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This thesis attempts to understand and evaluate sustainable tourism projects that have been in effect in Túcume since 1998; and local residents’ reactions towards these efforts. Specifically, this research examines residents’ attitudes regarding (socio-cultural, environmental, and economic) impacts brought on by tourism as well as opinions on additional tourism development. Moreover, continuing past research, this document analyzes the influence of socio-demographics (including sex, age, education, and income) and residency characteristics (both length and place) on tourism opinions.

Túcume was chosen as the study site due to the close proximity of modern settlements and impressive archaeological remains that serve as a tourist attraction. The town of Túcume and several rural settlements comprised the study area. Data collection involved one-on-one interviews. The resulting 337 survey participants were selected systematically over 66 days with a 96% response rate.

Results indicate that all residents welcome increased tourism development to the area. In particular, denizens are hopeful that tourism will yield greater economic benefits.
To date, tourism is believed to have augmented conservation, pride, and respect for Túcume’s history, archaeology, and myths. Regarding the environment: tourism is felt to have improved conservation of local plants and forests, but also to have negatively increased population size, noise, and traffic congestion. Economic impact perceptions are mixed: many residents admitted insufficient economic generation by tourism (including insufficient impact on economic opportunities, jobs, salaries, standard of living); others perceived positive changes in investment and spending, the sale of local products and services, the sale of local handicrafts, roads and transportation, utilities, the number of local businesses, and tourism training; and still others identified negative increases in the cost of real estate and leakages. Males, the middle-aged, and newer residents were slightly more positive about tourism than their counterparts. Moreover, high-school-educated and middle-income individuals were more sensitive to social benefits while college-educated and upper-income participants were more positive regarding economic benefits. Place of residence also influenced local opinions of tourism, particularly when land disputes were an issue. These results are intended to improve monitoring and equity.

Efforts at fostering a small-scale, sustainable tourism venture in Túcume have minimized negative socio-cultural, environmental, and archaeological impacts. To date, projects have improved infrastructure, tourism services, local education, and conservation. Yet, economic benefits are considered insufficient, thus calling into question the achievement of sustainability.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Like mass tourism, sustainable tourism calls for economic viability; however, unlike its predecessor, sustainable tourism also stresses the importance of social and environmental responsibility so that both visitors’ and hosts’ long-term experiences remain satisfactory without harming resources. These concerns emphasize the need to evaluate and monitor (socio-cultural, environmental, and economic) tourism impacts as perceived by the host community.

As a result, various scholars have investigated residents’ attitudes and perceptions of tourism – its costs, benefits, and development. In particular, authors have identified different sets of ‘real’ costs and benefits caused by tourism that are believed to impact the local culture, environment, and economy. Moreover, scholars have examined how these impacts are ‘perceived’ by locals. In general, it has been found that denizens of developing nations favor tourism for its economic potential: new employment, increased revenues, improved infrastructure (Liu and Var 1986). Also, “it is clear that the economic impacts of tourism are largely beneficial, the social impacts are mainly undesirable, and the environmental impacts are mixed” (Mathieson and Wall 1982:185). Social impacts include changes in social structures, customs, traditions, religious celebrations, crime, etc. And, environmental impacts deal with changes in pollution, congestion, noise, erosion, wildlife, vegetation, agriculture, etc.

Numerous factors are believed to influence the perception of these impacts, including socio-demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, age, education, income) and
residency (both length and place). (From this point forward, the aforementioned six variables will be referred to simply as socio-demographic characteristics.) For example, women and older residents seem to view tourism more negatively. More educated individuals, though, perceive tourism more positively. In addition, greater economic status seems to correlate positively with greater positive outlooks on tourism. As for residency: it appears that the longer one has lived in a host community, the more negative they are about tourism. Research has also shown that location of residence greatly influences tourism opinions, but results are conflicting: some authors cite that inhabitants living closest to tourism sectors view the industry more negatively, while others report the opposite.

**Peruvian Tourism: National Planning Efforts**

Tourism in Perú has traditionally focused on the archaeological ruins at Machu Picchu. However, excess numbers of tourists to this site have caused the Peruvian government to recognize the need to divert travelers to other locations (International Development Research Centre (IDRC) 1999:9; Road 2001:30), including the north coast and the Circuito Turistico Nororiental (CTN), or the north-oriental tourism circuit. Under the rubric of sustainable tourism, CTN hopes to develop cultural heritage tourism as well as other tourism resources within the northern departments of Lambayeque, La Libertad, Cajamarca, and Amazonas (Figure 1-1). Moreover, the FIT Perú (Integral Fortification of Tourism Perú) project, within the context of PENTUR (Perú’s National Strategic Plan for Tourism), emphasizes the need to educate Perú’s children on tourism and conservation as well as support local municipalities’ efforts at tourism development. Túcume represents the congruence of the aforementioned tourism plans. Located within the north-oriental circuit, Túcume has been designated a pilot site for FIT Perú’s work.
Figure 1-1. Map of Perú showing the different political departments, including Lambayeque. The North-oriental Tourism Circuit (CTN) includes La Libertad, Lambayeque, Cajamarca, and Amazonas.
Túcume within the Lambayeque Region

The Lambayeque Department is divided into three provinces: Lambayeque Province, Ferreñafe Province, and Chiclayo Province. The district of Túcume (Figure 1-3) is found within the first province. The discovery of golden riches at the Sipán Tombs in 1987 first placed this region of Perú on the international map. And additional discoveries of rich, unlooted Sicán tombs at Batán Grande added to the tourism potential of the coastal Lambayeque Department (Figure 1-2). As a result, the nearby pyramids at Túcume have received a great deal of attention and visitors since 1989 (Heyerdahl et al. 1995, 1996).

Túcume represents an important and unique archaeological site consisting of 26 monumental, mudbrick pyramids surrounding a central hill, Cerro La Raya. Under the guidance of Thor Heyerdahl, five years of excavations unearthed several structures and burials; and resulting artifacts are displayed and stored in a Site Museum. It is believed that after the fall of Batán Grande, the Sicán seat of power moved to Túcume, which continued to exercise local importance throughout the Chimú and Inka eras (Heyerdahl et al. 1995, 1996).

Today, the modern town of Túcume lies about 1km from the main 220 ha archaeological site (Figure 1-3). Over the last few decades, this urban center has expanded to include new settlements (e.g., Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal, Nueva Esperanza), which abut archaeological ruins. Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal is built around Huaca Manuelón, and Nueva Esperanza continues to creep around Huaca del Pueblo. Moreover smaller caserios (settlements) in the district, particularly San Antonio and La Raya, lie alongside pyramids, with some families squatting on archaeological land (Figure 1-4). Within Túcume Viejo, some residents have built their homes up against
Figure 1-2. Map showing Túcume and its proximity to other tourist attractions in the Department of Lambayeque: Chiclayo, Lambayeque, Sipán, Batán Grande. Courtesy of Site Museum
Figure 1-3. Map showing district of Túcume including caserios San Antonio, La Raya, Túcume Viejo, and Fundo Vera. Courtesy of Túcume Municipality.
Figure 1-4. Diagram of the urban Pueblo of Túcume including the more recent expansions of Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal (1972) and Nueva Esperanza (1983). Courtesy of the Municipality of Túcume.
a historical monument – the first church built in the Túcume district. Since many
members of the local population reside adjacent to or atop the archaeological monuments,
this causes conflicts and greatly affects tourism perceptions.

The Site Museum was built using local architectural styles and materials and
houses both a temporary and permanent exhibit. Explorations of the main archaeological
complex include glimpses at some of the pyramids as one ascends to a scenic overlook on
Cerro La Raya. Future plans involve creating a new circuit by which tourists can enter
one of the pyramids, Huaca Larga, admire excavation replicas, and view conserved
murals of the ave mítica (mythical bird). The Site Museum represents the leading
attraction in Túcume, but other options include: shamanism in Fundo Vera; a historic
church monument in Túcume Viejo; the current church monument in the Pueblo (town);
the historic home of Peruvian intellect, Federico Villarreal, in the Pueblo; local
gastronomy; and local handicrafts.

Aware of the importance of sustainable development, the directors of the Túcume
Museo de Sitio (Site Museum), particularly Alfredo Narváez, have tried to integrate and
train community members in tourism and conservation since 1998 with mixed results. As
such, Túcume represents an ideal cultural heritage site in which to evaluate perceived
community views of tourism development and impacts; as well as measure the level of
success regarding the implementation of sustainable tourism.

**Research Problem**

This study not only contributes to the knowledge base within tourism planning, but
also serves as project-oriented research and evaluation of sustainable tourism in Túcume,
Perú. As Peruvian archaeologists and tourism officials begin to place greater emphasis on
the use of cultural heritage sites as sustainable development resources, Túcume has
become a test site for such plans. An evaluation of tourism development efforts to date may influence the application of sustainable tourism throughout northern Perú, and perhaps the entire nation.

Moreover, a better understanding of why sustainable tourism projects succeed or fail may improve (Peruvian) tourism planning as well as add to the academic knowledge base. Examining the relationship between socio-demographic and residency characteristics and tourism opinions (regarding development and impacts) may also achieve greater adherence to the goals outlined in sustainable tourism: minimization of negative impacts; optimization of positive impacts; more equitable access to tourism involvement and tourism benefits.

**Research Aims and Objectives**

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate the community’s involvement in tourism as well as their reactions to tourism (both its development and impacts). Specifically, this study strives to understand residents’ opinions regarding: tourism development; socio-cultural costs and benefits; environmental costs and benefits; economic costs and benefits. Moreover, these investigations attempt to understand the relationship between tourism opinions and socio-demographic characteristics.

Furthermore, this research examines how certain community opinions regarding tourism have changed from 1998 to 2004. Finally, this thesis evaluates past tourism projects at Túcume in the context of sustainable tourism definitions and literature. In sum, the thesis has the following objectives:

- To describe the socio-demographic characteristics (including sex, age, education, household income, length of residence, place of residence) of the local population and understand how such aspects influence tourism opinions.
To examine changes in community outlooks of tourism by comparing results from a 1998 tourism survey conducted by Alfredo Narváez to results obtained from my 2004 fieldwork.

To describe opinions regarding tourism development held by local residents.

To describe the socio-economic costs and benefits of tourism perceived by local residents.

To describe the environmental costs and benefits of tourism perceived by local residents.

To describe the economic costs and benefits of tourism perceived by local residents.

To evaluate the sustainability of tourism in Túcume given past projects and current conditions.

**Thesis Organization**

The thesis is divided into six chapters with the following structure:

- Chapter 2 provides a literature review of sustainable tourism and tourism impacts – both ‘real’ and ‘perceived’.
- Chapter 3 details the past, present, and future of the Peruvian tourism industry, with emphasis on the Lambayeque region. This chapter also introduces Túcume’s cultural heritage, tourism development, and future tourism projects.
- Chapter 4 introduces Túcume’s current tourism attractions and services. Describes the methods used to achieve the research objectives.
- Chapter 5 presents and synthesizes survey findings.
- Chapter 6 summarizes research findings. This chapter also evaluates Túcume’s efforts to achieve sustainable tourism development, presents conclusions, and suggests recommendations for future tourism development.

**Delimitations**

This study was delimited to systematically chosen household heads who were 18 years and older living in Túcume, Peru.

**Limitations**

Although numerous socio-demographic variables could have been explored in Túcume, it was decided to focus on six variables that were both well documented in the literature and could be applied to the specific case of Túcume. Ethnicity’s influence on tourism opinions was not investigated because Túcume’s population is homogeneously composed of mestizos. Tourism involvement and economic dependence on tourism have both been shown to exhibit heavy influence on tourism perceptions (Snaith and Haley
1999; Jurowski et al. 1997; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Johnson et al. 1994; King et al. 1993; Allen et al. 1988; Milman and Pizam 1988; Schluter and Var 1988), yet Túcume is still at a relatively early stage of tourism development and, as such, does not have very many residents actively involved in the industry. The remaining residents’ characteristics were not chosen for investigation because they are not as well documented in the tourism literature.

The findings presented here cannot be generalized to all Peruvians due to geographic variations, differences in cultural histories, dissimilar tourist attractions, and varying stages of development. This study assumes that survey participants answered truthfully and accurately.

**Definitions**

The following definitions have been taken from academic literature in the field of tourism studies:

- **Tourism** – “sum of the phenomena and relationships arising from the interactions of tourists, business suppliers, host governments, and host communities in the process of attracting and hosting these tourists and other visitors” (Goeldner and Ritchie 2003).

- **Sustainable Tourism** – social and environmental responsibility coupled with economic viability. Visitors’ and hosts’ long-term experiences should remain satisfactory without harming available resources (Wearing 2001).

- **Tourism Impact** – positive or negative changes caused by processes and events related to tourism development (Mathieson and Wall 1982).

- **Socio-cultural Impact** – positive or negative changes in the life, culture, traditions, beliefs, relationships of local residents in tourism destination areas (Mathieson and Wall 1982).

- **Environmental Impact** – positive or negative changes in the natural environment whether they be natural or human processes (Mathieson and Wall 1982).

- **Economic Impact** – positive or negative monetary changes resulting from the development and use of tourist facilities and services (Mathieson and Wall 1982).
• Host community – “a group of people who share a common identity, such as geographical location, class and/or ethnic background” (Wearing 2001:395).

• Attitude – “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly and Chaiken, cited in Choi and Sirakaya 2005: 385).
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Sustainable tourism has been advocated as the optimal solution to minimize economic, socio-cultural, and ecological costs while maximizing positive impacts. This form of tourism stresses the importance of maintaining social and environmental responsibility in addition to economic viability: so that visitors’ and hosts’ long-term experiences are satisfactory and resources remain minimally affected. In particular, sustainable tourism calls for improved visitor management, including increased tourist satisfaction and improvement of destination services and attractiveness (Choi and Sirakaya 2005; Swarbrooke 1999). Moreover, sustainable tourism supports community participation in tourism management and decision-making. And, this form of tourism also encourages frequent monitoring of development plans and projects to ensure sustainability is being maintained.

Thus, these conditions of sustainable tourism all underscore the importance of assessing host community’s needs, concerns, and attitudes. In order to accomplish such an assessment, an evaluation of residents’ perceptions towards tourism (economic, socio-cultural, and ecological) impacts and support for tourism is recommended. And, such inquiries generally take the form of questionnaires (Wearing 2001; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; King et al. 1993; Liu and Var 1986). Numerous authors over the last three decades have identified what they believe to be the ‘real’ positive and negative impacts resulting from tourism on local societies, environments, and economies. Additionally,
tourism scholars have researched how residents ‘perceive’ tourism impacts on themselves and their communities. Although many of these studies were conducted decades ago, “impact and tourism-resident case studies from earlier periods still have much to offer in identifying issues and concerns which persist today” (Pearce 1998:129). For instance, “whilst the negative impacts of tourism have long been recognized, it has also been observed that there is limited understanding of why residents respond to the impacts of tourism as they do, and under what conditions residents react to those impacts” (Snaith and Haley 1999:596). Socio-demographic and other residents’ characteristics may help explain why locals perceive tourism impacts and development as they do.

Sustainable Tourism

National development of tourism is often embraced for its ability to provide revenues. However, this often leads to considerable negative (social and/or environmental) impacts (Mathieson and Wall 1982) and little concern for the local community (Page and Dowling 2002:11; Narváez 1998). Tourism planning needs to consider environmental and social elements in addition to economic incentives (Mathieson and Wall 1982). Sustainable tourism does, indeed, stress economic benefits for all stakeholders, while at the same time calling for a minimization of socio-cultural and environmental costs (Cooper and Wanhill 1997). Moreover, this form of tourism attempts to understand the positive and negative effects of tourism on the economy, society, and environment (Page and Dowling 2002:16); thus, proscribing impact analyses at the community level.

Sustainable tourism has its roots in sustainable development, which has been applied to numerous fields, including tourism. According to the Brundtland Report, sustainability refers, in essence, to meeting the “needs of present tourists and host regions
while protecting and enhancing environmental, social and economic values for the future” (Page and Dowling 2002:16; Swarbrooke 1999:13). Originally, sustainability was associated with the carrying capacity of the environment (Butler 1998:26). From this vantage point, conservation of natural resources was emphasized not as a constraint to tourism development but as a limited tourism attraction that must be available to meet long-term needs (Page and Dowling 2002:15; Swarbrooke 1999). One aspect of this entails use of local resources, goods, and building materials in order to reduce costs and conserve water, power, and labor (Swarbrooke 1999:6-7; Butler 1998:27).

Yet since the early 1990’s, the concept of sustainable tourism has expanded beyond ecological concerns to encompass socio-economic factors as well (Swarbrooke 1999). Goodwin et al. (1998) highlight the importance of socio-economic benefits for the local communities in any tourism project. This incorporates guaranteeing financial security for the community by training a responsible workforce and providing high quality attractions and services for visitors (Wearing 2001:406). Education and training of residents is particularly important in order to garner greater and more meaningful employment of locals (Wearing 2001:401,404). Since sustainable tourism sometimes falters in providing substantial profits for the community, local participation, training and access to capital are key (Wall 1997:489).

Furthermore, the Globe ‘90 conference in British Columbia called for the specific promotion of equity and equal opportunities through sustainable tourism (Page and Dowling 2002:16-17; Swarbrooke 1999:14). This entails achieving a fair distribution of economic benefits among residents as well (Choi and Sirakaya 2005:383; Macleod 1998:153). In addition to improving standard of living and quality of life, sustainable
tourism concentrates on maintaining and strengthening local identity and culture (Epler Wood 1998). Moreover, sustainable tourism must be community-driven and community-based. Promotion of full community participation at all levels of management and decision-making is necessary (Choi and Sirakaya 2005:382-3; Stabler 1997; Wahab and Pigram 1997), with additional emphasis on local ownership (Joppe 1996:475).

This can be accomplished by fostering cooperative planning and management by all stakeholders (Murphy 1998:186-7; Verand 1998:2), including local communities (Swarbrooke 1999:10). “A balance of private and public sector involvement in tourism planning is vital to ensure a suitable balance is reached and for principles of sustainability to be incorporated into development plans and scenarios” (Page and Dowling 2002:19). Yet planning must strive to reduce negative impacts, magnify positive impacts, and adhere to community objectives (Choi and Sirakaya 2005:384). Analyses of residents’ attitudes towards tourism address this need by helping planners evaluate tourism projects, thereby strengthening certain outcomes and avoiding others (Choi and Sirakaya 2005:391).

Along these lines, sustainable tourism also stresses the importance of continual monitoring of any tourism plan (Page and Dowling 2002:200; Mathieson and Wall 1982:7). Such measures determine to what degree tourism development is consistent with pre-established objectives. Inconsistencies or alterations can subsequently be implemented to avoid further damage and negative impacts (Swarbrooke 1999:10; Goodwin et al. 1998:viii). Thus, the continued application of impact analyses is necessary to evaluate tourism development projects and correct any discrepancies.
Tourism Impacts

Socio-cultural Impacts

Tourism is commonly heralded as a mechanism for national or regional development by which communities can acquire: increased investments; additional revenues; new employment; new businesses; greater diversity of economic opportunities; and enhanced market demand for local products, services, and handicrafts (Page and Dowling 2002; Swarbrooke 1999; Allen et al. 1988; Liu and Var 1986; Mathieson and Wall 1982). Furthermore, in order to enhance the tourism product and the quality of the destination, infrastructure and services (including education, health, transportation, lighting, potable water, sewage, etc.) are oftentimes improved (Mathieson and Wall 1982:157).

However, such an economic focus openly disregards socio-cultural and environmental impacts. Although sometimes hard to discern, negative social impacts include: disruptions of social structures, customs, and traditions; trivialization or loss of religious celebrations and/or traditional festivals; changes in traditional work patterns; new forms of social stratification; increased crime, prostitution, and drug abuse; changes of local values; migration; loss of authenticity; commodification; and decreased use of local languages (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004; De Haas 2003:151; Parks 2002:1-2; Brunt and Courtney 1999; Smith and Krannich 1998:784; Weaver 1998; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996:503; Jafari et al. 1990:470; Keogh 1990:450; Allen et al. 1988:16; Liu and Var 1986:194). Moreover, tourism often creates conflict within the local community; or between the local community and the visitors (Page and Dowling 2002:170-171; Dogan 1989:226). According to McNeely and Thorsell, “local community members could possibly view the areas as being developed exclusively for foreign interests” (Wearing
2001:397). In some cases, locals lose access to land and resources they previously enjoyed (Wearing 2001:402), which initiates the conflict. In many cultural heritage cases, locals near archaeological land may resent tourists as well as archaeologists (Castillo and Holmquist 2004; Silverman 2002) for threatening squatters’ status and prohibiting looting.

On the upside, however, tourism can also generate funding for protection, conservation, and maintenance of natural and cultural attractions; as well as increase respect and value awarded the local culture and/or environment (Wearing 2001:396; Upchurch and Teivane 2000:499; Bachleitner and Zins 1999:200; Swarbrooke 1999:72). Occasionally, locals view tourism as a means by which to establish pride for (King et al. 1993; Milman and Pizam 1988) and educate on local traditions, history, and culture (Besculides et al. 2002:306; Wearing 2001:399). Plus, tourism can cause a revival in traditional art and handicrafts (Besculides et al. 2002:306; Mathieson and Wall 1982:166) as well as folklore and traditional architecture. Furthermore, tourism can also prove beneficial by providing greater recreational areas (Upchurch and Teivane 2000:499; Lindberg and Johnson 1997:405) for locals to enjoy nature, open space, and quiet.

**Environmental Impacts**

Negative environmental impacts include: pollution and environmental degradation; soil erosion; overcrowding, overdevelopment, congestion, litter, and noise; and the disturbance, decrease, or disappearance of vegetation and wildlife. A decline in diversity of flora and fauna sometimes results from tourism. For instance, chopping and trampling reduce vegetation and also increase soil erosion (De Haas 2003:151; Parks 2002:1-2; Smith and Krannich 1998:784; Weaver 1998; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996:503; Jafari et al. 1990:470; Keogh 1990:450; Allen et al. 1988:16; Liu and Var 1986:194).
Wildlife is harmed as tourists destroy their natural habitat or disrupt their feeding and/or breeding patterns (Swarbrooke 1999:52). Additionally, tourism often conflicts with agriculture (Dogan 1989; Mathieson and Wall 1982:129-130) for labor and time: workers often decide to leave agricultural work in order to find employment in the tourism industry (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996:504). Tourism may also have a negative impact on agriculture by diverting land and water normally destined for crops. On the other hand, tourism revenues can help maintain marginal farms; and can augment conservation of local flora and fauna (Swarbrooke 1999:52). Increased education concerning (conservation of) natural patrimony enhances local awareness and can prevent further destruction.

**Economic Impacts**

Although economic benefits are often correlated with tourism development, tourism can also create economic costs. Quite frequently, tourism employment is seasonal, poorly paid, and low skill. In addition, tourism often causes communities to become overdependent on one activity or on imported (rather than local) goods. And, tourism is many times associated with leakages from the local economy, thus reducing visitors’ net expenditures and augmenting the purchase of non-local goods and services. Tourism can also increase the cost of living: including local prices for commodities, real estate, and local taxes (Page and Dowling 2002:151-157; Wearing 2001:397; Mathieson and Wall 1982).

Another problem is the inequitable distribution of benefits (Clancy 1999:3; Goodwin et al. 1998:vii). In many cases, only the elites reap the (economic) benefits, while the remainder of society must bear the costs (Clancy 1999:4; Akama 1996; Dogan
therefore, furthering existing economic and social divides (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004:39). In Cusco, for instance,

the main beneficiaries of tourism are members of the urban middle and lower-middle class of Cuzco itself: the entrepreneurs who own and run the hotels, restaurants, shops, and travel agencies; the craftsmen who produce the wares and services consumed by tourists; and, to a limited extent, the street vendors and service workers who occupy the lowest tier of the tourism trade. In the aggregate, they include, with their dependents, several thousand people, but they are a minority of the Cuzco population. (Van den Berghe and Flores Ochoa 2000:23)

Moreover, between 1995 and 2000, 90% of local (tourism) businesses failed, leaving foreign-owned and Lima-owned businesses to remain (Silverman 2002:887). This underscores another concern regarding the inequitable distribution of tourism benefits since tourism often generates employment for immigrants and expatriates rather than locals (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996:505). Since “equality should be the guiding principle for community-based projects,” (Sproule and Suhandi 1998:217) research is required to better understand pre-existing inequalities and differences that permeate particular host communities, with the goal of increasing resident participation. Inevitably, different segments of society hold different views and attitudes towards tourism. Thus, a community-oriented approach to sustainable tourism planning should include assessments of different residents’ perceptions towards tourism development (Parks 2002:1-2; Keogh 1990:450; Allen et al. 1988:16).

Finally, tourism and development often promote cultural imperialism and greater dependence on the national (and global) economies (Page and Dowling 2002:157; Clancy 1999:2; Goodwin et al. 1998:vii,23; Mathieson and Wall 1982:147-8; Boissevain 1979), depriving communities of their autonomy. Part of the reason for this revolves around the fact that tourism and development tend to be top-down impositions rather than bottom-up movements.
Residents’ Perceptions of Impacts

Residents’ perceptions of the aforementioned social, environmental, and economic impacts are site-dependent: influenced by numerous local factors, including socio-demographic and residency characteristics. Moreover, numerous researchers have found that perception of impacts is directly related to support for additional tourism development. If residents feel that tourism has produced or will produce net positive benefits, then support is forthcoming. But, if net negative impacts are perceived, then support is withdrawn (Gursoy et al. 2002; King et al. 1993; Perdue et al. 1990; Milman and Pizam 1988). For example, as the perceived negative impact of tourism on the environment increases, then the support for additional tourism decreases (Perdue et al. 1987). However, positively perceived economic impacts often outweigh other costs (Gursoy et al. 2002:96; Akis et al. 1996; Schluter and Var 1988; Liu and Var 1986:193; Var et al. 1985:654), leading to overall support for tourism expansion. This trend is heightened in economically depressed areas. Communities with lower economic activity will perceive tourism more positively, due mostly to potential economic benefits (Gursoy et al. 2002:84; Johnson et al. 1994:639). This has been demonstrated in numerous cases, including Santa Marta, Colombia (Belisle and Hoy 1980) and Nadi, Fiji (King et al. 1993).

Perceptions of Tourism Development

In most researched communities, locals favored continued development of tourism. On the island of Samos, Greece, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996:511) discovered that 76% of residents supported growth, with a mean score of 4.0 (out of a maximum 5.0); only 3.5% opposed tourism. Moreover, 78% indicated that they wished tourist numbers to increase. Similar findings were reported in other locations around the globe (Akis et al.
1996; King et al. 1993:659; Schluter and Var 1988; Perdue et al. 1987:424; Liu and Var 1986:193; Var et al. 1985). Yet, Bachleitner and Zins (1999:206) found that while a majority of residents favor tourism development, far fewer denizens are inclined to do so actively. Moreover, academics have detected that residents’ perceptions of tourism impacts greatly influence views of tourism development. If impacts are viewed positively, then support for tourism increases; likewise, if impacts are negative, then support decreases (Jurowski et al. 1997:4; Perdue et al. 1990:589). For example, Moab and Teton Valley residents in Colorado detect greater negative impacts due to tourism than their neighbors; as such, they are less supportive of greater tourism development than their counterparts (Smith and Krannich 1998:799). In the Silver Valley, Idaho, Johnson et al. (1994:635) found that the host community feared that tourism would induce changes in the culture, and as a result, looked negatively towards tourism development. Thus, to better understand perceptions of tourism development, it is necessary to examine residents’ attitudes towards tourism impacts.

**Perceived Socio-cultural Impacts**

Previous tourism studies have detailed host reactions to numerous socio-cultural, ecological, and economic impacts as well as support for tourism. For example, residents have perceived an increase in crime, drugs, and alcoholism due to tourism (Johnson et al. 1994; King et al. 1993; Milman and Pizam 1988; Schluter and Var 1988; Belisle and Hoy 1980). Moreover, residents who felt that tourism would increase crime made them less likely to support additional tourists (Perdue et al. 1987). Other perceived impacts include: widening of the divide between socio-economic classes, the employment of non-locals, and a gradual decay of local languages and traditions (Mathieson and Wall 1982).
However, local denizens have also detected positive socio-cultural impacts. In Argentina, Schluter and Var (1988:443) found that approximately 95% of residents attributed tourism with the enhancement of natural and cultural heritage, an increase in cultural activities, and the development of educational benefits. Similarly, Akis et al. (1996:488) discovered that a “large majority (92%) of the Turkish Cypriots believe that tourism provides an incentive for the restoration of historical buildings and the conservation of natural resources.” Furthermore, in Santa Marta, Colombia, Belisle and Hoy (1980:92-3) found that “tourism is not thought to disrupt traditional ways of life and local culture.” In fact, residents in Nadi, Fiji cited an improved quality of life and great community confidence due to tourism (King et al. 1993).

**Perceived Environmental Impacts**

Environmental impacts also yield mixed reactions. Some researchers found that residents perceive tourism as increasing recreational opportunities (Gursoy et al. 2002). In Hawaii, Liu and Var (1986:208-209) discovered that 51% of respondents agreed that tourism provided more parks and recreational areas; and 48% felt that tourism improved the quality of roads and public facilities. Moreover, interviewed residents did not feel that tourism increased traffic problems, caused overcrowded outdoor recreation, or disrupted the peace and tranquility of parks. Istanbul residents, additionally, did not perceive tourism as degrading the environment or causing increased noise (Liu et al. 1987:33).

However, other scholars have identified residents’ negative feelings about ecological degradation, overcrowding, traffic congestion, noise, and pollution (Johnson et al. 1994; Keogh 1990; Mathieson and Wall 1982:121). In Marmaris, Turkey, Var et al. (1985:656) found that 55.3% of residents felt that tourism had brought about ecological decline. And, this is mirrored in Schluter and Var’s (1988:444) research in Argentina,
which revealed that 55.4% of interviewees blamed tourism for environmental decline. In addition, numerous studies have highlighted residents’ concern over increasing traffic congestion due to tourism (Gursoy et al. 2002; Jurowski et al. 1997; Keogh 1990; Perdue et al. 1990; Milman and Pizam 1988).

**Perceived Economic Impacts**

As previously stated, economic impacts tend to be viewed positively. The development and expansion of tourism was commonly viewed as a source of new employment (both seasonal and permanent), new business, heightened revenues, increased living standard, better community infrastructure, and improved transportation (Keogh 1990; Milman and Pizam 1988; Schluter and Var 1988; Liu and Var 1986; Pizam and Pokela 1985; Var et al. 1985; Belisle and Hoy 1980; Boissevain 1979). For example, respondents in Samos, Greece identified positive benefits: employment, tax revenue, personal income (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996:522). And, denizens in Santa Marta, Colombia felt that tourism had particularly improved employment opportunities and standard of living for artisans. Moreover, 85% of residents felt that transportation had improved due to tourism (Belisle and Hoy 1980:92,89).

However, these same residents did not perceive tourism as improving public services or facilities (Belisle and Hoy 1980:93). In addition, inhabitants in Santa Marta felt that tourism benefits accrued to a minority of individuals (including non-local immigrants) and that tourism caused slight social and/or racial segregation (Belisle and Hoy 1980:88-89,92-93). This belief that economic gains are shared by a select few, namely elite members of society, is reflected in other studies (Johnson et al. 1994:635; Schluter and Var: 1988:443). In Argentina, Schluter and Var (1988:443) found that local business managers were those who benefited most from tourism. Furthermore,
communities as a whole felt that tourism increases the cost of living and property (Johnson et al. 1994:635; Schluter and Var 1988; Liu and Var 1986:199; Pizam and Pokela 1985; Var et al. 1985). Other problems involve low returns on investments due to seasonal fluctuations and an over-dependence on a fragile and/or seasonal industry (Mathieson and Wall 1982: 92). In Santa Marta, Colombia, tourism is held responsible for seasonal variations in food prices by about 70% of interviewees (Belisle and Hoy 1980:93).

