural and environmental. Positive and negative impacts will be considered separately.

4.2.1 Economic impacts

Positive economic impacts

Table 4.2 indicates that residents in Faro recognise that tourism has increased employment opportunities (Mean (M)=4,20) and created more business for local people (M=4,07). They also pointed out that tourism contributes to new services and businesses (M=4,02) and develops local economic activities (M=4,13).

The data indicated some ambivalence on whether tourism created more business for foreign people (M=3,59) and whether tourism was the main economic activity of their area (M=3,72) as this aspect yielded a high standard deviation (1,005) which indicates responses were varied.

Table 4.2. Perceptions regarding positive economic impacts of tourism.

POSITIVE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TOURISM							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
Tourism is the main economic activity	298	1	5	3,72	1,005		
Tourism increases employment opportunities	296	1	5	4,20	0,727		
Tourism creates more business for local people	297	1	5	4,07	0,822		
Tourism creates more business for foreign people	298	1	5	3,59	0,941		
Tourism contributes to create new services & businesses	296	1	5	4,02	0,694		
Tourism contributes to develop local economic activities	300	1	5	4,13	0,668		
Tourism is likely to attract more investment	298	1	5	3,95	0,827		
The money spent by tourists stays in the municipality	298	1	5	3,11	0,863		
More roads and urbanisations were constructed because of tourism	296	1	5	3,05	1,008		
Tourism promotes the restoration of historic buildings	299	1	5	3,34	1,066		
Tourism improves shopping, restaurant and entertainment opportunities	300	1	5	3,31	1,005		
						0,845	3,678

Negative economic impacts

Respondents showed mixed views – indicated by a high standard deviation - on whether cultural attractions and events were more expensive due to tourism, on whether tourism generated instability in employment due to the high incidence of seasonal work and whether the municipality was overly economically dependent on tourism. As table 4.3

evidences, there was a strong agreement that tourism increased the cost of living in the municipality ($M=4,26$), and a moderate agreement that goods and services became more expensive due to tourism ($M=3,97$). Further, the responses indicate that respondents disagreed or were neutral regarding perceptions that most of the local businesses were for tourists ($M=2,92$) and that tourism reduced traditional trade ($M=2,68$).

Table 4.3. Perceptions regarding negative economic impacts of tourism.

NEGATIVE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TOURISM							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
Tourism increases the cost of living	297	1	5	4,26	0,843		
Goods and services are more expensive because of tourism	300	1	5	3,97	0,955		
Cultural attractions and events are more expensive because of tourism	296	1	5	3,61	0,989		
Most of the local businesses are for tourists	298	1	5	2,92	0,986		
Tourism contributes to reduce the traditional trade	299	1	5	2,68	1,028		
Tourism generates employment instability due to seasonality	299	1	5	3,76	1,038		
My municipality is economically over-dependent on tourism.	299	1	5	3,66	0,995		
Tourism increases the price of housing and land	299	2	5	4,39	0,736		
						0,791	3,653

The overall means for perceptions about economic impacts show a slight difference between the positive impacts (3,68) and the negative impacts (3,65). This indicates that residents perceive high positive impacts and high negative impacts, with only marginally more positive impacts. An adequate level of internal consistency was verified in both scales given the Cronbach's alpha values, close or higher than 0,8 (0.845, for positive impacts and 0,791, for negative impacts).

4.2.2 Socio-cultural impacts

Positive socio-cultural impacts

At the socio-cultural level, table 4.4 shows that residents in Faro somewhat agreed that tourism stimulates cultural activities, festivals and traditions ($M=3,59$), that it promotes cultural exchange between residents and tourists ($M=3,64$), and that it contributes to the recognition, prestige and image of their municipality ($M=3,76$). Residents in Faro also showed agreement with the idea that residents are hospitable and receive tourists with politeness ($M=3,77$).

The overall average (3.26) reflects the positive perceptions of residents about several aspects: whether tourism encourages cultural activities, festivals and traditions ($M = 3.59$); whether tourism contributes to the preservation of local culture ($M = 3.32$); whether

tourism promotes cultural exchange between residents and tourists ($M = 3.64$); if tourism contributes to the recognition, prestige and image of my municipality ($M = 3.76$) and if residents in the municipality are hospitable and receive educated tourists ($M = 3.77$). Conversely, residents did not feel that tourism improved public services ($M=2,54$) or increased security ($M=2,84$). Regarding whether tourism raised the standard of living for residents ($M=2,92$) or changed their consumption habits ($M=2,96$), the responses lean towards perceptions of disagreement and neutrality. The standard deviations of the means, almost all close to 1, indicate diverse answers.

Table 4.4 Perceptions regarding positive socio-cultural impacts of tourism.

POSITIVE SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
Tourism improves public services	299	1	5	2,54	0,970		
Tourism stimulates cultural activities, festivals and traditions	297	1	5	3,59	0,904		
Tourism contributes to the preservation of the local culture	296	1	5	3,32	0,975		
Tourism promotes cultural exchange between residents and tourists	296	1	5	3,64	0,895		
Tourism changes the consumption habits of residents	297	1	5	2,96	1,014		
Tourism contributes to raising the standard of living of residents	299	1	5	2,92	1,015		
tourism contributes to increase security	293	1	5	2,84	0,991		
Tourism contributes to the recognition, prestige and image of my municipality	299	1	5	3,76	0,800		
Residents in my municipality are hospitable and receive tourists with politeness	298	1	5	3,77	0,944		
						0,789	3,255

Negative socio-cultural impacts

Perceptions about the negative socio-cultural impacts of tourism are presented in table 4.5. Findings indicate that most residents perceived that tourism did not cause a loss or change of traditions and cultural identity ($M=2,77$). The most significant negative socio-cultural impacts mentioned by residents were an increase in drug and alcohol consumption ($M=3.33$), followed by an increase in stress and disruptions to the quietness ($M=3.04$). The latter mean has a high standard deviation (1,066) which indicates diverse responses to the question. The remaining items presented low averages, between $M=2,45$ to $M=2.94$, showing perceptions of neutrality or disagreement.

