

RESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF CRUISE TOURISM IN AN OVERCROWDED CITY: THE CASE OF VENICE.

Giacomo Del Chiappa, Francesca Checchinato, Marcello Atzeni

The objectives of this chapter are to:

- Study and profile a quota sample of 325 residents in Venice, a home-port in Italy characterized by overtourism, based on their perceptions and attitudes toward the development of cruise tourism.
- Introduce three clusters derived from the study findings namely 'cautious', 'optimistic' and 'opposers' that significantly differ according to their economic reliance on cruise tourism, relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity, education level and geographical proximity to the cruise port area.
- Address both theoretical contributions and managerial implications, and to give future research venues.

Keywords: Overtourism, cruise tourism, community-based tourism, Venice, cluster analysis, homeport Italy

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is one of the most important industries in Europe: it represents 10% of the European Union GDP and 12 million people are employed in this sector (UNWTO, 2018). Due to its important contribution to the economy and its impact on the community, it affects the everyday life of residents, both in a positive and negative way. Within the industry, cruise tourism is the fastest growing segment of leisure tourism (Klein, 2011). In the last twenty years, the cruise sector has increased significantly, amounting to 24.7 million passengers in 2016 (CLIA, 2018a) and employing 1,021,681 people around the world (BREA, 2017). Further, the cruise sector produces \$57.9 billion in direct expenditures, thus creating a total economic output of \$125.96 billion worldwide. In this scenario, academic research has devoted to analyze the residents' perceptions and attitudes toward cruise tourism development (i.e. Brida *et al.*, 2011; Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016). However, studies have mostly analyzed cruising destinations in the Caribbean, Arctic and the polar areas (Hritz and Cecil 2008; Diedrich 2010; Klein 2010; Stewart *et al.*, 2013; Heeney, 2015; Stewart *et al.*, 2015; Jordan and Vogt, 2017) and, recently, also in the Mediterranean area (Marušić *et al.*, 2008; Brida *et al.*, 2012; Peručić and Puh, 2012; Pulina *et al.*, 2013; Del Chiappa and Abbate 2016; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2017; Del Chiappa, *et al.*, 2018), mainly focusing on port-of-call cruise destinations. Despite this, only few studies have been carried out on homeport cruise destinations so far (Brida and Zapata 2010), and very few studies exist on destinations where the number of tourists creates massive overcrowding.

This study was therefore carried out by surveying a quota sample of 354 individuals residing in Venice. Venice was selected as the research setting for this study for two main reasons. Firstly, it is the second home port in the Mediterranean area and one of the most famous tourism destinations worldwide, with around 24 million tourists a year. Secondly, it is considered to be affected by the so-called overtourism phenomenon (Seraphin *et al.*, 2018). Anti-tourism movements have been growing in the last few years, voicing their concerns toward the continuous growth of the tourism phenomenon in the city, particularly toward cruise-related activities. This renders the research setting particularly interesting for the purposes of this study. Specifically, this paper aims to profile residents in Venice according to their perceptions towards the impacts of cruise tourism, and to ascertain whether there are significant differences among the clusters based on the socio-demographic traits of respondents.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Considering the residents' perceptions, expectations and attitudes towards the impact of a prospective tourism development model is pivotal for planning the future of any tourism destination (e.g. Sharpley, 2014), especially to achieve sustainable tourism development and to ensure the community members' support for tourism projects (Vargas-Sánchez *et al.*, 2009). Most of the community-based studies are based on social exchange theory framework (Ap and Crompton, 1993) which links the costs and benefits for local population with its willingness to support tourism. Indeed, residents will be more inclined to support tourism development when they perceive that the benefits are greater than the related costs. Recent academic studies mainly support this theory, revealing that local communities recognize both positive and negative consequences arising from tourism (Andereck *et al.*, 2005) and their perceptions influence their support (or lack thereof) of tourism development.

In the last decades, community-based studies have sought to understand which factors can affect residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism development, and which of these are classifiable as extrinsic factors and intrinsic factors (Faulkner and Tideswell, 1997).

Extrinsic factors mainly refer to characteristics of a tourist destination (e.g. tourism seasonality, the stage of tourism development, tourist-guest ratio, etc.) (Fredline and Faulkner, 2000; Nyaupane *et al.*, 2006) and they are likely correlated with the different life-cycle stage of the specific destination (Butler, 1980), where the attitude towards tourism development decreases over time with the growth of tourism flows (Papathanassis, 2017; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2018). On the other hand, intrinsic factors refer to the residents' individual characteristics (e.g. socio-demographic characteristics), their environmental attitudes and beliefs, their economic reliance to tourism, their perception of positive and negative impacts arising from the tourism development (e.g. Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2018). As social exchange theory proposes, when residents perceive that benefits from tourism are greater than costs, they are more willing to support tourism development (Ap, 1992).

Hence, recent studies have moved to analyze the residents' perceptions and attitudes towards the implementation of cruise tourism (e.g. Hritz and Cecil, 2008; Brida *et al.*, 2014; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2018), thus expanding and deepening our understanding about the perceived impacts of cruise activity within the host community. Existing research highlights that residents usually show an overall slightly positive attitude towards cruise activity (e.g. Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016;

McCaughey *et al.*, 2018), in particular when the cruise tourism highly affects the destination economy (McCaughey *et al.*, 2018). But, at the same time, recent studies show that residents are not often so willing to support further cruise tourism development in their destination (Peručić and Puh, 2012), mainly showing concern for the issues of overcrowding and pollution (Klein, 2011), which are seen as ecological threat, damaging for example the marine ecosystem and its real impact on local economy (Diedrich, 2010; Kerswill and Mair 2015). Further, when compared with different types of tourism, cruise tourism is not listed as the favorite type (e.g. Brida *et al.*, 2012; Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2016; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2018), possibly because it is strongly linked to the mass tourism concept of large groups of people visiting local areas (Diedrich, 2010).

Furthermore, existing studies have investigated the moderator effect of intrinsic factors (namely socio-demographic characteristics) on residents' perceptions and attitudes towards cruise activity, and provided results that are somehow contradictory. For example, in the case study of Messina, Del Chiappa and Abbate (2016) found significant differences among people with different ages, employment reliance, levels of education, geographical proximity to the tourism area, length of residency and contact frequency with tourists. On the contrary, in Valencia no significant differences were found in the residents' perception according to their different level of education or length of residence (Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2018). This finding is partially confirmed by Del Chiappa *et al.*' study (2018), where resident attitudes toward cruise tourism development significantly differ according to their prior experience with cruise vacation and their relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity, while no significant differences were found based on gender, age, employment status, economic reliance on cruise tourism, education level, length of residence and geographical proximity to cruise port area.

In contrast, Jordan and Vogt (2017) found out that individuals with different levels of education had different perceptions of the impact of cruise tourism. Indeed, they underlined that residents with higher levels of education perceived different stressors: people with elementary school or high school education perceived stressors like “no tourists, no jobs, no money”, whilst people with a university degree perceived stress element like traffic congestion.

This suggests that community-based tourism studies in the context of cruise activity are highly site-specific and hardly generalizable (Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2018), thus making any effort to apply such type of investigation in other cruise tourism destinations particularly relevant, especially when home ports in tourism destinations affected by overtourism are considered.

Overtourism has been described as “the impact of tourism on a destination, or parts thereof, that excessively influences perceived quality of life of citizens and/or quality of visitors experiences in a negative way” (UNWTO, 2018). It is often correlated with negative factors, such as inappropriate behaviour of visitors, the touristification of the destination’s city center, the marginalization of residents to residential areas (Koens *et al.*, 2018), and the proliferation of new and non-institutionalized forms of tourist accommodation (Sarantakou and Terkenli, 2019; Smith *et al.*, 2019). Recently, overtourism has received public attention, as a consequence of the anti-tourism and anti-cruise protests in some popular tourism destinations and specifically in some homeport destinations, to then become a central topic in tourism research (Goodwin, 2017; Papathanassis, 2017; Wall, 2020). Despite this, in the best of our knowledge, limited research has been devoted to analyze the residents’ perception of cruise tourism impacts in homeport destinations affected by overtourism.

This study is therefore carried out to empirically investigate residents’ perceptions towards cruise tourism and whether these attitudes are homogeneous, when considering a Mediterranean-based homeport cruise destination affected by overtourism (i.e. Venice, Italy). Specifically, in accordance with previous studies (i.e. Fredline and Faulkner 2000; Aguiló and Rosselló 2005; Brida *et al.*, 2010; *Presenza et al.*, 2013; Del Chiappa and Atzeni 2015) a quantitative method based on factor-cluster analysis was applied on a sample of 354 residents living in the city of Venice, in order to profile residents according to their perceptions of cruise activity and to ascertain whether significant differences exist between clusters of residents based on their sociodemographic characteristics.

METHODOLOGY

Venice is one of the main homeport cruise destinations of the Mediterranean area. In 2017, Venice attracted 1,446,635 cruise tourists (Venice Port authority, 2019), who made up for 28.7% of total arrivals (5,034,882) in the city in the same year. In the last ten years, Venice has been increasingly suffering from tourist overcrowding, so that more and more residents are leaving the historic center of the city and moving to the hinterland.

In 2017, the Venice council launched the #enjoyrespectVenezia campaign providing guidelines on how to be a more responsible tourist, creating maps highlighting public toilets and picnic areas, and sharing a calendar illustrating tourist traffic forecasts. Moreover, during the same year, higher fines for inappropriate behavior were introduced. Due to the touristification of the city center – where the

cost of living has become too high (Bertocchi and Visentin, 2019) and most of the activities are designed to boost tourism - residents are moving out of Venice to Terraferma (i.e. Venice's mainland, including all the towns close to Venice but not the islands). As a result, while 66,386 people lived in the city center in 2000, only 52,996 residents were in the city center in 2018 (Municipality of Venice, 2019). Many Venetians who leave the heart of the city end up renting out their apartments to tourists, through platforms such as Airbnb.

Furthermore, Venice is currently suffering from a major environmental issue: the ecosystem of the lagoon is becoming more and more precarious and the city is slowly sinking, as the streets and the buildings do not have proper foundations and they are gradually subsiding into the waters of the lagoon. For these reasons, Venetians are campaigning against cruise ships being allowed to dock in the heart of their city.

In this scenario, cruise tourism can be perceived by residents negatively, because its flows concentrate in an already crowded city. Therefore, because of the overtourism phenomenon and related tourismphobia, more criticism towards cruise impacts are expected, when compared to those reported in other homeport tourism destinations.

Even if cruise shipping generates large economic benefits for the city of Venice, costs are often emphasized more and discussed by residents. In 2012, a number of residents founded an activist group called *Comitato No Grandi Navi* ("No Big Ships Committee") to protest against cruise tourism and its environmental impact, further showing that cruise tourism suffers from a negative reputation among residents. One of the debated issues is the ships' route, considered too close to St Mark's square and to the cultural heart of the city. Plans to divert large cruise ships away from St Mark's basin and the Giudecca canal were drawn up, and different proposals to keep ships out of the city were made, but no consensus has been reached yet. In June 2019, a big ship crashed on the Marittima dock, igniting further protests. During the same year, the President of the North Adriatic Sea Port Authority launched the «Cruise 2030 Call For Action» (Delepouve, 2019) in seven main European cruise ports, to outline common strategies to support the sustainability of cruise activities and to eliminate related externalities (e.g. waste, risks, overcrowding).

Despite the numerous newspapers and magazines' articles about cruise tourism and the anti-ships protest in Venice, to our knowledge no academic studies have yet investigated the residents' perspective towards the phenomenon.

These circumstances show that Venice is an interesting research setting to run any research aimed at investigating residents' views and attitude toward cruise tourism. For the purposes of the study, a survey was developed based on prior research on residents' perceptions and attitudes towards cruise tourism (e.g. Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016), and items were slightly modified to suit the specific destination under investigation. The first part of the questionnaire invited respondents to assess their level of agreement with 28 statements related to economic, social and environmental impacts deriving from cruise tourism development (5-point Likert scale: 1= strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The second part asked respondents to provide general socio-economic information (age, gender, level of education, employment reliance on cruise tourism, etc.). Data were collected in Venice in 2014, through face-to-face and online collection. At the end of the data collection, a total of 354 complete responses was obtained and used for the running statistics.

FINDINGS

The sample was mainly composed by females (55.60%) in the age bracket 26-35 years old (23.90%) or 36-56 years old (36.10%), with a high school degree (38.20%) or university degree (35.50%), working as employee (45.60%) or self-employed (17.70%). Respondents have resided in Venice for more than 21 years (19.40% for 21-30 years; 37.00% for more than 31 years), close to the cruise port area (34.30% under 5 kilometers) and without any economic reliance on cruise activity (88.80%) (Table 11.1). Overall, the majority of respondents reported not having contact with tourists (58.8%) and specifically with cruise tourists (51.20%) in their daily life, and they declared that neither their job (88.80%) or that of their relatives (84.70%) is related to tourism. Finally, 72.00% of residents interviewed have never had a cruise trip at the time of the data collection.

Overall, findings reveal that according to the residents, the negative effects of cruise tourism development significantly outweighed the positives ones, with responses scoring high or very high on items measuring negative social impacts (e.g. "Makes local entertainment facilities and public areas overcrowded"-M=4.01; "Produces significant levels of waste/garbage" – M=4.02) and negative environmental impacts (e.g. "Increases air and marine pollution"-M=4.25; "Alters the ecosystem (sand erosion, flora e fauna are damaged, etc.) – M=4.11; "Increases air and marine pollution" – M=4.25). Despite this, respondents were reported scoring slightly positive on some of the statements used to measure positive economic impacts (e.g. "Increases job opportunities"-M=3.47; "Increases private investments and infrastructures" – M=3.38) (Table 11.1).

For the purpose of this study, a factor cluster analysis was used. First, a factor analysis was applied and four factors emerged, explaining the 58.43% of total variance. The Bartlett test of sphericity (Chi squared=6649.429; sig=0.000) and the KMO index (KMO=0.938) indicated a good model acceptability (*Hair et al.*, 2013). To test the reliability of factors, Chronbach's alpha was then calculated, and following Nunnally (1978), the reliability of the scales demonstrated high internal consistency of the constructs as Cronbach's alpha exceeded 0.70 (Table 11.2). The first factor ("Positive socio-cultural and environmental impacts" - 41.07 of total variance), is composed by items devoted to measure the positive effects that cruise tourism could generate, such as improving the quality of daily life for residents, enhancing local identity and authenticity and incentivizing sustainable environmentally practices. The second factor is named "Negative environmental impacts" (7.89% of total variance), and included items related to residents' concerns about the negative environmental impact that cruise activity generates: increasing air and marine pollution, altering the ecosystem and generating serious damage for the environment and the city as a whole. The third factor "Negative social impacts" (5.28% of total variance) consisted of items related to the negative social effects perceived by residents, such as the increase in the cost of living, the higher production of waste/garbage, the increase of the number of minor crimes and the higher level of overcrowding on public areas. Finally, the fourth factor labelled "Positive economic impacts" (4.24% of total variance) was related to the residents' perceptions of the positive impacts that cruise tourism could generate, such as increasing public and private investment, increasing job opportunities and income for local people.

A double-step cluster analysis was then performed to factor scores. First, a hierarchical cluster analysis was performed, (Ward method – Manhattan distances) and three cluster emerged. Afterwards, a non-hierarchical method was used (k-means method), allowing to identify three groups: "Opposers", "Cautious" and "Optimistic" (Table 11.3).

"Opposers" was the largest group (N= 153), composed by mostly females (56.70%) belonging to the age bracket 26-35 years (28.30%) or 36-56 years, employees (47.50%) or students (15.80%) with high school degree (40.00%) or university degree (33.30%), residing more than 31 years in Venice (44.20%) between 1 and 20 kilometers from the cruise port area. 15.80% have relatives involved in jobs related to the cruise tourism and 15.80% have a cruise tourism related business activity.

Table 11.1 - Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample (%)

| | % | | % |
|--|-------|---|-------|
| Gender | | Secondary/high school | 14.60 |
| Male | 44.20 | Diploma/trade | 38.20 |
| Female | 55.80 | University degree | 35.50 |
| Age | | Postgraduate degree | 10.10 |
| 18-25 | 15.20 | No response | 1.60 |
| 26-35 | 23.90 | How many years have you been residing in the city of Venice? | |
| 36-56 | 36.10 | < 5 | 5.40 |
| over 56 | 23.60 | 6-10 | 0.60 |
| no response | 1.20 | 11-20 | 7.50 |
| Employment | | 21-30 | 19.40 |
| Employee | 45.60 | More than 31 | 37.00 |
| Self-employed | 17.70 | No response | 30.10 |
| Retired | 14.70 | Distance from home to cruise port | |
| Unemployed | 2.70 | Less than two | 17.90 |
| Student | 13.50 | Between 3 and 5 | 16.40 |
| Other | 5.70 | Between 6 and 10 | 19.10 |
| Does your job relate to tourism? | | Between 11 and 20 | 11.00 |
| Yes | 11.20 | More than 21 | 0.90 |
| No | 88.80 | No response | 34.70 |
| Does your relative's job relate to tourism? | | Have you ever had contacts with cruise tourists? | |
| Yes | 15.30 | Yes | 48.80 |
| No | 84.70 | No | 51.20 |
| Education | | Have you ever been on a cruise trip? | |
| No qualification | 0.00 | Yes | 28.00 |
| Elementary school | 1.20 | No | 72.00 |

Finally, 72.00% of “opposers” have never had a cruise trip in their life. Overall, they showed a very critical and negative view towards cruise tourism development and they did not perceive any positive impact from social (i.e. “Enhances social and cultural life for local people” – M=1.39; “Enhances the quality of life” – M=1.33), economic (i.e. “Increases public investments and infrastructures” – M=1.93; “Increases the income of local people” – M=1.89) or environmental standpoints (i.e. “Increases air and marine pollution” – M=4.73; “Serious damages for the environment could occur” – M=4.69). Further, they strongly believe that cruise activities make local facilities and public areas overcrowded (M=4.27), and they would like the regulation of tourism in the city (M=4.73).

“Cautious” (N=125) was the second largest cluster and is slightly composed by females (51.4%), aged between 36-56 years old (34.70%) or over 56 years old (25.00%), employed (38.60%) or self-employed (24.30%), with high school degree (37.50%), residing in Venice more than 31 years (33.30%), mostly between 6 and 10 kilometers from cruise port area. 21.10% of them is involved in jobs related to the cruise tourism (the highest percentage among clusters) and 31.00% of them declared that their relative’s job is related to the cruise tourism (the highest percentage among clusters). 38% of respondents belonging to this group had a cruise trip in their life. The second cluster included residents that are worried about the negative impacts that cruise tourism could have on the environment (e.g.” Increases air and marine pollution”-M=4.61; “Serious damages for the environment could occur” – M=4.54; “Incentivizes the preservation of the environment” – M=1.86) and on the daily quality of life (“Makes local entertainment facilities and public area overcrowded”-M=4.34; “Enhances social and cultural life for local people” – M=2.27). Further, Cautious respondents do not believe that cruise tourism development preserves and exploited the local identity and authenticity (M=2.62) and auspicated more regulation of tourism in Venice (M=4.69). Despite this, they thought that cruise tourism development increases “job opportunities” (M=4.20), as well as private (M=3.91) and public (M=3.53) investments on infrastructures, and the income of local people (M=3.46).

Table 11.2 – Residents’ views towards cruise tourism development: results of factor analysis

| | Loadings | Eigenvalue | % of variance | % cumulated variance | Alpha |
|---|----------|------------|---------------|----------------------|-------|
| Positive socio-cultural and environmental impacts | | 13.144 | 41.074 | 41.074 | 0.937 |
| Enhances the quality of life | 0.568 | | | | |
| Allows to meet new people and to experience new culture | 0.602 | | | | |
| Enhances the local offer of cultural entertainment activities and attractions | 0.628 | | | | |
| Makes the best of this location’s identity and authenticity | 0.765 | | | | |
| Enhances the quality of restaurants, hotels and retail facilities | 0.643 | | | | |
| Enhances social and cultural life for local people | 0.773 | | | | |
| Incentivizes better infrastructures (roads, water, supply, etc.) | 0.674 | | | | |
| Enhances the quality of public services | 0.699 | | | | |
| Allows to preserve and to exploit the local cultural heritage | 0.692 | | | | |
| Enhances urban and rural settings | 0.781 | | | | |
| Improves the safety and security of the city | 0.557 | | | | |
| Incentivizes the preservation of the environment | 0.69 | | | | |
| Tourism is effectively managed in Venice | 0.538 | | | | |
| Negative environmental impacts | | 2.505 | 7.829 | 48.903 | 0.909 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| Alters the ecosystem (sand erosion, flora e fauna are damaged, etc.) | 0.786 | | | | |
| Increases air and marine pollution | 0.828 | | | | |
| Serious damages to the city could occur | 0.776 | | | | |
| Serious damages for the environment could occur | 0.855 | | | | |
| Tourism should be regulated | 0.516 | | | | |
| Negative social impacts | | 1.691 | 5.283 | 54.186 | 0.795 |
| Forces me to change the way I manage my daily life | 0.689 | | | | |
| Increases the cost of living | 0.652 | | | | |
| Increases the number of minor crimes | 0.631 | | | | |
| Makes local entertainment facilities and public area overcrowded | 0.605 | | | | |
| Produces significant levels of waste/garbage | 0.602 | | | | |
| Cruise tourism influences the way I can manage my daily life | 0.71 | | | | |
| Positive economic impacts | | 1.358 | 4.244 | 58.43 | 0.787 |
| Increases job opportunities | 0.719 | | | | |
| Increases public investments and infrastructures | 0.583 | | | | |
| Increases private investments and infrastructures | 0.688 | | | | |
| Increases the income of local people | 0.612 | | | | |

The third cluster (“Optimistic”: N=76) are mostly women (57.3%) aged between 36-56 years old (41.30%), employed (47.60%) with university degree (44.80%). The large majority of individuals within this cluster do not economically depend on cruise activity (2.20%) and 93.00% were reported to have relatives whose income is not cruise tourism-related. They have been living in Venice for more than 21 years (20.30% between 21 and 30 years; 32.20% more than 31 years), reside close to the cruise port area (24.5% less than 2 km, the highest percentage among clusters) and have never gone on a cruise trip (78.0%). This group included respondents scoring slightly positive on items devoted to measure the positive socio-cultural and environmental impacts of cruise activity, whilst they are concerned about the negative environmental and social impacts arising from the cruise activities. For example, they agree that cruise tourism allows residents to meet new people and to experience new culture (M=3.43) and that it enhances the local offer of cultural entertainment activities and attractions (M=3.38) and the quality of restaurants, hotels and retail facilities (M=3.42). At the same time, they do not report concern about cruises’ negative impacts on the ecosystem (M=2.41) or on the environment (M=2.09) arising from the cruise tourism. Despite this, they express a neutral position regarding the way cruise tourism development is managed in the city (M=3.0), and slightly agree with more regulation of the tourism phenomenon in the city (M=3.46).

Table 11.3 – A comparative analysis of the level of agreement of different groups of residents (mean value)

| | Cautious N=125 | Optimistic N=76 | Opposers N=153 | Total N=354 |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Positive socio-cultural and environmental impacts | | | | |
| Enhances the quality of life | 2.47 | 3.17 | 1.33 | 2.13 |
| Allows to meet new people and to experience new culture | 3.08 | 3.43 | 1.71 | 2.56 |
| Enhances the local offer of cultural entertainment activities and attractions | 2.96 | 3.38 | 1.55 | 2.44 |
| Makes the best of this location's identity and authenticity | 2.67 | 3.29 | 1.45 | 2.28 |
| Enhances the quality of restaurants, hotels and retail facilities | 2.74 | 3.42 | 1.54 | 2.36 |
| Enhances social and cultural life for local people | 2.27 | 3.00 | 1.39 | 2.05 |
| Incentivizes better infrastructures (roads, water, supply, etc) | 2.88 | 3.05 | 1.64 | 2.38 |
| Enhance the quality of public services | 2.54 | 2.8 | 1.65 | 2.21 |
| Allows to preserve and to exploit the local cultural heritage | 2.62 | 3.26 | 1.6 | 2.32 |
| Enhances urban and rural settings | 2.3 | 3.04 | 1.37 | 2.06 |
| Improves the safety and security of the city | 2.94 | 3.16 | 2.00 | 2.58 |
| Incentivizes the preservation of the environment | 1.86 | 2.7 | 1.35 | 1.82 |
| Tourism is effectively managed in Venice | 2.66 | 3.00 | 1.66 | 2.3 |
| Negative environmental impacts | | | | |
| Alters the ecosystem (sand erosion, flora e fauna are damaged, etc) | 4.43 | 2.41 | 4.69 | 4.11 |
| Increases air and marine pollution | 4.61 | 2.67 | 4.73 | 4.25 |
| Serious damages to the city could occur | 4.25 | 2.03 | 4.55 | 3.9 |
| Serious damages for the environment could occur | 4.54 | 2.09 | 4.69 | 4.08 |
| Tourism should be regulated | 4.69 | 3.46 | 4.73 | 4.44 |
| Negative social impacts | | | | |
| Forces me to change the way I manage my daily life | 2.84 | 2.51 | 3.5 | 3.05 |
| Increases the cost of living | 3.66 | 2.75 | 4.06 | 3.64 |
| Increase the number of minor crimes | 3.23 | 2.21 | 3.07 | 2.94 |
| Makes local entertainment facilities and public area overcrowded | 4.34 | 2.95 | 4.27 | 4.01 |
| Produces significant levels of waste/garbage | 4.27 | 3.11 | 4.26 | 4.02 |
| Cruise tourism influences the way I can manage my daily life | 3.34 | 2.46 | 3.86 | 3.37 |
| Positive economic impacts | | | | |
| Increases job opportunities | 4.20 | 4.14 | 2.54 | 3.47 |
| Increases public investments and infrastructures | 3.53 | 3.5 | 1.93 | 2.83 |
| Increases private investments and infrastructures | 3.91 | 3.84 | 2.73 | 3.38 |
| Increases the income of local people | 3.46 | 3.78 | 1.89 | 2.85 |

Finally, a series of statistical tests (chi-squared and ANOVA) were run to test the existence of differences between clusters based on socio-economic and demographic characteristics of respondents (age, gender, employment status, education level, economic reliance on cruise activity,

relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity, geographical proximity to cruise port area, length of residence, contact with tourists in everyday life and prior experience with cruise vacation). Findings reveal that differences exist based on the respondents' economic reliance on cruise tourism ($X^2=20.85$, $p=0.000$), their relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity ($X^2=20.96$, $p=0.000$), their education level ($X^2=34.05$, $p=0.000$) and geographical proximity to cruise port area ($X^2=35.10$, $p=0.000$). In contrast, no significant differences exist based on the respondents' gender ($X^2=0.74$, $p=0.690$), age ($X^2=6.60$, $p=0.580$), employment status ($X^2=8.43$, $p=0.59$), length of residence ($X^2=14.29$, $p=0.160$), contact with tourists in everyday life ($X^2=14.19$, $p=0.165$) and prior experience with cruise vacation ($X^2=5.66$, $p=0.006$).

CONCLUSION

This study was therefore carried out in order to deepen the scientific debate on the residents' views of cruise tourism development in tourism destinations, specifically in homeport cruise destinations affected by overtourism, which represents an under-investigated research area. In this vein, this study presented and discussed the findings of an empirical study carried out in Venice (Italy), one of the most famous overcrowded homeport destinations in the world. In particular, a factor-cluster analysis was applied on a sample of 354 residents.

Overall, our findings revealed that residents in Venice believe that the negative effects of cruise tourism development significantly outweighed the positive ones. On the whole, respondents reported critical views towards cruise impacts more when compared to those surveyed in port-of-call tourism destinations (Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2016; Del Chiappa, *et al.*, 2016; Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016). This occurred despite the fact that residents in home ports were expected to express more positive views towards the cruise tourism impacts, since existing studies have proved that the economic impact of cruise activity is higher when home ports are considered (e.g. Brida and Zapata, 2010). This suggests that residents are strongly concerned about the significant contribution that cruise activity has in generating overtourism and related negative externalities. Furthermore, the factor-cluster analysis identified three segments ('cautious', 'opposers' and 'optimistic'), with significant differences based on specific socio-economic and demographic characteristics of respondents (i.e. economic reliance on cruise tourism, economic reliance on cruise activity of their relatives, level of education and geographical proximity to cruise port area). No significant

differences were found based on other socio-demographic characteristics (i.e. gender, age, length of residency, prior onboard experience).

Our findings provide some contradictory results when compared with previous studies. For example, they confirm prior studies reporting educational level as a moderator of residents' perception (Jordan and Vogt, 2017). At the same time, they contradict prior studies reporting gender being a moderator factor of residents' views towards cruise activity (e.g. Brida *et al.*, 2011; Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012), and those reporting that residents perceive the positive effects of cruise activity when living close to the port area (Belisle and Hoy, 1980). Further, they contradict prior studies (e.g. Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2013) reporting residents with a prior cruise vacation to express significantly different perceptions and attitudes toward cruise tourism, compared to their counterparts. This could be explained by the fact that residents in Venice are particularly involved and interested in significant problems associated with overtourism that affect, above all, the people living close to the center and the port area.

From a managerial perspective, the study provides relevant insights for policymakers and destination marketers, who should consider the perceptions of residents in an appropriate manner, when trying to determine whether the (perceived) carrying capacity has been reached and whether regulations activities need to be implemented to protect the interest of the local community and to avoid undermining the quality of the host-guest interactions. Furthermore, our findings suggest that policy makers and destination marketers should involve the local community in tourism planning better, and/or they could create activities and projects aiming at developing cruise tourism in a more sustainable way (Del Chiappa, 2012; Papathanassis, 2017), thus avoiding the residents' main perception of negative impacts of cruise activity, over the positive ones.

The fact that clusters differed based on certain socio-demographic characteristics does suggest that policy makers and destination marketers should take into account these variables when they plan internal marketing and communication activities. For instance, our findings reveal that significant differences among groups exist based on economic reliance on cruise activity and relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity, with residents or relatives who do not have an economic reliance on cruise activity being more critical than their counterparts. In this vein, it could be useful to deliver messages that focus on the positive impacts of cruise tourism on the local community, and to improve plans and activities devoted to involve residents in tourism planning and in tourism business activities.

While this study contributes to the literature and provides implications for practitioners, it is not free of limitations. Specifically, it has to be considered highly site specific and based on the use of a quota sample: hence, its findings can be hardly generalized, confirming the highly site-specific nature of community-based studies (Sharpley, 2014; Almeida *et al.*, 2015; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2016; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2018). For this reason, further research is needed to combine a broader set of characteristics (both intrinsic and extrinsic) that may moderate the residents' views towards cruise tourism, as well as to replicate the study in other homeport cruise destinations to cross-compare findings, and to verify whether findings can be generalized.

References

- Aguiló, E. and Roselló, J. (2005) 'Host community perceptions. A cluster analysis' *Annals of Tourism Research*, **32**(4), 925–941.
- Andereck, K. L., Valentine, K. M., Knopf, R. C., and Vogt, C. A. (2005) 'Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts', *Annals of tourism research*, **32**(4), 1056-1076.
- Ap, J. (1992) 'Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts' *Annals of Tourism Research*, **19**(4), 665–690.
- Ap, J. and Crompton, J. L. (1993) 'Residents' strategies for responding to tourism impacts', *Journal of travel research*, **32**(1), 47-50.
- Bertocchi, D. and Visentin, F. (2019) 'The Overwhelmed City ": Physical and Social Over-Capacities of Global Tourism in Venice', *Sustainability*, **11**(6937). doi:10.3390/su11246937.
- BREA (2017) 'The Global Economic Contribution of Cruise Tourism 2016'. URL: http://cruising.org/docs/defaultsource/research/global_economic_contribution_2016.pdf?sfvrsn=2 (Accessed on 17.09.2018).
- Brida, J. G. Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, G. and Pulina, M. (2014) 'A comparison of residents' perceptions in two cruise ports in the Mediterranean Sea.', *International Journal of Tourism Research*, **16**(2), 180– 190.
- Brida, J. G., Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, M. and Pulina, M. (2012) 'The perceptions of an island community towards cruise tourism: A factor analysis', *Tourism*, **60**(1), 29–42.
- Brida, J.G., Riaño, E. and Aguirre S.Z. (2011) 'Residents' attitudes and perceptions towards cruise tourism development: A case study of Cartagena de Indias (Colombia)', *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, **11**(3), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358411415153>

- Brida, J. G. and Zapata, S. (2010) 'Economic impacts of cruise tourism: The case of Costa Rica', *Anatolia*, **21**(2), 322-338.
- Butler, R. W. (1980) 'The concept of a tourism area cycle of evolution: Implications for management resources', *The Canadian Geographer*, **24**(1), 5–16.
- Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA) (2018a) '2018 Cruise Industry Outlook'. URL: <https://cruising.org/docs/default-source/research/clia-2018-state-of-the-industry.pdf?sfvrsn=2> (Accessed on 17.09.2018).
- Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA) (2018b) 'Contribution of Cruise Tourism to the Economies of Europe 2017'. URL: https://www.cliaeuropa.eu/images/Reports/2017_Europe_Economic_Impact_Report.pdf (Accessed on 17.09.2018).
- Dasilva, M. F. (2019) 'Short-Term Accommodation and Overtourism in Portuguese Urban Centres.' *Overtourism: Excesses, Discontents and Measures, Travel and Tourism*, 167-189
- Del Chiappa, G. and Abbate, T. (2016) 'Island cruise tourism development: a resident's perspective in the context of Italy', *Current Issues in Tourism*, **19**(13), 1372–1385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.854751>.
- Del Chiappa, G., Atzeni, M. and Ghasemi, V. (2018) 'Community-based collaborative tourism planning in islands: A cluster analysis in the context of Costa Smeralda', *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, **8**, 41-48.
- Del Chiappa, G., Atzeni, M., J. Pung and M. Risitano (2018) 'Residents' views on cruise tourism in Naples Profiles and insights from a Mediterranean home-port destination', *European Journal of Tourism Research*, **23**, 71-85
- Del Chiappa, G., Lorenzo-Romero, C. and Gallarza, M. (2018) 'Host community perceptions of cruise tourism in a homeport: A cluster analysis', *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, **7**, 170–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2016.08.011>.
- Del Chiappa, G., Melis, G. and Atzeni, M. (2017) 'Turismo crocieristico e percezioni della popolazione residente: i risultati di un'analisi cluster', *Sinergie Italian Journal of Management*, **35**(104), 135-154.
- Delepouve H. (2019) The preservation of Venice and of its citizens can no longer wait. URL <http://www.aivp.org/en/2019/12/19/the-preservation-of-venice-and-of-its-citizens-can-no-longer-wait/> (Accessed on 10.05.2019).
- Diedrich, A. (2010) 'Ocean and Coastal Management Cruise ship tourism in Belize: The implications of developing cruise ship tourism in an ecotourism destination', *Ocean and Coastal Management*, **53**(5–6), 234–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2010.04.003>
- Faulkner, B. and Tideswell, C. (1997) 'A framework for monitoring community impacts of

tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **5**(1), 3–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589708667273>.

- Fredline, E. and Faulkner, B. (2000) 'Host community reactions: A cluster analysis', *Annals of Tourism Research*, **27**(3), 763–784.
- Goodwin, H. (2017) 'The challenge of overtourism. Responsible Tourism Partnership'. Retrieved from <https://haroldgoodwin.info/pubs/RTP'WP4Overtourism01'2017.pdf>.
- Hair, J. F. Black, W. C. Babin, B. J. and Anderson, R. E. (2013) *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th edn, Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Heeney, E. (2015) 'Connection and understanding: the basis of a positive mutual gaze between residents of a small island developing state and a community of multinational ocean cruisers', *World Leisure Journal*, **57**(2), 118-130.
- Hritz, N., and Cecil, A. (2008) 'Investigating the sustainability of cruise tourism: A case study of Key West', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, **16**(2), 168–181.
- Koens, K. Postma, A., and Papp, B. (2018) 'Is overtourism overused? Understanding the impact of tourism in a city context', *Sustainability*, **10**(12), 4384.
- Kerswill, M. and Mair, H. (2015) 'Big ships, small towns: Understanding cruise port development in Falmouth, Jamaica', *Tourism in Marine Environments*, **10**(3–4), 189–199. doi:10.3727/154427315X14181438892766
- Klein, R. A. (2010) 'Cruises and Bruises: Safety, Security and Social Issues on Polar Cruises' in M. Luck, P.T. Maher and E. Steward (ed.), *Cruise Tourism in Polar Regions: Promoting Environmental and Social Sustainability*, London: Earthscan Ltd, pp. 54–74.
- Klein, R. A. (2011). 'Responsible cruise tourism: Issues of cruise tourism and sustainability', *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, **18**(1), 107-116.
- Koens, K., Postma, A. and Papp, B. (2018) 'Is overtourism overused? Understanding the impact of tourism in a city context', *Sustainability*, **10**(12), 4384.
- Jordan, E. J. and Vogt, C. A. (2017) 'Residents' Perceptions of Stress Related to Cruise Tourism Development', *Tourism Planning and Development*, **14**(4), 527–547.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2017.1287123>
- Marušić, A., Horak, S. and Tomljenović, R. (2008) 'The socio-economic impacts of cruise tourism: A case study of Croatian destinations', *Tourism in Marine Environments*, **5**(2–3), 131–144.
- McCaughey, R., Mao, I. and Dowling, R. (2018) 'Residents' perceptions towards cruise tourism development: the case of Esperance, Western Australia', *Tourism Recreation Research*, **43**(3), 403-408.

- Municipality of Venice (2019) Demographic statistics. URL <https://www.comune.venezia.it/it/statistica> (Accessed on 10.06.2019).
- Nyaupane, G. P., Morais, D. B. and Dowler, L. (2006) 'The role of community involvement and number/type of visitors on tourism impacts: A controlled comparison of Annapurna, Nepal and Northwest Yunnan, China', *Tourism Management*, **27**(6), 1373–1385.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Reilly, A. M. (1986) 'Tourism carrying capacity. Concept and issues', *Tourism Management*, **7**(4), 254–258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(86\)90035-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(86)90035-X).
- Papathanassis, A. (2017) 'Over-tourism and anti-tourist sentiment: An exploratory analysis and discussion'. *Ovidius University Annals, Economic Sciences Series*, **17**(2), 288-293.
- Peručić, D. and Puh, B. (2012) 'Attitudes of citizens of Dubrovnik towards the impact of cruise tourism on Dubrovnik', *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, **18**(2), 213-228.
- Pulina, M., Meleddu, M. and Del Chiappa, G. (2013) 'Residents choice probability and tourism development', *Tourism Management Perspectives*, **5**, 57–67.
- Sarantakou, E. and Terkenli, T. S. (2019) 'Non-institutionalized forms of tourism accommodation and overtourism impacts on the landscape: the case of Santorini, Greece', *Tourism Planning and Development*, **16**(4), 411-433.
- Seraphin, H., Sheeran, P. and Pilato, M. (2018) 'Over-tourism and the fall of Venice as a destination', *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, **9**, 374–376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2018.01.011>
- Sharpley, R. (2014) 'Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research', *Tourism Management*, **42**, 37-49.
- Smith, B. Y. J. (2018) 'Venice oods show that overtourism is a climate change issue', WMT, November, 1–6.
- Smith, M. K., Sziva, I. P. and Olt, G. (2019) 'Overtourism and resident resistance in budapest', *Tourism Planning and Development*, **16**(4), 376-392.
- Stewart, E. J., Dawson, S. E. L., Johnston, M. E., Pearce, T. and Lemelin, H. (2013) 'Local-level responses to sea ice change and cruise tourism', *Arctic Canada's Northwest Passage. Polar Geography*, **36**, 142-162.
- Stewart, E., Dawson, J. and Johnston, M. (2015) 'Risks and opportunities associated with change in the cruise tourism sector: community perspectives from Arctic Canada', *The Polar Journal*, **5**(2), 403-427.
- Trancoso González, A. (2018) 'Venice: the problem of overtourism and the impact of cruises', *Investigaciones Regionales - Journal of Regional Research*, **42**(42), 35–51.

- UNWTO (2018) Report on Tourism and Culture Synergies. Madrid: UNWTO. URL <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284419876> (Accessed on 17.09.2018)
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Plaza-Mejía, M. and Porrás-Bueno, N. (2009) 'Understanding residents' attitudes toward the development of industrial tourism in a former mining community', *Journal of Travel Research*, **47**(3), 373-387.
- Venice Port authority (2019) The port in figures. URL <https://www.port.venice.it/en/the-port-in-figures.html> (Accessed on 10.06.2019)
- Wall, G. (2020) 'From carrying capacity to overtourism: a perspective article', *Tourism Review*, **1**(1), <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-08-2019-0356>