

ISSN (PRINT): 1994 - 7658

ISSN (ONLINE): 1314 - 0817



European Journal of Tourism Research

<http://ejtr.vumk.eu>

Residents' views on cruise tourism in Naples

Profiles and insights from a Mediterranean home-port destination

Giacomo Del Chiappa ^{1*}, Marcello Atzeni ², Jessica Mei Pung ³
and Marcello Risitano ⁴

Received: 26/09/2018 Accepted: 26/04/2019

¹ Department of Economics and Business, University of Sassari, Via Muroni, 25, 07100 Sassari, Italy. Phone: +39 (079) 20 17 313. Senior Research Fellow, School of Tourism & Hospitality, University of Johannesburg, South Africa. Email: gdelchiappa@uniss.it

² Department of Economics and Business, University of Cagliari, Viale Sant'Ignazio, 74, 09123 Cagliari, Italy. Phone: +39 (070) 67 53 361. Email: marcelloatzeni@icloud.com

³ Department of Economics and Business, University of Cagliari, Viale Sant'Ignazio, 74, 09123 Cagliari, Italy. Email: jm.pung@unica.it

⁴ Department of Management and Quantitative Studies, University 'Parthenope' of Naples, Via Gen. Parisi, 13, 80132 Naples (Italy). Phone: +39 (081) 54 74 125. Email: marcello.risitano@uniparthenope.it

* Corresponding author

Abstract

This study aims at profiling a quota sample of 600 residents in Naples, a home port in the Campania Region (Southern Italy), based on their perceptions and attitudes toward the development of cruise tourism, and their willingness to support different tourism types. To achieve this aim, a factor-cluster analysis was applied and five clusters were identified, namely 'indifferent', 'moderate lovers', 'moderate critics', and 'cautious'. Significant differences emerged between the identified groups based on their prior experience with cruise vacation and their relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity. On the contrary, no significant differences exist based on gender, age, employment status, economic reliance on cruise tourism, education level, length of residence, geographical proximity to cruise port area. Furthermore, no significant differences between clusters were found based on residents' attitude towards cruise tourism and their support to its further development. Hence, theoretical contributions and managerial implications are addressed, including recommendations for future research.

Keywords: Community-based tourism; Cluster analysis; Cruise development; Homeport; Italy

Citation: Del Chiappa, G., M. Atzeni, J. Pung and M. Risitano (2019) Residents' views on cruise tourism in Naples Profiles and insights from a Mediterranean home-port destination. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 23, pp. 71-85



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Introduction

In the last few decades, the cruise sector has been growing exponentially. From 2003 to 2016, the international demand for cruising increased from 12.0 to 24.7 million passengers (CLIA, 2018a). In 2016, the 129.4 million passengers and crews' onshore visits raised \$57.9 billion in direct expenditures at source markets and destinations, thus producing a total economic output of \$125.96 billion, as well as the employment of 1,021,681 people around the world (BREA, 2017). According to the Cruise Lines International Association (2018b), in 2017 the cruise sector in Italy generated €5,463 million direct expenditures and 119,052 jobs.

Prior to 2000, few publications regarding cruise tourism existed (Wild and Dearing, 2000). Despite the fact that over the last decade the number of articles devoted to this topic has been considerably increasing, it could be argued that further research is required to expand the academic debate on cruise activity (Papathanassis and Beckman, 2011).

In this scenario, recent studies have also focused on the residents' perceptions and attitudes towards cruise tourism and have mostly analysed cruising destinations situated in the Caribbean, Arctic and the polar areas (e.g. Hritz and Cecil 2008; Diedrich 2010; Klein 2010; Stewart *et al.*, 2013; Heeney, 2015; Stewart *et al.*, 2015; Jordan and Vogt, 2017). Mediterranean destinations have also raised interest among tourism researchers, although to a lesser extent, with interesting papers on residents' attitudes toward cruise tourism in Croatian (e.g. Marušić *et al.*, 2008; Peručić and Puh, 2012) and Spanish destinations (Del Chiappa, Lorenzo-Romero, & Gallarza, 2018) or Italian islands, namely Sardinia and Sicily (e.g. Brida *et al.*, 2012a; Pulina *et al.*, 2013; Del Chiappa and Abbate 2016; Del Chiappa, Atzeni & Ghasemi, 2018), mainly focusing on port-of-call cruise destinations. However, since the impacts of cruising on Mediterranean regions and on their home ports are expected to be higher (Brida and Zapata 2010), further knowledge on this area is needed to be developed.

This study was, therefore, carried out through a quota sample of 600 individuals residing in Naples, a home port in the Italian region of Campania. Specifically, it aims to identify typologies of residents according to their perceptions and attitudes towards the impacts of cruise tourism, and to ascertain whether there are significant differences among the clusters formed around socio-demographic traits of respondents (e.g. age, gender, education level, employment status, spatial proximity to the port, dependence of residents' and their family circle's income on cruise activity, length of residency, prior experience with cruise vacations).

Literature review

Over the last few decades, it has been established that while planning the outlook of any tourism destination, it is necessary to consider the residents' perceptions, expectations and attitudes towards the impact of a prospective tourism development model (e.g. Mowforth and Munt, 2003; Sharpley, 2014); such aspect has been defined as one of the staples of the notion of sustainability, and a necessary component to ensure the community members' support for tourism projects (Fredline and Faulkner, 2000; Pérez and Nadal, 2005; Vargas-Sánchez *et al.*, 2009).

Community-based research showed that several factors can affect residents' perceptions and attitudes towards tourism. As Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) note, such tourism-related attitudes can be characterised by a range of intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

On the one hand, intrinsic factors refer to the residents' individual traits and aspects, such as: socio-demographic characteristics (e.g. age, gender, level of education, geographical proximity to the tourist area, etc.), their economic reliance on tourism activity, their environmental beliefs, their perceived balance between positive and negative impacts generated by the tourism phenomenon (e.g. Del Chiappa, Atzeni & Ghasemi 2018). As far as this latter point is concerned, social exchange theory argues that if locals perceive that the benefits of development are greater than the costs, they are more inclined to support its further expansion (Ap, 1992).