Table 4.5 Perceptions regarding negative socio-cultural impacts of tourism

NEGATIVE SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
Tourism increases drugs and alcohol consumption	299	1	5	3,33	0,990		
Tourism increases prostitution and moral degradation	298	1	5	2,88	1,001		
Tourism increases sexually transmitted diseases	298	1	5	2,94	0,928		
Tourism causes more crime and vandalism	296	1	5	2,86	0,966		
Tourism generates loss or change of traditions and cultural identity	299	1	5	2,77	0,936		
Tourism causes loss of tolerance and respect for other cultures	296	1	5	2,45	0,897		
Tourism increases stress and disturbs quietness	299	1	5	3,04	1,066		
The increasing number of tourists is likely to result in conflicts with residents	299	1	5	2,72	0,973		
Residents change their behaviour in an attempt to mimic tourists	299	1	5	2,55	0,930		
Residents are likely to suffer from living in this tourism destination	297	1	5	2,87	1,042		
My municipality is overcrowded because of tourism	299	1	5	2,75	1,062		
						0,899	2,818

The overall mean for positive impacts (3,26) and overall mean for negative impacts (2,82) indicate more positive perceptions regarding socio-economic impacts of tourism than negative. Regarding the socio-cultural impacts, the scales report an adequate level of internal consistency given the Cronbach's alpha values, close or higher than 0,8 (0,789, for positive impacts and 0,899, for negative impacts).

4.2.3 Environmental impacts

Positive environmental impacts

As shown in table 4.6, perceptions towards positive environmental impacts have high variance. They are low overall, showing that residents in Faro disagree regarding tourism impacts being the impetus to creating more gardens and parks (M=2,46), improving the protection of the environment (M=2,61), protecting natural heritage and natural resources (M=2,92), improving cleanliness of public spaces (M=2,93), and influencing ecological awareness amongst residents (M=2,85). Residents mostly perceived neutral environmental impacts regarding an improvement of public infrastructure (M=3,01) and road signage systems (M=3,18).

Table 4.6. Perceptions regarding positive environmental impacts of tourism.

POSITIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
There are more public gardens and parks because of tourism	300	1	5	2,46	0,972		
Tourism improves the protection of the environment	298	1	5	2,61	0,915		
Tourism improves the protection of natural heritage and natural resources	299	1	5	2,92	0,971		
Tourism improves public infrastructures	296	1	5	3,01	1,051		
Tourism improves road signage systems	298	1	5	3,18	0,987		
Tourism improves the cleanliness of public spaces	298	1	5	2,93	0,979		
Tourism positively influences ecological awareness amongst residents	298	1	5	2,85	0,924		
						0,878	2,851

Negative environmental impacts

The responses in table 4.7 show that residents had varied perceptions towards the negative impacts of tourism, with a high incidence of agreement that tourism increases pollution, noise, garbage, etc. (M=3,38), that tourism contributes to occupy the natural areas (M=3,45), and that tourism mischaracterises and deteriorates the natural landscape (M=3,15), and generates traffic congestion, accidents and parking problems (M=3,72).

Table 4.7. Perceptions regarding negative environmental impacts of tourism.

NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
Tourism increases pollution, noise, garbage, etc	299	1	5	3,38	0,998		
Tourism deteriorates the natural environment	299	1	5	2,94	0,912		
Tourism contributes to occupy the natural areas	299	1	5	3,45	0,969		
Tourism prevents the access of residents to natural spaces	296	1	5	2,93	1,077		
Tourism contributes to decharacterise the landscape	299	1	5	3,15	1,099		
Tourism generates traffic congestion, accidents and parking problems	299	1	5	3,72	1,041		
						0,864	3,263

The overall mean for positive impacts being 2.85 is considerably lower than the mean for negative impacts of 3.26, this indicates that residents perceive greater negative environmental impacts due to tourism. Both scales report a high level of internal consistency given the Cronbach's alpha values, higher than 0,85 (0.878, for positive impacts and 0,864, for negative impacts).

4.3 Perceptions about residents' quality of life

This section is dedicated to describing how residents in Faro classify their satisfaction in various domains regarding quality of life. The analysis will be disaggregated by material life domain, community life domain, emotional life domain, health and safety life domain

and overall life satisfaction. The scales were 1-5: 1=very unsatisfied, 2=unsatisfied, 3=neutral, 4=satisfied, 5=very satisfied.

4.3.1 Satisfaction with material life domain of quality of life

Residents indicated an 'unsatisfied' response overall (M=2,43), demonstrating dissatisfaction and poor perceptions of material domain quality of life (table 4.8). The real estate taxes (M=1,94) showed the highest level of dissatisfaction, with a low standard deviation of 0,846 which indicates some unanimity and low diversity in these responses. The benefits received from the government (M=2,09) and the cost of basic necessities in the municipality (M=2,41) presented low means, also indicating dissatisfaction with these items. Responses between unsatisfied and neutral were shown with regards to cost of living (M=2,44), the cost of basic necessities (M=2,41), income at current job (M=2,55), the economic security at the current job (M=2,89), and the family income (M=2,67).

The items composing the scale used to measure satisfaction with material life domain report a high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=0.860).

Table 4.8. Satisfaction with material life domain quality of life.

SATISFACTION OF MATERIAL LIFE DOMAIN							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The cost of living in my municipality	275	1	5	2,44	0,935		
The cost of basic necessities in my municipality	275	1	5	2,41	0,922		
The real estate taxes in my municipality	275	1	5	1,94	0,846		
The income at my current job	275	1	5	2,55	0,963		
The economic security of my current job	275	1	5	2,89	1,053		
The family income	275	1	5	2,67	0,933		
The benefits I receive from the government	275	1	5	2,09	0,927		
						0,860	2,43

4.3.2 Satisfaction with community life domain of quality of life

As table 4.9 evidences, residents showed moderate perceptions of satisfaction toward the people who live in the community (M=3,32) and overall municipality life (M=3,27) both of these items had low standard deviations which indicates a low variance of answers and, therefore, agreement by residents on their perceptions of these factors. The remaining items show dissatisfied perceptions of the environmental conditions of the municipality (M=2,74), the conditions of the public transport in the municipality (M=2,46), the services and facilities received in the municipality (M=2,69) and the way culture is preserved in the municipality (M=2,99). An overall mean of 2,91 indicates a majority of dissatisfied perceptions regarding community domain quality of life. This scale presents a high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=0.850).

Table 4.9. Satisfaction with community life domain quality of life.

SATISFACTION OF COMMUNITY LIFE DOMAIN							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The environmental conditions of my municipality	287	1	5	2,74	0,973		
The conditions of the public transportation in my municipality	287	1	5	2,46	1,016		
The services and facilities I receive in my municipality	287	1	5	2,69	0,941		
The people who live in my municipality	287	1	5	3,32	0,771		
The way culture is preserved in my municipality	287	1	5	2,99	0,881		
The overall municipality life	287	1	5	3,27	0,901	0,850	2,91

4.3.3 Satisfaction with emotional life domain of quality of life

Residents showed moderate satisfaction regarding spare time ($M=3,36$) and leisure life ($M=3,38$), although high standard deviations of 1,027 and 1,020 respectively indicate diverse responses (table 4.10). Leisure activities in the municipality showed neutral responses ($M=3,06$). Religious services in the municipality ($M=3,14$), and spiritual life in the municipality ($M=3,11$) had an average response of 'neutral' with low standard deviations (0,692 and 0,698, respectively) that indicate high unanimity in responses. The overall mean of 3,21 indicates residents generally have neutral perceptions regarding emotional life domain satisfaction. The scale reports a high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=0.825).

