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Abstract
Our research addresses the perceived authenticity by the local community, as a means of enhancing Industrial Heritage Tourism. It aims to explore the influence of perceived authenticity in the future intentions of the local community, concerning a heritage tourism destination. Data was collected from São João da Madeira residents, Portugal, and the sample consisted of 389 respondents. The statistical technique applied was the structural equation model (SEM). Our findings suggest that perceived heritage plays a significant role in residents’ attitudes towards tourism development support, their own participation ideals, and their attachment to the place. These findings will contribute to both practical and theoretical research, as they aim to enhance current knowledge on residents’ perceived authenticity, being an understudied approach; furthermore, it offers a valuable opportunity to consider residents in the management and planning of an industrial tourism destination. This study analyses the outcomes of the obtained results. Additionally, it presents the main limitations, suggests future lines of research, and provides practical and theoretical data for both public and private entities, aiming at future improvements in the development of industrial heritage tourism.
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1. Introduction

The growth of the tourism sector in the world is increasingly significantly, as long as this, aligned with other industries, meets the economic needs of the respective places. The European Parliament disclosed that cultural tourism represents about 40% of European tourism, revealing a key sector in countries’ economy, and showing high growth potential (European Parliament, 2015). Also, in Portugal, tourism has become an important industry by contributing to the economic development of local communities, both in urban and rural areas (Turismo de Portugal, 2017). Currently, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, heritage destinations have faced a severe decline in the number of visitors (Alvarez-Sousa & Prados, 2020). Despite this, São João da Madeira industrial tourism shows strong indicators of post Covid 19 recovery, supported by the integration of six new visiting companies, announced on the 16th of May 2021 by the São João da Madeira municipality (CMSJM, n.d.).

The economic development of certain regions is formally driven by this catalyst, i.e., tourism, which further meets the demands of local communities and its inhabitants (Moyle, Croy, & Weiler, 2010). Moreover, the desire for differentiating experiences, and the increase of tourists’ expectations, has led to the emergence of specific tourism segments, with culture being one of the main motivations for travel (Richards, 1996). Therefore, cultural tourism, in its broadest sense, has become a very important part of the tourism industry. Likewise, experiencing heritage is one of the main purposes for cultural tourism trips (Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2004; Waitt, 2000).

One of the branches of cultural tourism is industrial tourism, which is based on valuing a territory’s industrial heritage, while also taking advantage of growing interest, related to nostalgia, concerning the conservation and reuse of this heritage (Pardo, 2010). Industrial tourism, besides being a typology of cultural tourism, is also considered as “experiences” tourism, in which the tourist has an active role, associated with the curiosity and interest in visiting industrial heritage, and active production places (Xie, 2006). Thus, industrial tourism is becoming increasingly attractive as an enhancement for local community identity, showing the different stages of its historical evolution, technological processes, forms of work, and socio-economic changes which have occurred over time (Fernández & Guzmán, 2005) Considering that, for some authors (Taylor, 2001; Wiatt, 2000), authenticity has become a main topic of discussion in heritage tourism, it will be relevant to assess the importance of authenticity in this heritage typology.

In 1994, the Nara Document on Authenticity considered the community of a place as a crucial element, emphasising a fundamental principle for UNESCO, thus, "(...) the cultural heritage of each is the cultural heritage of all. Responsibility for cultural heritage and the management of it belongs, in the first place, to the cultural community that has generated it, and subsequently to that which cares for it." (ICOMOS, 1994, p.46).

Xie (2006), referring to industrial heritage, also advises that successful tourism development requires a common perception of the community. Likewise, Mydland and Grahn (2011), highlight that, in recent years, there has been a growing discussion within international literature about community involvement, and the interactions between local and official authorities’ understanding of heritage. This understanding of the preservation of tangible and intangible heritage elements, cannot be dissociated from a community’s life and work. People who are themselves heirs and interpreters of traditional cultural heritage, are therefore often involved in the tourism product producing process (Zhou, Zhang, Zhang & Ma, 2015), have a common perception, based on shared models of identity and community (Ballesteros & Ramírez, 2007).
Considering that in many other European countries, this tourist segment has evolved favourably with growing interest, reaching a prominent position in the development of heritage tourism destinations (Guenaga & Hernando, 2012; Pardo, 2005; Prat & Cánovas, 2012), and that previous studies have mostly acknowledged the importance of authenticity in heritage tourism from the tourist’s perspective (Zhou et al., 2015), it was considered relevant to carry out this research, which will analyse industrial tourism, from the supply perspective, considering as authentic, the endogenous resources of an industrialised territory. Furthermore, as stressed by Vargas-Sánchez et al. (2007), the role of industrial tourism is an indispensable element for tourism planning and management, as it increases the value of industrial heritage, also focusing on the impact that tourism causes to a destination, with regard to the perception of the residents. Therefore, knowing that tourism can drastically affect the lives of a community (Andereck et al., 2005), it is essential to study the protection of industrial areas, centred on an approach that focuses heritage authenticity, as perceived by the local community. Based on this rationale, and to accomplish the research aim, the following objective has been defined:

To analyse perceived authenticity of the São João da Madeira local community, as an antecedent of the community’s support for tourism development, its participation ideals, and place attachment.

The paper begins by summarizing key literature concepts, such as industrial heritage, authenticity, and host authenticity. Furthermore, it considers the attitudes of residents to tourism development, with a focus on community participation and place attachment. From this, the hypotheses were formulated, and the conceptual model was developed. We are then presented with empirical data obtained from questionnaire surveys, within the research setting, and briefly discusses its implications. The paper finishes with the limitations of the study, as well as some suggestions for future research, followed by the main conclusions.

