

Recebimento: 18/11/2019

Aceite: 25/02/2029

RESIDENTS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS TOURISM IN AN INDUSTRIAL BRAZILIAN CITY: A CLUSTER ANALYSIS

Elaine Cristina Borges Scalabrini¹

Paula Cristina Remoaldo²

Abstract

Joinville is the biggest city of Santa Catarina State (Brazil) and its main economic activity is industry. The service sector is expanding rapidly and tourism has been gaining momentum, especially regarding business and events. Although tourism is also an important economic activity, there were no studies about residents' perception regarding it in Joinville (SC – Brazil) until now, hence the purpose of this study. We conducted 498 surveys with residents from every neighborhood in the city. The questionnaire had 20 questions. The data were tabulated, then we performed a non-hierarchical cluster analysis. We identified four clusters: Moderate Optimists, Optimists, Sceptics and Enthusiasts, the latter being the most representative. It was concluded that Joinville residents perceive tourism positively. On the other hand, tourism needs to be planned and needs a more effective promotion. This way, residents can have a better understanding of its economic, sociocultural and environmental benefits.

Keywords: Tourism impacts. Residents' attitudes. Events. Cluster analysis.

Introduction

Internationally, tourism is the activity with the highest growth in the last decades. World Tourism Organization (2018) presents a 6% increase in international tourists, comparing to 2017, and states that tourism can be considered the world's third largest 'exporter' (after the oil industry and the automotive industry). Moreover, tourism is also important in social, cultural and environmental areas that are influenced by tourism activities, mainly the preservation and development of natural and cultural heritage.

In the last forty years, many studies were published covering a wide range of areas, such as: tourism epistemology (Botterill, 2001; Wijesinghe et al., 2019), tourists' motivation (Fodness, 1994; Pearce and Lee, 2005; Albayrak and Caber, 2018), tourism destination image (Bigne et al., 2001; Agapito et al., 2010; Brea and Cardoso, 2011; Bădiță, 2012) and residents' perception towards tourism (Lankford and Howard, 1994; Besculides et al., 2002; Sharma and Dyer, 2009; Carneiro et al., 2018; Gursoy et al., 2019). These last authors argue that a destination's success is directly related to

¹ Postdoctoral student at the Department of Geography, University of Minho, Portugal. Email: ecristinborges@outlook.com

² PhD in Human Geography (University of Minho). Professor at Department of Geography, Institute of Social Sciences, University of Minho Portugal. E-mail: premoaldo@geografia.uminho.pt

residents' satisfaction. There are no studies on residents' perception towards tourism in Joinville, which justifies the study we made about this industrial city.

The methodology used was quantitative in nature. We conducted 498 surveys with Joinville residents and subsequently, the data were analyzed using a cluster analysis technique.

This paper is structured in five sections. The first one deals with a literature review focusing on the analyses of the studies about residents' perceptions towards tourism impacts. In the second section, we describe the methodology used and present a short contextualization of the studied area. In the third section, we present the results and its discussion. Finally, the last section is concerned with the conclusions and some recommendations on policies.

Residents' perception towards tourism

A lot has been written and said about perception, notably in social sciences and social psychology, when it comes to understand social relations. Perception was addressed by Tuan (1980) as an answer of the senses (sight, smell, touch, taste and hearing) to external stimuli. Hence, it is not possible for two people to see the same reality, because perception is directly related to individual experiences. Shurum (2006) agrees when he states that individuals are influenced by factors and events, perception being defined as a stimulus-response process. In other words, as people are stimulated by an event, they will respond to it according to their previous experiences and interaction with other people (SHURUM, 2006). So, perception is closely related to tourism, since this activity causes different perceptions in both tourists and residents. Cordero (2008) states that the terms perceptions, attitudes and reactions have been used in the studies to refer to opinions.

Residents' perception towards tourism is an important subject, so there are several international studies on this issue (Getz, 1993; Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Besculides et al., 2002; Harrill, 2004; Andereck et al., 2005; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Brida et al., 2010; McDowall and Choi, 2010; Remoaldo et al., 2015; Carneiro et al., 2018; Su et al., 2018; Gursoy et al., 2019).

Recently, Monjardino (2009), Eusébio and Carneiro (2012), Vareiro et al. (2013), Remoaldo et al. (2015) and Carneiro et al. (2018) addressed the topic regarding Portugal, where the recent increase in publications on the relationship between residents and tourism is notorious. In Brazil, researches about this subject are increasing, but are still scarce Maio et al. (2006), Xavier (2007), Aires et al. (2010), Aires and Fortes (2011), Gastal and Dall'Agnol (2012), Silva and Marques Junior (2016) and Vieira et al. (2018). Scalabrini et al. (2014) identified the researches mainly focused on the north-east of the country, essentially qualitative and empirica. It was also identified that it is necessary to improve the methodological aspects in these studies (SCALABRINI et al., 2014).

A large number of empirical studies present residents' attitudes as determinant for tourism destination's success (Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Williams and Lawson, 2001; Gursoy et al., 2002; Gursoy and Rutherford, 2004; Kuvan and Akan, 2005; Gursoy and Kendall, 2006; Dyer et al., 2007; Nunkoo and So, 2015; Su et al., 2018; Gursoy et al., 2019).