Table 4.10. Satisfaction with emotional life domain quality of life.

SATISFACTION OF EMOTIONAL LIFE DOMAIN							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The spare time	287	1	5	3,36	1,027		
The leisure life	287	1	5	3,38	1,020		
The leisure activities in my municipality	287	1	5	3,06	0,922		
The religious services in my municipality	287	1	5	3,14	0,692		
The spiritual life in my municipality	287	1	5	3,11	0,678	0,825	3,21

4.3.4 Satisfaction with health and safety life domain of quality of life

Residents showed some satisfaction with environmental quality ($M=3,26$), air quality ($M=3,31$) and water quality ($M=3,36$) in their community (table 4.11). Neutral views were generally held regarding safety and security ($M=3,02$), environmental cleanliness ($M=2,95$), traffic congestion ($M=2,75$) and crime rates ($M=2,98$). More negative views were reported regarding the municipal health facilities ($M=2,38$) and the health service quality ($M=2,36$).

An overall mean of 2,93 indicates neutral perceptions, leaning towards positive views. The scale reports a high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=0.861).

Table 4.11. Satisfaction with health and safety life domain quality of life.

SATISFACTION OF HEALTH AND SAFETY LIFE DOMAIN							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The health facilities in my municipality	287	1	5	2,38	1,017		
The health service quality in my municipality	287	1	5	2,36	1,024		
The air quality in my municipality	287	1	5	3,31	0,835		
The water quality in my municipality	287	1	5	3,36	0,912		
The environmental quality in my municipality	287	1	5	3,26	0,891		
The environmental cleanliness in my municipality	287	1	5	2,95	0,986		
The safety and security in my municipality	287	1	5	3,02	0,971		
The traffic congestion in my municipality	287	1	5	2,75	1,022		
The crime rate in my municipality	287	1	5	2,98	0,925		
						0,861	2,93

4.3.5 Overall satisfaction with Quality of Life

Respondents indicated satisfaction with their life (3,74) and perceived themselves as generally happy people (3,82) – these responses were supported by low standard deviations that indicate high agreement from residents (table 4.12). Further, residents responded with 'neutral' to the items, 'so far, I have gotten the important things I want in life' (M=3,20), 'in most ways my life is close to the ideal' (M=3,02), and 'the conditions of my life are excellent' (M=3,01). The only factor that provided a negative response (M=2,85) was 'if I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing' – this response had a standard deviation of 0,978 – the highest of the items (although not high), indicating that this item had the most diverse answers. The overall mean (3,27) shows residents in general are moderately satisfied with their life. The scale reports a very good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=0.875).

Table 4.12. Overall life satisfaction.

OVERALL LIFE SATISFACTION							
Item analysed	No.	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
I am satisfied with my life as a whole	289	1	5	3,74	0,758		
The conditions of my life are excellent	289	1	5	3,01	0,928		
In most ways my life is close to the ideal	289	1	5	3,02	0,922		
So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life	289	1	5	3,20	0,903		
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	289	1	5	2,85	0,978		
In general, I am a happy person	289	1	5	3,82	0,802		
						0,875	3,27

4.4 Impacts of tourism and perceptions toward quality of life

The matrix below (table 4.13) reflects Pearson R correlations among the dimensions of perceptions about tourism impacts (economic, socio-cultural and environmental) and the dimensions of quality of life (material, community, emotional, health and safety, and

overall life satisfaction). These correlations are analysed in relation to the research question: which aspects of tourism impacts are related to resident's quality of life in the capital of Algarve, Faro?

The correlation coefficient range is from -1.0 to 1.0, with -1.0 being a perfect negative correlation and 1.0 being a perfect positive correlation. Correlations at 0 (zero) reflect no correlation, and coefficients in close proximity to 0 infer a weak correlation (Berenson et al., 2018). As reported in table 4.13, overall, the correlations are low to moderate. Their highest value is 0.456 between perceptions about positive environmental impacts and satisfaction with the health and safety life domain. Results also show that all correlations are significant at 1% or 5%. This means that hypotheses of the absence of correlations between the pairs of variables in the target population, should be rejected. In other words, and with respect to our research question, results allow us to conclude that all aspects of tourism impacts are related to resident's quality of life in the city of Faro.

Another significant finding is that all correlations between positive impacts and the dimensions of quality of life are positive. This implies that residents' positive perceptions about tourism impacts are positively correlated to higher levels of satisfaction with the quality of life. Regarding the positive economic impacts, the higher correlations are with the health and safety life domain (0.374) and community life domain (0.363). The same pattern was reported in what concerns the positive socio-cultural impacts, and the positive environmental impacts. They are stronger correlated to the same life domains: health and safety life domain (0.421 and 0.456, respectively) and community life domain (0.337 and 0.431, respectively). However, the highest correlation with perceptions about positive impacts regarding the overall life domain involves the economic impacts (0.255).

Of further significance is that all correlations between negative impacts and the dimensions of quality of life are negative. This implies that residents' strongly perceive the negative impacts of tourism, at the three levels – economic, socio-cultural and environmental – and are less satisfied with quality of life, considering its several domains: material, community, emotional, health and safety, and overall life satisfaction. This implies that residents' negative perceptions about tourism impacts are negatively correlated to lower satisfaction levels with quality of life. Regarding the negative economic impacts, the highest correlations were in the material life domain (-0,237) and health and safety domain (-0,175). With the negative socio-cultural impact, the highest

correlations were for the health and safety domain (-0,282), followed by the emotional domain (-0,233). The negative environmental impacts had the highest correlation with the health and safety domain (-0,262) followed by the material life domain (-0,232). Interestingly, health and safety domain was negatively correlated in all three impacts – economic, socio-cultural and environmental – with the highest negative correlation in socio-cultural and environmental levels. This indicates that negative perceptions about environmental and socio-cultural impacts negatively correlate to negative perceptions of quality of life in the health and safety domain. Regarding the overall life domain, the highest correlation was regarding socio-cultural impacts (-0,151).

Table 4.13 Correlation matrix of tourism impacts (positive and negative) and the life domains.