While community members identify both positive and negative impacts, tourism is generally supported if positive economic benefits outweigh costs. “If tourism development is associated with increased economic activity, then residents will hold favorable attitudes concerning tourism development” (Johnson et al. 1994:639; Schluter and Var 1988). In both Argentina and Hawaii, scholars found that economic contributions from tourism were felt to outweigh social costs (Schluter and Var 1988:443; Liu and Var 1986:199).

Role of Socio-demographics and Residency on Perceptions

Communities are composed of various factions or interest groups (Joppe 1996:475), which should, ideally, all be incorporated into the sustainable tourism planning process. Moreover, tourism costs and benefits are not evenly spread throughout a community: “what may be a benefit to one group of individuals within a community may be a cost to the neighbors” (Mathieson and Wall 1982:6-7). Therefore, research must be undertaken to achieve a greater cultural understanding of the local community, its power structure, its divisions, etc.; as well as their ties to tourism development and impacts. This should be done in order: to encourage more equitable participation in tourism management; to promote more equitable sharing of benefits (and costs) resulting
from tourism; to prevent tourism-related conflict from developing; and to better comprehend why certain tourism projects fail to achieve sustainability while others succeed (Nyaupane 1999:1).

Communities are complex organizations whose members possess different political, economic, cultural, and individual characteristics (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996:523; Lankford and Howard 1994:125). Certain individual characteristics include gender, age, education, income, length of residence, and place of residence. However, these categories are not mutually exclusive: they are often inter-related and often tied to additional factors. In order to better understand the impact that socio-demographic variables have on tourism perceptions, it is necessary to analyze the host community’s social structure (Drake 1991; Husbands 1989; Smith 1980).

There have been several scholars over the last three decades that have attempted to understand how socio-demographic variables influence tourism perceptions. Academics have analyzed age, gender, ethnicity, education, income, occupation, length of residency, place of residency, tourism involvement, economic dependence on tourism, family size, home ownership, marital status, and birthplace (Bachleitner and Zins 1999; Snaith and Haley 1999; Jurowski et al. 1997; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Johnson et al 1994; King et al. 1993; Husbands 1989; Allen et al. 1988; Milman and Pizam 1988; Schluter and Var 1988; Liu and Var 1986; Pizam and Pokela 1985). “Each of these variables seems to affect attitudes toward tourism, but the studies are far from conclusive” (Allen et al. 1988:16).

**Gender and Age**

Tourism scholars have shown that both gender and age (Smith and Krannich 1998) seem to influence attitudes towards tourism. In general, women and older residents
perceive greater negative impacts. For example, in Samos, Greece, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996:520) found that younger residents had more positive perceptions of tourism, particularly regarding economic and social issues, than their older counterparts. Of the 33 questionnaire items asked of interviewees in Samos, 17 tourism impacts revealed statistically different perceptions based on age. Similarly, in Cambridge, England, Fordham Research Services found that younger people were more likely to view tourism positively (Snaith and Haley 1999:597). In addition, 20-29 year olds in Livingstone, Zambia perceived positive impacts from tourism, whereas individuals over 40 years of age appeared indifferent to tourism (Husbands 1989:246). However, in Nadi, Fiji, 51-60 year olds had a more positive opinion of tourism than 29-39 year olds (King et al. 1993:660). According to Bastias-Perez and Var, middle-age residents in Darwin, Australia were the most likely to identify positive economic benefits from tourism (Snaith and Haley 1999:596). Thus, while prevailing evidence indicates that younger residents are more likely to view tourism more positively, there is some evidence demonstrating that middle-aged and older individuals can hold positive views as well.

As for gender: females in some instances seem to view tourism differently than males, and Belisle and Hoy (1980:95) reason that this may be due to cultural norms that consider it inappropriate for women to associate too closely with tourists. Thus, in certain communities, women may be less knowledgeable about tourism and its impacts. Overall, females are reported to be less supportive of tourism than males (Milman and Pizam 1988:199), particularly since they seem more likely to identify negative tourism impacts (Pizam and Pokela 1985:159). In Hawaii, females were more sensitive to increases in
crime (Liu and Var 1986). Moreover, Liu and Var also discovered that females felt more strongly about conservation and the need for historical and cultural exhibition.

**Education**

Education, particularly tourism education, also seems to have an impact on attitudes. “Perceived impacts may be changed by the processes of education and community information” (Pearce 1998:130). It seems that the more educated an individual is, the more positively they view tourism (Smith and Krannich 1998; Brayley et al. 1990). In the study of Samos, Greece, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996:522) found that more educated persons viewed seven impact variables (e.g., tourism’s presence in the area, image of the area, employment opportunities, personal income, standard of living, crime, and vandalism) more positively than their less educated counterparts. Thus, more-educated individuals attributed greater benefits to tourism concerning employment, income, and standard of living; and they saw limited negative effects from tourism on crime. In Hawaii, residents with different education levels held significantly different opinions as to the effects of tourism on traffic and local business (Liu and Var 1986:202). Moreover, in Ghana, “as education levels of residents increased, attitudes toward cultural impacts improved as well” (Teye et al. 2002:681); yet, more educated residents also noticed greater crowding due to tourism.

However, Husbands’ (1989:245) research in Livingstone, Zambia contrasts with findings by others. He detected that both the least-educated and most-educated members of society were indifferent to tourism, whereas the middle group viewed tourism more positively. “Respondents with only primary education are indifferent to the assumed impact of tourism, those with secondary education indicate that tourism is a powerful force in the community, and that to some extent this impact is favorable. On the other
hand, respondents with post-secondary education do not attribute any real importance to tourism; if anything, they have a negative view of tourism.”

**Income**

Economic status also seems to influence resident tourism perceptions. “The perception of tourist impact varies with the resident’s socio-economic status. It is supposed that certain socio-economic classes derive more benefits from tourism than others; hence, some classes may perceive tourism in a more positive manner than others” (Belisle and Hoy 1980:87). Naturally, greater economic dependence on tourism causes more favorable views of it (Jurowski et al. 1997; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Johnson et al. 1994; King, Pizam and Milman 1993; Allen et al. 1988). Thus, it is assumed that elite classes will benefit more from tourism and, thus, perceive it more positively. In Livingstone, Zambia, Husbands (1989:250) notes, “the underlying principle governing differences in the perception of tourism is derived from the interests which different [social] classes have in respect to tourism.” In Ayia Napa, Cyprus, Akis et al. (1996:490) revealed a significant relationship between income and positive impressions of tourism. Moreover, in villages where tourism’s economic benefits are not evenly spread, those with less money seem to be slightly resentful of tourism: there is “some resentment on the part of those people who have done less well out of the tourism boom, and have seen a relative decline in income when compared with the more successful members of the village community.”

In Central Florida, Milman and Pizam (1988) found that respondents earning yearly incomes of $40,000-50,000 were more supportive of tourism than those earning $20,000-30,000. In Samos, Greece, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996:522) discovered that the higher the household income of the respondents, the more positive they were regarding
economic impacts, social impacts, and tourism development. About two-thirds of the impact variables they tested were statistically significant for income, including employment opportunities, personal income, standard of living, and courtesy to visitors (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996:521).

Yet, wealthier community members are not always more supportive of tourism than their poorer neighbors. For example, in Ghana, denizens with greater income increasingly felt that tourism was interfering with their daily life (Teye et al. 2002:682).

**Length of Residence**

Certain other characteristics, including residency, also influence how different groups respond to tourism. Researchers have found that the longer an individual has lived in the host community, the more negative they are towards tourism (Lankford and Howard 1994; Davis et al. 1988; Um and Crompton 1987; Liu and Var 1986; Brougham and Butler 1981). For instance, in the towns of Cambridge and York in England, research revealed that recent arrivals were more likely to see tourism positively as an important industry (Snaith and Haley 1999:597,600). And, Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996:520-521) found that people who had lived in Samos, Greece for shorter periods were more positive to tourism and more supportive of its development. Their results indicate that length of residence was most highly correlated with views of economic impacts, followed by some social impacts. For example, they found that younger residents were more positive about employment opportunities, personal income, standard of living, and prices of goods and services. Moreover, Liu and Var (1986:202,210) found that the length of residency affected how Hawaii inhabitants perceived tourism’s impacts on investment and spending, noise, courtesy to visitors, recreational spaces, and traffic. Like other
academics, their results supported the idea that newer residents view tourism more positively.

However, there is some indication that newer residents also demonstrate a certain proclivity to view tourism negatively (Lankford and Howard 1994). “The shorter the period of residence, the greater the likelihood of recognizing both the positive and the negative impacts of tourism” (Snaith and Haley 1999:602).

**Place of Residence**

As for residence location: it seems that “rural residents and those living further from the tourist center are more apathetic toward tourists and tourism” (Lankford and Howard 1994:124). Attitudes appear to become increasingly negative the farther away one travels from the tourist development zone (Bachleitner and Zins 1999; Pearce 1980). For instance, in Santa Marta, Colombia, Belisle and Hoy (1980) detected that residents living farther away from the urban tourism center held more negative views of tourism. This finding is also mirrored in York, England (Snaith and Haley 1999:601).

However, other scholars have found that residents living closest to the tourism sector hold more negative views (Besculides et al. 2002; Perdue et al. 1987). In Oxford, England, Glasson et al. discovered that individuals dwelling in the city center considered tourism costs to outweigh benefits (Snaith and Haley 1999:596). And in Cap-Pelé, Canada, Keogh (1990:456) uncovered that residents living closest to the park entrance perceived more negative impacts.

**Summary**

The aforementioned authors have endeavored to understand tourism’s socio-cultural, environmental, and economic impacts as well as local perceptions of these impacts. They have also attempted to understand local support for tourism development.
In so doing, scholars have identified certain factors that appear to influence residents’ tourism opinions; yet much more research is needed to better understand their relationship. Such factors include socio-demographic characteristics (including gender, age, education, and income), length of residence, and place of residence.

Additional fieldwork is necessary to comprehend how these items impact tourism viewpoints for select destinations. By obtaining a better grasp of such relationships, it is hoped that more equitable tourism participation and planning can be achieved. Furthermore, such results may also minimize costs and maximize benefits for all community divisions. These are some of the aspirations of sustainable tourism development, as established by tourism scholars. However, sustainable tourism – its definitions, goals, strategies, and implementation – reflects who is in power (Swarbrooke 1999:41). Thus, sustainable tourism in Túcume, Perú is greatly influenced by: national tourism officials and projects from the tourism ministry in Lima (MINCETUR); regional officials and projects within Lambayeque and northern Perú; and local government officers and tourism planners. Each of these entities holds slightly different ideas of sustainable tourism; yet each impacts the development of tourism in Túcume.
CHAPTER 3
SITE DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY: NATIONAL AND REGIONAL CONTEXT
FOR TÚCUME

Introduction

Perú’s unique biodiversity, fascinating (pre-)history, and rich folklore and traditions, comprises great potential for the further development of the US$1 billion-a-year tourism industry. Traditionally, Perú has focused on cultural heritage tourism due to a wealth of archaeological sites and remains, most notably Machu Picchu. This condition is due in part to the remarkable preservation of artifacts (including mummies, textiles, plants, and architecture) in Perú’s environment. Not only can Perú claim the world’s earliest mummies, but it also contains some of the largest stone and adobe monuments in the Americas (Moseley 1992). Although it is estimated that Perú contains over 8,000 archaeological sites within its boundaries, approximately 30% of this number have been officially registered by the National Institute of Culture; and fewer still have been properly documented (International Development Research Centre (IDRC) 1999:xxx, 217-8). “90% de los sitios arqueológicos se encuentran en total abandono y muy pocos están integrados a circuitos turísticos [90% of archaeological sites are completely abandoned and very few are integrated into tourist circuits]” (IDRC 1999:xxx). Until a few years ago, those sites that were included in tourist circuits were, unsurprisingly, found in the Cusco region.

However, the 1987 discovery of El Señor de Sipán – the richest unlooted tomb ever discovered in the Americas (Moseley 1992:180) – spurred interest in Perú’s pre-
Colombian (especially pre-Inca) past on the northern coast. It became evident that archaeology in the north could also contribute to increasing jobs and augmenting revenues.

Soon after, municipal and regional governments, and in a lesser degree national agencies, started to sponsor excavations aimed at the presentation of archaeological sites. Likewise, foreign funding agencies and private foundations...contributed funds for archaeological research and habilitation of sites for tourist purposes. (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:4)

Currently, through the development of CTN - the Circuito Turístico Nororiental (North-oriental Tourism Circuit) – there exists a plan to promote the northern departments of La Libertad, Lambayeque, Cajamarca, and Amazonas as a whole (Figure 1-1). This circuit would link ruins in Lambayeque to other famous archaeological attractions around Trujillo, Cajamarca, and Chachapoyas, including: Chan Chan, Huaca del Sol y de la Luna, El Brujo, Baños del Inka, Kuelap, etc. Around Chiclayo in Lambayeque, major tourism attractions include Túcume, Huaca Rajada, Batán Grande, the Sipán Museum, and the Sicán Museum. While these circuits do not completely dismiss Inka remains, they shift the focus to pre-Inka cultures.

As tourism continues to grow in Perú, including the northern coast, there is increasing concern to ensure the development of sustainable tourism that benefits host communities: both the residents as well as the local municipalities. These goals are specifically outlined in PENTUR - Perú’s most recent Plan Estratégico Nacional de Turismo (National Strategic Plan for Tourism). Moreover, Perú is attempting to diversify its cultural heritage attractions to include environmental aspects. While statistics indicate that the primary motivation for visiting Perú in most cases is to experience archaeological, historical, and cultural attractions (IDRC 1999:222), it is possible to “ampliar el concepto de ‘ruina arqueológica’, dándole una valoración más integral,
vinculando cultura y medio ambiente [expand the concept of ‘archaeological ruin’, giving it a more integral value, tying culture and environment]” (IDRC 1999:237).

At the same time, Peruvian archaeologists have become increasingly aware of the need to prepare sites for tourism and visitors (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:6). Local ruins and site museums can benefit the host communities if the archaeologists are able to garner the community’s collaboration. The Sipán discoveries thrust archaeologist, Walter Alva, into conservation, museum construction, and tourism development; and, other archaeologists are now delving into tourism and sustainability studies. Moreover, archaeologists also realize the benefits of promoting smaller archaeological sites through tourism circuits (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:6).

Within these changing contexts of Peruvian tourism and Peruvian archaeology, Túcume – with its unique archaeological attractions and setting – has been designated a test site. As such, Túcume is considered an important point in the northern circuits. Since 1998, Túcume has been involved in several sustainable tourism pilot projects, which have been directed by archaeologist, Alfredo Narváez. Due to the special attention given this location by international organizations, national organizations, regional officials, and local officers, Túcume is ideal for carrying out residents’ perceptions analyses.

Tourism in Perú

A Brief History

Since the 1960’s, it was realized that international tourism could offer many benefits to developing economies (Mings 1971). Perú was no exception: in 1965, the US-based consulting company, Checchi, openly recognized the great tourism potential, and subsequent financial potential, held by Perú (Desforges 2000:182-3; Cámara Nacional de Turismo (CANATUR) 1997:158). While Checchi recognized that Perú possessed a
greater variety of tourism attractions than most countries (CANATUR 1997:158), it also
highlighted Perú’s obvious lack of tourism infrastructure (Villena Lescano 1989:62).
Checchi recommended that Perú concentrate on improving the Lima-Cuzco-Machu
Picchu route (Talavera Rospigliosi 2003:311; Villena Lescano 1989:62). In response,
Perú sought technical and economic assistance from UNESCO for the restoration of
Machu Picchu as well as cultural tourism development in the Cusco region (de Azevedo
1982:105). So began Perú’s obsession with tourism to southern Perú, particularly the
Cusco area.

Following the abrupt October 3, 1968 military coup, General Velasco more fully
integrated tourism within the national development plan for Perú. Many of the public and
private agencies still in existence today were created under this government. Moreover,
due to the authoritarian nature of the Armed Forces (1968-1980), tourism became
primarily a state-led initiative. Like many other industries at this time, Perú used “foreign
investment to fund state enterprises in an effort to mix economic growth with social
justice. The result was a network of state institutions that effectively ran the industry”
(Desforges 2000:184).

However, this state-led model of development collapsed in the 1980s due to the
debt crisis that swept Latin America (Desforges 2000:183). Known as the ‘lost decade,’
Perú was plagued by internal problems, including severe economic problems, political
violence with the Shining Path guerrilla movement, and an outbreak of cholera from
1988-1993. These events had a marked negative impact on tourism, greatly decreasing
tourism arrivals and revenues (Figure 3-1).
Figure 3-1. Reported total tourism earnings and international tourist arrivals from 1970 through 2002. Courtesy of CANATUR.

Upon taking office, President Fujimori (1990-2000) immediately instituted neo-liberal reforms involving state cutbacks and privatization of state-owned industries (Desforges 2000:185), which halted the economic downturn. Also, in September 1992, the leader of Sendero Luminoso, Abimael Guzmán, was captured and imprisoned. These two events increased international confidence and allowed tourism to continue its development. From 1992 to 2002, international tourist arrivals increased from 217,000 to 930,000 (Figure 3-1).

**Governing Bodies**

Today, tourism is regulated by a number of public and private agencies, many of which have been in existence since the late-1960s and the 1970s. Originally created on March 21, 1969 (but reorganized several times since then), the Ministry of External Commerce and Tourism (MINCETUR) directly oversees and regulates tourism (Villena
Lescano 1989:63,71). The National Cabinet of Tourism (CANATUR) – a private, non-profit consortium of all tourism service industries in Perú – was established on January 7, 1972 in order to organize the private sector and link it to the public sector (CANATUR 2004, 1997). As for tourism training: the recently privatized Training Center in Tourism (CENFOTUR) has been instructing individuals in tourism-related services and administration since May 3, 1978. Instituted on June 4, 1974, the Tourism Police not only vie for the safety of tourists, but they also provide information to travelers and perform inspections of tourist services (Aguilar et al. 1992:90). In recent years, this corpus of officers has been funneled into the Nacional Police of Tourism and Ecology, with the hopes of unifying sustainability, tourism (Talavera Rospigliosi 2001:34), and protection. As a result, officers from this unit are assigned to guard archaeological, historical, and natural treasures.

The protection, conservation, promotion, and investigation of cultural patrimony (including archaeological sites as well as museums) have been carried out since 1970 under the direction of the National Institute of Culture (INC), within the Ministry of Education. Unfortunately, these tasks are often assigned without sufficient support or funds (Narváez 1998:15). Law no. 26961, passed in May 1998, undermined the power of the INC by extending control of cultural patrimony to MINCETUR for its development as tourism resources (Talavera Rospigliosi 2001:32-34; IDRC 1999:219). This has increased tensions between the various organizations that have a stake in archaeological sites (Narváez 1998:15). On the other hand, this law was an initial step towards promoting the use of Perú’s cultural and natural heritage for sustainable tourism (Verand 1998:2). Law no. 27779 (MINCETUR 2002:20), passed on July 25, 2002, re-emphasizes
this state of affairs. Moreover, MINCETUR is also charged with fomenting greater respect for cultural diversity, increasing tourism awareness, and supporting national decentralization.

Created in 1990, the Institute of Natural Resources (INRENA), within the Ministry of Agriculture, is responsible for environmental protection, conservation, and sustainable development (including tourism). President Fujimori is also credited with delegating the promotion of tourism to the Commission for the Promotion of Perú (PromPerú). Of note: while many of the aforementioned organizations are directly responsible for cultural heritage tourism and its sustainable development, “the role of state, paradoxically, has been very limited,” (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:6) particularly at many smaller, remote sites.

Machu Picchu

Overwhelming numbers of visitors to Machu Picchu, as mentioned, have transformed the site into an example of mass tourism. While tourism to Machu Picchu does provide national economic benefits, it negatively impacts the environment, the local communities, and the archaeology. Machu Picchu has resulted in the forced social integration of the local communities into the national plan, but has accomplished this without considerable participation by the locals. Moreover, due to high levels of leakage, local denizens have not experienced considerable economic benefits. In general, there has been insufficient local decision-making and planning.

Apart from environmental problems, tourism has resulted in negative social impacts. For instance, crime (particularly theft and drug use) has increased dramatically (Emery 1997:9). Moreover, the “tourist imagination of an ‘authentic’ Andean culture works against local producers, who are expected to sell products such as ethnic
handicrafts at low prices” (Desforges 2000:190). This effect also creates the commodification of Andean culture. Many inhabitants don “traditional” costumes in the hope that they will receive tips in exchange for being photographed. Another example is the June Inti Raymi festival, which has been transformed to accommodate foreign visitors. In order to perpetuate the ‘authentic’ image that attracts tourists, locals represent an “unpaid set of ‘workers’. The fact that there is a large group of people who attempt to play a part in the tourism economy but are excluded is evident” (Desforges 2000:190). Many young people have also started imitating Western dress and habits, exemplifying the “demonstration effect”.

In addition, anticipated economic benefits have caused the nearby town of Aguas Calientes to undergo rapid growth over the last decade (Hennessy 2003:28), which has undoubtedly altered the social structure and relationships of the inhabitants. Furthermore, new jobs have not brought social justice and equality to many locals. Instead, it has created an elite, which in many cases strengthens the traditional hierarchy. Unfortunately, non-local businessmen from Lima or abroad perpetuate their elite positions by earning profits off the cheap labor of indigenous locals. For example, indigenous porters are highly mistreated by white and mestizo operators (Bauer 2003). In conclusion, the marked increase in tourist arrivals to Machu Picchu over the last decade has not had positive social or economic impacts for the host communities.

Increased tourism has additionally impacted the archaeological ruins. Unfortunately, the Inca drainage system, which had survived numerous centuries, has decayed under a lack of adequate supervision (Purisaca Puicon 2003:9). The excess water that has resulted has undoubtedly heightened decay of underground archaeological
material. Furthermore, increased visitors have caused erosion and loosening of the stonework (Emery 1997:9). Although climbing is explicitly prohibited, many tourists (especially children) continue this practice, which has directly affected the stability of many of the walls.

In order to minimize the negative impacts to the site and the local communities, UNESCO recommended in December 2003 that Perú cap the level of daily tourists at 800. In response, the National Institute of Culture suggested a cap of 1500 visitors per day, spread equally over three time periods (Hennessy 2003:28). This response implies that Perú’s economic concerns override important environmental and social issues. However, recently the Peruvian government has come to recognize the need to avoid creating other examples of mass tourism; instead, it has begun to emphasize the development of sustainable tourism at other attractions around the nation, particularly in the north-oriental area.

PENTUR

Slowly, Perú is coming to view tourism as a great form of development for the nation; while at the same time, realizing that tourism resources that are not properly managed in a sustainable manner will quickly depreciate (IDRC 1999:xix). With mass tourism at Machu Picchu creating such controversy, Perú is looking to develop and promote its other attractions. In sum, Perú hopes to diversify its tourism products by targeting different geographic areas and different forms of tourism, but in a sustainable way. In order to take advantage of its other attractions (as opposed to simply cultural heritage ones) and capitalize on increasing international demand, Perú is placing greater concentration on ecotourism, cultural tourism, and culinary attractions (MINCETUR 2004:14).
Passed in 2005, Perú’s National Strategic Plan for Tourism (PENTUR) outlines the aforementioned objectives: decentralized development of both national and international tourism in a competitive and sustainable manner; and strengthening of institutions related to tourism (MINCETUR 2005). PENTUR further elaborates that competitive and sustainable tourism requires: the training of local residents; the development and promotion of local handicrafts, folklore, and cuisine; and means by which to incorporate the community in tourism planning, decision-making, and development (MINCETUR 2004:18-20). Moreover, the development of a tourism culture is thought to be possible through tourism education in schools and tourism training on a national level (MINCETUR 2004:20). In order to strengthen tourism institutions, PENTUR outlines the need to support local and regional governments as they become more actively involved in tourism management (MINCETUR 2004:22).

FIT Perú

Although mirroring PENTUR’s goals, Integral Fortification of Tourism Perú (FIT Perú) has been operating since 2000. Under the supervision of MINCETUR, this tourism project is being tested in northern Perú (including Túcume) with the expectation that the project will be expanded to the rest of the country (FIT Perú staff, personal communication 2005). Under the rubric of social and economic development, FIT Perú strives to use sustainable tourism in order to improve the living conditions of Perú’s poor. To accomplish this, MINCETUR has begun exposing children to potential employment possibilities in tourism and instructing them to value local patrimony and tourism (MINCETUR 2002). In addition, MINCETUR aims to support local municipalities and regional governments so that they may plan, coordinate, and execute sustainable tourism
projects (MINCETUR 2002). In sum, FIT Perú focuses on fortifying the national government’s emphasis on improved education and decentralization.

Moreover, FIT Perú strives to achieve equal involvement in tourism by all young people in the targeted communities. This project hopes to achieve equal participation of community members in participation and decision-making; for instance, “se promoverá la activa participación de las mujeres en las decisiones de su comunidad, en planes de desarrollo sostenible [the active participation of women in community decisions, in sustainable tourism plans, will be promoted]” (MINCETUR 2002:21). Yet in order to achieve equal participation in tourism, it is necessary to understand how different groups (such as men vs. women) view tourism. Moreover, it is important to focus not only on gender differences, but also on age, educational, income, and residency differences.

**CTN**

From the private sphere, CANATUR – the main supporter of the North-oriental Tourism Circuit (CTN) – recognizes that it needs to work in close conjunction with the government on economic sustainability, social sustainability, and economic sustainability (Talavera Rospigliosi 2001:27). Moreover, CANATUR also emphasizes the need to increase local participation in tourism activities (Talavera Rospigliosi 2001:28). In particular, they view local governments as the key actors in tourism development (Talavera Rospigliosi 2001:27). In sum, CTN complements state efforts within the north-oriental region.

CTN, itself, is a relatively old idea that has only recently received support from the British Government, the Yanacocha Mine, and MINCETUR (CANATUR 2004; MINCETUR 2002). CTN hopes to draw attention away from Machu Picchu - a symbol of Inka heritage in southern Perú. To do so, CTN promotes northern Perú as “un mundo
espléndido de cultura pre-inca...combinado con atractivos de naturaleza y de cultura viva [a splendid world of pre-Inca culture...combined with natural and living cultural attractions]” (Raffo n.d.:108). Since the circuit includes the dramatically different departments of Cajamarca, Lambayeque, La Libertad, and Amazonas, the variety in archaeological remains, natural attractions, and cultural adaptations is great. The circuit includes barren deserts, the Andean mountain ranges, and ceja de selva (the edge of the Amazonian jungle). Moreover, some of the pre-Inka cultures contained in the area include: Cupisnique, Moche, Lambayeque or Sicán, Chimú, and Chachapoyas. Within the circuit, Túcume represents just one stop in the Lambayeque Department. Other attractions in the Lambayeque Department include the Sipán Museum, the Sicán Museum and Batán Grande, and Huaca Rajada.

In general, CTN hopes to use (luxury) tourism to achieve sustainable, bottom-up development within the aforementioned circuit. More importantly, CTN appears to be based on the principles of sustainable tourism, ecotourism, and pro-poor tourism. CTN defines sustainable tourism as

- using resources in a rational form; reduction of overconsumption and waste;
- maintenance of diversity; integrating tourism in all levels of planning; sustaining the local economy; involving the local communities; consented agreements between the actors; trained personnel. (CANATUR 2004)

Whilst keeping an eye on economic sustainability and community participation, CTN should create numerous small-scale projects over the next few years to address training, archaeological excavations, ecological investigations, cultural research, visitor services, infrastructure, marketing, and administration.
Tourism in Lambayeque

Lambayeque Department

The northern political department of Lambayeque is divided into three provinces: Chiclayo, Ferreñafe, and Lambayeque. The latter province contains the Túcume district. In 2002, it was estimated that over 491,209 citizens resided in the entire Lambayeque Department (La República 2003). 79% of these individuals are based in ‘urban’ areas, mostly in Chiclayo – the fourth largest city in Perú (La República 2003:132; Rachowiecki 1996:356). Established in 1560, Chiclayo is about 700 km north of Lima: about 10 hours by bus or 1 hour by plane. Today, the bustling city of Chiclayo serves as a convergence point for the coasts, highlands, and jungles of northern Perú (Comisión para la Promoción de Perú (PromPerú) et al. n.d.). Moreover, Chiclayo is the second most visited city in Perú after Cusco (Chiclayo tour operators, personal communication 2005).

Regarding tourism infrastructure: in 1995, the Lambayeque Department reported 37 travel agencies, 1209 restaurants, 15 night clubs, and 82 hostels/hotels (encompassing 2541 rooms and 4170 beds). According to the National Institute of Statistics and Information, in 1997, the Department of Lambayeque received 576,791 national visitors and 33,867 international tourists (Verand 1998:6). Nationals averaged 1.13 days in Lambayeque while foreigners stayed for 1.29 days, on average (La República 2003). Most visitors to the Department tend to stay in Chiclayo; this is reinforced by the fact that tourism brochures list “up to four-star hotels in Chiclayo…basic accommodation in Túcume and Ferreñafe” (PromPerú 2003:31). As a result, most tourism services (especially higher end services) are concentrated in this city.

The most important reason international visitors come to Lambayeque is because of its historical and archaeological attractions (Verand 1998:53). 70.4% of these visitors rely
54.3% of foreigners travel through Lambayeque without a tour package, while 28.3% purchase a package in their country of origin, and 17.4% arrange a package while in Perú. Of this latter group, 58.3% purchase their tour in Lima, 19.5% arrange their tour in Trujillo, and 22.2% sign-on for a tour in Chiclayo. “These results show once more Lima’s hegemony in the Peruvian tourism industry. However, travel agencies in Chiclayo are the ones who deliver the final product, acting as middlemen between tourists and the tour operators in Lima” (Verand 1998:55).

**Chiclayo**

Within the “City of Friendship”, itself, one can enjoy the Plaza de Armas (surrounded by the Cathedral, Municipal Palace, and Union Club) as well as the Modelo Market, with a section devoted to the sale of ritual items used in shamanism and healing (Murphy 1999:353). From Chiclayo, tourists can arrange daytrips (either through public transport, hired transport, or fully guided tour) to the “spectacular cache of archaeological treasures that lie at its doorstep” (Box 2004:1126; La República 2003:191). Nearby attractions include: the town of Lambayeque (including the Sipán Museum and the Bruning Museum); Huaca Rajada (the site museum and the excavations of el Señor de Sipán); the Pómac Forest (containing Batán Grande) and Ferreñafe (housing the Sicán Museum); and Túcume (Figure 1.2). Túcume is just 35 km (or one hour) from Chiclayo on the old Panamerican highway to Piura, and the main archaeological complex is a 15-minute walk or 5-minute mototaxi ride from town. A $10 Boleto Turístico (tourist ticket) can permit entry to the aforementioned five museums.

Tour operators and brochures (PromPerú 2003:31) recommend that visitors spend at least two days in Chiclayo in order to adequately explore the nearby attractions:
“minimum length of stay, two days to visit the Sipán, Sicán and Túcume museums; 2 additional days to visit other attractions in the area” (PromPerú 2003:31). Visitors can “expect to pay $18-25 per person for a 3-hour tour to Sipán; $25-35 per person for Túcume and Bruning Museum (5hrs); Batán Grande is $45-55 per person for a full-day tour including Ferreñafe and Pómac…These prices are based on 2 people; discount for larger groups” (Box 2004:1129).

Apart from the heavy focus on cultural heritage tourism, tourists can also enjoy nature-based excursions, cultural experiences, shamanism, and culinary delights. The entire Department is known for its unique culinary dishes: arroz con pato a la chiclayana, seco de cabrito, humitas, chirimpico, tortilla de raya, chinguirito de guitarra, chilcanos, ceviches, chifas, alfajores, and king kongs (La República 2003:191). Moreover, the Lambayeque region has been an important center for curanderismo (shamanism) since pre-Hispanic times (Lexus 1998:620). Moche iconography depicts ritual healings, and shamans today continue these traditions while, at the same time, relying heavily on pre-Hispanic energies. Cultural attractions include dances, festivals, and handicraft production.

