Chapter 15
Tourism Impacts of a Portuguese World Heritage Historic Center: Resident's Perceptions

Laurentina Vareiro and Raquel Mendes

15.1 Introduction

The World Heritage List (WHL) is widely considered a powerful tool for national tourism campaigns. Sites inscribed on the WHL by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) are commonly treated as catholicons in promoting the tourism industry, which in turn helps to promote economic growth and development.

This study analyzes local community perceptions of the importance of the World Heritage Site (WHS) classification of the historic center of the Portuguese city of Évora. The research also includes an analysis of the local residents' perceived tourism impacts on the municipality of Évora. The methodology consists of quantitative research based on a self-administered survey applied to convenience samples of local residents of the municipality of Évora in the beginning of 2014. The local residents' perceptions of the level of importance of the WHS classification to the municipality and its impact in the increase of tourists is analyzed. Positive and negative tourism impacts are then ranked and a principal components factor analysis is employed separately to the two groups of impacts in order to identify underlying dimensions associated with residents' perceptions on tourism development. Based on the results of the factor analysis, independent sample *t*-tests are used to investigate differences regarding positive and negative tourism impacts between residents that live near and far from the historic center, and between residents who work/have worked in the tourism sector and residents that work/have worked in other sectors.

This paper is organized as follows. The first section is dedicated to a brief literature review. The second section describes the methodology used for empirical

L. Vareiro (✉) • R. Mendes
Polytechnic Institute of Cávado and Ave, Barcelos, Portugal
e-mail: lvareiro@ipca.pt

Á. Matias et al. (eds.), *Impact Assessment in Tourism Economics*,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-14920-2_15

purposes, while the third section reports and discusses the estimated results. The final section reports the main conclusions.

15.2 Literature Review

Based on their merits as the best possible examples of cultural and natural heritage (UNESCO 2005), numerous sites throughout the world have been formally designated as World Heritage. With this designation, the UNESCO aims to encourage the protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage considered to be of outstanding value to humanity. In accordance with the heritage classification defined by the UNESCO, sites inscribed on the WHL are classified into three categories: cultural, natural and mixed (cultural and natural) heritage. Both cultural and natural heritage have always been a major tourist attraction. The impact on tourism development may be even more significant when a particular heritage is designated a UNESCO WHS (Drost 1996; Hergesell 2006; Huang et al. 2012; Li et al. 2008; Sadiki 2005; Yang et al. 2010). Indeed, certified sites may have potential advantages with regard to tourism. On the one hand, these sites are commonly used in marketing campaigns aimed at promoting national tourism. These campaigns may increase the international visibility of destinations and therefore attract more tourists (Yang et al. 2010). The growth in attractiveness and tourist activity is not solely attributable to an increase in public visibility but also to the association of the certification with quality. The WHS certification itself is perceived as an internationally recognized marker of quality (Hergesell 2006). On the other hand, countries that lack in resources to protect and maintain the certified sites are provided financial and technological aid by UNESCO for the preservation of these sites (Yang et al. 2010). The fulfilled expectations of the visitors are essential to strengthen the credibility of the WHS certification as a marker of quality.

It is important to note that although tourism may profit from heritage certification, it may benefit it as well. It is generally assumed that tourism and heritage are interdependently related (Aas et al. 2005; Hergesell 2006). Tourism may support the WHS objectives in various manners: creation of funds for conservation efforts; raise of public awareness of conservation by informing visitors about world heritage objectives; promotion of cultural values by enabling visitors to experience heritage (Hergesell 2006).

Despite the mutual benefits, a conflict between heritage preservation and tourism development may arise (Drost 1996; Jimura 2011; Li et al. 2008; Yang et al. 2010). The WHS certification may attract an excessive number of tourists and tourism activities resulting in overcrowding and the destruction of the cultural and natural integrity of heritage sites that are not prepared to accommodate such a large number of visitors. Hence, the success of a heritage site must balance its preservation and visitation.

It is commonly accepted that the success of heritage tourism within a given destination depends upon unique and attractive resources, maintainability, and an adequate tourism policy (Chen and Chen 2010). Additionally, heritage residents' support for tourism development is considered a key factor to that overall success (Chen and Chen 2010; Jimura 2011; Yoon et al. 2001). Given that this support is affected by the perceived impacts of tourism, policy-makers and planners need to incorporate local communities' opinions into tourism development by continuously monitoring these opinions in order to maximize the benefits, and to minimize the adverse affects (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997; Jackson 2008).

Research on residents' perceptions of the impacts of tourism is extensive, suggesting that tourism development affects the local communities in both positive and negative ways. These benefits and costs are typically classified as economic, social and cultural, and/or environmental (Andereck et al. 2005; Besculides et al. 2002; Brunt and Courtney 1999; Chen and Chen 2010; Dogan 1989; Dyer et al. 2007; Faulkner and Tideswell 1997; Jackson 2008; Kim et al. 2006; Ko and Stewart 2002; Kuvan and Akan 2005; Liu and Var 1986; Ozturk et al. 2015; Pizam 1978; Renda et al. 2014; Sharma and Dyer 2009; Yoon et al. 2001). The economic impacts include positive elements such as tax revenue, increased jobs, and additional income, and negative elements such as tax burdens, inflation, and local government debt. The sociocultural impacts include positive elements such as resurgence in traditional crafts and ceremonies, increased intercultural communication and understanding, and negative elements such as increased crime rates and changes in traditional cultures. Among the environmental impacts are positive elements such as the protection of parks and wildlife, as well as negative elements that include crowding, pollution, vandalism, and litter.

Local residents' level of acceptance of costs brought on by tourism is largely dependent on the perceptions of the benefits derived from it. The trade-off between benefits and costs may be explained through the social exchange theory. This theory posits that social behavior is the result of an exchange process by which the exchange is subjectively evaluated based on the benefits and costs that result from that exchange (Emerson 1976; Homans 1958). The purpose is to maximize the benefits and to minimize the costs. Hence, and according to this theory, residents' attitudes toward tourism and their subsequent support for its development are influenced by their evaluation of tourism effects. If the perceived benefits exceed the potential costs, residents are likely to view tourism positively and to support it, whereas if the perceived costs outweigh the benefits, residents are likely to evaluate tourism negatively and to oppose to it (Andereck et al. 2005; Ap 1990, 1992; Gursoy et al. 2002; Jackson 2008; Jurowski and Gursoy 2004).

Different types of factors may influence residents' perceptions of tourism impacts. Based on a two-dimensional interface of tourism development/community, Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) summarize these factors as extrinsic and intrinsic factors. The extrinsic factors are related to the characteristics of the location with regard to its role as a tourism destination. These comprise the nature and stage of the location's tourism development, the level of tourist activity, and the type of tourists the location involves. The intrinsic factors refer to characteristics of

the members of the community that may affect variations in the tourism impacts within the community. Among other factors, these include socio-demographic characteristics of the resident population, such as age, gender, education, length of residency, and ethnicity, economic dependency on the tourism industry, residential proximity to the tourism activity, community attachment, and attitudes about environmental issues (Faulkner and Tideswell 1997; Gursoy et al. 2002; Jurowski and Gursoy 2004; Kuvan and Akan 2005; Liu and Var 1986; Nicholas et al. 2009; Renda et al. 2014; Sharma and Dyer 2009; Vareiro et al. 2013; Williams and Lawson 2001).

As shown above, empirical research regarding residents' perceptions of tourism impacts is very well documented. However, there are still very few studies that focus the Portuguese case (Renda et al. 2014; Vareiro et al. 2011, 2013). The present study aims to contribute to the limited research regarding residents' attitudes towards tourism impacts.

15.3 Methodology

This study analyzes local community perceptions of the importance of the WHS classification of the historic center of Évora. It also measures positive and negative tourism impacts on the municipality of Évora, perceived by local residents.

The municipality of Évora is located in the Alentejo region, in southern Portugal. Composed of 19 parishes, the municipality covers an area of 1307.08 km^2, with a total of 56,596 inhabitants (INE 2012). The municipality is seated by the city of Évora, one of the most important historical cities in Portugal, with a strong cultural significance. Given its immense and varied historical and monumental heritage, the city is commonly referred to as a "museum-city". The historic center of Évora was designated a WHS by the UNESCO in November 1986. This classification fostered not only the preservation of heritage, but also the promotion of tourism (Borges et al. 2013). The historic center's certified heritage attracts visitors from all over the world, positioning it as an important tourism destination in Portugal.

15.3.1 Questionnaire and Data Collection

The questionnaire consists of three main sections. In the first section, information about the characteristics of the historic city center is collected. In the second section, respondents are asked to indicate to what extent they agree/disagree with statements about tourism impacts on their municipality using a five-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = totally agree). Various items are used to assess residents' perceptions of tourism impacts on this Portuguese municipality. These items are based on previous empirical research (Jackson 2008; Jimura 2011; Sharma and Dyer 2009; Williams and Lawson 2001).

In the final section, information on socio-demographic characteristics of the residents, such as gender, age, residence, marital status, education, and occupation, are collected. In the beginning of 2014, a pre-test was carried out involving 10 graduate students with residence in Guimarães (a Portuguese municipality with a historic center classified by UNESCO in December 2001). This exercise made it possible, among other things, to discover and correct any potential problems. Minor changes, mostly related to the clarity of the questions, were included in the final questionnaire.

Data for this study were collected using a self-administered survey applied to local residents of Évora. Based on the purpose of this study, a public secondary school (Escola Secundária Gabriel Pereira) located in the municipality was used for constructing the survey sample. The questionnaires were mailed to the directors of the two classes (an 11th grade class and a 12th grade class) selected by the headmaster of the school. The class directors distributed four questionnaires to each student of the two selected classes. The student should answer one of the questionnaires, and family or friends that were residents in the city in analysis should fill in the remaining. The students were asked to return the filled in questionnaires within a 2 weeks' time schedule.

A total of 160 survey questionnaires were mailed in the beginning of 2014. Only 113 questionnaires were returned, which reveals an approximate 70.6 % response rate. However, four questionnaires were excluded: two due to a large percentage of missing values, and two due to not being from residents of the municipality under analysis. A total of 109 questionnaires (68.1 %) were analyzed in this study.

15.3.2 Data Analysis

The data analysis in this study consisted of five stages. First the local residents' perceptions of the level of importance of the WHS classification to the municipality and its impact in the increase of tourists were analyzed. Second, positive and negative tourism impacts were ranked and the three most important and the three least important were highlighted. Third, the principal components factor analysis was employed separately to the positive and negative impacts expressions in order to identify underlying dimensions associated with residents' perceptions about tourism development. A varimax rotation, the most common choice in the orthogonal rotation method, was used since it generally provides easier interpretation and the resulting factors were expected to be utilized in the subsequent analysis (Hair et al. 1998). A cut-off eigenvalue of 1 was pre-determined. All items have factor loadings greater than 0.4 and were retained for each factor grouping. Cronbach's alpha was applied to test the reliability of factor groupings (Hair et al. 1998). Fourth, based on the results of the factor analysis, independent sample *t*-tests were used to examine the differences regarding positive and negative tourism impacts between the residents that live near and far from the historic center. The mean scores of positive and negative factors were compared to understand what

factors were perceived more important for residents considering the place of residence. Finally, the same procedure (*t*-tests) was used to investigate if there are any differences in the perceptions of those who have worked in the tourism sector and those who have not. Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 21.0.

15.4 Results

15.4.1 Sample Profile

Table 15.1 summarizes the socio-demographic profile of the survey sample. The respondents are mostly female (56.9 %) and single (40.4 %). The largest age cohort is the cohort aged between 15–24 years old (29.4 %), followed by the 25–44 years old (25.7 %) cohort.

A total of 45.9 % of the survey respondents is endowed with a secondary education and 24.8 % with a higher education level. The majority of respondents

Table 15.1 Sample profile

	Total (N = 109)
Gender	
Female	62
Male	47
Age	
15–24	32
25–44	28
45–64	25
65 and over	24
Marital status	
Single	44
Married	42
Divorced	8
Widowed	15
Education	
Primary	27
High school	50
Graduate school	27
Place of residence	
Near the historic center	79
Far the historic center	30
Economic dependency on tourism	
Yes	28
No	81

Table 15.2 Perceptions of WHS classification

WHS questions	Likert scale					M	SD
	1	2	3	4	5		
The WHS classification is important for the municipality	0.0	0.9	10.1	36.7	52.3	4.40	0.71
The WHS classification contributes to tourist increase	0.0	0.9	14.7	35.8	48.6	4.32	0.76

(72.5 %) lives in or near the historic center (less than a 3 km distance), and 74.3 % of the sample does not depend, directly, from tourist activities.

15.4.2 World Heritage Site Classification

Residents were asked to rate the level of importance that the classification of the historic center as a WHS has for the municipality and also the impact in the increase of the number of tourists using a five-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = totally agree). As shown in Table 15.2, the mean rating of the importance of the classification of the historic center for the municipality across the whole sample was 4.40, indicating a strongly positive perception of the WHS designation. Almost 85 % reported that the classification of the historic center as a WHS had effect on tourist attraction. This finding is consistent with previous case studies in which it has been observed that many people rate the WHS classification as having a positive impact on tourism development.

15.4.3 Ranking of Tourism Impacts

In the second part of the questionnaire, residents were asked about 26 specific impacts that tourism may have on a host community. Specifically, the respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they agree/disagree that the tourism impact occurred in their municipality based on the five-point Likert scale (1 = totally disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neutral; 4 = agree; 5 = totally agree) used in the first part of the questionnaire. Table 15.3 shows the highest levels of agreement and disagreement rankings of tourism impacts expressions delineated into the positive and negative categories.

With only two items with mean scores below 3, the highest levels of agreement with positive items include “increase in the number of tourist facilities” (3.84), “preservation of the local culture” (3.64) and “improvement in the quality of services” (3.31). On the other hand, “increase in real estate” (2.92) and “increase in the number of recreational activities” (2.97) were considered the least important/

Table 15.3 Rankings of tourism impacts

	Rank		Items	Mean	SD
Positive	More	1	Increase in the number of tourist facilities	3.84	0.89
		2	Preservation of the local culture	3.64	0.92
		3	Improvement in the quality of services	3.31	1.08
	Less	1	Increase in real estate	2.92	0.92
		2	Increase in the number of recreational activities	2.97	1.10
		3	Improvement of local infrastructure	3.03	0.89
Negative	More	1	Increase in the price of many goods and services	3.55	1.01
		2	Increase in traffic congestion and related problems	2.77	1.08
		3	Too many resources on the promotion of tourism	2.74	1.01
	Less	1	Social conflicts	1.96	0.88
		2	Increase in prostitution	2.13	1.00
		3	Disturbance of peace and tranquility	2.14	0.91

highest level of disagreement. The top three items of negative factors included "increase in the price of many goods and services" (3.55), "increase in traffic congestion and related problems" (2.77) and "too many resources on the promotion of tourism" (2.74). The least strongly perceived negative items were related to "social conflicts" (1.96), "increase in prostitution" (2.13) and "disturbance of peace and tranquility" (2.14).

15.4.4 Tourism Impact Factors

In order to determine the underlying dimensions of the tourism impacts, the 13 positive and 13 negative items were factor analyzed utilizing two principal components analyses with varimax rotation.

Positive Factors Three factors were derived from the factor analysis of 13 positive items (Table 15.4). These factors explained 52.77 % of the variance. The first positive factor was labeled "activities, services, and local infra-structures" and accounted for 32.06 % of the variance. It had a reliability alpha of 0.78 with an eigenvalue of 4.17. The second factor, labeled "culture and environment" was comprised of four items: "increase in the cultural and educational experience", "conservation of local natural resources", "increase in the number of recreational activities" and "reinforcement of the beauty of the municipality". With an eigenvalue of 1.57, it captured 12.06 % of the variance in the positive impacts. The third factor was labeled "real estate and enterprises" had the lowest explanatory power (8.65 %) with a reliability alpha of 0.47.

Table 15.4 Factor analysis for positive tourism impacts

Positive factors (reliability alpha)	Loading	Eigen-values	Explained variance	Mean
(1) Activities, services, and local infra-structures (0.78)		4.17	32.06	3.35
Increase in the number of tourist facilities	0.76			
Increase in the number of employment opportunities	0.69			
Encouragement of a variety of cultural activities	0.68			
Improvement in the quality of services	0.61			
Improvement of local infrastructure	0.59			
Preservation of the local culture	0.52			
(2) Culture and environment (0.66)		1.57	12.06	3.13
Increase in the cultural and educational experience	0.81			
Conservation of local natural resources	0.69			
Increase in the number of recreational activities	0.60			
Reinforcement of the beauty of the municipality	0.49			
(3) Real estate and enterprises (0.47)		1.12	8.65	3.05
Increase in real estate	0.77			
Increase in the variety of businesses	0.65			
Restoration of local buildings	0.45			
Total variances explained	52.77			

Notes: Extraction method—Principal component analysis; Rotation method—Varimax with Kaiser normalization; KMO = 0.77; Bartlett's test of sphericity: p = 0.00

In sum, two factors, "activities, services, and local infra-structures" and "culture and environment", captured 44.12 % of the positive variance, contributing to explaining much of residents' positive perceptions of tourism impacts in Évora.

Based on the structure of the five-point scale for tourism impacts used in the survey, level 3 can be interpreted as an indifferent point that does not make a distinction between agreement and disagreement. The higher the mean score is, the higher the level of agreement is. With the highest mean agreement of 3.35, "activities, services, and local infra-structures" was the most significant factor to the residents of Évora.

Negative Factors As negative effects of tourism development, the 13 negative items resulted in 3 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1, and the factors accounted for 59.28 % of the total negative impacts variance as presented in Table 15.5. These factors were labeled "disruption and environmental deterioration", "delinquent behavior and opportunity costs", and "living costs". The first negative factor, labeled "disruption and environmental deterioration", explained 40.67 % of the variance with a reliability coefficient of 0.85. It is followed by factor

Table 15.5 Factor analysis for negative tourism impacts

Negative factors (reliability alpha)	Loading	Eigen-values	Explained variance	Mean
(1) Disruption and environmental deterioration (0.85)		5.29	40.67	2.34
Invasion of local residents' privacy	0.85			
Increase in use of drugs	0.82			
Disturbance of peace and tranquility	0.76			
Increase in traffic congestion and related problems	0.64			
Increase in litter	0.51			
Social conflicts	0.47			
(2) Delinquent behavior and opportunity costs (0.71)		1.23	9.46	2.41
Increase in prostitution	0.72			
Increase in crime	0.71			
Too many resources on the promotion of tourism	0.65			
Increase in vandalism	0.63			
(3) Living costs (0.57)		1.19	9.15	2.89
Pressure on local services	0.70			
Increase in the price of many goods and services	0.60			
Affects the traditional lifestyle	0.50			
Total variances explained	59.28			

Source: Authors' own survey data. *Notes*: Extraction method—Principal component analysis; Rotation method—Varimax with Kaiser normalization; KMO = 0.85; Bartlett's test of sphericity: p = 0.00

2 (9.46 % of the total variance and Cronbach's alpha level of 0.71), which comprises items related to the "increase in prostitution", "increase in crime", "too many resources on the promotion of tourism" and "increase in vandalism". Factor 3, labeled "living costs", explained 9.15 % of the variance contained by the original variables, with the alpha level of 0.57. With high mean scores, "living costs" appeared as the most important negative factor to the residents of Évora.

The mean scores of the extracted factors were also consistent with the rankings of the individual tourism impacts items. "Activities, services, and local infrastructures", a positive factor with the highest mean of importance, includes the three top individual positive items. As the bottom negative factor, "disruption and environmental deterioration" encompasses two less important items of individual negative impacts.

Table 15.6 Comparison of impact factors by place of residence

Impact factors		Near historic center	Far historic center
Positive	(1) Activities, services, and local infra-structures	**3.42***	3.17
	(2) Culture and environment	**3.15**	3.08
	(3) Real estate and enterprises	**3.08***	2.98
Negative	(1) Disruption and environmental deterioration	2.23	**2.62***
	(2) Delinquent behavior and opportunity costs	2.30	**2.70**
	(3) Living costs	2.78	**3.19***

Note: Numbers in bold correspond to the highest values observed for each factor
*$p < 0.05$

15.4.5 Place of Residence Comparison on Positive and Negative Factors

After the positive and negative impacts factors were delineated, their mean scores were compared across residents that live near and far from the historic centers (see Table 15.6). The comparison revealed how different positive and negative factors were in relation to the place of residence of respondents, although the factors most valued and least valued are common to all residents, in both positive and negative factors.

The positive factor "activities, services, and local infra-structures" scored the highest value for all residents, indicating that the residents of Évora believe that tourism is responsible for the creation of more and better equipments and activities. Also, all residents groups place "real estate and enterprises" as the least important factor among the positive factors. *T*-test results indicated, however, that only these factors (1 and 3) present differences statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The residents living near the historic center value factors 1 and 3 more than residents living far from the historic center.

With regard to negative factors, all residents ranked "disruption and environmental deterioration" as the least important factor, and place "living costs" as the most important factor. *T*-test results indicated, however, that only these negative factors (1 and 3) present differences statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Factors 1 and 3 are less important to the residents living near the historic center than to the residents living far from there.

Table 15.7 Comparison of impact factors by economic dependency on tourism

Impact factors		Economic dependent	Others
Positive	(1) Activities, services and local infra-structures	**3.39**	3.34
	(2) Culture and environment	**3.23**	3.09
	(3) Real estate and enterprises	3.04	**3.05**
Negative	(1) Disruption and environmental deterioration	**2.39**	2.32
	(2) Delinquent behavior and opportunity costs	**2.46**	2.40
	(3) Living costs	2.89	2.89

Notes: Numbers in bold correspond to the highest values observed for each factor

15.4.6 Economic Dependency Comparison on Positive and Negative Factors

The mean scores of positive and negative impact factors were also used to investigate differences in the perceptions of residents economically dependent on tourism and residents that do not directly benefit from tourism (see Table 15.7).

Results indicated that residents economically dependent on tourism had higher mean scores in most factors, except "real estate and enterprises" and "living costs. However, *t*-tests showed that these differences were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

For all residents, the most valued positive factor was "activities, services, and local infra-structures", followed by "culture and environment". Both groups also put "disruption and environmental deterioration" as the least important factor among the negative factors and ranked "living costs" as the most important negative factor from tourism development.

15.5 Conclusions

This study attempted to examine local community perceptions of the importance of the WHS certification of the historic center of Évora. It also aimed at measuring tourism impacts on the municipality of Évora, perceived by local residents. Specifically, the objective was to determine positive and negative tourism impact factors, as well as to discover significant differences in these factors across the residents of the municipality of Évora (considering place of residence and economic dependency).

The main findings of this study reveal that local residents have a strongly positive perception of the WHS designation. The vast majority considers that the classification of the historic center as a WHS had a positive effect on tourist attraction.

The two principal component factor analyses delineated three positive and three negative factors. The positive factors were labeled: "activities, services, and local infra-structures", "culture and environment", and "real estate and enterprises". The

negative factors included "disruption and environmental deterioration", "delinquent behavior and opportunity costs" and "living costs".

The comparison of the mean scores of these positive and negative factors across residents living near and far from the historic center reveals that the most valued and least valued factors are common to all residents. With regard to the positive factors, the residents rank "activities, services, and local infra-structures" as the most important factor, whereas "real estate and enterprises" is considered the least important. Among the negative factors, the most highlighted factor for all residents is "living costs"; the least focus of concern to all residents is "disruption and environmental deterioration". There were significant differences between the mean ratings of two positive and two negative impact factors between residents living near and far from the historic center with the former group with higher means in terms of positive impacts and the latter with higher means in terms of costs.

Similar results are observed when comparing the mean scores of the positive and negative factors across residents economically dependent on tourism and residents that do not directly benefit from it. Hence, both groups of residents rank "activities, services, and local infra-structures" as the most important positive impact from tourism development and consider "real estate and enterprises" to be the least decisive impact factor among the positive factors. With regard to the negative factors, "living costs" is valued the most important, with the same mean score for both groups. Residents economically dependent on tourism had higher means in terms of positive and negative impacts; however the differences were not statistically significant.

From these findings, it can be stated that residents living closer to the historic center are more positive about tourism than those who live far from it. On the other hand, residents economically dependent on tourism are more conscious of benefits and costs linked to the tourism development. However, in this last case, the difference in benefits and costs rating by the two groups is not significantly different.

The insight gained by the empirical analysis conducted in this paper may be an important policy tool for tourism planners and managers in the development of strategies with regard to the future management of the historic center and tourism associated to it. The results of the study suggest that decision makers and tourism planners should consider local residents' concerns about the economic and environmental impacts of tourism (namely, the increase in the price of many goods and services, and the increase in traffic congestion and related problems). It is important that tourism planners and managers apply internal marketing techniques to inform local residents about not only the direct but also indirect benefits of tourism. These attempts can make residents have more realistic opinions. Also, a better communication between the residents and tourism planners and managers should be established through informal meetings. These meetings would be useful for explaining plans and policies and for obtaining a real public involvement and the opinion of local people about tourism activities in Évora, and particularly in the historic center.

References

Aas C, Ladkin A, Fletcher J (2005) Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. Ann Tourism Res 32(1):28–48

Andereck K, Valentine K, Knopf R et al (2005) Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. Ann Tourism Res 32(4):1056–1076

Ap J (1990) Residents' perceptions: research on the social impacts of tourism. Ann Tourism Res 17(4):610–616

Ap J (1992) Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. Ann Tourism Res 19(4):665–690

Besculides A, Lee M, McCormick P (2002) Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. Ann Tourism Res 29(2):303–319

Borges M, Marujo N, Serra J (2013) Turismo cultural em cidades património mundial: A importância das fontes de informação para visitar a cidade de Évora. Tourism Hospit Int J 1(1):137–156

Brunt P, Courtney P (1999) Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. Ann Tourism Res 26 (3):493–515

Chen C, Chen P (2010) Resident attitudes toward heritage tourism development. Tourism Geogr 12(4):525–545

Dogan H (1989) Forms of adjustment: sociocultural impacts of tourism. Ann Tourism Res 16 (2):216–236

Drost A (1996) Developing sustainable tourism for world heritage sites. Ann Tourism Res 23 (2):479–492

Dyer P, Gursoy D, Sharma B et al (2007) Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. Tour Manage 28(2):409–422

Emerson R (1976) Social exchange theory. Annu Rev Sociol 2:335–362

Faulkner B, Tideswell C (1997) A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. J Sustain Tourism 5(1):3–28

Gursoy D, Jurowski C, Uysal M (2002) Resident attitudes: a structural modeling approach. Ann Tourism Res 29(1):79–105

Hair J, Anderson R, Tatham R, Black W (1998) Multivariate data analysis with readings. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ

Hergesell A (2006) Influence of the world heritage certification on destination choice. Dissertation, Bournemouth University

Homans G (1958) Social behavior as exchange. Am J Sociol 63(6):597–606

Huang C, Tsaur J, Yang C (2012) Does world heritage list really induce more tourists? Evidence from Macau. Tour Manage 33(6):1450–1457

INE (2012) Censos 2011. Resultados definitivos – Portugal. Instituto Nacional de Estatística, Lisboa

Jackson L (2008) Residents' perceptions of the impacts of special event tourism. J Place Manage Dev 1(3):240–255

Jimura T (2011) The impact of world heritage site designation on local communities: a case study of Ogimachi, Shirakawa-mura, Japan. Tour Manage 32(2):288–296

Jurowski C, Gursoy C (2004) Distance effects on residents' attitudes toward tourism. Ann Tourism Res 31(2):296–312

Kim H, Gursoy G, Lee S (2006) The impact of the 2002 World Cup on South Korea: comparisons of pre- and post-games. Tour Manage 27(1):86–96

Ko D, Stewart W (2002) A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. Tour Manage 23(5):521–530

Kuvan Y, Akan P (2005) Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: the case of Belek, Antalya. Tour Manage 26(5):691–706

Li M, Wu B, Cai L (2008) Tourism development of world heritage sites in China: a geographic perspective. Tour Manage 29(2):308–319

Liu J, Var T (1986) Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. Ann Tourism Res 13 (2):193–214

Nicholas L, Thapa B, Ko Y (2009) Residents' perspectives on a world heritage site: The Pitons Management Area. St Lucia Ann Tourism Res 36(3):390–412
Ozturk A, Ozer O, Caliskan U (2015) The relationship between local residents' perceptions of tourism and their happiness: a case of Kusadasi, Turkey. Tourism Rev 70(3):232–242
Pizam A (1978) Tourism impacts: the social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. J Travel Res 16(4):8–12
Renda A, Mendes J, Oom do Valle P (2014) The destination is where I live! Residents' perception of tourism impacts. J Spatial Organ Dyn 2(1):72–88
Sadiki F (2005) Sustainable tourism strategies at UNESCO world heritage sites. http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2478&context=thesesdissertations. Accessed 2 Feb 2014
Sharma B, Dyer P (2009) An investigation of differences in residents' perceptions on the Sunshine Coast: tourism impacts and demographic variables. Tourism Geogr 11(2):187–213
Vareiro L, Cadima Ribeiro J, Remoaldo P et al (2011) Residents' perception of the benefits of cultural tourism: the case of Guimarães. In: Steinecke A, Kagermeier A (eds) Kultur als Touristischer Standortfaktor – Potenziale – Nutzung – Management, Paderborn Geographical Studies, Institute series n° 23. University of Paderborn, Germany, pp 187–202
Vareiro L, Remoaldo P, Cadima Ribeiro J (2013) Residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in Guimarães (Portugal): a cluster analysis. Curr Issues Tourism 16(6):535–551
Williams J, Lawson R (2001) Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. Ann Tourism Res 28(2):269–290
UNESCO World Heritage Centre (2005) World heritage information kit. http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/567/. Accessed 27 Oct 2014
Yang C, Lin H, Han C (2010) Analysis of international tourist arrivals in China: the role of world heritage sites. Tour Manage 31(6):827–837
Yoon Y, Gursoy D, Chen J (2001) Validating a tourism development theory with structural equation modeling. Tour Manage 22(4):363–372