

Creative Tourism and Urban Sustainability: The Cases of Lisbon and Oporto

Turismo Criativo e Sustentabilidade Urbana: Os Casos de Lisboa e Porto

Cláudia Henriques

chenri@ualg.pt

Department of Economics, School of Management, Hospitality and Tourism, University of Minho Algarve (ESGHT/UALG), (CIEO – Centre for Spatial and Organizational Dynamics)

Maria Cristina Moreira

mcristinamoreira@gmail.com

Department of Economics, School of Economics and Management and research centre: Interdisciplinary Centre of Social Sciences, University of Minho (CICS.NOVA.UMinho)

Abstract/ Resumo

The paper contributes to the emergent debate on cultural and creative tourism and sustainable development interconnections base on two cases studies: Lisbon and Porto, discussing a set or composite of indicators that contribute to assess cultural/creative tourism dynamic and policy, such as ‘Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor’ and ‘Creative Cities Index’. The study underlines the growing importance of cultural and creative tourism in the two Portuguese cities, based for instance in the existence of UNESCO World Heritage Sites, initiatives such as European Capital of Culture, Expo and Euro, international thematic festivals, growing dynamic of Cultural and Creative industries, among many other international, national, regional and local initiatives. Comparing Lisbon and Oporto, the capital reveals a better performance in “cultural vibrancy”, “creative economy”, “enabling environment”.

Keywords: creative tourism; cultural tourism; sustainability; Lisbon; Oporto; creative cities

JEL codes: Z1; Z32; Z38

O artigo contribui para o debate emergente sobre as interconexões entre o turismo cultural e criativo e o desenvolvimento sustentável, com base em dois estudos de casos: Lisboa e do Porto, discutindo-se um conjunto de indicadores, nomeadamente o Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM/JRC) e Creative Cities Index (Charles Landry). Sublinha-se a crescente importância do turismo cultural/criativo nas duas cidades portuguesas assente na existência de Património Mundial (UNESCO) e em iniciativas europeias, tais como Capital Europeia da Cultura, Expo e Euro, nacionais, regionais e locais patentes numa maior dinâmica do tecido empresarial cultural e criativo. A comparação entre Lisboa e Porto evidencia a cidade capital com melhor performance, em termos de “vibração cultural”, “economia criativa” e “ambiente”.

Palavras-chave: turismo criativo; turismo cultural; sustentabilidade; Lisboa; Porto; Cidades criativas

Códigos JEL: Z1; Z32; Z38

1. INTRODUCTION

Cities' cultural and creative assets are often highlighted to promote tourism development. In this context, this article discusses the importance of culture in cities, as a driver of tourism development, and how to measure it through key indicators.

As UNESCO (2016b) emphasizes, the Cultural and Creative Industries (CCIs) and related activities make an important contribution to economic growth, in particular because of their weight in GDP, cultural employment, and household spending on culture. In addition, the importance of CCIs for development is recognized by identifying their direct and indirect effects on competitiveness, more and better jobs, sustainable development, innovation, cohesion, and local development. For example, at European level, a study by the European Commission (EC, 2011) showed that the regions with the highest levels of prosperity were those where CCIs had a greater weight in the productive structure. According to UNCTAD (2017a), in 2015 the trade in creative products amounted to 510 billion dollars.

Culture and creativity have an important role in the sustainable development of tourism in cities. The European Commission's document titled *European Tourism Indicators System for Sustainable Destination Management* underlines that tourist destinations "are increasingly being called upon to tackle social, cultural, economic, and environmental challenges. To help them measure their performance in relation to sustainability, which is essential, the European Commission has developed a 'European Tourism Indicators System' (ETIS)." (EC, 2018).

In this context, the present paper aims at investigating about the growing importance of creative tourism in the two major cities of Portugal: Lisbon and Oporto. Accordingly, firstly it discusses theoretically on one hand the challenges of urban cultural and creative tourism as well as the interconnections between culture and sustainability development models. On the other hand it also highlights recent research in the monitorization of cultural and creative tourism sustainable development through a set of indicators.

Secondly, the paper considers the case study approach associated with sustainable cultural and creative tourism in Lisbon and Oporto. Thirdly, it presents a discussion and assessment about cultural/creative tourism dynamic and

policy in the two Portuguese cities based in a set of cities culture/creativity indices, such as Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM/JRC), Creative Cities Index (Charles Landry).

Finally, there's the results comparative discussion and main conclusions.

2. SUSTAINABILITY AND URBAN CULTURAL AND CREATIVE TOURISM CHALLENGES

2.1 Culture and sustainability development models: interconnections

Culture is recognised as a key resource for sustainable urban development (UNESCO, 2016b). As the UNESCO Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development points out, "the valuing of local cultures, old and new, and the promotion of cultural expressions, the arts and heritage [are] pillars of sustainable social and economic development" (UNESCO, 2016b: 17).

With this in mind, it is clear that "our understanding of culture is no longer limited to appreciating 'art for art's sake' or for its entertainment value – rather, culture is now recognised as being a competitive and resilient economic sector in its own right as well as having broader impacts: for example, as an attractor of creative talent and a catalyst of economic, technological and social innovation and change" (JRC, 2017: 32).

As a complex and dynamic concept, culture is difficult to value in the context of culture new meanings and values. In contemporary societies, culture is not only 'high culture', but also 'popular culture' and 'everyday culture' (Menger, 2013). At the same time, the distinction between them ['high culture' (elite) and 'low culture' (mass or 'pop' culture)] are "fuzzier and fuzzier" (Larsen, 2012). Simultaneously, culture encompasses not only tangible heritage, but cultural landscapes and intangible heritage.

Due to its new nature, the value of culture is associated with use and non-use value (Menon Economics, 2017), among many others, such as cognitive, symbolic, educational, semiologic, artistic, and economic significance (Navrud & Read, 2002; O'Brien, 2015).

Culture is also associated with the "triangle of value", namely "intrinsic", "institutional"

and “instrumental” values (Holden, 2006: 15). The fact induces culture to play new roles, where economy emerges “highly interdependent” with social and environmental spheres (UNESCO, 2003: 2).

Culture, in the framework of Cultural and Creative Sector (CCS), is considered as a set of “activities undertaken by a group of people, and the product of these activities, drawing upon enlightenment and education of the mind” (Throsby, 2010:10). The concept of CCIs involves “creativity, cultural knowledge and intellectual property to produce products and services with social and cultural meaning”. CCIs are also connected with the emergence of a ‘creative economy’ that following Rifkin (2000) leads us to consider the interconnections between “creativity, culture, economics and technology in a contemporary world dominated by images, sounds, texts and symbols”. Moreover, the CCIs comprise many different sectors, including cultural heritage, publishing, advertising, events coordination, architecture, design, fashion, film, gaming, gastronomy, music, performing and visual arts, software and interactive games, television and radio, and new forms of media (OECD, 2014).

CCIs have an important role in the urban life qualification and in the protection of urban identities, once culture is recognised as “key to what makes cities attractive, creative and sustainable” (UNESCO, 2016: 17) in the urbanization process. As Musterd and Ostendorf (2004) point out cities “feel that they have to adapt to arenas in which knowledge and creativity can develop”. Culture in urban spaces is consequently seen “not just as a condition to attract the creative knowledge workers, but also as a major economic sector, intricately interwoven with other sectors of the economy” (Musterd and Ostendorf, 2004).

Cities are growing in importance. In 2050, a document titled “Realizing the Future We Want for All” (UN, 2012) forecasts that “70% of world population will live in cities” and thus, highlights the need of urban planning and management. Cities as “the new states” (Global Influence, 2017) have also a high potential for tourism, and namely for cultural and creative tourism. According to UNWTO (2014) “cities attract a growing number of visitors every year, generating a positive impact on the local economy by creating jobs, stimulating foreign exchange and promoting investment in infrastructure that benefits residents and visitors alike”.

Additionally, as JRC (2017: 32) underlines the “potential of the so-called ‘cultural and creative sectors’ (CCS) is best realised and demonstrated at city level”. The reasons are mainly three: - 1) in recent decades cities have acquired a greater role in socio-economic development due to the high concentration of people and economic activity; 2) local autonomy has increased over time to enable cities better to address specific opportunities and challenges; 3) geographical clustering tend to generate positive externalities in the areas where they are located, ranging from improved image and reputation and increased numbers of tourists to greater social pride and revitalised local economies.

“The role of public policies is crucial in maximising the positive effects of culture and creativity and avoiding potential traps” (JRC, 2017: 32). Consequently, urban investment in culture and creativity is at the centre of urban development strategies to support policy objectives ranging from urban regeneration, economic diversification and rejuvenation to job creation and social innovation, economic health, competitiveness, and cohesion. Furthermore, it is important to note that culture “fosters a sense of belonging and cohesion among citizens; improves quality of life and the attractiveness of cities and regions for citizens, tourists, businesses and investors; and ultimately promotes peace, inter-cultural dialogue and socio-economic development within and beyond national borders” (JRC, 2017: 31).