		MATERIAL LIFE DOMAIN	COMMUNITY LIFE DOMAIN	EMOTIONAL LIFE DOMAIN	HEALTH & SAFETY LIFE DOMAIN	OVERALL LIFE DOMAIN
POSITIVE ECONOMIC IMPACTS	Pearson Correlation	,153	,363 ^{**}	,244 ^{**}	,374 ^{**}	,255 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,010	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000
	N	280	280	280	281	279
NEGATIVE ECONOMIC IMPACTS	Pearson Correlation	-,237 ^{**}	-,140 [*]	-,172 ^{**}	-,175 ^{**}	-,126 [*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,017	0,003	0,003	0,032
	N	288	288	288	289	287
POSITIVE SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS	Pearson Correlation	,281 ^{**}	,337 ^{**}	,197 ^{**}	,421 ^{**}	,198 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000	0,001	0,000	0,001
	N	278	278	278	279	277
NEGATIVE SOCIO-CULTURAL IMPACTS	Pearson Correlation	-,126 [*]	-,197 ^{**}	-,233 ^{**}	-,282 ^{**}	-,151 [*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,035	0,001	0,000	0,000	0,011
	N	282	282	282	283	281
POSITIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	Pearson Correlation	,290 ^{**}	,431 ^{**}	,246 ^{**}	,456 ^{**}	,130 [*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,000	0,028
	N	287	287	287	288	286
NEGATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	Pearson Correlation	-,232 ^{**}	-,225 ^{**}	-,185 ^{**}	-,262 ^{**}	-,130 [*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000	0,000	0,002	0,000	0,027
	N	290	290	290	291	289

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study, integrated into the RESTUR project (RESTUR, 2019), is the first to research residents' perceptions in Faro, in the Algarve, Portugal.

The research utilised data gathered from 300 Faro residents in 2020 to answer the research question of which aspects of tourism are related to residents' quality of life in the Algarve capital, Faro.

The aims of the research were strategized as follows:

- Measure residents' perceptions of tourism impacts - both positive and negative - within the domains of material, community, emotional, health & safety, and overall life satisfaction.
- Measure residents' perceptions of quality of life regarding the domains of material, community, emotional, health & safety, and overall life satisfaction.
- Determine whether a relationship exists between residents' perceptions of tourism impacts and their valuation of quality of life in the city of Faro.
- Determine if any commonalities exist between the findings of the study in relation to previous literature on the impacts of tourism and quality of life.

Results in chapter 4 allowed us to achieve the first two aims. The following analysis details the results and links these and the previous literature to determine commonalities and differences that support findings, therefore responding to the third research aim.

Residents' perceptions about tourism impacts

The measurement of residents' perceptions of tourism impacts demonstrated a variety of views in response to data collected from the RESTUR survey questionnaire questions (Annex 1).

Perceptions toward economic impacts were perceived to have high positive, and high negative impacts in Faro, with only marginally more positive impacts than negative. This presented as views of increased employment opportunities, more business creation, a contribution to new services and businesses and towards developing local economic activities for local people, yet this was countered by only marginally fewer views that tourism generated unemployment due to seasonality. Overall, views on the negative impact of tourism on the cost of living in the

Faro municipality were highest, indicating the strong positive perceptions were contrasted by these strong negative perceptions. Overall, findings on economic impacts demonstrate residents experience mixed views and a sense of duality in their perceptions towards these economic impacts. These findings are aligned to Telfer and Sharpley's (2015) idea that tourism destinations engage in an exchange between the benefits (positive perceptions) and negative social and environmental impacts of tourism. The findings are also similar to those of Tovar et al. (2020) who determined that residents of Gran Canaria experienced a duality between the positive economic impacts of employment, and the negative economic impacts of that employment being seasonal, and Gonzalez et al. (2018) who concluded that residents were appreciative of the positive and negative impacts of tourism on the economy, which created overall positive perceptions of tourism, despite their awareness of the negative impacts. Yet, the findings differ to those of Bahia, Brazil where researchers determined that residents were grateful for the economic effects of tourism for providing their assets (Winter and Adu-Ampong, 2021). So, our study reinforces that idea that the findings are different or similar in different locations, indicating that residents' perceptions are reliant on contextual factors related to the destination, and are therefore not consistent when generalised – as determined by Garcia *et al.* (2015).

Perceptions toward socio-cultural impacts demonstrated overall high positive perceptions, especially towards tourism's contribution toward residents' hospitality in receiving tourists with politeness, and the recognition, prestige, and image of the municipality -much like the residents of Gran Canaria who felt that cruise ship tourism positively benefitted the image and prestige of the destination (Tovar *et al.*, 2020). This is contrasted by destinations, such as Bahia, Brazil where perceptions of prestige are of little significance when economic impacts are of high importance (Winter and Adu-Ampong, 2021). This was complemented by positive views of tourism stimulating cultural activities, festivals and traditions, and promoting cultural exchange between residents and tourists. Negative perceptions were mostly related to a loss of cultural identity and tradition, a degradation of society through increased drug and alcohol consumption and increased stress and disruptions to the municipality's quietness. Noise pollution is similarly reported in Venice, Italy due to travellers wheeling suitcases along cobbled streets (Yeomans and Slater, 2021) and in Gran Canaria due to cruise ship tourism (Tovar *et al.*, 2020). These residents also cited that tourists made the beach water seem more polluted. Once again, it is

hard to draw generalities from these findings as the outcome – noise pollution is the same, yet the source, context and predetermining factors are entirely different.

Perceptions toward environmental impacts showed that residents viewed high negative impacts, mostly associated to an increase in noise, pollution, garbage and so on, as well as tourism's impact on deteriorating the natural landscape, occupying natural areas and generating traffic congestion and related problems such as accidents and parking insufficiency. Saenz-de-Miera and Rossello (2012) concluded that an increase in tourists lowered speeds and increased traffic congestions, which created a negative image of the destination and reduced tourism to the area. While the effect – congestion – is the same in both destinations, the outcome of the impact is different, necessitating research that is location specific to gain more holistic views of tourism impacts.