On the other hand, extrinsic factors refer to the destination characteristics, such as: stage of tourism development, tourist-guest ratio, tourism seasonality, the type of tourist visiting the destination (e.g. Fredline and Faulkner, 2000; Nyaupane *et al.*, 2006). As far as these factors are considered, according to the Tourist Area Life Cycle theory (Butler, 1980), there is a correlation between residents' attitudes and the different tourism life cycle phases (i.e. exploration, involvement, development, consolidation, stagnation and decline). Specifically, the author suggests that initially residents may have a positive attitude towards visitors but, as their number increases, locals start to be concerned about the impacts of the tourism phenomenon. Hence, as suggested by the Doxey's Irridex "irritation" index (1976), as the number of tourists increase, resident would experience four main stages, namely: euphoria, apathy, irritation and antagonism. Furthermore, since existing cruise-related research has clearly shown that the overall economic impact for a homeport destination is higher than for ports of call (e.g. Brida and Zapata, 2010), one could expect residents holding more favourable views on the impacts of cruise tourism, when homeport destinations are considered. Quite surprisingly, no published paper exists empirically addressing this aspect, and this theoretical assumption still remains to be investigated.

In Papathanassis and Beckmann (2011)'s review of the research on cruise tourism, four main agents emerged (namely, cruise staff, cruise passengers, cruise operators and cruise vessels, and destinations), while the role of the community has been implicitly considered or completely lacking. Hence, recent studies have moved to analyse the perceptions and attitudes of residents towards the implementation of cruise tourism (e.g. Diedrich, 2010; Hritz and Cecil, 2008; Klein, 2010; Brida *et al.*, 2011; Stewart *et al.*, 2013; Brida *et al.*, 2012a; Brida *et al.*, 2014; Heeney, 2015; Stewart *et al.*, 2015; Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016; Jordan and Vogt, 2017; Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2017), thus expanding the understanding of the cruising context, which was recently uncovered. However, it could be argued that research on this topic is still in its infancy. Existing research highlights that local residents may not support

cruise ships, as in the case of Key West, Florida (Hritz and Cecil 2008) and Dubrovnik (Marušić *et al.*, 2008; Peručić and Puh, 2012), even representing a source of stress for the community of Falmouth, Jamaica (Jordan and Vogt, 2017); of course, there are also communities presenting an overall positive attitude towards cruise activity, as in the cases of Messina (Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016) and Cagliari (Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2017) in Italy, Falmouth in England (Gibson and Bentley, 2013), Esperance in Western Australia (McCaughy *et al.*, 2018) and Tyrell Bay in Grenada (Heeney, 2015). Further, academic research evaluating the moderator effect of intrinsic factors (namely socio-demographic characteristics) on residents' perceptions and attitudes towards cruise activity provide results that are somehow contradictory; this latter circumstance could be explained by the fact that the researched locations are highly site-specific (in terms of local culture, residents' values, etc.) and hardly generalizable (Sharpley, 2014; Almeida *et al.*, 2015).

A relatively recent study conducted in Messina (on the island of Sicily, Italy) showed that the residents with higher positive perceptions and attitudes towards cruise tourism are in their midlife, hold a high school or university degree, reside near the tourism area, have been living in the city for less than five years, and have had social contact with tourists (Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016). Del Chiappa *et al.*, (2013) and Brida *et al.*, (2012a) have found similar results with regard to the city and port of call of Olbia, in the north-east of Sardinia, Italy. While significant differences in the socio-demographic traits of community members were also found in the city of Cagliari (Sardinia, Italy), contrary to Del Chiappa and Abbate's (2016) findings, Del Chiappa and Melis' study (2015) did not report a significant role of the level of education and geographical proximity to the port in the extent of the residents' approval of further cruise tourism development. Interestingly, previous studies also found that the attitudes toward further cruise development are more positive when the respondents reported to have had a cruise trip experience in the past; surprisingly, residents with relatives employed in activities related to cruise tourism may prefer a low or very low degree of investment in cruise

tourism (Brida *et al.*, 2012b). Del Chiappa *et al.* (2013), in their study in the context of Olbia, confirmed that residents with a prior experience of cruising have different perceptions and attitudes toward cruise tourism; specifically, respondents who had taken a cruise trip were seen to have a greater awareness of the positive externalities and to be more perceptive of the negative economic externalities. Further, Brida *et al.* (2014) compared residents' perceptions and attitudes towards cruise activity in Messina and Olbia and found that they were similar despite being in different phases in their cruise tourism development life cycle, thus indirectly providing some evidence that a correlation between the tourism life cycle stage and the residents' perceptions and attitudes does not necessarily exist as prior studies suggested (Doxey, 1976; Butler, 1980; Madrigal, 1993). Recently, researchers have also begun to compare residents' attitudes towards cruise tourism, to the community perceptions of other tourism development segments. For example, Del Chiappa and Abbate (2016) have discovered that residents of Messina would prefer the implementation of cultural and heritage tourism and beach tourism, followed by cruise tourism and sport tourism respectively; similar results have been recently found in a study in Cagliari (Del Chiappa and Melis, 2015).

Among the various methodologies and approaches that have been used to ascertain residents' perceptions and attitudes towards tourism development, it is very common to employ cluster analysis (e.g. Aguiló and Roselló, 2005; Brida *et al.*, 2010; Sinclair-Maragh *et al.*, 2014). This could be explained by the fact that cluster analysis allows us to gain better understanding of each segment's relationship among the perception variables (Gursoy *et al.*, 2010), and to provide more useful information to practitioners than that can be obtained using other approaches (Fredline and Faulkner, 2000).

Despite this, according to the authors' investigation, only few papers have been found to apply cluster analysis to residents' attitudes towards the implementation of cruise tourism. In this vein, Brida *et al.* (2011) conducted an empirical investigation in Cartagena and found

four different clusters, namely the: 'opposites', 'neutrals', 'developers', and 'tourism workers'. The 'opposites' were mainly female, older residents, with a high level of education, living close to the cruise passengers' visited areas and not employed in the tourism sector. Most 'neutrals' were men, under 45, not working in the cruise industry. The majority of the 'developers' are not employed in a cruise-related sector and earn the lowest income among the groups. Lastly, most 'tourism workers' are employed in the tourism industry and present frequent interchange with cruise passengers. Del Chiappa, Lorenzo-Romero & Gallarza (2018) carried out an empirical investigation in the city of Valencia and found three different clusters (i.e. 'pessimists', 'cautious supporters' and 'optimists') with significant differences among them just based on age and geographical proximity to the tourist area and port.