Due to its broad definition and understanding “culture” can be regarded as a fundamental issue, even a precondition to be met on the path towards Sustainable Development (SD) that is necessary to get to grips with in our various European societies (Cost, 2018). Cultural sustainability is related to 10 major themes: 1) culture of sustainability; 2) globalisation; 3) heritage conservation; 4) sense of place; 5) indigenous knowledge and traditional practices; 6) community cultural development; 7) arts, education, and youth; 8) sustainable design; 9) planning and 10) cultural policy and local government (Blankenship, 2005: 7).

Sustainable development models tend to emphasize culture and its role in promoting ‘interconnectedness’ (Throsby, 2008: 228) between the different dimensions of sustainability. Among several models that put in evidence the cultural dimension, Stylianou-Lambert et al. (2015) theoretical framework stands out. The authors highlight three major models in which

culture can play different roles: culture in sustainable development, culture for sustainable development, and culture as sustainable development. The model “Culture in sustainable development” considers culture as a new self-standing fourth pillar of sustainability, alongside the economic, environmental, and social pillars. The model “Culture for sustainable development” presents culture in interconnection with the other pillars of sustainability. Regarding the last model, “Culture as sustainable development”, culture is the foundation for achieving sustainable development, in a dynamic process.

2.2 Cultural and creative tourism in the context of urban sustainable development

As of the 1960s, a set of policy documents have contributed to strengthen the role of culture and creativity in sustainable development.

In the last two decades alone, landmark documents have been put forward, namely UNESCO’s Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001); UNESCO’s Intangible Heritage Convention (2003); The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005); UNESCO’s The Power of Culture for Development (2010); The UN’s Creative Economy Report (2013); UNESCO’s first Global Report monitoring the aforementioned 2005 convention (2015); and, The second Global Report on the 2005 convention (2018).

This latter report considers culture as a ‘driver’ and ‘enabler’ of development (UNESCO, 2017). The power of culture to promote development is associated with improved sustainability at the local level.

The megatrends towards adding culture as the fourth dimension of sustainability – initiated in 2001 – led to the 2030 Agenda. Its action plan ‘for people, planet and prosperity’ is based on 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs) with a total of 169 targets (UNESCO, 2015). UNESCO’s culture programme seeks to strengthen the direct implementation of sustainable measures in the following ways: first, protecting and promoting the world’s cultural and natural heritage to make cities inclusive, safe, resilient, and sustainable (i.e. SDG 11); second, combatting the illicit trafficking of cultural objects; third, safeguarding and campaigning for cultural and natural heritage; and, fourth,

supporting CCIs, while enhancing fundamental freedoms and participatory systems of governance of culture (i.e. SDG 16).

Sustainable cultural development in urban places leads us to consider the Habitat process. In the United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development – Habitat III’s (Quito, 2016), New Urban Agenda in its 10th point “acknowledges that culture and cultural diversity are sources of enrichment for humankind and provide an important contribution to the sustainable development of cities, human settlements and citizens, empowering them to play an active and unique role in development initiatives”. Furthermore, it “recognizes that culture should be taken into account in the promotion and implementation of new sustainable consumption and production patterns that contribute to the responsible use of resources and address the adverse impact of climate change” (UN, 2017: 4).

In its topic “Sustainable and inclusive urban prosperity and opportunities for all”, we highlight the commitment to “developing vibrant, sustainable and inclusive urban economies, building on endogenous potential, competitive advantages, cultural heritage and local resources, as well as resource-efficient and resilient infrastructure, promoting sustainable and inclusive industrial development and sustainable consumption and production patterns and fostering an enabling environment for businesses and innovation, as well as livelihoods” (UN, 2017: 14).

The Muscat Declaration on Tourism and Culture: Fostering Sustainable Development (UNWTO & UNESCO, 2017) also discusses ways to build and strengthen the partnerships between tourism and culture within the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It discusses the synergies and strategies for a sustainable development of cultural tourism that generates resources for the conservation of cultural heritage while creating socio-economic benefits for local communities. Among others, the declaration reaffirms the signatories’ commitment to:

- Encouraging a creative and innovative approach for sustainable urban development through cultural tourism;
- Exploring the inter-linkages between culture and nature in sustainable tourism through development.

Sustainably managed, tourism can contribute to the valuing and safeguarding of the

tangible and intangible heritage it relies on, while encouraging the development of arts, crafts, and other creative activities to create meaningful (Korez-Vide, 2013), authentic, and memorable (Pine & Gilmore, 1999) experiences.

Cultural and creative tourism experience (Pine & Gilmore, 1999) leads us to consider that cultural tourism is changing into 'creative tourism' (Richards & Wilson, 2006) connected with a "new generation of tourism products" (UNESCO, 2006). This type of tourism enables a deeper and synergetic interconnection between visitors, service providers, and local communities, enhancing tourists' participation in the destinations' creative life. This participation in the construction of the tourist experience in a co-creation process could result in value-added products that strengthen tourists' sense of places (Richards, 2011). A creative tourism typology of experiences would include, among others, creative shows and events, places fostering creativity, cultural neighbourhoods and/or industries, creative clusters, creative economy, and cultural clusters.

Because creativity is a process, creative tourism can potentially add value to destinations' offers more easily because of its scarcity. This process evokes creative means of using existing resources, ways to strengthen identity and distinctiveness, forms of self-expression and/or discovery, resources for creating an atmosphere for places, and ways to recreate and revive localities (Richards, 2011). While cultural consumption is dependent on the concentrations of cultural resources, performances and artwork can currently be produced virtually anywhere without requiring much infrastructure. Moreover, creativity involves not only value creation (i.e. economic wealth) but also the creation of cultural values (Richards & Wilson, 2006).

Cultural and creative tourism development in cities within a sustainability framework, leads us to establish synergies between tourism sustainability and competitiveness. Regarding tourism competitiveness, the travel and tourism competitiveness index (WEF, 2017: XIV) presents 4 sub-indices and 14 pillars. Namely, Enabling Environment (Pillars: Business Environ-

ment Safety and Security; Health and Hygiene; Human Resources and Labour Market; ICT Readiness); T&T Policy and Enabling Conditions (Pillars: Prioritization of Travel & Tourism International Openness; Price competitiveness; Environmental Sustainability); Infrastructure (Pillars: Air Transport; Infrastructure Ground and Port Infrastructure; Tourist Service Infrastructure); Natural and Cultural Resources (Pillars: Natural Resources; Cultural Resources and Business Travel).

2.3 Monitoring Cultural and creative tourism sustainable development

The sustainable development of cultural and creative tourism could play an important role in cities, as previously mentioned. Thus, it is important to measure the impacts of investments, initiatives, or actions that can deliver cultural, social, and economic benefits to cities. In this context, tools to promote mutual exchange and learning between cities to boost culture-led development, are crucial, namely, in the following main domains: 1) cities and culture/creativity, and 2) tourism sustainability. The purpose, as the JRC (2017: 31) points out is to support policy makers in identifying strengths, assessing the impact of policy action, and learning from peers; Illuminating and communicating the importance of culture and creativity for improving socio-economic perspectives and resilience; Inspiring new research questions and approaches to studying the role of culture and creativity in cities.

As far as cities are concerned, JLL Cities Research Center (2017) identifies the existence of more than 300 indices associated with urban spaces. However, only 2.9% of these consider "Culture and diversity" topics (JLL, 2017: 10). Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM)¹, Creative Cities Index (developed by Charles Landry and Jonathan Hyams), Sustainable Cities Index (Arcadis), Redefining Global Cities (Brookings JPMorgan Chase)², Global Cities Talent/Competitiveness Index (GCTCI), The Global Talent Competitiveness Index³, Globalization & Cities Index GaWC (Loughborough University)⁴, The 2025 City Competitiveness

¹ The Joint Research Centre (JRC) of the European Commission has therefore developed the 'Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor', a tool to help assess and analyse the cultural and creative condition of cities across Europe. The tool considers 168 'Cultural and Creative Cities' of varying population sizes, employment profiles, etc.

² In www.brookings.edu/research/redefining-global-cities/

³ In <https://gtcistudy.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/GTCI-2018-web.r1-1.pdf>

⁴ In <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/index.html>

Index (The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited)⁵, are some of the city indices. In this paper, we distinguish the first two, once they highlight the comparison between Lisbon and Oporto cities.

The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor is inspired by the Urban Agenda for the EU, and by the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), which call for an urban development model that is economically, socially, ecologically, and culturally sustainable and inclusive. It considers as Cultural and Creative Cities those which host or support international initiatives aimed at promoting arts, culture, and creativity coming from artists, creative professionals and the related 'cultural and creative sectors' (CCS) (Ibidem: 21).

The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor and its online tool allow users to:

Assess how cultural and creative a city is in relation to others; Benchmark cities within countries and across Europe; Learn what peers are good at and look for opportunities for fruitful exchanges; Use findings on the relation between culture and creativity on one hand and growth and resilience on the other for advocacy purposes; Create a new ranking by creating new entries, adding or changing data for existing entries or adapting weights; Simulate the impact of policies (e.g. increased visitor numbers) on a city's performance in the rankings. (JRC, 2017: 20).

If accompanied by appropriate policy actions, the Cultural and Creative Cities (C3) of tomorrow will have the capacity to launch new waves of local development that:

- Aligns the cities' economies with their historical and cultural identities (authentic development);
- Empowers culturally diverse people to be the key agents of innovation, entrepreneurship, and job creation (people-centred development); and,
- Promotes social interaction and inclusion by fostering the collaborative culture typical of the cultural and creative sectors and by developing accessible cultural infrastructure and public spaces that help connect diverse people, including migrants (inclusive development) (JRC, 2017: 43).

C3 considers 3 sub-indices, 9 dimensions, and 29 indicators (Table 1).

The Creative City Index considers "a method for assessing cities holistically. This helps assess their creative abilities and potential, a precondition for downstream innovations and economic and cultural vigour" (Charles Landry, 2018). It is based on ten cross-cutting domains - headings or groups of indicators for creativity. As Charles Landry (2018) point out in each domain there are key traits or questions indicating creativity, such as: Political & public framework; Distinctiveness, diversity, vitality & expression; Openness, trust, accessibility & participation; Entrepreneurship, exploration & innovation; Strategic leadership, agility & vision; Talent development & the learning landscape; Communication, connectivity & networking; The place & place-making; Liveability & well-being; Professionalism & effectiveness." (Charles Landry, 2018).

According to this index, "creativity is not the preserve of any single sector. It is important to be wide ranging. The sectors assessed include the education and training system at all levels; commerce, industry and business from large to small; the public administration and public bodies and their facilities; professionals in the design communities; health and social services experts; movement and mobility specialists; the community and voluntary sector: local societies, social action groups; the culture, arts and gastronomy fields as well leisure, sports, the hospitality industry and tourism institutions and the media and communications industries." (Charles Landry, 2018).

Regarding the domain of "tourism and sustainability", we highlight the European Tourism Indicators System for sustainable destination management (ETIS). It is "a management tool, supporting destinations who want to take a sustainable approach to destination management a monitoring system, easy to use for collecting data and detailed information and to let destinations monitor their performance from one year to another an information tool (not a certification scheme), useful for policy makers, tourism enterprises and other stakeholders (EC, 2018). The indicators encourage tourist destinations to adopt a "more intelligent approach to tourism planning" (EC, 2018).

⁵ In <http://www.citigroup.com/citi/citiforcities/pdfs/hotspots2025.pdf>

Table 1: The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor’s conceptual framework, weighting scheme and indicators

Subindex	Dimensions	Indicators
Cultural Vibrancy (40%)	Cultural Venues & Facilities (50%)	Sights & landmarks
		Museums
		Cinema seats
		Theatres
		Concerts & shows
	Cultural Participation & Attractiveness (50%)	Tourist overnight stays
		Museum visitors
		Cinema attendance
		Satisfaction with cultural facilities
Creative Economy (40%)	Creative & Knowledge-based Jobs (40%)	Jobs in arts, culture & entertainment
		Jobs in media & communication
		Jobs in other creative sectors
	Intellectual Property & Innovation (20%)	Community design applications
		ICT patent applications
	New Jobs in Creative Sectors (40%)	Jobs in new arts, culture & entertainment enterprises
		Jobs in new media & communication enterprises
		Jobs in new enterprises in other creative sectors
Enabling Environment (20%)	Human Capital & Education (40%)	Graduates in arts & humanities
		Graduates in ICT
		Average appearances in university rankings
	Openness, Tolerance & Trust (40%)	Foreign graduates
		Foreign-born population
		Tolerance of foreigners
		Integration of foreigners
		People trust
	Local & International Connections (15%)	Passenger flights
		Potential road accessibility
		Direct trains to other cities
	Quality of Governance (5%)	Quality of governance

Source: JRC (2017: 52)

Table 2. ETIS indicators

Economic value indicators	Social and cultural impact indicators	Environmental impact indicators
Tourist nights	Visitors per resident	Modes of transport
Daily spending	Beds per resident	Climate change mitigation
Length of stay	•Employment by gender	Waste recycling
Occupancy rates	Accessibility	Sewage treatment
Employment	Cultural heritage Protection	Water consumption
Use of local product	Social and cultural impact indicators	

Source: Adapted from EC (2018)

ETIS benefits to tourism destinations are highlighted, such as: improved information for decision-making; effective risk management; prioritisation of action projects; performance benchmarking; improved community buy-in and support for tourism stakeholders; enhanced visitor experience; increased bottom-line/cost savings; increased value per visitor (EC, 2018: 11).

3. METHODOLOGY

Cultural and creative tourism is a growing motivational segment in urban places. From this angle, the present paper investigates the relevance of this type of tourism in the two major cities of Portugal: Lisbon and Oporto.

Simultaneously, we adopt a comparative perspective regarding the last data available (year of 2018).

The assumption is that culture and creativity could be measured through a composite of indicators. In accordance, the methodological framework of this paper is based on three main strands.

Firstly, we present a theoretical discussion regarding creative tourism and sustainable development interconnections.

Secondly, we consider the case study approach associated with sustainable cultural and creative tourism in two Portuguese cities.

Thirdly, regarding the two cities, we discuss the set or composite of indicators that contribute to assess cultural/creative tourism dynamic and

policy. We consider two main domains of indicators: 1) cities and culture/creativity, and 2) tourism and sustainability. The assumption is that the existence of indices/indicators can foster a qualitative and quantitative understanding of the role of culture and tourism in sustainable development (Citiscopes, 2015), justified by the growing need for systematic and comparable indicators to analyse cities' data in order to establish comparisons.

This paper focuses on the first domain of indicators put in evidence a set of cities' culture/creativity indices, such as Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM/JRC), Creative Cities Index (Charles Landry). The emphasis is mainly on the former. There is also the consideration of Lisbon and Oporto in the following fields: Tourism satisfaction surveys; Tourism main attractions visited.

Regarding the second domain of indicators – tourism and sustainability, there is a theoretical reference to ETIS system of indicators.

It is important to point out that the case study is based mainly on the CCCM/JRC. ETIS approach is intended to be an analytical complement and as an important framework for future research.

4. CASE STUDY: LISBON AND OPORTO CHALLENGES IN CREATIVE TOURISM

Portugal is integrated in the most important tourism region of the world – Europe. The country ranks 14th and 27th respectively in Europe and world in terms of arrivals (UNWTO, 2016). It occupies the 11th and the 24th positions respectively in Europe and world receipts ranking (UNWTO, 2016). Among 136 countries, Portugal ranks 14th in travel and tourism competitiveness (WEF, 2017).

The importance of tourism is high once the economy of travel and tourism represents 17.3% of GDP and 20.4% of total Employment (WTTC, 2017).

Lisbon and North are the Portuguese regions (NUT II), in 2017, where the two biggest cities are located: Lisbon (capital) and Oporto. In terms of overnight stays and guests, Lisbon region presents respectively 14,283,582 and 6,176,156 and the North 7,402,145 and 4,100,902. The growth rate in 2017/16 (%) is above the country average (Portugal: 9,8%) in Lisbon (10.2%) and under average in North (7.8%) (IMPACTUR, 2018).

The 'Global Destination Cities Index – 2016' (Mastercard, 2016) shows that Lisbon occupies (among 132 cities) the 37th place in terms of 'international overnight visitors' (3,63 millions), of which more than 70% are foreign visitors.

The European cities hotel forecast 2018 & 2019 (Pwc, 2018: 2) "analyses past trading trends and provides econometric forecasts for 12 cities, all national or regional capitals of finance, commerce, culture or tourism". The forecast underlines that in 2018 Oporto "on top of four years of consecutive double-digit growth" achieves the highest potential growth with over 10% RevPAR (revenue per available room) followed by Amsterdam, Lisbon, and Prague, with around 7% RevPAR. In 2019, Lisbon occupies the top position with 6.5% RevPAR growth expected, followed by Paris with 6.4% and Oporto with 5% (Pwc, 2018).

Lisbon is the fifth fastest-growing European city in terms of international tourists. "Between 2009 and 2016, the number of international visitors staying in Lisbon grew by 7.4% per cent, placing the Portuguese capital in the top 5 of Europe's fastest growing cities after Hamburg, Berlin, Istanbul, and Copenhagen." (Mastercard, 2016).

Lisbon and Oporto comparison leads us to consider the importance given to international and European contexts and the different territorial scales interconnection.

In terms of the two cities comparison, table 3 shows the reference to UNESCO World Heritage Sites in each mentioned city, as well as the reference to a significant number of international events. Lisbon associated World Heritage Monuments and Fado. (Henriques, 2016). The award of World Cultural Heritage by UNESCO, in 1996, to Oporto's historic centre contributed to the appreciation of cultural destination of Oporto (Moreira and Cordeiro, 2016).

Simultaneously, relevant European initiatives are also emphasized, such as European Capital of Culture, Expo '98, and Euro 2004. The historic quarters and its rehabilitation process is also highlighted, as well as important cultural and creative events (Lisbon Architecture Triennale, the Lisbon Fashion Week and the Lisbon & Estoril Film Festival, European Creative Hubs Forum; Festivals, Festivals for Europe - labelled festivals). Regarding Oporto events, it could be highlighted São João Festival, NOS Primavera Sound, Porto's New Year's Eve, several international congresses (Pwc, 2018:42), among others.

Table 3. Lisbon and Oporto characteristics following European Commission (EU - Science Hub Home, 2018)

Lisbon	Oporto
<p>Population group 2: 500,000-1,000,000 GDP group 3: €20,000-25,000 Employment group 3: 68%-73% Group XL: 500,000-1,000,000</p>	<p>Population group 4: 100,000-250,000 GDP group 5: <€15,000 Employment group 5: <63% Group S-M: <250,000 </p>
<p><i>Lisbon</i> - the capital and largest city of Portugal - is well known as a diverse and multicultural city in the south of Europe.</p> <p><i>Lisbon's</i> rich cultural heritage includes two UNESCO World Heritage Sites, namely the Belém Tower and the Jerónimos Monastery as beautiful examples of the Manueline architectural style.</p> <p><i>Since</i> 1994, when it was a European Capital of Culture, various international events (such as Expo '98 and Euro 2004) have taken place in the city, boosting the local cultural infrastructure and activities.</p> <p><i>Culture</i> is seen as a tool for social cohesion thanks to the positive experience of the Urban Art Gallery (GAU) (since 2008, Bairro Alto).</p> <p><i>In</i> recent years, the local authorities have taken new action to strengthen the economic potential of arts, culture and creativity. Co-working spaces, fab labs and start-up incubators are now available in the rehabilitated urban areas.</p> <p><i>In</i> addition to long-lived international events such as the Lisbon Architecture Triennale, the Lisbon Fashion Week and the Lisbon & Estoril Film Festival, the city has started to host new creativity-related events, such as the European Creative Hubs Forum in 2015, connecting over 200 creative hubs across Europe.</p>	<p>Porto is the second-largest city in Portugal after Lisbon and one of the major urban areas of the Iberian Peninsula.</p> <p>Porto is one of the oldest European city centres, and its historical centre was proclaimed a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1996.</p> <p>Porto hosts numerous Europe for Festivals, Festivals for Europe -labelled festivals, including three film festivals, namely...</p> <p>Porto is a city covered in tiles, and in order to preserve this particularity, the Bank of Materials has been open to the public since 2010 and has welcomed more than 21,000 visitors since.</p> <p>Porto was a European Capital of Culture in 2001. 'Porto 2001' was a year-long programme of arts, cultural events and urban regeneration activities and led to big investment in the cultural infrastructure, such as the major concert hall space Casa da Música</p>

Source: Adapted from JRC (2018).

Additionally, the relevance of cultural and creative industries is also referred (co-working spaces, fab labs, and start-up incubators) (see Table 3). Lisbon and Oporto have received a significant number of awards. For instance the Portuguese capital has already won the Best European Destination award in the first edition of the contest in 2010 and then in 2015, distinction that was awarded to Oporto three times, in 2012, 2014, and 2017. In addition, Oporto won several prizes and accolades in 2017. Timeout Index 2018, highlighted that Oporto “is the second most exciting city in the world “for making friends, finding love, feeling free to be yourself

and the most affordable night”. Awarded European Best Destination in 2017, Porto also won the World Excellence Award 2018 for Best Startup-Friendly City of Europe by the World Business Angels Investment Forum. Moreover, Porto obtained a distinction as 8th Best Mid-Sized City for FDI Strategy by fDi ‘Intelligence European Cities of the Future’ 2018/19 awards, for its quality of life, strategic location, labour and real estate costs which are important factors to attract investment. The Port of Leixões’ Cruise Terminal has been elected ‘Building of the Year 2017’ by one of the most prestigious international awards of ArchDaily. Porto’s

Francisco Sá Carneiro’s airport, was voted by ACI – Airports Council International as one of the best in the European Region for airports handling between 5 and 15 million passengers/year (Pwc, 2018: 42).

Comparing Lisbon and Oporto cities, Table 4 shows, in descending order, that Lisbon has a better performance in “Cultural Vibrancy”, “Creative Economy”, “Enabling Environment”. The main difference is in “Cultural Vibrancy” (namely – 22.3).

Table 4. Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor – 3 sub-indices: Lisbon and Oporto

	Lisbon	Oporto
Index	42.6	27.9 (-14.7)
CV - Cultural Vibrancy	54.3	32 (-22.3)
CE - Creative Economy	36.4	22.5 (-13.9)
EE - Enabling Environment	31.4	30.5 (-0.9)

Source: Adapted from JRC (2018).

Cultural Vibrancy is based in 2 dimensions, namely: Cultural Venues & Facilities and Cultural Participation & Attractiveness. Lisbon presents a better performance when compared with Oporto in the two dimensions, notably in the first one: 63.1 confronting with 33.2. Oporto

only performs better in two indicators (Sights & landmarks and Satisfaction with cultural facilities).

Lisbon’s best performance is in indicators such as “Concerts & Shows”, “Cinema attendance”, “Cinema seats”, among others.

Table 5. Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor – Cultural Vibrancy: Lisbon and Oporto

V - CULTURAL VIBRANCY	54.3	32 (-22.3)
D1 - Cultural Venues & Facilities	63.1	33.2 (-29.9)
I1 - Sights & landmarks	41.3	55.7 (+14.4)
I2 - Museums	51.6	40.4 (-11.2)
I3 - Cinema seats	44.7	7.7 (-37)
I4 - Concerts & Shows	89.6	21.1 (-68.5)
I5 - Theatres	71.8	55.9 (-15.9)
D2 - Cultural Participation & Attractiveness	45.5	30.9 (-14.7)
I6 - Tourist overnight stays	50	30 (-20)
I7 - Museum visitors	70.6	61.5 (-9.1)
I8 - Cinema attendance	56.6	4.4 (-52.2)
I9 - Satisfaction with cultural facilities	7.1	27.1 (+20)

Source: Adapted from JRC (2018)

In Creative Economy sub index Lisbon has, again, a better performance. However, the gap between the two cities is smaller than the

cultural vibrancy gap (Tables 5 and 6). The “Intellectual Property & Innovations” is the dimension which shows more closeness between

the two cities. In the dimension “New Jobs in Creative Fields”, Lisbon has a greater dynamic in CCI, since it generates more “Jobs in new arts, & entertainment enterprises”, “Jobs in new media & communication enterprises”, “Jobs in

new enterprises in other creative sectors”. In accordance, the “Rise of the Creative Class” (Florida, 2012), puts in evidence the growing role of creativity in our economy, once creative ethos is increasingly dominant.

Table 6. Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor – Creative economy: Lisbon and Oporto

CE - Creative Economy	36.4	22.5 (-13.9)
D3 - Creative & Knowledge-based workers	26.9	13.6 (-13.4)
I10 - Jobs in arts, culture & entertainment	32	19.3 (-12.7)
I11 - Jobs in media & communication	22	6.1 (-15.9)
I12 - Jobs in other creative sectors	26.8	15.4 (-11.4)
D4 - Intellectual Property & Innovations	3.9	3.7 (-0.2)
I13 - ICT patent applications	1.6	1.4 (-0.2)
I14 - Community design applications	6.2	6 (-0.2)
D5 - New Jobs in Creative Fields	62.1	40.7 (-21.4)
I15 - Jobs in new arts, & entertainment enterprises	54.3	36.4 (-17.9)
I16 - Jobs in new media & communication enterprises	32.1	15 (-17.1)
I17 - Jobs in new enterprises in other creative sectors	100	70.8 (-29.2)

Source: Adapted from JRC (2018).

The sub-index “Enabling Environment” positions the two cities near each other. Generally, Lisbon presents better performance in the different dimensions and indicators (Human Capital & Education; Human Capital & Education and Governance & Regulations). Oporto “Openness, Tolerance & Trust” dimension reveals better performance than Lisbon. “Graduates in arts & humanities”, “Graduates in ICT” indicators, rank Oporto ahead of Lisbon (see Table 7).

The comparison between Lisbon and Oporto shows that tourism motivation is clearly associated with these cities’ culture and creativity, since the main motivation segment is “city and short breaks”. Regarding Lisbon, a Lisbon Tourism survey considers “city and short breaks” the most important foreign tourism motivational segment with a weight of approximately 70% (TL, 2016: 2). In addition, by “purpose of trip” the emphasis is on visit monuments and museums, knowledge of Portuguese culture, gastronomy and wine, knowledge of

different local customs, among others (TL, 2016a: 3).

The main purpose of visit – visit monuments and museums – is based on the visit to the following “attractions, monuments and museums” (TL, 2016a: 3): Torre de Belém (85.2%), Mosteiro dos Jerónimos (82.4%), Padrão Descobrimientos (76.2%), CC Belém (55.1%), Museu Chiado (44.7%), Museu Gulbenkian (44.0%), Sé de Lisboa (41.7%), among others (TL, 2015).

The ‘Satisfaction and Image Survey - 2015’ (TL, 2015a: 21) shows the image of ‘Lisbon-Lisbon – Lisbon region’ as a ‘capital city’ (97.0%), ‘city of feelings/sensations’ (93.9%) ‘ancient city with history’ (92.9%), ‘creative and trendy city’ (92.0%), ‘unique city’ (88.0%) (% of agreement: ‘agree’ and ‘totally agree’), among others (TL, 2015a). Accordingly, in the Strategic Tourism Plan for the Lisbon region 2015-2019’ (Roland Berger/ERTRL/TL, 2014), Lisbon is seen as ‘city/short breaks’ and highlights its ‘culture’ as a transversal ‘qualifier’ of

its offer. In the ‘Tourism Strategy 2027 Portugal’ (TP, 2016) considers Lisbon as being ‘a multicultural destination with a strong international vocation’. It recognises some of Lisbon assets to achieve it, namely ‘active differentiators’ (climate and light, history and culture, sea,

nature and biodiversity, water), ‘active qualifiers’ (gastronomy and wines, artistic and cultural events, sports and business), ‘emerging assets’ (well-being, living in Portugal), and a ‘unique transversal asset’ (people).

Table 7. Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor – Enabling Environment: Lisbon and Oporto

EE - Enabling Environment	31.4	30.5 (-0.9)
D6 - Human Capital & Education	36.4	36 (-0.4)
I18 - Graduates in arts & humanities	33	39.8 (+6.8)
I19 - Graduates in ICT	34.6	41.2 (+6.6)
I20 - Average appearances in university rankings	41.7	27.1 (-14.6)
D7 - Openness, Tolerance & Trust	24.4	24.6 (+0.2)
I21 - Foreign graduates	33.3	31.9 (-1.4)
I22 - Foreign-born population	21.4	11.1 (-10.3)
I23 - Tolerance of foreigners	48.1	48.1
I24 - Integration of foreigners	6.7	6.7
I25 - People trust	12.5	25 (+12.5)
D8 - Accessibility – local & international	28	23.1 (-4.9)
26 - Passenger flights	4.9	0.8 (-4.1)
I27 - Potential road accessibility	75.1	66.1 (-9)
I28 - Direct trains to other cities	3.9	2.4 (-1.5)
D9 - Governance & Regulations	58.2	56.8 (-1.4)
29 - Quality of governance	58.2	56.8 (-1.4)

Source: Adapted from JRC (2018).

Since 1999, Oporto has promoted the wine regions of *Vinho Verde* wines, Douro Wines and Port Wine by the Great Wine Capitals Capital Network which is made up of 9 cities internationally renowned for their wine regions.

Oporto has undergone in the last few decades through a process of active reconstruction and in result, especially from 2001 but more deepened from 2004, the city of Oporto touristifies itself. Here one understands touristification as the appropriation of urban space by tourists.

The cultural heritage is still an important topic consulted on Oporto’s tourism website (<http://visitporto.travel/Visitar/Paginas/default.aspx>), namely Oporto historic centre, Miguel Bombarda, electric transport, Douro river, and the tiles (Visitporto, 2018). Moreira and Cordeiro (2016: 52) study underlines others factors that contribute to the increase of tourism demand in this city during this decade such as the qualification of the cultural offer of the city and its Historical Centre, with the creation of new museums (for example, the Museum of Marionetas, Museum of Mercy), the emergence of low cost flights and hostels, and the qualification of the Port of Leixões for large cruise ships, among others.

According to Martins (2015: 9), the satisfactory Oporto attributes are: beautiful views,

cultural attraction, good nightlife and entertaining, world heritage, unique and different, good climate, and local gastronomy. Although the last two were also referred as non-satisfactory Oporto's attributes, together with local shopping and transportation infrastructure.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper is a contribution to the debate on the role of culture and creativity in the sustainable development of tourism in cities.

The results of this exploratory analysis underline the growing importance of cultural and creative tourism in the two major cities of Portugal: Lisbon (a capital city) and Oporto (the second city of Portugal), and add to the theoretical discussion on cultural/creative tourism and sustainable development interconnections.

The consideration of a set of city or urban culture/creativity indices, such as Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor (CCCM/JRC), Creative Cities Index (Charles Landry), applied to Lisbon and Oporto could be seen as a crucial tool in tourism planning and management in the framework of the cities' own strategy. Cities as short break cultural destinations could integrate culture to add value to their offer. Namely, in a context of a significant growth in their tourism demand and supply, as showed through a set of indicators (see: overnights, REVPAR, guest, ...) of performance in recent years. Monitoring cultural and creative tourism sustainable development is crucial given that they could improve the assessment of cultural/creative tourism dynamic and policy, once culture in the two cities is a huge motivator to tourists.

Simultaneously, the existence of UNESCO World Heritage Sites, the association to other international/supranational classifications such as European Capital of Culture, Expo, Euro, international thematic festivals (e.g. of cinema/film, architecture, fashion, creative hubs forums), participation /dynamic of Cultural and Creative industries (fab labs, start-ups, ...), among many other international but also national, regional and local initiatives contributed to highlight the cultural and creative attributes and activities of the two Portuguese major cities.

Comparing Lisbon and Oporto, the first city reveals a better performance in "cultural vibrancy", "creative economy", "enabling environment", following the Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor. However, it is important to note that the gap between the two cities is lower in "enabling environment" sub-index. At the same time, Oporto was better positioned than Lisbon in terms of "Openness, Tolerance & Trust". The performance in "Graduates in arts & humanities", "Graduates in ICT" indicators also shows Oporto in a better position.

As an exploratory study, this paper presents some limitations, once a more in-depth analysis requires a higher number of indicators in cultural and creative tourism domain as well as a broader and temporal framework. However, our research has highlighted the significant scope and opportunity that exists for future research and development to address the questions of how cities can do the continuous monitorisation of its cultural and creative sector performance and how cultural creative public policies could improve their urban tourism development.

REFERENCES

Arcadis (2016), "Sustainable Cities Index 2016 - Putting people at the heart of city sustainability". In Web.pdf <https://www.arcadis.com/media/0/6/6/%7B06687980-3179-47AD-89FD-F6AFA76EBB73%7DSustainable%20Cities%20.pdf> (consulted on: 17.04.2017).

Blankenship, S. (2005), "Blankenship in Design Issues". In Creative City News, Creative City Network of Canada. Creative City News: Special Edition 2007.

Citiscope (2016), "Explainer: What is the New Urban Agenda?". Citiscope. Global goals. Local solutions". In <http://citiscope.org/> (consulted on: 17.04.2017).

Charles Landry (2017), "Creative Cities Index". In <http://charleslandry.com/themes/creative-cities-index/> (consulted on: 17.05.2017).

COST (2018), "ISCH COST Action IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability". In http://www.cost.eu/COST_Actions/isch/IS1007 (consulted on: 17.05.2017).

EC [European Commission] (2018), “European Tourism Indicators System for sustainable destination - European Commission website”. In http://ec.europa.eu/growth/sectors/tourism/offer/sustainable/indicators_en (consulted on: 17.05.2017).

EC (2011), “The European Cluster Observatory, Priority Sector Report: Creative and Cultural Industries”, Dominic Power, Uppsala University. In <http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/> (consulted on: 05.08.2017).

EI [Euromonitor International] (2017), “Top 100 City Destinations Ranking WTM”, London 2017 Edition In http://go.euromonitor.com/rs/805-KOK719/images/Euromonitor%20International_WTM%20London%202017_Top%20100%20City%20Destinations.pdf (consulted on: 17.02.2018).

EU (2017), “The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor JRC”. In <https://compositeindicators.jrc.ec.europa.eu/cultural-creative-citiesmonitor/> (consulted on: 05.11.2017).

Florida, R. (2012), “The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday”. Basic Books.

GaWC (2017), “Index”. In <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/gawc/rb/rb23.html> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

Global Influence (2017), “Global City Index 2017: The Most Connected Cities”. In <http://www.globalinfluence.world/en/global-city-index-2017-connected-cities/> (consulted on: 05.01.2018).

Henriques, C. (2016), “Lisbon Fado as Heritage of Humanity: Interconnections with Tourism”. In Henriques, C., Moreira, M. C., César, P. A. B. (Eds.) (2016), *Tourism and History World Heritage – Case Studies of Ibero-American Space*, Interdisciplinary Centre of Social Sciences – University of Minho (CICS.NOVA.UMinho). In http://www.lasics.uminho.pt/ojs/index.php/cics_ebooks/article/view/2516/2427 (consulted on: 17.05.2017).

Henriques, C. (2003), “Turismo, Cidade e Cultura. Planeamento e Gestão Sustentável”, Lisboa: Edições Sílabo.

Holden (2006), “Cultural policy is a closed conversation among experts. What culture needs is a democratic mandate from the public”, Demos. In <https://www.demos.co.uk/files/Culturalvalueweb.pdf> (consulted on: 17.05.2017).

IMPACTUR (2018), “Indicadores de Monitorização e Previsão da Atividade Turística”. In <http://www.ciitt.ualg.pt/impactur/> (consulted on: 17.03.2018).

Korez-Vide, R. (2013), “Promoting Sustainability of Tourism by Creative Tourism Development: How far is Slovenia?”, *Innovative Issues and Approaches in Social Sciences*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 78-102.

JLL (2017), “The Universe of City Indices 2017 - Decoding City Performance – JLL and The Business of Cities”. In <http://www.jll.com/citiesresearch/Documents/benchmarking-future-world-of-cities/JLL-Decoding-CityPerformance-2017.pdf> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

JRC (2017), “The Cultural and Creative Cities Monitor”, JRC/European Commission. In <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC107331/kj0217787enn.pdf> (consulted on: 07.03.2018)

Martins, M. (2015), “The tourist Imagery, the Destination Image and the Brand Image”, *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Management*, December 2015, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 1-14

Menger, Pierre-Michel (2013), “European cultural policies and the ‘creative industries’ turn. European cultural policies and the ‘creative industries’ turn”. In Kerry ThomasKeery, T. , and Janet Chan, J. (eEds), *Handbook of research on creativity*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 2013, chap. 32. In https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303314894_European_cultural_policies_and_the_'creative_industries'_turn_Pierre-Michel_Menger (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

Menon Economics (2017), “English Summary the Value of Cultural Heritage an Economic Analysis of Cultural Heritage and Cultural Environments”. In <https://www.menon.no/?lang=enDownloads/Verdien%20av%20kulturarv%20-%20engelsk%20sammendrag.pdf> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

Moreira, C. & Cordeiro (2016), “The Impact of the World Cultural Heritage Classification by Unesco on the Cultural Touristic Demand in Oporto”. In Henriques, C., Moreira, M. C., César, P. A. B. (Eds.) (2016), *Tourism and History World Heritage – Case Studies of Ibero-American Space*, Interdisciplinary Centre of Social Sciences – University of Minho (CICS.NOVA.UMinho). In http://www.lasics.uminho.pt/ojs/index.php/cics_ebooks/article/view/2516/2427, pp 40-54 (consulted on: 17.05.2017).

Musterd, S. & Ostendorf, W.J.M. (2004), “Creative Cultural Knowledge Cities: Perspectives and Planning Strategies”, *Built Environment* (3), 189–193.

Navrud, S. & R.C. Ready (eds.) (2002), “Valuing Cultural Heritage. Applying

Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historical Buildings. Monuments and Artifacts”, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

O’Brien, D. (2015), “Cultural value, measurement and policy making, Arts and Humanities in Higher Education”, Vol 14, Issue 1, 2015. pp. 79-94.

OECD [Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development] (2014), “Tourism and the Creative Economy”, OECD Studies.

Pine, B. J. II & Gilmore, J. H. (1999), “The Experience Economy”, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Pwc (2018), “The European cities hotel forecast 2018 & 2019” In <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/industries/hospitality-leisure/publications/european-hotels-forecast.html> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

Richards, G. (2011), “Creativity and tourism: the state of the art. Annals of tourism research”, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 2011, 1237.

Richards, G., (2001), “Cultural tourists or a culture of tourism? Developments in the European cultural tourism market”, Innovations in cultural tourism: proceedings of the 5th ATLAS International conference innovatory approaches to culture and tourism, 1998, Rethymnom, Crete, (ed. Buther, J.), ATLAS, Tilburg, 2001.

Richards, G. & Wilson, J. (2006), “Developing Creativity in tourist experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture?”, Tourism Management, Vol.: 27, No.:6, pp. 1209–1223.

Rifkin, J. (2000), “The age of access: The New Culture of Hypercapitalism, Where All of Life is a Paid-for Experience”. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Stylianou-Lambert, T., Mihailova, M., Spinuzzi, P., Cicerchia A., Johannisson, J., Kangas, A., Lapka, M., Sestic, M., Dragicevic, K., Siivonen, K. & Skjerven A. (2015), “Story 2: sustainable development”. In Dessein, J., K. Soini, G. Fairclough and L. G. Horlings (Eds.). (2015, May). Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development: Conclusions from the COST Action IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. In http://www.culturalsustainability.eu/conclusion_s.pdf 2015 by University of Jyväskylä, pp. 29-33 (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

TL [Turismo de Lisboa/ATL] (2016), “Survey to the Purpose of the trip – Lisbon city 2015”, In [https://www.visitlisboa.com/sites/default/files/2016-12/Survey%20to%20the%20Purpose%20of%20Trip%202015%20-](https://www.visitlisboa.com/sites/default/files/2016-12/Survey%20to%20the%20Purpose%20of%20Trip%202015%20-%20Lisbon%20City.pdf)

[%20Lisbon%20City.pdf](https://www.visitlisboa.com/sites/default/files/2016-12/Survey%20to%20the%20Purpose%20of%20Trip%202015%20-%20Lisbon%20City.pdf) (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

TL [Turismo de Lisboa/ATL] (2016), “Visit Lisbon Observatório Purpose of Trip”. In <https://www.visitlisboa.com/sites/default/files/2016-12/Survey%20to%20the%20Purpose%20of%20Trip%202015%20-%20Lisbon%20City.pdf> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

TL (2016a), “Visit Lisbon Observatório Satisfaction and Image Survey 2015”. In <https://www.visitlisboa.com/sites/default/files/2016-10/SATISFACTION%20AND%20IMAGE%20SURVEY%202015.pdf> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

TL (2015), “Visit Lisbon Observatório”, Turismo de Lisboa – Inquérito motivacional Cidade. In <https://www.visitlisboa.com/sites/default/files/2016-10/VISITOR%20ACTIVITIES%20AND%20INFORMATION%20SURVEY%202015.pdf>(consulted on: 03.12.2017).

Throsby, D. (2010), “The economics of cultural policy”, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Throsby, D. (2008), “Culture in sustainable development: Insights for the future implementation of art. 13”. In Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. UNESCO: Sydney, Australia, 2008.

TP [Turismo de Portugal] (2017), “Estratégia Turismo 2027”. In <http://estrategia.turismodeportugal.pt/>(consulted on: 03.12.2017).

TP (2013), “PENT revisto. Plano Estratégico Nacional do Turismo PENT Horizonte 2013-2015”, Lisboa: Turismo de Portugal. In <http://www.turismodeportugal.pt/Paginas/PageNotFound.aspx?requestUrl=http://www.turismodeportugal.pt/Portugu%C3%AAs/turismodeportugal/publicacoes/Documents/PENT%202007.pdf> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UN [United Nations] (2017), “2017 United Nations A/RES/71/256* New Urban Agenda 2017”.

UN (2012), “Rio +20 - Future We Want”, Outcome document –Sustainable Development. In <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=1298> (consulted on: 03.12. 2017).

UNCTAD (2017), “Creative Economy”. In <http://unctadstat.unctad.org/wds/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNCTAD (2017a), “The UNCTAD Handbook of Statistics 2017”, United Nations publication issued by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. In <http://unctad.org/en/Pages/DITC/CreativeEconomy>

Statistics-on-world-trade-increative-products.aspx. (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNESCO (2017), “Re|shaping cultural policies: advancing creativity for development - 2018 – Advancing creativity for development”, The second report on the 2005 Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions; Unesco, 2017. In <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002605/260592e.pdf>. (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNESCO (2015), “UNESCO moving forward the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. UNESCO Task Force on the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” In <http://en.unesco.org/sdgs>. (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNESCO (2010), “The power of culture for development”. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2006), “Towards sustainable strategies for creative tourism: creative cities network”, Santa Fé, Nwe Mexico, october 25-27,2006. In <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001598/159811e.pdf>. (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNESCO (2006a), “Tourism, culture and sustainable development” (M. Robinson and D. Picard). <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001475/147578e.pdf> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNESCO (2016b), “Global report on culture for sustainable urban development”. In www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/culture-and-development/culture-for-sustainableurban-development/ (accessed 26 March 2016). The UNESCO Global Report on Culture for Sustainable Urban Development (2016b) (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNESCO (2003), “Cultural landscapes: The challenges of conservation”, Proceedings of the workshop, 11–12 November 2002, Ferrara,

Italy. UNESCO World Heritage Papers, no. 7. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO (2001), “UNESCO universal declaration on cultural diversity”, Records of the general conference, 31st session, 15 October–3 November 2001, Paris, France. Annex I, Volume 1 Resolutions. Paris: UNESCO.

UNWTO [World Tourism Organization] (2016), “Tourism Highlights”, UNWTO.

UNWTO (2014), “AM Reports”, Volume ten – Global Benchmarking for City Tourism Measurement. UNWTO, Madrid. (UNWTO). In http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/global_benchmarking_hr.pdf (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

UNWTO/UNESCO (2017), “The Muscat Declaration on Tourism and Culture: Fostering Sustainable Development”, Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development 2017, Muscat, Oman, 11-12 dezembro 2017.

UNWTO/UNESCO (2015), “UNWTO/UNESCO World Conference on Tourism and Culture: Building a New Partnership. 2015”, Cambodia, Siem Reap. In <https://en.unesco.org/themes/culture-sustainable-development> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

Visit Porto (2018), “Site oficial do Porto”. In <http://visitporto.travel/Visitar/Paginas/default.aspx> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

WEF [World economic Forum] (2017), “The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2017 Paving the way for a more sustainable and inclusive future WEF (2017)”, The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2017 Paving the way for a more sustainable and inclusive future.

WTTC [World Travel & Tourism Council] (2017), “Tourism Economic Impact –World”, WTTC. In: <http://www.wttc.com> (consulted on: 03.12.2017).

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by national funds through the FCT- Foundation for Science and Technology under the project UID/SOC/04020/2013.

NORMAS PARA OS ARTIGOS A SUBMETER À REVISTA PORTUGUESA DE ESTUDOS REGIONAIS

A. Normas respeitantes à aceitação e avaliação dos artigos

1. Embora a Revista Portuguesa de Estudos Regionais (RPER) não seja membro do Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), a sua Direção Editorial decidiu declarar a sua adesão aos princípios do Código de Conduta do COPE, com efeitos a partir de 1 de Janeiro de 2012

(<http://publicationethics.org/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20for%20journal%20editors4.pdf>).