Generally, residents welcome the benefits of tourism but are sensitive to its negative impacts either economic, sociocultural or environmental. Therefore, residents support tourism when they welcome the benefits and are against it when they perceive the downsides (Jackson, 2008). In this respect, an analysis on the residents' perceptions is an important tool to support governments and stakeholders on tourism planning and policy-making.

Communities that perceive tourism's importance and the information about this activity will be able to perceive the positive impacts (SHARMA AND DYER, (2009). Moreover, to perceive the positive impacts, it is essential that the community is involved with tourism.

An analysis of different studies about residents' perception towards tourism, allows to identify different approaches to residents' impacts and perceptions. Many studies relate tourism impacts to demographic characteristics such as age and gender, as well as education level and residence time at the researched place (Getz, 1993; Besculides et al., 2002; Sharma and Dyer, 2009; Brida et al., 2010; Vareiro et al., 2013).

Besides, other studies associate impacts and perceptions with social and economic factors, as well as residence time and economic dependence on tourism (Brunt and Courtney, 1999). Spatial aspects are also considered in this relation. The closer residents are to a touristic area, the more negative their perceptions tend to be (Jurowski and Gursoy, 2004).

In this regard, Besculides et al. (2002) and Sharma and Dyer (2009) related residents' perception to the time they stay in a place. The longer people remain in a touristic area, the more negative impacts they will perceive.

Moreover, the involvement with tourism, especially with certain economic activities, usually makes residents have more positive perceptions, mainly the economic impacts (Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Andereck et al., 2005; Sharma and Dyer, 2009).

Residents' perceptions are also linked to tourism impacts, specifically economic, sociocultural and environmental. Pérez (2009) defines economic impacts as actions that influence a destination's economic structure. There is a tendency to highlight the economic impacts, because it can be easier to measure their effects on a community (Pérez, 2009). Some authors argue that economic benefits are the most important elements for local development (e.g., Gursoy and Rutheford, 2004), while others claim that these should not be studied separately from other impacts (Krippendorff, 1989). Also, in this sense, Sharma and Dyer (2009) suggest that economic dependence on tourism may influence residents' perceptions towards it. Once the community feels economically benefited from tourism, they will understand the activity better. As economic impacts are the most analyzed and measured parameters regarding tourism destinations, it is noteworthy that these are the most perceived positive impacts by the communities already studied (Getz, 1993; Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Sharma and Dyer, 2009; Webster and Ivanov, 2014; Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2015; Carneiro et al., 2018).

Sociocultural impacts are more difficult to measure than economic impacts because they are more subjective and less measurable. Sociocultural impacts are understood to be those that, in some way, may affect the way of life and the community's organization, values, family relationships, lifestyle, moral behavior, among other aspects that directly influence the lives of residents (Ap and Crompton, 1998; Brunt and Courtney, 1999; Styliadis et al., 2014; Carneiro et al., 2018).

With increasing environmental concerns and discussions about sustainability, studies on environmental impacts have also gained prominence, although Kuvan and Akan (2005) state that impact studies emphasize sociocultural and economic issues and environmental issues are treated more generally. Also in this sense, Wall and Mathieson (2006) expose the difficulties of measuring environmental impacts, since the human being has been modifying the environment where he lives, being difficult to affirm that the generated impacts result from tourism activity.

This previous analysis allows us to state the relation between tourism impacts and residents' perception on it, so, as a result, we decided to study the topic at Joinville – SC (Brazil) using its most relevant positive and negative perceived impacts.

Methodology

Survey and sample of residents

The empirical research was conducted at Joinville and was similar to other studies, like Besculides et al., (2002) in Colorado (USA), Remoaldo et. al. (2015) in Guimarães (Portugal), Gómez (2019) in Toledo (Spain). The data collection process was performed via a survey conducted between May and September 2014 with a convenience sample. 694 questionnaires were handed out to residents from all districts in Joinville, of which 498 were returned, which represents a 71% response rate. The volume of the sample was similar to international studies about this issue (Besculides et al., 2002; Inbakaran and Jackson, 2006; Brida et al., 2010; McDowall and Choi, 2010; Vareiro et al., 2013; Gómez, 2019).

Before the final application, we did two pre-tests (December 2013 and May 2014), involving students of an extension project at the University of the Region of Joinville (Univille). The final version of the survey had twenty closed questions. To evaluate the positive and negative impacts and tourism destination's image we asked a question (number 11 – “Please rate the following aspects about tourism in Joinville according to your opinion”), with 39 statements using a five-point Likert scale, grouped in positive and negative economic, sociocultural and environmental impacts, and affective image (Table 1). In the last part, there were questions about the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents (e.g., gender, age, education).

