

MASTER IN MANAGEMENT OF TOURISM DESTINATIONS

Academic Year 2025/2026

Irina Rodríguez de Peleato Blanch

***Cultural Heritage as a Tool for Tourism Diversification in Andorra:
Perceptions of the UNESCO World Heritage Candidature***

FINAL MASTER PROJECT

Academic tutor prof. Salvador Anton Clavé



UNIVERSITAT ROVIRA I VIRGILI

List of contents

Abstract	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Literature review	5
3. Case Study: Andorra	8
3.1. Historical development, tourism transition and contemporary challenges	8
3.2. Cultural tourism development and the UNESCO candidature “The Material Testimonies of State Formation in the Pyrenees: the Co-principality of Andorra”	10
4. Methodology	13
4.1. Research design	13
4.2. Data collection	13
4.2.1 Quantitative methods	13
4.2.2 Qualitative methods	14
4.3. Data analysis	15
5. Results	16
5.1. Quantitative results	16
5.1.1. Resident consultation	16
5.1.2 Visitor Survey	17
5.2. Qualitative results	19
5.2.1 Participant observation of professional mountain guides	19
5.2.2. Focus group with public sector stakeholders	21
6. Discussion	22
7. Conclusions	26
8. Bibliography	28
9. Appendices	30

Abstract

The UNESCO candidature “The Material Testimonies of State Formation in the Pyrenees: the Co-principality of Andorra” represents a transnational serial nomination led by Andorra in collaboration with France and Spain. This study explores the potential tourism impact of this candidature, focusing on how a possible UNESCO designation may influence Andorra’s international destination image and contribute to the diversification of its tourism offer.

The research is based on interviews with residents and visitors, whose perspectives were later shared with public stakeholders. The serial structure of the candidature allows for analysis at a national scale, as the proposed sites are distributed across all seven parishes of Andorra. In addition, the hypothetical nature of the study enables the examination of anticipated impacts without the influence of an existing inscription.

The findings indicate that UNESCO recognition is generally perceived as a mechanism that can enhance destination image and reinforce perceptions of cultural value, often associated with opportunities for tourism diversification. At the same time, the results suggest that UNESCO recognition may also contribute to the construction and communication of a curated national narrative, particularly in contexts with distinctive cultural and institutional characteristics such as Andorra, the world’s only co-principality.

1. Introduction

This research examines the tourism impact of UNESCO recognition through the case of Andorra, a consolidated destination characterised by strong seasonality, with ski tourism in winter, nature-based tourism in summer, and shopping-oriented tourism year-round. Although Andorra has developed a successful ski-based tourism economy, its current model is increasingly challenged by climate change. Despite diversification efforts in recent years, the country's image remains strongly associated with skiing, mountains, and retail tourism, while cultural tourism plays a limited role.

UNESCO World Heritage designation is widely associated with increased international visibility, enhanced destination image, and tourism development. Previous research has explored its effects on visitor numbers, attractiveness, and tourism diversification through cultural heritage promotion. However, findings remain mixed, and most studies focus on destinations after inscription, with limited attention given to perceptions of potential impacts prior to designation.

Against this background, this study analyses the hypothetical impact of the UNESCO transnational serial candidature "The Material Testimonies of State Formation in the Pyrenees: the Co-principality of Andorra", presented in January 2026 by Andorra, Spain, and France. The main objective is to assess how UNESCO recognition could contribute to both Andorra's destination image and tourism diversification strategy.

This case is particularly relevant due to its serial nature, involving ten sites distributed across all seven parishes of Andorra. Unlike studies focused on individual heritage sites, this allows UNESCO's potential effects to be examined at a national scale, considering its influence on overall destination image and tourism diversification.

To address these objectives, interviews were conducted with 52 residents and 158 visitors (tourists and excursionists). The research with residents explored awareness of UNESCO and the candidature, perceptions of the proposed sites and their Outstanding Universal Value, attitudes towards cultural tourism in the country, and perceived impacts of the nomination. The research with visitors explored, among other aspects, main trip motivations, awareness of UNESCO, interest in the nominated sites, and the potential influence of a hypothetical UNESCO designation on visitation intentions.

Finally, results were presented to public stakeholders, who highlighted additional contextual factors such as Andorra's uniqueness as the world's only co-principality and the importance of institutional cooperation for the success of the candidature.

2. Literature review

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) is a specialised agency of the United Nations established in 1945 following the Second World War, with the mandate to promote international cooperation in education, science, and culture. A central component of this mandate is the protection of cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV), as defined in the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

The Convention established the World Heritage List as the principal mechanism for identifying, recognising, and safeguarding sites of global significance that meet specific OUV criteria. As of May 2026, 1,248 properties have been inscribed, encompassing cultural, natural, and mixed sites. By ratifying the Convention, States Parties commit to the identification, protection, conservation, and transmission of World Heritage properties to future generations, reflecting the principle that OUV constitutes a shared responsibility of the international community. In this sense, the World Heritage List functions both as a normative framework and as an operational instrument of global heritage governance (Wager, 1995; Peira et al., 2023).

Beyond its conservation mandate, UNESCO also plays an important institutional role in supporting World Heritage Sites (WHs) through financial and technical assistance, particularly in resource-constrained contexts (Yang et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2012). At the same time, inscription on the World Heritage List operates as an international quality signal that enhances visibility, credibility, and attractiveness, especially for lesser-known destinations (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006; Wuepper & Patry, 2017). This symbolic capital contributes to destination branding by reinforcing perceptions of authenticity and cultural value (Poria et al., 2013).

This recognition effect has direct implications for tourism development. UNESCO designation can shape destination perception and influence travel decision-making by increasing cognitive awareness and enhancing perceived legitimacy and desirability. As a result, many destinations strategically leverage World Heritage status to stimulate tourism development. However, this process also introduces governance tensions, as increased visitation may conflict with conservation objectives when management capacity is limited or when growth-oriented strategies dominate (Peira et al., 2023).

The literature broadly recognises UNESCO inscription as a driver of increased media attention and tourism flows, sometimes producing “waves” of heritage tourism following listing (Yang et al., 2010; Peira et al., 2023). This effect is particularly pronounced in remote or lesser-known destinations, where the UNESCO label functions as a credibility shortcut that reduces perceived uncertainty and enhances

attractiveness (Wuepper & Patry, 2017). By contrast, already globally established destinations tend to exhibit weaker marginal effects, as their visibility and attractiveness are already structurally embedded.

However, increased tourism demand also generates significant sustainability challenges. Excessive visitation may lead to congestion, environmental degradation, and the erosion of authenticity and site integrity (Wager, 1995; Peira et al., 2023). Empirical cases illustrate these tensions clearly: at Angkor, visitor pressure has at times exceeded environmental and experiential carrying capacities; in Florence, regulatory interventions have been introduced to manage overcrowding in sensitive urban spaces (Mariani & Guizzardi, 2020); and at Pompeii, issues such as structural deterioration and inadequate visitor management have led to periods of crisis, demonstrating that UNESCO status alone does not guarantee effective preservation without robust governance structures (Ferri & Zan, 2014).

These tensions have been conceptualised by d'Eramo (2014) through the notion of “UNESCOcide,” describing the paradox in which World Heritage recognition contributes to the gradual erosion of authenticity and local life through intensified tourism pressure. In response, some destinations have adopted “de-marketing” strategies aimed at regulating demand and redistributing visitor flows in order to protect site integrity (Mariani & Guizzardi, 2020).

Research suggests that destinations with multiple World Heritage Sites, often described as “UNESCO clusters,” may benefit from shared governance experience and stronger institutional coordination, improving their capacity to manage tourism pressure and balance conservation with development objectives (Mariani & Guizzardi, 2020). However, this is not automatic. The case of the Baroque Cities in Val di Noto illustrates how weak coordination among local authorities can lead to fragmented management, where individual actors prioritise local strategies over a unified “cultural district” approach. This can result in inefficiencies and mismatches between tourism expectations and long-term development outcomes, including unbalanced growth in tourism-related infrastructure driven by overly optimistic expectations (Cuccia, 2012).

A central debate in the literature concerns whether UNESCO designation has a causal effect on tourism growth. Yang et al. (2010), using panel data from China, find that inscription is associated with a statistically significant increase in international tourist arrivals, with an effect size exceeding that of national tourism awards. Their interpretation is that UNESCO status operates as a strong international signalling mechanism that enhances destination attractiveness and reduces uncertainty for potential visitors.

In contrast, Cellini (2011) questions the robustness of these findings. The argument is that earlier estimates may suffer from omitted variable bias, as they often fail to adequately control for pre-existing destination characteristics such as historical popularity, accessibility, and quality of tourism infrastructure. Using Italian regional data and fixed-effects models that account for time-invariant heterogeneity, the study finds that the statistical significance of UNESCO designation often diminishes or disappears once these factors are included. This suggests that observed tourism growth may be driven more by underlying structural characteristics of destinations than by UNESCO status per se (Cellini, 2011; Mariani & Guizzardi, 2020). Overall, the empirical literature remains inconclusive regarding the independent causal impact of World Heritage inscription on tourism demand (Peira et al., 2023).

More recent research therefore shifts attention away from aggregate demand effects toward processes of destination repositioning and identity transformation. In Macau, UNESCO inscription has been used strategically to diversify the destination image away from gambling toward cultural tourism (Huang et al., 2012). In Ivrea, WHS designation has supported post-industrial regeneration and cultural rebranding processes (Peira et al., 2023). Although less recent, at Angkor, management strategies increasingly prioritise higher-value, lower-volume tourism segments in response to carrying capacity constraints (Wager, 1995). These developments align with the notion of “heritage tourists,” who tend to be more educated, spend more, and stay longer than mass-market tourists (Kerstetter et al., 2001).

Despite this growing body of research, an important gap remains in understanding how both tourists and residents perceive the *anticipated* effects of UNESCO designation on destination image, particularly at broader territorial or national scales (Peira et al., 2023). Most existing studies focus on post-inscription outcomes and observable economic indicators, with limited attention to pre-designation expectations and cognitive-affective image formation.

To address this gap, this study investigates perceptions of a hypothetical UNESCO World Heritage designation in Andorra from both tourists and residents. The case is particularly relevant given the proposed serial nomination structure, which implies that all Andorra’s seven parishes would host at least one World Heritage Site, enabling analysis of tourism development and diversification at a national scale. The use of a hypothetical scenario allows respondents to evaluate anticipated behavioural intentions and perceived impacts without the confounding influence of an existing inscription. Finally, the study examines how such a serial designation may influence Andorra’s overall destination image, potentially contributing to a shift from a predominantly ski- and retail-oriented identity toward a stronger association with cultural heritage.

3. Case Study: Andorra

3.1. Historical development, tourism transition and contemporary challenges

Although the earliest documented references to Andorra date back to the 9th century, its political identity was consolidated in 1278 with the first *pariatge*, establishing a unique co-sovereignty between the Bishop of Urgell and the Count of Foix. This arrangement ensured long-term institutional continuity and kept the territory largely outside major European processes of annexation and state formation. However, this stability coexisted with a constrained high-mountain environment, where survival depended on a tightly regulated agro-forestry-pastoral system (Cuevas-Contreras, Berthet & Urrutia de la Garza, 2016).

Despite this equilibrium, the traditional model reached structural limits by the late 19th century due to demographic pressure and economic stagnation, leading to emigration and the end of relative isolation. This crisis became a catalyst for profound socioeconomic transformation (Lara, 2022), setting the foundations for Andorra's gradual transition toward a service-based economy.

FHASA development and early modernisation

The early 20th-century crisis reduced the population to 4,309 inhabitants in 1917, triggering significant emigration to France and Catalonia (Lluelles-Larrosa, 2015). These diaspora communities introduced new political ideas, contributing to reform pressures that culminated in the Andorran Revolution of 1933, which introduced universal male suffrage and parliamentary openness.

A decisive turning point came with the 1929 FHASA concession (Forces Hidroelèctriques d'Andorra), which enabled hydroelectric development in exchange for infrastructure investment, particularly road construction. The project attracted over a thousand Spanish workers, producing demographic change, early labour conflict, and a temporary population increase of around 25% (Lara, 2022).

This transformation had immediate economic effects. Population growth and improved connectivity stimulated commerce and hospitality services, while also enabling the emergence of the financial sector, including the first bank of the country in 1930. This improved transport infrastructure ended centuries of geographical isolation and repositioned Andorra as a cross-border space of exchange between France and Spain (Cuevas-Contreras, Berthet & Urrutia de la Garza, 2016).

Tourism emergence and economic diversification

Early tourism in Andorra was based on natural assets such as mountains, snow, and thermal waters, but remained limited due to weak infrastructure and isolation. After FHASA-driven improvements, conditions

allowed a decisive tourism expansion in the 1950s, a decade widely considered as pivotal (García-Lluelles & Lluelles-Larrosa, 2022).

Moreover, growth was driven by rising automobile mobility in neighbouring regions and the gradual liberalisation of the Spanish economy, which facilitated cross-border flows. By the mid-1950s, visitor numbers had already reached several hundred thousand annually, concentrated along key urban corridors. International visibility was also reinforced through events such as the 1958 Brussels World's Fair and Radio Andorra. Andorra also capitalised on its institutional autonomy to develop a distinctive cross-border commercial model based on price differences between France and Spain (Lara, 2022), while the financial sector expanded under favourable regulatory conditions.

During the 1960s, tourism became increasingly state-led, with major investments in ski infrastructure such as Soldeu (1964) and expansion of ski areas. Visitor numbers rose rapidly, supported by improved accessibility and international sporting events (García-Lluelles & Lluelles-Larrosa, 2022). At the same time, reforms allowing foreign property ownership accelerated urbanisation and migration, reshaping both the labour market and social structure.

By the 1970s–1990s, tourism, commerce, and finance had fully consolidated as the three pillars of the economy, with ski tourism as the dominant sector. Visitor flows increased from 2.8 million (1970) to over 9 million by the late 1990s (García-Lluelles & Lluelles-Larrosa, 2022). During this period, investments such as Caldea (1994) were introduced to reduce seasonality, while the 1993 Constitution formalised Andorra as a sovereign constitutional state and ensured institutional stability (Lara, 2022).

Economic consolidation and emerging vulnerabilities

In the 21st century, Andorra consolidated a mature service economy. Financial reforms aligned the country with OECD and EU standards, including the adoption of a modern tax system that replaced its former tax haven status. In 2008, Andorran nationals once again became the majority population, reinforcing social cohesion within an already service-dominated economy (García-Lluelles & Lluelles-Larrosa, 2022).

However, structural vulnerabilities have intensified. Climate change represents a major long-term risk for the ski-based model, with rising temperatures reducing natural snow reliability and increasing dependence on artificial snowmaking (Tejada, 2025). While Andorra's altitude provides partial resilience compared to nearby ski destinations, this adaptation inevitably carries environmental and economic costs.

At the same time, a severe housing crisis—driven by real estate financialisation and foreign investment—has significantly increased living costs and placed pressure on the labour market (Lariau & Tejada, 2025), a dynamic that disproportionately affects service-sector workers and highlights underlying structural imbalances.

Overall, Andorra can be characterised as a mature service economy facing growing constraints linked to environmental change, housing affordability, and economic concentration (Emerson, 2007). While the system remains economically successful, its long-term resilience is increasingly uncertain. In this context, diversification toward new tourism typologies, such as cultural or gastronomic, are emerging not as an option, but as a strategic necessity to reduce seasonality and strengthen economic sustainability.

3.2. Cultural tourism development and the UNESCO candidature “The Material Testimonies of State Formation in the Pyrenees: the Co-principality of Andorra”

The evolution of cultural tourism in Andorra has progressively shifted from being a peripheral and complementary attraction to becoming a fundamental strategic pillar for the deseasonalisation and long-term sustainability of the national economic model. Starting in the 1980s, public policy began to value heritage not only as an element of identity and integration for the immigrant population, but also as a tool to enhance urban attractiveness and diversify the tourism offer beyond skiing (Lara, 2022).

This process of internationalisation was reinforced in the early 2000s with the designation of the Vall del Madriu-Perafita-Claror as a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 2004, alongside the development of high-visibility cultural programming such as Cirque du Soleil. These initiatives have contributed to extending the tourist season and consolidating Andorra’s image as a more diversified destination. Today, the country offers a dense cultural landscape, including more than 40 Romanesque churches and around 20 museums, as well as four elements inscribed on UNESCO’s Intangible Cultural Heritage list: the summer solstice fire festivals, transhumance practices, bear-related traditions, and dry stone construction techniques.

Despite this cultural richness, visitor behaviour still reflects a structural imbalance linked to Andorra’s historical positioning as a ski and shopping destination. Cultural tourism plays a secondary role in overall visitor motivations, particularly among short-duration visits, where shopping remains the dominant driver. By contrast, cultural motivations are more visible among visitors who stay longer, with cultural offerings proving more effective in encouraging extended stays than in shaping quick cross-border visits. For

instance, border survey data from October 2025 shows that cultural leisure accounted for around 6.4% of total tourism motivations.

A major milestone in the development of this tourism model was the January 2026 submission of the UNESCO nomination “*The Material Testimonies of State Formation in the Pyrenees: the Co-principality of Andorra.*” This transnational candidature, developed jointly by Andorra, France, and Spain, highlights the exceptional governance system of the Andorran co-principality. The nominated serial property comprises twelve component sites that together articulate Andorra’s historical and territorial landscape. Two of these sites are located outside Andorra, while the remaining ten are within its borders:

- The Cathedral complex of La Seu d’Urgell (Spain) and the Château de Foix (France), which represent the external seats of power of the co-princes.
- The Romanesque churches of Sant Joan de Caselles, Sant Romà de les Bons, Sant Martí de la Cortinada, Sant Climent de Pal, Santa Coloma, Sant Serni de Nagol, and Sant Miquel d’Engolasters (one for every parish in Andorra).
- The archaeological sites of Roc d’Enclar and La Roureda de la Margineda.
- Casa de la Vall, the historic seat of the General Council.

Despite its transnational scope, the serial property is contained within a relatively compact geographical area: Foix Castle and La Seu d’Urgell Cathedral are separated by only approximately 70 kilometres in a straight line, while the Andorran component sites are distributed within a radius of roughly 10 kilometres. These monuments—religious, civil, and defensive in nature—underscore the singularity of Andorra’s governance model, rooted in shared sovereignty, and reflect a broader message about the enduring value of dialogue, consensus, and cooperation.

Although Andorra already has five elements inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List—including the Vall del Madriu-Perafita-Claror (which represents approximately 10% of the national territory) and four intangible cultural heritage elements (fire festivals, transhumance, bear festivals, and dry stone craftsmanship)—the nomination is associated with a spatial distribution of heritage assets across the territory, with each parish hosting at least one World Heritage-related site within the proposed framework.

4. Methodology

4.1. Research design

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design, integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine perceptions of the nomination “*The Material Evidence of State Formation in the Pyrenees: The Co-Principality of Andorra*” for inscription on the UNESCO World Heritage List, as well as its potential implications for the Andorran tourism sector.

The study is guided by the following hypotheses:

H1: Recognition as a UNESCO World Heritage Site is perceived as a factor that can enhance Andorra’s international destination image.

H2: Recognition as a UNESCO World Heritage Site may increase interest in cultural tourism resources and contribute to the diversification of Andorra’s tourism offer.

The selection of stakeholder groups and data collection instruments was guided by the need to capture complementary perspectives from both demand (visitors and residents) and supply (institutional and professional actors) sides of the tourism system.

Fieldwork was conducted in May, a period characterised by relatively lower tourist inflows and a demand profile that does not correspond to the ski season. This timing enabled the research to analyse tourist profiles more inclined to explore the country beyond its snow-related offerings, thereby minimising potential seasonality effects on respondents’ perceptions. Access to the field setting and study participants was facilitated through institutional contacts within the Department of Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport, which supported the organisation of data collection activities.

4.2. Data collection

4.2.1 Quantitative methods

a) Structured consultation with residents

A structured consultation was administered to adult residents of Andorra. The consultation was distributed through the institutional communication channels of the Cultural Heritage Department. The final sample comprised 52 respondents. The consultation remained open for 48 hours in order to proceed with the data analysis phase within the research timeline.

The instrument included a structured questionnaire composed of closed-ended items, including Likert-scale and multiple-choice questions. It aimed to assess respondents' awareness of UNESCO and of the nomination, perceptions of the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed properties, attitudes towards cultural tourism in Andorra, perceived positive and negative impacts of the nomination, and perceived effects of UNESCO recognition on Andorra's international destination image.

b) Visitor survey

An in-person survey was administered to visitors, including both tourists and day-trippers, at various locations across Andorra during May 2026. Fieldwork was conducted over three weekend days in order to capture a diverse range of visitor profiles.

A convenience sampling approach was used, with participants approached on-site and invited to participate in the survey. The selected locations were the area in front of the large "Andorra la Vella" letters photo spot (a highly frequented tourist point in the city centre), and the Mirador del Roc d'Enclar, one of the main scenic viewpoints in the country. These locations were selected due to their high visitor flow and their representation of both urban-touristic and landscape-based attractions.

During the survey, respondents were shown the official nomination flyer to provide a visual reference for the sites under study. Participation was limited to visitors able to communicate in Catalan, Spanish, French, or English, which introduced a language-based exclusion criterion.

The final sample consisted of 158 respondents. The survey collected sociodemographic and travel-related information, including country of origin, age, trip typology, and length of stay. It also explored respondents' prior relationship with Andorra, travel motivations, awareness of UNESCO, previous experience with World Heritage Sites, and perceived influence of UNESCO designation on decisions to visit the nominated sites.

4.2.2 Qualitative methods

a) Participant observation of professional mountain guides

Participant observation was conducted during a training course attended by six professional mountain guides between 4 and 9 May 2026. The course, organised by the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport in collaboration with the School of Training for Sports and Mountain Professions (EFPEM), aimed to strengthen participants' knowledge of Andorran cultural heritage and support its integration into professional tourism practice.

As part of the fieldwork, training sessions and field visits were observed, including excursions to heritage sites associated with the UNESCO nomination: the archaeological sites of Roc d'Enclar and Roureda de la Margineda, and the Romanesque church of Santa Coloma. Informal discussions were conducted to explore participants' perceptions of the nomination and its potential implications for their professional practice.

Mountain guides were selected due to their role as intermediaries in the interpretation and communication of cultural heritage within nature-based tourism contexts, where they directly influence visitor experience and site understanding. This approach allowed for the analysis of how UNESCO recognition is understood and integrated into professional practice, providing insights that complement the visitor survey and resident consultation.

b) Focus group with public sector stakeholders

A focus group discussion was conducted to complement the quantitative survey data with qualitative insights. The session involved professionals from the Department of Cultural Heritage of Andorra and was organised following the preliminary analysis of the resident consultation and visitor survey, in order to help interpret and contextualise the initial findings.

This method was selected because it allows for the exploration of collective expert perspectives and the discussion of shared institutional approaches. The focus group was included to capture institutional and governance perspectives regarding the implementation and communication of the UNESCO candidature.

The discussion aimed to explore expert perspectives on the potential impacts and challenges of the UNESCO candidature, including the interpretation of cultural tourism, the role of UNESCO recognition in shaping visitor behaviour and destination image, and key structural factors influencing its implementation. Particular attention was given to issues such as site accessibility, coordination between stakeholders, and the territorial distribution of the nominated properties. The session was audio-recorded to ensure accurate transcription and reporting of the main thematic insights.

4.3. Data analysis

Quantitative data from the resident consultation and visitor survey were analysed using descriptive statistics. Frequencies and percentages were used to summarise responses to closed-ended questions, including Likert-scale and multiple-choice items. Cross-tabulations were applied in the visitor survey to examine relationships between selected variables, such as travel motivations, visit intention, and perceived influence of UNESCO recognition.

Qualitative data from the focus group and participant observation were analysed using thematic analysis. Audio recordings and field notes were reviewed to identify recurring themes related to cultural tourism, perceptions of the UNESCO nomination, and implementation challenges. Both datasets were integrated during the interpretation phase to allow comparison between quantitative and qualitative findings.

5. Results

5.1. Quantitative results

5.1.1. Resident consultation

The following results derive from the consultation conducted with 52 adult residents in Andorra. Regarding the socio-demographic profile of respondents, 3.8% were between 18 and 29 years old, 17.3% between 30 and 44, 61.5% between 45 and 64, and 17.3% were 65 years or older. In terms of gender, 61.5% identified as women, 36.5% as men, and one person identified as non-binary.

When asked about the importance of cultural tourism within Andorra's tourism offer, responses were mainly concentrated in the lower-middle range of the scale (1–5). Ratings of 2 and 3 each accounted for 36.5% of responses, followed by 4 (13.5%), 5 (7.7%), and 1 (5.8%).

A high level of familiarity with UNESCO was observed among respondents, with 86.5% indicating awareness of UNESCO and the World Heritage List. However, awareness of the specific nomination was lower, with 61.5% reporting prior knowledge and 38.5% stating that they were not aware of it prior to the consultation.

After being introduced to the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, respondents were asked to evaluate the extent to which the nominated elements reflect this value. The results show a generally positive perception, with 44.2% selecting 4 and 36.5% selecting 5. Lower values were less frequent, with 7.7% selecting both 2 and 3, and 3.8% selecting 1.

A similar pattern was observed regarding how UNESCO recognition could improve Andorra's international tourism image. Positive responses were equally distributed between 4 and 5 (35.3% each), followed by 19.6% selecting 3 and 9.8% selecting 2, while no respondents selected 1.

Regarding perceived positive impacts of the nomination, respondents most frequently identified diversification of the tourism offer (69.2%), followed by attraction of higher-quality tourism (61.5%), increased economic benefits (44.2%), and tourism de-seasonalisation (36.5%). A small proportion (9.6%) selected none of the listed positive impacts.

In terms of negative impacts, the most frequently mentioned concern was the risk of deterioration of heritage sites (48.1%), followed by increased pressure on infrastructure and public services (28.8%) and

tourism overcrowding (11.5%). A minority of respondents identified loss of cultural identity (1.9%), while 38.5% selected none of the proposed negative impacts.

5.1.2 Visitor Survey

A total of 158 tourists participated in the survey. The sample was composed mainly of visitors from Spain (32 respondents), France (22), United Kingdom (16), United States (16) and Germany (13), followed by other nationalities. Regarding gender, 51.3% of respondents were women and 48.7% were men. The age distribution was relatively balanced, with the largest group being tourists aged 65 or older (34.2%), followed by those aged 45–65 (25.9%), 18–29 (21.5%) and 30–44 (18.4%).

In terms of travel behaviour, half of the respondents reported travelling as a couple (50%), while the remaining participants travelled with friends (22.2%), with family (12.7%), alone (9.5%) or under other arrangements (5.7%).

The majority of the sample (77.2%) stated that it was their first visit to Andorra, while 22.8% had visited the destination previously. Regarding length of stay, the most common duration was two nights (24.8%), followed by one night (23.4%) and three nights (13.9%). A small proportion of respondents were day visitors (7%), while 5.7% reported stays longer than five nights.

Regarding travel motivations, nature-related activities (42.4%) and culture (40.5%) were the most frequently selected options, followed by shopping (27.2%). “Curiosity” was also reported by 21.5% of respondents as a travel motivation, although it was not included as a predefined category.

Concerning UNESCO awareness, only 4.4% of respondents reported being unfamiliar with UNESCO and the WHL. While 66% stated that they had previously visited a WHS, 31.4% were unsure whether they had previously visited a WHS.

Regarding Andorra’s UNESCO candidature sites, 43.7% of respondents had neither visited nor intended to visit them, while 37.3% reported having visited or intending to visit, and 19% were undecided.

When asked about the potential influence of a UNESCO designation on their decision to visit the sites, using a scale from 1 to 5, the predominant response was 3 (*neutral*, 42.4%), followed by 5 (*much more likely*, 29.7%) and 4 (*somewhat more likely*, 27.8%). No respondents selected 1 or 2.

Nonetheless, differences in perceived influence of UNESCO designation emerge according to visitors’ intentions. Among respondents who have already visited or intend to visit the sites, the UNESCO label is

predominantly perceived as neutral (64.4%), suggesting a limited influence on their visit decision. In contrast, tourists who do not intend to visit present a more balanced distribution of responses, with 36.2% reporting a neutral stance, 30.4% indicating that a UNESCO designation would make them somewhat more likely to visit, and 33.4% stating that it would make them much more likely to visit. Finally, undecided tourists represent the group with the highest potential responsiveness, as 86.7% indicated that UNESCO recognition would positively influence their decision to visit (somewhat or much more likely).

The following table presents the perceived influence of UNESCO designation according to visitors' intention to visit the candidature sites:

	<i>Neutral (3)</i>	<i>Somewhat more likely (4)</i>	<i>Much more likely (5)</i>	Positive influence (4 and 5)
Have visited / Intend to visit	64.4%	13.6%	22%	35.6%
Undecided	13.3%	50%	36.7%	86.7%
Have not visited / Not intend to visit	36.2%	30.4%	33.4%	63.8%

Table 1. Row percentages of perceived UNESCO influence according to visit intention. Own elaboration.

Finally, clear differences emerge in travel motivations. Among the listed purposes, “nature-based activities” was selected by 42.4% of visitors, followed closely by “culture” (40.5%) and “shopping” (27.2%).

Distinct patterns also appear in relation to the intention to visit UNESCO candidature sites. Shopping-oriented tourists show the highest proportion of respondents with no intention to visit these sites (58%), whereas nature-oriented tourists exhibit the strongest engagement, with 73% reporting that they have visited or intend to visit them. Cultural tourists fall in between, with 69% expressing similar engagement.

Among respondents with no intention to visit, attitudes towards the influence of UNESCO differ. Table 2 shows the distribution of perceived UNESCO influence (row percentages) among visitors with no initial intention to visit, segmented by travel motivation.

	Have not visited / No intention to visit (%)	Neutral (3)	Somewhat more likely (4)	Much more likely (5)
<i>Shopping</i>	58%	44%	16%	40%
<i>Nature</i>	27%	38.9%	38.9%	22.2%
<i>Culture</i>	31%	30%	30%	40%

Table 2. Distribution of perceived UNESCO influence (row percentages) among visitors with no initial intention to visit, segmented by travel motivation. Own elaboration.

On the one hand, shopping tourists represent the highest percentage of visitors with no initial intention to visit the candidature sites, with 58% reporting no prior visit intention. Among these respondents, almost half remained neutral regarding the potential UNESCO recognition (44%). Nevertheless, a considerable proportion indicated that the UNESCO label would positively influence their decision to visit, with 40% stating they would be much more likely to visit and 16% somewhat more likely.

On the other hand, nature tourists appear to be less influenced by a potential UNESCO designation. Among respondents with no initial intention to visit, 38.9% remained neutral and another 38.9% reported being somewhat more likely to visit, while only 22.2% indicated they would be much more likely to visit.

Responses among culture tourists were more evenly distributed. Of those with no initial intention to visit, 30% remained neutral, 30% reported being somewhat more likely to visit, and 40% indicated they would be much more likely to visit following a UNESCO designation.

Finally, differences are also observed in length of stay, with nature-oriented tourists reporting a slightly longer average stay (2.6 nights), followed by cultural tourists (2.3 nights) and shopping-oriented tourists (2.0 nights).

5.2. Qualitative results

5.2.1 Participant observation of professional mountain guides

The results presented below derive from the observation conducted during the training sessions and from the interactions among the group of six mountain guides participating in the cultural heritage training programme promoted by the Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sport in collaboration with the School for Sports and Mountain Professions Training (EFPEM).

Several relevant aspects were identified through the observation of these sessions and group interactions. First, all six participants agreed that their professional activity is closely linked to cultural heritage, particularly regarding the cultural landscape and the historical evolution of the territory. In this sense, no clear distinction was perceived between nature-based tourism and cultural tourism; rather, participants described an interdependent relationship that enables an integrated interpretation of the territory. However, participants also expressed the need to develop cultural training strategies in order to communicate heritage in a professional and appropriate manner. This was considered essential for encouraging the creation of hybrid tourism products based on the authenticity of the environment and on the historical relationship between human communities and the natural landscape.

Regarding the UNESCO nomination, differing levels of awareness were observed among participants. Three participants had no prior knowledge of the nomination, while the other three stated that they were aware of its existence, although without detailed knowledge of its content or transnational dimension. Once the nomination had been presented during the course, all participants agreed on its potential positive impact on their professional activity, particularly in relation to the development of new itineraries and tourism services linked to the heritage sites visited. Although some of these products were already considered viable independently of UNESCO recognition, participants indicated that the UNESCO label could strengthen their visibility and promotional capacity within the tourism market.

Third, one participant stated that, based on his experience as a mountain guide working in Andorra's only current UNESCO World Heritage site, Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley, the impact of the UNESCO label had been relatively limited. According to this participant, the main constraints were, first, the short duration of tourist stays and, second, the location of the site within a natural environment that requires a certain level of physical fitness and willingness to access it on foot. The participant suggested that a similar situation could occur in relation to the two archaeological sites included in the nomination, thereby creating a strong distinction between heritage assets that are easily accessible (such as the seven Romanesque churches and Casa de la Vall) and those that can only be reached on foot, such as the archaeological site of Roc d'Enclar.

Finally, all participants agreed that UNESCO recognition would strengthen Andorra's tourism image. More specifically, they emphasised the importance of promoting co-principality as a unique feature capable of differentiating and enriching the country's image, and they considered UNESCO recognition to be a highly effective tool for achieving this objective. Nevertheless, participants also expressed concerns regarding their ability to communicate the country's cultural heritage appropriately, highlighting the need

to improve their training in this area and to continue receiving ongoing support and training from public institutions.