Perceptions about resident's quality of life

The material life domain was determined to have an overall response of 'unsatisfied', indicating that residents in Faro manifest concern about material life, especially regarding the cost of real estate taxes and the cost of living (i.e. the cost of basic necessities), income, and economic security at their place of employ, as well as family income as a whole. Lai *et al.* (2020) found that residents experienced negative tourism impacts related to living costs, housing costs and basic necessity costs, and only modest positive effects on quality of life due to tourism impacts on income, job security and government benefits. Garcia *et al.* (2015) determined quality of life was improved by improved infrastructure and facilities and this resulted from positive economic impacts of employment generation and therefore income generation. The authors also determined that negative impacts resulted from seasonality and the low-quality jobs tourism provided. They also found duality in the negative perceptions of low wages and low-quality employment, countered by the positive impacts of income (from employment). Rao and Saksena (2021) found a similar negative perception in Ranthambore Tiger Reserve in India with economic factors such as high prices and unfair distribution of economic gains, yet here the residents perceived economic activity to be monopolised by large private companies and their perceptions were shaped by the politics of the region. Once again, similar impacts and effects on residents' perceptions occur, yet the context of their impact can be different, with different overall outcomes. Each location has its own environment of causation and this affects the perceptions of residents, as well as the impact of tourism that precedes this.

Community life domain had overall 'unsatisfied' responses accompanied by only moderate perceptions of satisfaction regarding overall municipality life and the people who live in the municipality. Negative perceptions were motivated by tourism impacts on the municipality's environmental conditions, the conditions of public transport, received services and facilities, and the preservation of culture in the municipality. Residents are attached to their local environment and as Garcia *et al.* (2015) found, residents were grateful for their infrastructure and preserving their natural resources in a tourism context.

The results about the Emotional life domain revealed that residents held neutral perceptions in this domain, neither feeling particularly positive or negative overall towards aspects such as spare time, leisure activities, religious services, spiritual life and leisure life. This is contrasted by the experience of residents in Bama, China who felt strong negative association to tourism due to the negative effects on their environment (Huang et al., 2021). In Bama the residents felt "worry, helplessness and disappointment" regarding the pollution of the Panyang river at their tourism location. Although these residents felt strong negative emotions regarding tourism impacts, they were optimistic and hopeful that tourism would bring positive economic impacts in the future and thereby improve their living conditions. The case of China, suggests that emotional life perceptions are location-specific and strong negative perceptions in one domain (in this instance the emotional life domain) may be suppressed by residents in hope of better impacts in other life domains.

Health & Safety domain revealed mostly neutral views toward safety and security, environmental cleanliness, traffic congestion and crime rates, with some leaning towards positive views such as environmental, air and water quality. Negative views were associated with health facilities and their service quality. These negative views align with the findings of Agovino *et al.* (2020) who determined that residents experienced a deterioration of health services during tourism season. Findings that align don't necessarily imply that a generalisation can be made, rather the context of the location must be considered and further research applied. Further to this, residents' perceptions of health and safety domains can change according to the context of how the world changes and these unpredictable aspects require frameworks that are adaptable. For instance, Joo *et al.* (2021) studied the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic on

residents' perceptions of safety vs. risk regarding domestic tourists and the virus. Ordinarily residents may have had positive perceptions of domestic tourists, yet findings indicated that under the threat of a pandemic, domestic tourists were now viewed as a risk.

An analysis of overall satisfaction with quality of life revealed that people in Faro are generally happy and had similar moderate responses of being 'satisfied' with their life. The only factor that showed an overall negative mean was the question of 'If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.'

Correlations among residents' perceptions on tourism impacts and quality of life

Correlation results showed that all aspects of tourism impacts are related to resident's quality of life in the city of Faro. As Faro may experience tourism differently to other locations, the understanding of the city and its tourism environment in terms of impacts on residents has value to the region and tourism related industries and services and necessitates research that is location specific to Faro.

Of significance is the finding that all correlations between the positive impacts and the four dimensions of quality of life were positive, implying that resident's positive perceptions of tourism impacts are positively correlated with higher levels of satisfaction with quality of life. The highest overall correlation involved the health and safety, and the community life domains – meaning that positive economic tourism impacts potentially improve aspects such as leisure activities, cultural preservation, religious and spiritual services, crime rates, and so on. This means that positive tourism impacts have the potential to create positive perceptions of quality of life. In the overall life domain, the highest correlation to the tourism impacts was with positive economic impacts. This implies that positive economic impacts have the greatest influence on residents' perceptions of quality of life.

Another significant finding is that all correlations between negative impacts and the dimensions of quality of life were negative, implying that residents strongly perceiving the negative impacts of tourism within the categories of economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts reported less satisfaction with quality of life across the four life domains. Moreover,

residents' negative perceptions about tourism impacts are correlated to lower levels of satisfaction with quality of life.

Data indicates that the economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts all had high correlations with the health and safety domain indicating that these three categories of impacts strongly influence residents' perceptions regarding the health and safety domain. Two impacts - namely negative economic and negative environmental – had high correlations with the material domain. This implies negative perceptions regarding environmental and socio-cultural impacts are correlated to negative perceptions on quality of life in the material domain.

Regarding the overall life domain, the highest correlation was with socio-cultural impacts, indicating socio-cultural impacts had the most impact on residents' overall perceptions of quality of life.

Conclusion

This study contributes to advance the knowledge of the tourism-resident connection in a city that is the capital of one important and well recognized tourism destination, the Algarve. The findings indicate a relationship between tourism impacts and residents' perceptions of quality of life in Faro. This relation had not been explored yet, even in the RESTUR project. By understanding the importance of tourism in improving residents' quality of life in the city, tourism planners should improve the tourism offer in order to also address the local residents' needs and wishes - and this could improve their quality of life. This includes, for example, more green zones, investments in better health infrastructures, and increased cultural events.

This study is not free of limitations. As some data was collected before the first pandemic lockdown it is likely results were affected by the pandemic, and this issue was not addressed in this study. These findings could also benefit from further research regarding the context of residents in different income groups or age categories, and those who are not related to the tourism industry or reliant on it for income. Further research into other areas of the Algarve can provide a holistic picture of the region which could provide a template for analysis of factors of differentiation or commonalities regarding how tourism impacts the region.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agovino, M., Musella, G., Pisano, S. & Scaletti, A. (2021) Assessing the impact of tourist flows on emergency department treatment speed for residents and tourists. The case of Sorrento. *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, 101004.
- Andereck, K. & Nyaupane, G. (2010) Exploring the Nature of Tourism and Quality of Life Perceptions among Residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50 (3), 248-260.
- Berenson, M. L., Levine, D. M., Szabat, K. A. & Stephan D.F. (2018) *Basic Business Statistics: Concepts and Applications*, 15th Edition. Pearson.
- Bryman, Alan. (2012) *Social Research Methods*. 4th ed. Oxford University Press.
- Choi, H-S. & Sirakaya, E. (2005) Measuring residents' attitude toward sustainable tourism: development of sustainable tourism attitude scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 380-394.
- Cinturs.pt (a). (2021) TurExperience - Tourist experiences' impacts on the destination image: searching for new opportunities to the Algarve. Available at: www.cinturs.pt/site/index.php/nm/26-coordination/153-turexperience-tourist-experiences-impacts-on-the-destination-image-searching-for-new-opportunities-to-the-algarve, (Accessed: 1 August 2021).
- Cinturs.pt (b). (2021) Monitor - Observation and monitoring of the Algarve tourist destination: contributions for its sustainable development. Available at: www.cinturs.pt/site/index.php/research-consulting/research-projects/coordination, (Accessed: 1 August 2021).
- Citypopulation.de. (2021) Faro (District, Portugal) - Population Statistics, Charts, Map and Location. Available at: www.citypopulation.de/en/portugal/admin/08__faro/, (Accessed: 1 July 2021).
- Correia, A. & Águas, P. (2017) O Perfil do Turista que Visita o Algarve 2016: Relatório Final. Faro: RTA e Universidade do Algarve.