2. Literature review and analytical framework

2.1. Industrial heritage

According to the OECD’s 2020 report on Tourism Trends and Policies, tourism is one of the world’s most important economic sectors, with six decades of consistent growth. In this, we see the environment and culture, as being the mains pillars of sustainability, which can bring benefits to local communities. Likewise, in 2018, a UNWTO report mentioned the immeasurable inherent value of culture to host communities, representing one of the main assets for tourism (Richards, 2018). As cultural tourism grows, promoting different types of cultural emergence, based on tangible and intangible heritage assets (OECD, 2009), local attention towards these resources also grows. This is not only to meet the growing needs of tourists for differentiating destinations, but also to achieve economic, environmental, and socio-cultural benefits for the host communities.

Many definitions are consensual in classifying cultural heritage into tangible and intangible assets (Duranti, Spallazzo, & Trocchianesi, 2016; ICOMOS, 1994). Tangible heritage refers to permanent features that can be physically touched (Duranti et al., 2016), its most traditional forms include static features, such as historic sites, monuments, and buildings (UNESCO, 2003). On the other hand, intangible cultural heritage includes phrases, music, folk songs, oral traditions, arts, performing arts, rituals, and events (ICOMOS, 1994; UNESCO, 2003). According to Jackson (1985), post-industrial sites, which are part of cultural heritage, are important, and should also be protected, as they provide an insight into how people and landscape have coexisted over time. Such sites, according to Alanen and Melnick (2000), also give identity and uniqueness to a place and to the community, thus protecting its origin and memory.
Together with industrial heritage, there is, nowadays, a greater recognition of current or active industrial resources for tourism use (Otgaar et al., 2010), which has led in recent years, to the significant trend of opening factories to the public, so, currently an increasing number of industrial sites serve as a tool for regional restructuring, and economic development alongside tourism promotion (Edwards & Llurdés, 1996; Mansfeld, 1992). Also in Portugal, as society shapes the way companies need to adjust their offerings to meet the consumers’ needs, industrial tourism, based on industrial heritage, has come to represent a growing slice of the cultural tourism sector (Guerra, Moreno, & Almeida, 2019; Turismo de Portugal, 2020), so the need to study the residents’ attitudes considering the uniqueness of industrial tourism, may be aligned with authenticity, as perceived by the community itself.

2.2. Authenticity and host authenticity
As authenticity is a dynamic and multifaceted concept, numerous debates have been triggered about its meaning and usefulness, thus it has occupied a central position in tourism studies (Chhabra, 2005; Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Hassan & Ekiz, 2021; MacCannell, 1973; Reisinger & Steiner, 2006; Rickly-Boyd, 2012; Taylor, 2001; Tung & Ritchie, 2011; Wang, 1999). Furthermore, in recent decades, it has been studied from different perspectives (Chhabra, 2005; Hassan & Ekiz, 2021; MacCannell, 1976; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010), often addressed as a universal value that motivates tourist demand (Cohen, 1988; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; Rickly-Boyd, 2012; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006; Wang, 1999). However, debate remains around who can assess authenticity, and who has the power to confer authenticity to a destination (Chhabra, 2005; Cohen & Cohen, 2012b), so the definition of authenticity is not at all consensual. Still, there is no doubt as to the fact that perceived authenticity plays a leading role in heritage tourism (Yeoman, Brass, & McMahon-Beattie, 2007; Yi, Fu, Yu, & Jiang, 2018).

MacCannell (1976) focused on authenticity as a tangible quality, that can be found in an object referring to the authenticity of original objects, thus enabling authentic experiences regarding tourism, that lead to knowledge, that is, authenticity of the originals (Wang, 1999). On the other hand, Cohen (1993) refers to authenticity as a social construction, based on a judgment or value placed on the scenario or product by its observers (Moscardo & Pearce, 1999; Xie & Wall, 2002), which Wang (1999) refers to as constructed, according to a culture’s point of view or belief. This is, in other words, a "staged" or represented authenticity. In this case, the tourist assumes authenticity, despite this being constructed, and being the whole purpose. Also noteworthy, is existential authenticity, this approach lies in the perception of the subject, and not in the object visited (Brown, 2013; Kim & Jamal, 2007; Rickly-Boyd, 2012; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006; Wang, 1999). This latter view opposes the objectivist and constructivist perspectives, relying not on objects but on the individual themselves, and evoking feelings and emotions by appealing to subjectivity and individuality (Wang, 1999).

The conceptualization of authenticity, was formally presented through official bodies by the Venice Charter, in 1964, and states that all communities have the duty to preserve heritage, with all the richness of its authenticity, adopting an objectivist perspective and involving the community. Later, the Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS, 1994), broadened the conceptual framework by also valuing the dimensions of humanity’s collective memory, thus promoting cultures and different ways of living in a community. Then, in 1996, at the ICOMOS meeting in San Antonio, Texas, the notion of authenticity of the Nara Document was discussed. This resulted in seven fundamental criteria for the application of the concept, with the sixth, being authenticity and administration, clearly highlighting the role of community perception towards authenticity. This has become the criterion at the basis of this research. However, questions related to residents’ opinions, and ideals on tourism development based on their authenticity perception, are still largely unexplored. Despite the acceptance of authenticity as a leading concept in tourism, the authenticity construction processes are still under-studied, with the question...
of who has the power to authenticate tourist attractions still being an issue (Cohen & Cohen, 2012b). In addition to this, there is still a lack of analysis concerning the contribution of authenticity by the host community (Hsu, 2018). Consequently, it was understood that there is still considerable space for studies that highlight perceived authenticity by residents, or by the host community, as a form of preserving and sharing culture, traditions, or rituals within a tourism destination.

The Steiner and Reisinger (2006) study, pointed out that host community authenticity relates to self-evaluation, and those residents are free to define themselves and respond to the demands of the tourist side, rather than meeting the expectations of others. Later, Zhou et al., (2015) supported this notion, by stating that most existing studies on authenticity involve the tourists’ perspectives, so the author intended to provide the aspects of tourism authenticity based on the interpreter’s perception. This took into account authenticity as a common human interpretation, built on the ideals and experiences of each subject. In other words, the sense of authenticity envisioned by the host community, involves the residents of a destination expressing the courage to face challenges, and respond to tourist circumstances, through their identity, rather than just meeting the expectations of others.

Commonly, authenticity is associated with truth, history, traditions, places, communities, and culture (Aplet & Cooper, 2000; MacCannell, 1976; Waitt, 2000). In turn, cultural tourism consists of activities that are carried out by communities to show their lifestyle, history, beliefs, artefacts, and monuments (Jones, 2009; Silberberg, 1995). Therefore, a region or community is considered authentic if it conserves and maintains the habits, rituals, customs, traditions, and the same language of its ancient peoples (Barreto, 2008). Due to this, authenticity is closely related to the daily lives of residents, and has a significant impact on the quality of the tourist experience, the tourists’ satisfaction, and even on the perceived image of a destination (Kolar & Zabkar, 2010). When dealing with industrial tourism, it is known that, unlike many destinations, an industrial territory has its own specific dimensions, as it occurs due to another main economic activity, production, and services. Therefore, the traditions and rituals are often around industry, and the significance of the host’s authenticity must be aligned with the strength preserved by the host community. This is stressed by Hsu (2018), mentioning the three levels of authenticity analysis from the host’s perspective. The first level is associated with the self, what each resident considers as authentic, the second is related to the host-guest encounter, here the resident meets the tourist in his own setting, and nothing is made differently to accommodate the tourist’s expectation. Finally, the third level is the cultural tourism setting, when a scenario, although an authentic symbol, is slightly changed to suit the tourist’s assumed expectations. All these levels engage residents; hence, it is crucial to obtain local communities’ involvement and support. This is because, as the resident, or holder, of industrial heritage (tangible and intangible), they may see behavioural intentions influenced, according to the level of engagement with heritage. Similarly, personal benefits are deeply aligned with community preferences, and consequently with their behavioural intentions. If the benefits gained from tourism through authenticity allow residents to understand and analyse their rituals more intensely, and thus become emotionally involved in tourism activities, their attitudes and perception towards tourism development will be influenced (Caneday & Zeiger, 1991).

Considering that studying authenticity as an antecedent of residents’ support for tourism, or residents’ community ideals, is an almost unexplored path, an in-depth exploration of authenticity, with community perceptions, is needed. This is in order to recognise if industrial heritage authenticity motivates community participation, and influences their perception on tourism development. Therefore, we are particularly interested in shedding light on the relationship between authenticity with the community ideals, and support for tourism variables.
2.3. Residents’ attitudes toward tourism
Given the benefits provided by the tourism industry, different communities around the world favour activities that help the tourism industry to develop. Due to this, many authors, in their research, have privileged the study of residents’ attitudes towards tourism and, consequently, its impacts (Getz, 1994; King, Pizam & Milman 1993; Lankford & Howard, 1994). Most research on resident support for tourism destination planning, focuses on factors that may influence the residents’ perceived impacts towards tourism, and also towards its future development (Besculides, Lee, & McCormick, 2002; Fredline & Faulkner, 2000; Gursoy, Jurowski, & Uysal, 2002; Williams & Lawson, 2001).

Several studies concentrate on social exchange theory (SET) (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004), to predict residents’ attitude towards tourism development. This theory suggests that residents are more likely to support development when they believe the benefits are expected to outweigh the costs, therefore, “residents’ act on their attitudes toward the perceived impacts of tourism by supporting/opposing the industry” (Nunkoo & Gursoy, 2012, p.245), and these impacts are commonly grouped as perceived costs and benefits (Gursoy et al., 2002; Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004). Nevertheless, beyond social exchange theory, there is a variety of conceptual frameworks arising from social psychology, and these can be employed to understand attitudes towards tourism, with personal value systems (Gu & Ryan, 2008) being one of them. Therefore, as hosts are also capable of interpreting their own culture (Sun, 2010, cited in Zhou et al., 2015), and the residents’ traditions and cultures are linked to their authenticity perception (Zhou et al., 2015), this study, verifying that there is a need to study resident’s attitudes from other personal value perspectives, offers a new perspective in estimating resident perceptions. Furthermore, we present a new viewpoint regarding attitudes resorting to perceived authenticity as a hypothetical factor, that influences host’s perceptions, this being a current research gap (Zhou et al., 2015).

Overall, "understanding the antecedents of local residents' support for tourism development is crucial for local governments, policy makers and businesses, because the success and sustainability of any development depends on the active support of local people" (Gursoy & Rutherford, 2004, p.495). Additionally, studies should widen perspectives, in order to grasp whether residents negotiate their support for tourism, in exchange for an active role in the authentication process (Zhou et al., 2015), thus focusing on the authenticity role from a supply-side point of view (Croes, Lee, & Olson, 2013). Based on the preceding discussion, the following hypothesis was formulated:

Hypothesis 1: A positive relationship exists between residents’ perceived authenticity and their support for tourism development.

In close relation with support for tourism, community involvement and participation in tourism have also been studied. This is mainly because it is believed that residents’ involvement promotes sustainable tourism (Fong & Lo, 2015), improves local community welfare (Ertuna & Kirbas, 2012), and helps in the maintaining of local culture, tradition, and the indigenous knowledge of the locals. On the one hand, community-based tourism might promote people’s quality of life, in line with resources conservation (Scheyvens, 1999), therefore, residents’ perceptions of tourism and its impacts, together with their support for tourism development, may also depend on the positive perception of their quality of life (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010; Rivera, Croes & Lee, 2016; Uysal, Sirgy, Woo & Kim, 2016). On the other hand, several studies based on attitude theories, explain residents’ behaviour is not constant in their results, thus leaving space for the need to explain residents’ behaviour through other variables which have not yet been considered. Studies have omitted reference to authenticity, as this is most commonly associated with tourists’ perceptions and experiences (Cohen & Cohen, 2012b). In this way, we see that
they seem to forget that the unique features of the culture of a community, reflect their own authenticity, and that the host community is the primary interested party in cultural heritage authentication (Khanom, Moyle, Scott, & Kennelly, 2019). Furthermore, cultural heritage value awareness guides inheritors’ behaviours (Su, Li, Wu, & Yao, 2020), therefore aspects of authenticity perceived by residents need empirical substantiation. Thus, research should consider the “uniqueness of the setting” (Uysal et al., 2016, p. 257), together with community behaviour (Uysal et al., 2016).

Local community participation in tourism development, aims to empower community (Sonjai, Bushell, Hawkins, & Staiff, 2018), this uses its socio-cultural uniqueness, and transforms it into commodities for the enjoyment of tourism (Sonjai, et al., 2018). Despite the fact commodification in heritage tourism allows the revitalisation of structures, which might otherwise have been deteriorated without a significant loss of authenticity (Prideaux, 2003), this transformation may be influenced by the perception that a community has of their heritage authenticity. This is a key issue when involving residents at all stages of the tourism planning and development process.

Since a tourism destination community ought to participate in establishing how culture should be communicated, and highlighted to tourists in terms of the authenticity of their cultural products (Mutana & Mukwada, 2017), it is crucial to understand if the perceived authenticity of residents will influence their participation, values or intentions, as it is not clear if those who inherit recognise the same value in their heritage cognition as tourists do (Su, Li, Wu, & Yao, 2020). Commonly, it can be suggested that stronger perceptions of authenticity are likely to lead to positive attitudes, as well as positive behavioural intentions (Gilmore & Pine 2007). Hence, deeper perceptions of authenticity will lead to positive participation intentions. More specifically:

Hypothesis 2: A positive relationship exists between residents’ perceived authenticity, and their community ideals, through participation values.

Recognising that communities have their own culture and traditions, based on a shared sense of authenticity, and, that it can influence residents’ attitudes towards tourism development, as well as their intention to engage and participate in tourism activities, might facilitate tourism planning. Also, place attachment plays a prominent role in a resident's ideal, as it comprises of a psychological involvement with a place, which tends to grow with time (Giuliani & Feldman 1993). As a result, a person who dwells for a long time in a particular area, will develop a sense of affection and belonging to a region, as part of their identity (Hay, 1998). This therefore creates emotional ties arising from living in a particular geographical region which, leads to an emotional attachment to the place (Giuliani & Feldman, 1993).

Tourism studies indicate that collective non-economic values, like community attachment, lead to an increase in support for tourism (Chen & Chen, 2010; Choi & Murray, 2010). Also, that the significance of a place is recognised as an affective bond, so the interaction that an individual has with a specific place (Morgan, 2010), is an interaction grounded on the attributes of the destination, which can influence place attachment (Hou, Lin, & Morais, 2005). Therefore, attachment is associated with the feelings that the community holds towards the place, and with a socially constructed and individually perceived concept, that is, authenticity (Kolar & Zabkar, 2010). For that reason, place attachment has mostly been studied as an antecedent of perceived authenticity (Prayag & Ryan, 2012; Ramkinssoon, Weiler, & Smith, 2012). However, considering that physical and/or social features offer a basis for place attachment and social ties (Scannell & Gifford, 2010), the intention of the present study is to further develop this notion by studying if an emotional bond links host community to their traditional culture (Zhou et al., 2015),
which refers to perceived authenticity as an antecedent of place attachment (Yi, Fu, So, Kevin, & Zheng, 2021). In this way, we estimate if community ideals based on place attachment are correlated with the perceived authenticity of the place, a path seldom measured by previous researchers.

Therefore, to confirm whether this emotional attachment is influenced by the residents’ perceived authenticity, and as no previous work analysing this relationship was found, the following research hypothesis was outlined:

*Hypothesis 3: A positive relationship exists between residents’ perceived authenticity, and their community ideals through their place attachment (level of attachment to their place).*

All hypotheses are based on the premise that residents’ attitudes of supporting or opposing industrial tourism development, are grounded in their perception of authenticity, impacting on the community ideals of participation.

Following on from the theoretical framework presented above, the conceptual model of this study is illustrated in Figure 1, and represents the relation between perceived authenticity with residents’ support for tourism and community ideals, being based on residents’ participation values and place attachment.

Figure 1. Proposed model
Source: authors

The aim of this model was to test the relationship between resident’s perceived authenticity, with its reflection and perception of the impacts of tourism, and behavioural intentions of that same community, such as support for tourism development participation values, and place attachment.
3. Methodology
The purpose of this research was to analyse residents' perceptions about industrial tourism in São João da Madeira. Specifically, it focused on the evaluation of the local community's perceptions of authenticity, based on the articulation of industrial heritage. This was with the industry promoted through industrial tourism circuits, which were managed by the municipal entity. Relations were established between perceived authenticity, with behavioural intentions grounded on community ideals.

3.1. Sample and data collection
The Portuguese city of São João da Madeira was chosen as the case study area, as it is an excellent industrial municipality and was a pioneer in the planning, implementation, and promotion of industrial tourism circuits in Portugal. Furthermore, there is a growing interest in industrial tourism, as the Portuguese governmental entity "Turismo de Portugal" announced in January 2020 the creation of an Industrial Tourism network in Portugal. Furthermore, in February 2021, it was considered as a priority to national tourism by the State Secretary of Tourism, Rita Marques. So, and due to the fact that in Portugal there are no other consistent industrial tourism programmes, it is believed that the study might be valuable for other destinations wishing to boost their territory’s industrial resources.

The data collected involved São João da Madeira residents, a municipality belonging to Aveiro district, the Northern region of Portugal. Data collection was conducted between April and October 2020, with applied surveys to São João da Madeira’s permanent resident population via convenience sampling. Based on the population density, 21,713 inhabitants, a confidence level of 95% and an error margin of 5% was estimated, obtaining a sample size of 378 respondents.

For this study, a total of 389 questionnaires were applied, 162 of which were online, using the LimeSurvey platform, and the remaining 227 face-to-face, by approaching individuals and requesting their co-operation. The respondents were selected using a convenience sampling technique, according to their willingness to collaborate, and were recruited via social and professional networks or approached in their municipality of residence. As the sample used two different collection methods, to prevent bias, a Mann-Whitney test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference in the variables. The Mann-Whitney test showed p values indicated that this difference was not statistically significant (perceived authenticity p>0.01; support for tourism: p>0.05; community ideals: participation values: p>0.05; community ideals: place attachment p>0.05).

Once the collection process was completed, and before statistical processing, data was coded and tabulated by creating a file using the SPSS for Windows (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 27.0.

3.2. Questionnaire design
The questionnaire consists of six blocks: the first block serves as an initial respondents' characterisation, in which they were asked about the years of residence, the relationship with companies or entities promoting industrial tourism, and their participation intention, these with a yes/no answer. The second block aims at industrial heritage and identity, the third refers to heritage values, and the fourth block is subdivided into two parts, one focusing on local community support for tourism development, and the second on local community ideals. The fifth block is linked to perceived host authenticity. From the second to the fifth block, the measurement scale employed was a 1-to-7-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The last block concerns sociodemographic data. For this study, only the fourth and fifth block were considered as variables.
Validated scales were used as measurement instruments, based on the theoretical framework. To measure the perceived authenticity by the host community, the scale prepared by Zhou et al. (2015) was used, which presented one of the few existing studies on host perceived authenticity. The Zhou et al. (2015) scale was divided into objective and existential authenticity, although in this case study, and considering that perceived authenticity incorporates the two components, objective, and existential authenticity, both symbolised personal experiences (Cohen & Cohen, 2012b), and both related to self-evaluation (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006). An 8-item single scale was used to measure perceived residents’ authenticity, with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.902.

The support for tourism development scale was measured using items from different scales, validated by several authors (Alshboul, 2016; Dragouni, 2017; Hamimi, 2013), which combined 15 items with questions. There were regarding different tourism development potentialities that measure support for tourism, and Cronbach’s alpha for these items was .829. Also, the community ideals variable scale combined items of several authors (Alshboul, 2016; Dragouni, 2017; Hamimi, 2013; Tosun, 2006), where 18 items referring to the community ideals were used, with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.86.

3.3. Statistical analysis

The relational structure of the variables under study, was analysed by applying exploratory factor analysis. A correlation matrix factor analysis was performed, and factor extraction was achieved using principal component analysis, and varimax rotation that aims to obtain a simple structure, while keeping the factor axes orthogonal, assuming that the rotated factors are uncorrelated (Kaiser, 1958).

In order to test the conceptual model, the structural equation analysis technique was applied using the AMOS (v. 21, SPPS, IBM Company, Chicago, IL) Software.

The two-step strategy suggested by Hair et al. (2010) was used, i.e., it starts with the adjustment of the measurement model, and, in the second step, analysis of the structural model is carried out. Previously, the outliers were identified through the AMOS software, and the Mahalanobis distance was calculated to assess data normality. Data normality was also analysed through the skewness and kurtosis coefficients, to verify compliance with the assumptions of normality with values sk<3 and ku<7. Severe violations of normality are considered if |Sk|<3 and |Ku|<7-10 (Kline, 2005).

The measurement model aims to test if perceived authenticity by the local community (exogenous variables), in an antecedent of support for tourism development, and community ideals, these are divided into participation values and community attachment (endogenous variables).

3.4. Common method bias and multicollinearity

Following Kock (2015), the common method bias (CMB) represents a problem in SEM studies, due to the measurement method. Therefore, Harman’s single-factor test was applied to assess common method bias (Harman, 1976).

An exploratory factor analysis of the measurement variables, using the principal component method to examine the total variance explained, was conducted, revealed that the first factor only explained 45.5%. Although a single factor accounted for less than 50% and, as Harman’s single factor test is not sufficient to confirm CMB, a common latent factor (CLF) was included in the structural model, which was connected to all observed the model items. The standardised regression weights of this model were compared to the model without the CLF, and no large differences (greater then 0.2) were detected (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Through the analysis of the tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF), values for each predictor variable in this model the Multicollinearity were
verified. The Variance Inflation Factor tolerance value is calculated as 1. The variables to be retained in the analysis are those which have Variance Inflation Factor values below the threshold of 10 (Ho, 2006). Findings revealed that all values were below the suggested threshold of 10.

4. Results

4.1. Sample profile

As shown in Table 1, the distribution of responses by gender was balanced, as 53.7% of respondents were female and 44.5% were male. Participants had a mean age of 40.91 (n=377, with 12 missing responses), and standard deviation of 13.108 years. The most representative age group was between 34 and 40 years old, immediately followed by the age group between 18 and 33. Furthermore, 47.3% had educational qualifications at secondary school level, followed by higher education – degree level (31.1%). An incidence in secondary education given is to be expected, because being an industrial city, there is no need for higher education for many jobs in said industry. As for the years of residence, 162 people (41.6%), state that they have always lived in the municipality. With this percentage, reliable data is expected, considering the connection to the place. Also, the average household earns between €1501 and €2000 per month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>Basic Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing value</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-33</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-40</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 and more</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing value</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of residence</th>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Household income</th>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>Less than 1000€</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>From 1000€ to 1500€</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>From 1501€ to 2000€</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 21 and 30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>From 2001€ to 2500€</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 31 and 40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>From 2501€ to 3000€</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>From 3001€ to 3500€</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>From 3501€ to 4000€</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

4.2. Factor and reliability analyses

The reliability and validity of measurement were verified through a factor analysis (Table 2), and a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) (Table 3).

Through the analysis, initial results revealed several items in the anti-image correlations matrix, with ratios below 0.3, the reference value of Hair et al. (2010). Thus, considering that their removal would improve Cronbach’s alpha, they were eliminated. The final analysis demonstrated that all indicators were accepted, and a total of four factors were extracted, accounting for 70% of the total variance (Table 2).
## Table 2. Factor analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Community ideals: participation values</strong></td>
<td>11.625</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that residents are involved in protecting and promoting industrial heritage.</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The heritage tourism design in São João da Madeira should be done in collaboration with all stakeholders.</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community can play an important role in establishing plans and projects in industrial tourism.</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation in industrial tourism planning strengthens social ties between the local community.</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation in industrial tourism planning helps participants gain knowledge and skills.</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation in industrial tourism planning contributes to the heritage and tourism specialists’ work.</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community can play an active role in deciding about industrial tourism development.</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation in industrial tourism planning safeguards win-win decisions.</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community contributes to meeting the challenges of tourism development.</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: support for tourism</strong></td>
<td>2.765</td>
<td>11.061%</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism development should be a priority for local bodies.</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism development of São João da Madeira must remain linked to industrial heritage.</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking tourism with industry will create incentives for the protection and promotion of that industry.</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial tourism development of will contribute to the development of the local economy.</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of industrial tourism will encourage the local community to learn more about its industrial heritage.</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of tourism will lead to the development of infrastructure and services for the local community.</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial tourism contributes to the increase and improvement of local commerce.</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial tourism promotes leisure and cultural activities improvement.</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: perceived authenticity</strong></td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>8.214%</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The historical industrial heritage and industrial archaeology (machinery) present in the museums preserve traditional characteristics.</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Components | Factor loading | Communalities | Eigenvalues | % of variance | Cronbach’s alpha
---|---|---|---|---|---
Locals maintain traditional factory production processes. | 0.662 | | | | 
I can feel the immense history of São João da Madeira industries and industrial heritage inherited from my ancestors. | 0.837 | | | | 
I can feel the richness of industry and industrial heritage and feel pride, confidence and appreciation anywhere in São João da Madeira. We, the locals of São João da Madeira, and the next generation are able to inherit and continue the legacy of industrial culture from our ancestors. | 0.821 | | | | 
I am immersed in the industrial atmosphere of the municipality through the local industries and industrial heritage and feel pride. | 0.770 | | | | 
Factor 4: Community ideals: place attachment | 1.067 | 4.268% | 0.794 | | 
Personally, I feel deeply connected to São João da Madeira. | 0.608 | 0.646 | | | 
I would like to help São João da Madeira and contribute to its development. | 0.715 | 0.719 | | | 
Total variance explained | | | 70.043% | | 
Source: authors

The final model showed a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy of 0.9, which, according to Hair et al. (2010), is very good, further to this, Bartlett’s test of sphericity was also significant at p≤0.001.

4.3. Conceptual model testing

4.3.1. Measurement validation

Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted to test the measurement model fitness. The fit indices were: $\chi^2$ (293) = 1451.994, p < 0.001; NFI = 0.829; CFI = 0.858; RMSEA = 0.103, which shows a moderate fit (MacCallum, Brown, & Sugawara, 1996). We tried to improve the model, and we confirmed that all the loadings were greater than the minimum cut off point of 0.5. This is suggested by Hair et al. (2010), the significant loading should be 0.50 or higher. Then, the Average Variance Extracted (AVEs), was verified, and some items are lower than 0.5, therefore, these were removed (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). The Standardised residual covariances were also analysed, and all items with value above |2.5| that could suggest a problem for the fit indices (Hair et al., 2010) were removed.

The final measurement model showed a good fit for the data ($\chi^2$ (38) = 74.711, p < 0.001; NFI = 0.971; CFI = 0.985; RMSEA = 0.051). The composite reliabilities of all constructs were between the cut-off value of .70 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998), ranging from 0.684 (close to 0.7) to 0.96. Thus, the multiple item scales were suitable in measuring each of the constructs (convergent validity assessed) – table 3. Comparing the AVE with the squared correlations, between constructs, tested for discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), the squared correlations between each pair of constructs were all smaller than the AVE values. Thus, discriminant validity, shown on table 4, was satisfied.
Table 3. Confirmatory factorial analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for tourism - TOUR</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Composite reliabilities</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism development should be a priority for local bodies.</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The development of industrial tourism will encourage the local community to learn more about its industrial heritage.</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community ideals: participation values - PARTV</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Composite reliabilities</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The local community can play an important role in establishing plans and projects in industrial tourism.</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community can play an active role in deciding about industrial tourism development.</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community participation in industrial tourism planning contributes to the heritage and tourism specialists’ work.</td>
<td>0.739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community ideals: place attachment - PLATT</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Composite reliabilities</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally, I feel deeply connected to São João da Madeira.</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to help São João da Madeira and contribute to its development.</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived authenticity - AUT</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Composite reliabilities</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can feel the immense history of São João da Madeira industries and industrial heritage inherited from my ancestors.</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can feel the richness of industry and industrial heritage and feel pride, confidence, and appreciation anywhere in São João da Madeira.</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We, the locals of São João da Madeira, and the next generation are able to inherit and continue the legacy of industrial culture from our ancestors.</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am immersed in the industrial atmosphere of the municipality through the local industries and industrial heritage and feel pride.</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors

Table 4. Discriminant validity of constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations between constructs (1↔2)</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient (Cor)</th>
<th>Cor²</th>
<th>Extracted variance 1</th>
<th>Extracted variance 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived authenticity ↔ Support for tourism</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.1991</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Authenticity ↔ Community ideals: participation values</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.3364</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Authenticity ↔ Community ideals: place attachment</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for tourism ↔ Community ideals: participation values</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for tourism ↔ Community ideals: place attachment</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community ideals: participation values ↔ Community ideals: place attachment</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors
4.3.2. Structural model estimation

To examine the hypothetical relations, a structural model was estimated (Figure 2). According to the results, the goodness-of-fit indices (goodness-of-fit statistics: χ² (41) = 158.374, p < 0.001; NFI = 0.938; CFI = 0.953; RMSEA = 0.08), were within the acceptable level, indicating that the model is adequate. The community ideals: participation values explained 50.4%, community ideals: place attachment explained 37.1% and support for tourism explained 21.9% of perceived authenticity variation.

![Structural model diagram]

**Figure 2. Structural model**
Source: authors

Table 5 shows the standardised coefficients and corresponding t values of all the proposed paths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Standardized estimate (t-value)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Support for tourism ← Perceived authenticity</td>
<td>0.47 (6.195)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Community ideals: participation values ← Perceived authenticity</td>
<td>0.71 (13.412)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Community ideals: place attachment ← Perceived authenticity</td>
<td>0.61 (11.017)</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: authors
The results of the structural model showed that perceived authenticity revealed a significant effect on support for tourism (standardized coefficient=0.47; t=6.195; p<0.0001). Therefore, hypothesis 1 is supported. Concerning the relation between perceived authenticity toward community ideals: participation values, the path has also shown to be significant (standardised coefficient=0.71; t=13.412; p<0.0001). The results also demonstrated that the effect of perceived authenticity on community ideals: place attachment is positive and significant (standardized coefficient=0.609; t=11.017 p<0.0001).

As demonstrated in table 5, all paths indicate positive relationships, as a result, all the hypotheses are accepted.

5. Discussion and implications
5.1. Discussion
The empirical findings of the current study, demonstrate that São João da Madeira residents act on their perception of heritage tourism, mainly in what concerns the tangible and intangible industrial heritage authenticity.

In Hypothesis 1., it was hypothesised that authenticity perception influences the residents’ behavioural intentions towards support for tourism. This hypothesis was supported. The study demonstrates that perceived authenticity by the community, is positively associated with their support for tourism development. Thus, if residents consider their heritage with authentic values, they will tend to endorse the development of tourism. In this context, residents demonstrate and experience authenticity, either as heirs or as interpreters of their own heritage (Zhou et al., 2015), as this perceived authenticity will connect and bring tourists and residents together (Hall, 2007). The result is partially consistent with Zhou et al. (2015), stating that the hosts’ perceived objective authenticity affects support for tourism. Contrary to the hosts’ perceived existential authenticity such as in Zhou et al. (2015) findings, it does not impact on community support for tourism. In this study residents recognise, not only their cultural objects, but also their experiences around industry, as essential for the industrial destination tourism development, and as a reflection of their own identity. Also, Croes et al. (2013) refer to authenticity as playing a crucial role in categorising cultural resources, such as those which influence tourism development. Although with different attributes, Starr’s (2011) findings reveal a significant effect of perceived authenticity on liking, perceived quality, and perceived value. These are three dependent variables that might be fundamental for positive perception of quality of life, this leading to support for tourism (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010; Rivera, Croes & Lee, 2016).

In hypothesis 2., it was assumed that a community who perceives their territory and industrial resources as authentic, will be willing to participate in tourism development, and a positive relation was assessed. This finding is in line with Sharma and Dyer (2009), when they mention that proximity to heritage tourism places is associated with community attitudes, and residents’ approach to heritage is likely to be considered in tourism planning and development. Although with different scales, this result is coherent with Verplanken and Holland (2002), in a study reporting that value perception positively affects self-concept, with this having an effect on inheritors’ behaviour. In this case study, the authenticity value perception positively influences the residents’ behaviour intentions of participating in tourism. Also, this result is consistent with the Khanom et al. (2019) study, when presenting a conceptual model demonstrating that cultural heritage authenticity is an enhancer of community empowerment, and at the same time, strengthens the community’s role towards cultural heritage.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that perceived authenticity influences community ideals, through place attachment feeling. This hypothesis was also supported, which substantiates the idea that there is an involvement intention in the planning process when they perceive authenticity, and when they have a
strong connection with the place, suggesting that this development can successfully complement the industrial tradition, heritage, and labouring industry. Specifically, perceived authenticity seems to play a crucial role in guiding community ideals, whether established through residents’ intentions towards involvement or their place attachment, as residents might feel more attached if they feel connected to industrial heritage. Therefore, attachment or detachment is indeed a significant factor, which must be considered when assessing host authenticity. Similarly, Mydland and Grahn (2012) reported that local communities are engaged by the desire to reinforce social ties. The findings are consistent with the results of Yi et al. (2021), when they reported that the tourists’ perceived authenticity of world heritage sites, including both tangible and intangible element, influences place attachment. Grounded on this parallel, a future comparative study between tourists’ and residents’ perceived authenticity might be interesting. This study also substantiates the interpretation of Rakić and Chambers (2012), by referring that perceived authenticity influences social bonding through both affective attachment and place identity. Likewise, Scannell and Gifford (2010) confirmed that physical or social features can lead to social ties or connections, validating the findings of Hou et al. (2005) when the authors reported that the cultural attributes of a destination can influence place attachment.

In other words, by supporting these hypotheses, it is assumed that there is a perception of mutual advantage leading to benefits for residents, and experiences for tourists, while promoting a rapprochement between locals and tourists (Almeida, 2017), thus ensuring, in a context of participation in tourism development, respect for community lifestyles and safeguarding traditional values (Lankford & Howard 1994; Linderberg & Johnson 1997; Mitchell & Reid 2001; Sheldon & Abenoja 2001). At the same time, the results present an original effort to highlight that authenticity is a construct, which is dependent on both participation intention and community values.

Through the analysis of the formulated hypotheses, we found that the local community tends to show support for tourism development, and is willing to participate in tourism development if they perceive their industrial resources and characteristics as authentic, and therefore with touristic value.

5.2. Theoretical and managerial implications

This study empirically confirmed the relationships between perceived authenticity with local community support for tourism, participation values, and place attachment. In addition to contributing to the development of authenticity concept, within the scope of resident perception, it is useful, from a theoretical perspective, to explain residents’ behavioural intentions and position towards tourism development, according to their physical and emotional proximity to industrial heritage. It clarifies that, if there is this emotional proximity, there will be an appreciation of the resources, and a consequent intention to participate in this specific context.

In line with the analysis of the expressed hypotheses, this study contributes theoretically by addressing a research gap, validating that perceived authenticity has an important effect on the positive attitudes of a community towards tourism. Also, with regard to theoretical implications, this study is important in providing a broad perspective, which evaluates the residents’ behaviours based on the perceived authenticity notions.

This research provides evidence that support for tourism and participation values constructs are dependent of perceived authenticity, so the key to the authentication process lies in the community interpretations and can be simultaneously “hot” and “cool” (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). This is because the first one often relies on a belief (existential) and is “socially produced in a participatory process”, and the second one relies on a “proof” (object), and “its effectiveness depends on the credibility of the
authenticating authority” (Cohen & Cohen, 2012b, p.8). In both cases, the community has a pre- eminent role.

As for practical and managerial implications, bearing in mind that community participation is increasingly considered in tourism policies, and reinforces the effectiveness of tourism planning (Gori, Fissi, & Romolini, 2021; Murphy, 1983), it is important for decision makers, aiming for a community- based approach, to identify and acquire a better understanding of the residents’ perspective on authenticity prior to the decision-making process. This achieves an equilibrium between stakeholder objectives and resident’s needs. This implies that managers should work on a successful interpretation of residents’ authenticity perceptions, emphasising the industrial community background, when conveying a tourism product or service.

Considering that, to our knowledge, there are no previous studies, regarding industrial tourism destination, that analyse authenticity perceived by residents, these also capable of expressing their appreciation of authenticity. Furthermore, the research will contribute to the planning of industrial tourism programmes, supported by the community, as perceived authenticity can be an effective determiner factor for industrial resources reinvention strategies. Assuming that tourists pursue authentic experiences instead of a “false experience” (Yeoman, Brass, & McMahon-Beattie, 2007), stakeholders can develop tourism activities around the social practices of the area. Also, these results will help local authorities devise effective development strategies.

Stakeholders can benefit from these results, by using industrial heritage resources as an instrument to involve residents in a twostep approach. Suggestions are as follows: first as consultors, asking them what they consider as authentic, and second as intervenient, calling on them to be a player in their own tourism activity. Furthermore, a tourism destination needs local support to properly convey industrial significance from a sociocultural and historical perspective. Eventually, residents will provide intrinsic, valuable, and fundamental knowledge of what they regard as authentic, improving the product offered and consequently enhancing and favouring endogenous tourists’ experiences.

Key findings of this research support that, applying management models suitable with the community interest, will lead to community tourism development acceptance, through spontaneous participation (Tosun, 2006). This can meet both tourists’ demand, who seek the authentic, and local communities that seek industrial heritage preservation and heritage value recognition, thus, aiming at individual and community wellbeing.

The findings offer an understanding of the relationship between perceived authenticity, support for tourism, and participation values, demonstrating that a community-wide analysis of heritage authenticity, is particularly useful in establishing a model of participatory strategies.

6. Limitations and future research
As a limitation, we highlight the fact that the study was carried out only in one Portuguese region, therefore cannot be generalized into other national or international industrial tourism regions. That being said, due in part to the intrinsic characteristics of the territory, the interpretation and implications of the study results should be considered with caution.

Another major limitation was due to the sampling collection period, during Covid 19 pandemics, thus we believe that the results might have been influenced by a negative perspective, as people might had
health related issues on their minds. The two types of sampling collection were also considered another limitation related to Covid 19 pandemics, as it was not possible to apply just face-to-face questionnaires. Concerning future studies, it would be relevant to include, as a way of complementing these results, qualitative methodologies, such as in-depth interviews and participant observation. The research results also suggest a number of possible lines of research, such as an industrial tourism destination sustainability analysis, through the stakeholders' lens. A future longitudinal study, to better confirm the hypothesis, would also be noteworthy.

7. Concluding remarks
To date, most of the research on authenticity has focused mainly on tourists’ perceptions, as a useful tool to explain tourists’ behavioural intentions towards a destination. However, based on the research procedures used in this study, it can be concluded that the results have highlighted the importance of studies on authenticity within a community, and that these may lead to more concerted planning of industrial cultural heritage, which, in the first instance will always be of local usage. Therefore, “tourism agents face (...) the double challenge, which consists, on the one hand, in the diagnosis of community engagement mechanisms (considering the local identity assumption as a differentiation factor of the tourism offer), on the other hand, in the experience intensifying factors diagnosis, doing justice to the primacy of the tourist experience” (Almeida & Pinto, 2017, p. 617).

The novelty of this study can be found in both considering perceived authenticity from the residents’ point of view, as the studies that explore authenticity from this approach are still scarce (Hsu, 2018), as well as linking authenticity with a community’s support for tourism and their ideals. Nevertheless, this is a fundamental research topic, due to the increasingly importance of considering residents in tourism development in general and, particularly, in industrial tourism (Vargas-Sánchez et al., 2007).

We conclude by highlighting that residents’ opinion about industrial tourism is crucial, as it will be reflected in the hospitality and, consequently, in the tourist experience. It is recognised that it is useful to integrate the community in tourism planning, by valuing their perception of authenticity, based on the assumption that the resident community, as workers or ex-workers, are also on stage to provide services to tourists, and are therefore at the centre of the authentic experience experienced by the tourist.
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