5.2.2. Focus group with public sector stakeholders

Following the analysis of the consultation and survey results, the findings were presented and discussed with professionals from the Department of Cultural Heritage of Andorra. The discussion generated several relevant insights regarding the potential and challenges of the UNESCO candidature. A key point was the distinction between different forms of cultural engagement, differentiating between cultural tourists, who actively seek heritage experiences, and cultural “excursionists”, for whom cultural visits are incidental. This was summarised as the difference between “going to” and “wanting to go”. In this context, UNESCO recognition was considered to have limited influence on visitors already motivated by cultural heritage, but greater relevance for undecided segments, where it was seen mainly as a general promotional instrument that may also support the communication of Andorra’s historical and identity narrative.

A second set of insights concerned identity and interpretation. The importance of strengthening the narrative around the nominated sites was highlighted, particularly in relation to visitors motivated by curiosity, which was interpreted as being linked more to Andorra’s identity as a mountain microstate than to its historical or institutional specificity. In this sense, UNESCO inscription was viewed as a potential legitimising tool to increase visibility of the country’s political uniqueness, its co-principality. It was also noted that visitors are unlikely to experience all nominated sites within a single stay, reinforcing the need for each site to function both independently and as part of a coherent system. From a diversification perspective, Casa de la Vall was identified as a key site due to its high visitation levels and year-round accessibility, making it an important anchor for cultural tourism beyond peak seasons.

Finally, the discussion addressed structural and territorial aspects of the candidature. It was suggested that UNESCO recognition could contribute to a more decentralised distribution of tourism flows across the territory, given the geographical dispersion of the nominated sites across different parishes. However, the potential impact of the candidature was also seen as dependent on several constraints, including accessibility, length of stay, and strong seasonality. Differences in accessibility and visitor capacity were highlighted as potential sources of uneven flows between sites, reinforcing the need for coordinated management and a shared strategy integrating heritage interpretation, tourism development, and cultural policy.

6. Discussion

After analysing the results, the findings support the first hypothesis: that UNESCO recognition could strengthen Andorra's international destination image. Most residents associated UNESCO recognition with this positive outcome, indicating strong perceived support for its potential contribution to the country's international image. As the candidature involves ten geographically distributed sites, Andorra's case can be interpreted as a form of "UNESCO cluster", whereby a concentration of heritage assets generates more favourable visitor evaluations than isolated attractions and contributes to the valorisation of the wider tourism area in which they are embedded (Mariani & Guizzardi, 2020).

Following Macau's case, UNESCO recognition could contribute to "re-modelling" Andorra's tourism image by adding a cultural dimension to its already established identity. As happened in Macau, through the incorporation of additional tourism products, the destination succeeded in promoting a more multifaceted image that did not replace the existing one but rather enriched it with a new cultural dimension (Huang et al., 2012). A similar dynamic was observed in Ivrea, Italy, where UNESCO recognition helped connect the industrial Olivetti heritage with surrounding assets such as the Gran Paradiso National Park and historical castles, creating a more coherent destination image through a "complementary effect" between cultural and natural resources that appealed to different visitor segments (Peira et al., 2023).

Finally, focus group results highlight that Andorra's competitive advantage lies in its inherent uniqueness as a European mountain microstate. While its current tourism image is heavily concentrated on modern urban offerings and mountain landscapes, there is a clear opportunity to enhance this by promoting its singular status as the world's only Co-principality. In this context, UNESCO recognition may function as more than a promotional instrument, providing international legitimacy to aspects of Andorra's identity that are otherwise difficult to communicate to external audiences. As Poria et al. (2013) suggest, the designation provides a "global recommendation". In Andorra's case, the UNESCO brand can confer a sense of "objective authenticity" upon the country's institutional context, helping transform its historical and institutional narrative into a tangible tourism resource. While national histories and political traditions may often remain abstract for visitors (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006), the prestige of the UNESCO label may provide the necessary authorisation to transform Andorra's unique political legacy into a physical and credible tourism asset.

Regarding the second hypothesis, which suggests that UNESCO recognition may increase interest in cultural tourism resources and contribute to the diversification of Andorra's tourism offer, the findings

provide partial support for this proposition. Overall, UNESCO designation is predominantly perceived as having a neutral influence on visitation intentions (42.4%), suggesting a limited capacity to alter pre-existing intentions. This neutral perception is particularly pronounced among respondents who have already visited or intend to visit the sites, suggesting limited additional influence on individuals already predisposed towards cultural engagement with the destination. This finding is consistent with the profile of “seasoned” tourists, whose visitation decisions are influenced primarily by the intrinsic qualities and perceived authenticity of heritage sites rather than by external branding (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006).

In contrast, undecided visitors appear considerably more responsive to UNESCO recognition. As in Quebec’s case, this suggests that the UNESCO label may play a more significant role in shaping the behaviour of “accidental tourists” within the destination, rather than visitors already motivated by its cultural heritage (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006). This segment is particularly noteworthy considering the significant proportion of curiosity-driven visitors identified during the research, whose motivations were not linked to a specific tourism activity but rather to a general interest in discovering the destination. Within this context, UNESCO recognition may operate as a recognised signal of quality that facilitates the exploration of lesser-known areas (Wuepper & Patry, 2017).

The UNESCO label is also positively perceived by nature- and shopping-oriented tourists without initial intentions to visit the sites. This suggests that UNESCO recognition retains appeal even among visitor segments whose primary motivations are unrelated to cultural heritage, supporting its role in broadening the attractiveness of the nominated sites beyond a strictly cultural audience. Moreover, Andorra’s case is particularly noteworthy given the breadth of its natural attractions, which often enhance the branding potential of UNESCO sites located near natural areas (Wuepper & Patry, 2017). Therefore, rather than directly reshaping travel motivations, the UNESCO label appears to operate as a complementary layer of interest within existing tourism profiles, which may indirectly contribute to diversification effects.

Following the case of the Val di Noto serial site in Sicily, the incorporation of ten geographically distributed sites allows Andorra to implement a “cultural district” model (Cuccia, 2012). Such a framework seeks to promote endogenous local development through the valorisation of both tangible cultural heritage and intangible expressions of national culture. In Andorra, this could be achieved by creating a “creative atmosphere” that links the nominated sites with local know-how in gastronomy and niche agriculture, such as the traditional *bordes*, similar to how the Sicilian model linked Baroque heritage with locally distinctive products such as wine and olive oil. However, the Val di Noto experience also serves as a warning: the success of a cultural district depends on overcoming institutional deficiencies through strong horizontal coordination among the seven parishes to ensure a unified

development strategy rather than fragmented and parish-specific initiatives, a challenge that was also highlighted during the focus group discussions.

Beyond diversification, residents also identified the attraction of “higher-quality tourism” as a key potential benefit. This perception aligns with Yang et al. (2010), who associate UNESCO designation with the strengthening of heritage-oriented tourism profiles and the attraction of more culturally engaged visitors in China. Collectively, these perceptions suggest that UNESCO recognition is associated not only with an expansion of tourism interest but also with a perceived qualitative shift in the type of demand expected.

Regarding potential drawbacks, concerns regarding tourism massification and potential loss of cultural identity were relatively uncommon among respondents. However, nearly half of respondents identified the deterioration of cultural sites as a potential risk. This sensitivity towards site integrity aligns with the findings of Peira et al. (2023), who emphasise that the long-term sustainability of World Heritage Sites depends heavily on efficient management and the ability to balance tourism development with the conservation of heritage assets.

Nonetheless, several challenges must be highlighted. First, the spatial distribution of the nominated sites presents accessibility challenges. The sites are dispersed across the territory, often located in areas accessible only by car and, in some cases, only on foot, such as the archaeological site of Roc d’Enclar. As highlighted by one of the mountain guides, physical accessibility constraints, combined with the relatively short average length of stay, may reduce the tourism potential of remote heritage sites. Consequently, the effectiveness of UNESCO designation may depend not only on symbolic recognition but also on the integration of the sites into broader tourism mobility and interpretation strategies.

Second, the tourism potential of most nominated sites may be constrained by seasonality, particularly given the harsh mountain conditions during winter. Nevertheless, the qualitative findings reveal significant potential for the development of hybrid nature-based and cultural tourism products during the summer season. In this regard, the nomination may encourage more integrated tourism experiences grounded in the concept of cultural landscape, creating a “matching effect” between natural and cultural assets that increases overall appeal (Wuepper & Patry, 2017). Such an approach could contribute to a partial rebalancing of tourism flows beyond the winter peak season and potentially support the type of seasonality stabilisation observed in other serial heritage destinations (Cuccia, 2012).

Overall, the results suggest that UNESCO recognition in Andorra acts primarily as a reinforcing element within existing tourism dynamics rather than a factor capable of substantially reshaping them. Its effects

vary across visitor profiles, being more relevant for less defined segments, while remaining limited among those already engaged with cultural heritage. At the same time, the findings indicate that its role is linked not only to potential changes in visitation patterns but also to perceptions of destination image, particularly in terms of international visibility and qualitative enhancement of Andorra's cultural profile. However, these effects are conditioned by structural and territorial factors such as accessibility, length of stay, dispersion of sites, and seasonality, which influence how both image-related and behavioural impacts of the designation materialise in practice.

7. Conclusions

This study set out to examine the potential effects of a possible UNESCO World Heritage designation on tourism dynamics and destination image in Andorra, with particular attention to tourism diversification and visitor behaviour. To achieve this objective, a mixed-methods approach was adopted, combining quantitative data from a resident consultation and a visitor survey with qualitative data from stakeholder discussions and participant observation. This design enabled a multi-actor perspective on the perceived impacts of the nomination and a clearer understanding of how different visitor segments respond to the UNESCO label in a hypothetical context. The analysis was structured around two hypotheses: first, that UNESCO recognition could strengthen Andorra's international tourism image; and second, that it could increase interest in cultural tourism resources and contribute to diversification of the tourism offer. Overall, the findings provide strong support for the first hypothesis and partial support for the second, as UNESCO recognition is primarily associated with symbolic and image-related effects, while its behavioural influence varies across visitor profiles.

Andorra's case is particularly significant for several reasons. First, it highlights how, although UNESCO recognition is generally perceived as neutral, it has a noticeable influence on tourists without a predefined itinerary, thereby reinforcing what previous literature has described as a quality label or a "global effect". Moreover, the results of this research suggest that UNESCO recognition can serve as an effective tool to attract specific tourism profiles, such as shopping-oriented or nature-oriented visitors. The latter is particularly relevant in the case of Andorra, where it has been conceptualised as a means of promoting cultural heritage through the development of hybrid nature–culture products.

Second, UNESCO recognition is generally perceived as an improvement in Andorra's international tourist image. Although this effect may appear somewhat abstract, it is particularly significant in Andorra's case, given its uniqueness as the only Co-principality in the world. Beyond being a European mountain microstate—already associated with a distinctive destination image—UNESCO recognition may further enhance this perception by adding value to its institutional uniqueness. In this sense, UNESCO recognition can be understood as a tool capable of communicating a visual and symbolic narrative of Andorra's history, which alternative branding strategies may struggle to convey effectively to all audience segments.

Finally, the effectiveness of UNESCO recognition does not depend solely on the label itself, but also on the capacity of the various stakeholders involved to appropriately communicate and transfer knowledge regarding the nomination. In Andorra's case, this is particularly relevant due to its nature as a serial nomination. In such a context, all sites involved, as well as the institutional actors managing them, should

adopt a coordinated strategy to ensure that the nomination generates balanced impacts across all sites and parishes.

Overall, the case of Andorra contributes to research on the impacts of UNESCO World Heritage Sites by offering a complementary perspective in which recognition is analysed in a hypothetical context, allowing for more controlled insights into visitors' intentions. The findings are consistent with existing literature and reinforce the idea that UNESCO recognition not only reshapes the destination image, but can also introduce additional layers or dimensions to it.

A limitation of this study is the lack of segmentation at the level of individual sites within the nomination. The assets included show different visitation patterns, opening conditions, and levels of accessibility, which results in uneven tourist flows. This is particularly evident in the case of Casa de la Vall, which, due to its central location and status as the most visited museum in Andorra, attracts a disproportionate share of visitors compared to other sites. A more detailed, site-level analysis would therefore have helped to better understand how demand is distributed and how visitors behave across the different assets.

Second, the study did not include information on tourists' mode of transport. This is a limitation because transport choice—especially for visitors using private vehicles—can provide useful insights into how cultural sites are integrated into wider itineraries within the destination.

In addition, the resident consultation and tourist survey were based on relatively small samples, which may not fully reflect the range of views within the destination. The tourist survey was also carried out during a specific period of the year, May, meaning the results mainly reflect the profiles and perceptions of visitors present at that time. For this reason, the findings should be interpreted with caution, as they do not cover all tourist nationalities and tourism typologies that visit Andorra throughout the year.

Building on these limitations, future research should involve larger and more diverse samples of both residents and tourists and be conducted across different seasons. This would provide a more complete picture of how different visitor segments behave and perceive the destination. Future studies could also explore visitor mobility patterns and the role of cultural heritage in travel decision-making processes. If the nomination is successful, it would also be interesting to assess how UNESCO World Heritage status might contribute to strengthening the image and positioning of the “Co-Principality” brand.

8. Bibliography

- Cellini, R. (2011). Is UNESCO recognition effective in fostering tourism? A comment on Yang, Lin and Han. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 452–454.
- Cuccia, T. (2012). Is it worth being inscribed in the World Heritage List? A case study of “The Baroque Cities in Val di Noto” (Sicily). *Rivista Italiana di Economia Demografia e Statistica*, 66(2), 169–190
- Cuevas-Contreras, T., Berthet, N., & Urrutia de la Garza, J. A. (2016). Andorra: Actual nodal context of tourism between France and Spain [Andorra: Contexto nodal actual del turismo entre Francia y España]. *Transitare: Revista de Turismo, Economía y Negocios*, 2(1), 74–99.
- D’Eramo, M. (2014). UNESCOcide. *New Left Review*, 88, 81–94.
- Emerson, M. (2007). *Andorra and the European Union*. Centre for European Policy Studies.
- Ferri, P., & Zan, L. (2014). Ten years after: The rise and fall of managerial autonomy in Pompeii. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 25, 368–387.
- Garcia i Lluelles, E. (2024). Andorra i els impactes territorials del turisme. In *20es Trobades Culturals Pirinenques: La protecció del territori pirinenc* (pp. 301–308). Societat Andorrana de Ciències.
- Garcia-Lluelles, E., & Lluelles Larrosa, M. J. (2022). Andorra de la segona meitat del segle XX al segle XXI. In *Relat Històric d’Andorra*. Govern d’Andorra.
- Garcia-Lluelles, E., Cánoves Valiente, G., & Casalprim-Ramonet, M. (2023). El impacto del turismo en Andorra: La percepción de los residentes. *Cuadernos de Turismo*, 52, 123–147.
- Garrod, B., & Fyall, A. (2000). Managing heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 682–708.
- Govern d’Andorra. (2024). *Andorra en xifres 2024*. Ministeri de Presidència, Economia, Treball i Habitatge.
- Huang, C. H., Tsaur, J. R., & Yang, C. H. (2012). Does World Heritage List really induce more tourists? Evidence from Macau. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1450–1457.
- Kerstetter, D. L., Confer, J. J., & Graefe, A. R. (2001). An exploration of the specialization concept within the context of heritage tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(3), 267–274.
- Lara, Y. (2022). Una nova Andorra. In *Relat Històric d’Andorra*. Govern d’Andorra.
- Lariau, A., & Tejada, M. (2025). *Housing affordability in Andorra* (IMF Selected Issues Paper No. SIP/2025/151). International Monetary Fund.
- Lluelles Larrosa, M. J. (2015). Impacte de les migracions a Andorra: Procés d’intercanvi d’idees i persones. *Annals 2014–15*, 47–58.

Marcotte, P., & Bourdeau, L. (2006). Tourists' knowledge of the UNESCO designation of World Heritage Sites: The case of visitors to Quebec City. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 8(2), 4–13.

Mariani, M. M., & Guizzardi, A. (2020). Does designation as a UNESCO World Heritage Site influence tourist evaluation of a local destination? *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(1), 22–36.

Peira, G., Pasino, G., Bonadonna, A., & Beltramo, R. (2023). A UNESCO site as a tool to promote local attractiveness: Investigating stakeholders' opinions. *Land*, 12(1), 11.

Pons-Pons, M., Johnson, P. A., Rosas-Casals, M., Sureda, B., & Jover, È. (2012). Modeling climate change impacts on winter ski tourism in Andorra. *Climate Research*, 54, 197–207.

Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Cohen, R. (2013). Tourists' perceptions of World Heritage Site and its designation. *Tourism Management*, 35, 272–274.

Tejada, C. M. (2025). *Climate change in small open economies: The case of Andorra* (IMF Selected Issues Paper No. SIP/2025/153). International Monetary Fund.

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (n.d.). *Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Wager, J. (1995). Developing a strategy for the Angkor World Heritage Site. *Tourism Management*, 16(7), 515–523.

Wuepper, D., & Patry, M. (2017). The World Heritage list: Which sites promote the brand? A big data spatial econometrics approach. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 41(1), 1–21.

Yang, C. H., Lin, H. L., & Han, C. C. (2010). Analysis of international tourist arrivals in China: The role of World Heritage Sites. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 827–837.

9. Appendices

Appendix A. Resident consultation

1. What is your age?
☐ 18–29 ☐ 30–44 ☐ 45–64 ☐ 65+
2. With which gender do you identify?
☐ Female ☐ Male ☐ Non-binary ☐ Prefer not to say
3. On a scale from 1 to 5, how important do you think cultural tourism is within Andorra's tourism offer? (1 = very low importance; 5 = very high importance)
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
4. Are you familiar with UNESCO and the World Heritage List?
☐ Yes ☐ No
5. Before answering this survey, were you aware of the nomination
“The Material Evidence of State Formation in the Pyrenees: the Co-Principality of Andorra”?
☐ Yes ☐ No
6. Outstanding Universal Value refers to “cultural and/or natural significance which is so exceptional as to transcend national boundaries and to be of common importance for present and future generations of all humanity”. On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent do you consider that the heritage elements included in the nomination reflect this Outstanding Universal Value?
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
7. On a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent do you think UNESCO recognition could improve Andorra's international tourism image?
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5
8. In your opinion, could UNESCO recognition have any of the following positive impacts? (multiple answers possible)
☐ Diversification of the tourism offer
☐ De-seasonalisation of tourism
☐ Increased economic benefits
☐ Attraction of higher-quality tourism
☐ Improved international image
☐ Interest from cultural and academic institutions
☐ None of the above
☐ Other: _
9. In your opinion, could UNESCO recognition have any of the following negative impacts? (multiple answers possible)
☐ Risk of tourism overcrowding
☐ Loss of cultural identity
☐ Risk of deterioration of heritage sites
☐ Increased pressure on infrastructure and public services
☐ None of the above
☐ Other: _

Appendix B. Visitor Survey

1. Where do you come from?
2. With which gender do you identify?
☐ Female ☐ Male ☐ Non-binary ☐ Prefer not to say
3. What is your age?
☐ 18–29 ☐ 30–44 ☐ 45–64 ☐ 65+
4. Who are you travelling with?
☐ Solo ☐ Partner ☐ Family ☐ Friends ☐ Other: _
5. Is this your first visit to Andorra?
☐ Yes ☐ No
6. How many nights are you staying in Andorra?
☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 5+
7. What is the main purpose of your trip to Andorra?
☐ Shopping
☐ Nature-based activities
☐ Cultural activities
☐ Visit to friends or family
☐ Stopover
☐ Other: _
8. Have you already visited or do you plan to visit any of the following cultural sites in Andorra?
 - *Any of the Romanesque churches of Sant Joan de Caselles, Sant Romà de les Bons, Sant Martí de la Cortinada, Sant Climent de Pal, Santa Coloma, Sant Serni de Nagol, and Sant Miquel d'Engolasters*
 - *Any of the archaeological sites of Roc d'Enclar and Roureda de la Margineda*
 - *Casa de la Vall*☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
9. Are you familiar with UNESCO and the World Heritage List?
☐ Yes ☐ No
10. Have you ever visited a UNESCO World Heritage Site anywhere in the world?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I don't know
11. On a scale from 1 to 5, how likely would you be to visit the previously mentioned cultural sites if they were inscribed as UNESCO World Heritage Sites? (1 = much less likely; 3 = no influence; 5 = much more likely)
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5