- García, F., Vázquez, A. & Macías, R., (2015) Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13, 33-40.
- García, F., Fernández, M., Vázquez, A. & Macias, R. (2016) Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54, 259-274.
- Godovykh, M. & Ridderstaat, J., (2020) Health outcomes of tourism development: A longitudinal study of the impact of tourism arrivals on residents' health. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 17, 100462.
- Gonzalez, M, Coromina C., & 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, 277-296.
- Hayati, Y., Adrianto, L., Krisanti, M., Pranowo, W. & Kurniawan, F., (2020) Magnitudes and tourist perception of marine debris on small tourism island: Assessment of Tidung Island, Jakarta, Indonesia. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 158, 111393.
- Huang, X., Lin, S. & Cui, Q., (2021) From "villages of longevity" to "villages of cancer"? The emotional geography of tourism development in Bama, China. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 40, 100813.
- INE (2017) Estatísticas dos Transportes e Comunicações 2016. Lisboa: Instituto Nacional de Estatística, I.P.
- INE (2018a) Anuário Estatístico da Região do Algarve 2017. Lisboa: Instituto Nacional de Estatística, I.P.
- INE (2018b) Estatísticas do Turismo 2017. Lisboa: Instituto Nacional de Estatística, I.P.
- INE (2020) Contas Regionais 2018 e 2019. Lisboa: Instituto Nacional de Estatística, I.P.
- Joo, D., Xu, W., Lee, J., Lee, C. & Woosnam, K., (2021) Residents' perceived risk, emotional solidarity, and support for tourism amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 19, 100553.

- Jordan, E., Spencer, D. & Prayag, G. (2019) Tourism impacts, emotions and stress. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 213-226.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M. & Sirgy, M. (2013) How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism Management*, 36, 527-540.
- Lai, H., Pinto, P. & Pintassilgo, P., (2020) Quality of Life and Emotional Solidarity in Residents' Attitudes toward Tourists: The Case of Macau. *Journal of Travel Research*, 60 (5), 1123-1139.
- Lai, I. & Hitchcock, M., (2017) Local reactions to mass tourism and community tourism development in Macau. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25 (4), 451-470.
- Lee, T. & Jan, F. (2019) Can community-based tourism contribute to sustainable development? Evidence from residents' perceptions of the sustainability. *Tourism Management*, 70, 368-380.
- Liang, Z. & Hui, T. (2016) Residents' quality of life and attitudes toward tourism development in China. *Tourism Management*, 57, 56-67.
- Lin, Z., Chen, Y. & Filieri, R. (2017) Resident-tourist value co-creation: the role of residents' perceived tourism impacts and life satisfaction. *Tourism Management* 61, 436-442.
- MacNeill, T. & Wozniak, D., (2018) The economic, social, and environmental impacts of cruise tourism. *Tourism Management*, 66, 387-404.
- Meeberg, G., (1993) Quality of life: a concept analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 18 (1), 32-38.
- 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.
- Nunkoo, R. & Gursoy, D. (2012) Residents' support for tourism: an identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39 (1), 243-268.

- Pordata.pt. (2021) PORDATA - Search Environment. Available at: www.pordata.pt/en/DB/Municipalities/Search+Environment/Table, (Accessed: 10 December 2021).
- Post Office Travel Money (2019) Holiday Costs Barometer 2019. Available at: www.postoffice.co.uk/dam/jcr:3fc064dc-67b8-4df7-a956-2a906ea6877e/holiday-costs-barometer-2019-tables.pdf, (Accessed: 1 July 2021).
- Rao, A. & Saksena, S., (2021) Wildlife tourism and local communities: Evidence from India. *Annals of Tourism Research Empirical Insights*, 2 (1), 100016.
- Rasoolimanesh, S., Jaafar, M., Kock, N. & Ramayah, T. (2015) A revised framework of social exchange theory to investigate the factors influencing residents' perceptions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 16, 335-345.
- RESTUR (2019) Residents attitudes and behaviours towards sustainable tourism development in the Algarve. Available at: www.cinturs.pt/site/index.php//nm/26-coordination/152-restur-residents-attitudes-and-behaviours-towards-sustainable-tourism-development-in-the-algarve. (Accessed: 1 July 2021).
- RESTUR report (2021) Available at <http://restur.pt/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Relatorio-Resultados-Epoca-Baixa.pdf>. (Accessed: 1 July 2021).
- Saenz-de-Miera, O. & Rosselló, J., (2012) The responsibility of tourism in traffic congestion and hyper-congestion: A case study from Mallorca, Spain. *Tourism Management*, 33 (2), 466-479.
- Sánchez, A., Bueno, N. & Mejía, M. (2014) Residents' attitude to tourism and seasonality. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53 (5), 581-596.
- Šegota, T., Mihalič, T. & Kuščer, K., (2017) The impact of residents' informedness and involvement on their perceptions of tourism impacts: The case of Bled. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6 (3), 196-206.
- Sharpley, R., (2014) Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37-49.