While these two studies tend to highlight that residents' perceptions and attitudes towards cruise tourism are not homogeneous, additional research is needed to further prove and generalise this finding (Del Chiappa, Lorenzo-Romero, & Gallarza, 2018), especially when homeport tourism destinations in the context of Italy are considered. The present paper sets out to empirically analyse a quota sample of 600 individuals residing in the city of Naples, a homeport in the Campania Region (Italy). Specifically, the following research questions guided this study:

RQ1: Are residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism cruise tourism development homogeneous?

RQ2: Do clusters show significant differences among them based on the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, their overall attitude and support to cruise tourism activity?

Based on the findings of our empirical study, theoretical contributions and managerial implications are addressed, including recommendations for future research.

Methods

This research took place in the city of Naples. According to Risposte Turismo (2018), in 2017 Naples ranked third as most visited cruise

tourism destination in Italy (927,458 cruise passengers), after Civitavecchia (2,200,328 cruise passengers) and Venice (1,427,812 cruise passengers). For the purposes of this study, a quota sampling technique was adopted. According to literature (e.g. Saunders *et al.*, 2012), quota samples are normally used for large populations and are a type of stratified sample that ensures that the variability in the sample for various quota variables is the same as the one in the observed population. Its main peculiarity is that the selection of cases within each strata is non-random (e.g. Saunders *et al.*, 2012). Quota sampling can be categorized in controlled (i.e. certain restrictions to limit the researchers' choice of samples are introduced) or uncontrolled (i.e. researchers are free to choose group members at their will) (Foreman, 1991). That said, our study specifically used an uncontrolled quota sample of individuals residing in Naples. Building on the official figures provided by the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT) website regarding the socio-demographic characteristics of the residents in Naples, the quotas were set on gender and age (three ranges were considered: 16-40, 41-65, and over 65). The quota sample was based on only two of the local population's demographic characteristics as the authors could not find more socio-economic data such as the level of education and income, financial dependence on tourism, and so on, for the city of Naples.

The questionnaire was divided in three sections. The first section contains socio-demographic information about the interviewees. The second part required the respondents to express their level of agreement or disagreement with 29 items chosen to investigate their perceptions toward the effects generated by cruise activity and, hence, their attitudes towards potential plans to further develop cruise tourism. The items were sourced from previous studies (i.e. Brida *et al.*, 2014; Del Chiappa and Abbate 2016), and employed a five-point Likert scale (1 = completely agree; 5 = completely disagree) to represent the participants' answers. The final section required the respondents to assess the level of priority by which they would express their level of preference of different tourism types (cruise tourism, cultural tourism, sport tourism, and sea, sun and sand tourism) on a

five-point Likert scale (1 = minimum; 5 = maximum).

The data collection consisted of face-to-face interviews conducted by 10 trained interviewers who were instructed on the area in which they should have conducted the questionnaire. At the end of the data collection (December 2012 –January 2013), 600 completed questionnaires were obtained and used to run the cluster analysis.

Findings

Table 1 shows the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample. The majority of the participants were female (53.35%), in the age bracket 46-60 (28.3%) or over 60 (24.6%), employed (25.3%) in the service sector (66.3%), holding a high school (54.3%) or bachelor degree (18.4%). The majority of interviewees reported a length of residency greater than 31 years (58%), and living 5 km away or less from the port (58.4% under 5 km). Finally, most of respondents reported not having an economic reliance on cruise activity (92%) and never having experienced a cruise vacation (57.50%).

On the whole (see table 3), findings indicate that respondents showed low to neutral responses ($M \leq 3$) in relation to most of the statements assessing their view on the negative and positive effects caused by cruise tourism implementation. Furthermore, they reveal that residents do not agree with the statement: 'Generally, cruise tourism has generated more benefits than costs' ($M=2.69$). Interestingly, the level of agreement toward this statement is even lower than that previously found in ports of call such as Olbia ($M=3.43$) (Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2013) or Cagliari ($M=3.54$) (Del Chiappa and Melis, 2015). This occurs even if one supposes that home port residents should perceive the higher economic impacts that home ports generated, compared to ports of call (Brida and Zapata, 2010). The fact that residents in Naples think that cruise tourism did not generate more benefits than costs appears to be attributable to the lack of effectiveness they think characterised the management of cruise tourism development ("Cruise tourism development is effectively managed": $M=1.87$). This would explain why

Table 1. *The sociodemographic characteristics of the sample*

| Variables | % | Variables | % |
|---|-------|---|-------|
| Gender | | Education | |
| Male | 46.70 | No qualification | 2.20 |
| Female | 53.30 | Elementary school | 6.70 |
| Age | | Secondary/high school | 16.70 |
| 18-25 | 23.40 | Diploma/trade | 54.30 |
| 26-35 | 11.20 | University degree | 18.40 |
| 36-45 | 12.50 | post graduate degree | 1.70 |
| 46-60 | 28.30 | How many years residing in the city of Napoli? | |
| > 60 | 24.60 | ≤ 5 | 2.00 |
| Employment | | 6-10 | 2.50 |
| Employee | 27.80 | 11-20 | 14.40 |
| Self-employed | 13.40 | 21-30 | 23.10 |
| Retired | 19.70 | More than 31 | 58.00 |
| Unemployed | 13.70 | Distance from home to cruise port | |
| Student | 19.90 | ≤ 2 | 23.10 |
| Other | 5.50 | 3-5 | 35.30 |
| Does your job relate to cruise tourism? | | 6-10 | 32.60 |
| Yes | 8.00 | 11- 20 | 8.00 |
| No | 92.00 | More than 21 | 1.00 |
| Does your relative's job relate to cruise tourism? | | Have you ever done a cruise vacation? | |
| Yes | 20.40 | Yes | 42.50 |
| No | 79.60 | No | 57.50 |

respondents appear to be supporting any initiatives local institutions could run to attract more cruise tourism (i.e. "Revitalization of retail facilities in the city center": (M=4.25) - "Revitalization of retail facilities outside the city center": M=4.14 - "Subsidies, tax cuts, etc.": M=4.04). Despite this, when respondents were asked to assess to what extent they would support four different types of tourism, cruise tourism was not the favourite. In particular, results showed that the local community would rather see the development of historic/cultural tourism (M=4.21) followed by sea, sun and sand tourism (M=3.44), cruise tourism (M=3.13) and sport tourism (M=2.71), thus highlighting the same preference order expressed by residents living in the cities of Cagliari and Messina (Del Chiappa and Melis, 2015; Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016).