Table 1 - Tourism impacts and affective image

Economic Impacts	
Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creates jobs for residents. - Helps providing residents with new services. - The money spent by tourists is received by municipality agents and residents. - Opportunities for local businesses. - Public services are improved due to the revenue generated by taxes. - Enables an increase in the standard of living of the population. - Tourism gives more visibility to the destination, attracting more tourists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in prices of goods and services. - Job vacancies are occupied by people who did not previously reside in the destination. - Tourism results in an increase in the cost of living.
Sociocultural Impacts	
Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Helps the conservation and restoration of historic buildings. - Promotes contacts with different cultures. - Encourages local culture and handicrafts. - The quality of services is now better due to tourism. - Residents have easy access to services used by tourists. - Increases the quality of life. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increases crime rates. - Tourism limits residents' access to leisure sites and equipment. - Local people change their behavior to mimic the behavior of tourists. - Increased stress due to the increase of people circulating in the destination - Conflicts between tourists and residents.
Environmental Impacts	
Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural areas are preserved. - Infrastructures and visits to the natural areas of the destination are improved. - Environmental planning to adapt areas for tourist use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generates excessive noise in the centre of the city. - Increase in air and water pollution. - Increase in litter. - Change in the composition of species of local fauna and flora. - Growth of the built-up area and reduction of natural areas. - Increase in water consumption.
Affective Image	
Benefits	Costs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pleasant - Happy - Restful/ relaxing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stressed - Upset - Depressed

Source: Authors' own survey data.

First, we produced a data descriptive analysis, and then a data cross-checking of gender, age, education level, and residence district, to understand the relations between the impacts and the socio-demographic characteristics. The data were evaluated using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test (K-S test), considering $p \leq 0,05$. With the K-S test, we identified non-normal data and applied nonparametric tests, as indicated by Field (2009) for these cases. So, to check the correlation between variables, we used Spearman Coefficient, indicated for non-parametric data (Field, 2009).

The last step was a non-hierarchical cluster analysis. This statistical technique allows you to separate groups by social demographic profile and its relationship with the impacts (BRIDA et al., 2010). Cluster analysis was chosen according to sample size ($n=200$). Brida et al. (2010) and Vareiro et al. (2013) argue that this is the ideal statistical technique.

Study area

Joinville is located at Santa Catarina, a Brazilian State, and it is its largest city with 583.144 inhabitants (IBGE, 2018). It is the most important economic pole of the State and the third industrial pole in Southern Brazil (SEPUD, 2018). Industry is one of the most lucrative sectors (annual turnover of US\$ 14.8 billion per year), marked by the presence of metallurgical, textile, plastic, chemical, and pharmaceutical companies. It is responsible for 20% of the exportations from Santa Catarina and has

one of the highest GDP per capita in Brazil (US\$ 8.456/year). In spite of the predominance of the industrial activity, the greatest number of jobs is generated in the service area, including tourism (SEPUD, 2018).

Concerning tourism, business and events are the stronger segments (Dalonso and Lourenço, 2011), with emphasis on cultural and artistic events such as “Festival de Dança” (Festival of Dance), which is considered, by Guinness Book, to be the largest dance festival in the world. In the 2019 edition, it welcomed 9.000 dancers (Morriesen, 2019). The only Bolshoi School outside of Russia is located in Joinville. In 2017, Joinville received the title of National Dance Capital (Senado, 2016).

Cultural tourism and specifically rural tourism, are emergent segments in Joinville. In this respect, the Secretary of Culture and Tourism has been developing, since 2010, a pedagogical tourism project called Viva Ciranda, which aims to promote tourism in rural areas of the municipality (SECTUR, 2018). Cultural tourism is a potential segment, although it requires long-term investment to attract more tourists.

Residents' profile

In what concerns the socio-demographic profile of the sample, 61.7% of the respondents were female (according to IBGE, 2010, latest census published). The respondents' most representative age group was 18-55 (86.3%), the economically active workforce. Also, 59.2% of respondents were native and had always lived (since they were born) in Joinville; 58.4% were single and 35.5% were married. They had average income: 78.9% of the respondents received \$425.00 to \$1.322.00. Regarding education level, 43.9% of the respondents were students and 16% had a higher education level. This latter aspect differs from Joinville's reality, but it results from the method previously explained.

In this regard, the social demographic profile is similar to studies dealing with this issue, with a predominance of females, ages between 18 and 55 (Agapito et al., 2010; Ryan and Aicken, 2010; Santos et al., 2015).

Non-hierarchical cluster analysis

A non-hierarchical cluster analysis was used to identify groups with similar behaviour about Joinville's positive and negative tourism impacts and its affective image. This approach has previously been employed in studies about residents' perceptions towards tourism (Inbakaran and Jackson, 2006; Brida et al., 2010; Vareiro et al., 2012).

According to Vareiro et al.'s (2013) model, the first step was to define the number of clusters. In this step, 39 items concerning tourism impacts and affective image were considered. ANOVA test indicates an F-value too low regarding the latter and this could modify the analysis (Lattin et al., 2011), so we excluded the items that refer to it. In the second step, 32 items concerning tourism impacts were considered. For this purpose, F-Value was ideal for cluster analysis and this methodology allowed the formation of 2-5 clusters (Table 2).

Table 2 - Distribution of sample in each cluster

Number of groups				
Cluster	2	3	4	5
1	267	175	78	74
2	221	140	146	108
3		173	111	61
4			153	138
5				107

Source: Authors' own survey data.

To define the clusters, we analyzed the iteration value on 2-5 clusters. In this case, the group with better performance was the one with 4 clusters. After the 9th iteration, it stabilized, in other words, only a small change in the center of the clusters was observed. To further establish the external validity, we conducted a one-way ANOVA test, analysing the variance (F) and the significance ($p \leq 0,005$) between clusters.

After these results, iteration value and ANOVA test were evaluated, residents' perception towards tourism in Joinville was explained using 4 clusters. Previous studies, like Williams and

Lawson (2001) and Inbarakaran and Jackson (2006), used this number of clusters to analyze residents' perception towards tourism.