- Sirgy, M., Cole, D., Kosenko, R., Meadow, H., Rahtz, D., Cicic, M., Jin, G., Yarsuvat, D., Blenkhorn, D. & Nagpal, N., (1995) A life satisfaction measure: Additional validation data for the Congruity Life Satisfaction measure. *Social Indicators Research*, 34 (2), 237-259.
- Soontayatron, S., (2013) Thais' Coping with Sociocultural Impacts of Tourism Development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19 (10), 1228-1238.
- Stylidis, D., Biran, A., Sit, J. & Szivas, E., (2014) Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. *Tourism Management*, 45, 260-274.
- Suess, C., Baloglu, S. & Busser, J. (2018) Perceived impacts of medical tourism development on community wellbeing. *Tourism Management*, 69, 232 - 245.
- Telfer, D. & Sharpley, R., (2008) *Tourism and development in the developing world*. 1st ed. Oxon: Routledge.
- Telfer, D. & Sharpley, R., (2015) *Tourism and development*. Bristol (U.K.): Channel View.
- Tosun, C. (2002) Host perceptions of impacts: a comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (1), 231-253.
- Tovar, B., Espino, R. & López-del-Pino, F., (2020) Residents' perceptions and attitudes towards the cruise tourism impact in Gran Canaria. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, 100586.
- UNWTO. (2021) Available at: www.unwto.org/glossary-tourism-terms), (Accessed: 15 July 2021).
- Uysal, M., Sirgy, M., Woo, E. & Kim, H., (2016) Quality of life (QOL) and well-being research in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 53, 244-261.
- Vareiro, L., Remoaldo, P. & Ribeiro, J. (2013) Residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in Guimarães (Portugal): a cluster analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16 (6), 535-551.

- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Valle, P., Mendes, J. & Silva, J. (2015) Residents' attitude and level of destination development: an international comparison. *Tourism Management*, 48, 199-210.
- Visitportugal.com. (2021) *Algarve* / www.visitportugal.com. Available at: www.visitportugal.com/en/destinos/algarve, (Accessed: 10 July 2021).
- Walton, J. K. (2020) Tourism. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Available at: www.britannica.com/topic/tourism, (Accessed: 25 July 2021).
- Wang, W. (2019) The effect of early-life outdoor experiences on residents' attitudes towards sustainable tourism within an urban context. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 25, 1-9.
- Williams, S. & Lew, A., (2015) *Tourism geography*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Winter, T. & Adu-Ampong, E., (2021) Residents with camera: Exploring tourism impacts through participant-generated images. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 87, 103112.
- Woo, E., Kim, H. & Uysal, M., (2015) Life satisfaction and support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 50, 84-97.
- Woo, E., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, M. J. (2018) Tourism impact and stakeholders' quality of life. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 42 (2), 260-286.
- Woosnam, K., (2011) Using Emotional Solidarity to Explain Residents' Attitudes about Tourism and Tourism Development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51 (3), 315-327.
- Worlddata.info. (2021) *Climate of Faro, Portugal*. [online] Available at: www.worlddata.info/europe/portugal/climate-faro.php, (Accessed: 28 July 2021).
- Xu, S., Barbieri, C., Anderson, D., Leung, Y. & Rozier-Rich, S., (2016) Residents' perceptions of wine tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 55, 276-286.
- Yeomans, B. & Slater, B., (2021). *Venice seeks to ban noisy suitcases on wheels*. The Telegraph. Available at: www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/italy/11243670/Venice-seeks-to-ban-noisy-suitcases-on-wheels.html, (Accessed: 25 June 2021).

Annex 1

Dear Mr./Ms./Mrs., the purpose of this questionnaire is to study the impacts of tourism on residents in the Algarve. Your answers will be statistically treated within **RESTUR Project**, being developed at the **University of Algarve**, and will be used only for scientific purposes. There is no right or wrong answers and your identity will be absolutely preserved. Therefore, we kindly ask you to be as sincere as possible. **YOUR ANSWERS SHOULD RELATE TO YOUR MUNICIPALITY OF RESIDENCE.** Thank you in advance for your support.

1. What is your municipality of residence in the Algarve? _____ | 2. And your parish of residence? _____

3. For how long have you been living in this municipality? _____ (years); --> **To answer this questionnaire, you must have been living in the Algarve for at least 1 year.**

4. How do you evaluate the present state of tourism development in your municipality?

Very low ₁ Low ₂ Moderate ₃ High ₄ Very high ₅

5. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about the **ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF TOURISM** in your municipality?

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5
Tourism is the main economic activity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases employment opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism creates more business for local people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism creates more business for foreign people	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to create new services and businesses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to develop local economic activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism is likely to attract more investment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The money spent by tourists stays in the municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
More roads and urbanizations were constructed because of tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism promotes the restauration of historic buildings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism improves shopping, restaurant and entertainment opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases the price of housing and land	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases the cost of living	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Goods and services are more expensive because of tourism (food, clothing, transports, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cultural attractions and events are more expensive because of tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Most of the local businesses are for tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to reduce the traditional trade	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism generates employment instability due to seasonality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My municipality is economically over-dependent on tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about the **SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM** in your municipality?

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5
Tourism improves public services (health centres, sports, police protection, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism stimulates cultural activities, festivals and traditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to the preservation of the local culture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism promotes cultural exchange between residents and tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism changes the consumption habits of residents (food, clothing, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to raising the standard of living of residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to increase security	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to the recognition, prestige and image of my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residents in my municipality are hospitable and receive tourists with politeness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases drugs and alcohol consumption	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases prostitution and moral degradation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases sexual transmitted diseases	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism causes more crime and vandalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism generates loss or change of traditions and cultural identity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism causes loss of tolerance and respect for other cultures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases stress and disturb quietness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The increasing number of tourists is likely to result in conflicts with residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residents change their behavior in an attempt to mimic tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Residents are likely to suffer from living in this tourism destination	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My municipality is overcrowded because of tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements about the ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF TOURISM in your municipality?

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5
There are more public gardens and parks because of tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism improves the protection of the environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism improves the protection of natural heritage and natural resources	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism improves public infrastructures (roads, railways, sports and cultural facilities, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism improves road signage system (for access housing, monuments, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism improves the cleanliness of public spaces	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism positively influences ecological awareness among residents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism increases pollution, noise, garbage, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism deteriorates the natural environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to occupy the natural areas (beaches, mountains, protected areas, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism prevents the access of residents to natural spaces (beaches, mountains, rivers, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism contributes to decharacterize the landscape (construction of new buildings, hotels, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tourism generates traffic congestion, accidents and parking problems	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Concerning your EMOTIONS and FEELINGS towards tourists in your municipality, to what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5
I am proud to have tourists in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel my municipality benefits from having tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I appreciate tourists for the contribution they make to the local economy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I treat all tourists I meet in a fairly way	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel close to some tourists I have met	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have made friends with some tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I identify with tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have a lot in common with tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel affection toward tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understand tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I get along with tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I can trust tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have respect for tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I share ideas with tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. During summer (high season), how often do you interact with tourists in your municipality?

Never 1 Rarely 2 Sometimes 3 Very often 4 Always 5

10. During winter (low season), how often do you interact with tourists in your municipality?

Never 1 Rarely 2 Sometimes 3 Very often 4 Always 5

Generally, how do you qualify the behavior of tourists in your municipality?

