

**AUTO-IMAGEN, AUTO-PERCEPCIÓN Y
AUTO-CONGRUENCIA EN LA DUALIDAD
RESIDENTE-TURISTA.
SELF-IMAGE, SELF-PERCEPTION, AND
SELF-CONGRUENCE IN THE RESIDENT-
TOURIST DUALITY**

RAQUEL CAMPRUBI¹

Universidad de Girona

SOLEDAD CANETTI²

Universidad de Girona

RESUMEN

Este estudio examina cómo las personas se autoperciben y comportan al transitar entre sus roles de residentes y turistas, abordando la limitada integración de esta perspectiva en la investigación turística. Partiendo del concepto de autopercepción y auto-congruencia, se explora si las personas mantienen actitudes y comportamientos consistentes en ambos roles o si exhiben formas de hipocresía moral. Mediante un enfoque cuantitativo exploratorio, se recopilaban datos a través de una encuesta en línea (n = 443) utilizando muestreo por conveniencia. Se aplicaron análisis factorial exploratorio, análisis de conglomerados y pruebas de chi-cuadrado para identificar perfiles de residentes y turistas y evaluar su alineación. Los resultados indican que, si bien generalmente prevalece la coherencia entre los roles, ciertos perfiles muestran inconsistencias entre su autopercepción y comportamiento. El estudio contribuye a una comprensión más integrada de los roles duales de residente-turista y proporciona directrices para futuras investigaciones en este campo.

Palabras clave: residentes, autopercepción, comportamiento turístico, hipocresía moral, auto-congruencia, tipologías turísticas.

ABSTRACT

This study examines how individuals perceive themselves and behave when transitioning between their roles as residents and tourists, addressing the limited integration of this perspective in tourism research. Drawing on the concept of self-perception and self-congruence, it explores whether individuals maintain consistent attitudes and behaviours across roles or exhibit forms of moral hypocrisy. Adopting an exploratory quantitative approach, data were collected through an online survey (n = 443) using convenience sampling. Exploratory factor analysis, cluster analysis, and Chi-

Fecha de Recepción: 30 de octubre de 2025 Fecha de Aceptación: 10 de junio de 2026

¹ Profesora Agregada. Universidad de Girona. Plaça Ferrater Mora, 1 17004 – Girona (España) ORCID: 0000-0001-7084-7889 E-mail: raquel.camprubi@udg.edu

² Investigadora independiente. Universidad de Girona Plaça Ferrater Mora, 1 17004 – Girona (España) ORCID: 0009-0001-2949-6164 E-mail. solecanetti@gmail.com

square tests were applied to identify resident and tourist profiles and assess their alignment. The results indicate that, while coherence between roles generally prevails, certain profiles display inconsistencies between self-perception and behaviour. The study contributes to a more integrated understanding of resident-tourist dual roles and provides directions for future research in this field.

Keywords: residents, self-perception, tourist behaviour, moral hypocrisy, self-congruence, tourist typologies

1. Introduction

Extensive research has explored tourist behaviour, self-perception, typologies, and their relationship with the tourism industry, as well as residents' perceptions and their support for tourism. However, studies that integrate the resident and tourist profiles to achieve a holistic understanding of individuals remain limited, even though every individual is a resident in their place of residence may also assume the role of tourist when travelling. Thus, a resident can be defined as an individual who lives permanently within a given territory and forms part of the local host community, participating in its everyday social, economic, and cultural life (e.g., Hall & Page, 2014; Sharpley, 2014). By contrast, a tourist is an individual who makes temporary departures from their residence for leisure or recreational purposes (Leiper, 1979; Lea et al., 1994). According to Leiper (1979), this distinction differentiates tourists from expatriates or emigrants, who relocate or become presently established in another place.

In this regard, examining individuals across their dual roles as residents and tourists offers a more comprehensive perspective on tourism-related attitudes and behaviours. Individuals who express opinions about tourism in their own destinations may adopt different behaviours when travelling themselves. In contexts characterised by mass tourism, where residents are frequently exposed to the impacts of tourism in their daily lives, understanding how individuals perceive and behave across these roles becomes particularly relevant. Analysing this relationship allows for a deeper understanding of whether attitudes, values, and behaviours remain consistent or vary depending on the role individuals assume.

Addressing this gap requires a conceptual lens capable of linking behaviour across roles. In this regard, the concept of self-image provides a particularly relevant framework. Introduced by Sirgy (1985), self-image helps explain how individuals perceive themselves and how this perception influences their attitudes, preferences and behaviours. In tourism research, self-image has been used to explore the relationship between individual identity and tourist behaviour, as well as the way people position themselves in relation to tourism practices.

An individual's self-image can be connected to various tourist typologies proposed in the literature. For instance, Plog (1974; 2001) classified tourists based on psychological traits, while MacCannell (1973), Boissevain (2005), and Di Betta (2014) examined tourists according to their search for authentic experiences. Similarly, Galani-Moutafi (2000) categorised tourists according to their travel motivations. Building on foundational typology research, recent studies have adopted more dynamic, identity- and value-oriented

segmentation models that link tourist typologies to self-concept (Gardiner et al., 2023), lifestyle characteristics (Parra Vargas et al., 2021), personal values (Zhang et al., 2024), and the challenges of defining and identifying tourists based on user-generated-photos in social media (Mor et al., 2023).

Another important aspect concerns individuals' self-perception regarding the positive or negative evaluation of tourists. Due to overcrowding and the disruptive behaviour sometimes associated with tourism, the term 'tourist' has often acquired negative connotations, being linked to images of irresponsible, consumerist, and disrespectful behaviour (Turner and Ash, 1997). Recent research shows how overtourism and residents' negative stereotypes and emotional responses towards tourists are shaped by perceived crowding and pressure on local life (Gössling, McCabe, & Chen, 2020; González-Reverté, 2022; Tse & Tung, 2025).

Consequently, some individuals reject the label of 'tourist' and instead identify themselves as 'travellers' or 'adventurers' to distance themselves from these stereotypes (Culler, 1981; Jacobsen, 2000; Prebensen et al., 2003; McCabe, 2005). At the same time, concepts like 'ethical tourist', 'responsible tourist', and 'ecotourist' have emerged, emphasising a commitment to responsible and conscious travel practices that seek to minimise negative impacts on destinations (Goodwin and Francis, 2003; Weeden, 2002; Das and Chatterjee, 2015). However, research also shown that individuals who identify with these labels do not always behave consistently with the values they claim to support, revealing potential forms of moral hypocrisy (McDonald et al., 2015; Hales and Caton, 2017; Mkonos, 2020).

In this context, further research is needed to examine whether individuals maintain consistent attitudes and behaviours across their dual roles as residents and tourists and explore the extent to which living in destinations that frequently host tourists may influence individuals' own tourism-related behaviours when travelling.

This study pursues two main objectives. First, it aims to analyse how individuals perceive themselves and behave as they transition between their roles as residents and tourists. Second, it seeks to explore the degree of coherence (self-congruence) or inconsistency (moral hypocrisy) between individuals' stated values and their actual behaviours when moving between these roles.

More specifically, the study examines how residents perceive themselves in these dual roles, their level of support for tourism development in their own place of residence, their attitudes toward tourists, whether they adopt common stereotypes associated with tourists, and the types of tourists they ultimately become when travelling themselves. From an empirical perspective, the study seeks to identify different resident and tourist profiles and to analyse the extent to which their defining characteristics align or contrast across these two roles.

By systematically identifying and comparing resident and tourist profiles within the same individuals, this research contributes to the literature by providing a more integrated understanding of how tourism-related attributes and behaviours are shaped across roles. In particular, it advances existing research by linking self-perception, tourist typologies, and the concept of self-congruence (consistency)

or moral hypocrisy (inconsistency) in the context of resident–tourist dynamics.

This paper is structured as follows. First, the literature review outlines the general framework of self-perception, with particular attention to its specificities in the context of tourists and residents. The concept of moral hypocrisy is then introduced to account for potential inconsistencies in individual self-congruence. Second, the methodology section details the research design, measurement instrument, data collection process, and analytical procedures. Third, the results are presented, followed by the conclusions, where the findings are discussed and the main limitations and avenues for future research are outlined.

2. Literature Review.

2.1 Self-perception

Self-perception is an individual's perception of themselves, based not only on physical appearance but also on products and services they consume and associate with themselves (Todd, 2001). Although the concept was initially treated as unidimensional in the literature (Birdwell, 1968; Grubb and Hupp, 1968), Sirgy (1985), later emphasised that it encompasses multiple dimensions of self, such as the real self, ideal self, social self, and real social self-image, and introduces the concept known as self-congruence. This term applies particularly when an individual consumes products or services that align with their ideal self-image.

Both the cognitive and affective dimensions of human beings interact in the perception process (Hansen, 2005). Additionally, diverse perceptions can lead to variations in the conative component or behavioural intentions of individuals. The way each individual perceives a situation and their self-perception in that context influences their behaviour (Cohen, 1979).

Regarding self-perception and identity, Galani-Moutafi (2000) suggests that travel is significant as it interconnects space, time, distance, and the internal and external dimensions. All these concepts strengthen the construction of the self in relation to the perceived differences with others.

2.2 Tourists' self-perception

The way in which individuals interpret the term 'tourist' is crucial to their self-perception. A substantial body of literature has shown that the label 'tourist' is often associated with negative stereotypes, such as superficiality, lack of authenticity, or culturally insensitive behaviour (e.g., MacCannell, 1973; Culler, 1981; Urry, 1990). As a result, many prefer to identify as 'atypical tourists' (Prebensen et al., 2003; Culler, 1981) or adopt alternative labels like 'adventurers' or 'travellers' to distinguish themselves from the stereotypical tourist (Jacobsen, 2000; McCabe, 2005). This is also the case of backpackers who have the tendency to define themselves as travellers rather than tourists (Uriely, 2009). Pellicer and Camprubí (2021) in their research on self-perception of cultural tourists, states that the negativity associated with 'tourist' does not come from self-perception but from what is socially associated with that term. Therefore, other's opinions influence self-perception as a tourist, and only when visitors perceive negative attitudes towards

tourism among residents of the destination do they seek to avoid being identified as tourists (Pellicer and Camprubí, 2021). This aligns with what Culler (1981, p. 4) states: “part of what is involved in being a tourist is disliking tourists (both other tourists and the fact that one is oneself a tourist). Tourists can always find someone more touristy than themselves to sneer at”.

Building on Sirgy's (1985) development of self-perception, the different types of tourists can be linked to their ideal and actual self-image in relation to the categories of tourists developed by Plog (1974, 2001) in the psychology of travel. Plog (1974) distinguishes two opposing categories: allocentric tourists, who seek to experience destinations like locals, a group in which those tourists who do not perceive themselves as typical tourists might be included; and psychocentric tourists, who seek comfort and destinations that have been visited and tested by other tourists. Between these extremes, there are countless variations, blending characteristics of both categories. This classical classification remains widely accepted in the academic literature in the field (Cruz-Milán, 2024).

All this information and the distinctions made about tourists and their self-perceptions are valuable for the tourism sector, as they help adapt products and services to the various self-definitions of its customers (Bruner, 1991). Studies of tourist behaviour and travel motivations are also widely used, including tourist behaviour based on the conceptual and behavioural nature of the concept (Fodness, 1994), the relationship between positive psychology and travel behaviour (Pearce, 2009; Vada et al., 2019); and the link between motivations, destination choice, and behaviour at the destination (Mansfeld, 1992; Dale et al., 2020). More specifically, in the case of cultural tourists, research has focused on the type of tour they engage in according to their experiential expectation (Donaire et al., 2006); their interest in cultural sites (Lynch et al., 2011); their level of participation and enjoyment in cultural activities (van der Ark and Richards, 2006) and how their motivations shape the activities they choose, which influence their destination selection (Douglas et al., 2024).

These patterns of behaviour and motivation are closely linked to the concept of self-congruence in tourism, whereby a destination's image aligns with a tourist's real or ideal self-concept, increasing the likelihood of visiting that place (Beerli et al., 2007); in this way, travel choices can be understood as an extension of the self, symbolically reinforcing aspirations for personal fulfilment, social acceptance, and prestige.

2.3 Resident's self-perception and attitude towards tourism

In the case of residents, their self-perception (Sirgy, 1985) is intrinsically linked to the image of the place and the values associated with their personality or status. Specifically, their actual self-congruence reflects how they perceive themselves in relation to the image of the place, while their ideal self-congruence represents how they would like to perceive themselves in alignment with the destination's image.

On the other hand, the concept of social self-congruence, which involves the relationship between how people believe others perceive them and the image of the place (Hosany and Martin 2012;

Sirgy, 1985). Additionally, according to Šegota et al. (2022, 9. 803), “ideal social self-congruity is the ‘ideal’ of how residents would like to be seen by others and how this perception aligns with the place at the core of this ‘self’ dimension”.

Personal identification with attributes that represent a destination and differentiate it from others can contribute to a positive self-perception and foster a sense of belonging (Zenker and Petersen, 2011). Similarly, the level of attachment to a place has been shown to affect self-esteem (Korpela, 1989; Gu and Ryan, 2008; Zenker and Petersen, 2011) and can create “a strong connection between the self and the place on the levels of emotion, cognition, and values” (Zenker and Petersen, 2011, p. 6).

In relation to the tourism their place of residence receives, some researchers suggest that the more a resident value the positive effects of tourism, the more support they will give to the sector and its development (Perdue et al., 1990; Andereck and Vogt, 2000; Sharpley, 2014). In this regard, Wang and Xu (2015) add that residents’ feelings towards tourism also depend on their self-concept as a ‘tourist’, their travel behaviours, and their perception of the social and economic benefits it generates.

The reasons why residents oppose tourism are often linked to the perception of their identity, in relation to the place, is threatened by tourism development (Mason and Cheyne, 2000). This can also be due to their sense of rootedness in the community, specifically, the more attachment, length of residence, place of birth, and ethnic heritage they have, the more negatively they perceive the effects of tourism on their place of residence (Um and Crompton, 1987). Other factors that may affect positive or negative identification with the city include population density (Gu and Ryan, 2008), size, and the state of tourism development (Wang and Xu, 2015).

In some cases, negative perceptions of tourism development can intensify, leading to reactions associated with tourism-phobia in contexts of tourist overcrowding, where pressure on local life and perceived impacts generate tensions between residents and visitors (Gössling et al., 2020). Frequently, overcrowding has generated social and urban planning problems, particularly in the urban centres of large cities (Dodds and Butler, 2019; Milano et al., 2019).

In recent years, the concept of overtourism has become widely used, although the first definitions in the academic literature date back to Doxey (1975), who identified symptoms of irritability among residents due to the excessive tourism in the Niagara Falls area. Meanwhile, Kreag (2001) states that while tourism has contributed to job creation and economic development in communities, it has also led to anti-tourist manifestations caused by the behaviour of some tourists who, due to a lack of education, desecrate sacred sites or destroy cultural heritage.

2.4 Resident-tourist duality and the concept of moral hypocrisy

As discussed in the previous sections regarding tourists’ and residents’ self-perceptions, numerous studies have examined the relationship between these perceptions and individuals’ attitudes and support for tourism development (Sirgy, 1985; Hosany & Martin, 2012; Šegota et al., 2022). In the case of residents, the literature highlights how their self-perception and identification with the place influence their evaluation of tourism impacts (Zenker & Petersen,

2011; Gu & Ryan, 2008; Korpela, 1989). Furthermore, research in related fields has addressed the issue of incongruence between individuals' stated self-perceptions and their actual behaviour, more specifically pointing to the moral hypocrisy that can emerge when people claim to act responsibly towards tourism but do not consistently apply these attitudes in practice (Wang & Xu, 2015; Pellicer & Camprubí, 2021).

Moral hypocrisy can be defined as acting in a way that contradicts our beliefs (Valdesolo and DeSteno, 2007); that is, as an incongruence between our personal behaviours and what we publicly express (McDermott et al., 2015). Moral hypocrisy can also be understood as being unfaithful to our own principles, values, or standards, which represents a form of inauthenticity. This occurs when we impose moral standards on ourselves that we do not apply to others (Boaks and Levine, 2015; Tong and Yang, 2011). A person can be considered inauthentic when they fail to respect their own identity or values, when they deny parts of the experiences that have shaped who they have become (Rinder and Campbell, 1952), or when they conceal their 'real self' by pretending to feel something that is not true (Olsen, 2002; Steiner and Reisinger, 2006; Wang, 1999).

According to Graham *et al.* (2015), three types of moral hypocrisy can be distinguished: (a) moral weakness, which is private and personal, occurring when individuals fail to live according to their moral principles; (b) moral duplicity, which arises when individuals publicly advocate for something while acting in opposition to it; and (c) double standards, which occurs when individuals criticize others' transgressions more harshly than their own, even if the transgressions are identical. Therefore, it can be understood that, depending on the case, inauthenticity can be viewed as both an intra and interpersonal phenomenon, serving as an indicator of the level of self-congruence (Lenton et al., 2014). This condition of inauthenticity is dynamic, representing a constant internal negotiation between personal desires, needs, and emotions, and whether, or not, one behaves accordingly.

In addition to Graham *et al.*'s (2015) three types, other approaches distinguish moral hypocrisy based on intentions versus actions (Batson et al., 1997), circumstances and reasons where words-actions gaps elicit negative responses (Effron et al., 2018), the flexibility of moral standards according to social context (Valdesolo & DeSteno, 2007), and self-concept maintenance explaining why individuals pursue personal gains while trying to preserve a moral self-image (Mazar et al., 2008), offering complementary perspectives on the discrepancy between declared attitudes and actual behaviour.

Considering the hedonic nature of tourism, it can lead to a temporary suspension of morality, allowing tourists to deviate from their usual ideals and moral standards while on vacation (Mkono, 2020). Even tourists who perceive themselves as ecotourists create contradictions, as, despite being aware of the environmental damage caused by air travel, most still choose it as their primary mode of transportation (McDonald et al., 2015; Hales and Caton, 2017). This change in attitude and behaviour reflects elements of moral hypocrisy, as it highlights the inconsistency between individuals' expressed values and their actual actions, making it a critical aspect to be studied.

3. Methodology

3.1. Study design

This study adopts a quantitative, exploratory, and inductive research design. The inductive approach is appropriate given that no a priori hypotheses were formulated; instead, the objective was to allow latent structures and respondent profiles to emerge from the data through multivariate statistical techniques. The research seeks to examine individuals' self-perception and self-congruence during their transition from residents to tourists through an empirical, data-driven process.

3.2. Measurements instrument

The questionnaire was developed on the basis of established academic literature (Table 1) and integrates complementary theoretical frameworks in order to address the multidimensional nature of the resident-tourist relationship. Specifically, the instrument draws on Plog's (1974, 2001) psychographic model to assess psychological characteristics of tourists; on place attachment and sense of belonging literature (Bustillo-Castillejo et al., 2021; Gu & Ryan, 2008; Zenker & Petersen, 2011); on destination identification and satisfaction models (Gu & Ryan, 2008; Wang & Xu, 2015); on studies examining perceived tourism impacts and overtourism (Veríssimo et al., 2020); and on research exploring the distinction between 'tourist' and 'traveller' self-perception (Jacobsen, 2000; McCabe, 2005). The combination of these models does not constitute a methodological hybrid in an arbitrary sense, but rather a theoretically grounded integration of constructs that together capture psychological, relational, and perceptual dimensions relevant to the study.

The instrument was structured into three sections. The first section included 17 items measuring psychological characteristics associated with tourist behaviour. The second section comprised 18 items addressing sense of belonging to the city, identification and satisfaction with the place of residence, and perceptions of tourism and overtourism impacts. The third section included one categorical item measuring self-perception of the term 'tourist' versus 'traveller', together with demographic questions for profiling purposes. In total, the questionnaire included 36 attitudinal items measured on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree), plus one single-choice categorical item (tourist/traveller) and demographic variables. The Likert scale was selected due to its extensive use in social sciences for measuring attitudes and facilitating quantitative analysis (Matas, 2018).

It is important to note that although the study is exploratory and does not test causal hypotheses, the analytical structure distinguishes between explanatory constructs and outcome classifications. Therefore, psychological characteristics, sense of belonging, identification and satisfaction with the city, and perceptions of tourism impacts function as explanatory dimensions. The resulting cluster memberships and self-identification as 'tourist' or 'traveller' are treated as outcome variables in the relational analysis.

Table 1.
Variables and Sources Used in the Survey Design

Dimension	ID code	Variables	Authors
Psychological characteristics of tourists	P1	Preference for popular destinations	Plog (1974, 2001)
	P2	Preference for destinations recommended by family and friends	
	P3	Preference for traveling to nearby destinations	
	P4	Preference for unknown or exotic destinations	
	P5	Priority for comfort and safety while traveling	
	P6	Preference for traveling alone	
	P7	Preference for interacting with locals	
	P8	Comfort in revisiting familiar places	
	P9	Impulsive decision-making	
	P10	Perceived control over most aspects of life	
	P11	Preference for trying new products on the market	
	P12	Preference for consuming popular products	
	P13	Enjoyment of routine	
	P14	Tolerance to uncertainty	
	P15	Engaging in multiple activities in daily life	
	P16	Self-confidence	
	P17	Anxiety	
Sense of belonging to the city	SB1	The place is part of my identity	Bustillo-Castillejo et al. (2021); Gu and Ryan (2008); Zenker and Petersen (2011)
Identification with the city and satisfaction level	IC1	It gives me a good reputation and prestige	Gu and Ryan (2008), Wang and Xu (2015)
	IC2	It is a safe place	
	IC3	The cost of living is affordable	
	IC4	It is accessible and easy to move around	
	IC5	The population size matches the capacity of the area	
	IC6	It has good services and infrastructure	
	IC7	I think visitors are too intrusive in our daily lives	
	IC8	I feel proud to live here	

	IC9	I have a valued network of friends and family here	
	IC10	I actively participate in my community	
	IC11	I support tourism development here	
	IC12	Overall satisfaction level	
Perception of the effects of tourism and overtourism	PT1	Prices have increased	Veríssimo et al. (2020)
	PT2	Many residents have had to leave	
	PT3	The residential environment has changed	
	PT4	The number of visitors exceeds the area's capacity	
	PT5	Residents have had to adapt	
Self-perception of the term 'tourist'	SP1	Self-perception of the term 'tourist' versus 'traveller'	Jacobsen (2000) McCabe (2005)

Source: Authors' own

3.3. Data collection and sampling

Data were collected through an online survey administered between April 28 and May 24, 2023. The questionnaire was disseminated via Instagram and Facebook by sharing a public survey link. The online format was selected to facilitate broad and efficient access to respondents within the available research timeframe, to ensure anonymity, and to encourage voluntary participation. Respondents accessed the questionnaire through open dissemination on social media platforms. Participation was entirely voluntary, and informed consent was obtained at the beginning of the survey.

Table 2.
Sample profile

Category	%
Gender	
<i>Female</i>	67.30
<i>Male</i>	29.60
<i>Other</i>	3.20
Age	
<i>17-20</i>	2.30
<i>21-40</i>	46.70
<i>41-60</i>	34.80
<i>> 60</i>	16.30
Origin	
<i>Latin America</i>	57.10
<i>Europe</i>	35.90
<i>Other</i>	7.00

Source: Authors' own

The sampling strategy corresponds to non-probability convenience sampling (Altinay and Paraskevas, 2008), as participants were recruited through digital networks accessible to the researcher and extended online communities. While participation was open, the recruitment channel does not allow for probabilistic representativeness.

To ensure an adequate sample size, the minimum number of responses was calculated using the standard formula for estimating proportions in large populations, assuming a 95% confidence level, a 5% margin of error, and maximum variability ($p = 0.5$). This calculation established a minimum requirement of 384 valid responses. A total of 443 valid questionnaires were ultimately collected, exceeding the minimum threshold and thereby enhancing the robustness of the statistical analysis. The profile of the sample is presented in Table 2.

The research adopts a cross-sectional design, as data were collected during a single time period (Cummings, 2018). This four-week timeframe was defined in accordance with the research schedule and was considered sufficient to reach the required sample size while maintaining temporal homogeneity in respondents' perceptions. The objective was to capture individuals' perceptions at a specific moment rather than to analyse longitudinal changes; consequently, the findings reflect attitudes and self-perceptions as experienced during that defined period.

3.4 Data analysis

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS 24.0 statistical software and followed three main stages. First, exploratory factor analysis was performed. According to Hair et al. (1999), factor analysis is an interdependence technique whose primary purpose is to define the underlying structure among the variables in the analysis. Two separate factor analyses were conducted: one based on residents' attitudes and perceptions (including sense of belonging to the city; identification with their city and level of satisfaction; and perception of the effects of tourism and overtourism), and another addressing psychological characteristics of tourists. In both cases, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used as the extraction method, combined with VARIMAX rotation method with Kaiser normalization, to ensure a clearer and more interpretable factor structure (Hair et. al., 1999).

Second, a hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted to identify homogeneous groups among the respondents both to categorize residents and to distinguish different tourist profiles. Cluster analysis is a multivariate classification technique aiming to group data in a reduced number of mutually exclusive clusters (Baggio and Klobas, 2011). Several methodological decisions were made in conducting the cluster analysis. Firstly, average linkage was applied as a classification algorithm. This method is based on an agglomeration criterion that considers the average distance between all individuals in one cluster and those in another. It helps generate more balanced clusters, reduces sensitivity to extreme values, and tends to form groups with similar levels of internal variation (Hair et al., 1999). Square Euclidean distance was elected as the most appropriate similarity measure (Cea, 2004). Cluster solutions ranging

from two to six groups were examined for both residents' and tourists' profiles. The final solution was based on its interpretability, theoretical coherence, and variance explained (Hair et al., 2019). The cluster labels were assigned for descriptive and interpretative purposes based on the dominant characteristics of each group and should not be understood as formally validated tourist categories.

Finally, to assess the alignment between these classifications, a Chi-square test was performed to determine whether there was a significant association between the two groupings. This statistical test allowed to evaluate whether the patterns observed in one classification were consistent with those in the other, providing insights into the relationship between resident categories and tourist profiles. Additionally, the relationship between resident cluster membership and self-identification as 'tourists' or 'travellers' was analysed and reported.

4. Results.

4.1 Residents' typology

To define the types of residents, according to variables of perception of the territory where they live, both in relation to tourism and to their daily life in it, first the exploratory factor analysis was carried out, which allowed grouping the variables into 4 factors that explain 60.2% of the variance, and group 18 of the 19 variables initially proposed in the model.

Table 3.

Factor analysis of residents' profile.

Variables	Mean	S.D.	Factor 1_r. Effects of tourism on the place of residence	Factor 2_r. Territory characteristics	Factor 3_r. Identity and satisfaction with the place of residence	Factor 4_r. Connection and participation with the place of Residence	Eigenvalue	Explained variance
PT3	2.37	1.076	0.842				3.301	19.417
PT2	2.95	1.244	0.832					
PT4	2.14	1.071	0.815					
PT5	2.43	1.166	0.788					
PT1	3.24	1.213	0.719					
IC4	3.59	1.115		0.746			3.074	18.084
IC3	2.65	1.208		0.724				
IC5	3.45	1.178		0.715				
IC6	3.58	1.04		0.694				
IC2	3.67	1.066		0.667				
SB1	4.06	1.006			0.729		1.977	11.628
IC12	3.96	0.809			0.639			
IC1	3.12	1.073			0.636			
IC8	3.75	1.009			0.596			
IC11	4.04	1.063				0.789	1.874	11.023
IC9	4.15	0.996				0.747		
IC10	2.97	1.181				0.554		

Source: Authors' own

The variable IC7 was excluded from the factor analysis because its Measure of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) was below 0.5, indicating insufficient suitability for factor analysis. As a result, it was removed from the analysis. The values in the KMO test (0.821) and Bartlett's test (Sig. <.000) confirm the significance of this analysis, and the Cronbach's Alpha value (0.774) confirms its reliability. These factors explain how residents identify themselves with their territory and their level of satisfaction and support for tourism, as can be seen in Table 3.

Once the factor analysis had been carried out, a hierarchical cluster analysis suggested the existence of four cluster groups representing different residents' profiles (Table 4). These groups depict different levels of belonging sense, identification with the place of residence, satisfaction levels, perceptions of the tourism effects and support to tourism development.

- **Cluster 1 – Participative.** This group is the largest, comprising 40.9% of the sample. Their scores are above the mean for participation, close to the mean for identity, satisfaction, and tourism effects, and below the mean for the characteristics of the territory. Based on these findings, they can be described as moderately rooted in their community, with high levels of activity and participation but dissatisfaction with the services and benefits available in their place of residence. They maintain a relatively neutral stance on the effects of tourism in their area.
- **Cluster 2 – Outsiders.** This is the smallest group, representing 7.2% of the sample. Individuals in this cluster score below average in all factors. They are largely indifferent to the city, do not feel a sense of belonging, and neither participate in nor engage with it. Furthermore, they are the ones who perceive the negative effects of tourism the least. Despite their lack of involvement, they are also the most dissatisfied with the characteristics of the area.
- **Cluster 3 – Enthusiastic.** This cluster represents 29.3% of the sample. These residents score above average in factors related to territorial characteristics, identity, and satisfaction; close to average in participation; and below average in perceiving the negative effects of tourism. They can be defined as loyal promoters of their territory, demonstrating strong commitment, deep-rootedness, active participation, and high satisfaction. Additionally, they are very pleased with the characteristics and services of their place of residence and perceive minimal negative impacts from tourism.
- **Cluster 4 – Protectionists.** This group comprises 22.6% of the sample. Residents in this cluster score close to the average in all factors, except for the perception of tourism's negative effects, where they are above average. They are characterized by a generally acceptable level of satisfaction with their territory, a sense of belonging, and fairly active participation. However, they are also the most critical of tourism's impact and, as a result, the most opposed to its development in their place of residence.
-

Table 4.
ANOVA test - Residents' profile.

	Cluster 1. Participative (40.9%)	Cluster 2. Outsiders (7.2%)	Cluster 3. Enthusias- tic (29.3%)	Cluster 4. Protectio- nists (22.6%)	Mean	F	Sig.
Factor 1_r	2.5271	1.9188	2.1538	3.6420	2.6253	96.341	0.000
Factor 2_r	2.9492	2.0250	4.1569	3.6220	3.3887	211.348	0.000
Factor 3_r	3.6727	3.0938	4.0865	3.5450	3.7235	25.282	0.000
Factor 4_r	4.0442	2.2604	3.8641	3.4033	3.7178	76.056	0.000

Source: Authors' own

4.2 Tourists' typology

An exploratory factor analysis was also conducted on individuals' personalities as tourists. This analysis generated four factors that explain 53.2% of the variance and included 13 out of the 17 variables initially proposed in the model. P4, P9, P11, and P17 were excluded because their MSA values were below 0.5, indicating insufficient suitability for factor analysis. The KMO value (.748) and Bartlett's test (Sig. < .001) confirm the significance of the analysis, while the Cronbach's alpha value (.633) indicates an acceptable level of internal consistency. Although the reliability coefficient is moderate, it exceeds the minimum threshold of .60 commonly accepted for exploratory research (Hair et al., 2019). The identified factors capture various personality traits that shape individuals' self-perception as tourists, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5.
Factor analysis of tourists' profile.

Variables	Mean	S.D.	Factor 1_t. Safety and Control in Travel	Factor 2_t. Activity and Sociability	Factor 3_t. Routine and Consumption of Popular Products	Factor 4_t. Independence	Eigenvalue	Explained variance
P3	2.58	1.082	0.712				1.914	14.72
P8	3.36	1.126	0.659					
P5	3.48	1.132	0.63					
P2	3.58	1.038	0.566					
P15	3.93	0.969		0.754			1.32	10.153
P16	3.98	0.859		0.696				
P7	3.99	1.026		0.619				
P10	3.22	0.966			0.675		1.819	13.991
P13	3.28	1.01			0.638			
P1	3.16	1.088			0.581			
P12	2.97	1.027			0.551			
P14	2.8	1.133				0.691	1.865	14.35
P6	1.94	1.119				0.659		

Source: Authors' own

Based on the personality traits factors, a cluster analysis was conducted in order to identify tourists' personality profiles. As a result, 5 tourists' profiles were identified (Table 6).

- **Cluster 1 – Intrepid tourists.** This is the largest group and comprises 33% of the sample. Individuals in this cluster are characterized as adventurous, fearless, and highly social, with

a preference for exotic or unfamiliar destinations and solo travel. These traits are reflected in the analysis, which shows that they score above average in independence and slightly above average in sociability. Conversely, they score below average in prioritizing safety and comfort, as well as in choosing popular destinations and products.

- **Cluster 2 – Flexible tourists.** This group comprises 17.6% of the sample. Individuals in this cluster are characterized by a balance between choosing popular and safe destinations while also being open to solo travel and engaging with locals. They are self-confident, independent, and adaptable. Notably, they score above average in all factors.
- **Cluster 3 – Conventional tourists.** This cluster includes 29.8% of the sample. They are identified by their choice of popular destinations and products; they are influenced by what the majority in society dictates. Likewise, they carry out few activities in their daily lives, they are quiet and a bit antisocial. In terms of their values, they are above average in their choice of popular products and destinations and close to average in terms of preferences for security, control and independence. However, they are below average in their level of activity and sociability.
- **Cluster 4 – Contradictory tourists.** This group is the smallest, representing 4.3% of the sample. They are wanderers who prefer exotic destinations and enjoy trying new products. However, they also exhibit low levels of independence and self-confidence. Their profile contrasts with that of the flexible travellers, as all their values are below average.
- **Cluster 5 – Insecure tourists.** This cluster accounts of the 15.3% of the sample. Individuals integrating this group are characterized by being sociable and active, but insecure. In their travels they prioritize comfort, safety and control, and tend to choose recommended or popular destinations. They are above average in prioritizing safety and control, and slightly above average in preferring popular products. They are also well below average in independence.

Table 6.
ANOVA test - Tourists' profile

	Cluster					Total	F	Sig.
	Cluster 1. Intrepid (33%)	2. Flexible (17.6%)	Cluster 3. Conventional 1 (29.8%)	Cluster 4. Contradictor y (4.3%)	Cluster 5. Insecure (15.3%)			
Factor 1_t	2.933	3.689	3.178	1.921	3.934	3.249	67.536	0.000
Factor 2_t	4.187	4.248	3.528	2.632	4.407	3.968	68.562	0.000
Factor 3_t	2.748	3.439	3.504	2.026	3.360	3.158	65.767	0.000
Factor 4_t	2.706	3.205	1.962	1.790	1.632	2.368	70.071	0.000

Source: Authors' own

4.3 Analysis of the resident-tourist behaviour duality

After identifying the profiles of residents and tourists, a bivariate analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between the two clusters and assess the consistency between individuals' self-

perception and their behaviour when transitioning from residents to tourists (Table 7). The results of the Chi-squared test ($\chi^2 = 129.874$, $p < 0.001$) and Cramer's V (0.313) confirm a statistically significant association between these variables.

From this crossover analysis, it was found that the majority of 'participative residents' identify as 'intrepid tourists' (39.2%). This group consists of individuals who are moderately rooted in their territory, actively participate in their community, yet feel dissatisfied with the benefits of their place of residence and remain relatively indifferent to tourism. When traveling, they adopt an adventurous approach, preferring to explore unknown destinations alone and engaging socially.

Among 'outsider residents', the predominant tourist profile is 'contradictory tourists' (40.6%). These individuals, as locals, do not engage with their place of residence and are the most dissatisfied with its services, yet they do not perceive tourism's negative effects. As tourists, they express a preference for exotic destinations but exhibit low levels of self-confidence and independence.

For 'enthusiastic residents', the most common tourist profile is that of 'conventional tourists' (35.4%). These individuals display a strong sense of belonging and satisfaction with their territory, along with high support for tourism. However, they are independent and confident yet not very sociable, engaging in relatively few activities in their daily lives. As tourists, they tend to favour popular products and destinations.

Lastly, 'protectionist residents' are most frequently classified as 'intrepid tourists' (35.0%). Although they exhibit moderate satisfaction and attachment to their territory and have low tolerance for tourism, they become travellers who prefer to explore unknown or exotic destinations alone.

Table 7.
Cross-tabulation residents-tourists clusters

		Cluster of tourists					Total
		Cluster 1.	Cluster 2.	Cluster 3.	Cluster 4.	Cluster 5.	
		<i>Intrepid</i>	<i>Flexible</i>	<i>Conventional</i>	<i>Contradictory</i>	<i>Insecure</i>	
Clusters of residents	<i>Cluster 1. Participative</i>	39.20%	18.20%	26.50%	0.60%	15.50%	100.00%
	<i>Cluster 2. Outsiders</i>	18.0%	6.30%	31.30%	40.60%	3.10%	100.00%
	<i>Cluster 3. Enthusiastic</i>	26.20%	15.40%	35.40%	0.80%	22.30%	100.00%
	<i>Cluster 4. Protectionists</i>	35.00%	23.00%	28.00%	4.00%	10.00%	100.00%
Total	N	146	78	132	19	68	443
	% into residents	33.00%	17.60%	29.80%	4.30%	15.30%	100.00%

Source: Authors' own

The residents' profile was also analysed based on their self-identification when traveling (tourist or traveller), following Jacobsen (2000) and McCabe (2005). More than half prefer to identify themselves as 'travellers' (55.3%) rather than 'tourists'

(44.7%). The results confirm a statistically significant relationship between the residents' profile and their self-identification when traveling (table 8). Additionally, 'participative residents' (44.5%) and 'protectionist residents' (24.9%) predominantly self-identify as travellers, while 'enthusiastic residents' mainly refer to themselves as tourists (36.9%).

Table 8.*Cross-tabulation of residents' clusters by self-identification*

		Self-denomination		
		Tourist (n=198)	Traveler (n=245)	Total (n=443)
Clusters of residents	Cluster 1. Participative	36,40%	44,50%	40,90%
	Cluster 2. Outsiders	7,10%	7,30%	7,20%
	Cluster 3. Enthusiastic	36,90%	23,30%	29,30%
	Cluster 4. Protectionists	19,70%	24,90%	22,60%
Total		100,00%	100,00%	100,00%

Chi-squared: 9.999; Cramer's V: 0.150; p-value 0.019.

Source: Authors' own

5. Conclusions.

The purpose of this study was first to analyse how individuals perceive themselves and behave when transitioning between their roles as residents and tourists; and second, to examine the extent to which these transitions reflect self-congruence (consistency) or moral hypocrisy (inconsistency) between stated values and actual behaviours. To address these objectives, a quantitative, exploratory, and inductive research design approach based on an online survey was employed, enabling the identification and comparison of resident and tourist profiles within the same individuals.

The findings provide a clear response to both objectives. First, they suggest that individuals adopt differentiated yet interconnected profiles across their roles, supporting the existence of a resident-tourist duality. Second, the results indicate that most transitions between roles are coherent, suggesting that individuals generally maintain consistency between their attitudes and behaviours. However, the analysis also may suggest specific instances of inconsistency that can be interpreted as forms of moral hypocrisy, as defined by Graham *et al.* (2015).

More specifically, the transition from 'participative residents' to 'intrepid tourists' appears coherent. Individuals who are critical of tourism in their place of residence tend to favour independent travel, unfamiliar destinations, and risk-taking experiences. This behaviour can be interpreted as an intentional distancing from mass tourism. Their preference for identifying themselves as travellers rather than tourists reinforces this positioning, in line with the more positive social connotations associated with the term 'traveller' (Jacobsen, 2000; McCabe, 2005; Pellicer and Camprubí, 2021).

Similarly, the transition from ‘enthusiastic residents’ to ‘conventional tourists’ is also consistent. Individuals who express positive attitudes towards tourism in their place of residence tend to prefer popular and crowded destinations when travelling. Their identification as tourists aligns with this orientation, reflecting a coherent relationship between their perceptions and behaviours. Their identification as tourists aligns with their positive view of tourism, exemplifying self-congruence (Sirgy, 1985), where their self-perception is consistent with their behaviours and preferences.

The shift from ‘outsider residents’ to ‘contradictory tourists’ appears to indicate a more complex pattern combining coherence and inconsistency. While these individuals show a preference for exotic destinations and reduced social interaction, their tourist profile is characterised by low levels of self-confidence and independence. Furthermore, their tendency to identify as travellers rather than tourists contrasts with their behavioural patterns, suggesting a discrepancy between self-perception and actual conduct. This discrepancy is interpreted as a form of moral hypocrisy, and more specifically as moral weakness according to Graham et al.’s (2015) classification.

Finally, the transition from ‘protectionist residents’ to ‘intrepid tourists’ appears logically consistent. Individuals who are critical of tourism’s impact on their place of residence tend to avoid crowded destinations and favour less conventional travel experiences. Their identification as travellers rather than tourists further reinforces this coherence, as the term ‘tourist’ is often associated with negative connotations (Jacobsen, 2000; McCabe, 2005).

5.1 Discussion

These findings can be interpreted through the lens of self-congruence theory (Sirgy, 1985), as several transitions reflect alignment between individuals’ self-perception and their behavioural choices. In these cases, individuals maintain coherence across roles, suggesting that their identity remains relatively stable despite contextual changes. For instance, ‘participative residents’ adopting the ‘intrepid tourist’ profile and ‘enthusiastic residents’ shifting to ‘conventional tourists’ appears to indicate this consistency, suggesting that self-congruence influences travel behaviour, in line with Sirgy (1985) and Pellicer and Camprubí (2021).

In contrast, the inconsistencies observed in certain profiles might be understood as instances of moral hypocrisy, particularly as moral weakness, according to Graham, et al., (2015), whereby individuals fail to act in accordance with their stated values. This divergence may suggest a lack of alignment between real and ideal self-concept, emphasizing the influence of self-congruence on behaviour (Sirgy, 1985; Pellicer and Camprubí, 2021). It is especially evident in the ‘contradictory tourist’ profile, where self-identification and actual behaviour diverge, reflecting that the individual’s stated values do not consistently translate into their travel choices. This interpretation is consistent with the findings of Mkono (2020), who observed that environmentally conscious tourists often struggled to reconcile their actual behaviours with the values they professed to hold and the self-image they wished to project.

However, the objective of the present study does not directly measure moral behaviour, or attitude-behaviour gaps. Consequently, the findings should not be interpreted as direct evidence of moral hypocrisy per se, but rather as indicative of potential tensions between residents' perceptions of tourism in their place of residence and their self-reported tourist profiles and behaviours.

The study also contributes to the literature on tourist typologies by identifying profiles that reflect contemporary travel behaviours. Specifically, the present study applies Plog's typology of tourists, based on their psychological characteristics (Plog, 1974, 2001), which continues to be relevant and is widely used in contemporary studies of tourist behaviour (Griffith & Albanese, 1996; Park & Jang, 2014; Litvin & Smith, 2016; Merrit et al., 2016; Litvin & Guttentag, 2023). Building on this framework, the findings show that while some profiles, such as the 'intrepid tourist', closely resemble the allocentric type, others do not fit neatly within the allocentric-psychocentric continuum. Specifically, the 'flexible tourists' combine characteristics typical of both allocentric and psychocentric types, scoring above average in all personality factors, whereas the 'contradictory tourists' display below-average scores across the same factors, indicating an atypical pattern that does not correspond to any established category. Meanwhile, 'conventional tourists' align more closely with centric-psychocentric profiles, and 'insecure tourists' resemble psychocentric types.

This partial misalignment with Plog's model may reflect broader social transformations and increasing complexity in tourist identities. Contemporary tourists appear to combine traits that were previously considered distinct, suggesting that traditional psychographic models may require updating to better capture current behavioural patterns. These observations align with recent applications of Plog's typology, in which differences in modern travel behaviours are also acknowledged (e.g. Litvin & Guttentag, 2023).

5.2 Theoretical contributions and practical implications

This study contributes to tourism research by integrating and comparing resident and tourist perspectives within the same individuals, offering a more holistic and comprehensive understanding of tourism-related behaviour. By examining how individuals navigate their dual roles, it advances the discussion on tourism's social impact, the construction of identity across contexts and the alignment or misalignment between stated values and actual behaviours, as reflected in the concepts of self-congruence and moral hypocrisy.

Additionally, the identification of new tourist profiles provides an updated perspective on tourist typologies based on Plog's (1974) model, capturing evolving travel preferences and behaviours. By linking self-perception, tourist typologies, and the dynamics of resident-tourist roles, this research deepens theoretical insights how inconsistencies in self-congruence might influence tourism-related behaviours across individuals' roles.

From a practical standpoint, the findings offer valuable insights for policymakers and destination managers. Understanding how residents themselves behave as tourists elsewhere provides

insight into their expectations, attitudes, and behavioural patterns, which in turn can inform more effective tourism planning, policy design, and communication strategies. Such knowledge can contribute to the development of sustainable and socially balanced tourism practices, promoting a more harmonious coexistence between residents and visitors within destinations.

5.3 Limitations and future research

Although this research makes a valuable contribution to understanding resident-tourist dynamics, it should be noted that it is exploratory in nature, providing an initial insight into the coherence and inconsistencies between self-perceptions and behaviours across roles. Consequently, the results should be interpreted as primarily descriptive and indicative, rather than conclusive. Furthermore, cluster solutions for both residents and tourists should be understood as empirical patterns identified within the sample rather than as a definitive resident or tourist typology.

The use of an online survey, while efficient for reaching a broad audience, relied on the distribution of the survey link via social media and other online channels, effectively constituting a convenience sampling approach. This may have limited participation to individuals with internet access or familiarity with specific digital platforms, potentially excluding some segments of the population. Consequently, the final sample exhibits certain imbalances in terms of gender and geographical origin.

As this study employed a quantitative approach, it effectively identifies patterns and tourist-resident profiles, but it does not fully capture the underlying motivations or contextual factors that shape these behaviours.

Future research could address these limitations in several ways. Firstly, it could be built upon these findings by testing the stability of these profiles using alternative samples and additional validation procedures. Qualitative methods, such as in-depth interviews, could allow a deeper exploration of the origins of discrepancies in self-perception across roles. Additionally, replicating this study in specific contexts, particularly in destinations experiencing overtourism, could provide further insights into how local conditions influence the emergence of coherent or contradictory profiles. Moreover, by using larger samples, longitudinal designs, or mixed-methods approaches, future studies could generate more conclusive and generalisable findings, enabling stronger inferences about resident-tourist dynamics. Finally, future research could incorporate specific measures of moral dissonance or attitude-behaviour inconsistency to examine this relationship more directly.

6. References

- Altinay, L., & Paraskevas, A. (2008). *Planning Research in Hospitality and Tourism*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann
- Andereck, K. L., y Vogt, C. A. (2000). The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 27-36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875000390010>

- Baggio, R., & Klobas, J. (2011). *Quantitative Methods in Tourism: A Handbook*. Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.
- Batson, C. D., Kobryniewicz, D., Dinnerstein, J. L., Kampf, H. C., & Wilson, A. D. (1997). In a very different voice: unmasking moral hypocrisy. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 72(6), 1335. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.6.1335>
- Beerli, A., Meneses, G. D., & Gil, S. M. (2007). Self-congruity and destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(3), 571-587. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2007.01.005>
- Birdwell, A. E. (1968). A study of the influence of image congruence on consumer choice. *The Journal of Business*, 41(1), 76-88. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2351957>
- Boaks, J., y Levine, M. P. (2015). *Leadership and ethics*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Boissevain, J., & Armas, R. H. (2005). Rituales ocultos. Protegiendo la cultura de la mirada turística. *Pasos Revista de turismo y patrimonio cultural*, 3(2), 217-228. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2005.03.017>
- Bruner, E. M. (1991). Transformation of self in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 238-250. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(91\)90007-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(91)90007-X)
- Bustillo-Castillejo, M. C., Espriella-Mendoza, Y. D. L., & Machado-Licona, J. (2021). Pertenencia ciudadana: estudio de caso de las comunidades afro de la ciudad de Cartagena de Indias, Colombia. *Información tecnológica*, 32(4), 23-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07642021000400023>
- Cea, M. A. (2004). *Análisis multivariante. Teoría y práctica en la investigación social*. Madrid: Editorial Síntesis.
- Cohen, E. (1979). Rethinking the sociology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1), 18-35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(79\)90092-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(79)90092-6)
- Cruz-Milán, O. (2024). A review of empirical research on Plog's psychographics in tourism. En M. A. Camilleri (Ed.), *Tourism planning and destination marketing* (2nd ed., pp. 1-32). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80455-888-120241001>
- Culler, J. (1981). Semiotics of tourism. *The American Journal of Semiotics*, 1(1), 127-140.
- Cummings, C. L. (2018). Cross-sectional design. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications Inc. Retrieved. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411.n118>
- Dale, N. F., & Ritchie, B. W. (2020). Understanding travel behavior: A study of school excursion motivations, constraints and behavior. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43, 11-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.01.008>
- Das, M., y Chatterjee, B. (2015). Ecotourism: A panacea or a predicament? *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 14, 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.01.002>
- Di Betta, P. (2014). Authenticity as a mental state: a primer. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 47, 86-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2014.05.002>

- Dodds, R., y Butler, R. J. (2019). The phenomena of overtourism: a review. *International journal of tourism cities*, 5(4), 519-528. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJTC-06-2019-0090>
- Donaire, J. A., Galí, N., Vidal, D. (2006). Turistas culturales en espacios urbanos: el caso de Girona. *AECIT, Turismo y territorio: conflictos, corresponsabilidad y estrategias de gestión*, 1- 16.
- Douglas, A., Hoogendoorn, G., & Richards, G. (2024). Activities as the critical link between motivation and destination choice in cultural tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Insights*, 7(1), 249-271. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHTI-09-2022-0442>
- Doxey, G. (1975). A Causation Theory of Visitor–Resident Irritants: Methodology and Research Inferences. The Impact of Tourism. En *Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings*, pp.195-198. San Diego: The Travel Research Association.
- Effron, D. A., O'Connor, K., Leroy, H., & Lucas, B. J. (2018). From inconsistency to hypocrisy: When does “saying one thing but doing another” invite condemnation? *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 38, 61-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2018.10.003>
- Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 555-581. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)90120-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)90120-1)
- Galani-Moutafi, V. (2000). The self and the other. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(1), 203-224. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00066-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00066-3)
- Gardiner, S., Janowski, I., & Kwek, A. (2023). Self-identity and adventure tourism: Cross-country comparisons of youth consumers. *Tourism management perspectives*, 46, 101061. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2022.101061>
- González-Reverté, F. (2022). The perception of overtourism in urban destinations. Empirical evidence based on residents' emotional response. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 19(5), 451-477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2021.1980094>
- Goodwin, H., y Francis, J. (2003). Ethical and responsible tourism: Consumer trends in the UK. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(3), 271–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135676670300900306>
- Gössling, S., McCabe, S., & Chen, N. C. (2020). A socio-psychological conceptualisation of overtourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84, 102976. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102976>
- Graham, J., Meindl, P., Koleva, S., Iyer, R., & Johnson, K. M. (2015). When values and behavior conflict: Moral pluralism and intrapersonal moral hypocrisy. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 9(3), 158-170. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12158>
- Griffith, D. A., and Albanese, P. J. (1996). An examination of Plog's psychographic travel model within a student population. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(4), 47–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287596034004>
- Grubb, E., & Hupp, G. (1968). Perception of self, generalized stereotypes, and brand selection. *Journal of Marketing*

- Research, 5, 58-63.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002224376800500107>
- Gu, H., y Ryan, C. (2008). Place attachment, identity and community impacts of tourism—the case of a Beijing hutong. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 637-647.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.06.006>
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., y Black, W. (1999). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Hair, J. F. Jr, Black, W.C, Babin, B.J., Anderson R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis*. Andover, UK: Cengage Learning EMEA.
- Hales, R., y Caton, K. (2017). Proximity ethics, climate change and the flyer's dilemma: Ethical negotiations of the hypermobile traveller. *Tourist Studies*, 17(1), 94-113.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797616685650>
- Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2014). *The geography of tourism and recreation: Environment, place and space*. Routledge.
- Hansen, T. (2005). Perspectives on consumer decision making: an integrated approach. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 4(6), 420-437. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.33>
- Hosany, S., y Martin, D. (2012). Self-image congruence in consumer behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 65(5), 685-691.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.03.015>
- Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2000). Anti-tourist attitudes: Mediterranean charter tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 284-300.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00069-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00069-9)
- Korpela, K. M. (1989). Place-identity as a product of environmental self-regulation. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 9(3), 241-256. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944\(89\)80038-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0272-4944(89)80038-6)
- Kreag, G. (2001). *The Impacts of Tourism*. Minnesota Sea Grant.
- Lea, S. E., Kemp, S., & Willetts, K. (1994). Residents' concepts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(2), 406-410.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)90059-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)90059-0)
- Leiper, N. (1979). The framework of tourism: Towards a definition of tourism, tourist, and the tourist industry. *Annals of tourism research*, 6(4), 390-407.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(79\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(79)90003-3)
- Lenton, A. P., Slabu, L., Bruder, M., y Sedikides, C. (2014). Identifying differences in the experience of (in) authenticity: A latent class analysis approach. *Frontiers in psychology*, 5, 770. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00770>
- Litvin, S. W., and Guttentag, D. (2023). There is no place like home for the holidays: Who travels in the midst of a deadly pandemic? *Journal of Travel Research*, 62(5), 1077–1089.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875221113888>
- Litvin, S. W., and Smith, W. W. (2016). A new perspective on the Plog psychographic system. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 22(2), 89-97.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766715580187>
- MacCannell, D. (1973). Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), 589-603. <https://doi.org/10.1086/225585>

- Mansfeld, Y. (1992). From motivation to actual travel. *Annals of tourism research*, 19(3), 399-419. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(92\)90127-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(92)90127-B)
- Mason, P. W., y Cheyne, J. (2000). Residents' attitudes to proposed tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 391-411. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00084-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00084-5)
- Matas, A. (2018). Likert-type scale format design: a state of the art. *Electronic Journal of Educational Research*, 20(1), 38-47. <https://doi.org/10.24320/redie.2018.20.1.1347>
- Mazar, N., Amir, O., & Ariely, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of marketing research*, 45(6), 633-644. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.45.6.633>
- McCabe, S. (2005). 'Who is a tourist?': A critical review. *Tourist Studies*, 5(1), 85-106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797605062716>
- McDermott, M. L., Schwartz, D., y Vallejo, S. (2015). Talking the Talk but Not Walking the Walk. *American Politics Research*, 43(6), 952-974. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X15577830>
- McDonald, S., Oates, C., Thyne, M., Timmis, A., y Carlile, C. (2015). Flying in the face of environmental concern: why green consumers continue to fly. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31(13-14), 1503-1528. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2015.1059352>
- Merritt, R., Kline, C., Crawford, A., Viren, P. P., and Dilworth, G. (2016). An exploration of recreational activities while travelling relative to psychographic tendencies. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 41(3), 302-313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2016.1199123>
- Milano, C., Novelli, M., & Cheer, J. M. (2019). Overtourism and tourismphobia: A journey through four decades of tourism development, planning and local concerns. *Tourism planning & development*, 16(4), 353-357. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1599604>
- Mkono, M. (2020). Eco-hypocrisy and inauthenticity: Criticisms and confessions of the eco-conscious tourist/traveller. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84, 102967. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102967>
- Mor, M., Dalyot, S., & Ram, Y. (2023). Who is a tourist? Classifying international urban tourists using machine learning. *Tourism Management*, 95, 104689. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2022.104689>
- Olsen, K. (2002). Authenticity as a concept in tourism research: The social organization of the experience of authenticity. *Tourist Studies*, 2(2), 159-182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146879702761936644>
- Park, J. Y., and Jang, S. (2014). Psychographics: Static or dynamic? *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16(4), 351-354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr>
- Parra Vargas, E., de-Juan-Ripoll, C., Panadero, M. B., & Alcañiz, M. (2021). Lifestyle segmentation of tourists: the role of personality. *Heliyon*, 7(7). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07579>

- Pearce, P. L. (2009). The relationship between positive psychology and tourist behavior studies. *Tourism Analysis*, 14(1), 37-48. <https://doi.org/10.3727/108354209788970153>
- Pellicer, F., y Camprubí, R. (2021). The self-perception of cultural tourists in their role as tourists. *PASOS Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage*, 19(4), 713-724. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.pasos.2021.19.046>
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P., y Allen, L. R. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(4), 586-599. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(90\)90029-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(90)90029-Q)
- Plog, S. C. (1974). Why Destination Areas Rise and Fall in Popularity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 14(4), 55-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001088047401400409>
- Plog, S. C. (2001). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity: an update of a Cornell Quarterly classic. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42(3), 13-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010880401423001>
- Prebensen, N. K., Larsen, S., y Abelsen, B. (2003). I'm Not a Typical Tourist: German Tourists' Self-Perception, Activities, and Motivations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 416-420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287503041004011>
- Rinder, I. D., y Campbell, D. T. (1952). Varieties of Inauthenticity. *Phylon* (1940-1956), 13(4), 270. <https://doi.org/10.2307/272557>
- Šegota, T., Chen, N., y Golja, T. (2022). The Impact of Self-Congruity and Evaluation of the Place on WOM: Perspectives of Tourism Destination Residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 61(4), 800-817. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472875211008237>
- Sharpley, R. (2014). Host perceptions of tourism: A review of the research. *Tourism Management*, 42, 37-49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.10.007>
- Sirgy, M. (1985). Using self-congruity and ideal congruity to predict purchase motivation. *Journal of Business Research*, 13(3), 195-206. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(85\)90026-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(85)90026-8)
- Steiner, C. J., y Reisinger, Y. (2006). Understanding existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 299-318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2005.08.002>
- Todd, S. (2001). Self-concept: a tourism application. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 1(2), 184-196. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.64>
- Tong, E. M., y Yang, Z. (2011). Moral hypocrisy: Of proud and grateful people. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2(2), 159-165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550610385711>
- Tse, S. W. T., & Tung, V. W. S. (2025). Understanding residents' attitudes towards tourists through implicit stereotypes. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 49(1), 99-116. <http://doi.org/10.1177/10963480231175516>
- Turner, L., y Ash, J. D. (1997). Golden Hordes. *Guincho Notebooks*, 4, 18-24.

- Um, S., y Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring Resident's Attachment Levels In A Host Community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(1), 27-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758702600105>
- Uriely, N. (2009). Deconstructing tourist typologies: the case of backpacking. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3(4), 306-312. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17506180910994523>
- Urry, J. (1990). *The tourist gaze*. London: Sage.
- Vada, S., Prentice, C., & Hsiao, A. (2019). The role of positive psychology in tourists' behavioural intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 51, 293-303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.06.015>
- Valdesolo, P., y DeSteno, D. (2007). Moral hypocrisy: Social groups and the flexibility of virtue. *Psychological Science*, 18(8), 689-690. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01961.x>
- Van der Ark, A. L., y Richards, G. (2006). Attractiveness of cultural activities in European cities: A latent class approach. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1408-1413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.014>
- Veríssimo, M., Moraes, M., Breda, Z., Guizi, A., & Costa, C. (2020). Overtourism and tourismphobia: A systematic literature review. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 68(2), 156-169. <https://doi.org/10.37741/t.68.2.4>
- Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking authenticity in tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 349-370. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(98\)00103-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(98)00103-0)
- Wang, S., y Xu, H. (2015). Influence of place-based senses of distinctiveness, continuity, self-esteem and self-efficacy on residents' attitudes toward tourism. *Tourism Management*, 47, 241-250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.10.007>
- Weeden, C. (2002). Ethical tourism: an opportunity for competitive advantage? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8(2), 141-153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135676670200800204>
- Zenker, S., y Petersen, S. (2011). Resident-City Identification: Translating the Customer Relationship Management Approach into Place Marketing Theory. *ERSA conference papers, European Regional Science Association*. <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/118787>
- Zhang, Z., Zhang, Y., Li, Y., & Shen, Z. (2024). Solo traveler typology based on personal value: Incorporating cluster analysis into means-end chain. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 51, 101247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2024.101247>