A Factor-cluster analysis (Hair *et al.*, 2013) involving exploratory factor analysis with

extensively in prior studies aimed at underlying patterns and non-homogeneity of group attitudes within communities (e.g. Fredline and Faulkner, 2000; Williams and Lawson, 2001; Andriotis and Vaughan, 2003; Pérez and Nadal, 2005; Sinclair-Maragh *et al.*, 2015; Del Chiappa, Atzeni, & Ghasemi, 2018). The preference for an exploratory factor analysis, rather than a confirmatory one, can be also justified by the fact the existing studies aimed at applying factor analysis to reveal underlying factors describing residents' perceptions and attitudes toward cruise tourism activity are still relatively few and highly site-specific. Hence, any effort aimed at further investigating the phenomenon by adopting an exploratory approach, appears to be reasonable and useful; similarly, such an approach is useful to retain richer and more meaningful information that destination marketers and policy makers in Naples can employ to adopt a focused approach in

planning, managing and developing tourism in specific areas.

Seven factors explaining the 49.51% of total variance were identified (Table 2). The KMO-index (Kaiser-Myer-Olkin = 0.820) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity (chi-square = 4853.06, p-value <0.0001) indicated the suitability of the factor analysis in explaining the data (Hair *et al.*, 2013). Turning to test the reliability of the extracted factors, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. According to Nunnally (1978), Cronbach's coefficients should be higher than 0.7. However, Nunnally (1978) argues that Cronbach's coefficients can be also lower than 0.7 (but higher than 0.6) when there are a small number of items in the scale (fewer than 10). Further, as suggested by literature (e.g. Hair *et al.*, 2013; Hatcher, 1994), and according to prior research analysing residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism (e.g. Brida *et al.*, 2012a), items are deleted just when their factor loadings is lower than 0.4. That said, all the factors identified in our study can be considered as being reliable.

Based on the nature of the items included in each factor, for the purposes of our study the factors were defined as follow: 'positive economic-environmental impacts', 'positive social impacts', 'negative socio-environmental impacts', 'positive economic impacts', 'negative social impacts', 'overall attitude toward cruise tourism development' and 'support to cruise tourism development'.

'Positive economic-environmental impacts' (16.96% of total variance) is correlated with items describing the enhancement in infrastructure, services, cultural and environmental settings. 'Positive social impacts' (8.04% of total variance) is correlated with items that describe benefits related to the opportunities of encountering new cultures and to enhance/exploit the local tradition, authenticity and culture. 'Negative socio-environmental impacts' (7.13% of total variance) describes the negative social and environmental impacts, such as an increase in waste/refuse, crimes and crowding out effects. As far as the latter point is concerned, existing studies suggest that crowding out effect can be either considered to be an economic negative

externality (e.g. Del Chiappa, Lorenzo-Romero & Gallarza, 2018) or a social negative externality, with this second view referring to the negative impact that crowding effects can generate on social capital and welfare of local community (Van Oorschot and Arts, 2005; Sheng and Tsui, 2009). In this direction, the fact that the factor labelled as "negative socio-environmental impacts" includes an item measuring the perceived crowding out effects generated by cruise activity is considered to be appropriate in this study.

'Positive economic impacts' (5.73% of total variance) corresponds to the positive impacts arising from cruise tourism such as job opportunities, increase in available income and improvement in public/private infrastructures. 'Negative social impacts' (4.18% of total variance) includes items related to how cruise activity can negatively affect the way local communities can manage their daily life. 'Overall attitude toward cruise tourism development' (3.93% of total variance) comprises items assessing residents' opinions about the level of effectiveness by which cruise tourism development is managed, and the overall balance between the positive and negative impacts that it generates. Finally, 'Support to cruise tourism development' (3.52% of total variance) describes the extent to which residents are willing to be supportive of further cruise tourism development in their city and the type of activities that should be realised to achieve this goal.

The scores of the first five factors were subject to a cluster analysis to profile residents based on their perception of cruise tourism impacts. Following Hair *et al.* (2013), this involved the performance of a hierarchical cluster (Ward method – Manhattan distances), with the resulting formation of four groups. A non-hierarchical method (k-means) was then performed to factor scores in defining the four distinct residents' clusters. The interpretation of each cluster was done by analysing the factor scores related to each cluster. Further, in order to understand better the characteristics of each cluster, we calculated and analysed the means value of each item for each cluster (Table 3).

Table 2. Factors' names extracted using the principal components method

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| O4. Enhances the physical and socio-cultural settings | 0.69 | | | | | | |
| O6. Incentivizes the preservation of the environment | 0.68 | | | | | | |
| O5. Improves the safety and security of the city | 0.65 | | | | | | |
| O3. Allows to preserve and to exploit the local cultural heritage | 0.61 | | | | | | |
| O2. Enhance the quality of public services | 0.59 | | | | | | |
| O1. Incentivizes better infrastructures (roads, water supply, etc.) | 0.55 | | | | | | |
| O9. Makes the best of this location's identity and authenticity | | 0.73 | | | | | |
| O8. Enhances the local offer of cultural entertainment activities and attractions | | 0.68 | | | | | |
| O7. Allows to meet new people and to experience new culture | | 0.61 | | | | | |
| O10. Enhances the quality of restaurants, hotels and retail facilities | | 0.56 | | | | | |
| O11. Enhances the quality of social and cultural life for local community | | 0.49 | | | | | |
| O16. Increases air and marine pollution | | | 0.75 | | | | |
| O15. Alters the ecosystem (sand erosion, flora and fauna are damaged, etc.) | | | 0.70 | | | | |
| O14. Produces significant levels of waste/garbage | | | 0.56 | | | | |
| O12. Produces benefits that go to external business investors for the most part ("crowding out effects") | | | 0.53 | | | | |
| O13. Increase the number of minor crimes | | | 0.43 | | | | |
| O20. Increases the income of local people | | | | 0.61 | | | |
| O18. Increases public investments and infrastructures | | | | 0.59 | | | |
| O17. Increases job opportunities | | | | 0.52 | | | |
| O21. Enhances the quality of life | | | | 0.51 | | | |
| O19. Increases private investments and infrastructures | | | | 0.50 | | | |
| O23. Increases the cost of living | | | | | 0.68 | | |
| O22. Forces me to change the way I manage my daily life | | | | | 0.61 | | |
| O24. Makes local entertainment facilities and public area overcrowded | | | | | 0.48 | | |
| O26. Overall cruise tourism brought more benefits than costs | | | | | | 0.71 | |
| O25. Cruise tourism development is effectively managed | | | | | | 0.47 | |
| O29. Local institutions should attract (through subsidies, tax cuts, etc) cruise ships | | | | | | | 0.71 |
| O28. The revitalization of retail facilities outside the city center would be useful to attract more cruise tourism | | | | | | | 0.68 |
| O27. The revitalization of retail facilities in the city center would be useful to attract more cruise tourism | | | | | | | 0.62 |
| Eigenvalues | 5.6 | 2.65 | 2.35 | 1.89 | 1.38 | 1.29 | 1.16 |
| % of variance | 16.96 | 8.04 | 7.13 | 5.73 | 4.18 | 3.93 | 3.52 |
| % cumulate | 16.96 | 25.01 | 32.14 | 37.88 | 42.06 | 45.99 | 49.51 |
| Cronbach's alpha | 0.79 | 0.76 | 0.71 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.66 | 0.63 |

A = Positive economic-environmental impacts; B = Positive social impacts; C = Negative socio-environmental impacts; D = Positive economic impacts; E = Negative social impacts; F = Overall attitude toward cruise tourism; G = Support to cruise tourism development

'Indifferent' resulted to be the largest cluster (N=190), preceding 'moderate lovers' (N=162), 'moderate critics' (N=129), and 'cautious' (N=119). 'Indifferent' are mostly female (56.8%), aged less than 25 years old (27.4%)

or more than 60 years old (26.3%), employed (23.2%) in the service sector (63.20%) or retired (22.1%), holding a high school degree (55.3%).

They have been living in Naples for over 31 years (48.4%) and reside close to the cruise port area (59.6% under 5 km); their job (96.2%) or their relatives' job (80.2%) is not related to

cruise tourism. Further, they have never had a cruise trip in their life (63.2%). 'Indifferent' score low or very low in all the positive and negative impact statements. However, they are

Table 3. Comparative analysis of the degree of agreement for groups of respondents (means)

| | Cautious N=119 | Indifferents N=190 | Moderate Critics N=129 | Moderate Lovers N=162 | Total |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| FA: Positive economic-environmental impacts | -0.80 | 0.19 | -0.74 | 0.74 | |
| FB: Positive social impacts | 1.13 | -0.12 | 0.09 | 0.56 | |
| FC: Negative socio-environmental impacts | -0.16 | -0.99 | -0.60 | -0.56 | |
| FD: Positive economic impacts | 0.18 | 0.35 | 0.75 | -0.19 | |
| FE: Negative social impacts | -0.43 | 0.57 | 0.55 | -0.62 | |
| O1. Incentivizes better infrastructures (roads, water supply, etc.) | 2.83 | 2.06 | 2.21 | 3.37 | 2.6 |
| O2. Enhance the quality of public services | 2.83 | 1.89 | 2.09 | 3.35 | 2.52 |
| O3. Allows to preserve and to exploit the local cultural heritage | 3.54 | 2.49 | 3.03 | 3.85 | 3.18 |
| O4. Enhances the physical and socio-cultural settings | 3.33 | 2.11 | 2.39 | 3.69 | 2.84 |
| O5. Improves the safety and security of the city | 2.90 | 1.82 | 2.46 | 3.38 | 2.6 |
| O6. Incentivizes the preservation of the environment | 2.83 | 1.80 | 1.98 | 3.15 | 2.41 |
| O7. Allows to meet new people and to experience new culture | 3.81 | 3.04 | 3.98 | 3.88 | 3.62 |
| O8. Enhances the local offer of cultural entertainment activities and attractions | 3.85 | 2.95 | 3.78 | 3.59 | 3.48 |
| O9. Makes the best of this location's identity and authenticity | 4.07 | 3.06 | 4.05 | 3.52 | 3.6 |
| O10. Enhances the quality of restaurants, hotels and retail facilities | 3.76 | 3.22 | 3.91 | 3.62 | 3.58 |
| O11. Enhances the quality of social and cultural life for local community | 3.57 | 2.79 | 3.03 | 3.58 | 2.68 |
| O12. Produces benefits that go to external business investors for the most part ("crowding out effects") | 3.03 | 2.50 | 4.04 | 2.94 | 3.05 |
| O13. Increase the number of minor crimes | 2.8 | 2.82 | 4.21 | 3.19 | 3.21 |
| O14. Produces significant levels of waste/garbage | 2.66 | 1.75 | 2.98 | 3.18 | 2.58 |
| O15. Alters the ecosystem (sand erosion, flora and fauna are damaged, etc.) | 2.62 | 1.42 | 3.20 | 1.94 | 2.18 |
| O16. Increases air and marine pollution | 3.22 | 1.74 | 3.94 | 2.39 | 2.68 |
| O17. Increases job opportunities | 3.02 | 2.43 | 3.15 | 2.91 | 2.83 |
| O18. Increases public investments and infrastructures | 2.49 | 1.97 | 2.52 | 2.48 | 2.33 |
| O19. Increases private investments and infrastructures | 2.73 | 2.59 | 3.69 | 3.13 | 3 |
| O20. Increases the income of local people | 2.59 | 2.71 | 2.69 | 3.52 | 2.9 |
| O21. Enhances the quality of life | 2.50 | 2.33 | 2.43 | 3.44 | 2.68 |
| O22. Forces me to change the way I manage my daily life | 2.00 | 2.04 | 1.54 | 2.99 | 2.18 |
| O23. Increases the cost of living | 3.46 | 2.57 | 2.99 | 2.77 | 2.89 |
| O24. Makes local entertainment facilities and public area overcrowded | 2.55 | 2.01 | 3.24 | 3.07 | 2.67 |
| O25. Cruise tourism development is effectively managed | 2.08 | 1.89 | 1.36 | 2.08 | 1.87 |
| O26. Overall cruise tourism brought more benefits than costs | 2.29 | 2.68 | 2.93 | 2.83 | 2.69 |
| O27. The revitalization of retail facilities in the city center would be useful to attract more cruise tourism | 3.89 | 4.12 | 4.54 | 4.43 | 4.25 |
| O28. The revitalization of retail facilities outside the city center would be useful to attract more cruise tourism | 3.67 | 4.01 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.14 |
| O29. Local institutions should attract (through subsidies, tax cuts, etc) cruise ships | 3.06 | 4.03 | 4.41 | 4.48 | 4.04 |
| Willingness to invest in cruise tourism | 2.96 | 3.08 | 3.34 | 3.13 | 3.13 |
| Willingness to invest in sport tourism | 2.91 | 2.64 | 3.43 | 2.71 | 2.88 |
| Willingness to invest in sun & sand tourism | 3.55 | 3.13 | 3.96 | 3.32 | 3.44 |
| Willingness to invest in cultural tourism | 3.97 | 4.17 | 4.48 | 4.22 | 4.21 |

somehow supportive of further cruise tourism development; specifically, the indifferent believe that local institutions should favour cruise ships ($M=4.03$) (through tax cuts, subsidies etc.), and that a revitalization of retail facilities would be desirable both in ($M=4.12$) and out of the town centre ($M=4.01$). Despite this, cruise tourism development does not represent the tourism type they would prefer; they would rather host cultural tourism ($M=4.17$).

'Moderate lovers' are mostly males (50.6%), aged under 30 (24.7%), employed (29.6%) in the service sector (74.4%), or students (19.1%) with a high school degree (58.0%), residing more than 31 years in Naples (63.6%) and less than 2 kilometres from the cruise port area (62.3%); 9.4% of them have family members involved in business activities related to cruise activity and 10.5% have a cruise-related job. Overall, they score relatively high on the economic, environmental and socio-cultural positive impacts arising from cruise tourism and they believe that local institution should attract cruise ships ($M=4.48$).

'Moderate critics' are mostly females (55.90%), more than 56 years old (32.2%), in retirement (22.0%) or employed (28.3%), mostly in the service sector (63.5%), with high school degrees (52.8%). The majority of individuals within this cluster do not economically depend on cruise activity (88.8%). However, 71.9% were reported to have relatives whose income is not cruise-related. They have been living in Naples for more than 31 years (65.4%), reside close to the cruise port area (57.5% under 5 km) and have never had a cruise trip in their life (55.9%). They think that cruise tourism development in the city is not well managed ($M=1.36$); specifically, they express some concerns about the marine pollution ($M=3.94$), the micro-crimes ($M=4.21$) and the crowding effects ($M=4.04$) that cruise tourism can generate. This certainly explains why cruise tourism may represent the least favoured tourism type ($M=3.34$).

'Cautious' are mostly women (50.4%), over 56 years old (30.3%), with high school degrees (49.6%), employed (31.9%) in the service sector (60.3%) or retired (20.2%). They were

reported living in Naples for more than 31 years (58.0%), residing close to the cruise port area (52.0%), and without an economic reliance on cruise tourism (90.8%). They positively perceive, even if only slightly, the positive social impacts arising from cruise activity, whilst they seem not to be concerned about the negative ones; for example, they agree that cruise tourism makes the best of the city's identity and authenticity ($M=4.07$), allowing meeting new people and experiencing new culture ($M=3.81$). Further, they are relatively cautious as regards to the positive economic impacts; for example, they think cruise activity does not increase the income of local people ($M=2.59$) or public investments in infrastructure ($M=2.49$). Cruise tourism is not viewed by them as the preferred tourism development option ($M=2.96$).

Finally, a series of statistical tests (chi-squared and ANOVA) were run to test the existence of differences between the four clusters based on socio-economic and demographic characteristics of respondents (age, gender, education, etc.) and based on their overall attitude toward cruise tourism and their support for cruise tourism development (Hair *et al.*, 2013). Findings reveal that differences exist based on prior experience with cruise vacation ($X_2=8.595$, $p=0.035$) and relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity ($X_2=10.594$, $p=0.014$). On the contrary, no significant differences exist based on gender ($X_2=2.699$, $p=0.440$), age ($X_2=39.137$, $p=0.062$), employment status ($X_2=32.966$, $p=0.198$), economic reliance on cruise tourism ($X_2=6.938$, $p=0.074$), education level ($X_2=19.521$, $p=0.191$), length of residence ($X_2=16.852$, $p=0.155$) and geographical proximity to the cruise port area ($X_2=36.626$, $p=0.630$). Furthermore, no significant differences between clusters were found based on residents' overall attitude towards cruise tourism ($F=2.463$, $p=0.062$) and their support for cruise tourism development ($F=2.463$, $p=0.836$).

Conclusion

Current research adopting a community perspective towards cruise activity has analysed a number of destination types, with a relatively recent attention to the Mediterranean

area (e.g. Croatia, the islands of Sicily and Sardinia in Italy). However, Mediterranean-based studies have mainly considered port-of-call cruise destinations, thus calling for further research aiming at further expanding the academic knowledge for homeport cruise destinations. This study was therefore developed to expand the scientific debate around this still somewhat under-investigated research area.

Overall, our findings revealed that residents in Naples believe that, compared to costs, cruise activity is not generating a greater number of benefits, and that on the item “Generally, cruise tourism has generated more benefits than costs” the local community in the city scored even lower than communities in ports of call such as Olbia (Brida *et al.*, 2014) and Cagliari (Del Chiappa and Melis, 2015). Since Naples is a homeport, residents would have been expected to be more favourable towards the cruise tourism impacts, especially when compared to what happens in a port-of-call. In fact, previous studies have proved that a homeport destination has an overall greater economic impact compared to ports of call (e.g. Brida and Zapata, 2010). In line with prior studies (e.g. Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2016), our findings call for future research aimed at simultaneously evaluating and comparing the objective impacts that cruise activity generates on the destination (such as passengers and crew expenditures, employment opportunities created by cruise tourism development, etc.) with the subjective ones (i.e. according to the residents’ viewpoint). This would help to understand whether residents can be considered to be “myopic”, unable to consciously perceive the benefits of cruise activity in the city (Del Chiappa *et al.*, 2016). Furthermore, the fact that our findings revealed that residents in Naples are prone to support a further cruise tourism development despite believing that cruise activity is not generating greater benefits when compared to costs, seems to contradict social exchange theory, which would assume that locals should be more inclined to support further expansion of cruise activity only when they perceive that the benefits of cruise tourism development are greater than its related costs (Ap, 1992). In our study, this could be explained with the fact that

residents do not appear to be “sceptical” about the potential benefits that cruise activity could bring to their city, they rather seem to attribute the lower benefits to the lack of effectiveness they think characterises the way cruise tourism development is managed in their city.

That said, residents in Naples express a relatively neutral position toward cruise impacts and that they would prefer investment in cultural tourism over cruise tourism, thus confirming prior studies (e.g. Del Chiappa and Abbate, 2016; Del Chiappa and Melis, 2015). Further, they show that, on average, cruise activity is perceived to mostly benefit non-local firms, thus causing a crowding-out effect that has also been found in prior studies devoted to analysing residents’ perceptions and attitude toward cruise tourism development (e.g. Brida *et al.*, 2014).

When factor-cluster analysis was applied, results showed that the perceptions and attitudes of community members in the area are different. Four groups were identified (‘indifferent’, ‘moderate lovers’, ‘moderate critics’ and ‘cautious’) to significantly differ according to prior experience with cruise vacation and relatives’ economic reliance on cruise activity. 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. Further, no significant differences emerged based on residents’ overall attitude towards cruise tourism and their support for cruise tourism development.

Comparing findings with previous studies, our research reveals a number of contradictory results. For example, they confirm 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. However, our findings revealed that no significant differences among clusters exist based on gender, thus contrasting existing studies (e.g. Tosun, 2002; Brida *et al.*, 2011; Nunkoo and Gursoy, 2012). Our results also did not confirm prior studies by finding that the local community may not promptly perceive

the positive effects of cruise activity when they live close to ports (Belisle and Hoy, 1980).

From a managerial perspective, the study provides relevant insights for policymakers and destination marketers willing to develop cruise tourism. Specifically, findings suggest that destination marketers and policymakers should implement internal marketing operations to more effectively deliver messages highlighting the beneficial balance between positive and negative impacts of tourism (e.g. Brida *et al.*, 2014), by mostly drawing upon objective measures (e.g. passengers' average expenditure), and involving unbiased sources of knowledge (e.g. research centres, universities, etc.), or organisations not belonging to the destination community which would less likely be questioned by residents (Litvin *et al.*, 2013). The fact that clusters based on certain socio-demographic characteristics present significant differences does suggest that these variables should be taken into account by internal marketing and communication operations. In this vein, our findings reported significant differences among clusters only based on residents' prior experience with cruise vacation and their relatives' economic reliance on cruise activity, with individuals not reporting any prior experience with a cruise vacation and having relatives who do not have an economic reliance on cruise tourism being more critics when compared to their counterparts. Hence, in an effort to increase the favourableness of residents' attitudes towards cruise tourism, policy-makers and destination marketers should deliver messages which better focus on and highlight the positive balance between the positive and negative impacts of tourism to these individuals. Finally, our findings suggest that policy makers and destination marketers should better convey the extent to which the local community is involved and benefits from the cruise activity, and/or they could create activities and projects aiming at developing cruise tourism in a more endogenous and sustainable manner (Del Chiappa, 2012; Papathanassis, 2017), thus avoiding residents' perceptions of a crowding effect occurring in their city.

Although this study contributes in filling a gap in the present literature and presents specific implications for practitioners, it is highly site-specific (Naples city) and does not use an area sample but rather a quota sample, so that the findings can be hardly generalised at the city level. The fact that this study found some contradictory findings with prior studies, confirms the highly site-specific and not generalisable nature of the research on residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism (Sharpley, 2014; Almeida *et al.*, 2015) and that further research is needed combining a broader set of characteristics, both intrinsic (e.g. values, pro-environmentalism behaviour, etc.) and extrinsic (e.g. tourism seasonality, guest-passengers ratio, etc), as well as cross-comparing different cruise tourism destinations (port-of-call and/or homeports) to verify whether findings can be generalised or not. For example, repeating the study combining a broader set of intrinsic, extrinsic and psychographics variables factors (e.g. community attachment, pro-environmentalism, post-materialism, etc.) could help to explain why the residents' perception about the cost-benefit balance rising from cruise tourism is lower in Naples (home port) compared to Olbia and Cagliari (ports of call). Finally, it would be interesting to develop future studies aimed at investigating the locals' views and reactions to sustainability policies implemented by policymakers, destination marketers, port authorities and cruise lines in order to make cruise activity more sustainable.

References

- Aguiló, E., & Roselló, J. (2005). Host community perceptions. A cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 925–941.
- Almeida, F., Balbuena, A., & Cortés, R. (2015). Residents' attitudes towards the impacts of tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 13 (1), 33-40.
- Andriotis, K., & Vaughan, R. D. (2003). Urban residents' attitudes toward tourism development: The case of Crete. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 42(2), 172–185.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 665–690.

- Belisle, F. J., & Hoy, D. R. (1980). The perceived impact of tourism by residents: A case study in Santa Maria, Columbia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 12(1), 83–101.
- BREA (2017). The Global Economic Contribution of Cruise Tourism 2016. URL: http://cruising.org/docs/default-source/research/global_economic_contribution_2016.pdf?sfvrsn=2 (Accessed on 17.09.2018).
- Brida, J. G., & Zapata, S. (2010). Cruise tourism: Economic, socio-cultural and environmental impacts. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, 1(3), 205–226.
- Brida, J. G., Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, G., & Pulina, M. (2012b) Cruise tourism externalities and residents's support: A mixed approach. *Economics*, 6(40), 1–26.
- Brida, J. G., Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, G., & 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., & Pulina, M. (2012a). The perceptions of an island community towards cruise tourism: A factor analysis. *Tourism*, 60(1), 29–42.
- Brida, J. G., Osti, L., & Barquet, A. (2010). Segmenting resident perceptions towards tourism – a cluster analysis with a multinomial logit model of a mountain community. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(5), 591–602.
- Brida, J. G., Riaño, E., & Zapata-Aguirre, S. (2011). Residents' attitudes and perceptions towards cruise tourism development: A case study of Cartage de Indias (Colombia). *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(3), 187–202.
- 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.cliaeurope.eu/images/Reports/2017_Europe_Economic_Impact_Report.pdf (Accessed on 17.09.2018).
- Del Chiappa, G. (2012). Community integration: a case study of Costa Smeralda, Italy. In E. Fayos-Sola, J. Silva and J. Jafari (eds.) *Knowledge management in tourism: Policy and governance applications bridging tourism theory and practice*. Bingley: Emerald, 243-263.
- Del Chiappa, G., & Abbate, T. (2016). Island cruise tourism development: A resident's perspective in the context of Italy. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(13), 1372-1385.
- Del Chiappa, G., & Melis, G. (2015). Residents' Perceptions of Impacts of Ship Tourism and Their Preferences towards Different Types of Tourism. In A. Correia, J. Gnoth, M. Kozak & A. Fyall (eds.) *Marketing Places and Spaces (Advances in Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, Volume 10)*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 45–60.
- Del Chiappa, G., Atzeni, M., & Ghasemi, V. (2018). Community-based collaborative tourism planning in islands: A cluster analysis in the context of Costa Smeralda. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 8, 41-48.
- Del Chiappa, G., Lorenzo-Romero, C., & Gallarza, M. (2018). Host community perceptions of cruise tourism in a homeport: A cluster analysis. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 7, 170-181.
- Del Chiappa, G., Meleddu, M., & Pulina, M. (2013). "Cruise Tourism Development. A Community Perspective." In M. Kozack and N. Kozack (eds.) *Interdisciplinary Tourism Research*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 108-123.
- Del Chiappa, G., Melis, G., & 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.
- Diedrich, A. (2010). Cruise ship tourism in Belize: The implications of developing cruise ship tourism in an ecotourism

- destination. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 53, 234–244.
- Doxey, G. (1976). When enough's enough: The natives are restless in old Niagara. *Heritage Canada*, 2, 26–27.
- Faulkner, B., & Tideswell, C. (1997). A framework for monitoring community impacts of tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(1), 3–28.
- Foreman, E. K. (1991). *Survey Sampling Principles*. New York: CRC Press.
- Fredline, E., & Faulkner, B. (2000). Host community reactions: A cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 763–784.
- Gibson, P., & Bentley, M. (2007). A Study of Impacts—Cruise Tourism and the South West of England. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 20(3-4), 63-77.
- Gursoy, D., Chi, C. G., & Dyer, P. (2010). Local attitudes toward mass and alternative tourism: the Case of Sunshine Coast, Australia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 381–394.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2013). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hatcher, L. (1994). *A Step-By-Step approach: To using the SAS System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.
- 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., & Cecil, A. (2008). Investigating the sustainability of cruise tourism: A case study of Key West. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(2), 168–181.
- ISTAT (Istituto Nazionale di Statistica) (2014). URL: <http://demo.istat.it/pop2013/index.html> (Accessed on: 17.09.2018).
- Jordan, E. J., & Vogt, C. A. (2017). Residents' Perceptions of Stress Related to Cruise Tourism Development. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 14(4), 527-547.
- Klein, R. A. (2010). Cruises and Bruises: Safety, Security and Social Issues on Polar Cruises. In M. Luck, P.T. Maher and E. Steward (eds.) *Cruise Tourism in Polar Regions: Promoting Environmental and Social Sustainability*. London: Earthscan Ltd, pp. 54–74.
- Litvin, S. W., Luce, N. E., & Smith, W. W. (2013). A Case Study of Cruise Ships and Resident Attitudes—Research Gone Wild. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 38(2), 243-248.
- Madrigal, R. (1993). A tale of tourism in two cities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(2), 336-353.
- Marušić, A., Horak, S., & 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., & Dowling, R. (2018). Residents' perceptions towards cruise tourism development: the case of Esperance, Western Australia. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 43(3), 403-408.
- Mowforth M., & Munt, I. (2003). *Tourism and Sustainability: Development and New Tourism in the Third World* (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2012). Residents' support for tourism an identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243–268.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Morais, D. B., & 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.
- Papathanassis, A. (2017). Cruise tourism management: state of the art. *Tourism Review*, 72(1), 104-119.
- Papathanassis, A., & Beckman, I. (2011). Assessing the poverty of cruise theory hypothesis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(1), 153–174.
- Pérez, E. A., & Nadal, J. R. (2005). Host community perceptions a cluster analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(4), 925-941.
- Peručić, D., & 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., & Del Chiappa, G. (2013). Residents choice probability and tourism development. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 5, 57–67.
- Risposte Turismo (2018). Il Traffico Crocieristico nel Italia 2017 e le previsioni per il 2018. URL: [http://www.risposteturismo.it/Public/RisposteTurismo\(2018\)_SpecialeCrociere.pdf](http://www.risposteturismo.it/Public/RisposteTurismo(2018)_SpecialeCrociere.pdf) (Accessed on: 17.09.2018).
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2012). *Research Methods for Business Students* (6th ed). Edinburgh Gate, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37-49.
- Sheng, L., & Tsui, Y. (2009). A general equilibrium approach to tourism and welfare: The case of Macao. *Habitat International*, 33(4), 419-424.
- Sinclair-Maragh, G., Gursoy, D., & Vieregge, M. (2014). Residents' perceptions toward tourism development. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 4, 36–45.
- Stewart, E. J., Dawson, S. E. L., Johnston, M. E., Pearce, T. ,& Lemelin, H. (2013). Local-level responses to sea ice change and cruise tourism in Arctic Canada's Northwest Passage. *Polar Geography*, 36, 142-162.
- Stewart, E., Dawson, J., & 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.
- Tosun, C. (2002). Host perceptions of impacts: A comparative tourism study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 231–253.
- Van Oorschot, W., & Arts, W. (2005). The social capital of European welfare states: the crowding out hypothesis revisited. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(1), 5-26.
- Vargas-Sánchez, A., Plaza-Mejía, M., & Porras-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.
- Wild, P., & Dearing, J. (2000). Development of and prospects for cruising in Europe. *Maritime Policy and Management*, 27(4), 315–333.
- Williams, J., & Lawson, R. 2001. Community issues and residents' opinions of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(2), 269–290.
-