In the next step, we analysed the socio-demographic profile per cluster. We considered gender, personal employment in tourism, education level, age, and residence location. Table 3 presents socio-demographic profile per cluster.

Table 3 - Social and Demographic profile per cluster

	Cluster 1		Cluster 2		Cluster 3		Cluster 4		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
	78	16	146	30	111	23	153	31		
Gender										
Female	54	69.2	80	55.2	78	70.3	89	58.6	301	61.9
Male	24	30.8	65	44.8	33	29.7	63	41.4	185	38.1
									486	100
Personal Employment in Tourism										
Yes	14	17.9	38	26.4	14	12.6	44	28.9	110	22.7
No	64	82.1	106	73.6	97	87.4	108	71.1	375	77.3
									485	100
Education level										
Incomplete Elementary School	3	3.9	3	2.1	1	0.9	2	1.3	9	1.9
Elementary School	4	5.2	1	0.7	1	0.9	2	1.3	8	1.7
Incomplete Secondary School	5	6.5	4	2.8	5	4.5	3	2.0	17	3.5
Secondary School	8	10.4	17	11.9	13	11.8	23	15.3	61	12.7
Incomplete Higher Education Level	38	49.4	66	46.2	55	50	55	36.7	241	44.6
Higher Education Level	8	10.4	24	16.8	14	2.7	32	21.3	78	16.3
Specialization	10	13.0	25	17.5	18	16.4	26	17.3	79	16.5
Master Degree	1	1.3	3	2.1	2	1.8	7	4.7	13	2.7
PhD	0	0	0	0	1	0.9	0	0	1	0.2
									480	100
Age										
Under 18 years	5	6.6	6	4.1	3	2.8	7	4.6	21	4.4
18 - 25 years	34	44.7	62	42.8	61	56.5	50	32.7	207	42.9
26 - 40 years	23	30.3	49	33.8	31	28.7	45	29.4	148	30.7
41 - 55 years	13	17.1	23	15.9	9	8.3	44	28.8	89	18.5
56 - 70 years	1	1.3	4	2.8	4	3.7	7	4.6	16	3.3
Over 70 years	0	0	1	0.7	0	0	0	0	1	0.2
									482	100
Residence Location										
Northeast	5	6.7	7	4.9	6	5.6	8	5.3	26	5.5
East	11	14.7	13	9.1	12	11.1	14	9.3	50	10.5
Southeast	11	14.7	22	15.4	15	13.9	21	13.9	69	14.5
South	15	20.0	26	18.2	30	27.8	27	17.9	98	20.5
South-West	4	5.3	5	3.5	7	6.5	11	7.3	27	5.7
West	1	1.3	9	6.3	0	0	7	4.6	17	3.6
North Centre	20	26.7	57	39.9	36	33.3	61	40.4	174	36.5
Pirabeiraba	8	10.7	4	2.8	2	1.9	2	1.3	16	3.4
									477	100

Source: Authors' own survey data.

In other words, the four clusters present the socio-demographic profile as follows.

Cluster 1: consists predominantly of women (69.2%). The majority does not work in tourism (82.1%) and 75% are aged between 18 and 40. This cluster presents a lower education level. Besides, the highest number of residents lives in the Northeast, East, and Pirabeiraba. This profile is similar to

the socio-demographic profile of Joinville. It is worth pointing out the Northeast as the district with the lower per capita income (1.52 minimum income/resident).

Cluster 2: men account for 44.8% of the sample in this cluster. This data is similar in districts that comprise the cluster. 73.6% of the sample has no contact with tourism. This cluster has a high percentage of residents aged between 26 and 40 and the highest number of residents with a secondary school degree. Comparing to the other 3 clusters, these residents are on the Southeast district (per capita income 1.54 minimum income/ resident) and West district (1.76 minimum income/ resident).

Cluster 3: presents the highest difference in percentage between men and women. The women account for 70.3% of the sample in this cluster. It is also the cluster with a higher percentage of residents with no contact with tourism (84.4%). The respondents are aged between 18 and 25 (56.5%), have a secondary school degree and incomplete higher education (61.8%). South (1.65 minimum income/resident) and South-West (1.75 minimum income/resident) represent the highest number of residents in the clusters.

Cluster 4: women consist of 58.6% of the sample and men 41.4%. The majority of the respondents works in tourism. 33.4% of them are aged between 41 and 70 and 43.3% present higher education. 40.4% of the respondents live in the Centre-North district, where the main tourist attractions are located. This corresponds also to the district with the highest per capita income (4.4 minimum income/ resident).

Furthermore, an average of 32 tourism impact items was verified. The averages are presented in Table 4 and the highlighted are the highest averages in the 4 clusters per item.