2. Só serão em princípio aceites para avaliação na RPER artigos que nunca tenham sido publicados em nenhum suporte (outra revista ou livro, incluindo livros de Atas). Excetua-se a divulgação anterior em séries do tipo “working papers” (eletrónicas ou em papel). Outras exceções pontuais podem ser aceites pela Direção Editorial, se os direitos de reprodução estiverem salvaguardados.

3. Ao enviar uma proposta de artigo para a Revista, os autores devem renunciar explicitamente a submetê-la para publicação a qualquer outra revista ou livro até à conclusão do processo de avaliação. Para o efeito deverão sempre enviar, juntamente com o artigo que submetem, uma declaração assinada neste sentido. No caso de recusa do artigo pela Direção Editorial, os autores ficarão livres para o publicar noutra parte.

4. Os artigos submetidos à Direção Editorial para publicação serão sempre avaliados (anonimamente) por dois especialistas na área, convidados para o efeito pela Direção Editorial. Os dois avaliadores farão os comentários que entenderem ao artigo e classificá-lo-ão de acordo com critérios definidos pela Direção Editorial. Os critérios de avaliação procurarão refletir a originalidade, a consistência, a legibilidade e a correção formal do artigo. No prazo máximo de 16 semanas após a submissão do artigo, os seus autores serão contactados pela Direção Editorial, sendo-lhes comunicado o resultado da avaliação feita.

O processo de avaliação tem três desenlaces possíveis:

(1) O artigo é admitido para publicação tal como está (ou com meras alterações de pormenor) e é inserido no plano editorial da revista. Neste caso, a data previsível de publicação será de imediato comunicada aos autores.

(2) O artigo é considerado aceitável mas sob condição de serem efetuadas alterações significativas na sua forma ou nos seus conteúdos. Neste caso, os autores disporão de um máximo de 6 semanas para, se quiserem, procederem aos ajustamentos propostos e para voltarem a submeter o artigo, iniciando-se, após a receção da versão corrigida, um novo processo de avaliação.

(3) O artigo é recusado.

5. A RPER poderá organizar números especiais de natureza temática, na sequência de conferências, *workshops* ou outros eventos relevantes na sua área de interesse. Embora nestes casos o processo de avaliação dos artigos possa ser simplificado, a RPER manterá ainda assim, escrupulosamente, o princípio de revisão pelos pares de todos os artigos.

6. Excecionalmente a RPER poderá contudo publicar artigos “por convite”, ou seja não sujeitos ao crivo de revisores. A singularidade destes artigos será sempre assinalada, de forma transparente, na sua primeira página.

7. A RPER reconhece o direito dos membros da sua Direção Editorial (incluindo o seu Diretor) a submeterem artigos para publicação. Sempre que um membro da Direção Editorial é autor ou coautor de um artigo, então é necessariamente excluído do processo de revisão, em todos os seus passos, incluindo a decisão final.

8. A RPER reconhece o direito de recurso de qualquer sua decisão relativa à aceitação de um artigo para publicação. Esse recurso é endereçado ao Diretor que deverá informar toda a Direção Editorial. Os termos do recurso serão enviados aos revisores, que terão um prazo máximo de 30 dias para se pronunciarem em definitivo. No caso de não haver acordo entre os dois *referees*, a Direção Editorial tem obrigatoriamente de indicar um terceiro especialista. Não existe novo recurso, para uma segunda decisão que decorra deste processo.

9. A RPER encoraja a publicação de críticas relevantes, por outros autores, a artigos publicados nas suas páginas. Os autores criticados têm sempre a possibilidade de resposta.

10. Os *referees* estão sujeitos ao dever de confidencialidade, quer quanto ao conteúdo dos artigos que apreciam, quer quanto aos seus próprios comentários, devendo mais em geral garantir que todo o material que lhes é submetido é tratado em confiança. Será sempre enviada aos revisores a informação sobre os princípios do Código de Conduta referido em 1.

11. Uma vez o artigo aceite, e feito o trabalho de formatação gráfica prévio à sua publicação na revista, serão enviadas ao autor as respetivas provas tipográficas para revisão. As eventuais correções que este quiser fazer terão de ser devolvidas à Direção Editorial no prazo máximo de 5 dias úteis a contar da data da sua receção. Só serão aceites correções de forma.

12. Ao autor e a cada um dos coautores de cada artigo aceite será oferecido um exemplar do número da Revista em que o artigo foi publicado.

13. Os originais, depois de formatados de acordo com as presentes normas, não poderão exceder as 30 páginas, incluindo a página de título, a página de resumo, as notas, os quadros, gráficos e mapas e as referências bibliográficas.

14. As propostas de artigo deverão ser enviadas por e-mail para rper.geral@gmail.com, ou pelo correio, para o Secretariado da RPER: APDR - Universidade dos Açores, Rua Capitão João d'Ávila 9700-042 Angra do Heroísmo – PORTUGAL. Para comunicação posterior o contacto com o Secretariado far-se-á pelo: e-mail: rper.geral@gmail.com.

B. Normas respeitantes à estrutura dos artigos

1. Os autores deverão enviar o artigo completo (conforme os pontos seguintes), por e-mail ou em CD-rom, para o os contactos referidos no ponto 14 das Normas A.

2. Os textos deverão ser processados em Microsoft Word for Windows (versão 97 ou posterior). O texto deverá ser integralmente a preto e branco.

3. Na publicação os gráficos, mapas, diagramas, etc. serão designados por “figuras” e as tabelas por “quadros”.

4. As eventuais figuras e quadros deverão ser disponibilizados de duas formas distintas: por um lado devem ser colocados no texto, com o aspeto pretendido pelos autores. Para além disso, deverão ser disponibilizados em ficheiros separados: os quadros, tabelas e gráficos serão entregues em Microsoft Excel for Windows, versão 97 ou posterior (no caso dos gráficos deverá ser enviado tanto o gráfico final como toda a série de dados que lhe está na origem, de preferência no mesmo ficheiro e um por worksheet); para os mapas deverá usar-se um formato vetorial em Corel Draw (versão 9 ou posterior).

5. As expressões matemáticas deverão ser tão simples quanto possível. Serão apresentadas numa linha (entre duas marcas de parágrafo) e numeradas sequencialmente na margem direita com numeração entre parêntesis curvos. A aplicação para a construção das expressões deverá ser ou o Equation Editor (Microsoft) ou o MathType.

6. Salvo casos excecionais, que exigem justificação adequada a submeter à Direção Editorial, o número máximo de coautores das propostas de artigo é quatro. Só deverão ser considerados autores os que contribuíram direta e efetivamente para a pesquisa refletida no trabalho.

7. O texto deve ser processado em página A4, com utilização do tipo de letra Times New Roman 12, a um espaço e meio, com um espaço após parágrafo de 6 pt. As margens superior, inferior, esquerda e direita devem ter 2,5 cm.

8. A primeira página conterá exclusivamente o título do artigo, em português e em inglês, bem como o nome, morada, telefone, fax e e-mail do autor, com indicação das funções exercidas e da instituição a que pertence. No caso de vários autores deverá af indicar-se qual o contacto para toda a correspondência da Revista. Deve ser também incluída na primeira página uma nota sobre as instituições financiadoras da investigação que conduziu ao artigo. Este nota é obrigatória quando pertinente.

9. A segunda página conterá unicamente o título e dois resumos do artigo, um em português e outro inglês, com um máximo de 800 caracteres cada, seguidos de um parágrafo com

indicação, em português e inglês, de palavras-chave até ao limite de 5, e ainda 2 a 5 códigos do Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) apropriados à temática do artigo, a 3 dígitos, como por exemplo R11. Os títulos, os resumos, as palavras-chave e os códigos JEL são obrigatórios.

10. Na terceira página começará o texto do artigo, sendo as suas eventuais secções ou capítulos numerados sequencialmente utilizando apenas algarismos (não deverão utilizar-se nem letras nem numeração romana).

11. Cada uma das figuras e quadros deverá conter uma indicação clara da fonte e ser, tanto quanto possível, compreensível sem ser necessário recorrer ao texto. Todos deverão ter um título e, se aplicável, uma legenda descritiva.

12. A forma final das figuras e quadros será da responsabilidade da Direção Editorial que procederá, sempre que necessário, aos ajustamentos necessários.

C. Normas respeitantes às referências bibliográficas

1. A “Bibliografia” a apresentar no final de cada artigo deverá conter exclusivamente as citações e referências bibliográficas efetivamente feitas no texto.

2. Para garantir o anonimato dos artigos, o número máximo de citações de obras do autor do artigo (ou de cada um dos seus coautores) é três e não são permitidas expressões que possam denunciar a autoria tais como, por exemplo, “conforme afirmámos em trabalhos anteriores (cfr. Silva (1998:3))”.

3. O estrito cumprimento das normas à frente só é obrigatório na versão final dos artigos, após aceitação. Ainda assim, recomenda-se

fortemente a sua adoção em todas as versões submetidas.

4. Os autores citados ao longo do texto serão indicados pelo apelido seguido, entre parêntesis curvos, do ano da publicação, de “:” e da(s) página(s) em que se encontra a citação. Por exemplo: ao citar-se “Silva (2003: 390-93)”: está-se a referir a obra escrita em 2003 pelo autor “Silva”, nas páginas 390 a 393. Deverá usar-se “Silva (2003: 390-93)” e não “SILVA (2003: 390-93)”. No caso de uma mera referência do autor bastará indicar “Silva (2003)”.

5. No caso de o mesmo autor ter mais de um trabalho do mesmo ano citado no artigo, indicar-se-á a ordem da citação, por exemplo: Silva (2003a: 240) e Silva (2003b: 232).

6. As referências bibliográficas serão listadas por ordem alfabética dos apelidos dos respetivos autores no fim do manuscrito. O nome será seguido do ano da obra entre parêntesis, e da descrição conforme com a seguinte regra geral:

Monografias: Silva, Hermenegildo (2007a), *A Teoria dos Legumes*, Coimbra, Editora Agrícola

Coletâneas: Sousa, João (2002), “Herbicidas e estrumes” in Cunha, Maria (coord.), *Teoria e Prática Hortícola*, Lisboa, Quintal Editora, pp. 222-244

Artigos de Revista: Martins, Vicente (2009), “Leguminosas Gostosas”, *Revista Agrícola*, Vol. 32, nº 3, pp. 234-275

7. A forma final das referências bibliográficas será da responsabilidade da Direção Editorial que procederá, sempre que necessário, aos ajustamentos necessários.

NORMS FOR THE SUBMISSION OF PAPERS TO THE PORTUGUESE REVIEW OF REGIONAL STUDIES

A. Norms concerning papers submission and evaluation

1. Although the Portuguese Review of Regional Studies (RPER) is not a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), its Editorial Board decided to adhere to the principles of the COPE Code of Conduct, from January 1st 2012 onwards:

(<http://publicationethics.org/files/Code%20of%20conduct%20for%20journal%20editors4.pdf>).

2. In principle, only papers that have never been published (in another journal or book, including conference Proceedings) can be considered for publication in RPER. The previous publication in a series of “working papers” (electronic or paper format) is an exception to this rule. The Editorial Board may agree with other sporadic exceptions, when copyrights are secured.

3. When a paper is submitted to RPER, authors must explicitly state that it will not be submitted for publication in any other journal or book until the reviewing process is completed. For this purpose, a signed declaration must be sent along with the paper. If the paper is rejected by the Editorial Board, the authors are free to publish it anywhere else.

4. Papers submitted for publication will always be reviewed (anonymously) by two experts in the area, invited by the Editorial Board. Both referees will offer their comments and classify it in accordance with the criteria defined by the Editorial Board. The reviewing criteria include originality, consistency, readability and the paper’s formal correction. The authors will be informed by the Editorial Board of the results of the evaluation within 16 weeks of its receipt. The assessment has three possible outcomes:

(1) The paper is accepted for publication just as it is (or with minor changes) and it is included in the editorial plan. In this case, the authors are immediately informed of the expected publication date.

(2) The paper is considered acceptable provided that major changes are made to its form

or contents. In this case, authors will have a maximum of six weeks to make such changes and to submit the paper again. Once the revised version is received, a new assessment process starts.

(3) The paper is refused.

5. RPER may organize special issues on specific themes, following conferences, workshops, or other events relevant in its area of interest. Although, in these cases, a simplifying shorter reviewing process may be adopted, the principle of peer-review selection will always be preserved.

6. Exceptionally, RPER may publish articles “by invitation”, meaning that they are not subject to the reviewing process. These outstanding articles, however, are always clearly signaled as such in their front page.

7. RPER acknowledges the right of the members of its Editorial Board (including its Director) to submit papers to the journal. When an author or co-author is also a member of the Editorial Board, he/she is excluded from the reviewing process in all its stages, including the final decision.

8. RPER acknowledges the authors’ right of appeal on any publishing decision of the Editorial Board. That appeal is made to the Director of RPER that will inform the Editorial Board. The new arguments will be sent to the reviewers, asking for a final judgment within a 30-day term. In case of disagreement between the two referees, the Editorial Board is compelled to appoint a third reviewer. There is no further appeal for a second decision ensuing this process.

9. RPER positively welcomes cogent criticism on the works it publishes. Authors of criticized material will have the opportunity to respond.

10. Reviewers are required to preserve the confidentiality on the contents of the papers and on their comments, and requested, more generally, to handle all the submitted material in confidence. Proper information on the principles of the Code of Conduct referred in 1. will always be provided to the reviewers.

11. Once the paper has been accepted and formatted for publishing, it will be sent to the

author for graphics checking and revision. Any corrections the author might want to make must be sent to RPER within five days. Only formal corrections will be accepted.

12. Each author and co-author of accepted papers will be offered a number of the published issue

13. Articles cannot exceed 30 pages after being formatted according to the present norms, including the title page, the summary page, notes, tables, graphics, maps and references.

14. Papers must be sent, by e-mail to rper.geral@gmail.com or by normal mail, to the Secretariat of RPER: APDR - Universidade dos Açores, Rua Capitão João d'Ávila, 9700-042 Angra do Heroísmo – PORTUGAL. For future contact please use the e-mail address: rper.geral@gmail.com.

B. Norms concerning papers structure

1. The authors must send a complete version of the paper by e-mail or on a CD-Rom by mail, in the original Microsoft Word file, to the contacts specified in point 14 of Norms (A).

2. Texts must be processed in Microsoft Word for Windows (97 or later version). All written text must be black.

3. Graphics, maps, diagrams, etc. shall be referred to as “Figures” and tables shall be referred to as “Tables”.

4. Figures and Tables must be delivered in two different forms: inserted in the text, according to the author's choice, and in a separate file. Tables and graphics must be delivered in Microsoft Excel for Windows 97 or later. Graphics must be sent in both the final form and accompanied by the original data, preferably in the same file (each graphic in a different worksheet). Maps must be sent in a vector format, like Corel Draw or Windows Metafile Applications.

5. Mathematical expressions must be as simple as possible. They will be presented on one line (between two paragraph marks) and numbered sequentially at the right margin, with numeration inside round brackets. Equation Editor (Microsoft) or Math Type are the accepted Applications for original format files.

6. The paper must have no more than four co-authors. Exceptions may be accepted when

a reasonable explanation is presented to the Editorial Board. Authorship must be limited to actual and direct contributors to the conducted research.

7. Text must be processed in A4 format, Times New Roman font, size 12, line space 1.5 and 6 pt space between paragraphs. The upper, lower, left and right margins must be set to 2.5 cm.

8. The first page shall contain only the paper's title, the author's name, address, phone and fax numbers and e-mail, and the author's affiliation. In the case of several authors, please indicate the contact person for correspondence. A remark on funding institutions of the research or related work leading to the article – that is compulsory when it applies – must be placed as well in this first page.

9. Second page shall contain the title and the abstract of the paper, in English and, if possible, in Portuguese as well, with no more than 800 characters, followed by two lines, one with the keywords to a limit of 5, and the other with the proper Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) codes describing the paper. JEL codes must be from 2 up to 5, with three digits, as for example R11. The title, the abstract, the keywords and the JEL codes area all compulsory, at least in English.

10. Text starts on the third page. Sections or chapters are numbered sequentially using Arabic numbers only (letters or Roman numeration must not be used).

11. Figures and Tables must contain a clear source reference. These shall be as clear as possible. Each must have a title and, if applicable, a legend.

12. The final format of Figures and Tables will be of the responsibility of the Editorial Board, who will allow some adjustments, whenever necessary.

C. Norms concerning bibliographic references

1. The references listed at the end of each paper shall only contain citations and references actually mentioned in the text.

2. To ensure the anonymity of papers, each author's self references are limited to three and no expressions that might betray the authorship are allowed (for example, “as we affirmed in previous works (cfr. Silva (1998:3))”).

3. Although their meeting in preliminary versions is recommendable, the bibliographic norms below are mandatory for the final (accepted) version only.

4. Authors cited in the text must be indicated by his/her surname followed, within round brackets, by year of publication, by “:” and by the relevant page number(s). For example, the citation “Silva (2003: 390-93)”, refers to the work written in 2003 by the author Silva, on pages 390 to 393. If the author is merely mentioned, indication of “Silva (2003)” is sufficient.

5. In case an author has more than one work from the same year cited in the paper, citation must be ordered. For example: Silva (2003a: 240) and Silva (2003b: 232).

6. References must be listed alphabetically by authors’ surnames, at the end of the manuscript. The name will be followed by year of publication inside round brackets and the description, thus:

Monographs: Silva, Hermenegildo (2007a), *The Vegetables Theory*, Cambridge, Agriculture Press

Collection: Sousa, João (2002), “Weed Killers and Manure” in Cunha, Maria (coord.), *Farming - Theories and Practices*, London, Grassland Publishing Company, pp. 222-244

Journal Papers: Martins, Vicente (2009), Tasty Broccoli, *Farmer Review*, Vol. 32, nº 3, pp. 234-275

7. The final format of the references will be the responsibility of the Editorial Board, who will allow adjustments whenever necessary