Finally, excursions into the dry forest are best accomplished by visiting the Pómac Sanctuary, although the dry forest can also be appreciated at Túcume. Both sites consist of impressive, pre-Hispanic monumental architecture, surrounded by an equally impressive landscape. As environmental archaeology attempts to stress the relationship between past environments and past cultures, tourism is also looking to unify both concepts under cultural ecotourism. Both these sites are particularly special in this regard for their experiences with El Niño phenomena. Archaeological and historical data
indicate that both sites have suffered severe inundations over the last several millennia that greatly impacted the local populations; and were probably in some way influenced by the local populations. Thus, it is little wonder that the Lambayeque area is beginning to stress ties between cultural heritage tourism and ecotourism.

**Lambayeque and Sipán**

Located just 12km northwest of Chiclayo (or 20 minutes away), Lambayeque has some great examples of colonial and republican architecture, including the Municipal Palace and the San Pedro Monumental Religious Complex (Murphy 1999:199). However, the real reason visitors came to Lambayeque was to see the Bruning Museum (Murphy 1999:355). Since 1966, the museum has been exhibiting extensive collections of Chavín, Vicús, Moche, Lambayeque (or Sicán), Chimú, and Inka artifacts (Rachowiecki 1996:361). Yet, its main attraction in recent years was its display of the Señor de Sipán tomb (Murphy 1999:355). In 1995, the museum attracted 45,249 tourists - 40,725 nationals and 4,524 foreigners (Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas e Informática 1996:197). However, the November 8, 2002 opening of the Museo de las Tumbas Reales de Sipán - just three blocks away from the Bruning Museum - drew away the Sipán objects as well as many visitors (Tumbas Reales staff and Lambayeque archaeologists, personal communications 2005). Today, the Bruning Museum struggles to match its more modern competitor. Although older tour books list no hotels in Lambayeque (Murphy 1999:355), the most recent edition of the South American Handbook (Box 2004:1130) mentions four lodges as well as several restaurants. This transition may be due, in part, to the opening of the new Tumbas Reales Museum; but, it is probably also due to a changing view of Lambayeque by guidebooks and tour operators.
Sipán discovery

The dramatic and rich discovery of the tomb of el Señor de Sipán at Huaca Rajada (about 33 km or 35 minutes southeast of Chiclayo) has overshadowed other archaeological sites while at the same time propelling them into the spotlight. Heralded as the “most important archaeological discovery in Perú in the last 50 years” (Rachowiecki 1996:356) and “solo comparable al descubrimiento de la tumba de Tutankhamon en Egipto [only comparable with the discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamon in Egypt],” (PromPerú n.d.) Sipán is arguably the most famous attraction in Lambayeque (and perhaps the north coast). While many individuals come to Lambayeque with the purpose of seeing the famous remains of this legendary Moche ruler, they often find themselves visiting other nearby attractions in their free time (including Túcume). More importantly, excavations at Túcume were a direct product of the nearby Sipán discoveries (Heyerdahl et al. 1995:38-42). Thus, the current state of (cultural heritage) tourism in the Department of Lambayeque has been heavily influenced by the Sipán finds at Huaca Rajada.

It all began in 1987 with the discovery of spectacular metal artifacts by local looters in Sipán. Alerted to such discoveries, the police immediately called upon local archaeologists, including Walter Alva, for help with the matter. In the resulting skirmish for control of the archaeological site, a local resident was killed, the looters were forced to abandon their digging, and archaeologists quickly initiated rescue operations (Alva 1988:514). Although the site had already been heavily looted by this point, archaeologists were astounded to come upon the unearthed tomb of el Señor de Sipán. This Moche dignitary was buried by precious accompaniments, including: eight human sacrifices, three animal sacrifices, elaborate shell necklaces, metal scepters, metal uniforms and headgear, jewelry, etc. (IDRC 1999:33; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:40-42; Alva 1988).
Huaca Rajada

Further excavations at the Huaca Rajada complex in Sipán have revealed twelve other ‘royal’ burials, including el Viejo Señor de Sipán, el Sacerdote, etc. Moreover, the archaeological complex consists of two adobe pyramids that were probably occupied c. A.D. 0 – 700; the larger of the two measures 140 m by 140 m by 35 m. Both structures face north and have access ramps. The burials found to date have been concentrated primarily on a platform mound at the base of the larger pyramid, Huaca Rajada. In 1992, a small site museum was opened that contains a replica of the Señor de Sipán ruins as well as additional site information and explanations. In addition to this tourist attraction, visitors can also witness archaeologists at work (Box 2004:1130; Murphy 1999:357; Rachowiecki 1996:362).

Unfortunately, the initial violent confrontation between local residents and archaeologists has perpetuated fears, tensions, and residents’ sense of exploitation (archaeologists in Lambayeque, personal communication 2005). The construction of the Museo de las Tumbas Reales de Sipán in Lambayeque (and not Sipán) has perpetuated these negative feelings and apparently undermined sustainability.

Tumbas Reales

In order to better display, house, and preserve the fantastic Sipán finds, Walter Alva decided to construct a modern museum – the likes of which have never before been seen in Perú. Construction was funded through generous donations as well as funds raised through the international tour of the Sipán exhibit (La República 2003:199). Heralded as “one of the most important in the Americas, considered a 21st century museum because of its structural design and excellent museography, with the newest audiovisual technology,” (PromPerú 2003:33) this museum has the shape of a bright red pyramid. To
enter, visitors must ascend a 74 m ramp to access the third floor. The exhibits are arranged so that tourists descend into the depths of the ‘pyramid’—“mirroring the sequence of the archaeologists’ discovery” (Box 2004:1130). In the months after its opening, this museum attracted more visitors than Machu Picchu (La República 2003:199).

**Sicán**

Another recent addition to the Lambayeque Department has been the modern National Sicán Museum in Ferreñafe. Ferreñafe (just 18 km northeast of Chiclayo) was founded in 1550 as ‘la Tierra de la Doble Fe’ [land of two faiths] (Elera et al. 2003), and contains some colonial period architectural treasures. However, most visitors come to this town to experience the Sicán Museum. Completed in November 2003, this museum exhibits finds from 23 years of excavations by Izumi Shimada at Batán Grande (18 km away). Moreover, the museum strives to preserve and research recovered artifacts (Elera et al. 2003) of the Sicán or Lambayeque culture. The permanent exhibit displays the elaborately rich burials, including that of el Señor de Sicán, discovered at the foot of Huaca Loro: replicas of the tombs convey the context of the remains while the valuable metal objects are more securely displayed. Additional display cases focus on the production of artifacts, their uses, as well as their examination by archaeologists. In sum, the South American Handbook (Box 2004:1131) reports “excellent exhibits, knowledgeable staff, but little English spoken.”

**Pómac Forest Sanctuary**

As a representative of the INC, the Museo Sicán is also responsible for monitoring and preserving the archaeological complex of Batán Grande, from which the museum’s artifacts are derived. Established on October 16, 1991 (by Supreme Decree No. 031-91-
ED), the Pómac Forest Sanctuary was created to preserve the archaeological ruins of Batán Grande as well as its tropical dry forest context. Moreover, efforts are made to rely on the “activa participación de la población residente en la zona [active participation of the resident population in the zone]” (La República 2003:152). Working together, the INC and INRENA (in charge of archaeological conservation and environmental conservation, respectively) were able to expand the delimited reserved area on June 4, 2001 (under Supreme Decree No. 034-2001-AG) (La República 2003:152). As a result, the park now covers 588,738 ha. Today, several national, regional, and local organizations work together for the development of sustainable tourism in the park (Gobierno Regional Lambayeque, Dirección Regional de Turismo, Comercio, y Artesanía (DIRCETUR) n.d.). Within the park, there is a small Information Center, staffed by local guides who offer information on both archaeological and ecological aspects.

Apart from admiring man’s constructions, one is also impressed by the “extenso algarrobal que forma un manto verde [extensive carob forest that forms a green blanket].” As the largest tropical dry forest park in the country, the area contains a unique collection of flora (acacia macracantha, capparis angulata, capparis ovalifolia, vallesia dichotomica, cercidium praecox, and carob) and fauna (pseudalopex, puma, condor, cavia tschudii, boa constrictor, lizards, birds). Moreover, the park includes a well-visited attraction – the Árbol Milenario (Millenary Tree) – that is considered to have mystical and religious properties (DIRCETUR n.d.). Unfortunately, recent droughts in the area have led to an increase in tree felling in order to supplement depleted household incomes (Jorge Chávez
and rural Túcume residents, personal communication 2004). Bundles of carob trees are smuggled out of the park and its environs on horseback or truck-bed.

**Batán Grande**

Peeping through the carob forest are 34 mudbrick pyramids that comprised the capital of the Sicán or Lambayeque culture from c. A.D. 900-1100. As its name indicates, this culture was based in the Lambayeque region, but had roots in the Moche, Huari, and Cajamarca cultures (Heyerdahl et al. 1995:64). Archaeologist, Izumi Shimada, has established three stages for the culture: Early Sicán (c. A.D. 750-900), Middle Sicán (c. A.D. 900-1100), and Late Sicán (c. A.D. 1100-1370). Each of these periods is marked by different social, political, and religious characteristics (Heyerdahl et al. 1995:64; DIRCETUR n.d.). According to ethnohistorical data acquired by Spanish chroniclers (Miguel Cabello Balboa, Antonio de la Calancha, and Rubiños y Andrade), the Lambayeque culture was founded by the mythical figure of Naymlap (translated sea bird), who arrived on a balsa raft from the sea (Heyerdahl et al. 1995:35; Moseley 1992:250). After establishing his capital city, Chot(una), he was able to expand his influence to nearby peoples. After his death, Naymlap’s followers claimed that he had simply grown wings and flown away (Narváez 2001b:13; Moseley 1992:250); thus, adding to his lore. Moreover, according to Spanish chronicler, Balboa, “‘during the life of Cium, hereditary son of Naymlap (and second lord of these valleys), it is said that his sons parted to start new families and settlements bringing with them much people…Cala went to Túcume, and others to other places.’” (Heyerdahl et al. 1995:35)

Batán Grande was occupied at the height of the Middle Sicán, which is displayed in the elaborate tombs discovered. Yet around A.D. 1050-1100, the site of Batán Grande was burned and largely abandoned after suffering extensively from natural disasters (i.e.
El Niño, flooding). At this time, the capital of the Lambayeque culture moved to Túcume (Narváez 2001b:11; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:190). As demonstrated, mythology holds that Cala, Naymlap’s grandson, established this seat of elite power.

Tourism in Túcume

History of Site

Located just 5 km south from Batán Grande, Túcume was established c. A.D. 1000. Over the next 500 years, the site was controlled by several different cultures that left behind 26 impressive mudbrick pyramids (Figure 3-2). The Chimú conquered the area c. A.D. 1375, and the Inkas arrived c. A.D. 1470. Both cultures recognized the political and administrative importance of the site within the region, and so both cultures (re)used earlier structures for their own purposes (Heyerdahl et al. 1995, 1996; Museo de Sitio Túcume n.d.). Since the site’s final abandonment shortly after the arrival of the Spanish (c. A.D. 1536), the site has greatly decayed: “centuries of erosion by torrential El Niño rains, which occur intermittently, have carved out virtual canyons in the terraces of the pyramids which are made up of millions of sun-dried mud-bricks, or adobes” (Sandweiss 1999; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:16). Today, the pyramids and other structures encircle a natural hill, Cerro La Raya (or Cerro El Purgatorio), rising 140 m. To the north of the cerro, pyramids were clustered into an apparent administrative center. Of these structures, Huaca Larga (700 m long by 280 m wide by 30 m high) is considered to be the largest adobe structure in the world (Narváez 2001b:31). The area south of the cerro appears to have been used for residence, metallurgical production, and burial purposes (Narváez 2001b:14; Bennett 1939:114). The cerro, itself, appears to have been transformed into a monument during the Inka occupation (Heyerdahl et al. 1995:194). Although
Figure 3-2. Drawing of the main archaeological complex around Cerro La Raya in Túcume: 1) Huaca Larga; 2) Temple of the Sacred Stone; 3) Huaca Las Estacas; 4) Huaca I; 6) Huaca Las Balsas; 10-13) Inka construction on Cerro La Raya. Red line indicates tourist circuit leading to two scenic overlooks. Courtesy of the Site Museum.
archaeological remains pepper the entire valley, the main complex is restricted to 220 ha.

**Excavations**

Although Túcume was superficially investigated by Hans Heinrich Bruning, Alfred Kroeber, Wendell Bennett, Paul Kosok, Richard Schaedel, and Hermann Trimborn, it was Thor Heyerdahl – of Kon-Tiki fame – who was the first to initiate prolonged excavations of the site. Following the initial discovery of Sipán treasures, Alvawas able to convince Heyerdahl to begin research in 1989. Excavations continued for five years with the financial support of the Kon-Tiki Museum, and up to 100 local residents were hired to aid in the massive undertaking (Narváez 1998:8-10; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:201), including huaqueros (Rosana Correa, personal communication 2004).

Excavations at Huaca 1 reveal this structure to be quite representative of truncated, Lambayeque pyramidal constructions, which are accessed by extensive ramps (Museo de Sitio Túcume n.d.). Moreover, it is believed that this pyramid was the seat of local political power and home to the local Lord (Narváez 2001b:25). Huaca Las Balsas in the southwest portion of the complex reveals seven (probably Lambayeque) construction phases, all of which illustrate mythical marine imagery. Friezes display men aboard balsa rafts surrounded by fish and marine birds (Figure 3-2). Although it is believed that Túcume was a non-urban pyramid center during Lambayeque occupation (Heyerdahl et al. 1995:197), this structure also demonstrates some domestic and residential use in addition to religious use (Museo de Sitio Túcume n.d.).

Following further excavations at Huaca Larga, it is clear that this massive structure - consisting of numerous plazas, patios, and platforms connected by corridors and ramps - was occupied by the Lambayeque, Chimú, and Inka (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:7). Upon conquest by the Chimú (c. A.D. 1375), Huaca Larga was
extended south to the base of Cerro La Raya and a temple was constructed on the central platform. Since this central structure displays murals with checkered patterns of a polychrome bird (Figure 3-3), it has been named the Temple of the Mythical Bird

Figure 3-3. Diagram of the Chimú Temple showing the location and design of the ave mitica (mythical bird) polychrome mural. Courtesy of the Site Museum. (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:7,8; Museo de Sitio Túcume n.d.).

Archaeologists feel that Huaca Larga represented the center of political and administrative power of the region during this time period (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:8; Museo de Sitio Túcume n.d.; Narváez 2001b:31-33; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:192). With the arrival of the Inkas, however, this temple was rebuilt into four stone rooms, using stone from Cerro La Raya (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio
Near the end of Inka reign, 22 burials were quickly interred in the floors of this structure (Figure 3-4). The main male personage is believed to have been the last Inka governor, and he was buried with two male companions (in two individual pits) and 19 females (in five collective pits). Moreover, the principal dignitary was adorned with objects marking his elevated position: a crown, breastplate, silver ear spools, feather headdress, etc. (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:9-11; Narváez 2001b:34-35; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:194-5).
To the east, the Temple of the Sacred Stone was constructed by the Lambayeque for the reverence of a single rock brought from Cerro La Raya. Surrounding this sacred object were found benches as well as countless offerings: miniature metal objects, miniature textiles, ceramics, shells, llama sacrifices, and human sacrifices. Adoration of this apu (god) continued with the Chimú and Inka as they, too, contributed offerings. The continued use and respect of this temple reveals its important religious significance for the region (Coppin and Doig 1999:20; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:191; Museo de Sitio Túcume n.d.).

In sum, Heyerdahl and his team of excavators (including Daniel Sandweiss, Alfredo Narváez, and Bernarda Delgado) must be congratulated for improving our understanding of Túcume. Yet due to the massive expanse of the site, their work represents only a small fraction of what remains to be explored.

However, apart from funding archaeological investigations, Heyerdahl was also responsible for founding the local NGO, Túcume Vivo, under the auspices of the Stromme Foundation in 1990. Túcume Vivo’s objective was to foment the active participation of the population in Túcume’s future, and the Stromme Foundation provided funding and guidance for such endeavors. In particular, they assisted with the creation of infrastructure: running water and sewage in the town as well as covered wells in the rural areas. Moreover, they supported local schools through donations for supplies and annexes (Narváez 1998:19; Heyerdahl et al. 1995:206-7). The arrangement between Túcume Vivo and the Stromme Foundation was one involving an initial infusion of funds followed by a lessening of financial backing and governance (Túcume Vivo representatives, personal communication 2004). It may be said that Thor Heyerdahl was the first who had the
vision to implement sustainable archaeology and sustainable tourism at Túcume. Rather than focusing simply on archaeological excavations and research, Heyerdahl realized the need for: conservation of the recovered remains; adequate display of the acquired information and materials for the locals as well as visitors; participation and integration of the locals in archaeological work; and investment in the host community.

Site Museum

The Site Museum opened on August 20, 1993. The permanent hall (Figure 3-5) was built first, and over the years additional buildings have been added, including a

![Figure 3-5. The Site Museum’s permanent exhibit is housed in a structure employing traditional architectural styles.]

‘temporary exhibit hall’ in 1994. Other structures include bathrooms, an amphitheater, an auditorium, a small police office, the director’s office, a ticket stand, a small store, a small refreshment stand, storerooms, and researchers’ housing (Figure 3-6). All
edifices are constructed using local pre-Hispanic architectural styles, involving the use of adobe and carob logs. Moreover, the museum relies primarily on natural light. These architectural decisions have made the museum a more sustainable enterprise (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:9) and were probably intended to foment greater ties with the local community. This construction style was widely applauded and honored: in 1994 the museum was given the “Hexágon de Plata” award by the Association of Architects of
Perú; and in 1995, it received an honorable mention at the Architecture Biennial in Quito, Ecuador (Narváez 2001b:7; Museo de Sitio Túcume n.d.). The museum grounds also contain a playground and an outdoor eating area that is staffed by local women selling local cuisine and *chicha de jora* (maize beer).

The permanent exhibit contains display cases, excavated materials, replicas of friezes, paintings, and miniature models of the pyramids to convey Túcume’s history. Information contained in the solely Spanish texts has been presented above. The temporary exhibit, entitled “A Thousand Years of Traditions of Túcume”, strives to bridge the gap between archaeological remains and current, local practices. The displays focus on cooking, drinking, diet, ceramics, textiles, and religion.

An exploration of the 220 ha archaeological complex includes two potential circuits. The more popular circuit involves a direct path to the summit of Cerro La Raya (or El Purgatorio). From the Cerro, visitors can catch their breath at two miradores (overlooks). The view from the miradores provides a great panorama of the numerous pyramids and structures in the complex (Box 2004:1130) as well as the nearby town. Along the path to Cerro La Raya, tourists can glimpse Huaca 1. The second circuit takes visitors on a more scenic, circuitous route around Huaca 1 and Huaca Las Estacas, before rejoining the first circuit. However, this second circuit is not well marked or explained. A visit to the museum and archaeological complex normally takes between one and two hours (Coppin and Doig 1999:28).

Visitor arrivals to the site have increased dramatically since the museum first opened its doors in 1993 (Figure 3-7), with national tourists representing the majority of arrivals. In 2003, the museum recorded 28,894 tourists (22,930 Peruvians and 5,964
Figure 3-7. Tourist arrivals in Túcume, 1993-2003. Courtesy of Site Museum records. foreigners), marking a sharp increase from 13,636 visitors in 1994. The museum practices tiered entrance fees, meaning that adults are charged seven soles (about US$2), students are charged 1.5 soles (about US$0.50), and children pay one sol (about US$0.25). Moreover, during the winter of 2004, the museum decided to excuse all Túcume residents from paying fees so that more locals could enjoy the site (museum staff, personal communication 2004). For a breakdown of the number of adults, students, and children who visited the Túcume site museum from November 2003 through November 2004, Table 3-1. This data demonstrates that tourism in Túcume is seasonal and influenced by festivals, school vacations, and climate.
Table 3-1: Site Museum tourist arrivals and revenues between December 2003 and November 2004. Courtesy of Site Museum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Adults Peruvians</th>
<th>Adults Foreigners</th>
<th>Students Peruvians</th>
<th>Students Foreigners</th>
<th>Children Peruvians</th>
<th>Children Foreigners</th>
<th>Earnings (Soles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18686.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8827.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1538</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2665</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14298.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2402</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8823.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7009</td>
<td>5546</td>
<td>10089</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>10165</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>127765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1998 Survey

Since 1998, the Site Museum, under the direction of Alfredo Narváez, has worked hard to establish (socio-cultural, environmental, and economic) sustainable tourism (PromPerú 2001) through efforts at community integration and participation, conservation instruction, and income diversification. In addition, there have been numerous efforts to improve visitor services and local tourism capacities, namely, handicraft production (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:2). In order that Peruvian scholars might learn more about tourism and conservation, Alfredo Narváez was awarded a scholarship to the University of Kent (Narváez 1998:14). As part of this degree, he arranged workshops with community members, Chiclayo tour operators and tourism officials, and Túcume authorities. He also conducted a 14-question survey to “explore the attitudes and expectations of the local community regarding the conservation and tourism development” (Narváez 1998:27). From June 15, 1998 through June 26, 1998, six surveyors were hired to conduct 300 interviews of the local population in La Raya, San
Antonio, and the Pueblo (town). Of the 300 participants, 58.67% were female; 36.33% were housewives; and 34.33% had attended elementary school while 40% had attended high school (Narváez 1998:43).

As for tourism opinions: 58.3% of respondents viewed tourism as a ‘very important activity’ for Túcume, suggesting that residents viewed tourism as a potential means by which to sustain themselves and improve their quality of life. According to Narváez, high levels of support for conservation of the archaeological complex (85.3%), the Festival of the Purísima Concepción (63.3%), landscape (50.3%), and customs and traditions (44%), imply that residents realized its importance for development of the region (Narváez 1998:43-45,65-69). Whether they did then or not, residents should now view conservation and tourism development more favorably after experiencing Narváez’s workshops and subsequent training sessions.

Most residents (91.33%) felt that their families had not received any benefits from tourism, yet 95% felt that “local people can earn money from tourism,” through handicrafts (28.67%), hotels (13.33%), and restaurants (12.67%). Moreover, 93% of participants mentioned that they would like to participate in tourism activities such as guiding (18.52%), handicrafts (17.02%), lodging (12.77%). When considering difficulties for engaging in tourism activities, respondents cited: lack of capital (92.3%), lack of interest by authorities (76.7%), lack of training (68.3%), lack of market demand (57%), and lack of interest by local people (0.7%) (Narváez 1998:45-48, 69-76).

Only 32% of the population admitted having some contact with tourists; within this group, 45.27% had answered queries by tourists, 20.27% had acted as guides, 18.92% had invited tourists to their homes, 6.08% had provided accommodation, 6.08% had
supplied transportation, and 3.38% had sold tourists something. However, 98.67% of interviewees replied that they would like to have more contact with tourists. To continue: 59.67% of participants considered both national and foreign tourists important for Túcume, but 36.33% prioritized foreign visitors and 4% prioritized nationals (Narváez 1998:48-49, 77). This, of course, is the result of the common association between tourism, foreigners, and foreign capital.

The results of the workshops and the surveys proved instrumental as tourism developed over the next few months and years in Túcume. The responses served as guidelines for development and were based on community involvement. However, since monitoring of sustainable tourism projects is so important, Narváez (1998b:94) recommends the “design of monitoring systems to evaluate the dynamics of tourism programs…evaluating and improving their results.”

**Tourism Projects**

In 1998, Túcume experienced an El Niño that caused much destruction. As the community came together in July 1998 to rebuild itself, members identified the need to concentrate on cultural patrimony and tourism in addition to other more primary concerns (like health, roads, education, agriculture, and housing). The community formed CSDIT – the Solidarity Committee for the Integral Development of Túcume – and Narváez headed up the tourism subcommittee, APCTUR – Area of Cultural Patrimony and Tourism (PromPerú 2001; Coppin and Doig 1999:30; Narváez 1998:24). In this position, he was able to manage the Túcume Pilot Project, sponsored by the European Union and PromPerú. In conjunction with Túcume Vivo and CSDIT, the 1988 Pilot Project attempted to improve the quality of the site, promote local tourism product initiatives (Coppin and Doig 1999:30), increase local involvement, and augment conservation of
patrimony - all within the concept of sustainable tourism (Narváez 1998:2). (Sustainable tourism was defined by Narváez (1998b:6) as, “the active participation of local communities for the conservation of the natural and cultural patrimony, respect for local traditions and the control of the carrying capacity of tourism destinations.”) Over the next few months, many community members divided themselves into ‘Interest Groups’-specific tourism activities (e.g., food, lodging, handicrafts, transportation, guiding, etc). The purpose of these ‘Interest Groups’ was to increase community awareness, education, and participation in tourism by training interested community members in their selected tourism activity as well cultural heritage conservation and sustainable tourism (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:3; PromPerú 2001; Narváez 1998:65).


On April 17, 1999, a Management Committee, including the Túcume Tourism Club and the Municipality, was developed to manage tourism activities. This Committee was transformed in mid-1999 into ACODET – the Association for the Conservation of Patrimony and Development of Tourism in Túcume. Although this organization is led by the Site Museum (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:3), it also consists of the Municipality, the local Catholic Church, the Túcume Tourism Club, local schools, and artisans. While ACODET should be credited with bringing together representatives from all the major institutions in Túcume, it also alienated community members who were in charge of the ‘Interest Groups’. Moreover, by late-1999 ACODET had failed to cultivate greater commercialization of local tourism products, and “los grupos de interés entraran en inactividad por el poco volumen de ventas [the Interest Groups entered into
inactivity due to low volume of sales)” (PromPerú 2001). Furthermore, ACODET entered into a period of general inactivity between November 1999 and April 2000 (PromPerú 2001); thus adding to the disorder.

At this juncture, PromPerú initiated a follow-up project that concentrated on improving the tourism circuits and offering training on guiding, handicrafts, and transportation. For instance, PromPerú improved signage of the circuits at the archaeological complex by erecting English-Spanish displays. Apart from previous Túcume guidebooks written by Alfredo Narváez, PromPerú also focused on creating shortened informational pamphlets for distribution to tourists. After much ethnographic research, Narváez published a book on Túcume myths and storytelling (Narváez 2001a). From March through July 2001, the museum worked on restoring the dilapidated former home of the famous sabio (wiseman), Federico Villarreal, and transforming it into an Information Center. (Federico Villarreal was a world renowned mathematician that lived in the late 18th century.) Moreover, PromPerú and MINCETUR initiated two guiding workshops (May 2002, Aug. 2002), aimed primarily at the youth in the Túcume Tourism Club, in order to staff the Information Center. Mototaxistas also received optional training (June 2002) in transportation within the realm of cultural and natural conservation. And, PromPerú and MINCETUR helped arrange workshops in ceramics (Aug. – Sept. 2002) for interested artisans; while AXIS directed workshops in reliefs (Oct. 2002), jewelry making (Dec. 2002 – Jan. 2003), and batik (May 2003). These handicraft workshops have focused on perpetuating the use of pre-Hispanic iconography found in the excavations. The great diffusion of the ave mítica (mythical bird) image (Figure 3.3) in Túcume and Lambayeque attests to the museum’s successful efforts.
Recent tourism collaborations by FIT Perú, AECI (Spanish International Cooperation Agency), AXIS-ARTE (Applied Art and Design Research Group) and ACODET have benefited greatly from previous strides taken by the Pilot Project. However, the current focus for these projects revolves around teachers (Figure 3-8). It is the hope that students may benefit from the instruction of these individuals in cultural identity, conservation, sustainable tourism, and handicraft production. MINCETUR, in particular, has worked hard to produce a teachers’ manual, *Guía de Contenidos Turísticos: Lambayeque*, for inclusion in secondary school instruction around the Department. Moreover, AXIS-ARTE has created children’s books geared at instruction in Túcume’s patrimony. *El Vuelo del Ave Mítica*, for example, focuses on conveying local myths and archaeology to young children. And, three interactive notebooks (*Tradiciones y Costumbres de Túcume, Patrimonio Natural de Túcume, Conservación de Patrimonio*...
Arqueológico) use playful means to introduce themes of patrimony, conservation, and tourism. These products were created after several workshop consultations with both teachers and students in the Túcume area from October 2003 to February 2004. Furthermore, the four aforementioned collaborators held handicraft workshops (in notebook-making, natural dyes and plants, ceramics, and papermaking) from September – October 2004 for teachers, with some artisans also participating (Delgado Elías 2004:24). Finally, AECI, MINCETUR, and the Túcume Municipality sponsored a two-day mototaxi training session in November 2004 in order to re-emphasize conservation, patrimony, improved transportation service, and tourists’ security.

On a day-to-day level, tourism is overseen by and supported by ACODET, namely the Site Museum. Today, ACODET’s objectives and goals include: “1) Research and Conservation, b) Education, c) Promotion, and d) Regulation of Tourist Services” (Narváez 2001b:65). In addition to claiming Túcume as a paragon of sustainable tourism development for the northern circuit, the museum stresses the importance of continued scientific investigations and cultural heritage conservation (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:4). As regards tourism, the museum specifically hopes to: 1) increase community involvement in tourism and conservation planning, management, and monitoring; 2) unite the different stakeholders (including the local community, local authorities, archaeologists, teachers, church, private businesses) under the premise of tourism and conservation; 3) diversify tourism attractions to include mystical tourism and cultural ecotourism; 4) educate locals and visitors in conservation and tourism; 5) increase economic benefits from tourism (Coppin and Doig 1999:30).
To these ends, the museum cites as one of its most recent accomplishments: the creation of a Túcume Artisan Association in May 2004. This association is comprised of 17 individuals who mainly practice batik, jewelry making, metal reliefs, and weaving (in that order). Their wares are currently on sale in the Site Museum’s storefront, and a couple of batik producers have managed (through the Museum’s Director) to tap into opportunities in Lima. The Museum also boasts its involvement in the recent creation of the Patronato (Patronage) of Túcume. Through the establishment of this corporate entity – comprised mostly of Chiclayo businessmen – the archaeological site of Túcume now diverts financial control of its donations from the INC to this select board of businessmen (INC and Museum staff, personal communications). One hopes that environmental and social sustainability will continue to represent high priorities for these individuals in the years to come.

In addition, the museum spent most of 2004 involved in the careful restoration and conservation of Huaca Larga, particularly the Temple of the Mythical Bird. These efforts were undertaken with the future plan to transform Huaca Larga into a third tourist circuit at the archaeological complex. It is hoped that this circuit may one day be further expanded to include the Temple of the Sacred Stone; but, additional excavation and conservation are required before that becomes even a remote possibility (INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:4, 12).

**Summary**

As indicated, Perú’s tourism history has not included sustainable goals. As an example of mass tourism, Machu Picchu reaps economic benefits for a select few, while at the same time incurring social, environmental, and archaeological costs. However, adhering to global trends, Perú now promotes sustainability in all of its tourism projects
and endeavors. CTN, although concentrated in northern Perú, incorporates sustainable tourism, ecotourism, and pro-poor tourism. Likewise, FIT Perú exercises sustainable projects that strive to empower local governments and empower children through tourism education. And, PENTUR combines these programs and objectives, yet at a national level. Thus, Perú is now attempting to foment sustainable tourism attractions at the local level that can then be incorporated into regional (or national) circuits. As the government shifts its attention from Machu Picchu, it is interested in stressing other regional circuits as well as a diversity of attractions (i.e. apart from Inka heritage sites).

Túcume is an important pre-Inka heritage site within the north-oriental circuit that has sought to develop sustainable tourism. Since the onset of excavations, Heyerdahl highlighted the importance of community participation and community development. And since 1998, Narváez has been instrumental in leading tourism workshops and training sessions as well as enhancing community support and community awareness.

However, Túcume must be understood within the regional circuit of Lambayeque, which can then be evaluated within the north-oriental circuit (and the national landscape). Many tourists come to Chiclayo to see the Sipán artifacts and/or site, but stay to visit Túcume. At the moment, most visitors spend a couple of hours in Túcume exploring the Site Museum and archaeological complex. In the last year, about 35,000 tourists visited the Site Museum – with nationals outnumbering foreigners four to one. Although cultural heritage represents the main attraction in Túcume, other diverse attractions can be developed.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The present study relies mainly on the methodology of Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), but applies itself to the understanding of perceptions of Peruvian residents to tourism in Túcume. Like the aforementioned research, this study focuses primarily on investigating perceived tourism impacts rather than evaluating ‘real’ effects of tourism. Similar to Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996:510), residents’ attitudes towards tourism were treated to be a function of socio-demographic characteristics. To measure residents’ attitudes, the sampling plan employed systematic interviewing of household heads or spouses in the town of Túcume and several nearby caserios (settlements).

The survey instrument consisted of a pre-structured questionnaire, comprised mainly of questions from Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), Parks (2002), and Nyaupane and Thapa (2004). Pre-tested tourism impact variables were combined with additional sustainability questions. Although statistical techniques vary considerably from study to study (Ap 1990:614), this project follows the direction selected by Besculides et al. (2002) and Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996:514): measurement of the relationship between socio-demographic characteristics and tourism opinions is achieved with descriptive statistics and one-way analyses of variance.

However, this quantitative focus is also supplemented with a qualitative approach. Since no individual method reveals the full nature of the problem, different methods are selected to compensate for the weaknesses inherent in each (Denzin 1989). As a result,
this study combines quantitative research with in-depth personal interviews and participant observation. Open-ended, semi-structured interviews were conducted with current and former artisans, local authorities, and museum staff. Participant observations focused particularly on interactions with the artisans and the museum staff. Observations were recorded daily.

**Study Area**

Within the Lambayeque Province, the district of Túcume (Figure 1-3) is primarily centered in the town of Túcume, but also encompasses several settlements (or caserios). The district of Túcume has 21,435 inhabitants - 7,341 “urban” residents and 14,125 “rural” residents (Municipalidad de Túcume 2005:3). The urban zone is characterized by the actual town of Túcume - with its Plaza de Armas - as well as the newer expansions of Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal and Nueva Esperanza (Municipalidad de Túcume
The rural zone is comprised of 35 caserios, including San Antonio, La Raya, Túcume Viejo, Fundo Vera, etc. This apparently strict division between rural and urban is further emphasized by territorial markers (Figure 4-1). Moreover, divisions between rural and urban appear to go far beyond geographic differences: family size, education, occupation, basic services, and housing differ dramatically as well. Rural areas are typified by larger families, poorer education, poorer utilities, and adobe homes (Municipalidad de Túcume 2005:3-4).

The district’s economy is based primarily on the harvesting of corn, beans, rice, and sugar cane (Narváez 1998:8); with herding seen as a less popular complement to agricultural practices. Rice is the preferred crop, but insufficient water forces rice to be substituted by legumes and corn (Coppin and Doig 1999:23). Commercial activities (e.g., clothing production, handicraft production), small businesses (e.g., small groceries, hardware stores, pharmacies, farming equipment suppliers, bars/restaurants), and church and municipal authorities are centered in the capital (or town) of Túcume (Municipalidad de Túcume 2005:4; INC Lambayeque and Museo de Sitio Túcume 2004:2; Narváez 1998:8). Basic services (water, sewage, and electricity) are almost completely restricted to the urban town (Municipalidad de Túcume 2005:4). Only the town of Túcume has plumbing, and this service is still being extended to Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal. Yet these residents only receive running water six hours each day – two hours three times a day. Rural areas are forced to obtain water from wells, except for La Raya, which has some working plumbing. Electricity was recently extended to nearby caserios. However, only half of the residents of La Raya and San Antonio have connections due to disputes over illegal squatting on archaeological land.
Tourist Attractions

Túcume’s main tourist attraction is, of course, its Site Museum and main archaeological complex (see chapter three), located just one kilometer east from the town center along a recently paved road. President Fujimori had this route paved in 2000 in order to facilitate transportation to the site from the old Panamericana. While the paved portion of the road veers slightly south to the museum entrance, a dirt road continues east to numerous caserios (Figure 1-3). This road provides access to San Antonio and La Raya – two caserios that border the main archaeological site to the north and east, respectively – as well as Túcume Viejo and Fundo Vera.

Apart from the Site Museum and the main archaeological complex, there are other potential cultural heritage, cultural, and ecological attractions in the Túcume vicinity. Huaca del Pueblo lies in Nueva Esperanza (Figure 4-2) on the edges of the town of

Figure 4-2. The settlement of Nueva Esperanza surrounds Huaca del Pueblo.
Túcume and en route to the main archaeological site. Moreover, Huaca el Manuelón lies in the center of Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal (Figure 4-3). In addition, the original site of Túcume lies in the *caserio* of Túcume Viejo, just 1.5 km east of the museum. Visible remains of this founding include the foundations of the original Colonial church of Túcume (Figure 4-4): “restos del pórtico en ladrillo pintado, los grandes muros de su nave central y la sacristía. Precisamente en esta última existen restos de pintura mural de finales del siglo XVI [remains of the portico in painted brick, the great walls of its central nave and sacristy. Precisely in this last location, there exist remains of mural painting from the end of the 16th century]” (Coppin and Doig 1999:22).

The newer church of San Pedro (c. 1720), lying on the current Plaza de Armas (Figure 4-5) is another potential tourist attraction. The church combines a mixture of
Figure 4-4. Remains of original Catholic Church founded in Túcume Viejo.

Figure 4-5. The current San Pedro Church and the Municipality border the Plaza de Armas.
baroque and neo-classical styles (Murphy 1999:361). Additionally, the home of renowned national wiseman Federico Villarreal, lies on the old Panamerican road entering town (Figure 4-6). This building is currently being used as an information center.

Figure 4-6. The previous home of wiseman, Federico Villarreal, now serves as an information center.

The district of Túcume is also recognized for its shamanism and ritual healing. There is substantial archaeological and ethnohistorical evidence demonstrating the importance of curanderismo in Lambayeque in pre-Hispanic times (Lexus 1998:620). Today, “in rural areas, the shaman plays an important role and is part of a magic world that has considerable influence in everyday life” (Narváez 2001b:39). And, tourists can participate in mesas (ritual ‘tables’) with several local curanderos (shamans). In fact, these individuals eagerly welcome tourist participation (shamans, personal communication 2004). Perhaps the most famous shaman is Orlando Vera, son of Santos
Vera. Not only does Orlando Vera hold sessions twice weekly, but he also constructed a museum in honor of his father (Figure 4-7). Located in the _caserio_ of Fundo Vera, just 2 km east of the Site Museum, Santos Vera’s home has been transformed into a small museum containing replicas of instruments and objects used by Don Santos.

Túcume’s celebration of its patron saint, the _Fiesta de la Purísima Concepción_, which occurs twice yearly, also represents a tourist potential. The main festivities take place eight days prior to Carnival in February, but a smaller celebration also occurs in September. These events are accompanied by music, dancing, fireworks, cockfights, sports, eating, and drinking. The dances, in particular, are renowned in the area. The dramatic re-creations of the Dance of the Devils and the Dance of the Seven Vices have roots in Colonial times (La República 2003; Murphy 1999:361), and represent a unique melding of African, Andean, and Spanish influence (Narváez 2001b:62). There were
plans to create a museum that would offer information and instruction on theses dances (Narváez 1998:24-26), but efforts never materialized.

The Túcume district also represents a good spot for ecotourism. Túcume lies at the outer limits of the Batán Grande Nature Reserve, the largest dry forest on the Peruvian coast. Moreover, “Batán Grande has a great ecotourism potential that can be integrated with Túcume by means of an appropriate circuit” (Narváez 1998:12). There are hopes to create such a circuit involving horseback riding and local guides. Attempts to create this four-hour, round-trip excursion or similar horseback-riding excursions to Túcume Viejo and Fundo Vera have been delayed due to lack of capital and constant demand. However, the rural landscape within the archaeological complex, surrounding the complex, and along the roads also bears witness of the dry forest as well as traditional agriculture. The campiña (rural areas) contains extensive parcels of land with crops and fruit trees (Narváez 1998:12,22).

Tourist Services

In the late-1990’s, Narváez (1998b:13) recognized that “Túcume lacks services for tourism activities: there are no restaurants, coffee shops, bars, local guides, souvenir industries, linked to the tourist activity.” While the situation has changed somewhat in the last seven years, Túcume now provides limited food, lodging, transportation, information services, and souvenirs for tourists.

The museum, itself, offers a refreshment stand (selling sodas, snacks, film, etc.) and a small outdoor dining area. The former is staffed and operated by only one resident; the latter relies on the services of six women in two shifts (with only three women preparing and serving food each day). These women use “traditional” stoves (researched and constructed by the museum) to cook traditional dishes (including seco de cabrito,
arroz con pato, espesado, ceviche), which they then sell for US$1 (Figure 4-8). In addition to this food, these individuals also prepare and sell chicha de jora (maize beer).

Figure 4-8. Each day three women from local caserios provide traditional cuisine using “traditional” stoves.

A more upscale tourist restaurant, directly across from the museum entrance, was no longer in operation at the time of fieldwork. Due to change of management, the reopening of this facility is uncertain. However, tourists are also encouraged to find nourishment at Hostal Los Horcones – just a few minutes walk from the museum entrance – or Restaurante Kala, in town. Both provide well-presented, quality meals in pleasant environments, but are a little more expensive than other local restaurants. Restaurant La Sirena, on the old Panamerican, serves heartier meals for less, but is mostly popular with drivers and travelers en route to other locations. On the Plaza de Armas, a small café serves good juices as well as pollo a la brasa [roasted chicken]. Finally, a bar off of the Plaza caters mostly to locals.
Túcume contains three lodges of which two are locally owned. Los Horcones is a “good, new hostel built of traditional materials, next to the huacas [ruins]” (Box 2004:113). This tranquil hostel and its lovely gardens are owned by Lima architect, Rosana Correa, who also designed the structures. Two buildings house six bedrooms, a kitchen, dining area, and patio – all of which are built in traditional architectural style using carob trees and adobe (Figure 4-9). However, a local family that lives on the premises generally operates the hostel. Food and drinks are sold with advance notice. And, the property offers additional recreation including: hammocks, ping-pong, bonfires, and coin tossing. Potential plans to expand the hostel include new rooms and construction of a pool.

In town, Hostal Las Balsas is owned and shared by a local family: the family lives on the ground floor, while guests stay in the four visitor rooms upstairs. Unfortunately,
plans to build additional rooms mean that the house is in a perpetual state of construction. Food and information is readily provided in this friendly family atmosphere. Another local-run lodge is also located closer to the southern entrance of town.

Travelers who choose not to purchase a tour package with pre-arranged transportation have several options for getting to the archaeological site and nearby caserios. Upon one’s arrival into Túcume, most tourists find themselves on the old Panamerican. Mototaxi drivers wait at combi (bus) stops (Figure 4-10) waiting to take passengers to the museum entrance. Alternatively, tourists can approach the taxis on the Plaza de Armas that depart for the museum, La Raya, Túcume Viejo, and Fundo Vera when they are full.

The home of Federico Villarreal was awarded to ACODET by the Municipality with the hopes that this site would be refurbished into a tourism attraction and tourism
information center. The Tourism Club originally staffed this location, but their incompetence forced the museum to intervene (Club members, personal communication 2004). Currently, a well-recognized community member staffs this post on a full-time basis, offering information for tourists and schoolchildren. However, this individual does not speak English, making communication with many tourists difficult.

Further information is also provided at the museum. Tours are occasionally available upon request in Spanish and French, and there is hope that additional languages will be available soon. At the time of field research, there was only one local guide that worked part-time. Moreover, many tourists arrive having already contracted a guide.

Local handicrafts represent another attraction as well as a source of income for Túcume’s artisans. At the time of fieldwork, local products included textiles, jewelry, batik, and relief in aluminum. And, these goods were sold exclusively at the site.

Figure 4-11. Traditional weaving with a backstrap loom is occasionally exhibited outside the artisans’ souvenir shop at the Site Museum.
museum’s souvenir shop. Except for textiles, production of these items was introduced by AXIS through training sessions. _Tejidos_ are still made using naturally dyed cotton on a backstrap loom (Figure 4-11); whereas other handicrafts involve modern techniques. Traditional Lambayeque ceramics appear to have been made and sold at the museum (Coppin and Doig 1999), but there was no evidence of this during my fieldwork. Other souvenirs, such as t-shirts, bags, and caps, are made by Chiclayo tour guides and sold at the museum ticket booth.

**Selection of Survey Subjects**

The sampling plan was based on achieving a representative sample (Henry 1990; DiGrino 1986) between October 20, 2004 and December 24, 2004. According to Henry (1990:98), a sample of 300 is sufficient for a population of 15,000. Using maps acquired from the Túcume Municipality, the questionnaire was systematically applied (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004) to every 7th household in the actual town of Túcume. “Systematic sampling has statistical properties that are similar to simple random sampling” (Henry 1990:98). Rural caserios (settlements) with few residents were oversampled in order to ensure a greater balance between different geographic locations with different occupations, earned income, and educational attainment (Table 4-1). In all areas: if the indicated home was unwilling or unable to participate in the study, then the house next door was selected. In some instances, alternate times were scheduled for repeat visits (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004). Participation was generally limited to household heads and their spouses, both of which were approached in their homes. In a few cases another knowledgeable member of the household answered the survey. All participants were at least 18 years of age.
Table 4-1. Summary of Respondent Numbers Based on Location within the District of Túcume.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Approx. No. Homes</th>
<th>No. Homes Surveyed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Joven F.V.</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Esperanza</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Raya</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Túcume Viejo</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundo Vera</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2134</strong></td>
<td><strong>337</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sampling plan originally called for the principal investigator to approach each home. However, after several weeks of sampling, it was decided to hire four local assistants: two males and two females. These assistants minimized tensions that had inadvertently developed between the principal investigator and some residents and also facilitated the timely realization of the sample size objective. All assistants were trained before engaging in surveying. Part of this training included instruction on IRB norms.

All subjects were explained the research by each of the interviewers and then asked to voluntarily participate in the completely anonymous study. Since most residents were not familiar with survey procedures, participants were asked questions while the interviewer completed the questionnaire. Survey-takers often elaborated on certain points, and I encouraged additional attitudes and comments. Interviews averaged 45 minutes, but were heavily influenced by residents’ garrulousness. All conversations were conducted in Spanish.

337 households were interviewed out of a possible 2134 homes in the region encompassing the town of Túcume (including Nueva Esperanza, Pueblo Joven
Federico Villarreal) as well as four nearby caserios (San Antonio, La Raya, Túcume Viejo, Fundo Vera). This represents a 95% confidence level and a 5.25 confidence interval. Moreover, this signifies a 96% response rate. Surveying principally took place during the afternoon and evening hours (2-7pm) in order to avoid conflicts with agricultural tasks or cooking responsibilities. This improved participants’ willingness to answer questions. If men were at home, they generally assumed responsibility for answering the survey. However, women were more frequently found at home than their male counterparts. In some instances, males - wary of answering the questionnaire – indicated that their wives should respond.

Before implementing the survey, the principal researcher announced the purposes of this project on the local radio station as well as several cultural events. This was conducted in order to create transparency.

**Survey Instrumentation**

The questionnaire was compiled using previously tested questions used by Nyaupane and Thapa (2004), Besculides et al. (2002), Gursoy et al. (2002), Parks (2002), Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996), King et al. (1993), Keogh (1990), Perdue et al. (1990), Liu and Var (1986), Beslisle and Hoy (1980) (Tables 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, and 4-5.) Their work on residents’ perceptions of tourism development, socio-cultural impacts, environmental impacts, and economic impacts served as models for this research. In addition, site-specific issues were added to the survey.

Believing in the importance of having multi-item measures (Lankford and Howard 1994), each index (tourism development, socio-cultural impacts, environmental impacts, and economic impacts) consisted of numerous questions. Admittedly, there is great overlap between the indexes in the survey, particularly between the three impact indexes.
The survey, itself, consisted of a three-page, double-sided questionnaire with 103 questions divided into six sections. The first section contained 19 closed items that attempted to understand residents’ opinions regarding aspects related to continued tourism development in Túcume (Table 4-2). This index specifically questioned concern for: tourism development, different types of tourism, tourism services, tourism promotion, tourists, infrastructure, government’s role in tourism planning, community participation, and tourism training. Each of the 19 items required interviewees to indicate their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert scale (Snaith and Haley 1999; Jurowski et al. 1997; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Lankford and Howard 1994:127) ranging from: ‘Completely in Disagreement’ (1) to ‘Completely in Agreement’ (5).

The second, third, and fourth sections dealt with residents’ opinions regarding positive and negative socio-cultural impacts (15 items), environmental impacts (10 items), and economic impacts (18 items), respectively (Tables 4-3, 4-4, 4-5). In order to avoid inherent biases contained in impact questions that are structured as agree/disagree statements, questions were posited in more neutral terms (Jurowski et al. 1997). Respondents were asked if they felt tourism had improved or worsened. Thus, each of the items in these three sections was measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from: ‘Increased Greatly’ (1) to ‘Decreased Greatly’ (5) – similar to the scales used by Upchurch and Teviane (2000) and Milman and Pizam (1988). The socio-cultural index contained items assessing tourism impacts on crime, local culture, archaeological sites, oral traditions, pride and respect for archaeological heritage, traditional architecture, traditional festivals, warmth toward tourists, recreational opportunities, community bonds, educational experiences, quality of life, handicrafts, and community involvement.
in tourism planning. Perceived environmental impact items included noise, waste disposal, plant and wildlife conservation, population growth and crowding, agricultural change, traffic, water quality and sanitation, environmental awareness, and deforestation and soil erosion. Economic impacts measured local investment and consumption, local employment generation, income, cost of life, economic stratification, sale of products by the local people, infrastructure development, ownership of business ventures, and tourism training.

The fifth section asked socio-demographic questions such as: age, gender, education, residency, household income, etc. Finally, the last section contained questions on tourism, some of which were used in Narváez’s 1998 survey so that a comparative study might be possible. Respondents were asked: their contact with tourists, the extent to which their income was derived from tourism, their desire for greater tourism involvement, their desire for increased tourists; and perceived obstacles to tourism development.

After compiling and translating the survey into Spanish, all questions were edited by a native Spanish speaker. All questions were subsequently pre-tested in Lima with the input of a focus group. Then, intensive interviews were conducted with the aid of several Site Museum employees in Túcume in order to better understand how the questions would be interpreted by Túcume residents. As a result, certain aspects of the survey were modified to accommodate site-specific issues. For example, adjectives were used to highlight differences in Likert values so that respondents would better understand possible answers (Narváez 1998).
Treatment of Data

Data obtained from the residents’ questionnaire was entered and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Nominal data was coded and re-entered as numerical values. Descriptive statistics (including frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were run on socio-demographic characteristics as well as all 62 tourism impact variables contained in the four indexes (tourism development, socio-cultural impacts, environmental impacts, economic impacts) (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Perdue et al. 1990; Belisle and Hoy 1980). One-way analyses of variance with a significance level of 0.05 were then used to determine if residents’ perceptions of tourism – as conveyed by the 62 tourism impact items – were a function of certain socio-demographic characteristics. Evaluations focused on differences in means for each of the items based on socio-demographic changes (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004; Besculides et al. 2002; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Liu and Var 1986; Pizam and Pokela 1985; Belisle and Hoy 1980). Post hoc analyses using Scheffe’s test were employed to evaluate differences between groups.

Limitations

The translation of the survey from English to Spanish inevitably caused changes in meaning and interpretation. The survey, itself, was conducted at the end of the tourist season, and a lower concentration of tourists may have influenced residents’ perceptions. Moreover, the self-selection of residents who agreed to answer the survey constitutes an additional bias (Snaith and Haley 1999). Furthermore, the hiring of four additional surveyors inevitably created added biases within the data. As a foreigner, I was perceived differently than the local surveyors and this influenced responses. Finally, although it was heavily emphasized that the survey and interview questions were strictly about tourism,
respondents may have answered more broadly: without precisely considering the impacts of tourism on specified items, residents may have only contemplated general changes in society over time. “It is usually difficult to disentangle the effects caused by tourism from those initiated by other forces of modernization (Mathieson and Wall 1982:185), and such is the case in Túcume.
Table 4-2. Items Used to Measure Residents’ Support for Continued Tourism Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you agree with*:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greater tourism development\textsuperscript{10,13} (in general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More development of cultural heritage tourism\textsuperscript{8} to the pyramids of Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More development of cultural heritage tourism\textsuperscript{8} to the museum of Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development of nature-based tourism\textsuperscript{13} in the Túcume area (such as hikes, horseback riding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development of cultural tourism\textsuperscript{8} in the community (such as festivals)\textsuperscript{13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Development of visitor services in Túcume (such as hotels and restaurants)\textsuperscript{13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Development of small businesses in Túcume (such as guide services, souvenir shops)\textsuperscript{13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Greater tourism promotion of the Túcume area (publicity at the local and national level)\textsuperscript{13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increased number of national tourists\textsuperscript{9,10} to Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increased number of foreign tourists\textsuperscript{9,10} to Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Improved transportation, facilities, and roads\textsuperscript{13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Information on Túcume for tourists (such as maps, guidebooks)\textsuperscript{13}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intervention of the national government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Intervention of the regional government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Local management of tourism in Túcume by the Municipality\textsuperscript{9} and Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Local management of tourism in Túcume by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Community decision-making on the planning/development of tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Training of community members in tourism services (such as hotels, restaurants, guides)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Training of community members in the production of handicrafts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All variables coded on 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Completely in Disagreement, 2 = In Disagreement, 3 = Indifferent, 4 = In Agreement, 5 = Completely in Agreement.\textsuperscript{8}Adapted from Gursoy et al. (2002).\textsuperscript{9}Adapted from Perdue et al. (1990).\textsuperscript{13}Adapted from Parks (2002).
Table 4-3. Items Used to Measure Residents’ Perceptions of Socio-cultural Impacts Resulting from Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What impact has tourism had on the following?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Crime rate&lt;sup&gt;1,2,4,6,8,10,12,13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of conservation of local culture&lt;sup&gt;1,3,11,12,13&lt;/sup&gt; in Túcume (e.g., customs and traditions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of conservation of archaeological sites in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of conservation of local history and myths&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level of pride and respect&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; for the history and archaeological sites of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of traditional architecture&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt; in construction of homes (using carob, adobe, reeds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Level of conservation of festivals&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt; in Túcume (such as the Purísima Concepción)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of warmth of Túcume residents towards visitors&lt;sup&gt;2,4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of outdoor recreational opportunities and spaces&lt;sup&gt;5,6,8,10,13&lt;/sup&gt; in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Quality and quantity of kinship ties and community bonds&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quality and quantity of educational experiences and learning&lt;sup&gt;6,12&lt;/sup&gt; in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quality of life&lt;sup&gt;4,12&lt;/sup&gt; in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Quality and quantity of local arts and handicrafts&lt;sup&gt;6,12&lt;/sup&gt; in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Quantity of conflicts and division between residents of Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Level of community participation in the planning and development of tourism&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All variables coded on 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Increased Greatly, 2 = Increased Slightly, 3 = No Impact, 4 = Decreased Slightly, 5 = Decreased Greatly.

<sup>1</sup>Adapted from Beslisle and Hoy (1980).
<sup>2</sup>Adapted from Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996).
<sup>3</sup>Adapted from Besculides et al. (2002).
<sup>4</sup>Adapted from King et al. (1993).
<sup>5</sup>Adapted from Keogh (1990).
<sup>6</sup>Adapted from Liu and Var (1986).
<sup>8</sup>Adapted from Gursoy et al. (2002).
<sup>12</sup>Adapted from Nyaupane and Thapa (2004).
<sup>13</sup>Adapted from Parks (2002).
Table 4-4. Items Used to Measure Residents’ Perceptions of Environmental Impacts Resulting from Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What impact has tourism had on the following?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of noise(^5,6,7,10,11) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of pollution and waste disposal(^7,10,11,12) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of conservation of wildlife(^11,12) endemic to the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of conservation of plants and forests(^11,12) in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quantity of population in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level of agricultural practice(^1) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Level of traffic congestion(^4,6,7,8,11,13) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of sanitation and water quality(^7,12) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Level of awareness of the environment(^12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Level of deforestation and soil erosion(^12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All variables coded on 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Increased Greatly, 2 = Increased Slightly, 3 = No Impact, 4 = Decreased Slightly, 5 = Decreased Greatly.

\(^1\)Adapted from Belisle and Hoy (1980).
\(^4\)Adapted from King et al. (1993).
\(^5\)Adapted from Keogh (1990).
\(^7\)Adapted from Pizam (1978).
\(^8\)Adapted from Gursoy et al. (2002).
\(^12\)Adapted from Nyaupane and Thapa (2004).
\(^13\)Adapted from Parks (2002).
Table 4-5. Items Used to Measure Residents’ Perceptions of Economic Impacts Resulting from Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What impact has tourism had on the following?*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of investment and spending(^6,11) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quantity of economic opportunities(^2,4,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quantity and quality of permanent jobs(^10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quantity and quality of seasonal jobs(^10,12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salaries(^2,4,5,10) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Standard of living(^1,2,4,6,10,11) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cost of land and homes(^1,12) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of economic stratification(^1,12) within Túcume residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sale of local products and services(^12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Purchase of products and services from outside of Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sale of local handicrafts(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Level of development of infrastructure in Túcume (roads, transportation)(^1,10,12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Quality and quantity of water, sewage, and electricity(^1,10,12) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Quality and quantity of medical services(^12) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Quality and quantity of schools(^8,12) and formal education in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Number of local businesses(^6,12) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Number of businesses owned by nonresidents(^12) in Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Quantity and quality of tourism training(^12) (in tourism services, handicrafts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All variables coded on 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Increased Greatly, 2 = Increased Slightly, 3 = No Impact, 4 = Decreased Slightly, 5 = Decreased Greatly.

\(^1\)Adapted from Belisle and Hoy (1980).
\(^2\)Adapted from Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996).
\(^3\)Adapted from King et al. (1993).
\(^4\)Adapted from Keogh (1990).
\(^5\)Adapted from Liu and Var (1986).
\(^6\)Adapted from Gursoy et al. (2002).
\(^7\)Adapted from Nyaupane and Thapa (2004).
\(^8\)Adapted from Parks (2002).
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

Introduction

This study presents perceptions of tourism by local residents in Túcume. After delving into a profile of respondents, this chapter will compare answers between this survey and Narváez’s 1998 survey. This chapter will also present descriptive statistics on survey-takers’ views of tourism development and impacts. Moreover, the influence of socio-demographic characteristics on tourism opinions will be expounded.

Profile of Respondents

Gender

Of the 337 respondents, the majority (62.9%) were women (Table 5-1). This is probably due to the fact that women were more likely to be at home than their male counterparts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

This study was primarily limited to household heads and spouses of at least 18 years of age. Age was determined through an open-ended question, and results were recoded into four groups based on frequency distributions: 22% of respondents were between 18 and 30 years of age, 27.3% of participants were between 31 and 40, another
27.3% were between 41 and 50, and 23.4% of those surveyed were over 50 years of age (Table 5-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-2. Age Profile of Respondents.

Education

Many respondents (39%) indicated that they had received no schooling whatsoever (3%), received some elementary education (14.3%), or completed elementary school (22.3%). Of those who had attended high school (45.2%), 31.5% finished and 13.7% did not. Moreover, only 15.8% admitted going on to higher education: 9.8% to an institute and 6% to a university. No participants received graduate education (Table 5-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schooling</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some degree of High</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-3. Education Profile of Respondents.

Income

Most respondents (44.1%) claimed that their household monthly income (during the time of the survey) was less than 200 soles (or approximately US$62.50). This was partly due to a continuing drought that reduced the amount of agricultural work available for day laborers. Instead of working six days each week, laborers were apparently only being hired for three days a week. At the current rate of 10 soles per day, day laborers were earning about 120 soles (US$37.50) per month. An additional 36.6% of households interviewed indicated that their household income was between 200 and 500 soles (or
US$62.50-US$156.25), and 11.7% stated that their household income was between 500 and 800 soles (or US$156.25-250) (Table 5-4).

Table 5-4. Profile of Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earnings (soles*/month)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;200 soles</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-500 soles</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;500</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1US$ = 3.2 soles

Length of Residence

Most residents (73%) admitted that they had never lived outside of Túcume. Years spent away from Túcume are the result of: non-Tucumanos coming to live in Túcume at later stages in their lives; or Tucumanos leaving their hometown for several years in the hope of improving their economic situation in some of the bigger cities. Length of residence was determined through an open-ended survey question, and results were recoded into three groups based on frequency distributions. For example, 35.8% of the respondents had lived in Túcume for 30 years or less; 36.7% had lived in Túcume between 31 and 45 years; and 27.5% had dwelt in the town for over 45 years (Table 5-5). Given that most of the Túcume populace does not leave the area, these statistics are, no doubt, related to age.

Table 5-5. Profile of Respondents’ Length of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Lived in Túcume</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Place of Residence

As stipulated in chapter four, 254 homes (75.4%) were interviewed in the more congested urban area (Pueblo, Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal, and Nueva Esperanza).
In the less populated rural area (including San Antonio, La Raya, Túcume Viejo, and Fundo Vera), only 83 individuals (24.6%) were surveyed (Table 5-6). As aforementioned, the 154 residents (45.7%) surveyed who live in San Antonio, La Raya, Túcume Viejo, Nueva Esperanza, and Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal, border cultural heritage monuments. Those living in other areas (n=183; 54.3%) do not.

Table 5-6. Profile of Respondents’ Place of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Settlement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Joven F.V.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Esperanza</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Raya</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Túcume Viejo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundo Vera</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within communities bordering cultural heritage monuments, there is often controversy between the National Institute of Culture (INC), who is entrusted with preserving culture heritage, and “local residents who frequently destroy ruins in order to gain space for factories, agricultural fields, and housing” (Silverman 2002:883). This has happened to a limited degree in Túcume: residents have constructed homes and fields abutting cultural heritage monuments. Most of these ‘invasions’ on archaeological land were done before the ruins were delimited by archaeologists. Moreover, many families set-up residence on archaeological land during El Niño events – when most of the countryside was inundated save archaeological monuments on higher ground (Heyerdahl et al. 1995). Today, inhabitants on archaeological land are regarded as squatters by the museum. For these squatters, ownership of their land is contested: for the time being, they are allowed possession of their homes, but prohibited from additional construction. This is not uncommon in many parts of Perú. At the Moche site of San Jose de Morro:
the ownership of land in the site is rather unstable because of the archaeological nature of all the area, thus residents have what is technically a possession of their lots rather than a real property. Regrettably long term [tourism] development plans are faced with resistance by poor communities due to their needs to satisfy short term necessities, to a long history of unfulfilled promises and exploitation by unscrupulous individuals and politicians, and particularly by endemic local factionalism. (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:9-10)

As suggested by these authors, archaeological ruins and tourism projects are often negatively viewed, as they tend to conflict with short-term needs for land. “In the rural communities and even in the urban area, the archaeological monuments are considered an obstacle for the expansion of agriculture or other productive activities” (Narváez 1998:18).

Rural caserio, La Raya, represents the best example of this controversy since this community has the greatest concentration of homes (n=100 homes; 50% of community) lying within the archaeological perimeter. San Antonio has about 18 homes that lie on archaeological territory – also 50% of the community – but their political authority falls under that of La Raya. Túcume Viejo only has a few homes that encroach upon the ruins of Túcume’s first church. The same applies for Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal: only one block of homes lies within archaeological territory. Nueva Esperanza, though, consists of numerous homes that lie on designated archaeological land. However, their geographical location places them on the outskirts of town and somewhat distanced from the museum.

**Tourism**

Only 8.3% (n=28) admitted receiving any instruction on tourism by the Site Museum (Table 5-7).
Moreover, only 6.6% (n=22) admitted that they were currently involved in tourism in some form or another. Seven individuals listed food preparation and serving as their tourism activity, another seven indicated that they provided transportation for tourists, and nine respondents mentioned their involvement in handicraft production or sales. Only four respondents mentioned that they acted as unofficial guides for passersby, and two people provided lodging (Table 5-8).

Since only 6.6% (n=22) of respondents are in some way involved in tourism, it is not surprising that only 7.0% (n=23) admitted receiving economic benefits from the industry. Seventeen individuals (5.2%) claimed that monies earned from tourism represent less that 20% of their total monthly income. Five participants (1.5%) admitted that about half of their total income was due to tourism, and only one person recognized that most of their income was derived from tourism (Table 5-9).
Table 5-9. Profile of Earnings from Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Earnings Due to Tourism</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, when asked if they wished to become more involved in tourism-related activities, 86.5% (n=289) of respondents answered affirmatively. Those who answered negatively (n=45) cited old age or other professional obligations as hindrances.

**Comparison with Narváez’s 1998 Survey**

In order to understand how perceptions of tourism had changed since the initiation of tourism projects in 1998, several tourism questions, in some form or another similar to Narváez’s 1998 study, were asked. To comprehend what tourist attractions residents were interested in developing, types of tourism desired were investigated (Table 5-10). As in 1998, the great majority of residents (87%) responded that they wished further development of cultural heritage tourism. Seventy-four percent of participants also mentioned that they wished development of cultural tourism, including emphasis on local customs and traditions as well as the religious Festival of the Purísima Concepción. Only 39.3% desired nature-based tourism attractions. Moreover, 36% wanted *gastronomía* (or

Table 5-10. Profile of Tourism Types Desired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Types</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>288 (87.0%)</td>
<td>43 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>245 (74.0%)</td>
<td>86 (26.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature-based</td>
<td>130 (39.3%)</td>
<td>201 (60.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastronomia*</td>
<td>119 (36.0%)</td>
<td>212 (64.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamanism</td>
<td>108 (32.6%)</td>
<td>223 (67.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>328 (99.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Food-based tourism*
local cuisine) marketed as a tourism attraction, and 32.6% thought shamanism and healing could represent a good attraction. These last two attractions represent new forms of tourism that have not been heavily marketed, but which evidently show some level of community support. Thus, in addition to more recognized tourist attractions (namely, the archaeological ruins, local customs, and festivals), there is growing community support for newer attractions, including food and shamanism.

Unfortunately, when examining residents’ perceptions of economic benefits resulting from tourism, we see little difference from 1998. While Narváez found that 91.3% of respondents felt their families had received no income from tourism, in this study 93% of respondents confessed that tourism had not impacted their monthly earnings (Table 5-9). When asked if they would like to become involved in tourism and tourism services, 289 respondents (86.5%) answered positively. Of this group, 31% cited that they would like to participate in tourism through handicrafts; others mentioned guiding (23.5%), food (22.8%), and lodging (12.6%) (Table 5-11). Interestingly, in both surveys, respondents identified handicrafts and guiding as their preferred avenues for tourism participation; and these opinions are undoubtedly swayed by perceptions of required capital and time investments. It is quite clear that the majority of residents in 2004 wished to become involved in tourism through activities that could supplement their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handicrafts</td>
<td>91 (31.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding</td>
<td>69 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>67 (22.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>37 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>20 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
current occupation and require little start-up capital. For this reason, individual desires to supply restaurants, lodges, and transportation are not as marked in both surveys.

This conclusion is further supported by the fact that 77.5% (n=258) of participants cited lack of capital as their primary difficulty for participating in tourism. Other obstacles included: lack of training (62.3%), lack of interest by authorities (62.3%), lack of interest by other residents (41.6%), and lack of sufficient publicity of the town (22.2%) (Table 5-12). It is interesting to note that worries over capital and authorities’ interest had declined since Narváez’s 1998 study, perhaps reflecting greater awareness of tourism and recent tourism projects. However, lack of training was still seen as an obstacle. Moreover, the idea that local people lacked interest in tourism had risen substantially since 1998.

As for contact with tourists: only 20.6% of respondents admitted having direct contact (conservation and through services). This figure is reduced from 32% of the respondents in 1998. Only 4.0% (n=13) of individuals mentioned that they directly interacted with tourists through the offering of services, including lodging, food, guiding, transportation, etc. However, 16.6% (n=54) of participants admitted that they had conversed with tourists by answering their questions. Finally, 78.8% of the populace have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles for Development</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capital</td>
<td>258 (77.5%)</td>
<td>75 (22.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training</td>
<td>208 (62.3%)</td>
<td>126 (37.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of authorities’ interest</td>
<td>208 (62.3%)</td>
<td>126 (37.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of residents’ interest</td>
<td>139 (41.6%)</td>
<td>195 (58.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of publicity of site</td>
<td>74 (22.2%)</td>
<td>259 (77.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of organization</td>
<td>11 (3.3%)</td>
<td>323 (96.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only indirectly interacted with tourists through visual contact, implying that 21.2% of the population has not even been consciously affected by tourists (Table 5-13).

Table 5-13. Profile of Respondents’ Contact with Tourists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight Only</td>
<td>256 (78.8%)</td>
<td>69 (21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>54 (16.6%)</td>
<td>271 (83.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through Offering of Services</td>
<td>13 (4.0%)</td>
<td>312 (96.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most respondents desired an increase in tourists and tourism to Túcume. In particular, 70.5% (n=234) of respondents wished both national and foreign tourist arrivals to increase. Yet, 25% (n=83) wanted specifically foreign tourist arrivals to increase; whereas 4.5% (n=15) wanted solely national tourists to augment (Table 5-14). Compared to 1998 data, there is more support for ‘both’ kinds of tourists and less support for just foreigners. This may be due to a realization that Túcume is a good national attraction for vacationing Peruvians.

Table 5-14. Profile of Tourist Types Desired

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tourists</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peruvians</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tourism Perceptions: Descriptive Statistics

Tourism Development

In order to establish residents’ opinions towards continued tourism development, 19 questions were asked of survey participants. Responses for each item were coded on a 5-point Likert scale: respondents could select ‘Completely Opposed’ (1), ‘Opposed’ (2), ‘Indifferent’ (3), ‘In Agreement’ (4), and ‘Completely in Agreement’ (5). In general, means for each of these 19 items ranged from 3.98 to 4.69, indicating that the
respondents, as a whole, agreed with all aspects of tourism development (Table 5-15). In fact, 98.8% of respondents agreed with ‘greater tourism development’ (item 1).

However, 97.6% of surveyees (combining ‘in agreement’ and ‘completely in agreement’ responses) supported the continued development of tourism to the pyramids as opposed to 98.5% supporting continued development to the museum specifically. This slight difference may signify certain respondents’ uncertainties regarding the impacts of continued tourism on the surrounding communities of La Raya and Pueblo Joven Federico Villarreal. In particular, some of the residents in those settlements worry that increased tourism will deprive them of the land upon which they are squatting. As a result, 2.1% are opposed to increased tourism to the pyramids.

Most survey participants (97.4%) agree with the development of nature-based tourism and 97.6% support the development of cultural tourism. However, several respondents were slightly concerned about the commodification of religious festivals such as the celebrations of La Purísima Concepción.

As for the development of tourism services and infrastructure: about 98% of respondents agreed with developing more hotels and restaurants for tourists, developing guide services and souvenir shops, and increasing promotion of Túcume. The majority of surveyees (95.6%) support attracting a greater number of both Peruvian tourists and foreign visitors. However, 52.2% are ‘completely in agreement’ with increasing national arrivals, as opposed to 65.8% who are ‘completely in agreement’ with increasing foreign arrivals. This response reflects data in Table 5-14 and implies that respondents are slightly more supportive of foreign visitors, particularly due to foreigners’ proclivity to spend greater sums of money than Peruvians.
Table 5-15. Frequency Distributions (Percentage) for Respondents' Perceptions of Tourism Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>(1) Completely Opposed % (N)</th>
<th>(2) Opposed % (N)</th>
<th>(3) Indifferent % (N)</th>
<th>(4) In agreement % (N)</th>
<th>(5) Completely in agreement % (N)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD (^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater tourism development (in general)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.9 (3)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>39.8 (135)</td>
<td>59.0 (200)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More development of cultural heritage tourism to the pyramids of Túcume</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>40.2 (135)</td>
<td>57.4 (193)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More development of cultural heritage tourism to the museum of Túcume</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>42.3 (143)</td>
<td>56.2 (190)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of nature-based tourism in the Túcume area</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>1.5 (5)</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>37.5 (127)</td>
<td>59.9 (203)</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of cultural tourism in the community (such as festivals)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.9 (3)</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>39.9 (134)</td>
<td>57.7 (194)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of visitor services in Túcume (i.e. hotels and restaurants)</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>37.2 (126)</td>
<td>61.7 (209)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of small businesses in Túcume (i.e. guide services, souvenirs)</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>42.5 (144)</td>
<td>56.3 (191)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater tourism promotion of the Túcume area (publicity)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>29.2 (99)</td>
<td>68.4 (232)</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of national tourists to Túcume</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>2.1 (7)</td>
<td>43.4 (147)</td>
<td>52.2 (177)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of foreign tourists to Túcume</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>0.9 (3)</td>
<td>2.1 (7)</td>
<td>29.8 (101)</td>
<td>65.8 (223)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transportation, facilities, and roads</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>30.1 (102)</td>
<td>68.7 (233)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on Túcume for tourists (such as maps, guidebooks)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>2.1 (7)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>44.0 (149)</td>
<td>53.7 (182)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention of the national government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
<td>3.8 (13)</td>
<td>12.7 (43)</td>
<td>4.1 (14)</td>
<td>39.6 (134)</td>
<td>39.6 (134)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention of the regional government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
<td>2.1 (7)</td>
<td>10.9 (37)</td>
<td>2.4 (8)</td>
<td>38.3 (130)</td>
<td>45.7 (155)</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management of tourism in Túcume by the Municipality and Museum</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>5.9 (20)</td>
<td>4.1 (14)</td>
<td>46.0 (156)</td>
<td>41.9 (142)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management of tourism in Túcume by the community</td>
<td>0.9 (3)</td>
<td>5.3 (18)</td>
<td>6.2 (21)</td>
<td>46.6 (158)</td>
<td>39.8 (135)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community decision-making on the planning/development of tourism</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>1.5 (5)</td>
<td>1.5 (5)</td>
<td>49.6 (168)</td>
<td>46.0 (156)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of community members in tourism services</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.9 (3)</td>
<td>41.3 (140)</td>
<td>56.9 (193)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of community members in the production of handicrafts</td>
<td>0.3 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>35.7 (121)</td>
<td>61.9 (210)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variables coded on 5-point Likert scale with 1=Complete Opposed, 2=Opposed, 3=Indifferent, 4=In agreement, 5=Completely in agreement

\(^1\) Standard Deviation
However, a slightly larger standard deviation might be due to the reservations that certain residents have towards potential exploitation by foreigners. On several occasions, residents expressed their concerns that the pyramids were being plundered by foreign scholars. And, upon Heyerdahl’s (1995:205) initial arrival in Túcume, he was mistaken for a huaquero (looter). On a lighter note, residents worried that the pyramids were only being enjoyed by foreign arrivals, as opposed to locals. Until 1998, “tourism was understood wrongly as part of the activities of the local museum, the scientific project and of the presence of foreign people” (Narváez 1998:87).

Most participants (98.8%) support improving roads and transportation. Only the old Panamerican highway and Plaza de Armas are currently paved. Although some archaeologists oppose paving dirt roads in the area, particularly those that lie alongside archaeological sites, most residents only see benefits attributed to paving. Mototaxi and taxi drivers, especially, would appreciate pavement, as it would reduce the damage to their vehicles.

Although tourism development requires the combined efforts of numerous entities (including the state government, regional government, local authorities, and community groups), only 79.2% of respondents agreed with the involvement of the national government in tourism development. In conversation, many residents complained about the state of affairs under the Toledo government, and as such, preferred that the state government not get involved in tourism in Túcume. In fact, 16.5% of participants opposed national government intervention. This differs somewhat from 13.1% of participants opposing regional government intervention. In addition, 84% of respondents agreed with regional government involvement in Túcume tourism, partly due to the fact
that residents were supportive of government decentralization. Yet, 87.9% of individuals surveyed agreed (41.9% ‘completely in agreement’ and 46% ‘in agreement’) with management of Túcume tourism by the Municipality and the Museum. Moreover, it is generally perceived that the museum and the municipality, in that order, manage tourism in Túcume today. It is interesting to note that only 86.4% of respondents agree with community management of tourism in Túcume. Many expressed concern that a community-based organization would be unable to adequately manage tourism due to lack of experience, corruption, etc. Although the NGO, Túcume Vivo, was cited for improving conditions in Túcume, its recent collapse at the hands of local community members was still fresh in many minds. As a result, 6.2% of respondents opposed community-run management and 6.2% were ‘indifferent’ (or uncertain). In summary, Túcume survey participants seem to prefer tourism management in the hands of the museum and municipality, the community, the regional government, and the national government, in that order.

Respondents (95.6%) agreed with community input regarding tourism decisions. This indicates that while Túcume residents are skeptical about community-based tourism management, they are clearly supportive of community involvement in tourism decision-making. Plus, 98.2% of respondents favored the training of community members in tourism services and 97.6% agreed with the training of community members in handicraft production.

In conclusion, it appears that Túcume residents are generally supportive of continued tourism development. The majority of respondents agree with each of the 19 items measuring opinions of tourism development.
Socio-cultural Impacts

In order to establish residents’ opinions towards socio-cultural impacts, 15 questions were asked of survey participants. Responses for each item were coded on a 5-point Likert scale: respondents could select ‘Increased Greatly’ (1), ‘Increased Slightly’ (2), ‘No Impact’ (3), ‘Decreased Slightly’ (4), and ‘Decreased Greatly’ (5). Survey results indicate positive impacts due to tourism (Table 5-16).

According to residents, conservation, pride, and respect for Túcume’s history and archaeology have increased due to tourism. Conservation of huacas (ruins), in particular, is felt to have increased due to the museum’s efforts: preservation of the main archaeological site and surrounding mounds; and conservation workshops for community members. Conservation of local history and myths is not felt to have increased as much, but individuals cite publications by Alfredo Narváez and AXIS on local mythology as examples of conservation efforts. It is probably due to the aforementioned events and achievements that 46.1% of respondents feel that fellow residents exhibit greater pride and respect for Túcume’s history and archaeology. There was still some evidence of looting: pits were visible, stories were circulated concerning recent finds, and attempts were made to sell me artifacts. However, community members emphasize that looting, and thus disrespect for the ruins, has decreased substantially over the years. Yet, one wonders if looting has decreased due to greater surveillance over this activity by policeman at the museum or because of changing attitudes towards looting itself.

“Looting is not seen traditionally as an illegal activity, quite the contrary, successful looters are praised in local folklore” (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:8). Moreover, poor families have used looting to supplement their incomes (Silverman 2002:883; Sandweiss
Table 5-16. Frequency Distributions (Percentage) for Respondents' Perceptions of Socio-cultural Impacts due to Tourism

| Questionnaire Statement* | (1) Increased Greatly % (N) | (2) Increased Slightly % (N) | (3) No Impact % (N) | (4) Decreased Slightly % (N) | (5) Decreased Greatly % (N) | N | Mean Score | SD
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-------------|-----
| Crime rate               | 16.0 (54)                    | 19.6 (66)                   | 49.3 (166)          | 13.4 (45)                   | 1.8 (6)                     | 337 | 2.65       | 0.96 |
| Level of Conservation of local culture in Túcume (i.e. customs and traditions) | 13.6 (46)                    | 31.0 (105)                  | 28.3 (96)           | 23.3 (79)                   | 3.8 (13)                    | 339 | 2.73       | 1.08 |
| Level of Conservation of archaeological sites in Túcume | 32.5 (110)                   | 32.0 (108)                  | 24.6 (83)           | 9.5 (32)                    | 1.5 (5)                     | 338 | 2.15       | 1.03 |
| Level of conservation of local history and myths in Túcume | 17.0 (57)                    | 25.9 (87)                   | 28.9 (97)           | 22.9 (77)                   | 5.4 (18)                    | 336 | 2.74       | 1.15 |
| Level of Pride and respect for the history and archaeological sites of the area | 46.1 (155)                   | 28.0 (94)                   | 16.1 (54)           | 7.4 (25)                    | 2.4 (8)                     | 336 | 1.92       | 1.06 |
| Use of traditional architecture in construction of homes | 8.6 (29)                     | 11.6 (39)                   | 16.7 (56)           | 27.7 (93)                   | 35.4 (119)                  | 336 | 3.70       | 1.29 |
| Level of Conservation of festivals in Túcume (i.e. Purísima Concepción) | 20.2 (68)                    | 21.4 (72)                   | 32.4 (109)          | 23.2 (78)                   | 2.7 (9)                     | 336 | 2.67       | 1.12 |
| Level of Warmth of Túcume residents towards visitors | 31.5 (106)                   | 43.6 (147)                  | 22.3 (75)           | 2.1 (7)                     | 0.6 (2)                     | 337 | 1.97       | 0.82 |
| Number of Outdoor recreational opportunities and spaces in Túcume | 11.4 (38)                    | 24.6 (82)                   | 58.1 (194)          | 5.7 (19)                    | 0.3 (1)                     | 334 | 2.59       | 0.77 |
| Quality and quantity of Kinship ties and community bonds | 9.0 (30)                     | 30.2 (101)                  | 47.6 (159)          | 11.4 (38)                   | 1.8 (6)                     | 334 | 2.67       | 0.86 |
| Quality and quantity of Educational experiences and learning in Túcume | 13.2 (44)                    | 40.7 (136)                  | 40.4 (135)          | 5.1 (17)                    | 0.6 (2)                     | 334 | 2.39       | 0.80 |
| Quality of life in Túcume | 6.3 (21)                     | 18.6 (62)                   | 46.8 (156)          | 18.6 (62)                   | 9.6 (32)                    | 333 | 3.07       | 1.00 |
| Quality and quantity of Local arts and handicrafts in Túcume | 15.5 (51)                    | 41.3 (136)                  | 32.8 (108)          | 7.9 (26)                    | 2.4 (8)                     | 329 | 2.40       | 0.93 |
| Quantity of Conflicts and division between residents of Túcume | 6.7 (22)                     | 16.4 (54)                   | 63.8 (210)          | 9.4 (31)                    | 3.6 (12)                    | 329 | 2.87       | 0.81 |
| Level of Community participation in the planning and development of tourism | 9.4 (30)                     | 40.6 (130)                  | 39.1 (125)          | 8.4 (27)                    | 2.5 (8)                     | 320 | 2.54       | 0.87 |

*Variables coded on 5-point Likert scale with 1=Increased Greatly, 2=Increased Slightly, 3=No Impact, 4=Decreased Slightly, 5=Decreased Greatly.

Standard Deviation
1999; Narváez 1998:18). Shortly before I arrived in Túcume, high school children were caught chipping off pieces of the polychrome mural in the Temple of the Mythical Bird for a school project (residents and school directors, personal communication 2004). Such actions severely question whether years of education and training in conservation have had any lasting effect on locals’ respect for cultural patrimony.

Survey participants (75.1%) generally felt that fellow residents had become warmer and friendlier towards tourists. As for warmth within the community of Túcume, 47.6% of residents felt that tourism had had no impact on kinship ties and community bonds. Furthermore, residents seem to feel that tourism has slightly improved educational experiences -- due mainly to the museums’ training sessions and recent publication of educational material on Túcume patrimony. However, 58.1% of surveyees do not feel that tourism has affected their recreational opportunities and spaces. Only 36% recognized that the main archaeological complex represented a ‘new’ recreational space for picnicking, playing, and relaxing for Túcume residents. This may be due to the fact that as of winter 2004, entrance fees for Túcume residents have been waived; before this date, residents were obliged to pay. However, most residents interviewed are still unaware of this policy, and thus, feel financially incapable of enjoying the pyramids and surrounding recreational spaces.

As for conservation of local culture, customs, and traditions in Túcume, residents seem to be somewhat split: 28.3% feel no impact has been made by tourism, while 27.1% have noticed a decrease in conservation and 46.6% have noted an increase in conservation. Thus, although some residents cite disruptions due to tourism, slightly more denizens laud the museum’s focus and efforts for enhanced preservation of Túcume
culture. Similarly, residents were split regarding the impacts of tourism upon festivals like the Purísima Concepción: 32.4% saw no impact whatsoever, 25.9% felt a decrease in conservation, and 41.6% detected an increase in conservation. Again, while some viewed festival accommodation for the tourists as negative, others perceived changes as a form of increased preservation. And according to the local priest, celebrations for Túcume’s patron saint continue unchanged. As for conservation of traditional architecture in the region, 53.1% of respondents felt that tourism had minimized its use. However, this question may be an example of respondents not separating tourism’s impact on society from other influences. Although the Site Museum and Hostal Los Horcones have implemented traditional carob and adobe architectural styles, there is a growing desire by Túcume residents to replace these materials with brick and cement. This trend does not seem to be driven so much by tourism as by general socio-economic, security, and meteorological concerns. If financially possible, families tend to rebuild their homes in material noble (brick or cement) in order to preserve their homes from the onslaughts of El Niño, protect their possessions, and indicate their socio-economic status (Román Asalde, personal communication 2004).

Quality of life, for the most part, seems not to have been affected by tourism. But, 56.8% of participants felt that tourism had increased the production and quality of handicrafts. Although many Túcume residents (mostly women) create handicrafts on a regular basis, few are regarded as ‘artesanos’ [artisans] and allowed to sell their wares to tourists. Only individuals having received training at the museum and belonging to the Association of Artisans, can display their goods in the museum’s souvenir shop. Since 1998, the museum has sponsored several training sessions that have been directly aimed
at teaching locals to produce high-quality goods for tourists – and these efforts are recognized by respondents who perceive an increase in handicrafts. As for community participation in tourism planning and development: 39.1% of respondents have witnessed no change since tourism’s inception, and 40.6% believe community participation has increased slightly.

As for tourism’s influence on crime and internal community conflict, most residents notice no impact. Just under half (49.3%) see no change in crime associated with tourism since most criminal activity in Túcume is related to the theft of animals in the middle of the night (Police, personal communication 2004). Moreover, interviews with the police force reveal that officers believe looting has decreased since the onset of tourism. However, 35.6% of participants feel that tourism has somehow contributed to increased crime. In addition, 63.8% of respondents believe that tourism has not affected local conflicts and division, but 23.1% mention an increase and point to divisions caused by the NGO, Túcume Vivo.

In summary, over half of all respondents perceived a positive increase in the conservation of archaeological patrimony, local pride in cultural patrimony, warmth of residents towards visitors, and production of handicrafts. Participants also noted an increase in educational experiences and community participation in tourism planning and development.

Environmental Impacts

To determine residents’ opinions towards environmental impacts, 10 questions were asked of survey participants. Responses for each item were coded on a 5-point Likert scale: respondents could select ‘Increased Greatly’ (1), ‘Increased Slightly’ (2),
‘No Impact’ (3), ‘Decreased Slightly’ (4), and ‘Decreased Greatly’ (5). Survey results indicate both positive and negative impacts due to tourism (Table 5-17).

For example, tourism is thought to have conserved slightly the endemic flora and fauna. Just over half of respondents (51%) felt that tourism had intensified conservation of local plants and forests. Until recently, massive manmade deforestation in Lambayeque had cleared large tracts of land, enhanced soil erosion, and increased drought (Lexus 1998:597). Although some Peruvians surreptitiously continue to cut down carob trees, the government has condemned this activity as illegal. Seeing as Túcume borders the Pómac National Sanctuary, residents more clearly experienced and perceived conservation efforts. This is mirrored in the fact that 33.9% of respondents believed that deforestation (and thus soil erosion) had decreased. However, 50.9% of respondents did not feel that tourism had had any impact on the conservation of wildlife. This may be due, in part, to respondents’ reluctance to acknowledge that Túcume contains wildlife. Yet, 33.9% of survey participants felt that local and national efforts were being made to conserve wildlife.

Tourism’s impact on the populace appears to have been somewhat negative: population size, noise, and traffic congestion are all perceived to have augmented due to tourism. In fact, 83.9% of respondents felt that the population had increased due to tourism. Continued population growth is clearly evident in Túcume and has caused shantytowns like 10 de Enero and Señor Cautivo de Ayabaca to rise on the outskirts of town. While tourism has no doubt served as an economic attraction for residents in nearby communities, other forces are also responsible for population growth. Constant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>(1) Increased Greatly % (N)</th>
<th>(2) Increased Slightly % (N)</th>
<th>(3) No Impact % (N)</th>
<th>(4) Decreased Slightly % (N)</th>
<th>(5) Decreased Greatly % (N)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD(^1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Noise in Túcume</td>
<td>35.8 (120)</td>
<td>26.6 (89)</td>
<td>31.3 (105)</td>
<td>5.4 (18)</td>
<td>0.9 (3)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Pollution and waste in Túcume</td>
<td>10.8 (36)</td>
<td>24.6 (82)</td>
<td>28.8 (96)</td>
<td>23.7 (79)</td>
<td>12.0 (40)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Conservation of wildlife endemic to the area</td>
<td>12.6 (42)</td>
<td>21.3 (71)</td>
<td>50.9 (170)</td>
<td>10.5 (35)</td>
<td>4.8 (16)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Conservation of plants and forests in the area</td>
<td>27.3 (91)</td>
<td>23.7 (79)</td>
<td>34.5 (115)</td>
<td>11.1 (37)</td>
<td>3.3 (11)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of population in Túcume</td>
<td>64.5 (216)</td>
<td>19.4 (65)</td>
<td>13.7 (46)</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Agricultural practice in Túcume</td>
<td>17.4 (58)</td>
<td>18.6 (62)</td>
<td>46.4 (155)</td>
<td>14.1 (47)</td>
<td>3.6 (12)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Traffic congestion in Túcume</td>
<td>48.2 (161)</td>
<td>29.3 (98)</td>
<td>20.1 (67)</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Sanitation and water quality in Túcume</td>
<td>11.7 (39)</td>
<td>27.1 (90)</td>
<td>46.7 (155)</td>
<td>9.9 (33)</td>
<td>4.5 (15)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Awareness of the environment</td>
<td>9.9 (33)</td>
<td>20.1 (67)</td>
<td>63.2 (211)</td>
<td>5.1 (17)</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Deforestation and soil erosion</td>
<td>9.3 (31)</td>
<td>16.8 (56)</td>
<td>40.1 (134)</td>
<td>17.7 (59)</td>
<td>16.2 (54)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variables coded on 5-point Likert scale with 1=Increased Greatly, 2=Increased Slightly, 3=No Impact, 4=Decreased Slightly, 5=Decreased Greatly.

1Standard Deviation
increases in population and town size are due to slight growths in the general economy of the area (Municipalidad de Túcume 2005:3). It may be that respondents did not isolate tourism’s influence upon Túcume’s increasing population. Naturally, increased population creates increased noise and traffic. However, tourism contributes significantly to both. While 31.3% of residents felt that tourism had no impact on noise levels, 62.4% perceived an increase. Moreover, 77.5% believed that traffic congestion had intensified.

As for agriculture, pollution, and water quality: the majority of participants believe that tourism has had no impact. Just under half (46.4%) felt that agricultural practices had not changed due to tourism, but 36% perceived an increase. This increase may be due to economic gains from tourism that are reinvested in Túcume’s mainstay, agriculture. Respondents were not in accord, however, concerning tourism’s role in pollution and waste in Túcume: 28.8% perceived no impact, 35.7% felt pollution and waste had decreased, and 35.4% felt they had increased. Participants remarked that the museum had mandated increased cleaning efforts by community members in order to improve tourists’ experiences. It appears that the municipality even increased its garbage collection service on a few occasions; but continued collection failed for monetary reasons and residents blame this event for accumulating trash. Without organized garbage collection, residents have resorted to burning their rubbish, often at the base of pyramids. Water quality is viewed by 46.7% of the respondents as having remained constant. However, 38.8% feel that tourism has improved water quality through Heyerdahl’s constructions of sewage systems and covered wells.

Respondents (63.2%) perceived tourism as having no impact on local environmental awareness, and many welcomed the idea of greater instruction.
In summary, residents feel that tourism has had a positive impact on the conservation of local plants and forests. However, they also believe that tourism has negatively increased population size, noise, and traffic congestion.

**Economic Impacts**

In order to ascertain residents’ opinions of economic impacts, 18 questions were asked of survey participants. Responses for each item were coded on a 5-point Likert scale: respondents could select ‘Increased Greatly’ (1), ‘Increased Slightly’ (2), ‘No Impact’ (3), ‘Decreased Slightly’ (4), and ‘Decreased Greatly’ (5). Survey results indicate both positive and negative impacts (Table 5-18).

A majority of respondents attributed positive improvements in local infrastructure and services to tourism. Respondents (70.7%) agreed that tourism had improved roads and transportation, pointing to the paving of the Plaza de Armas and the road leading to the Site Museum. In addition, 64.1% felt that tourism had improved water, sewage, and electricity services. Again, residents recognized Heyerdahl for creating sewage lines and covered wells. Yet, many other respondents felt that recent electrification and sewage projects were accomplished, in part, to provide tourists with better services and experiences. The mayor, himself, admits that recent improvement in these services has been done to assist residents as well as tourists. As for schools and education, 51.8% of participants perceived no change due to tourism. Yet, 43.7% felt they had improved due to tourism, citing Heyerdahl’s construction of new classrooms and the museum’s efforts to educate schoolchildren in local patrimony and handicrafts. This is further demonstrated by the fact that 55.7% of respondents felt that training in tourism services (including handicrafts) had improved. Residents recognized the museum’s collaborations with outside organizations (AXIS, AECI, and MINCETUR) to instruct locals in tourism
activities. Finally, 61.4% of respondents believed that tourism had not impacted medical services at all.

As for the local economy, 52% of respondents felt that investment and spending in Túcume had increased due to tourism. Yet, 47% also felt that economic opportunities had not been impacted. Moreover, 43.2% responded that tourism had not impacted the cost of living in Túcume. On the other hand, 72.4% complained about a rise in real estate prices due to tourism. To summarize: it appears that tourism has improved investment in the community, which has also brought an increase in property prices. The latter has been directly experienced by Túcume residents, who have - at the same time - not directly experienced an increase in economic opportunities or cost of living. Furthermore, 62.7% of respondents felt no impact from tourism on economic differences and stratification. This evidence implies that while tourism has increased in Túcume over the last years, it has had little impact on most residents.

Yet, many respondents did not fail to notice broad changes in the community. For example, 58.4% of participants perceived an increase in the sale of local products and services to visiting tourists. Moreover, 53.4% recognized a particular increase in the sale of local handicrafts. However, 61.2% felt that tourism had also resulted in an increase in the purchase of products from outside Túcume, namely Chiclayo. In order to provide tourism services, it is often necessary to ‘import’ goods from outside, causing negative leakages. 71% of respondents also felt that local businesses in Túcume had increased to accommodate growing tourism, and most felt that nonresidents were not opening these businesses.
Table 5-18. Frequency Distributions (Percentage) for Respondents' Perceptions of Economic Impacts due to Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>(1) Increased Greatly % (N)</th>
<th>(2) Increased Slightly % (N)</th>
<th>(3) No Impact % (N)</th>
<th>(4) Decreased Slightly % (N)</th>
<th>(5) Decreased Greatly % (N)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Investment and spending in Túcume</td>
<td>13.6 (45)</td>
<td>39.4 (130)</td>
<td>39.4 (130)</td>
<td>6.4 (21)</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of Economic opportunities</td>
<td>4.5 (15)</td>
<td>30.2 (101)</td>
<td>47.0 (157)</td>
<td>14.4 (48)</td>
<td>3.9 (13)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and quality of permanent jobs</td>
<td>2.1 (7)</td>
<td>11.1 (37)</td>
<td>50.8 (169)</td>
<td>19.5 (65)</td>
<td>16.5 (55)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and quality of seasonal jobs</td>
<td>3.6 (12)</td>
<td>27.5 (92)</td>
<td>46.3 (155)</td>
<td>13.7 (46)</td>
<td>9.0 (30)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries in Túcume</td>
<td>2.7 (9)</td>
<td>9.9 (33)</td>
<td>56.0 (187)</td>
<td>21.9 (73)</td>
<td>9.6 (32)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard of living in Túcume</td>
<td>17.3 (58)</td>
<td>26.2 (88)</td>
<td>43.2 (145)</td>
<td>8.0 (27)</td>
<td>5.4 (18)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of land and homes in Túcume</td>
<td>44.7 (147)</td>
<td>27.7 (91)</td>
<td>26.1 (86)</td>
<td>0.6 (2)</td>
<td>0.9 (3)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Economic differences and stratification within Túcume</td>
<td>6.8 (22)</td>
<td>17.6 (57)</td>
<td>62.7 (203)</td>
<td>9.9 (32)</td>
<td>3.1 (10)</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of local products and services</td>
<td>11.7 (39)</td>
<td>46.7 (156)</td>
<td>30.2 (101)</td>
<td>8.1 (27)</td>
<td>3.3 (11)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of products and services from outside of Túcume</td>
<td>13.6 (45)</td>
<td>47.6 (158)</td>
<td>25.0 (83)</td>
<td>10.2 (34)</td>
<td>3.6 (12)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of local handicrafts</td>
<td>19.8 (64)</td>
<td>33.6 (109)</td>
<td>36.7 (119)</td>
<td>5.9 (19)</td>
<td>4.0 (13)</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Development of infrastructure in Túcume</td>
<td>28.7 (95)</td>
<td>42.0 (139)</td>
<td>23.6 (78)</td>
<td>4.5 (15)</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and quantity of Water, sewage, and electricity in Túcume</td>
<td>25.1 (83)</td>
<td>39.0 (129)</td>
<td>31.4 (104)</td>
<td>2.7 (9)</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and quantity of Medical services in Túcume</td>
<td>3.3 (11)</td>
<td>29.8 (98)</td>
<td>61.4 (202)</td>
<td>3.3 (11)</td>
<td>2.1 (7)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and quantity of Schools and formal education in Túcume</td>
<td>8.5 (28)</td>
<td>35.2 (116)</td>
<td>51.8 (171)</td>
<td>2.7 (9)</td>
<td>1.8 (6)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of local businesses in Túcume</td>
<td>22.7 (75)</td>
<td>48.3 (160)</td>
<td>21.1 (70)</td>
<td>5.4 (18)</td>
<td>2.4 (8)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of businesses owned by nonresidents in Túcume</td>
<td>8.7 (28)</td>
<td>27.0 (87)</td>
<td>59.9 (193)</td>
<td>3.1 (10)</td>
<td>1.2 (4)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and quality of Tourism training (services, handicrafts)</td>
<td>10.2 (33)</td>
<td>45.5 (148)</td>
<td>37.5 (122)</td>
<td>2.8 (9)</td>
<td>4.0 (13)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variables coded on 5-point Likert scale with 1=Increased Greatly, 2=Increased Slightly, 3=No Impact, 4=Decreased Slightly, 5=Decreased Greatly.

1Standard Deviation
Finally, respondents perceived minimal impacts from tourism on jobs and salaries. 50.8% felt that permanent jobs had not been impacted whatsoever, while 36% believed that permanent jobs had decreased. As for seasonal jobs: 46.3% saw no impact from tourism while 31.1% perceived an increase. Given that tourism in Túcume has been seasonal, it is little wonder that seasonal jobs would be favored over permanent jobs. However, in reality, few residents have directly benefited from any tourism-related jobs – this explains the continued ‘no impact’ viewpoint. Additionally, 56% of respondents experienced no change in salary due to tourism.

In conclusion, survey participants perceived positive increases in investment and spending, the sale of local products and services, the sale of local handicrafts, roads and transportation, utilities (including water, sewage, and electricity), the number of local businesses, and tourism training. However, respondents also noted negative increases in the cost of real estate and the purchase of goods and services from outside Túcume. No impact was perceived on economic opportunities, jobs, salaries, standard of living, and medical services.

**Socio-demographic Characteristics and Tourism Opinions**

To evaluate the impact of certain socio-demographic characteristics on the aforementioned tourism perceptions, a series of one-way analyses of variance were performed. Investigations were carried out to determine the role of gender, age, education, income, length of residence, and place of residence on tourism opinions. Scheffe’s post hoc analyses were conducted to evaluate significant differences in mean values between groups.
**Gender**

It is widely recognized that tourism allows women the opportunity to find employment, and thus, decrease their independence upon family relationships and erode gender differences (Wearing 2001:402). These goals are also part of FIT Perú’s national plan (MINCETUR 2002:21). ANOVA was used to assess perceptual differences of tourism based on gender. Of the 62 items, only seven demonstrated significant differences in means between male and female respondents (Table 5-19). Men are more likely to favor increasing numbers of foreign visitors (mean = 4.7 vs. 4.52; p = 0.017). Moreover, men are also more likely to favor the involvement of the regional government in tourism development than women (mean = 4.31 vs. 4.06; p = 0.036). These gender differences may be attributed to potential variations in exposure to, awareness of, and experience with the aforementioned entities – foreigners and the regional government.

Some women admitted to me that they were limited by family members from leaving their home or surrounding environs except with male permission. With such strict restrictions, it is not hard to imagine that some women do not have as much awareness of foreigners and the newly empowered regional government as many men.

As for socio-cultural impacts: women felt more strongly than men that tourism had increased crime in Túcume (mean = 2.57 vs. 2.79; p = 0.046). Women are also more likely to believe that tourism has increased conservation of local customs and traditions (mean = 2.62 vs. 2.92; p = 0.013) and conservation of local history and myths (mean = 2.59 vs. 2.98; p = 0.003). These feelings may be due to women’s contact with the museum – either directly or via their children.

Regarding environmental impacts, women appear more sensitive to noise as they
Table 5-19. Perceptual Differences in Tourism Opinions between Males and Females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male Mean (n) SD</td>
<td>Female Mean (n) SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increased number of foreign tourists to Túcume</td>
<td>4.70 (125) 0.476</td>
<td>4.52 (211) 0.789</td>
<td>5.801</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Intervention of the regional government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
<td>4.31 (124) 0.939</td>
<td>4.06 (211) 1.094</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Crime rate</td>
<td>2.79 (124) 0.848</td>
<td>2.57 (211) 1.018</td>
<td>3.995</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Conservation of local culture in Túcume (e.g., customs and traditions)</td>
<td>2.92 (125) 1.126</td>
<td>2.62 (212) 1.044</td>
<td>6.207</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of conservation of local history and myths in Túcume</td>
<td>2.98 (125) 1.254</td>
<td>2.59 (209) 1.062</td>
<td>8.858</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Noise in Túcume</td>
<td>2.22 (125) 0.983</td>
<td>2.01 (208) 0.973</td>
<td>3.762</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of Sanitation and water quality in Túcume</td>
<td>2.55 (122) 0.937</td>
<td>2.77 (208) 0.965</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Standard Deviation
were more likely than men to note that noise level in Túcume had increased (mean = 2.01 vs. 2.22; p = 0.053). As for water quality, women were also less likely to note that level of sanitation and water quality had increased (mean = 2.77 vs. 2.55; p = 0.044).

In sum, it appears that women are slightly less supportive of tourism than males, which mimics Milman and Pizam’s findings (1988). Moreover, females were more sensitive to negative impacts (i.e. crime and noise), which corresponds with research conducted by Liu and Var (1986) and Pizam and Pokela (1985). Finally, women also seem to be more in tune with conservation of culture and history than men, which supports Liu and Var’s results (1986:206).

**Age**

Of the 62 items, ANOVA revealed that only three statements obtained significantly different responses based on age (Table 5-20). Those over 50 years of age felt the most strongly about tourism creating greater levels of pride and respect for Túcume’s cultural heritage. This group was closely followed by 31-40 year olds. Moreover, 31-40 year olds were more likely to note that quality of life in Túcume had improved slightly due to tourism.

In a similar vein, the 31-40 year olds also felt the strongest about tourism having positively increased investment and spending in Túcume. The youngest individuals surveyed (18-30 year olds) held the least positive perception regarding this issue as well as increased pride and respect for cultural heritage. In closing, it appears that the middle-aged were the most positive regarding tourism’s impacts in Túcume – similar to findings by Bastias-Perez and Var (1995). However, since scholars show disparate results regarding the influence of age on tourism opinions, further study is required.
Table 5-20. Perceptual Differences in Tourism Opinions between Residents of Different Ages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>18-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-cultural Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level of Pride and respect for the history and archaeological sites of the area</td>
<td>2.22 (72)</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>1.80 (92)</td>
<td>1.131</td>
<td>1.90 (92)</td>
<td>1.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quality of life in Túcume</td>
<td>3.07 (72)</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>2.85 (92)</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>3.23 (91)</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Investment and spending in Túcume</td>
<td>2.67a (70)</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>2.26a (91)</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>2.34 (90)</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Standard Deviation
Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffé’s post hoc analysis.
Education

Of the 62 survey items, only 12 statements were perceived differently between groups (Table 5-21). The most educated group (those having received at least some degree of post-secondary education) were the most supportive of increased cultural tourism. As level of education increased, so did support; this strengthens the idea that increased education induces residents to view tourism more favorably (Smith and Kranich 1998; Brayley, Var, and Sheldon 1990).

However, the middle group (residents with some level of high school education) views socio-cultural impacts the most favorably. And, the least educated – those having at most finished elementary school – tended to be the least favorable of socio-cultural impacts. For example, the middle group most strongly believed that tourism had increased conservation of history and myths in Túcume, improved kinship ties and community bonds, and enhanced handicrafts. Moreover, while both high-school-educated and post-secondary-educated individuals believed that tourism had slightly improved quality of life in Túcume (means = 2.89 and 2.88 respectively), the least educated disagreed (mean = 3.36). The perception that tourism had worsened quality of life may be a reflection of dissatisfaction with one’s economic condition and tourism’s inability to improve that condition.

It is also interesting to note that the middle group was the most sensitive to negative environmental impacts. The most educated, though, took the least notice of increases in noise and traffic. Perhaps those with post-secondary school education understood increases in noise and traffic as effects of development (as a whole) and population increases, rather than specific attributes of tourism.
Table 5-21. Perceptual Differences in Tourism Opinions between Residents with Different Levels of Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary or less</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD¹</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD¹</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD¹</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development of cultural tourism in the community (such as festivals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.44 (130)</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>4.59 (151)</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>4.63 (52)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>2.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socio-cultural Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of conservation of local history and myths in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.81 (129)</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>2.58 (151)</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>3.00 (53)</td>
<td>1.209</td>
<td>3.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Quality and quantity of Kinship ties and community bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.82¹ (130)</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>2.56⁹ (149)</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>2.60 (52)</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>3.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quality of life in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.36⁶,⁷ (129)</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>2.89⁹ (149)</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>2.88⁷ (52)</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>9.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Quality and quantity of Local arts and handicrafts in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.56¹ (129)</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>2.28⁹ (149)</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>2.43 (49)</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>3.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Noise in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.18 (130)</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>1.95 (150)</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>2.25 (52)</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>2.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Level of Traffic congestion in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.75¹ (131)</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>1.66⁶ (149)</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>2.14⁶,⁷ (51)</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>5.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Investment and spending in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.60⁶,⁷ (129)</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>2.34⁹ (149)</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>2.24⁶,⁷ (49)</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>4.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quantity of Economic opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.99⁹ (131)</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>2.78 (149)</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>2.59⁹ (51)</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>4.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sale of local products and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.61 (131)</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>2.36 (148)</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>2.27 (52)</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>3.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Level of Development of infrastructure in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.26¹ (129)</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>1.92¹ (147)</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>2.06 (53)</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>5.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Quality and quantity of Schools and formal education in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.72⁶,⁷ (129)</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>2.45⁹ (146)</td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td>2.40⁶,⁷ (53)</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>5.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Standard Deviation
Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffe’s post hoc analysis
For economic impacts, there is a relationship of disparity between the most educated and the least educated: the most educated tended to view economic changes the most positively, while the least educated held the least favorable outlooks. Apart from being a function of education, this disparity is probably also a function of financial well-being. Those with post-secondary education felt strongest that tourism had increased investment and spending, economic opportunities, and local sales; yet, those with primary school education were the most reluctant to perceive positive economic changes due to tourism. The least educated group was also least likely to detect favorable improvements in infrastructure (i.e. roads, schools). However, the middle group was the most likely to recognize improvements to roads due to tourism. And, both the secondary-school-educated and the post-secondary-school-educated were more willing to admit positive changes in education due to tourism than the least educated group. It may be that the middle group is more sensitive to or approving of infrastructure changes, while the most educated are more in tune with financial matters.

In sum, the least educated were the least optimistic about tourism. The most educated were the most favorably disposed towards tourism’s impacts upon economic variables (i.e. investment and spending, economic opportunities, and local sales) and, thus, were the most supportive of continued tourism development. This bears witness to results obtained by Haralambopoulos and Pizam (1996) in which the more educated attributed greater benefits to tourism regarding economic impacts. Moreover, just like study participants in Samos, Greece, the most-educated in Túcume saw limited negative effects from tourism. The middle group is actually the most concerned about negative impacts from tourism on noise and traffic. Furthermore, it is curious that the middle
group is also the most likely to identify positive changes from tourism on socio-cultural issues. Like respondents in Husbands’ (1989) work in Livingstone, Zambia, Túcume residents with secondary education might be more likely to view tourism as a powerful force in the community that is, to some extent, favorable.

**Income**

Of the 62 survey items, only 11 showed statistically significant differences based on income categories (Table 5-22). Interestingly, it appears that the ‘middle class’ – those earning between 200 and 500 soles per month – is the most supportive of tourism expansion; whereas, the wealthiest class (with earners receiving over 500 soles monthly) viewed continued tourism development least favorably.

The ‘middle class’ was the most approving of heritage tourism, nature-based tourism, and improved infrastructure. Perhaps the slight divergence in support between the ‘middle’ and ‘upper classes’ may be attributed to perceptions of potential opportunities by the ‘middle class’ vs. slight reservations and fears of interference by the ‘upper class’. However, it is the ‘lower class’ that is the most skeptical of national government involvement in Túcume’s tourism. Without a doubt, this sentiment is linked to nationwide dissatisfaction with President Toledo’s government, particularly its apparent decrease in handouts to the poor. The ‘middle class’, though, appear to be the most supportive of national government involvement.

The ‘middle class’ is also the most likely to agree that tourism has led to an increase in pride and respect for cultural heritage, in contrast with the ‘upper class’. However, the ‘upper class’ feels that tourism has slightly improved the quality of life in Túcume.

The ‘lower class’ was the least likely group to perceive negative increases in
### Table 5-22. Perceptual Differences in Tourism Opinions between Residents with Different Household Income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;200 Soles</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More development of cultural heritage tourism to the pyramids of Túcume</td>
<td>4.49 (145)</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>4.64 (121)</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>4.41 (64)</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>3.673</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development of nature-based tourism in the Túcume area</td>
<td>4.52 (146)</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>4.67 (121)</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>4.47 (64)</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>3.190</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Improved transportation, facilities, and roads</td>
<td>4.66 (147)</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>4.80 (119)</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>4.53 (64)</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>6.916</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intervention of the national government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
<td>3.82 (147)</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>4.17 (121)</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>4.05 (64)</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Level of Pride and respect for the history and archaeological sites of the area</td>
<td>1.86 (146)</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>1.83 (120)</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>2.22 (64)</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quality of life in Túcume</td>
<td>3.16 (147)</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>3.13 (119)</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>2.76 (62)</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>3.937</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Pollution and waste in Túcume</td>
<td>3.23 (147)</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>2.87 (119)</td>
<td>1.171</td>
<td>2.87 (62)</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>3.923</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level of Agricultural practice in Túcume</td>
<td>2.84 (147)</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>2.54 (121)</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>2.58 (60)</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>3.305</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salaries in Túcume</td>
<td>3.16 (147)</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>3.48 (120)</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>3.13 (62)</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>5.682</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cost of living in Túcume</td>
<td>2.41 (147)</td>
<td>1.039</td>
<td>2.70 (122)</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>2.81 (62)</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>4.327</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Number of local businesses in Túcume</td>
<td>2.37 (146)</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>2.06 (119)</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>1.89 (62)</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>7.498</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard Deviation

Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffé’s post hoc analysis.
pollution and waste. Moreover, the ‘lower class’ acknowledged that agriculture had changed little due to tourism. This disparity may be attributed to differences in occupation and exposure: poorer individuals tend to be day-laborers (rather than wealthier landowners), and thus, less likely to reinvest tourism earnings into agricultural endeavors.

As for economic impacts, the ‘middle class’ is the most negative about decreases in salaries due to tourism. Understandably, the poorest group is the most sensitive about increases in the cost of living, while the richest group is the least sensitive. Finally, the ‘upper class’ (in contrast with the ‘lower class’) is the most keenly aware of positive increases in the number of local businesses.

In summary, the ‘middle class’ appears to be the most supportive of continued tourism development, suggesting that this group (expects) benefits from tourism. However, as other researchers (Akis et al. 1996; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Milman and Pizam 1988) have discovered, the wealthiest residents in Túcume are the most positive about economic impacts: they are the least negative about negative impacts (decreasing salaries, increased cost of living) and the most positive about positive impacts (increasing local business).

**Length of Residence**

Seven survey items showed significant differences based on years lived in Túcume (Table 5-35). Those living in Túcume 31-45 years were the most positive group regarding tourism’s impact on conservation of history and myths. The group living in Túcume longest (46-92 years) detected the least changes from tourism on this issue. Moreover, this group also felt most strongly that tourism had created negative conflicts within
Table 5-23. Perceptual Differences in Tourism Opinions Based on Length of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Years Lived in Túcume</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-30 Years</td>
<td>31-45 Years</td>
<td>46-92 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD¹</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>SD¹</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of conservation of local history and myths in Túcume</td>
<td>2.78 (119)</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>2.52ᵃ (122)</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>2.97ᵃ (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Quantity of Conflicts and division between residents of Túcume</td>
<td>2.94 (116)</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>2.93 (123)</td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td>2.66 (86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Noise in Túcume</td>
<td>2.27 (116)</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>1.98 (123)</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>2.02 (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quantity and quality of permanent jobs</td>
<td>3.50ᵃ (117)</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>3.13ᵃᵇ (121)</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>3.52ᵃ (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quantity and quality of seasonal jobs</td>
<td>2.76ᵃ (117)</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>3.08ᵃ (123)</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>3.02 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salaries in Túcume</td>
<td>3.21ᵃ (117)</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>3.12ᵇ (122)</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>3.53ᵃᵇ (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of Economic differences and stratification within Túcume residents</td>
<td>2.76 (113)</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>3.00 (120)</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>2.75 (87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Standard Deviation

Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffe’s post hoc analysis.
the community. Furthermore, survey participants living in Túcume over 30 years were more sensitive to increases in noise due to tourism than more recent arrivals.

As for economic impacts: those residing in Túcume 31-45 years (compared to older and newer residents) were the least negative about decreases in permanent jobs. Yet, the newest arrivals were slightly favorable about tourism increasing seasonal jobs, while older residents remained indifferent. Those living in Túcume longest also perceived the greatest negative decreases in salaries due to tourism. Finally, newer and older residents both detected slight negative increases in economic stratification due to tourism, while the middle group was indifferent.

Thus, it does indeed appear that the longer an individual has resided in the host community, the more negative they are towards tourism (Snaith and Haley 1999; Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; Lankford and Howard 1994; Liu and Var 1986; Brougham and Butler 1981). These residents were least likely to agree with positive impacts (i.e. conservation of history and myths) and more likely to agree with negative impacts (i.e. conflicts, noise, less jobs, decreasing salaries, economic stratification). However, these results must also be considered as a function of age.

Place of Residence

Of the 62 survey items, 41 variables showed significant differences based on residence. 18 of the 19 tourism development opinions proved significant (Table 5-24). On average, denizens of La Raya were the least supportive of tourism development, while members of Nueva Esperanza appear to be the most supportive of continued development. For example, regarding ‘greater tourism development’ (item 1), inhabitants of La Raya were less positive (mean = 4.22) than respondents in Nueva Esperanza (mean= 4.81) or Fundo Vera (mean = 4.79). Survey-takers in urban Nueva Esperanza
Table 5-24. Perceptual Differences in Tourism Development Opinions between Residents with Different Places of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Residence Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo Joven</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>Joven</td>
<td>Nueva</td>
<td>Esperanza</td>
<td>San</td>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>La Raya</td>
<td>Túcume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
<td>SD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Greater tourism development (in general)</td>
<td>4.57a (164)</td>
<td>4.53 (53)</td>
<td>4.81b (37)</td>
<td>4.67 (12)</td>
<td>4.22abc (36)</td>
<td>4.56 (16)</td>
<td>4.79c (19)</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>4.413 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More development of cultural heritage tourism to the pyramids of Túcume</td>
<td>4.51a (161)</td>
<td>4.47 (53)</td>
<td>4.92ab (37)</td>
<td>4.50 (12)</td>
<td>4.14b (36)</td>
<td>4.75 (16)</td>
<td>4.58 (19)</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>5.481 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More development of cultural heritage tourism to the museum of Túcume</td>
<td>4.49a (164)</td>
<td>4.54b (52)</td>
<td>4.95abc (37)</td>
<td>4.58 (12)</td>
<td>4.25c (36)</td>
<td>4.69 (16)</td>
<td>4.63 (19)</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>6.276 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development of nature-based tourism in the Túcume area</td>
<td>4.57 (163)</td>
<td>4.65 (52)</td>
<td>4.81ab (37)</td>
<td>4.67 (12)</td>
<td>4.28a (36)</td>
<td>4.25 (16)</td>
<td>4.63 (19)</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>3.726 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Development of cultural tourism in the community (such as festivals)</td>
<td>4.55 (162)</td>
<td>4.52 (52)</td>
<td>4.81a (37)</td>
<td>4.50 (12)</td>
<td>4.19a (36)</td>
<td>4.56 (16)</td>
<td>4.63 (19)</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>3.468 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Development of visitor services in Túcume (such as hotels and restaurants)</td>
<td>4.63a (163)</td>
<td>4.57 (53)</td>
<td>4.78b (37)</td>
<td>4.50 (12)</td>
<td>4.22ab (36)</td>
<td>4.69 (16)</td>
<td>4.68 (19)</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>3.683 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Development of small businesses in Túcume (i.e. guide services, souvenir shops)</td>
<td>4.52 (164)</td>
<td>4.53 (53)</td>
<td>4.81a (37)</td>
<td>4.50 (12)</td>
<td>4.22a (36)</td>
<td>4.69 (16)</td>
<td>4.68 (19)</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>3.783 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Greater tourism promotion of the Túcume area (publicity)</td>
<td>4.72a (163)</td>
<td>4.75b (53)</td>
<td>4.81c (37)</td>
<td>4.58 (12)</td>
<td>4.25abc (36)</td>
<td>4.56 (16)</td>
<td>4.50 (18)</td>
<td>0.5135 0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increased number of national tourists to Túcume</td>
<td>4.55 (161)</td>
<td>4.38 (53)</td>
<td>4.57 (37)</td>
<td>4.42 (12)</td>
<td>4.19 (36)</td>
<td>4.56 (16)</td>
<td>4.37 (19)</td>
<td>0.2128 0.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Increased number of foreign tourists to Túcume</td>
<td>4.60a (163)</td>
<td>4.66b (53)</td>
<td>4.89c (37)</td>
<td>4.67 (12)</td>
<td>4.00abcd (36)</td>
<td>4.56 (16)</td>
<td>4.74d (19)</td>
<td>6.313 0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 5-24 (continued). Perceptual Differences in Tourism Development Opinions between Residents with Different Places of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Residence Location</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>Mean (n)</th>
<th>SD¹</th>
<th>SD¹</th>
<th>SD¹</th>
<th>SD¹</th>
<th>SD¹</th>
<th>SD¹</th>
<th>SD¹</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Improved transportation, facilities, and roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.66 (161)</td>
<td>4.77 b (53)</td>
<td>4.86 b (37)</td>
<td>4.75 (12)</td>
<td>4.36 a, b, c (36)</td>
<td>4.88 c (16)</td>
<td>4.74 (19)</td>
<td>4.692</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Information on Túcume for tourists (such as maps, guidebooks)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.55 a (164)</td>
<td>4.48 b (52)</td>
<td>4.76 c (37)</td>
<td>4.25 (12)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>4.69 d (16)</td>
<td>4.53 c (19)</td>
<td>7.623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Intervention of the national government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13 a (164)</td>
<td>4.32 b (53)</td>
<td>3.73 (37)</td>
<td>3.50 (12)</td>
<td>3.14 a,b (35)</td>
<td>4.00 (16)</td>
<td>4.11 (19)</td>
<td>5.477</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Intervention of the regional government in Túcume’s tourism development</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.26 a (163)</td>
<td>4.63 b (52)</td>
<td>3.65 c,d (37)</td>
<td>3.67 (12)</td>
<td>3.50 a,b,c (36)</td>
<td>3.88 (16)</td>
<td>4.63 a,c (19)</td>
<td>8.044</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Local management of tourism in Túcume by the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11 a (161)</td>
<td>4.27 (52)</td>
<td>4.84 a,b (37)</td>
<td>4.33 (12)</td>
<td>4.00 b (36)</td>
<td>4.00 (16)</td>
<td>4.05 (19)</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Community decision-making on the planning/development of tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.36 a (162)</td>
<td>4.45 (51)</td>
<td>4.78 a,b (37)</td>
<td>4.50 (12)</td>
<td>4.08 b (36)</td>
<td>4.44 (16)</td>
<td>4.53 (19)</td>
<td>4.389</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Training of community members in tourism services</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>4.461</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Training of community members in the production of handicrafts</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58 (164)</td>
<td>4.62 (52)</td>
<td>4.86 a (37)</td>
<td>4.58 (12)</td>
<td>4.28 a (36)</td>
<td>4.81 (16)</td>
<td>4.58 (19)</td>
<td>4.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Standard Deviation

Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffe’s post hoc analysis
may be supportive of tourism because they lie along the road to the Site Museum; tourists must pass through their community to reach the archaeological complex. Also, their community contains Huaca del Pueblo, which they hope to transform into a tourist attraction. Fundo Vera residents may be positively disposed towards tourism development because they hope to attract more economic rewards from increased visitors to the Santos Vera Museum. And, La Raya’s proximity to the main archaeological complex may help explain their less enthusiastic viewpoints. La Raya’s heated territorial dispute with the Site Museum rationalizes their stance. Some residents even blame tourism and tourists (particularly foreigners) for their current situation. Denizens feel that had foreigners not become interested in the pyramids and encouraged tourism, no importance would have been given to illegal squatting. It is their belief that archaeological preservation is preventing them from staking legal claim to their land and from acquiring utilities, particularly electricity. In response to these issues, one individual expressed the sentiment that, “los gringos malograron todo [the foreigners ruined everything].” Another respondent felt upset that gringos had taken possession of their huacas (La Raya residents, personal communication 2004) For these reasons, La Raya denizens are not entirely supportive of (increased) tourism.

Post hoc analyses revealed significant discrepancies between La Raya and Nueva Esperanza on most tourism development variables. Nueva Esperanza was the most supportive of cultural heritage tourism, cultural tourism, and nature-based tourism; and La Raya was the least positive. Nueva Esperanza was also the most in agreement with the development of hotels and restaurants, small businesses, tourism publicity, and tourist information; and, again, La Raya was the least supportive on these issues. Furthermore,
La Raya was the least enthusiastic about increasing foreign tourists to Túcume (mean = 4.0). Given their expressed worries over land ownership and utilities, it is little wonder that they be slightly hesitant about foreign visitors. Post hoc analyses additionally revealed that the Pueblo – in comparison with La Raya – was significantly more supportive of cultural (heritage) tourism, visitor services, tourism promotion, foreign tourists, and tourist information. Likewise, Pueblo Joven was significantly more positive towards tourism promotion, foreign tourists, improved transportation, and tourist information than La Raya. Finally, Túcume Viejo residents were significantly more supportive of improved transportation and tourist information; and Fundo Vera denizens were more supportive of foreign tourists and tourist information.

As for tourism management, La Raya was the least supportive of the national government, regional government, and local community. La Raya was particularly skeptical of the national government (mean = 3.14) due to their dissatisfaction with President Toledo’s performance. However, the urban Pueblo and Pueblo Joven areas were significantly more supportive of national and regional intervention. Nueva Esperanza was also somewhat skeptical of regional involvement; yet, they were the most supportive of community decision-making, community management, and community training. La Raya survey participants were the least supportive on these issues.

As demonstrated, La Raya appears to be the least supportive of continued tourism development, while Nueva Esperanza is the most supportive. Both abut archaeological sites, but the former is rural while the latter is urban. Nueva Esperanza has more access to utilities since it is an extension of the Pueblo. Moreover, La Raya lies alongside the main archaeological complex, while Nueva Esperanza surrounds the yet undeveloped Huaca
del Pueblo. Both areas have territorial disputes regarding illegal squatting, but La Raya is under greater pressure since it encroaches Huaca Larga and the Temple of the Sacred Stone – both of which are intended to become part of tourist circuits in the near future. Currently, plans do not exist to excavate or develop Huaca del Pueblo. Moreover, certain residents of Nueva Esperanza possess official land titles by the Peruvian government (Museum staff, personal communication 2004), which leads many Nueva Esperanza denizens to believe that resettlement is unlikely. In contrast to La Raya, Nueva Esperanza is not as worried about losing their land. Instead, residents of Nueva Esperanza hope that tourism development of Huaca del Pueblo may draw more economic benefits to their community, yet they seem to underestimate the controversies that may accompany this. Therefore, disparities in tourism development opinions may be influenced by rural vs. urban differences, but proximity to the tourism center (i.e. the Site Museum and archaeological complex) more clearly shapes viewpoints. Urban denizens, particularly those living closest to the Plaza de Armas, are highly encouraging of greater tourism development. But, proximity to the Site Museum is more important: residents living closest to the tourism center incur costs that make them less sympathetic to further tourism development; but those living farther from the Site Museum have more welcoming standpoints.

As for socio-cultural impacts, only five items showed significant variations based on place of residence (Table 5-25). Nueva Esperanza was the most sensitive to increases in crime and improvements in the quality of life. Túcume Viejo, San Antonio, Pueblo Joven, and La Raya, however, felt that quality of life had decayed. Residents of Nueva Esperanza were also the most assertive that tourism had brought about increases in
Table 5-25. Perceptual Differences in Socio-cultural Tourism Impact Opinions between Residents with Different Places of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Residence Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo Joven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (n) SD²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Crime rate</td>
<td>2.72² (163) 0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Conservation of local culture in Túcume</td>
<td>2.79 (164) 1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Level of conservation of local history and myths</td>
<td>2.75 (163) 1.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of traditional architecture in construction of homes</td>
<td>3.86⁶ (163) 1.29⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Quality of life in Túcume</td>
<td>1.31 (159) 2.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Standard Deviation

Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffé’s post hoc analysis
the conservation of local culture (mean = 2.27). Yet Pueblo Joven inhabitants admitted that conservation of local culture had decreased (mean = 3.11). Pueblo Joven also felt that tourism had decreased the conservation of local history and myths (mean = 3.19), whereas La Raya saw the most increases in conservation of these items (mean = 2.31). Finally, the urban Pueblo and Pueblo Joven indicate that use of traditional architectural styles and materials has decreased, while San Antonio feels that such use has increased.

San Antonio was the only community to acknowledge an increase in the use of carob and adobe, and this may be linked to their proximity to the Site Museum as well as the Los Horcones hostel. Decreases in the use of traditional architecture in the Pueblo and Pueblo Joven are probably due to urban influences. Therefore, with minor exceptions, it again appears that proximity to the tourism center affects tourism opinions. Individuals in La Raya and Nueva Esperanza (living closest to the Site Museum) have the most positive stances regarding socio-cultural impacts from tourism, while those living farthest away are the least positive.

Of the 10 environmental variables, only 6 demonstrated significant differences based on place of residence (Table 5-26). The urban area, particularly Nueva Esperanza, appears to be the most aware of increases in noise due to tourism. Residents in Nueva Esperanza and the Pueblo also cite increases in pollution and waste, while all other survey participants notice a decrease. La Raya, specifically, recalls the Site Museum’s cleaning efforts and mandates as reasons for diminished garbage (mean = 4.03). However, increased garbage is visible in Nueva Esperanza as denizens have taken to dumping and burning their excess trash around Huaca del Pueblo. According to residents
Table 5-26. Perceptual Differences in Environmental Tourism Impact Opinions between Residents with Different Places of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Residence Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Level of Noise in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.05(^a) (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Pollution and waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.74(^a) (159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Level of Conservation of wildlife endemic to the area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.83 (159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quantity of population in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.49(^a) (161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level of Agricultural practice in Túcume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.61 (159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of Sanitation and water quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.59(^a) (158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Standard Deviation

Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffe’s post hoc analysis.
around the Site Museum (i.e. San Antonio and La Raya), wildlife conservation has increased; yet, residents farthest from the museum in Pueblo Joven, notice no real change. Most Túcume Viejo denizens agree that population had increased due to tourism (or development in general), but dwellers in San Antonio and La Raya seem to take less notice. San Antonio and Túcume Viejo feel most strongly that tourism has increased agricultural practice; whereas Pueblo Joven believes the opposite – that tourism has decreased agricultural practice. Lastly, Túcume Viejo and Pueblo Joven agree that water quality has improved (due to tourism), but Nueva Esperanza and La Raya are under the impression that water quality has worsened. At the time of fieldwork, Pueblo Joven was constructing a new sewage system, which may have swayed their responses. Likewise, La Raya residents complained that insufficient water pressure prevented half the community from obtaining water. In sum, it appears that residents living closest to the Site Museum as well as those living farthest away share more negative opinions of environmental impacts than middle-range inhabitants.

Of the 18 economic impact items, only 12 demonstrated significant differences based on place of residence (Table 5-27). San Antonio residents were the most positive regarding creation of permanent jobs due to tourism; yet, Pueblo Joven denizens felt that tourism had reduced job opportunities. Similarly, San Antonio and La Raya felt that salaries had increased due to tourism, while Pueblo Joven and Fundo Vera felt the opposite. These differences in opinion may be related to distance from the Site Museum. Areas closer to the Site Museum seemed more positive about these economic benefits than communities at greater distances. Furthermore, San Antonio, La Raya, and Túcume Viejo also sense that tourism has increased economic stratification, while members of
Table 5-27. Perceptual Differences in Economic Tourism Impact Opinions between Residents with Different Places of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement*</th>
<th>Residence Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>Pueblo Joven</td>
<td>Nueva Esperanza</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>La Raya</td>
<td>Túcume Viejo</td>
<td>Fundo Vera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
<td>Mean (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quantity and quality of permanent jobs</td>
<td>3.46 (158)</td>
<td>3.81 a (53)</td>
<td>2.97 a (37)</td>
<td>2.83 (12)</td>
<td>3.17 (36)</td>
<td>3.00 (16)</td>
<td>3.37 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Salaries in Túcume</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 a,c,d,e (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cost of land and homes in Túcume</td>
<td>3.24 a (160)</td>
<td>3.51 b (53)</td>
<td>3.00 c (37)</td>
<td>2.92 d (12)</td>
<td>2.83 b,c (36)</td>
<td>3.67 (15)</td>
<td>1.75 a (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.655</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.79 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Level of Economic differences and stratification between residents</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sale of local products and services</td>
<td>2.79 (150)</td>
<td>2.55 a (53)</td>
<td>3.00 (37)</td>
<td>3.33 (12)</td>
<td>3.17 a (36)</td>
<td>3.13 (15)</td>
<td>2.79 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Purchase of products and services from outside of Túcume</td>
<td>2.36 (159)</td>
<td>2.42 (53)</td>
<td>2.05 a (37)</td>
<td>2.67 (12)</td>
<td>2.72 (36)</td>
<td>3.19 a (16)</td>
<td>2.71 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>1.031</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sale of local handicrafts</td>
<td>2.40 (159)</td>
<td>2.06 a (52)</td>
<td>2.19 (37)</td>
<td>2.50 (12)</td>
<td>2.92 a (36)</td>
<td>2.93 (15)</td>
<td>2.79 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>1.025</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Level of Development of infrastructure in Túcume</td>
<td>2.31 (154)</td>
<td>2.45 (49)</td>
<td>2.05 a (37)</td>
<td>2.33 (12)</td>
<td>2.72 (36)</td>
<td>2.67 (15)</td>
<td>3.05 a (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.89 a (157)</td>
<td>2.11 b (53)</td>
<td>1.97 c (37)</td>
<td>2.42 (12)</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>2.89 a,b,c,d (36)</td>
<td>2.19 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 5-27 (continued). Perceptual Differences in Economic Tourism Impact Opinions between Residents with Different Places of Residence.

| Questionnaire Statement* | Residence Location |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                          | Pueblo            | Pueblo Joven     | Nueva Esperanza  | San Antonio      | La Raya          | Túcume Viejo     | Fundo Vera       |
|                          | Mean (n)          | Mean (n)         | Mean (n)         | Mean (n)         | Mean (n)         | Mean (n)         | Mean (n)         |
|                          | SD1               | SD1              | SD1              | SD1              | SD1              | SD1              | SD1              |
| Economic Impacts         |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |
| 13. Quality and quantity of Water, sewage, and electricity | 2.06a (157) | 1.81b,c (53) | 2.51c (37) | 2.33 (12) | 2.72ab (36) | 2.25 (16) | 2.32 (19) | 5.582 | 0.000 |
|                         | 0.935 | 0.761 | 0.870 | 0.888 | 0.815 | 0.447 | 0.820 |                     |
| 16. Number of local businesses in Túcume | 1.97ab (157) | 2.02c,d (53) | 2.00e (37) | 2.50 (12) | 2.83ace (36) | 2.42 (19) | 8.004 | 0.000 |
|                         | 0.847 | 0.866 | 0.667 | 0.522 | 0.910 | 1.124 | 1.170 |                     |
| 17. Number of businesses owned by nonresidents in Túcume | 2.51a,d (150) | 2.84b (51) | (37) | 2.83a (12) | 3.06d,e (36) | 2.74f (19) | 11.13 | 0.000 |
|                         | 0.721 | 0.579 | 0.645 | 0.718 | 0.674 | 0.250 | 0.806 |                     |
| 18. Quantity and quality of Tourism training | 2.54 (153) | 2.22 (51) | 2.16 (37) | 2.67 (12) | 2.58 (36) | 2.88 (16) | 2.21 (19) | 2.863 | 0.010 |
|                         | 1.006 | 0.702 | 0.602 | 0.888 | 0.732 | 0.342 | 0.631 |                     |

1Standard Deviation  
Note: Similar superscripts designate significant differences with Scheffe’s post hoc analysis.
Fundo Vera, the Pueblo, and Pueblo Joven feel that stratification has diminished. Nueva Esperanza, in particular, appears to be the most optimistic about tourism training, the sale of local handicrafts, and the sale of local goods and services. In fact, the urban communities appear to be more positive about these issues than the rural areas.

Similarly, the urban areas more strongly agree that tourism has increased the number of businesses in Túcume. This apparent rural-urban divide may be attributed to the fact that “although tourism presents additional income and employment opportunities, rural pops remain marginalized from dev associated with protected areas. Despite the rural location of national parks, the industry retains a distinctly urban bias” (Goodwin et al. 1998:vii). To restate: although the Site Museum may offer limited, permanent job opportunities and tourism training to rural and urban residents, the urban dwellers (particularly those closest to the Plaza de Armas) are in a better position to market and sell visitor services and handicrafts.

To continue, the urban areas are the most likely to agree with positive impacts on transportation and roads due to tourism, and this is probably due to President Fujimori’s 2000 efforts. Another apparently rural-urban divide deals with the purchase of goods and services from outside Túcume. Urban areas feel that leakages have increased, while rural residents are less likely to acknowledge this pattern. Furthermore, the Pueblo and Pueblo Joven are the most likely to admit that tourism has improved utility services, while La Raya is the least likely to recognize this. Electricity disputes and water shortages may explain their perspective, but the rural area (as a whole) has inferior services compared to the urban communities. Finally, Nueva Esperanza feels most strongly about tourism having increased the number of businesses owned my nonresidents; yet La Raya and
Túcume Viejo see minor decreases in this area. Therefore, in addition to rural vs. urban differences, proximity to the tourism center is also swaying economic opinions. Individuals living closest to the archaeological complex appear the least content with tourism’s economic results.

To sum up the effect of place of residence on tourism opinions: members of La Raya appear to be the least supportive of tourism and its development. Their reluctance is understandable, however, when considering the land and utility disputes they have had to endure in the name of archaeological conservation and tourism development. Besides these deprivations, they have also had to curtail their activities (herding, wood collection, garbage disposal, etc.) within the archaeological complex. Their situation is not unique: “those who live in or adjacent to heritage areas bear the costs of setting areas aside for conservation, by being denied the opportunity to hunt, gather fruit, graze livestock …” (Goodwin et al. 1998:63) Nueva Esperanza, on the other hand, is the most enthusiastic supporter of tourism development, and this is probably influenced by expectations that tourism to Huaca del Pueblo will generate (economic) benefits. Nueva Esperanza and La Raya both recognize positive socio-cultural impacts from tourism, while Pueblo Joven perceives negative impacts. Perhaps Pueblo Joven’s reactions are related to the non-development of Huaca Manuelón, their urban setting, and/or their distance from the Site Museum. Proximity to the Site Museum also appears to influence opinions of economic variables; as does level of urban development (Bachleitner and Zins 1999; Snaith and Haley 1999; Belisle and Hoy 1980; Pearce 1980). While it is clear that place of residence influences tourism opinions, further research is needed to better understand the aspects of residence that do the influencing and to what degree.
Summary

Survey results from Túcume reveal that an overwhelming majority of respondents support increased tourism development of all 19 items. This is undoubtedly connected with the belief by most respondents that tourism had positively increased conservation of archaeology, pride and respect for cultural heritage, warmth of residents towards tourists, educational experiences, handicraft production, and community participation in tourism planning. Moreover, participants felt that tourism had improved the conservation of local plants and forests as well as positively increased investment and spending, the sale of local products and services, the sale of handicrafts, roads and transportation, utilities, the number of local businesses, and tourism training. These positive perceptions underscore willingness for continued tourism in the area. However, respondents also perceived negative impacts: increased noise, population, and traffic congestion; higher real estate costs; and greater purchase of products and services from outside of Túcume. Additionally, residents seemed to complain of insufficient income generation, and survey results support these ‘no impact’ beliefs.

Socio-demographic and residency characteristics did seem to influence tourism opinions somewhat. Different groups did demonstrate significantly different attitudes on various survey variables. Women seem to be more sensitive to negative increases in crime and noise and positive advances in conservation of culture and history. Those aged 31-40 were the most positive age group – they felt tourism had increased pride and respect for cultural heritage, improved quality of life, and augmented investment and spending. The high-school educated were more sensitive to positive socio-cultural impacts and negative environmental effects, but the postsecondary educated were the most enthusiastic about economic advances. Likewise, the ‘middle class’ were the most
supportive of continued tourism development, but the ‘upper class’ perceived the greatest economic benefits. As for residency, newer residents viewed tourism more positively; and urban residents living closer to the Site Museum and the tourist route were the most positive regarding development and impacts.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

One Sunday afternoon, I attended a wedding party in La Raya. As the attendees danced, passed around chicha and beer, and toasted each other, I was drawn into conversation with one of the guests. Upon hearing a summary of my tourism research, he responded, “da y damos [you give and we give].” This expression conveyed his belief that tourism should be a reciprocal relationship: one in which locals benefit from positive (economic, environmental, and socio-cultural) impacts, and tourists, then, gain experience and enjoyment from the pyramids. Moreover, this individual was highlighting the idea that La Raya should first benefit before welcoming or encouraging further tourism development. Given the reciprocal drinking in the background, these words were remarkably poignant, and they also underscored tourism postulates. Like findings by Gursoy et al. (2002), residents in Túcume are more likely to favor tourism development if they feel they have received net benefits from tourism. Thus, Túcume appears to adhere to social exchange theory:

residents seek benefits of tourism in exchange for something considered approximately equal to the benefits they in turn give. The resources they may offer to tourism actors include supporting appropriate development, extending friendliness, courtesy, and hospitality to tourists, and tolerating inconveniences caused by tourism. Assume that reciprocal obligations exist and, if one actor ignores, coerces or overrides the other, the disadvantaged actor will feel unfairly treated and exploited. (Ap 1992:676)

In all areas of Túcume, including the most urban or remote areas, there was great interest in tourism and its development. And, survey results confirm these observations.
Residents were eager to enter into tourism ‘exchanges’ due to expectations of positive rewards for themselves and their families. These sentiments also typify Butler’s (1980) destination life cycle model as well as Doxey’s (1975) irridex scale. Butler’s model proposes different stages of evolution for tourism, each with associated tourism numbers, tourist types, tourist-host contact, tourism infrastructure, and level of impacts. In the early stage of “involvement”, low tourism numbers induce few changes in the host community; thus, maintaining positive impressions of tourism and generating excitement over its growth (Hanson 1992: 133; Butler 1980:7-8). Yet, Doxey (1975) argues that initial euphoria may turn to apathy as tourist numbers continue to increase and only a minority of the host community receives economic rewards (Hanson 1992:136). Residents in Túcume are still “exploring”, getting “involved”, and “developing” tourism; as such, survey results and observations confirm that impacts are minimal and expectations are high. “A considerable time may elapse before the full implications of [tourism] activity are apparent,” (Mathieson and Wall 1982:6) and perceived by residents.

These models may help explain perceptions of tourism development and tourism impacts. Apart from stage of tourism, history and type of tourism are also important influential factors. Other shaping variables include the number of tourism jobs and the extent of contact with tourists. Those who are involved in tourism jobs and/or have greater contact with tourists are generally more positive towards the industry (Haralambopoulos and Pizam 1996; King et al. 1993). Yet, since Túcume has such few tourism-related jobs and such few residents who admitted having direct contact with tourists, it was decided not to conduct analyses with such skewed data.
Tourism Development Perceptions

Again, survey results indicate overwhelming support for tourism, which may be due to a low level of tourism, minimal negative impacts, and great expectations. Over 95% of Túcume denizens agreed with the development of all types of tourism (i.e. cultural heritage, cultural, nature-based) as well as the development of tourism services and infrastructure (i.e. lodging, restaurants, businesses, information, transportation) and site promotion. Like Narváez’s 1998 data, residents are slightly more supportive of augmenting foreign traveler numbers than Peruvian visitor numbers, and this is probably due to several causes. When interviewed, most residents be tourists as well. With increasing levels of migration, Túcume residents find it difficult to separate visits from distant family members from visits of other nationals. Furthermore, many residents (particularly the artisans) favor foreign visitors due to the perception that foreigners spend more on local goods than nationals. However, these perceptions conflict with reality: Túcume received four times more domestic visitors than international ones last year. Greater support for foreign visitors symbolizes economic expectations that supersede reality.

Survey participants also ranked their preference for tourism managers, indicating that management be conducted by the museum and municipality, the community, the regional government, and the national government (in that order). Although residents vociferously expressed their complaints of museum and municipality policies, it appears that Tucumanos are not entirely dissatisfied with both entities and wish tourism management to remain under their domain. As for community involvement: residents are much more comfortable with the idea of community input in decision-making, but less supportive of community management. Denizens are skeptical of successful community
management of tourism due to fears of insufficient interest, insufficient training and education, and jealousy and corruption. The mismanagement and corruption of NGO, Túcume Vivo, is commonly brought up as an example of the community’s inability to manage projects. Instead, some residents would rather see non-Tucumanos manage projects in order to avoid the aforementioned pitfalls.

Thus, most survey participants expressed their agreement with all 19 aspects of continued tourism development, and this reflects community expectations. “Even the smallest amount of business from tourism raises expectations for a steady source of income within communities. Rarely are these expectations met by the flow of tourists who actually reach the communities after the first flush of revenue is received” (Epler Wood 1998:25). And, Túcume is no exception. Of note: since 1998, respondents have indicated greater community disinterest in tourism activities, which heralds growing apathy. Although survey results show community excitement and expectations, apathy may be increasing.

**Tourism Impact Perceptions**

Concerning perceived socio-cultural, environmental, and economic impacts, most residents were at a loss to identify any. When asked to name positive effects of tourism, residents cited paved roads, educational improvements, and greater conservation of the pyramids. However, when asked to identify negative effects of tourism, many drew blanks; others specified insufficient economic returns. Most denizens reluctantly admitted that tourism had had no impact on Túcume due to low tourist numbers and low consumption of goods and services. Also, most residents believed that few people (except some mototaxi drivers and artisans) were involved in the tourism industry, and thus, receiving economic benefits. This dissatisfaction with insufficient economic revenues is
also underscored in resident perceptions of sustainability. Some expressed the opinion that tourism in Túcume is not sustainable due to scarce income generation. And, these sentiments echo academics’ concerns that small-scale, community-based tourism successfully minimizes negative social and environmental impacts without maximizing economic benefits (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004:42).

In the survey, however, residents were more willing to identify both positive and negative impacts. To explain this discrepancy: perhaps residents perceived few markedly distinct impacts caused by tourism. By volunteering their opinions on tourism impacts, residents were specifying effects that had become particularly noticeable to them in their daily lives. These valuable responses imply that tourism has had minimal impact on the consciousness and lives of most Túcume denizens. However, when asked to consider the impact of tourism on variables in the survey instrument, residents then drew connections that they had not previously vocalized, implying that such concerns were secondary to them. Moreover, some residents probably answered the survey questions without focusing on changes due to tourism per se, but on community changes at large. Although these responses skew the data set, it can also be argued that changes in Túcume have been brought on by tourism (as well as other factors).

The majority of survey participants indicated that they felt tourism had increased conservation, pride, and respect for Túcume’s history, archaeology, and myths. However, few residents relayed to me their desire that the museum permit the sale of artifacts so that they might obtain much needed income. Although tourism has had a positive effect on the archaeology of the area, this notion characterizes residents’ willingness to trade positive social and environmental impacts for economic gains. The majority of
interviewees also recognized improvements in residents’ warmth towards tourists, educational experiences, and production and quality of handicrafts. Fewer residents acknowledged increases in the conservation of local culture and festivals as well as community participation in tourism. The majority of residents perceived no change on their recreational opportunities and spaces, which bespeaks a lack of warmth, promotion, and/or communication on the part of the museum regarding free entry for locals as well as residents’ disinterest in the museum.

Furthermore, the majority of survey participants responded that tourism had had no impact on community ties and local conflicts. However, it appears that “fragmentation and factionalism are common features of small community’s interactions, accentuated by partisan political leadership” (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:2). Distrust, envy, and conflict were repeatedly alluded to and were indirectly visible in community interactions. Such characteristics are responsible for preventing greater unity amongst the artisans. Effective leadership within the Site Museum and ACODET might help alleviate such tensions.

As for environmental impacts, residents felt that tourism had positively increased conservation of local plants and forests. However, they also believed that tourism had negatively augmented population size, noise, and traffic congestion. Residents were divided on the impact of tourism on pollution and waste, and most agreed that tourism had had nearly no impact on conservation of wildlife, agricultural practice, water quality, and environmental awareness.

Although residents complained of insufficient economic benefits, the majority of survey participants did acknowledge improvements in investment and spending, the sale
of local products and services, the sale of local handicrafts, roads and transportation, utilities, the number of local businesses, and tourism training. Respondents also perceived negative increases in the cost of real estate and the purchase of goods and services form outside Túcume. Furthermore, respondents felt tourism had had no impact on economic opportunities, jobs (both permanent and seasonal), salaries, standard of living, economic stratification, medical services, schools, and the number of business owned by nonresidents.

In summary, the survey instrument revealed greater tourism effects than were originally volunteered by interviewees. And, tourism has undoubtedly impacted additional aspects of Túcume that were not addressed in the surveys or the interviews. However, economic impact results from the survey seem to correspond with interview statements. Although respondents perceived greater economic benefits and costs than interviewees, respondents vocalized the idea of insufficient income generation by admitting that tourism had had no impact on economic opportunities, jobs, salaries, and standard of living. Thus, residents clearly recognize few economic gains from tourism, leaving many dissatisfied and expecting changes.

**Perceptions of Tourism Based on Socio-demographic Characteristics**

Only 22% of tourism items showed significant differences based on socio-demographic characteristics (including gender, age, education, income) and residence (both length and place). This scenario may be explained by the idea that “continued promotion of tourism benefits and awareness have eliminated differences between different demographic categories” (Liu and Var 1986:201). Women appear slightly less supportive of tourism than their male counterparts, and this may be influenced by the fact that women were more sensitive to the increasing negative impacts of crime and noise
than men. Females also recognized greater improvements in conservation of culture and history than men. As for age, the middle-aged (between 31 and 40 years of age) were the most positive about tourism: they agreed tourism had increased pride and respect for cultural heritage, improved quality of life, and augmented investment and spending. Length of residence also appears to have influenced tourism opinions, with newer residents being more supportive of tourism and less likely to agree with negative impacts (such as conflicts, noise, less seasonal jobs, decreasing salaries, and economic stratification). Future tourism projects should consider targeting less satisfied groups (particularly women and older residents).

**Education and income**

As for education and income, viewpoints expressed by the middle groups (i.e. the high-school educated and the ‘middle class’) proved interesting. Findings in San Jose de Morro reveal that the middle class is more likely to get involved in tourism projects (Prof. Castillo Butters, personal communication 2004), which then influences their opinions and attitudes of the industry. In Túcume, the artisans appear to be derived mainly from the middle class (museum staff, personal communication 2004) since their business interests and financial status do not prevent them from participating. To a certain degree, this pattern is reflected in survey results.

As education and income are highly correlated (Husbands 1989), it is not surprising to find that both high-school-educated individuals and the ‘middle class’ share views of tourism. The high-school educated were the most concerned about increasing noise and traffic, while also strongly agreeing that tourism had induced positive changes in the conservation of history and myths, bettered community ties, improved local handicrafts, and improved roads and transportation. Moreover, the ‘middle-class’ was the most
supportive of continued tourism development in Túcume as well as the most likely to agree with increases in pride and respect for history and archaeology.

At the same time, however, the most educated (with some level of postsecondary education) and the ‘upper class’ were the most positive about tourism’s impacts upon economic items. Those with postsecondary education more readily agreed that tourism had increased investment and spending, economic opportunities, and local sales; and the ‘upper class’ were the most positive about salaries, cost of living, and the number of local businesses in Túcume. As the poor and the less educated are the least positive regarding tourism, further community projects need to reach out to these specific groups.

**Place of residence**

According to tourism scholars, proximity to the tourism center (in this case the Site Museum and pyramids) influences host opinions. For example, residents in La Raya have incurred more costs due to the development of the archaeological site than their neighboring communities, and this inevitably influences attitudes. According to a La Raya artisan, close proximity to the site has brought La Raya difficulties as well as awareness of tourism. Yet, community members emphasized rural-urban differences and their sway on tourism opinions. In many tourist sites around the world, there are discrepancies between rural and urban areas. Rural residents are believed to be more apathetic towards tourism than their urban counterparts (Lankford and Howard 1994:124). Although many sites are located in rural areas, rural residents are often not involved or employed in such projects (Goodwin et al. 1998). In Perú, differences in lifestyle and infrastructure are continually divided along rural-urban lines. Within the District of Túcume, the Municipality also subdivides the population by rural vs. urban areas (Municipality of Túcume 2005). The *zona urbana* (urban zone) street sign (Figure
4-1) typifies this distinction. Thus, it was thought that tourism opinions would vary based on rural-urban lines. Local officials expressed the idea that rural denizens are more interested in tourism, but are prevented from greater involvement due to lack of capital; urban residents, on the other hand, are believed to lack sufficient interest. Urban residents, though, felt that it was the rural residents who lacked interest in tourism and who failed to value Túcume’s cultural heritage.

Survey results indicated significant differences in tourism opinions based on the rural-urban divide, but findings also highlighted the influence of proximity to the tourism center. Closest to the archaeological site, rural La Raya was the least supportive of tourism development; whereas, urban Nueva Esperanza was the most supportive. Moreover, both La Raya and Nueva Esperanza (two of the closest communities to the Site Museum) were the most positive about socio-cultural impacts, while Pueblo Joven (the community farthest from the Museum) was the most negative. Communities closest to the Site Museum detected increases in salaries and economic stratification, as opposed to far-lying communities. But, urban areas were more optimistic about improvements in tourism training, the sale of local handicrafts, the sale of local goods and services, the number of businesses, transportation, and utilities than their rural counterparts. In conclusion, rural-urban differences, in combination with proximity to the tourism center influence tourism attitudes. Rural areas with close proximity to the tourism center expressed the most negative views of tourism impacts and tourism development compared to urban residents living around the Plaza de Armas and along the tourist path. Future tourism endeavors should, thus, attempt to resolve negative impacts in La Raya and promote greater community participation and income generation for this particular
community. Efforts should continue to be made to relocate individuals wishing to exchange their land in La Raya for another parcel of land. Otherwise, rescue archaeology may encourage the INC to move the boundary of the archaeological site by 50 meters, thereby granting residents full possession of their lands.

**Progress Since 1998**

After starting the 1998 Pilot Project, Alfredo Narváez summarized Túcume’s tourism reality. At that time, Túcume lacked tourism services (including restaurants, local guides, souvenir shops, an information center), site promotion, adequate signage within the site, informational brochures, tourism training, and conservation projects (Narváez 1998: 13; Verand 1998:70). “The population [was] not prepared neither organized. For the population [and authorities,] tourism [was] an ignored element for development” (Narváez 1998:13).

Since 1998, the Site Museum, under the direction of Narváez, has striven to unite local authorities, private industry, archaeologists, tour operators, and international organizations under the premise of conservation and tourism. In addition, the Pilot Project emphasized tourism training for all interested community members as well as conservation education for young people. The Site Museum has also tried to improve the quality of tourism offerings and services. It was considered that, “agrotourism, shamanism, ecotourism, adventure sports, could be alternative programs to the current archaeological tourism. The integration of Túcume with the Batán Grande Natural Reserve should be considered as a high priority” (Narváez 1998:93). Moreover, the importance of monitoring and evaluating all aspects of tourism in Túcume was stressed (Narváez 2001b; Narváez 1998).
Today, Túcume is advertised as an example of cultural ecotourism – involving active community participation and conservation of natural and cultural patrimony (PromPerú 2004; Narváez 2001b; PromPerú et al. n.d.). It is also cited as a model for the transformation of archaeological sites into tourism resources (Raffo n.d.:108). The remaining portion of this chapter is devoted to evaluating progress of tourism in Túcume since 1998, especially within the framework of sustainable tourism. Admittedly, (un)sustainability is achieved after many years of operation (Butler 1998:31); thus, the following assessments are provisional.

**Development of Sustainable Tourism?**

Sustainable tourism may be defined as social and environmental responsibility, coupled with economic viability, that allows satisfactory experiences for visitors and hosts and ensures available resources remain unharmed (Wearing 2001). Sustainable tourism should encourage local traditions and labor, promote local ownership, perpetuate local identity, encourage learning and tourism training, improve education and infrastructure, and strengthen economic equity (Page and Dowling 2002:175; Goodwin et al. 1998). “But if the activities do not aim at the same time at the development of income, based in a rational exploitation of cultural resources, then it will be doomed to fail. Activities have to include an aspect of income generation” (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:10). Thus, sustainable tourism needs to maximize local expenditures, expand local economic multipliers, reduce leakages, train locals for employment, and financially support site improvement and management (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004:22).

In order to promote sustainable tourism in Perú, PENTUR emphasizes decentralization of tourism development and community-based planning and decision making through the support of local governments and the training of local residents and
schoolchildren (MINCETUR 2004). This decision carries on the work and goals of FIT Perú and CTN. FIT Perú (in collaboration with AXIS Arte) has been working on instructing children in tourism, local patrimony, conservation, and handicraft production (MINCETUR 2002). Within northern Perú, CTN also stresses sustainable tourism development, ecotourism, and pro-poor tourism. This nexus calls for: respecting the carrying capacity of sites to ensure minimal natural and cultural impacts; tourism training and patrimony education for locals; and, most importantly, economic benefits for the host community (CANATUR 2004).

Tourism management

The Site Museum of Túcume has been able to establish strategic alliances with governmental agencies and international organizations. Currently, the museum has ties to AECI, the World Bank, MINCETUR, INC, INRENA, and the Regional government of Lambayeque. Moreover, the museum has fostered relationships with Chiclayo tour operators and local authorities. ACODET, the conservation and tourism development association of Túcume, is comprised of community leaders that, together, manage tourism. This entity represents cooperative planning and management by local stakeholders (Murphy 1998:186-7; Verand 1998:2), and may be considered community-based since it incorporates community leaders. Moreover, most survey participants agree that community participation in tourism planning has increased.

However, “ideas spoken by community leaders may represent only a small section of the community,” (Swarbrooke 1999:125) while the majority remain unheard. Thus, one of the integral problems of community involvement is that, by nature, so few people are involved that the community is not truly represented (Castillo and Holmquist 2004; Swarbrooke 1999:33,41). Survey results confirm that Túcume is no exception. However,
since 1998, the Site Museum has tried to uphold principles of community management by instigating education on tourism and conservation. Interest Groups were formed in order to incorporate community members and community perspectives, but were then disbanded in favor of ACODET. In addition to community participation and planning, ACODET’s tenets include: 1) Regulation of Tourist Services, 2) Promotion, 3) Education (Narváez 2001b:65).

**Tourist services**

In December 2004, a German cruise ship attempted to dock at Pimentel, a town on the Lambayeque coast. Tourists on the ship were supposed to disembark and visit main attractions in the Department. However, inadequate docking facilities prevented passengers from landing, and the ship sailed. This misfortune epitomizes the current condition of Lambayeque’s tourism: inadequate tourism services and infrastructure that prevent further investment and expenditure by visitors.

Sustainable tourism requires improved visitor management (Choi and Sirakaya 2005; Swarbrooke 1999). Services should be improved so as to enhance visitors’ experiences, yet without causing negative social and environmental impacts. For example, the use of local resources, goods, and building materials reduces costs and prevents waste of power, water, and labor (Swarbrooke 1999:6-7; Butler 1998:27). In Túcume, the Site Museum has worked hard to improve the quality and authenticity of the tourism product. The use of local architectural styles in the construction of the Site Museum and the Los Horcones Hostal were sustainable decisions: not only do both buildings conserve power, water, labor, and costs, but they also rely on local resources and services and promote authentic local traditions.
Due to museum training sessions, two lodges and one restaurant were opened, thereby improving visitor services. Plus, these three businesses are locally owned and reduce the chance of leakages. However, there is always room for improvement in the quality of these services. And, some thought should be spent on accommodating increased visitor numbers during the *fiestas patronales* (patron saint festivals).

As for the archaeological site, itself, the Site Museum must again be lauded for its efforts at conservation and preservation. Survey participants recognize that tourism has increased conservation of archaeology and history (as well as myths, local culture, and festivals). During 2004, a team of conservationists was hired by the museum to conserve and restore portions of Huaca Larga from further decay; and for eventual inclusion in a tourism circuit. Moreover, the Site Museum has attempted to shield some of the pyramids from heavy rains, and thus erosion, by erecting corrugated metal roofs. However, inadequate drainage pipes from the roofs are actually exacerbating decay in precise areas. It is hoped that these roofs will be removed or replaced in the future.

Since 1998, the museum has created and erected descriptive Spanish-English signs within the archaeological site. Not only do these signs help direct tourists along the two pre-established circuits, but they also provide valuable information. However, considering that one circuit is in dire need of repairs and development, more of an effort should be made to dissuade visitors from embarking on this route. Hopefully, this circuit will be developed or removed from maps. In a similar vein, the ‘working zone’ circuit to Huaca Larga, as listed on maps, should be removed until such time as the route is ready. Confused tourists often make their way along an unmarked path to visit Huaca Larga, where they are not permitted.
Yet the idea of tourists seeing archaeological work in progress is not a bad one. Excavations are tourist attractions in and of themselves, and they have been implemented at Huaca Rajada (Box 2004:1130; Murphy 1999:357; Rachowiecki 1996:362), Huaca del Sol y la Luna, Huaca El Brujo, and San Jose de Morro (to name a few sites). Moreover, excavations satisfy many sustainable tourism objectives: they enhance visitors’ experiences as an added attraction; provide work and income for locals; increase archaeological and historical knowledge; improve local identity; and supply additional information that can, again, be used to enhance visitors’ experiences. Should the Site Museum wish to set-up conservation or excavation zones as tourist attractions, though, adequate signage is necessary.

The main circuit traversed by tourists also needs some work: symbolic security ropes should be added around Huaca 1 in order to prevent wayward visitors from entering (and destroying) this pyramid. In fact, better security at the site might prevent visitors from entering the site at non-designated areas and prevent destruction to the site in the form of looting and graffiti. The 24-hour presence of the police at the museum entrance has, undoubtedly, reduced the aforementioned transgressions, and the police constitute a valuable resource during the day. Admittedly, guarding a 220 ha area is a considerable challenge. However, incidents like the looting of the mythical bird mural by teenagers and the filching of the museum’s electric wires while still in use, demonstrate that greater security is always needed.

To continue: the temporary hall of the Site Museum aptly incorporates the present community of Túcume by emphasizing continuities (and some changes) from pre-historic times. This presentation encapsulates archaeologists’ intentions to focus on the present
society in addition to the past. For example, numerous local artists and artisans were hired in the construction, design, and furnishing of the exhibits. Yet, English translations of text in the display cases would greatly enhance foreign visitors’ experiences, especially since on-site, non-Spanish informational booklets and guided tours are rare.

In 1998, Alfredo Narváez wrote English and Spanish information books that provide detailed information on the museum, other nearby attractions, and the community. But, at the time of fieldwork, supplies had diminished and required reordering. One respondent asked that residents be allowed to sell tourist information to visitors; under careful supervision, this might be another way in which to involve community members and generate some additional income.

Regarding guiding, only one part-time guide staffed the museum during fieldwork. This individual provided tours upon request in Spanish or French, and was learning English; also she was studying to become an officially certified guide. This process requires a great investment, both in time and money, and is difficult for most locals to attain. Moreover, demand for guide services is sporadic as many travelers arrive in prearranged tour groups. However, reliance upon less-trained, supplementary guides from the local community during busy periods might enhance visitors’ experiences and generate additional income.

The Information Center, located in the former home of Federico Villarreal, offers tourist information and represents an additional tourist attraction. Yet, foreign tourists are disappointed to learn that staff speaks no English and the Center offers no English materials. Moreover, the structure, itself, requires cleaning and restoration as well as adequate development as an attraction.
Finally, tourist services are directly related to the state of local infrastructure. Over the last few years, the Municipality has greatly improved road, water, sewage, power, and telephone services (Mayor, personal communication 2004). Survey respondents acknowledge that roads and utilities have improved due to tourism. However, continued advances in these areas, as well as garbage disposal, would better tourists’ experiences (Rosana Correa, personal communication 2004) and satisfy residents’ desires. Residents would like to see tourism improve garbage collection, latrines and sewage lines, water supply, access to electricity, schools, and health facilities.

In sum, the Site Museum has worked tirelessly since 1998 to improve tourist services and with praiseworthy results. However, continued upkeep and enhancement are required.

Marketing

Since 1998, the Site Museum, with the help of PromPerú, has produced informational brochures and booklets on Túcume that are available at information centers, government tourism offices, and travel agencies in major Peruvian cities. Túcume is also included within PromPerú’s (2003) top tourist destinations. However, further marketing and promotion of Túcume is necessary. Insufficient marketing and commercialization are partially responsible for setbacks with the 1998 Pilot Project:

aunque inicialmente se planteó que la población se incorporara al turismo para incrementar sus ingresos, motivo por el que se les capacitó, se descuidó la adecuación de los productos al Mercado, la definición de este Mercado, los canales de distribución y la comercialización tanto de los productos (artesanías, textiles) como de los servicios (guias, caballos, entre otros), que permitieran la rentabilidad y el incremento de ingresos para la población local [although initially we hoped the population would join tourism to increase its income, the reason for which we trained them, we neglected the adjustment of the products to the Market, the definition of this Market, the distribution channels and the commercialization of the products (handicrafts, textiles) as well as services (guides, horses, among others),
that would allow the yield and increase of income for the local population]. (PromPerú 2001)

Survey results demonstrate that an overwhelming majority of respondents agree with greater promotion, and interviews show that artisans specifically request additional promotion of Túcume as well as their products. And, 22.2% of respondents felt that insufficient publicity represented an obstacle for tourism development. As an initial step, the Site Museum should complete plans to set-up an internet site that advertises the museum as well as the surrounding community. Moreover, given that 70.4% of foreigners visit Lambayeque under the guidance of guidebooks (Verand 1998:54), better coverage of Túcume in these publications is necessary.

As Perú tries to diversify its tourism products, Túcume can diversify its attractions by promoting the Site Museum as well as other growing attractions. In 1998 and 2004 survey results, residents supported the development of additional attractions, including cultural tourism, nature-based tourism, gastronomy, and mystical tourism. While maintaining emphasis on Túcume’s most important tourism resource – its culture heritage – Túcume can develop other attractions and, thereby, potentially lengthen visitors’ stay. According to Narváez (1998b:12), “the district has cultural resources: dance, food, theatre, religious festivities, traditional medicine and crafts with tourist potential,” that can be exploited. Indeed, cultural ecotourism in Túcume (and Batán Grande) is particularly apropos given the undeniable link between humans and the environment since pre-history. El Niño is recorded in the archaeological record of Túcume and it continues to represent a powerful influence over the lives of current denizens (Sandweiss 1999). Moreover, the 1998 El Niño devastation kick-started tourism development. On a practical level, tentative plans to sustainably link Túcume and Batán Grande (Narváez
1998) would create camping trips, bike trips, and/or horseback riding trips that would generate camping fees, cycle hire, and/or horse hire. And, development and promotion of these additional attractions would satisfy one of the museum’s goals: to diversify tourism attractions, including mystical tourism and ecotourism (Coppin and Doig 1999).

Moreover, emphasis on mystical tourism (or shamanism), ecotourism, agrotourism, and cultural (heritage) tourism might help create a tourist circuit within the district of Túcume. As tourists walk (or ride) from attraction to attraction, opportunities for contact with and spending in the host community would increase (Castillo and Holmquist 2004:1-2).

While Túcume should be promoted individually, it must also be heavily marketed as part of the Lambayeque Department and the North-oriental circuit. Admittedly, most visitors to the region come to see the Tumbas Reales Museum and, subsequently, stay to visit Túcume. Thus, Túcume needs to be understood and sold within the framework of larger circuits. MINCETUR, DIRCETUR, CANATUR, and PromPerú, under the guidance of PENTUR and CTN, are making great strides in this area (CANATUR 2004; MINCETUR 2005, 2004, 2002). Moreover, the Site Museum has established ties with tour operators in Chiclayo, and Túcume is included in nearly every tour package sold in this city (Chiclayo tour operators, personal communication 2005). However, since so many visitors purchase tour packages from Chiclayo, Lima, or abroad (Verand 1998), investment and spending in Túcume is reduced. On the one hand, such promotion augments tourist numbers to the museum (i.e. the INC); but on the other hand, increased numbers of this type of tourist have little impact on local economic gains. In fact, disproportional tourist numbers and tourist spending may be fostering increased
dissatisfaction and resentment on the part of local residents. Efforts need to be made to encourage longer stays in Túcume as well as increased expenditures. Tours generally prevent the consumption of Túcume’s food and guide services, and tour guides often prohibit visitors from stopping at the souvenir shop due to scheduling conflicts. Since most locally, nationally, or internationally arranged tours rely on Chiclayo operators (Verand 1998), accords need to be reached with them to remedy these situations. To sum up: as Túcume seems fairly well covered within national and regional circuits, more emphasis needs to be shifted to promoting circuits within Túcume.

**Education and training**

Since 1998, the Site Museum has offered training sessions and workshops on tourism. These labors served to increase community participation and decision-making, enhance local identity and traditions, and establish lines of communication between the community and the museum. The Pilot Project has been able to rescue and conserve cultural traditions (such as the Devil’s Dance, oral traditions, *el hornado* cooking style, and local iconography) that might have otherwise been lost (PromPerú 2001). Also, training provided more meaningful employment of locals (Wearing 2001:401,404). In the beginning, these sessions were open to everyone. However, lack of interest, inappropriate expectations, insufficient financial rewards and/or management conflicts caused many participants to withdraw. According to AXIS, less than 30% of residents trained in handicrafts are still producing goods. Of the respondents who had participated in training sessions, some expressed unrealistic expectations: they thought the museum would pay them a fixed salary, and they left when they realized otherwise. Yet others blame insufficient sales and lack of start-up capital for their withdrawal; without money to purchase starting materials, artisans had little chance to sell. Furthermore, several former
artisans mentioned change in museum management as a deterrent. After Narváez left Túcume, some felt museum support slackened and conflicts arose.

Moreover, most training sessions were superficial in nature, making it clear that long-term training was necessary for those few who truly wished to participate in tourism. In reality, active community participation is often limited to few individuals, and Túcume is no exception. And, although the Site Museum has worked hard to increase awareness of, interest in, and communication on tourism, continued efforts are needed. Although survey results show residents perceive greater educational experiences and tourism training, most residents found ‘no impact’ on environmental awareness.

30 minutes into the supposed start of a 2004 mototaxi-driver training session by FIT Perú, only a handful of men had arrived. To avoid an embarrassing situation in front of MINCETUR, the Túcume police chief was called upon to round up the drivers, who shortly appeared in droves. By the next day, the museum auditorium was filled to capacity because rumor had spread that MINCETUR was handing out free t-shirts and fanny packs to all attendees. At the end of the training, extra t-shirts were awarded to anyone and everyone rather than cart them back to Lima; although a sign of generosity, this action undermined the importance of the workshop. Moreover, these gestures bespeak inadequate communication with the mototaxi drivers and the use of temporary measures to spark drivers’ interests. When later asked to explain recent teachings on conservation and tourism, mototaxi drivers demonstrated little knowledge, pointing to the workshop’s failures.

However, most of the museum’s current tourism education programs focus on children. In collaboration with MINCETUR, AXIS, and AECI, the Site Museum is
laboring to enhance children’s exposure to conservation, patrimony, and tourism both in and outside of the classroom. According to Castillo and Holmquist (2005:2): “in our experience the most fruitful opportunities are to work with children in school settings, through the creation of learning and activity programs.” Not only are Túcume parents grateful of improvements in public school education, but these methods also teach young people to respect and value local patrimony. Additionally, plans to link tourism with vocational training may enhance community participation in tourism by preparing students for work in tourist services. An added suggestion would be to also emphasize instruction in English: not only for tourism purposes, but also as an important skill in today’s global community. In sum, the Site Museum has continually emphasized community participation through tourism training. Although initial workshops failed to produce expected results, current education projects with schoolchildren look promising.

**Economic revenues**

Often, sustainability of small-scale, community-based tourism projects lies in the generation of positive economic benefits (Nyaupane and Thapa 2004:42). Although money is spent to arrive and to enter the archaeological site, very little is spent in the actual destination. Moreover, Túcume’s current tourist attractions require only a few hours to visit, thus reducing the chances of expenditure. The Site Museum has tried to stress local labor, the multiplier effect, and backward linkages through its construction and its promotion of local goods and services. For example, food services at the museum are provided by six San Antonio women, who rely on neighbors’ animals for meat supplies. The Site Museum also requires that all prices in Túcume reflect Peruvian living standards (in order to remain competitive and treat tourists fairly), but this signifies that profiles remain small. Furthermore, while Hostal Los Horcones provides quality
accommodations, it may generate leakages through its provision of non-local goods and its ownership.

Given that Túcume’s tourism is small-scale, few locals are employed in the industry. Of survey respondents, 86.5% admitted that they would like to become more involved in tourism, particularly in areas requiring low start-up capital (e.g., handicraft production, guiding, and food preparation). Plus, 77.5% felt that insufficient capital was preventing them from becoming more involved. Only 22 (6.6%) individuals admitted that they were involved in tourism in some capacity. And, only 23 individuals recognized that a part of their monthly income was due to tourism; but 17 of these 23 believed that tourism provided less than 20 percent of their monthly income. Primary employment includes mototaxi drivers, museum maintenance staff, museum cooks, storeowners, and the artisans. Secondary jobs created by tourism include construction workers, tailors, and animal husbandry practitioners. Tailors, for instance, put the finishing touches on artisans’ products. Although most artisans are dissatisfied with their earnings, a couple honestly admitted that their tourism earnings were sufficient to provide a living. Since its opening in May 2004, the museum’s souvenir shop has ranged per diem sales of US$0.61 to US$306. During July 2004, various artisans each sold merchandise worth over US$242. While these earnings are seasonal and do not take into account costs of labor and materials, it is evident that tourism is creating positive income generation for many artisans. All artisans, however, would like to expand their market by tapping into opportunities in Lima and abroad. AXIS had tried to establish occasional contracts between the Túcume artisans and interested parties, but lack of organization, unity, and greed caused the last agreement to fall through.
Survey results also show that 86.5% of respondents wish to be more involved in tourism through handicraft production, guiding, and/or food preparation. Residents throughout all areas of Túcume ask for the creation of additional tourism jobs or tourism businesses. Some suggested opening a handicraft or clothing store in town so that locals could sell their wares. Nearly every household in Túcume produces some form of handicraft or another, which can be distinguished from the museum’s merchandise. Others suggested the creation of informal businesses, but these seem to be restricted by the museum. In any case, soft loans and long-term credit are required so that residents can become more involved in tourism. For example, the owner of Hostal Las Balsas is deterred in his desire to finish construction by a lack of capital. Survey results show that 77.5% of respondents mentioned that lack of capital was an obstacle to tourism development, followed by lack of training (62.3%), lack of authorities’ interest (62.3%), lack of residents’ interest (41.6%), and lack of publicity (22.2%).

According to Lindberg et al. (1996), local economic benefits also include financial support for the tourist site and conservation efforts (Nyaupane 1999:27-8). As of 2004, the Site Museum was not receiving much monetary support from the INC, and conservation efforts were being funded by outside organizations (e.g., Backus, MINCETUR, AECI). All income from ticket sales is directly deposited in an INC account, meaning no profits remain in Túcume. The Site Museum is apparently only reimbursed enough to pay for staff salaries and operating costs (Bernarda Delgado, personal communication 2004). And, given the barebones staff and the sustainable construction of the museum, its operating costs are minimal. During 2003, the Site Museum raised US$31,515 in ticket sales, but was only returned US$16,061. According
to acting director, Bernarda Delgado, Túcume’s profits must be shared with the less cost-effective regional museums (i.e. Museo Sipán and Museo Sicán) in order to prevent the Lambayeque INC from going into the red. In essence, sustainable museums are made to pay for non-sustainable museums, making the whole system unsustainable.

Many residents do not realize the museum’s financial predicament; they only see the 30,000+ visitors each year paying their entrance fees, and they wonder where the money goes. The Site Museum and Municipality should be more proactive about communicating and dispersing the truth. However, those few residents that were aware of the museum’s financial bind expressed their anger and resentment. Rather than see the money remitted to Lima, they rightly feel that the profits should be reinvested in the site and the local community. Many asked that a percentage of the museum’s profits be diverted to the Municipality for community development. In response, perhaps the Site Museum should consider raising some revenue for the community. Perhaps an accord can be reached with the INC whereby reduced subsidies to foreigners can be channeled into a town fund? Otherwise, perhaps the INC should carry President Toledo’s aims a step further and require each district be self-sufficient.

**Conclusions and Implications**

Of the five cultural heritage museums in the Department of Lambayeque, the Site Museum in Túcume is by far the best example of sustainable tourism. Since 1998, the Site Museum has labored to achieve sustainable tourism in Túcume. Moreover, their characterization of sustainability surpassed other Peruvian standards at the time. And, over the years, the museum has greatly improved tourist services, site promotion, education and training, and economic opportunities. While attempting to minimize negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts, they have also tried to augment
income generation. They have implemented community workshops to encourage tourism training, local participation, local labor, and local identity. Moreover, they have established ties between numerous local stakeholders and national (and international) organizations. In addition, their efforts have brought about advances in local education and infrastructure.

As a form of monitoring and evaluation, survey results further support sustainability efforts. In particular, survey results demonstrate that tourism has caused minimal negative socio-cultural and environmental impacts. Residents only noted negative increases in noise, population size, and traffic congestion. Considerations should be made, though, to decreasing pollution and waste, increasing wildlife conservation, improving water quality, raising environmental awareness, and encouraging additional use of recreational opportunities and spaces. On the other hand, tourism has produced positive impacts: increases in the conservation of local culture, archaeology, history, myths, and festivals; additional pride and respect for cultural heritage; greater educational experiences and handicraft production; and more community participation in tourism planning.

Yet economic viability is also very important to achieve sustainability (Castillo and Holmquist 2004; Goodwin et al. 1998), especially in poorer communities. Areas with low economic activity view tourism more positively for economic reasons (Johnson et al. 1994; King et al. 1993; Belisle and Hoy 1980); as such, positive economic benefits commonly outweigh costs (Gursoy et al. 2002; Akis et al. 1996; Liu and Var 1986). According to Túcume respondents, tourism has increased investment and spending, the sale of local products and services, the sale of local handicrafts, roads and transportation,
utilities, the number of local businesses, and tourism training. But, tourism has also brought about rises in the cost of real estate and increased leakages. And, Site Museum profits are not reinvested in Túcume but returned to the INC. Additionally, tourism is not perceived to have impacted jobs, economic opportunities, salaries, and standard of living. Residents believe that insufficient income generation is distributed to too few. Túcume residents wish for greater economic gains, thus calling into question tourism’s current and future sustainability. Perhaps “sustainability” cannot be reached per se, but more sustainable forms of tourism can certainly be encouraged and promoted (Swarbrooke 1999:41).

More sustainable forms of tourism entail promoting the fair distribution of (economic) tourism benefits among residents (Choi and Sirakaya 2005; Page and Dowling 2002; Swarbrooke 1999; Sproule and Suhandi 1998). Although Perú wishes to actively reduce gender and age inequalities (MINCETUR 2002), these characteristics showed only slight influence over tourism opinions in Túcume. Instead, survey results indicate that less educated and poorer residents in Túcume are less optimistic about tourism. Also, rural denizens living closest to the tourist center are the least satisfied with and enthusiastic about tourism. Thus, efforts need to be made to support these particular groups and increase their participation in community planning and decision-making. Perú claims it wants to use tourism to improve living conditions, particularly for the rural poor (CANATUR 2004; MINCETUR 2002), so it is hoped that further actions will promote equality along these lines.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

To better understand the influence of socio-demographic characteristics on tourism opinions, it would be interesting to examine how the aforementioned characteristics relate
to each other and then, jointly, affect tourism opinions. Additional qualitative research is also needed to contextualize quantitative results. Such work might help reveal more important factors that influence tourism opinions as well as better explain why different groups have different tourism opinions.

To complement this research, full analyses of ‘real’ environmental and economic impacts are necessary. In addition, visitors’ studies would help disclose reactions and perceptions of Túcume from the tourists’ standpoint. Finally, market research would be useful for understanding Túcume’s potential in national and international contexts.
APPENDIX
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Section 1 - Support for Tourism Development
The following section will ask you how much you oppose or support each of the following items. 1 = Completely opposed, 2 = Opposed, 3 = Indifferent, 4 = In agreement, 5 = Completely in agreement.

Do you agree with:

1. Greater tourism development (in general) _____
2. More development of cultural heritage tourism to the pyramids of Túcume _____
3. More development of cultural heritage tourism to the museum of Túcume _____
4. Development of nature-based tourism in the Túcume area (such as hikes, horseback riding) _____
5. Development of cultural tourism in the community (such as festivals) _____
6. Development of visitor services in Túcume (such as hotels and restaurants) _____
7. Development of small businesses in Túcume (such as guide services, souvenir shops) _____
8. Greater tourism promotion of the Túcume area (publicity at the local and national level) _____
9. Increased number of national tourists to Túcume _____
10. Increased number of foreign tourists to Túcume _____
11. Improved transportation, facilities, and roads _____
12. Information on Túcume for tourists (such as maps, guidebooks) _____
13. Intervention of the national government in Túcume’s tourism development _____
14. Intervention of the regional government in Túcume’s tourism development _____
15. Local management of tourism in Túcume by the Municipality and Museum _____
16. Local management of tourism in Túcume by the community _____
17. Community decision-making on the planning/development of tourism _____
18. Training of community members in tourism services (such as hotels, restaurants, guides) _____
19. Training of community members in the production of handicrafts _____
Section 2 - Socio-cultural Impacts of Tourism Development
Please evaluate each of the following statements and indicate if tourism has had an impact. 1 = Increased greatly, 2 = Increased slightly, 3 = No Impact, 4 = Decreased slightly, 5 = Decreased greatly.

What impact has tourism had on the following?

1. Crime rate _____
2. Level of conservation of local culture in Túcume (e.g., customs & traditions) _____
3. Level of conservation of archaeological sites in Túcume _____
4. Level of conservation of local history and myths in Túcume _____
5. Level of pride and respect for the history and archaeological sites of the area _____
6. Use of traditional architecture in construction of homes (using algarrobos, adobe, quincha) _____
7. Level of conservation of festivals in Túcume (such as the Purísima Concepción) _____
8. Level of warmth of Túcume residents towards visitors _____
9. Number of outdoor recreational opportunities and spaces in Túcume _____
10. Quality and quantity of kinship ties and community bonds _____
11. Quality and quantity of educational experiences and learning in Túcume _____
12. Quality of life in Túcume _____
13. Quality and quantity of local arts and handicrafts in Túcume _____
14. Quantity of conflicts and division between residents of Túcume _____
15. Level of community participation in the planning and development of tourism _____

Section 3 - Environmental Impacts of Tourism Development
Please evaluate each of the following statements and indicate if tourism has had an impact. 1 = Increased greatly, 2 = Increased slightly, 3 = No Impact, 4 = Decreased slightly, 5 = Decreased greatly.

What impact has tourism had on the following?

1. Level of noise in Túcume _____
2. Level of pollution and waste in Túcume _____
3. Level of conservation of wildlife endemic to the area _____
4. Level of conservation of plants and forests in the area _____
5. Quantity of population in Túcume _____
6. Level of agricultural practice in Túcume _____
7. Level of traffic congestion in Túcume _____
8. Level of sanitation and water quality in Túcume _____
9. Level of awareness of the environment _____
10. Level of deforestation and soil erosion _____

**Section 4 - Economic Impacts of Tourism Development**

Please evaluate each of the following statements and indicate if tourism has had an impact. 1 = Increased greatly, 2 = Increased slightly, 3 = No Impact, 4 = Decreased slightly, 5 = Decreased greatly.

**What impact has tourism had on the following?**

1. Level of investment and spending in Túcume _____
2. Quantity of economic opportunities _____
3. Quantity and quality of permanent jobs _____
4. Quantity and quality of seasonal jobs _____
5. Salaries in Túcume _____
6. Standard of living in Túcume _____
7. Cost of land and homes in Túcume _____
8. Level of economic differences and stratification within Túcume residents _____
9. Sale of local products and services _____
10. Purchase of products and services from outside of Túcume _____
11. Sale of local handicrafts _____
12. Level of development of infrastructure in Túcume _____
13. Quality and quantity of water, sewage, and electricity in Túcume _____
14. Quality and quantity of medical services in Túcume _____
15. Quality and quantity of schools and formal education in Túcume _____
16. Number of local businesses in Túcume _____
17. Number of businesses owned by nonresidents in Túcume _____
18. Quantity and quality of tourism training (in tourism services, handicrafts) _____

**Section 5 - Sociodemographic Characteristics**

Please answer each of the following questions.

1. Sex:  Male / Female

2. Residence location: _______________

3. What is your position in the Household?
   a.  Head/Husband  
   b.  Head/Wife
4. Number of Persons in Household (including yourself, newborns, and elders)? _______

5. Who lives in the household and how old is each member?
   ___ Spouse Age:______ ___ Inlaw(s) Age:______
   ___ Children Age:______ ___ Uncle(s)/Aunt(s) Age:______
   ___ Sibling(s) Age:______ ___ Niece(s)/Nephew(s) Age:______
   ___ Parent(s) Age:______ ___ Godparent(s) Age:______
   ___ Grandchildren Age:______ ___ Stepchildren Age:______
   ___ Grandparent(s) Age:______ ___ Other(s) Age:______
   ___ Cousin(s) Age:______

6. How old are you? __________

7. How long in minutes does it take you to walk from your home to the Plaza de Armas in Túcume?_____

8. Marital Status
   a. Single   c. Conviviente   e. Separated
   b. Married  d. Divorced    f. Widowed

9. Where were you born? What district and province? _____________________

10. How long in years have you lived in Túcume?_____

11. How many years of schooling have you received?
   a. No schooling   f. Some schooling at technological institute
   b. Some elementary school   g. Completion of schooling at technological institute
   c. Completion of elementary school   h. Some university training
   d. Some high school   i. Completion of university
   e. Completion of high school   j. Graduate studies

12. Do you have the following in your home:
   a. Electricity Yes/No
   b. Running water Yes/No
   c. Sewage disposal Yes/No

13. Does your home contain one of the following items:
   a. Radio SI / NO   g. VCR SI / NO
   b. B/W television SI / NO   h. Sewing machine SI / NO
   c. Color television SI / NO   i. Computer SI / NO
   d. Stereo system SI / NO   j. Telephone SI / NO
   e. Refrigerator SI / NO   k. Washing machine SI / NO
   f. Stove SI / NO

14. For transportation, do you have:
   a. Bicycle SI / NO   e. Mototaxi SI / NO
   b. Horsedrawn wagon SI / NO   f. Car SI / NO
   c. Triciclo SI / NO   g. Van SI / NO
   d. Motorcycle SI / NO   h. Truck SI / NO

15. Do you have family members living in Lima? How many? What relations?
16. Do you have family members living abroad? How many? What relations?

17. What do you work at? What activities are you involved in during your free time?

18. What does your spouse work at? What activities is (s)he involved in during his/her free time?

19. Is your monthly income sufficient to cover:
   a. Basic needs (food, health, lodging) YES / NO / SOMETIMES
   b. Education expenses YES / NO / SOMETIMES
   c. Clothing expenses YES / NO / SOMETIMES
   d. Recreation/entertainment YES / NO / SOMETIMES
   e. Savings YES / NO / SOMETIMES

20. What is your total monthly household income?
   a. < 200 Nuevos Soles
e. 1200 – 2000 Nuevos Soles
   b. 200 – 500 Nuevos Soles
   f. 2000 – 3000 Nuevos Soles
c. 500 – 800 Nuevos Soles
   g. > 3000 Nuevos Soles
d. 800 – 1200 Nuevos Soles

21. How much land do you own? 21. Do you own or rent this land?
   a. House ______(hectares) Own / Rent
   b. Farm ______(hectares) Own / Rent
   c. Other________(hectares) Own / Rent

22. Do you own animals? If so, what kinds and how many of each?
   □ Cow(s)____ □ Chicken(s)_____ □ Donkey(s)____
   □ Goat(s)____ □ Duck(s)_____ □ Mule(s)____
   □ Sheep____ □ Turkey(s)_____ □ Horse(s)____
   □ Pig(s)____ □ Guinea Pig(s)_____ □ Other____

Section 6 – Additional Tourism Questions
Please answer each of the following questions.

1. Did you participate in one of the tourism workshops?
   a. NO  b. YES
   If yes, which one?_________________
   When?_________________
   Did you find it helpful?   A. Very much    B. Very little    C. Not at all
   How long did you work in that activity following the training?_______________
2. How are you involved in tourism now?
   a. Not involved  
   b. Offer guide services  
   c. Produce handicrafts  
   d. Sell handicrafts  
   e. Provide lodging  
   f. Provide food  
   g. Provide transportation  
   h. Other ________________

3. Describe the contact you have had with tourists.
   a. By sight  
   b. Conversation  
   c. Providing services  
   d. Other ____________

4. What percentage of your earnings is due to tourism? (How much do you earn monthly more or less from tourism?)
   a. Almost all (more than 80%)  
   b. About half (50%)  
   c. Little (less than 20%)  
   d. Nothing (0%)  

5. Which kind of tourists are more important for Tucume?
   a. National tourists  
   b. International tourists  
   c. Both  

6. Which organizations should manage tourism in Tucume?
   [ ] National Government  
   [ ] Site Museum  
   [ ] Regional Government  
   [ ] Community  
   [ ] Municipality  
   [ ] Tourism Club  
   [ ] ACODET  
   [ ] Schools  
   [ ] Túcume Vivo  
   [ ] Other ________________

7. Are you content with the current level of tourism in the area?
   a. YES  
   b. NO, I would like to see more tourism  
   c. NO, I would like to see less tourism  

8. Would you like to become more involved in tourism?
   a. NO  
   b. YES  
   If yes, then how? ________________  
   What do you lack for this to become a reality? ________________

9. What do you think are the main obstacles for tourism development in Tucume?
   [ ] Lack of capital  
   [ ] Lack of interest by residents  
   [ ] Lack of training  
   [ ] Lack of publicity  
   [ ] Lack of interest by authorities  
   [ ] Other ________________

10. In your opinion, which kind of tourism should be developed in Tucume?
    [ ] Archaeological tourism  
    [ ] Gastronomy  
    [ ] Nature-based tourism  
    [ ] Mystical tourism  
    [ ] Cultural tourism  
    [ ] Other  
    [ ] Adventure tourism  

11. What aid does the Museum provide the community? How can the museum provide aid?
OBSERVATIONS

1. Type of Home
   a. Independent House
   b. Vivienda en Quinta
   c. Vivienda en Casa de Vecindad, sharing utilities
   d. Shack
   e. Other ________________

2. What material predominantly composes your home?
   a. Bricks or cement block
   b. Stones and lime or concrete
   c. Adobe
   d. Reeds and mud
   e. Stones and mud
   f. Wood
   g. Reeds
   h. Other ________________

3. What material predominantly composes your roof?
   a. Concrete
   b. Wood
   c. Tejas
   d. Planchas de calamina
   e. Reeds
   f. Leaves
   g. Other ________________

4. What material predominantly composes your floor?
   a. Parquet
   b. Vinyl Sheets
   c. Tiles
   d. Wood
   e. Cement
   f. Dirt
   g. Other ________________
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Geraldine Slean hails from New Jersey, but maintains deep interest in Peru through her maternal lineage. After graduating cum laude with a B.A. in anthropology from Harvard University in 2000, she attended the University of Cambridge. There, she obtained an M.Phil. in archaeological science in 2002. At the University of Florida, she has been able to combine her past instruction and experience with her interest in Peru. Her M.A. degree in Latin American studies represents the coalescence of anthropology, archaeology, and tourism, with a country-specific focus.