Table 4 - Mean Scores per cluster

	<i>Cluster</i> 1	<i>Cluster</i> 2	<i>Cluster</i> 3	<i>Cluster</i> 4
Economic Impacts				
Benefits				
Creates jobs for residents	3.74	4.46	3.51	4.33
Helps providing residents with new services	3.60	4.31	3.27	4.25
Money spent by tourists is received by municipality agents and residents	3.23	3.77	3.09	3.74
Opportunities for local businesses	3.69	4.23	3.38	4.22
Public services are improved due to the revenue generated by taxes	2.81	3.20	2.29	3.07
Enables the increase of the standard of living of the population	3.25	3.86	2.79	3.75
Tourism gives more visibility to the destinations attracting more tourists	3.83	4.40	3.61	4.32
Costs				
Increase in prices of goods and services	3.71	3.88	3.41	3.37
Job vacancies are occupied by people who did not previously reside in the destination	3.19	2.92	2.58	2.43
Tourism results in an increase in the cost of living	3.67	3.57	2.83	2.65
Sociocultural Impacts				
Benefits				
Helps the conservation and restoration of historic buildings	3.30	4.02	3.05	4.08
Promotes contacts with different cultures	3.99	4.62	3.90	4.49
Encourages local culture and handicrafts	3.69	4.34	3.56	4.28
The quality of services is now better due to tourism	3.36	3.71	2.81	3.72
Residents have easy access to services used by tourists	2.92	3.53	3.02	3.68
Increases the quality of life	2.86	3.65	2.80	3.80
Costs				
Increases crime rates	3.49	3.12	2.87	2.31

Tourism limits residents' access to leisure sites and equipment	3.51	2.52	2.45	1.84
Local people change their behaviour to mimic the behaviour of tourists	3.21	2.53	2.29	2.13
Increases the stress	3.98	3.34	2.75	2.10
Conflicts between tourists and residents	2.98	2.36	2.11	1.89
Environmental Impacts				
Benefits				
Natural areas are preserved	2.84	3.53	2.91	3,71
Infrastructures and visits to natural areas are improved	3.24	3.95	3.13	4,00
Environmental planning to adapt areas for tourist use	3.29	3.95	3.04	4,05
Costs				
Generates excessive noise in the centre of the city	3.37	2.68	2.33	1.91
Increase in air and water pollution	3.72	3.37	2.58	2.25
Increase in litter	3.82	3.76	3.04	2.68
Change in the composition of species of local fauna and flora	3.53	2.96	2.41	2.18
Growth of the built-up area and reduction of natural areas	3.69	3.43	2.82	2.68
Increase in water consumption	3.59	3.52	2.82	2.43
Affective Image				
Benefits				
Pleasant	3.44	3.74	3.53	3.83
Happy	3.58	3.75	3.68	3.92
Restful/ relaxing	3.23	3.40	3.15	3.51
Costs				
Stressed	3.23	3.09	3.22	2.80
Upset	2.96	2.69	2.86	2.43
Depressed	2.71	2.40	2.58	2.22

Source: Authors' own survey data.

By grouping the items per impact and affective image, Table 5 presents the overall average by attribute and per cluster. The ranking demonstrates the maximum and the minimum mean for each attribute.

Table 5 - Dimensions scores

Variable	Mean Score	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4	Maximum Mean	Minimum Mean
Tourism is good for Joinville	4.40	4.10	4.69	3.95	4.61	C2	C3
I benefit from the development of tourism in Joinville	3.61	3.10	4.02	2.99	3.92	C2	C3
Economic benefits	3.71	3.45	4.03	3.13	3.96	C2	C3
Economic costs	3.15	3.52	3.46	2.94	2.82	C1	C4
Sociocultural benefits	3.71	3.35	3.98	3.19	4.01	C4	C3
Sociocultural costs	2.59	3.43	2.77	2.49	2.05	C1	C4
Environmental benefits	3.56	3.12	3.81	3.03	3.92	C4	C3
Environmental costs	2.91	3.62	3.29	2.67	2.36	C1	C3
Affective image benefits	3.48	3.33	3.51	3.30	3.67	C4	C3
Affective image costs	2.73	2.97	2.73	2.88	2.49	C1	C4

Source: Authors' own survey data.

In addition, we present the sum of the averages (benefits and costs). Just as Inbakaran e Jackson (2006) have stated, this procedure allows to identify performance per cluster in relation to variables. These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 - Sum of the benefits and cost attributes per cluster

Elements	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4
Benefits*	20.45	24.04	19.59	24.09
Costs	13.54	12.25	10.98	9.72

Source: Authors' own survey data.

* Considering the statements "tourism is good for Joinville" and "I benefit from the development of tourism in Joinville".

In reference to Tables 5 and 6, it is important to point out cluster 3 with the lowest averages regarding benefits, while regarding cluster 4 we should highlight the costs. We named and classified the clusters according to the socio-demographic profile and the impacts' averages. The classification was based on previous studies (Fredline and Faulkner, 2000; Inbakaran and Jackson, 2006; Brida et al., 2010; Vareiro et al., 2012; Sinclair-Maragh et al., 2015).

Vareiro et al. (2013) referred to the enthusiasts cluster. In that case, the residents with higher education levels perceived tourism positively. Similar results were identified by Inbakaran and Jackson (2006). Clusters with residents who work in tourism support better this activity, according to Brida et al. (2010). These situations also appear in cluster 4 – Enthusiasts group in our study. Table 7 presents a description per cluster.

Table 7 - Clusters descriptions

Cluster	Name	Description
1	Moderate Optimistic	It is the smallest group, involving 16% of the sample. A high percentage of residents have no contact with tourism. The majority of the sample has a low education level. The cluster is formed by residents from districts that present lower per capita income. These cluster members are really concerned about the negative impacts (presenting higher averages in these). We considered this cluster as Moderate Optimistic because the averages from "tourism is good for Joinville" (85.9%) and "I benefit from the development of tourism in Joinville" (34.6%) were higher than those of cluster 3.
2	Optimists	It contains 30% of the sample. A high percentage of men and individuals aged between 26 to 40, residents in Southeast and East Districts. We considered them Optimists because this cluster shows a high degree of agreement regarding "tourism is good for Joinville" (98.6%) and "I benefit from the development of tourism in Joinville" (75.5%). The highest averages regarding economic benefits are in this cluster, being the most sensitive to these impacts.
3	Sceptics	This group corresponds to 23% of the sample. It is the cluster which least approved tourism at Joinville. There is a high percentage of women, aged between 18 and 25 years. We named this cluster Sceptics because it shows the lowest degree of agreement regarding "Tourism is good for Joinville" (78.9%) and "I benefit from the development of tourism in Joinville" (24.8%).
4	Enthusiasts	It is the largest group, containing 31% of the sample; it includes the oldest individuals and the ones with the highest education level. We named it Enthusiasts because this cluster presented the highest averages regarding benefits. This cluster perceives positively both sociocultural and environmental benefits. In this cluster, the statements "Natural areas are preserved" (78.7%) and "Environmental planning to adapt areas for tourist use" (89.3%) have higher agreement percentages than any other clusters.

Source: Authors' own survey data.

Unlike previous studies in which women identify tourism positively, our study shows women and youth who identify tourism somewhat negatively (as seen on cluster 1 - Moderate Optimistic and cluster 3 – Sceptics), although older people and with higher education levels support tourism activity better (cluster 4 – Enthusiasts). Furthermore, 61% of the respondents encourage tourism development at Joinville. In this respect, we understand it is important to promote communication and education actions to increase public awareness on tourism issues and improve residents' perception towards tourism, especially clusters 1 and 3.

Conclusion

Although the industry sector is the most important economic activity at Joinville, tourism is increasingly gaining ground. Residents from Joinville perceive this importance when the majority (92%) of the sample agreed that “tourism is good for Joinville”.

However, residents argue that Joinville is not yet prepared for this activity, specifying, in particular, the lack of information about tourist attractions. In fact, it is quite common for residents to claim there is no tourism option in the city, but in truth, they don't know the offers.

The results also indicated that 33.4% of the sample was concerned with tourism, especially basic infrastructures, and Joinville's marketing promotion. Traffic conditions and current conditions of tourist attractions were the main concerns of residents.

About the promotion strategy, residents don't perceive an efficient promotion. They affirmed that Joinville has no consistent branding and considered publicity/marketing investment to be low. This indicates that there should be stronger investment in the promotion of Joinville with different potential customers.

In the cluster analysis, we identified two of four clusters, Moderate Optimistic and Sceptics, composed mostly by young women, with a low education level and lower incomes. These results led us to question why women perceive tourism in Joinville more negatively. Could the increase in the prices of services and goods explain it? We know that women in Joinville are still the ones that take care of the house and buy the necessary household goods. Or is it because Joinville has a predominant tourism segment concerned with business and events, visited mainly by men (sex tourism)? The data did not allow us to answer these questions, suggesting future studies on this issue.

this study had some limitations that must be pointed out. The first one was the surveys which were sent back. 694 surveys were distributed/handed out, but only 498 were returned. The second limitation was the difficulty in obtaining secondary data about tourism in Joinville, which made it harder for us to carry out a holistic analysis of tourism.

We underline the importance of this study since this framework should set out tourism policies that take residents' perceptions into account. This study can also contribute to Brazilian publications about this issue as they are still scarce.

References

- Agapito, D.; Mendes, J. d. C. ; Valle, P. O. d. Destination image: perspectives of tourists versus residents. **European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation**. v.1. n. 1. 90-109, 2010.
- Aires, J. D.; Pequeno, E. A. ; Fortes, L. A Relação Entre Turistas Estrangeiros e Residentes: O Caso de Ponta Negra-Natal/RN. **Revista Hospitalidade**. v.7. n. 2. 38-51, 2010.
- Aires, J. D. M. ; Fortes, L. O Modelo Irridex de Doxey: Breves Considerações Acerca de Sua Aplicação em Ponta Negra (Natal-RN). **RITUR-Revista Iberoamericana de Turismo**. v.1. n. 1. 23-33, 2011.
- Albayrak, T. ; Caber, M. Examining the relationship between tourist motivation and satisfaction by two competing methods. **Tourism Management**. v.69. n. 201-213, 2018.
- Andereck, K. L.; Valentine, K. M.; Knopf, R. C. ; Vogt, C. A. Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.32. n. 4. 1056-1076, 2005.
- Ap, J. ; Crompton, J. L. Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. **Journal of Travel Research**. v.37. n. 2. 120-130, 1998.
- Bădiță, A. Residents and non-residents' perception towards the touristic image of Craiova municipality, Romania. **Forum geografic**. 52-58, 2012.
- Besculides, A.; Lee, M. E. ; McCormick, P. J. Residents' perceptions of the cultural benefits of tourism. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.29. n. 2. 303-319, 2002.
- Bigne, J. E.; Sanchez, M. I. ; Sanchez, J. Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behaviour: inter-relationship. **Tourism Management**. v.22. n. 6. 607-616, 2001.
- Botterill, D. The epistemology of a set of tourism studies. **Leisure Studies**. v.20. n. 3. 199-214, 2001.

- Brea, J. A. F. ; Cardoso, L. Tourism destination image: Reflexão sobre as principais investigações internacionais. **CULTUR: Revista de Cultura e Turismo**. v.5. n. 2. 4-18, 2011.
- Brida, J. G.; Osti, L. ; Barquet, A. Segmenting resident perceptions towards tourism - a cluster analysis with a multinomial logit model of a mountain community. **International Journal of Tourism Research**. v.12. n. 5. 591-602, 2010.
- Brunt, P. ; Courtney, P. Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.26. n. 3. 493-515, 1999.
- Carneiro, M. J.; Eusébio, C. ; Caldeira, A. The influence of social contact in residents' perceptions of the tourism impact on their quality of life: A structural equation model. **Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism**. v.19. n. 1. 1-30, 2018.
- Cordero, J. C. M. Residents' Perception of Tourism. **CIENCIA ergo sum**. v.15. n. 1. 35-44, 2008.
- Dalonso, Y. d. S. ; Lourenço, J. O impacto socioeconômico do segmento de eventos nos destinos turísticos: uma análise da cidade de Joinville-SC. **AICA-Revista e Divulgação Científica**. v.3. n. 67-82, 2011.
- Dyer, P.; Gursoy, D.; Sharma, B. ; Carter, J. Structural modeling of resident perceptions of tourism and associated development on the Sunshine Coast, Australia. **Tourism Management**. v.28. n. 2. 409-422, 2007.
- Eusébio, C. ; Carneiro, M. J. Impactes sócio-culturais do turismo em destinos urbanos. **Revista Portuguesa de Estudos Regionais**. n. 30. 65-75, 2012.
- Field, A. **Descobrimo a estatística usando o SPSS**. Porto Alegre: Bookman Editora, 2009.
- Fodness, D. Measuring tourist motivation. **Annals of tourism research**. v.21. n. 3. 555-581, 1994.
- Fredline, E. ; Faulkner, B. Host community reactions: a cluster analysis. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.27. n. 3. 763-784, 2000.
- Gastal, S. d. A. ; Dall'Agnol, S. Turismo em Laguna (SC): Impactos e atitude. **Revista Brasileira de Turismo - RBTUR**. v.6. n. 1. 16-31, 2012.
- Getz, D. Impacts of tourism on residents' leisure: concepts, and a longitudinal case study of Spey Valley, Scotland. **Journal of Tourism Studies**. v.4. n. 2. 33-44, 1993.
- Gómez, L. A. E. Residents' Opinions and Perceptions of Tourism Development in the Historic City of Toledo, Spain. **Sustainability**. v.11. n. 14. 1-24, 2019.
- Gursoy, D.; Jurowski, C. ; Uysal, M. Resident attitudes: A structural modeling approach. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.29. n. 1. 79-105, 2002.
- Gursoy, D. ; Kendall, K. Hosting mega events: Modeling locals' support. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.33. n. 3. 603-623, 2006.
- Gursoy, D.; Ouyang, Z.; Nunkoo, R. ; Wei, W. Residents' impact perceptions of and attitudes towards tourism development: a meta-analysis. **Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management**. v.28. n. 3. 306-333, 2019.
- Gursoy, D. ; Rutherford, D. G. Host attitudes toward tourism: An improved structural model. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.31. n. 3. 495-516, 2004.
- Harrill, R. Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: A literature review with implications for tourism planning. **Journal of Planning Literature**. v.18. n. 3. 251-266, 2004.
- Inbakaran, R. ; Jackson, M. Resident attitudes inside Victoria's tourism product regions: a cluster analysis. **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management**. v.13. n. 1. 59-74, 2006.
- Jackson, L. A. Residents' perceptions of the impacts of special event tourism. **Journal of Place Management and Development**. v.1. n. 3. 240-255, 2008.