11. In terms of respect:	12. In terms of treatment:	13. In terms of expenses:
Very disrespectful <input type="radio"/> 1	Very unpleasant <input type="radio"/> 1	Spend very little <input type="radio"/> 1
Disrespectful <input type="radio"/> 2	Unpleasant <input type="radio"/> 2	Spend little <input type="radio"/> 2
Normal <input type="radio"/> 3	Normal <input type="radio"/> 3	Spend normal <input type="radio"/> 3
Respectful <input type="radio"/> 4	Pleasant <input type="radio"/> 4	Spend enough <input type="radio"/> 4
Very respectful <input type="radio"/> 5	Very pleasant <input type="radio"/> 5	Spend a lot <input type="radio"/> 5

14. Would you please use three words to describe tourists in your municipality?

_____;

_____;

_____.

15. How much do you want to interact with tourists in the future? Much less 1 Less 2 The same 3 More 4 Much more 5

16. In relation to the number of tourists, what do you think your municipality should do?

Accept less tourists 1 Mantain the current number of tourists 2 Accept more tourists 3

17. To what extent do you consider you are INFORMED about tourism development in your municipality?

Not at all informed 1 Slightly informed 2 Moderately informed 3 Very informed 4 Extremely informed 5

18. Would you like to be MORE INFORMED about tourism development in your municipality? No 1 Yes 2

19. To what extent do you consider you are INVOLVED in the planning of tourism in your municipality?
 Not at all involved ₁ Slightly involved ₂ Moderately involved ₃ Very involved ₄ Extremely involved ₅

20. Would you like to be MORE INVOLVED in the planning of tourism in your municipality? No ₁ Yes ₂

21. Is your professional activity related to the tourism sector (hotels, restaurants, transports, tourism attractions, etc.)? No ₁ Yes ₂ | 22. Does anyone in your household work in the tourism sector? No ₁ Yes ₂ | 23. Does your household income (part or totality) comes from tourism? No ₁ Yes ₂

24. Concerning your place of residence, your home is:
 Close to tourism attractions ₁ Neither close nor far from tourism attractions ₂ Far from tourism attractions ₃

25. If you live CLOSE to tourism attractions, could you specify which are they? (Max. 2) _____ ; _____

26. Please indicate how much do you OPPOSE or SUPPORT tourists to your neighborhood?
 Strongly oppose ₁ Oppose ₂ It's indifferent to me ₃ Support ₄ Strongly support ₅

27. Do you use to travel? No ₁ Yes ₂ | 28. If YES, how often?
 Rarely ₁ Occasionally ₂ Once a year ₃ Twice a year ₄ Three or more times per year ₅
 ↳ (If not, please go to question 30)

29. When traveling, you usually choose (you can choose more than one option):
 Other municipalities in the Algarve ₁ Other regions in Portugal ₂ Foreign countries ₃

30. Is there any Airbnb in your neighborhood? No ₁ Yes ₂ | 31. Do you own any Airbnb? No ₁ Yes ₂

32. If the number of tourists to your neighborhood increases, how do you believe your SENSE OF FEELING SAFE will be?
 Much worse ₁ Worse ₂ The same ₃ Better ₄ Much better ₅

33. Please indicate how much do you agree with each of the following statements about Airbnb in your neighborhood?

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5
Airbnb (would) help my neighborhood to face current economic challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Airbnb (would) help my neighborhood to face future economic challenges	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Airbnb (would) help my neighborhood to face unemployment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Airbnb (would) generate more garbage and pollution in my neighborhood	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Airbnb (would) generate more noise and disorder in my neighborhood	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Airbnb (would) generate more promiscuity in my neighborhood	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would personally benefit from more tourists to my neighborhood	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would personally benefit if more Airbnb hosts were in my neighborhood	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

34. Please indicate how much do you OPPOSE or SUPPORT Airbnb hosts in your neighborhood?
 Strongly oppose ₁ Oppose ₂ It's indifferent to me ₃ Support ₄ Strongly support ₅

35. Concerning your BEHAVIORS and level of SUPPORT FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT in your municipality, to what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5
I think my municipality should remain a tourism destination	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think my municipality should support the promotion of tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe the overall impacts of tourism in my municipality are positive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I support tourism having a vital role in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I favor building new tourism facilities which will attract more tourists	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am willing to protect the natural and environmental resources on which tourism depends	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am willing to receive tourists as affable host and being more hospitable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am willing to provide information to tourists and contribute to enhance their experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am willing to do more in order to promote my municipality as a tourism destination	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am willing to accept some inconveniences in order to receive benefits from tourism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am willing to pay higher taxes to contribute to the tourism development in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Personally, I benefit from tourism development in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the current level of tourism development in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am satisfied with the way tourism is being managed in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

36. To what extent are you SATISFIED with each of the following aspects of your life?

	Very unsatisfied 1	Unsatisfied 2	Neutral 3	Satisfied 4	Very satisfied 5
The cost of living in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The cost of basic necessities in my municipality (food, housing, clothing, transportation, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The real estate taxes in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The income at my current job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The economic security of my current job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The family income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The benefits I receive from the government (infrastructures, education, health, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The environmental conditions of my municipality (air, water, green spaces, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conditions of the public transportation in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The services and facilities I receive in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The people who live in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The way culture is preserved in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The overall municipality life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The spare time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The leisure life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The leisure activities in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The religious services in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The spiritual life in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The health facilities in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The health service quality in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The air quality in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The water quality in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The environmental quality in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The environmental cleanliness in my municipality (streets, pavements, public spaces, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The safety and security in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The traffic congestion in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The crime rate in my municipality	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

37. To what extent do you AGREE with each of the following aspects of your life?

	Strongly disagree 1	Disagree 2	Neither agree nor disagree 3	Agree 4	Strongly agree 5
I am satisfied with my life as a whole	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conditions of my life are excellent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In most ways my life is close to the ideal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In general, I am a happy person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

38. Gender: Male 1 Female 2 | 39. Age: _____ | 40. Job: _____

41. Marital status: Single 1 Married/living together 2 Divorced 3 Widowed 4

42. Education level: Without studies 1 Elementary (4 years) 2 Elementary (6 years) 3 Elementary (9 years) 4
High school 5 Bachelor 6 Master 7 PhD 8

43. Employment situation: Employed 1 Unemployed 2 Student 3 Retired 4 Housekeeper 5

If you want, you can write in this space:
 --> Your main concern about tourism in your municipality:

 --> What should be done to improve tourism in your municipality:

 --> Other considerations about tourism development in your municipality: