

STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN CAPE VERDE, AFRICA¹

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of tourism stakeholders regarding the effects of tourism development in their communities are essential in ensuring the proper design and implementation of sustainable tourism development strategies in an area. We designed a survey to gather data about the attitudes of three stakeholders: tourists, residents, and business owners. The respondents were from the island of Sao Vicente in the African archipelago of Cape Verde, which is currently under expansion. The results showed that the three groups positively view increased tourism development in the area, with virtually no differences found between business owners and the other groups, although tourists had a more favourable opinion than residents. Engaging the three groups is essential for the success of tourism development.

Keywords: stakeholder, tourism development, residents, tourists, business owners, Cape Verde

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the contribution of the travel and tourism sector to the world economy has grown significantly each year, until reaching around 9% of global GDP according to the World Travel and Tourism Council (<http://www.wttc.org>). For this reason, tourism development is widely regarded as key for revitalising local economies. Tourism development and promotion is not only a source of employment, but also tax revenue, cultural benefits, and enhanced infrastructure that will in turn have positive, indirect impacts on other industries (Lankford & Howard, 1994; Ko & Stewart, 2002).

However, tourism development can also lead to potentially adverse impacts at the local level (tourism congestion, increased prices, etc.). To mitigate these effects, many authors advocate engaging tourism stakeholders in decision-making processes in the early stages of tourism development of a destination (Jamal & Getz, 1995). Studies such as those of Lanquar (1985) and Vargas et al. (2007) define tourism stakeholders as the local communities of coastal or inland destinations, government agencies, tour promoters and agents, and the tourists themselves.

Local community refers to the residents who live in a destination that have direct involvement in an activity or project (Akkawai, 2010). Thus, local communities affect or are affected by the achievement in tourism industry (Sook et al., 2014). The connection between tourism and community is reflected in Murphy's work (1985; 2004), which examines the potential of the community as a main role-player in tourism management.

Although research has been carried out on the perceptions of residents and tourists in island regions of the Pacific (Apostoulos & Gayle, 2002) and the Mediterranean (Lockhart, 1997; Apostoulos & Gayle, 2002, Beerli & Martin, 2004), no studies have simultaneously compared the opinions of various stakeholders (e.g. tourists, residents and business owners) in an island destination, specifically the Atlantic region. This article aims to fill this gap through the comparative study of the perceptions of three groups of stakeholders on tourism development in Sao Vicente; an island belonging to the

¹ The findings of this article were drawn from research funded by the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation (AECID) through projects PCI-A/023083/09 and A/032748/10. The authors wish to thank both the AECID and the inhabitants of the Cape Verde archipelago.

African archipelago of Cape Verde. This area is of particular interest given its recent economic boom as a result of the expansion of tourism in recent decades.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The proper management of tourism development requires responsible planning (Southgate & Sharpley, 2002; De Oliveira, 2003). To do so, areas where tourism is a driver of economic growth must take into account sustainable development with a view to the community. In this regard, several authors (Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Andriotis, 2005; Byrd et al., 2009; Dabphet et al., 2012; Waligoa et al., 2013; Ellis & Sheridan, 2014; Imran et al., 2014) have pointed to the need to consider the views of the various stakeholders involved and without whose support it is virtually impossible to manage tourism sustainably. Stakeholders' views or perceptions refer to their attitudes, opinions, and perceptions about tourism development regarding the positive and negative impacts in the community and the individual benefits gained as a result of tourism growth.

In less economically developed countries, multi-stakeholder collaboration is crucial to support entrepreneurship education and training and marketing innovation for small and medium-sized enterprises to assist with poverty alleviation and tourism development (Carlisle et al., 2013).

Freeman (1984:46) defined stakeholders as 'any group or individual who is affected by or can affect the achievement of an organisation's objectives'; a concept which several authors have applied to the tourism sector (Ryan, 2002; Davis & Morais, 2004; Byrd et al., 2009). Although the work of Morales and Hernandez (2011) distinguishes between 15 different tourism stakeholders, they can be classified into four basic types:

- the local population or host community
- tourists, who are the users of the tourism experience
- tourism promoters, business owners, or providers: this group forms a very heterogeneous set of providers (accommodation, catering, transport, intermediation, cultural and leisure activities, etc.) that can operate either in conjunction or independently.
- Public agencies and bodies: local governments, government ministries, foundations, associations, universities, and others.

In their recent study in Croatia, Tomljenovic et al. (2013) added a new stakeholder called 'advocacy groups' (activists and non-government organisations that can influence tourism development). Studies that analyse the perceptions of each of these groups individually are fairly common in the literature. These include studies on tourists (Pizam et al., 2000; Cottrell et al., 2004; Beerli & Martin, 2004), residents (Brunt & Courtney, 1999; Andereck & Vogt, 2000; Ko & Stewart, 2002; Teye et al., 2002; Vargas et al., 2010; Ribeiro et al. 2014), business owners (Carlsen et al., 2010), and local public officials (McGehee et al., 2006). However, studies comparing various groups of stakeholders are more scarce (Kavallinis & Pizam, 1994; Byrd, 1997; Puckzo & Ratz, 2000; Andriotis, 2005; Byrd et al., 2009; Gil Arroyo et al., 2013; Kuvan & Akan, 2012; Kim, 2013; Tomljenovic et al., 2013; Begum et al., 2014).

Nonetheless, the attitudes and perceptions of different stakeholders can lead to conflict when attempting to develop tourism in an appropriate manner in a given area. These conflicts arise as a consequence of the particular interests of each group, thus bringing into play social exchange theory (Homan, 1961). Since tourism development in a region requires negotiated exchanges between the parties involved, social exchange theory in this context implies that each party must perceive that the benefits derived from tourism outweigh the costs or negative impacts (Cropanzano & Mitchel, 2005; Cook et al., 2013).

This article examines three groups of stakeholders in the private sector. The results of the study are intended to be of use to the fourth group of stakeholders when planning tourism in the destination,

namely public officials (i.e. legislators, government). Specifically, the aim is to promote sustainable tourism development in accordance with the views and perceptions of tourists, residents, and business owners and in which the positive impacts outweigh the negative ones.

2.1. TOURISTS' PERCEPTIONS

The image tourists have of a destination is an important element to consider in tourism planning given that visitor expenditures have a large impact on the local economy and a positive perception of a destination encourages longer stays and more spending. Indeed, a key aspect in achieving and maintaining sustainable tourism development in a destination is to create positive interactions between residents and foreign tourists (Armenski et al., 2011).

To maximise the benefits of tourism programmes while reducing their negative consequences, it is essential to determine the extent to which tourists value the different activities proposed and the resources of the area. This knowledge allows the community and tourism agents to develop strategies that contribute to a sustainable balance between residents' desires and tourists' preferences (Oh et al., 2010).

It is also necessary to consider the characteristics of the tourists themselves; specifically, aspects related to their sociodemographic profiles. In this regard, several studies on tourists' perceptions of the destination have analysed variables such as gender, age, occupation, nationality, or educational level and found a relationship between individuals' cognitive structure and their perceived image of the tourist destination (Stabler, 1995; Beerli et al., 2004), reasons for travel, or sources of information used to choose the destination. According to Poria et al. (2003) and Yankholmes and Akyeampong (2010), tourist attributes are correlated with visit patterns and the perceptions of the trip.

2.2. RESIDENTS' PERCEPTIONS

Until the 1970s, few studies examined the views and opinions of residents about tourism development. From the seventies onwards, however, attention turned to both the negative and positive social, cultural, and environmental impacts of tourism on the destination community. One of the first studies in this line was that of Murphy (1985), who suggested that tourism is a sociocultural event for both the guest and host. According to the author, rather than catering solely to tourists' interests, it is necessary to consider the negative effects, as well as the interests of industry and social impacts.

In recent decades, studies that explore tourism from the perspective of residents have increased considerably in number. Harril (2004), for example, conducted a review of tourism planning according to residents' perceptions towards tourism development, while Monterrubio (2008) included a review of residents' perceptions from a methodological point of view.

The literature centres on several aspects, such as identifying the sociodemographic profiles of residents and the influence of their involvement in tourism development, exploring residents' attitudes and perceptions towards tourism development (Hernández et al., 1996). Authors such as Cooke (1982) argued that residents' perceptions of tourism are more favourable when their opinions are taken into account.

The local community's perception of tourism development has been shown to be influenced by several factors, among them length of residency in the community (Liu & Var, 1986), the level of tourism concentration in the destination (Canan & Hennessy, 1989), age (Allen et al., 1988), and the educational level of the resident (Teye et al., 2002).

2.3. BUSINESS OWNERS' PERCEPTIONS

There remains a shortage of studies that analyse the views of other groups of stakeholders involved in tourism development. One of these groups comprises business owners or individuals who own tourism-related businesses. Studies that compare business owners with other stakeholders are also scarce. Examples include Pizam (1978), who found few differences between the perceptions of residents' and business owners; Tyrrell and Spaulding's (1984) study of an island destination; or the more recent work of Andreotis (2005), which reported that business owners and residents have a positive view regarding the economic effects of tourism in Greece, but are concerned about the environmental and social impacts it might have. Byrd and Gustke (2007) and Byrd et al. (2009) compared four groups of stakeholders, including local government. They found that tourists and residents have a more favourable attitude towards tourism development, although there are few differences with regard to the other two groups. Kuvan & Akan (2012) compared attitudes of local residents and managers of tourism facilities in Turkey. They found significant differences in the strength of opinion: while managers believed that the environmental and social impacts of tourism were few, residents were extremely concerned and negative about these two kind of impacts.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. STUDY AREA

The study was carried out in the Cape Verde archipelago located south of the Canary Islands off the west coast of Africa. The archipelago consists of ten islands and eight islets spanning a total area of 4,033 km² with a population of just over half a million inhabitants. Due to the country's high proportion of emigrants (37.6% of the population migrated in 2010 according to World Bank, 2011), there is very little demographic growth.

Cape Verde gained independence from Portugal in 1975 and has been a multiparty democracy since 1991. It is ranked among the best countries in Africa in terms of stability, political freedom, respect for civil rights, and freedom of the press. According to the Human Development Report (United Nations Program for Development, 2013), Cape Verde ranks 132 out of 187 countries with medium human development, with a human development index (HDI) of 0.586, an average life expectancy at birth of 74.3 years, and 3.5 mean years of schooling over 12.7 years of expected schooling. Direct foreign investment represented 6.7% of GDP in 2010 and continues to account for a large portion of the GDP given the country's low wages and rental and property prices. Approximately 90% of all capital flows are directed at the tourism sector.

According to the Cape Verde Statistics Bureau (INECV, 2012), tourism is the country's main source of employment and economic growth. Tourism's contribution to the GDP has increased considerably in recent years from 4% in 1998 to 11.8% in 2005, 18.3% in 2006, and 25% in 2010. The tourism industry has grown 17% annually on average and seems to have an even greater potential for growth. One of the government's main tourism policy objectives in this regard is to develop national infrastructures; for example, by increasing the number of international airports on the islands.

Sao Vicente Island, where the empirical study was conducted, boasts beautiful beaches, but also hosts music festivals (Baías das Gatas in August is the main one) and offers a variety of cultural activities.

3.2. OBJECTIVE AND SAMPLE DESIGN

The main objective of this research was to analyse stakeholders' perceptions of tourism development in Cape Verde. To do so, surveys were designed specifically for each of the groups studied. Although the fieldwork was conducted in the entire archipelago, the results presented here refer only to the island of Sao Vicente. Although Sal and Boavista are the islands which attract the largest number of sun and sea tourists, we selected Sao Vicente as tourism development on the island is in the preliminary stage, thus permitting us to analyse the perceptions of the stakeholders involved in the tourism planning process.

According to the 2010 census of the INECV, Sao Vicente has a population of 76,140 inhabitants and 29,453 tourists visited the island in 2011 (latest available data). Stratified random sampling was used to obtain the sample of residents (298 valid questionnaires with a confidence interval of 95% and a sampling error of 5%) and the sample of tourists (74 valid questionnaires). For the case of tourism services providers, the INECV has data only on accommodation providers but no data for sample size or the error to be estimated. Therefore, convenience sampling was performed to collect the responses of business owners from a variety of sectors (12 valid questionnaires): managers/owners of accommodation and catering establishments, travel agencies, adventure tourism businesses, and car rental companies. The sampling method for each type of stakeholder seeks to ensure the reliability of the samples by adapting the proportions regarding the sociodemographic characteristics to those of the population.

3.3. MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENT

Separate structured and closed surveys were designed for each group of stakeholders. They were based on the survey designed by Vargas et al. (2010) and included questions about sociodemographic profile, travel details for tourists, evaluation of services on the island, and opinion about the development and characteristics of the tourism product. The reliability of the survey items is correct (Sharma, 1996). The internal consistency of the survey is adequate, as Cronbach's alpha of all the blocks exceeds the reference value of 0.6 proposed by Luque (1997). Bivariate and multivariate methods of statistical analysis were used to obtain the results (Hair et al., 2006). The surveys were translated into Portuguese, English, French, and German to ensure that the respondents properly understood the questions.

4. RESULTS

4.1. SAMPLE ANALYSIS

The residents of Sao Vicente are predominantly young (over 87% of the respondents are under 44 years of age), single, and have a middle or high school education, although there is a significant percentage of college graduates (21.5%). The monthly income of the respondents is considerably less than 65,000 escudos (equivalent to around €590). The sample includes a large number of students and salaried employees. Only a small percentage (18%) works or has worked in a tourism-related job. However, a majority of residents (60.2%) stated that they would like to work in the sector in the future.

As regards the sample of tourists, most travel with a partner (31.1%) or colleagues (23%). The percentage of tourists travelling with children is significantly lower (10.8%) since Sao Vicente, unlike Sal and Boavista, does not stand out for its family tourism offering. There is a significantly higher percentage of men than women in the sample. Moreover, most respondents have a college degree and are between 30 and 59 years old. They come mainly from three countries: Portugal, due to regular flights between the two countries; and Spain and Germany, where travel agencies have begun to promote the island as a summer holiday destination.

Finally, the sample of business owners is comprised mostly of hotel and restaurant owners, although a small number of respondents operate travel agencies, adventure tourism businesses, or car rental companies. Most of the businesses are owned by Cape Verde nationals (three out of four), have less than 6 employees, and have been operating for more than 10 years (almost half). Only a third has a website. Most stated that they were not involved in tourism planning on the island, either through tourism consortia or business associations. None of the businesses have received financial support through microcredits, grants, or aid for international cooperation.

4.2. TOURIST STAKEHOLDERS

Of the tourists surveyed, 59.2% were visiting Sao Vicente for the first time, thus indicating a high return rate among visitors to the destination. The main reason for the visit was tourism (64.4%), followed by business (30.1%). Tourists choose this destination mainly upon recommendation of friends and family (47.1%) or a travel agency (31.4%). Few tourists come to Sao Vicente based on information they find in the Internet, media advertisements, or brochures.

Hotels are the most frequent type of accommodation (79.7%), followed by guesthouses (11.3%). Visitors do not usually make use of local tourism services with the exception of restaurants and, to a lesser extent, local tourist guides. However, these figures are better than those of other islands with a more extensive sun and sand tourism offering, such as Boavista and Sal, where all-inclusive hotel resort packages discourage tourists from seeking external services. Tourists who make use of the local services usually do so for two main reasons: either because they like to experience this type of initiative due to the service they provide (51.8%), or because they are aware of the need to interact with the local community (25%). The main reasons tourists do not make use of these services are due to a lack of knowledge or misinformation about them (44.4%), while a large percentage believes they are too expensive (33.3%).

In response to these results, a new form of tourism is emerging in Sao Vicente – and in Cape Verde in general – in order to promote an economic activity that improves the living conditions of the local community and fosters their cultural heritage. This new form of tourism, which is known as community tourism, implies high participation in the activities, as well as a return of the incomes to the own community (Simpson, 2008). Community tourism is based on aspects such as culture, the environment, and traditional economic activities (e.g. agriculture), gastronomy, and artisan crafts, among other values, which are traditionally part of the life and idiosyncrasy of individuals living in a community. This form of tourism requires that residents have a positive attitude towards tourism and participate in decision-making processes when designing tourism offers. It also requires financial resources to create small, local businesses and an effort to enhance social and environmental awareness among the population. As stated above, given that tourists do not make use of these services due to their lack of knowledge or misperceptions about their cost, efforts should also be directed towards promoting community-based activities among tourists.

Regarding tourist satisfaction, 80% of respondents stated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their visit to Sao Vicente. A cluster analysis performed on satisfaction detected two distinct groups (see Appendix). The first group showed a higher mean satisfaction (4.41 points on a 5-point Likert scale). This group is mainly composed of male tourists from Portugal, Spain, Germany, and the United States with a university education (61.1% of cases), who stay for 3 and 7 days on the island, and travel with colleagues (26.8%), friends (25%), or alone.

In contrast, the most dissatisfied group of tourists (the remaining 20%) showed a mean satisfaction score of under 3 points (2.93). These tourists come from Portugal and France in equal percentages. The educational level of this group is lower (secondary schooling or college diploma), they travel to the island with a partner (41.9%) or alone (21.4%), and stay for more than one week (69.2%).

A chi-square contingency analysis was performed between the two groups and their use of the abovementioned tourism services (see Appendix, Table 2). It is interesting to note that no association was found between these variables, thus indicating that the degree of satisfaction is not statistically related to experience with the service.

4.3. BUSINESS OWNER STAKEHOLDERS

Tourism providers lack knowledge about the type of tourists who visit Sao Vicente. They have regular clients, but are unaware that a large percentage of travellers visit this destination for the first time. We found that these stakeholders have a misunderstanding of the market, supply, and profile of potential tourists and, as a result, are not tapping into this niche segment.

Their perception regarding the island's tourism offering highlights some weaknesses. Specifically, they consider that those employed in the tourism sector are low-skilled (44.4%) or at most intermediate-skilled workers (33.3%). However, they believe that the public authorities should be responsible for improving or investing in training schemes (it is noteworthy that half of the respondents in this group did not invest any resources in training their employees).

Almost all believe that tourism growth on the island can contribute to increasing wealth, and hence benefit residents, the government, and private companies alike, while improving job opportunities for young people. They state that the tourism subsectors with a potential for development are mainly catering and accommodation establishments, while few indicate a potential for improvement of handicrafts or sports tourism businesses (i.e. windsurfing and other water sports).

4.4. RESIDENT STAKEHOLDERS

The majority of residents are in favour of further tourism development in the area due to its positive effects. However, the perception that development entails a personal benefit or that the benefits of tourism outweigh the costs of an influx of visitors is divided.

Residents' opinions about the different services on the island were measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1-very dissatisfied, 5-very satisfied). Cluster analysis was then performed to detect groups of residents who evaluated the services on Sao Vicente in a similar way (see Appendix, Table 4). Respondents were grouped into three clusters given that the groups must have a similar number of individuals and sufficiently heterogeneous characteristics that differentiate them.

The scores obtained indicate that residents are not very satisfied with the island's services. Although the scores for transportation, the educational system, and the environment were above 3 points, mean satisfaction was not significant in any case. Electricity and water supply obtained the lowest score.

As regards the groups resulting from the cluster analysis, the first is composed of 91 residents that have a positive opinion of air, sea, and ground transportation services. Filtering showed that the group was mainly comprised of men (63.7%), age 18-29 (63.7%) and students with some knowledge of languages, who agreed more with tourist development on the island.

The second group consisted of 78 individuals (with a slightly higher percentage of men, 52.6%) above 30 years old (50.0%) who stated that they were more satisfied with aspects such as the educational system, public services, and sea transport. However, they are especially critical of the poor electricity and water supply. This group had the highest knowledge of languages of the three clusters, as well as the largest number of salaried employees (48.7%). Although this group viewed tourism development positively, a certain percentage of respondents were indifferent or expressed some disagreement with it.

The third cluster is the largest (101 residents) and also the most negative in terms of their evaluation of tourism development as all items were scored below three points. This cluster was made up predominantly of women (52.5%) with less knowledge of languages. In this group, 16.9% of the women have no schooling or only primary studies, while 11.3% are unemployed. Given that the labour force participation rate is 33 points lower for females than for males in Cape Verde (World Bank, 2011), this result explains the greater discontent of this cluster as it has benefited less from tourism development on the island.

4.5. COMPARISON OF STAKEHOLDERS' PERCEPTIONS

The three groups of stakeholders were asked to evaluate a total of 17 items on a 5-point Likert scale (1-very negative, 5-very positive) with regard to the benefits that increased tourism development on Sao Vicente could bring. An ANOVA test was performed to determine the existence of statistically significant differences. Scheffe's test was also performed following the methodology proposed by Byrd et al. (2009) to determine which groups show statistically significant differences and in what direction (see Appendix, Table 5). The results showed that there are not significant differences between business owners' perceptions and the perceptions of the other two groups of stakeholders.

In contrast, the perception of tourists and residents differ in more than half the items. Residents only have a more positive opinion about prices (tourists perceive that trip, accommodation, and restaurant prices are high) and the state of the beaches. It is logical that tourists perceive higher prices as a negative and undesirable consequence of tourism, while residents perceive them as a potential economic benefit for the island, but do not consider the indirect effects that higher prices could have on certain sectors.

The remaining items that were found to be significantly different between the stakeholders are always evaluated more positively by the tourists. Specifically, tourists believe that the quality of accommodation and catering establishments, the overall cleanliness of the island, the hospitality of the local community, or environmental conservation can be improved through tourism planning in the event of increased tourism demand. Residents, however, are more sceptical about a hypothetical tourism growth and instead evaluate those items that affect them at the present time, such as an increase in the crime rate that has led to a decline in public safety, the lack of shopping areas and establishments, or the shortage of products and services for citizens and tourists.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The individual and comparative analysis of tourists, residents, and business owners' perceptions regarding tourism development on Sao Vicente has yielded some interesting results that could be useful for the strategic planning and promotion of sustainable tourism on the island.

Although the tourists stated that they were satisfied with their overall travel experience, there are many aspects that the competent authorities should take into consideration in tourism planning. Residents, on the other hand, largely view future tourism development on Sao Vicente in a positive light, although this is related to the possibility of deriving a personal benefit from it. The local community has a positive opinion about the island's transport system which permits fast sea and air travel, but it is especially critical about utilities, recreational opportunities, and the economy. Business owners make low investment in training workers in the tourism sector; something they believe is the responsibility of the government. Moreover, they show little interest in belonging to tourism or business consortia or associations. They do not receive government funding to improve their businesses.

5.1. Policy Implications

- It should be the mission of policymakers to respond to the needs of the local community, which would undoubtedly have a positive effect on the other stakeholders. Improvements in infrastructure and substantial economic changes are required to ensure that the benefits of tourism reach the community. Until now, the government has encouraged foreign investment in large, all-inclusive resorts, a measure which does not benefit the Cape Verdean population.
- It would be advisable to advertise Sao Vicente as a tourist destination using new technologies, such as the Internet or social networks. A strong commitment should also be made to promoting activities other than going to restaurants or hotel stays. The local community would benefit more through the promotion of local handicrafts, guesthouses, or sports activities. At the present time these tourism resources are not being fully tapped into either due to tourists' lack of knowledge about them or their high cost.
- Public bodies responsible for these policies should promote the creation of consortia or associations to give voice to the views of business owners and employers, determine their needs, and provide the necessary assistance. Business networks should also be promoted in order to build synergies targeted at conducting market research or the use of new technologies to advertise the island's tourism offering. Moreover, it is necessary to invest in business training schemes to enhance these stakeholders' understanding of the tourism market.
- There is a need for greater integration of mass media communication and other channels to ensure that stakeholders receive the required information about tourism development on the island.

5.2. Comparison of stakeholders' perception

As regards the comparison of the perceptions of the three groups, our results are in line with those of Pizam (1978), Tyrrell and Spaulding (1984), and Andreotis (2005). We found virtually no differences between the views of business owners and the other stakeholders. Similar to the study of Kavallinis and Pizam (1994), we also found that tourists and residents have different opinions about tourism development, with tourists having the most favourable opinion.

Our study suggests that the three groups of stakeholders surveyed have an optimistic outlook and view tourism development on Sao Vicente positively. However, this will require that the government establish the appropriate channels for communication between the different groups, which must be bidirectional. Firstly, stakeholders must be informed of the positive and negative impacts of tourism on the community, as well as the measures being taken to mitigate these negative effects. Second, the government must strive to involve citizens and business owners in the strategic planning of tourism on the island so as to take into account their views, suggestions, and complaints. If the stakeholders are not involved in tourism development, the odds of failure will be high.

References

- Akkawi, M.H. (2010). *Residents Attitudes towards Tourism Development in Conservative Cultures: The Case of Qatar*. University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- Allen, L. R., Long, P.T., Perdue, R.R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The Impact of Tourism Development on Residents' Perception of Community Life. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(1), 16-21.
- Anderek, K., & Vogt, C. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32 (4), 1056-1076.
- Andriotis, K. (2005). Community groups' perceptions of and preferences for tourism development: Evidence from Crete. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 39 (1), 27-36.
- Apostolopoulos, Y., & Gayle, D. J. (2002). *Island Tourism and Sustainable Development: Caribbean, Pacific and Mediterranean Experiences*. Westport, Conn: Praeger.

- Armenski, T., Dragicevic, V., Pejovic, L., Lukic, T., & Djurdjev, B. (2011). Interaction between tourists and residents: influence on tourism development. *Polish Sociological Review*, 173, 107-118.
- Banco de Cabo Verde. (<http://www.bcv.cv/vEN/Pages/Homepage.aspx>)
- Begum, H., Alam, A., & Sahazali, N. (2014). Tourist's perceptions towards the role of stakeholders in sustainable tourism. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 313-321.
- Berli, A., & Martín, J. D. (2004). Tourists' characteristics and the perceived image of tourist destinations: a quantitative analysis –a case study of Lanzarote, Spain. *Tourism Management*, 25, 623-636.
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 493–515.
- Byrd, E. T. (1997). *Barriers to rural tourism: a comparison of the perceptions of the host community, local business owners, and tourists*. Unpublished master's thesis, North Carolina State University: Raleigh, NC.
- Byrd, E. T., & Gustke, L. (2007). Using decision trees to identify tourism stakeholders: the case of two Eastern North Carolina counties. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 7 (3/4), 176-193.
- Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E., & Dronberger, M. G. (2009). Comparisons of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina. *Tourism Management*, 30, 693-703.
- Cannan, P., & Hennessy, M. (1989): The growth machine, tourism and the selling of culture. *Sociological Perspectives*, 32, 227-243.
- Carlisle, S., Kunc, M., Jones, E. & Tiffin, S. (2013). Supporting innovation for tourism development through multi-stakeholder approaches: Experiences from Africa. *Tourism Management* 35,59-69.
- Carlsen, J., Getz, D., & Ali-Knight, J. (2010). The environmental attitudes and practices of family businesses in the rural tourism and hospitality sectors. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9(4), 281–297.
- Cook, K. S.; Cheshire, C.; Rice, E. R.; & Nakagawa, S. (2013). Social exchange theory. *Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research*, Chapter 3, 61-88. Springer Netherlands.
- Cooke, K. (1982). Guidelines for socially appropriate tourism development in British Columbia. *Journal of Travel Research*, 21(1), 22–28.
- Cottrell, S., Van der Duim, R., Ankersmid, P., & Kelder, L. (2004). Measuring the sustainability of tourism in Manuel Antonio and Texel. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12(5), 409–431.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Dabphet, S., Scott, N. & Ruhanen, L. (2012). Applying diffusion theory to destination stakeholder understanding of sustainable tourism development: a case from Thailand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20 (8), 1107-1124.
- Davis, J. S., & Morais, D. P. (2004). Factions and enclaves: small towns and socially unsustainable tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 3–10.
- De Oliveira, J. A. P. (2003). Governmental responses to tourism development: three Brazilian case studies. *Tourism Management*, 24, 97–110.

- Ellis, S., & Sheridan, L. (2014). A critical reflection on the role of stakeholders in sustainable tourism development in least-developed countries. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 11 (4), 467-471
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Gil Arroyo, C., Barbieri, C. & Rozier Rich, S. (2013). Defining agritourism: A comparative study of stakeholders' perceptions in Missouri and North California. *Tourism Management*, 37, 39-47.
- Hair, J.H. Jr.; Tatham, R.L.; Anderson, R.E.; & Black, W.C. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. Madrid: Prentice Hall.
- Harril, R. (2004). Residents' attitudes toward tourism development: a literature review with implications for tourism planning. *Journal of Planning Literature*, 18, 1, 251-266.
- Hernández, S.A., Cohen, J., & García, H.L. (1996). Residents' attitudes towards an instant resort enclave. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16, 755-759.
- Homans, G. (1961): *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Imran, S., Khorshed, A. & Beaumont, N. (2014). Environmental orientations and environmental behavior: Perceptions of protected area tourism stakeholders. *Tourism Management*, 40, 290-299.
- Instituto Nacional de Estatística de Cabo Verde. (<http://www.ine.cv>)
- Jamal, T. B., & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration Theory and Community Tourism Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22 (1), 186 – 204 .
- Kavallinis, I., & Pizam, A. (1994). The environmental impact of tourism: whose responsibility is it anyway? The case study of Mykonos. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(2), 26–32.
- Kim, K. B. (2013). *The perceived role of key stakeholders' involvement in sustainable tourism development*. PhD thesis, University of Nottingham (UK). <http://eprints.nottingham.ac.uk/14389/>
- Ko, D., & Steward, W. (2002). A structural equation model of residents' attitudes for tourism development. *Tourism Management*, 23, 521-530.
- Kuvan, Y., & Akan, P. (2012). Conflict and agreement in stakeholder attitudes: resident's and hotel managers' views of tourism impacts and forest-related tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20 (4), 571-584.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a Tourism Attitude Impact Scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 121-139.
- Lanquar, R. (1985). *Sociologie du tourisme et des voyages*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986): Residents Attitudes toward Tourism Impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, 193-214.
- Lockhart, D. G. (1997). *Tourism to Malta and Cyprus*, in: D. G. Lockhart & D. Drakakis-Smith (Eds) *Island Tourism: Trends and Prospects*, 152-180, London and New York: Pinter.
- Luque, T. (1997). *Investigación de marketing*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- McGehee, N. G., Meng, F., & Tepanon, Y. (2006). Understanding legislators and their perceptions of the tourism industry: the case of North Carolina, USA, 1990 and 2003. *Tourism Management*, 27, 684–694.

- Monterrubio Cordero, J.C. (2008). Residents' perception of tourism: a critical theoretical and methodological review. *Ciencia ergo sum*, 15(1), 35-44.
- Morales, G. I., & Hernández, J. M. (2011). *Los stakeholders del turismo. International Conference on Tourism and Management Studies*, Algarve (Portugal).
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Murphy, P.E. & Murphy, A.E. (2004). *Strategic management for tourism communities: Bridging the gaps*. Clevedon. Aspects of Tourism series Channel View Publications.448p.
- Oh, C. O.; Draper, J., & Dixon, A. W. (2010). Comparing resident and tourist preferences for public beach access and related amenities. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 53(5-6), 245-251.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's Impacts: The Social Costs to the Destination Community as Perceived by its Residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8-12.
- Pizam, A., Uriely, N., & Reichel, A. (2000). The intensity of tourist-host social relationship and its effects on satisfaction and change of attitudes: the case of working tourist in Israel. *Tourism Management*, 21(4), 395-406.
- Poria Y, Butler R., & Airey D. (2003). The core of heritage tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 238-254.
- Puczko, L., & Ratz, T. (2000). Tourist and resident perceptions of the physical impacts of tourism at Lake Balaton, Hungary: Issues for sustainable tourism management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 8, 458-478.
- Ribeiro, M. A; Do Valle, P. O., & Silva, J. A. (2013). Residents' attitudes towards tourism development in Cape Verde islands. *Tourism Geographies*, 15(4), 654-679.
- Ryan, C. (2002). Equity, management, power sharing and sustainability – issues of the 'new tourism'. *Tourism Management*, 23, 17-26.
- Sharma, S. (1996): *Applied Multivariate Techniques*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Simpson, M. (2008). Community Benefit Tourism Initiatives - A Conceptual Osymoron. *Tourism Management*, 29, 1-18.
- Sook, F.; May L.; Songan P. & Nair V. (2014). The impact of Local Communities' Involvement and Relationship Quality on Sustainable Tourism in Rural. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 144, 60-65.
- Southgate, C., & Sharpley, R. (2002). *Tourism, development and the environment*. In R. Sharpley, & D. J. Telfer (Eds.), *Tourism and development: Concepts and issues* (pp. 231-262). Cleveland, OH: Channel View Publications.
- Stabler, M. J. (1995). *The image of destination regions: Theoretical and empirical aspects*. In B. Goodall, & G. Ashworth (Eds.), *Marketing in tourism Industry: The Promotion of destination regions* (pp. 133-159). London.
- Teye, V., Sirakaya, E., & Sönmez, S.F. (2002). Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism Development. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 29(3), pp. 668-688.
- Tomljenovic, R., Boranic Zivoder, S., & Marusic,Z. (2013). Stakeholder support for tourism development. *Acta Turistica*, 25 (1), 73-102.

Tyrell, T.J., & Spaulding, I.A. (1984). A survey of attitudes toward tourism growth in Rhode Island. *Hospitality Education and Research Journal*, 8(2), pp. 22-33.

United Nations Program for Development (2013). Human Development Report 2013. Electronic Resource available at: http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2013_es_complete.pdf

Vargas, A., Porras, N., & Plaza, M.A. (2007). “Desarrollo del turismo y percepción de la comunidad local: factores determinantes de su actitud hacia un mayor desarrollo turístico”. XXI Congreso Anual AEDEM, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, 6,7, y 8 de junio de 2007/Vol.1, pág. 24, coord. por Carmelo Mercado Idoeta.

Vargas, A., Porras, N., & Plaza, M.A. (2010). Explaining residents’ attitudes to tourism. Is a universal model possible? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 460-480.

Yankholmes, A.K.B., Akyeampong, O.A., & Dei, L.A. (2009). Residents’ perceptions of Transatlantic Slave Trade attractions for heritage tourism in Danish-Osu, Ghana. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 4(4), 315–329.

Waligo, V., Clarke, J. & Hawkings, R. (2013). Implementing sustainable tourism: A multi-stakeholder involvement management framework. *Tourism Management*, 36, 342-353.

World Bank (2011). Datos sobre migración y remesas 2011. Electronic resource available in: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPROSPECTS/Resources/334934-1110315015165/Factbook2011Spanish.pdf>

World Travel and Tourism Council. (<http://www.wttc.org/>)

Appendix. Main statistical results

Table 1 . Sociodemographic profile of the sample of residents and tourists

Residents:

| Variable | % | Variable | % |
|---------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| Sex | | | |
| Male | 52.9% | Marital status | |
| Female | 47.1% | | |
| Age | | Married or partner | 21.4% |
| 18 - 29 years old | 56.6% | Single | 72.2% |
| 30- 44 years old | 31.0% | Widowed | 2.8% |
| 45- 64 years old | 10.1% | Divorced | 3.6% |
| 65 years old or more | 2.3% | | |
| Years of residence | | Educational level | |
| Less than 2 years | 5.7% | No schooling | 6.0% |
| 2 - 6 years | 10.5% | Primary school | 11.1% |
| 7 – 10 years | 3.0% | Secondary school | 54.7% |
| 11 – 20 years | 15.2% | University | 21.5% |
| More than 20 years | 65.6% | Others | 6.7% |
| Net monthly income | | Employment status | |
| < 65,000 escudos | 84.4% | Unemployed | 11.4% |
| 65,000-100,000 escudos | 12.2% | Employee | 30.5% |
| 100,000-165,000 escudos | 2.4% | Self-employed | 6.0% |
| 165,000-200,000 escudos | 0.0% | Civil servant | 13.1% |
| 200,000-265,000 escudos | 0.3% | Retired | 2.7% |
| More than 265,000 escudos | 0.7% | Student | 31.2% |
| | | Housewife | 1.3% |
| | | Others | 3.7% |

Tourists:

| Variable | % | Variable | % |
|-----------------------|------|---------------------|------|
| Sex | | Educational level | |
| -Male | 58.9 | -Primary school | 2.8 |
| -Female | 41.1 | -Secondary school | 16.7 |
| | | -University diploma | 33.3 |
| | | -University degree | 47.2 |
| Age | | Country of origin | |
| -Under 30 | 16.2 | -Spain | 16.4 |
| -30-39 years old | 31.1 | -Germany | 12.3 |
| -40-49 years old | 21.6 | -Portugal | 38.4 |
| -50-59 years old | 20.3 | -Cape Verde | 9.6 |
| -60 years old or more | 10.8 | -France | 6.8 |
| | | -Austria | 1.4 |
| | | -United States | 8.2 |
| | | -Switzerland | 7.8 |
| | | -Brazil | 2.7 |
| | | -Greece | 1.4 |

Table 3. Chi-square cluster analysis of satisfaction with tourist services

| Variable | χ^2 (p-value) |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Catering establishments | 0.153 (0.472) |
| Local handicrafts | 0.277 (0.513) |
| Tourist guides | 0.006 (0.626) |
| Sports activities | 1.234 (0.353) |

Table 4. Cluster analysis on satisfaction with island services

| Item | Overall mean | Cluster | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------|------|------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Public services | 2.93 | 2.70 | 3.86 | 2.33 |
| Educational system | 3.51 | 3.79 | 4.17 | 2.75 |
| Environment | 3.21 | 3.35 | 3.51 | 2.86 |
| Leisure opportunities | 2.07 | 2.31 | 2.05 | 1.89 |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Economy | 2.22 | 2.33 | 2.73 | 1.79 |
| Social cohesion | 2.53 | 2.71 | 2.77 | 2.21 |
| Airports | 3.36 | 4.15 | 3.40 | 2.69 |
| Seaports | 3.53 | 4.11 | 3.90 | 2.75 |
| Ground transportation | 3.24 | 4.15 | 2.99 | 2.66 |
| Electricity and water | 1.80 | 2.37 | 1.46 | 1.54 |
| Internet | 2.95 | 3.41 | 3.37 | 2.23 |

Table 5. Stakeholders' evaluation of tourism impacts on the island. ANOVA and Scheffe's test

| Variable | Mean residents (R) | Mean tourists (T) | Mean business owners (B) | F | Sig. | Scheffe's test (p < 0.05) |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| Prices | 3.04 | 2.50 | 2.27 | 6.05 | 0.003* | R > T |
| Hospitality | 3.83 | 4.32 | 4.00 | 6.86 | 0.001* | T > R |
| Environmental conservation | 3.32 | 3.70 | 3.20 | 3.81 | 0.023** | T > R |
| Information | 3.11 | 3.70 | 3.20 | 2.70 | 0.069 | |
| Quality of accomm. establishments | 3.62 | 3.30 | 2.50 | 5.08 | 0.007* | T > R |
| Quality of catering establishments | 3.38 | 3.98 | 3.40 | 8.06 | 0.000* | T > R |
| Communications | 3.31 | 3.36 | 3.10 | 0.321 | 0.725 | |
| Public safety | 2.40 | 3.53 | 3.22 | 26.58 | 0.000* | T > R |
| Cleanliness | 3.38 | 3.78 | 3.36 | 3.85 | 0.022** | T > R |
| Telecommunications | 3.43 | 3.44 | 3.18 | 0.366 | 0.694 | |
| Food and beverage services | 3.90 | 4.10 | 3.55 | 1.748 | 0.176 | |
| Cultural activities | 3.06 | 3.39 | 3.20 | 1.884 | 0.154 | |
| Shopping areas | 2.81 | 2.88 | 3.00 | 0.277 | 0.758 | |
| Ecology | 3.08 | 3.49 | 3.20 | 3.292 | 0.039** | T > R |
| Beaches | 4.51 | 4.02 | 4.10 | 9.59 | 0.000* | R > T |
| Wildlife | 3.00 | 3.34 | 3.67 | 2.58 | 0.078 | |
| Hiking trails | 3.63 | 3.73 | 3.70 | 0.20 | 0.819 | |

*Significant at 1%, ** Significant at 5%

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: [Sandra M. Sánchez- Cañizares, Ana M. castillo-Canalejo, Julia Margarita Núñez-Tabales (2015) Stakeholders' perceptions of tourism development in Cape Verde, Africa, Current Issues in Tourism, 19:10, 966-980], which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1008428>This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Routledge Taylor & Francis Group terms and conditions for use of self-archived versions. this article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Routledge Taylor & Francis Group or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. the article must be linked to Routledge Taylor & Francis Group's version of record on Routledge Taylor & Francis Group online library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Routledge Taylor & Francis Group online library must be prohibited.