EXPERIENCE, DISCOVER & VALORISE HIDDEN TREASURE TOWNS AND SITES OF THE ADRIATIC AREA

EXCOVER – LOCAL SWOT REPORT

NAME OF THE CONCERNED LOCATION

NAME OF THE AUTHOR ORGANIZATION

OUTLINE

1. RESIDENTS' WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE

Name of the concerned location joined the EXCOVER Project aiming at improving its residents' life and economic conditions, while preserving the local cultural identity and environmental resources, through the development of sustainable tourism. To reach this goal, the participation of the local community in the tourism development planning and implementation phases is fundamental, in fact it is one of the main characteristics of tourism development processes to be sustainable. Thus, before going into the residents survey-based SWOT Analysis, main topic of this report, the willingness to participate in the local tourism development of the interviewees is investigated by means of a participation index, developed to meet the informative needs of EXCOVER.

The residents participation index is built with information of different kind, both direct (retrieved from the answers to specific questions) and indirect (making use of response rates), collected during the SWOT survey. The index is a weighted average of 5 components:

- "1_COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION": the evaluation of the extent to which the respondent's local community is willing to participate in the local tourist development (directly asked in the questionnaire and measured with the reported level of agreement, in the range [1, 7]);
- "2_MAIL LEFT": the actual willingness to be more involved and active in the tourism development planning (estimated indirectly with the rate of respondents who left their personal e-mail address to be contacted in the near future to provide further information about their town);
- "3_PERSONAL SHARING ATTITUDE": the self-reported willingness of the respondent to make use of sharing economy platforms to share something of his own with visitors (directly asked in the questionnaire).
- "4_WELCOMING COMMUNITY": the assessment of the extent to which tourists and people with different cultures are welcomed by the respondent's local community (directly asked in the questionnaire and measured with the reported level of agreement, in the range [1, 7]);
- "5_RESPONDENT ENGAGEMENT": the manifested intention to participate in the local tourism development by providing information (indirectly retrieved from the average response rate to the SWOT open-ended questions, that require a considerable involvement and effort, compared to closed-ended ones);

As the first 2 components of the index are expressed on a scale ranging between 1 and 7 (while the other components are rates), they are normalized by dividing the average level of agreement by the maximum value possible (that is 7), to facilitate comparisons. The 5 components are weighted based on their relative importance in the context of EXCOVER, especially in view of the forthcoming activities of the next working packages:

- weight of 1_COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION = 0.4
- weight of 2_MAIL LEFT = 0.2
- weight of 3_PERSONAL SHARING ATTITUDE = 0.2
- weight of 4_WELCOMING COMMUNITY = 0.1
- weight of 5_RESPONDENT ENGAGEMENT = 0.1

By construction, the minimum value of the participation index is 0, the maximum is 1.

1.1 ANALYSIS OF THE PARTICIPATION INDEX

In *Name of the concerned location,* the participation index and its 5 components, described above, take the following values:

GRAPH TO BE PASTED HERE

Comment the graph representing the Participation Index and its components for the whole sample, remembering that the maximum possible value is 1, the minimum is 0. Which component takes the highest value? Which one the lowest value? What does it mean in terms of availability of the local community to participate? Which are the consequences for the prosecution of the EXCOVER project? (refer to WP4 and WP5). How the respondents depict their fellow villagers' attitude towards participation to tourism development? Is it consistent with the respondents' own availability to participate? How can you explain possible discrepancies? (e.g. the community is depicted as very willing to participate, but respondents themselves are not or vice-versa).

Now look at the two graphs representing the values of the Participation Index and its components for males and females separately:

GRAPH TO BE PASTED HERE

Are there important differences in the respondents' availability to participate between males and females? What does it suggest for the prosecution of the project, in particular WP4 and WP5? Are there important differences in how the respondents depict their local community's availability to participate between males and females? Are there discrepancies with own willingness to participate? What does it suggest for the prosecution of the project, in particular WP4 and WP5?

Now look at the two graphs representing the values of the Participation Index and its components for juniors (respondents aged 15-34) and seniors (respondents aged 35 and more) separately:

GRAPH TO BE PASTED HERE

Are there important differences in the respondents' availability to participate between juniors and seniors? What does it suggest for the prosecution of the project, in particular WP4 and WP5? Are there important differences in how the respondents depict their local community's availability to participate between juniors and seniors? Are there discrepancies with own willingness to participate? What does it suggest for the prosecution of the project, in particular WP4 and WP5?

Now look at the two graphs representing the values of the Participation Index and its components for self-employed and respondents with other occupations (NON self-employed) separately:

GRAPH TO BE PASTED HERE

Are there important differences in the respondents' availability to participate between for self-employed and respondents with other occupations? What does it suggest for the prosecution of the project, in particular WP4 and WP5? Are there important differences in how the respondents depict their local community's availability to participate between for self-employed and respondents with other occupations? Are there discrepancies with own willingness to participate? What does it suggest for the prosecution of the project, in particular WP4 and WP5? It is often assumed that entrepreneurs are adverse to sharing economy, because they see it as a dangerous source of (maybe in their opinion not too fair) competition. Do these data confirm or disconfirm this assumption? How can you explain it? What does it suggest for the prosecution of the EXCOVER project, in particular WP4 and WP5?

2. RESIDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SHARING ECONOMY

Since EXCOVER aims at developing sustainable tourism in *Name of the concerned location,* where the local natural and cultural heritage constitute potential tourism attractions, but many tourist services and facilities are missing, a crucial phase of the project is dedicated to the construction or strengthening of the local supply chain. But the EXCOVER budget does allow to make big investments for building accommodation structures, restaurants, transportation services and the like. Therefore, a pivotal idea of

the project is to invite the local community to put into play their unused assets to deliver tourist services, by exploiting the new opportunities offered by the sharing economy. 'Sharing economy' means sharing something of a private's own with another person temporarily, in exchange for some money, through the web. Then, for the prosecution of the project, it is essential to understand on which private unused assets the construction of the supply chain can rely. To this aim, the SWOT questionnaire included 2 specific questions:

- In your opinion, what may your fellow villagers be willing to share?
- What would you share?

From the analysis of the correspondent answers, it emerges that *…*

Comment the graphs representing the assets respondents think their local community may be willing to share and those interviewees themselves are available to share. (On the bars you see the number of respondents who guessed that their local community is willing to share/declared to be themselves willing to share the correspondent asset).

GRAPH TO BE PASTED HERE

What do these data suggest for the prosecution of the EXCOVER project, especially in view of WP5? Which services and facilities can be offered by means of the sharing economy? Do you think that these assets meet the needs of potential visitors in the concerned location? Do you think that quantities are enough to start? Based on these answers, do you think that the services and facilities that can be developed through sharing economy platforms are complimentary to the supply of the local businesses? Or do they overlap with existing businesses? Do you foresee conflicts or synergies between local businesses and private residents willing to share their assets online?

Are there important discrepancies between what respondents declared to be themselves willing to share and what they think their fellow villagers may be available to share? How can you explain this? What does it suggest in the context of EXCOVER?

3. SWOT ANALYSIS OF THE LOCAL TOURISM SYSTEM

Although *Name of the concerned location* can lever on some tangible and intangible assets that are potentially attractive for tourists, to boost a sustainable tourism development, the tourism sector and its economic potential is still scarcely unfolded (as described in the Preparatory Local Report attached). Whence the need to deeply investigate how the local resources can be effectively employed to attract

and create value for visitors, why they are not currently source of economic growth, which opportunities should be caught, also in terms of valorizing underutilized or neglected assets, and which risks may arise. To this aim, the SWOT Analysis shown in the present Report was conducted.

The SWOT factors were identified through a semi-structured survey on the opinions of *number of interviewed people* residents, as the involvement of the locals is crucial to co-construct a tourism development consistent with their vision of the future of their own territory. The *face to face/phone* survey interviews were carried out *time span during which the interviews were performed* throughout *Name of the concerned location,* with a special focus on the city center and sites of tourist attractions. The resulting SWOT matrix was discussed with policy makers, who assigned a relative importance score to each SWOT factor, so that the subsequent strategic interventions can be effectively prioritized and financial resources can be efficiently allocated. The resulting weighted SWOT matrix is reported below.

SWOT MATRIX TO BE PASTED HERE

3.1 STRENGHTS OF THE LOCAL TOURISM SYSTEM

Describe the factors shown in the first quadrant of the SWOT matrix.

Discuss the importance order of such factors.

3.2 WEAKNESSES OF THE LOCAL TOURISM SYSTEM

Describe the factors shown in the second quadrant of the SWOT matrix.

Discuss the importance order of such factors.

3.3 OPPORTUNITIES FOR TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

Describe the factors shown in the third quadrant of the SWOT matrix.

Discuss the importance order of such factors.

3.4 THREATS TO TOURIST DEVELOPMENT

Describe the factors shown in the fourth quadrant of the SWOT matrix.

Discuss the importance order of such factors.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, assess the availability of the local community to participate in the local tourism development and to share own underutilized assets, as emerged from the SWOT survey, making explicit reference to the effects on the prosecution of the project.

Compare the emerged strengths and weaknesses of the involved area with the assets that residents declared to be willing to share. Can we expect that the gaps in the local tourism system can be, at least partially, filled through the sharing economy? In case there are inconsistencies between sharable assets, strengths and weaknesses (e.g. a weakness is 'too few accommodation structures' but residents are not willing to share accommodation; a strength is 'good transportation' and many residents are willing to share car rides/transportation), how can residents be persuaded to share what is needed instead? Which strategies can be put into place to exploit sharing economy at best?

Should we expect local businesses to suffer from the competition of the sharing economy? Do self-employed residents seem to fear such a competition, based on the survey?

Based on the external opportunities and threats, highlighted in the SWOT matrix, propose some possible tourism products that could be created and leveraged to increase the tourist inflows. Take into account the following questions: in the neighborhood, are there more popular destinations, overloaded with visitors, from where tourists could be induced to visit the destination of interest? How? Are there very similar locations, offering akin attractions and intercepting tourists, from which it would be profitable to

differentiate the destination positioning? How? Are there areas offering complimentary reasons of interest, with which to establish a synergic cooperation? How?

Draw suggestions to remove the actual and prospective obstacles to the development of sustainable tourism in the concerned location. Discuss any sustainability issue emerged.