- Jurowski, C. ; Gursoy, D. Distance Effects On Residents' Attitudes Toward Tourism. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.31. n. 2. 296-312, 2004.
- Krippendorf, J. **Sociologia do turismo: para uma nova compreensão do lazer e das viagens**. Civilização Brasileira Rio de Janeiro, 1989.
- Kuvan, Y. ; Akan, P. Residents' attitudes toward general and forest-related impacts of tourism: the case of Belek, Antalya. **Tourism Management**. v.26. n. 5. 691-706, 2005.
- Lankford, S. V. ; Howard, D. R. Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.21. n. 1. 121-139, 1994.
- Lattin, J.; Carroll, J. D. ; Green, P. E. **Análise de dados multivariados**. São Paulo: Cengage Learning, 2011.
- Maio, I. d. P.; Barretto, M. ; dos Santos, R. J. Processos Socioculturais do Turismo na Localidade Receptora: o olhar de residentes sobre os visitantes da ilha da Pintada/Porto Alegre/RS. **Turismo-Visão e Ação**. v.8. n. 2. 235-252, 2006.
- McDowall, S. ; Choi, Y. A Comparative Analysis of Thailand Residents' Perception of Tourism's Impacts. **Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism**. v.11. n. 1. 36-55, 2010.
- Monjardino, I. Indicadores de Sustentabilidade do Turismo nos Açores: o papel das opiniões e da atitude dos residentes face ao Turismo na Região. **Congresso da APDR-Redes e Desenvolvimento Regional, Praia, Cabo Verde**. 2009.
- Morriesen, C. Festival de Dança de Joinville dobra número de participantes que o colocou no Guinness NSC Total. <https://www.nsctotal.com.br/noticias/festival-de-danca-de-joinville-dobra-numero-de-participantes-que-o-colocou-no-guinness>. 2019.
- Nunkoo, R. ; So, K. K. F. Residents' Support for Tourism Testing Alternative Structural Models. **Journal of Travel Research**. n. 1-15, 2015.
- Pearce, P. L. ; Lee, U.-I. Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. **Journal of travel research**. v.43. n. 3. 226-237, 2005.
- Pérez, X. P. **Turismo cultural: uma visão antropológica**. Asociación Canaria de Antropología, 2009.
- Remoaldo, P. C. A.; Duque, E. ; Ribeiro, J. C. The Environmental Impacts of Hosting the "2012 Guimarães European Capital of Culture" as Perceived by the Local Community. **Ambiente y Desarrollo**. v.19. n. 36. 25-38, 2015.
- Ryan, C. ; Aicken, M. The destination image gap – visitors' and residents' perceptions of place: evidence from Waiheke Island, New Zealand. **Current Issues in Tourism**. v.13. n. 6. 541-561, 2010.
- Santos, J. d. F.; Vareiro, L.; Remoaldo, P. C. A. ; Ribeiro, J. C. Mega cultural events: Does attendance affect residents' perceptions of a city's identity? **NIPE Working Paper Series**. v.10. n. 1-10, 2015.
- Scalabrini, E. C. B.; Remoaldo, P. C. A. ; Lourenço, J. Percepções de residentes a respeito dos impactos da atividade turística: Uma análise das publicações brasileiras sobre o tema. **Tourism and Hospitality International Journal**. v.2. n. 2. 12-31, 2014.
- SEPUD, S. d. P. U. e. D. S. **Joinville: Cidade em Dados 2018**. Joinville: Prefeitura Municipal de Joinville, 2018.
- Sharma, B. ; Dyer, P. An investigation of differences in residents' perceptions on the Sunshine Coast: tourism impacts and demographic variables. **Tourism Geographies**. v.11. n. 2. 187-213, 2009.
- Silva, G. B. d. ; Marques Junior, S. Fatores que afetam o apoio dos residentes para o desenvolvimento do turismo religioso: o caso de Santa Cruz (RN), Brasil. **Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo**. v.10. n. 3. 497-515, 2016.
- Sinclair-Maragh, G.; Gursoy, D. ; Vieregge, M. Residents' perceptions toward tourism development: A factor-cluster approach. **Journal of Destination Marketing & Management**. v.4. n. 1. 36-45, 2015.

- Stylidis, D.; Biran, A.; Sit, J. ; Szivas, E. M. Residents' support for tourism development: The role of residents' place image and perceived tourism impacts. **Tourism Management**. v.45. n. 260-274, 2014.
- Su, L.; Huang, S. ; Huang, J. Effects of destination social responsibility and tourism impacts on residents' support for tourism and perceived quality of life. **Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research**. v.42. n. 7. 1039-1057, 2018.
- Tuan, Y.-F. **Topofilia um estudo da percepção, atitudes e valores do meio ambiente**. São Paulo: Difel, 1980.
- Vareiro, L. M. d. C.; Remoaldo, P. C. ; Ribeiro, J. A. C. Residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in Guimarães (Portugal): a cluster analysis. **Current Issues in Tourism**. v.16. n. 6. 1-17, 2013.
- Vareiro, L. M. d. C.; Remoaldo, P. C. ; Ribeiro, J. A. C. Residents' perceptions of tourism impacts in Guimarães (Portugal): a cluster analysis. **Current Issues in Tourism**. n. 1-17, 2012.
- Vargas-Sánchez, A.; do Valle, P. O.; da Costa Mendes, J. ; Silva, J. A. Residents' attitude and level of destination development: An international comparison. **Tourism Management**. v.48. n. 199-210, 2015.
- Vieira, J.; Ardigó, C. M. ; Behling, H. P. Impactos da Volvo Ocean Race–Itajaí Stopover: análise pós-evento da percepção dos residentes da cidade de Itajaí (SC). **Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo**. v.12. n. 3. 2018.
- Wall, G. ; Mathieson, A. **Tourism: change, impacts, and opportunities**. Prentice Hall, 2006.
- Webster, C. ; Ivanov, S. Transforming competitiveness into economic benefits: Does tourism stimulate economic growth in more competitive destinations? **Tourism Management**. v.40. n. 137-140, 2014.
- Wijesinghe, S. N.; Mura, P. ; Bouchon, F. Tourism knowledge and neocolonialism–A systematic critical review of the literature. **Current Issues in Tourism**. v.22. n. 11. 1263-1279, 2019.
- Williams, J. ; Lawson, R. Community issues and resident opinions of tourism. **Annals of Tourism Research**. v.28. n. 2. 269-290, 2001.
- Xavier, H. **A percepção Geográfica do Turismo**. São Paulo: Editora Aleph, 2007.



Esta obra está licenciada com uma Licença Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional.