

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

Taya Robert  ¹

Ana Isabel Renda  ²

Patrícia Pinto  ³

1. Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Portugal

2. Centre for Tourism Research, Development and Innovation (CiTUR) and School of Management, Hospitality and Tourism, University of Algarve, Portugal

3. Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs) and Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Portugal

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 used 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 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.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 30 July 2021 Accepted 17 March 2022

1. Introduction

Economic tourism impacts are at the fore of research. Telfer and Sharpley (2008, p. 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 non-costs associated to tourism that limit these net economic benefits. They list some of the impacts as the generation of income, employment, and the 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 & 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 simultaneously at the destination- as evidenced in Gran Canaria by Tovar et al. (2020).

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 & 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 & 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 study aims to determine residents’ perceptions of tourism impact 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 focus is on what links can be determined between both positive and negative tourism impacts within the four life domains and within overall life satisfaction.

2. Literature Review

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.

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, p. 37) frames this idea as follows: “the destination communities face something of a ‘development dilemma (Tefler & 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 & Wozniak, 2018).

Economic impacts include the costs of living, housing and 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 attract investment in the destination (Šegota, Mihalič & 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).

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 & 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 & 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.

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 & 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. 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. 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 & 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. 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 & Adu-Ampong, 2021). Interestingly, Winter and Adu-Ampong (2021) found that positive perceptions of tourism impacts were mainly related to economic, community health and well-being, and negative perceptions were mainly 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 regarding 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. 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 & Saksena, 2021). 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 increas-

ing quality of life in their countries, their study also validates research centred around location-specific factors, and highlights the importance of understanding local residents' perceptions of tourism impacts.

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. 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 study.

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. Woo et al. (2015) conducted a study in five different areas, namely: New York City, Hawaii, Orlando, Las-Vegas, and Virginia. The authors concluded that residents' perceptions of quality of life affect their support for further tourism development.

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. 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. Rao and Saksena (2021) 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. 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).

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. 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.

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.

3. Methodology

3.1 Study Site

Faro is a municipality of the Algarve region in mainland Portugal. It is also the capital of the Algarve region, the most important and well-known Portuguese destination. In 2019, tourism activity boosted a GDP growth in the Algarve (2.6%) higher than the national average (2.2%) (INE, 2020).

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 study, only data from residents living in Faro will be considered. The collected sample size (300) represents 90.1% of the defined 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.

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 mentioned, 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. This study explores some questions of the questionnaire used in the RESTUR project, namely about perceptions towards tourism impacts, perceptions towards quality of life, sociodemographic variables and 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 gender, 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. Table 1 shows the studies used to inform the items chosen to assess the tourism impacts and quality of life dimensions in this study.

Table 1. Analysed Questions Theoretical Foundation

Analysis Dimensions	References
Perceptions about the economic, environmental and sociocultural impacts of tourism	Vargas-Sánchez et al. (2015); Sánchez et al. (2014) García et al. (2016); Vareiro et al. (2013); Nunkoo & Gursoy (2012); Jordan et al. (2019); Segota et al. (2017); Rasoolimanesh et al. (2015); Choi et al. (2005); Tosun (2002); Wang (2019); Lin et al. (2017); Lee & Jan (2019); Liang & Hui (2016); Kim et al. (2013) Woo et al. (2018)
Perceptions about tourism impacts on the quality of life	Suess et al. (2018); Andereck et al. (2011); Lee & Jan (2019); Kim et al. (2013, 2018)
Personal characteristics	Used by all the aforementioned researches Liang & Hui (2016)

Source: Own Elaboration

3.4 Sample Characteristics

The sample consisted of 300 residents in Faro, with slightly more female (51.7%) respondents than male (48.3%). 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. 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.

3.5 Data Analysis

Once collected, data from the questionnaires were entered into the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 software for analysis. The tourism impacts were divided by positive and negative impacts, allowing each to be presented independently and also in relation to the other. 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. 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.

4. Results

4.1 Perceptions about Economic Impacts

The overall means for perceptions about economic impacts show a slight difference between the positive impacts (3.68) and the negative impacts (3.65) (Table 2). 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).

Table 2. Perceptions Regarding Economic Impacts of Tourism

Type of Impacts	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
Positive economic impacts			0.845	3.68
Tourism is the main economic activity	3.72	1.005		
Tourism increases employment opportunities	4.20	0.727		
Tourism creates more business for local people	4.07	0.822		
Tourism creates more business for foreign people	3.59	0.941		
Tourism contributes to create new services & businesses	4.02	0.694		
Tourism contributes to develop local economic activities	4.13	0.668		
Tourism is likely to attract more investment	3.95	0.827		
The money spent by tourists stays in the municipality	3.11	0.863		
More roads and urbanisation were constructed due to tourism	3.05	1.008		
Tourism promotes the restoration of historic buildings	3.34	1.066		
Tourism improves shopping, restaurant and entertainment opportunities	3.31	1.005		
Negative economic impacts			0.791	3.65
Tourism increases the cost of living	4.26	0.843		
Goods and services are more expensive because of tourism	3.97	0.955		
Cultural attractions and events are more expensive because of tourism	3.61	0.989		
Most of the local business are for tourists	2.92	0.986		
Tourism contributes to reduce the traditional trade	2.68	1.028		
Tourism generates employment instability due to seasonality	3.76	1.038		
My municipality is economically over-dependent on tourism	3.66	0.995		
Tourism increases the price of housing and land	4.39	0.736		

Source: Own Elaboration

Regarding negative 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 2 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 ($M=3.97$).

Regarding negative 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 2 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 ($M=3.97$).

4.2 Perceptions about Socio-cultural Impacts

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 (Table 3). 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).

Table 3 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 ($M=3.77$).

Table 3. Perceptions Regarding Socio-Cultural Impacts of Tourism

Type of Impacts	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
Positive socio-cultural impacts			0.789	3.255
Tourism improves public services	2.54	0.970		
Tourism stimulates cultural activities, festivals and traditions	3.59	0.904		
Tourism contributes to the preservation of the local culture	3.32	0.975		
Tourism promotes cultural exchange between residents and tourists	3.64	0.895		
Tourism changes the consumption habits of residents	2.96	1.014		
Tourism contributes to raising the standard of living of residents	2.92	1.015		
Tourism contributes to increase security	2.84	0.991		
Tourism contributes to the recognition, prestige, and image of my municipality	3.76	0.800		
Residents in my municipality are hospitable and receive tourists with politeness	3.77	0.944		
Negative socio-cultural impacts			0.899	2.818
Tourism increases drugs and alcohol consumption	3.33	0.990		
Tourism increases prostitution and moral degradation	2.88	1.001		
Tourism increases sexually transmitted diseases	2.94	0.928		
Tourism causes more crime and vandalism	2.86	0.966		
Tourism generates loss or change of traditions and cultural identity	2.77	0.936		
Tourism causes loss of tolerance and respect for other cultures	2.45	0.897		
Tourism increases stress and disturbs quietness	3.04	1.066		
The increasing number of tourists is likely to result in conflicts with residents	2.72	0.973		
Residents change their behaviour in an attempt to mimic tourists	2.55	0.930		
Residents are likely to suffer from living in this tourism destination	2.87	1.042		
My municipality is overcrowded because of tourism	2.75	1.062		

Source: Own Elaboration

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 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 negative impacts, 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 ($M=3.04$).

4.3 Perceptions about Environmental Impacts

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 (Table 4). 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).

As shown in table 4 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 ($M=2.85$).

Table 4. Perceptions Regarding Environmental Impacts of Tourism

Positive environmental impacts	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
There are more public gardens and parks because of tourism	2.46	0.972	0.878	2.851
Tourism improves the protection of the environment	2.61	0.915		
Tourism improves the protection of natural heritage and resources	2.92	0.971		
Tourism improves public infrastructures	3.01	1.051		
Tourism improves road signage systems	3.18	0.987		
Tourism improves the cleanliness of public spaces	2.93	0.979		
Tourism positively influences ecological awareness amongst residents	2.85	0.924		
Negative environmental impacts			0.864	3.263
Tourism increases pollution, noise, garbage, etc	3.38	0.998		
Tourism deteriorates the natural environment	2.94	0.912		
Tourism contributes to occupy the natural areas	3.45	0.969		
Tourism prevents the access of residents to natural spaces	2.93	1.077		
Tourism contributes to decharacterise the landscape	3.15	1.099		
Tourism generates traffic congestion, accidents and parking problems	3.72	1.041		

Source: Own Elaboration

Moreover, residents have 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 ($M=3.72$).

4.4 Perceptions about Residents' Quality of Life

4.4.1 Satisfaction with the live domains of quality of life

Regarding the material life domain, residents indicated an 'unsatisfied' response overall ($M=2.43$), demonstrating dissatisfaction and poor perceptions of material domain quality of life (table 5). 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 5. Satisfaction with Material Life Domain Quality of Life

Items Analysed	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The cost of living in my municipality	2.44 2.41	0.935	0.860	2.43
The cost of necessities in my municipality	1.94 2.55	0.922		
The real estate taxes in my municipality	2.89 2.67	0.846		
The income at my current jobs	2.09	0.963		
The economic security of my current job		1.053		
The family income		0.933		
The benefits I receive from the government		0.927		

Source: Own Elaboration

As for community life domain, table 6 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 6. Satisfaction with Community Life Domain Quality of Life

Items Analysed	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The environmental conditions of my municipality	2.74	0.973	0.850	2.91
The conditions of the public transportation in my municipality	2.46	1.016		
The services and facilities I receive in my municipality	2.69	0.941		
The people who live in my municipality	3.32	0.771		
The way culture is preserved in my municipality	2.99	0.881		
The overall municipality life	3.27	0.901		

Source: Own Elaboration

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 7). 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 7. Satisfaction with Emotional Life Domain Quality of Life

Items Analysed	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The spare time	3.36	1.027	0.825	3.21
The leisure life	3.38	1.020		
The leisure activities in my municipality	3.06	0.922		
The religious services in my municipality	3.14	0.692		
The spiritual life in my municipality	3.11	0.678		

Source: Own Elaboration

Related to the health and safety life domain, 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 8). 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 8. Satisfaction with Health and Safety Life Domain Quality of Life

Items Analysed	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
The health facilities in my municipality	2.38	1.017	0.861	2.93
The health service quality in my municipality	2.36	1.024		
The air quality in my municipality	3.31	0.835		
The water quality in my municipality	3.36	0.912		
The environmental quality in my municipality	3.26	0.891		
The environmental cleanliness in my municipality	2.95	0.986		
The safety and security in my municipality	3.02	0.971		
The traffic congestion in my municipality	2.75	1.022		
The crime rate in my municipality	2.98	0.925		

Source: Own Elaboration

4.4.2 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 9). 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 9. Overall Life Satisfaction

Item Analysed	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Mean
I am satisfied with my life as a whole	3.74	0.758	0.875	3.27
The conditions of my life are excellent	3.01	0.928		
In most ways my life is close to the ideal	3.02	0.922		
So far, I have gotten the important things I want in life	3.20	0.903		
If I could live my live over, I would change almost nothing	2.85	0.978		
In general, I am a happy person	3.82	0.802		

Source: Own Elaboration

4.5 Impacts of Tourism and Perceptions Toward Quality of Life

The matrix below (table 10) reflects Pearson R correlations among the dimensions of perceptions on 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?

As reported in table 10, 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 were 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 10. Correlation Matrix of Tourism Impacts (Positive and Negative) and the Life Domains

Tourism Impacts	Life Domains				
	Material	Community	Emotional	Health & Safety	Overall
Positive Economic Impacts	0.153*	0.363**	0.244**	0.374**	0.255**
Negative Economic Impacts	-0.237**	-0.140*	-0.172**	-0.175**	-0.126*
Positive Socio-Cultural Impacts	0.281**	0.337**	0.197**	0.421**	0.198**
Negative Socio-Cultural Impacts	-0.126*	-0.197**	-0.233**	-0.282**	-0.151*
Positive Environmental Impacts	0.290**	0.431**	0.246**	0.456**	0.130*
Negative Environmental Impacts	-0.232**	-0.225**	-0.185**	-0.262**	-0.130**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level

Source: Own Elaboration

5. Discussion

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 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.

5.1 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.

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 & 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 & 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 & 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 Rosselló (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.

5.2 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 enhanced 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. (2021) 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.'

5.2.1 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.

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.

6. Conclusion

This study contributes to advance the knowledge of the tourism-resident connection in a city that is the capital of an 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 offer 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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the support provided by the European Regional Development Fund by CRESC Algarve 2020 through project SAICT-ALG/39584/2018— RESTUR - Residents' attitudes and Behaviours towards Sustainable Tourism Development in the Algarve. The authors are thankful for support from the Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs) [FCT Grant Number UIDP/SOC/04020/2020] and Centre for Tourism Research, Development and Innovation (CiTUR) [FCT Grant Number UIDB/04470/2020 CiTUR].

References

- 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*, 77, 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.
- 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.
- Citypopulation.de. (2021). Faro (District, Portugal) - Population Statistics, Charts, Map and Location. Retrieved July 1, 2021, from www.citypopulation.de/en/portugal/admin/08_faro/.
- García, F., Vázquez, A., & Macías, R., (2015). Resident's attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13(1), 33-40.
- García, F., Fernández, M., Vázquez, A., & Macías, R. (2016). Residents' perceptions of tourism development in Benalmádena (Spain). *Tourism Management*, 54(3), 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 (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.
- 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. Retrieved December 10, 2021, from www.pordata.pt/en/DB/Municipalities/Search+Environment/Table.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Yeomans, B., & Slater, B. (2021). *Venice seeks to ban noisy suitcases on wheels*. The Telegraph. www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/italy/11243670/Venice-seeks-to-ban-noisy-suitcases-on-wheels.html

ORCID

Taya Robert  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3864-7718>

Ana Isabel Renda  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1279-0703>

Patrícia Pinto  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3153-2830>

Notes on Contributors

Taya Roberts holds a master's in business management in Tourism, undertaken at the Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Portugal. Before this, she undertook a BA in Professional Writing and Publishing and a Diploma in Education. She currently works as an Educator at a school in the Algarve and a writer for various independent corporate and creative projects. Her main interest is Tourism, with a focus on the perspective of residents in tourism locations, and the effects of tourism in different locations.

Patrícia Susana Lopes Guerrilha dos Santos Pinto holds a PhD in Quantitative Methods Applied to Economics and Business. She is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Economics, University of Algarve, Portugal. She is the coordinator of the Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs) and director of the PhD in Tourism of the University of Algarve. Her current research interests are in applied statistics and modelling especially in Tourism Management (Sustainable Tourism, Destination image and branding, Marketing segmentation, Consumer behavior).

Ana Isabel Renda has a PhD in Tourism, a postgraduate degree in Business Marketing (University of the Algarve), a postgraduate degree in Tendencias Actuales de la Administración Empresarial (University of Huelva), and a degree in Social Communication (Technical University of Lisbon - ISCSP). She is director of the Masters in Tourism at the University of Algarve and Adjunct Professor at the School of Management, Hospitality and Tourism at this university where, since 1992, she teaches in the areas of tourism, marketing, and social sciences. She integrates the Centre for Research, Development, and Innovation in Tourism (CiTUR) and collaborates with the Research Centre for Tourism, Sustainability and Well-being (CinTurs). Her current research interests are in sustainable tourism development, residents' perceptions and attitudes towards tourism, quality of life and well-being.