



# Enlightening Tourism.

## A Pathmaking Journal



Universidad  
de Huelva

## Editorial Team

### Editor in Chief

Alfonso Vargas-Sánchez, University of Huelva, Spain

### Associate Editor

T.C. Huan, National Chiayi University, Taiwan

### Books Review Editor

Steve Watson, York St. John University, United Kingdom

### Secretariat

Cinta Borrero-Domínguez, University of Huelva, Spain

Mirko Perano, University of Salerno, Italy

### Style reviewer and text editor

Beatriz Rodríguez-Arrizabalaga, University of Huelva, Spain

## Editorial Board

José Manuel Alcaraz, Barna Business School, República Dominicana

Mario Castellanos-Verdugo, University of Seville, España

José Antonio Fraiz-Brea, University of Vigo, España

José Manuel Hernández-Mogollón, University of Extremadura, España

Shaul Krakover, Ben Gurion University, Israel

Jean Pierre Levy-Mangin, University of Quebec, Canadá

Tomás López-Guzmán, University of Córdoba, España

Alfonso Morvillo, National Research Council (CNR), Italia

Yasuo Ohe, Chiba University, Japón

María de los Ángeles Plaza-Mejía, University of Huelva, España

Nuria Porrás-Bueno, University of Huelva, España

João Albino Silva, Algarve University, Portugal

## Advisory Board (Spanish Members)

César Camisón-Zornoza, Jaume I University, Spain

Enrique Claver-Cortés, University of Alicante, Spain

María Teresa Fernández-Alles, University of Cádiz, Spain

José Luis Galán-González, University of Seville, Spain

Félix Grande-Torrales, University of Jaén, España

Inmaculada Martín-Rojo, University of Málaga, Spain

Antonio Manuel Martínez-López, University of Huelva, España

Francisco José Martínez-López, University of Huelva, Rector, España

María Jesús Moreno-Domínguez, University of Huelva,

España

Pablo A. Muñoz-Gallego, University of Salamanca, España

Francisco Riquel-Ligero, University of Huelva, España

Josep Francesc Valls-Giménez, ESADE, España

## Advisory Board (Other European Members)

Paulo Aguas, Algarve University, Portugal

Gustavo Barresi, University of Messina, Italy

Carlos Costa, Aveiro University, Portugal

Salvatore Esposito de Falco, University of Rome "La Sapienza", Italy

Sheila Flanagan, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland

Tania Gorcheva, Tsenov Academy of Economics, Bulgaria

Tadeja Jere-Lazanski, University of Primorska, Slovenia

Metin Kozak, Mugla University, Turkey

Álvaro Matias, Lusitana University, Portugal

Claudio Nigro, University of Foggia, Italy

Angelo Presenza, University "G. D'Annunzio" of Chieti-Pescara, Italy

Renee Reid, Glasgow Caledonian University, United Kingdom

## Advisory Board (Members from the rest of the world)

John Allee, American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

Nestor Pedro Braidot, National University of La Plata, Argentina

Roberto Elias Canese, Columbia University, Rector, Paraguay

Luca Casali, Queensland University of Technology, Australia

Nimit Chowdhary, Indian Institute of Tourism and Travel Management, India

Steven Chung-chi Wu, National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwán

Dianne Dredge, Southern Cross University, Australia

Daniel Fesenmaier, Temple University, United States

Babu George, University of Southern Mississippi, United States

Dogan Gursoy, Washington State University, United States

Kanes Rajah, Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa

Albert Yeh Shangpao, I-SHOU University, Taiwán

Pauline Sheldon, University of Hawaii, United States

Germán A. Sierra-Anaya, University of Cartagena de Indias, Rector, Colombia

Xiaohua Yang, University of San Francisco, United States



## **EU membership and the impact on the image and attractiveness on tourism destinations**

Jorge Umbelino

Escola Superior de Hotelaria e Turismo do Estoril; e-Geo,  
FCSH/Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Portugal)

[jorge.umbelino@eshte.pt](mailto:jorge.umbelino@eshte.pt)

José Miguel Rodríguez-Antón

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Spain)

[josem.rodriquez@uam.es](mailto:josem.rodriquez@uam.es)

Maria de la Soledad Celemín-Pedroche

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Spain)

[marisol.celemin@uam.es](mailto:marisol.celemin@uam.es)

Raúl Filipe

Escola Superior de Hotelaria e Turismo do Estoril (Portugal)

[raul.filipe@eshte.pt](mailto:raul.filipe@eshte.pt)

Éricka Amorim

Instituto Politécnico de Tomar; e-Geo, FCSH/Universidade Nova de  
Lisboa (Portugal)

[erickaaa@msn.com](mailto:erickaaa@msn.com)

Maria Adelaide Carranca

e-Geo, FCSH/Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Portugal)

[adelaide.carranca@fcsb.unl.pt](mailto:adelaide.carranca@fcsb.unl.pt)

**ABSTRACT**

*The aim of this paper is twofold. Firstly, it aims to understand if the territory of the European Union (EU) contains any form of identity, with particular effects on tourism. Secondly, to identify how EU citizens interpret the Union in a special way when they choose their international tourist destinations. The key issue is to understand the behaviour of EU nationals as a new form of 'domestic' tourism in the European Union in order to know what factors determine the choice of an international tourism destination in Europe by European citizens and what attributes make a European tourist destination more attractive than other. That is why authors conducted a direct survey on EU residents. A descriptive and a factorial analysis have been applied to more than 600 replies received from 26 States.*

**KEYWORDS:**

*European Union territory; European citizens; tourism demand; tourist behaviour.*

**ECONLIT KEYS:**

*L83; O52; M39.*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

There is no doubt about the importance of tourism in Europe and, in particular, in the EU. It is worth mentioning that ten of the countries included in the top world 25 international tourist destinations are members of this Union. In addition, on the list of the 25 top world international tourism generating countries nine EU members are included. But in this paper what we want to highlight is the behaviour of EU nationals as a new form of 'domestic' tourism in the European Union or, in other words, to set an exploratory observation about the value and characteristics of tourism demand in the EU countries by citizens resident in other Member-States.

Most studies show that tourism used to be considered in the EU as an appropriate matter to the national level, as an application of the general principle of subsidiarity that marks the Union, but in the last few years it has emerged as an essential and interesting issue among the common political and technical responsibilities.

The traditional statement of tourism in the European Union was probably due to the coexistence of countries that primarily used to identify themselves as suppliers and others where is evident an important dimension of tourism offer, so it was difficult to imagine and delimit European policies where everyone could see their interests well defended. But this may be changing, both by the amazing emergence of Asian destinations and by the increasing importance of tourism offer in countries seen as particularly suppliers, a phenomenon supported by the growth of the designated city-breaks which, in turn, was made possible by the significant advances generated in

accessibility by air, rail and road. The inclusion of Article 195 of the Lisbon Treaty, which marks the first time that the topic of tourism was recognized in the Treaty of the Union, is a landmark of the changing trend now diagnosed.

The marketing principles teach that some factors are identified as a limit or an encouragement, but others are even more effective in making (im)possible the tourism demand – the so-called limiting factors or determinants. While the determinants are the conditions for meeting the individual travel (having money and available time, for example), the limiting factors are those that make difficult or impossible a trip to take place (such as the lack of visa, for example) (Cooper, Fletcher, Fyall, Gilbert & Wanhill, 2001; Kotler, Bowen & Makens, 2010; Kozac & Baloglu, 2001). It is commonly recognized that personal motivations are the main drivers of a destination selection (Fesenmaier & Werthner, 2006; Hudson, 2008; Kotler et al., 2010; Middleton, 2002; Moutinho, 2011).

Ironically, not all factors that restrict or disable certain tourist destinations are necessarily the ones that determine its success. Rather, external factors such as economic, financial, social and political, in general, that are not tourist attractions, can be favorable to the decision to purchase or, on the contrary, become restrictive or even impede access to tourist destinations (Buhalis & Costa, 2006; Kotler et al., 2010).

In the European context, the commitment of common development is reflected in the practice of free movement of people, goods and currencies. In all the countries that are members of the Schengen area and with a special condition for those who are also part of the Eurozone, tourists can travel without worrying about fluctuations in the currency exchange and without requesting a visa or having to explain their lives to the immigration services, for example. That is why it is considered interesting to know the real implications of the absence of such barriers in the decision of purchasing a trip to a destination inside or outside the European Union.

A review of some of the most well-known journals in tourism can easily show a few papers running close to this subject (for example: Coles & Hall, 2005; Go & Rovers, 2000; Jansen-Verbeke, Vandenbroucke & Tielen, 2005; Lickorish, 1980; Marrocu & Paci, 2011; O'Byrne, 2001; Pearce, 1988; Rudež & Bojnek, 2008; Szivás, Coles & Hall, 2005; Weidenfeld, 2013), but some of them are outdated and none is really focused in the same subject we are now pointing out.

## **2. THE EUROPEAN UNION AND TOURISM**

Europe is the world's largest tourism destination and it is where one finds the greatest density and diversity of tourist attractions. Tourism has established itself as a key sector of the European economy - in 2010, it was the third most important economic sector (following the trade/distribution and construction) generating around 10% of EU GDP (directly or indirectly) and creating 9.7 million jobs and 1.8 million businesses (EC, 2010a, p. 4).

The importance of tourism in the EU can be illustrated by its contribution to regional development and job creation, sustainable development, the protection and enhancement of natural and cultural heritage and strengthening of a European identity. No less important is the role of the sector in the EU relationship with the third countries: tourism, perhaps more than any other sector, promotes the image of Europe and its values.

However, there is neither a common tourism policy, nor a legal framework with binding requirements for Member States (MS) in this matter and, so far, there seems to be no need for that. Even in the current context of deep economic and financial crisis, Tourism continues to maintain a strong presence in the economy and has shown great resilience to the negative impacts of the crisis. Compared to other sectors in the scene of the functioning of EU institutions, tourism clearly demonstrates the organizational skills of an industry that, despite the multiplicity of the stakeholders involved, has persisted on good economic performances without the need for supranational regulatory framework.

Tourism has traditionally been viewed by MS as an unquestionable national policy, regarded as a domain that was necessary to keep away from EU legal frameworks under the excuse of not harming the diversity and not trivializing products and destinations, in other words, avoiding the risk of becoming monotonous and uninteresting. Instead of synergy and cooperation we have competition.

On the side of the institutions the attention given to the sector summed up, for a long time, only on the business and competitiveness perspective, benefiting the objectives of the internal market but disregarding the opportunity of building a strategic vision for a European policy.

Nevertheless, for some decades the EU ministers responsible for tourism have met informally to discuss the development of guidelines and principles that will govern its best individual performances in the sense that they contribute to the strengthening of European tourism, to promote a European dimension of tourism that can be more than the sum of national policies. This informal, voluntary and intergovernmental action was, somehow, laying the groundwork, if not for a common policy, at least for the consultation of tourism policies in MS, with the assumption of a balance between promoting sustainable development and improving competitiveness.

The year 2002 was marked as the date on which the Council of Ministers, following the EC Communication on "Working together for the future of European tourism" (EC, 2001), unanimously adopted the first resolution specifically on tourism. This communication recognized the importance of European tourism and formulated strategies for the future of the sector.

This communication was followed by three others: the first, in 2003, on the "Basic orientations for the sustainability of European tourism" (EC, 2003), as a consequence of a working group that was created to set guidelines for the sector; another in 2006, dedicated to "A renewed tourism EU policy" (EC, 2006), in particular the strengthening of partnerships; and the last in 2007, which featured an "Agenda for a sustainable and competitive European tourism" (EC, 2007), in other words, and for the first time, raising more consistently the question of a common policy.

It was in this path that, in 2007, the Treaties recognized the importance of tourism. Article 195 of the Lisbon Treaty (EU, 2007), although excluding "any harmonization of the laws and regulations of MS", i.e., away from the institution of a common policy, sets that the Union should "establish specific measures to complement actions within the Member States to achieve the objectives referred to in this Article", thus giving the EU a secondary role to the performances of national policies. That is why the Treaty states that the Union's action should be guided by two objectives: (i) encourage the creation of a favourable environment for the development of undertakings, and (ii) promoting cooperation between the Member States, particularly by the exchange of good practice.

The consecration of a title specifically dedicated to tourism in the Lisbon Treaty follows the long-time perception that it is necessary to develop mechanisms to ensure that Europe can persevere in its position as the world's largest tourist destination, and competes, at the same time, to encourage the creation of jobs by this sec-

tor, under the umbrella of Europe 2020 (EC, 2010b). For the first time, the EU is endowed with the power to support and supplement the action of the MS, establishing the legal basis for a coherent framework of action. According to the European Commission, this means "powers to be able to support, coordinate and supplement the action of Member States in this field" (EC, 2010a, p.4). In our opinion, this reading of Article 195 is an abuse of the EC, a claiming of increased power which is usual in this institution.

Similar to what has been observed in other sectors in which European coordination is only intergovernmental and non-formal (i.e., there is no specific team powered by the Council of the European Union in order to adopt legislative measures concerning the sector, such as exists, for example, for the agriculture, transport or environment), it should be highlighted that it was opened the possibility of developing an integrated approach to tourism, creating a real opportunity to develop activities with a European dimension in this area but, more than that, trying to ensure the consideration of this sector in other common policies.

It should be stressed that the European dimension gains more relevance in the present context, since the non-negligible impact of the crisis, which translates into more upcoming trips, shorter stays and reduced expenditure on the destination, are felt asymmetrically in the MS and affect the EU destination as a whole.

Following the introduction of "tourism" in the Treaty, the European Commission issued a communication, as before mentioned (EC 2010a), which advocated the creation of coordinated initiatives linked to tourism approach and proposed a framework for concerted action to boost the competitiveness and the growth of the sector, ensuring its sustainability, based on various initiatives at the European level or involving several MS.

It is understood in the document that a common operation in tourism should be guided by the strengthening of the competitiveness of the sector, in conjunction with the objectives of Europe 2020, in particular the initiative for an industrial policy, but simultaneously this document supports the answer to the present challenges (in particular, the economic and financial crisis, the growing of international competition, aging population, demographic changes, development of information and communication technologies, the seasonality), all this within the framework of sustainability, the only way to ensure long-term quality of European tourism and the importance of Europe as a tourist destination.



Considering the Madrid Declaration of 2010 (informal ministerial meeting on tourism, which final Report sets out some recommendations for the implementation of a consolidated European policy in the field of tourism), the policy proposed by the Commission is located at the intersection of the two goals presented above, being sure that they are not always easy to combine: improving the competitiveness and growth *versus* the promotion of sustainability. In parallel, the consideration of tourism as a vehicle for identity and bonding of cultures, languages, ways of life, social representations, in general, but also the recovery of natural diversity and built heritage, plays a fundamental role to complete the unique market as well as to contribute to the economic, social and territorial cohesion and to the approximation of the rights of European citizens.

In this framework, four main areas of activity are identified – i) stimulate the competitiveness of the tourism sector in Europe, ii) promote the development of a qualified, responsible and sustainable tourism, III) consolidate the image and profile of Europe as a collection of sustainable and high quality destinations and iv) maximize the potential of EU policies and financial instruments for the development of tourism – which should, hopefully, be developed in cooperation by the Commission, Member States and stakeholders while respecting the principle of subsidiarity and the powers of the States in the field of tourism.

In general terms, it can be said that the framework for action is built on a strategic matrix, where the axes are developed into specific objectives, the actions in pursuit of each objective being presented in a total of 21. To implement this strategy, the Commission has developed a rolling plan (EC, 2013) that identifies projects for the implementation of the 21 actions and the expected or achieved results (currently with updates to May 2013).

Finally, it should be emphasized that, in our view, the main innovation of this approach lies in the recognition of the added value of cooperation among all stakeholders, instead of the visions stated in a more competitive basis. Indeed, with the introduction of tourism in the Treaty it seems that the traditional perspective that tended to regard the sector, both among the European institutions and the administrations of Member States, as a policy of purely domestic nature was definitively abandoned.

Despite being still early to have data in order to do an evaluation of this framework for action, in a time when the economic and financial crisis has made endangering European solidarity and economic and social cohesion, it seems important to appre-

ciate a voluntary cooperation in a fundamental matter both for the European economy and for Europe's visibility abroad.

There is no doubt that the European Commission has already developed a set of actions to materialize a common action in tourism. This action can be systematized into four major types: i) a better understanding of tourism in the EU, by creating a virtual observatory and the organization of meetings for stakeholders, ii) the support for businesses, particularly in the area of Information and Communication Technologies, professional training and accessible tourism; iii) the promotion of tourism (e.g. Eden and Calypso; and iv) the way to an European tourism policy, through the institutional improvements that we saw earlier.

The European Commission in a recent Communication (EC 2012) about Implementation and development of the common visa policy to spur growth in the EU, examines “how the implementation and development of the common visa policy could help growth in the EU by facilitating travel opportunities for third country nationals willing to visit the EU. If fully exploited, the current visa rules could ensure that the EU remains an attractive destination for more tourists/third country nationals, while at the same time boosting EU's economic activity and job creation” (EC 2012, p. 1).

### **3. THE INTERNATIONAL TOURIST DEMAND OF EU CITIZENS**

The tourism phenomenon, as today is seen and recognized, has just over 50 years of existence. In fact, in 1950 the international tourist movement pointed out only 25 million tourists, when in 2012 it exceeded for the first time the symbolic value of 1.035 billion (UNWTO, Barometer). This means an increase of 40 times in just over 60 years. In economic terms, the numbers are equally impressive: in 2012, the UNWTO reports a total volume of revenue given to tourism of 1.3 trillion \$USD (UNWTO, Barometer). In many countries, the share of tourism in GDP and in the employment structure reaches values above 10%.

The explosive growth of tourism in recent decades, which led it to a situation of major economic, social and cultural importance, had and has a strong grounding in the European continent. Despite the relevant consolidation that other destinations have been taking recently, especially in Asia and the Middle East, Europe still remains the strongest regional brand of world tourism: in 2012, 54,7% of the tourists

that left their countries were European, so was the fact that 51,6% of the incoming international tourism movements reached the European countries.

Being the EU27 reality of the present time almost a whole continent, the observation of relevance that we did above for Europe also serves, almost equally, in this specific context. For example, 10 of the countries included in the top 25 international tourist destinations are members of this Union, and the list of the top 25 countries of the international tourist demand includes 9 EU members.

Being certain that Europe and the European Union are the main focus of the international tourist flows, both for arrivals and departures, the main objective of this article, as mentioned earlier, focuses on the *domestic* tourism in the European Union, which means an exploratory observation about the value and characteristics of the tourism demand in the European Union countries by citizens resident in other member States.

Table1, that depicts the number of "guests registered in all means of accommodation" in 2010, in the European Union countries, highlighting its origins in other member states, allows drawing the following main conclusions:

	Outbound																										
	Austria	Belgium	Bulgaria	Cyprus	Czech Republic	Denmark	Estonia	Finland	France	Germany	Greece	Hungary	Ireland	Italy	Latvia	Lithuania	Luxembourg	Malta	Netherlands	Poland	Portugal	Romania	Slovakia	Slovenia	Spain	Sweden	United Kingdom
<b>Inbound</b>	37	19	22	190	48	5	25	171	1388	187	273	..	2011	7	6	6	6	20	..	59	73	61	52	201	377	47	206
	462	33	24	83	114	6	22	2708	1132	237	51	103	..	1013	11	8	165	24	1257	64	155	24	14	35	1122	51	527
	56	16	4	21	2	2	2	26	..	..	25	..	..	..	1	1	1	..	..	10	7	25	5	19	..	..	..
	10	5	3	8	0	0	1	14	..	..	177	..	..	21	0	1	0	..	..	2	..	..	1	..	..	..	..
	569	31	39	16	..	5	12	92	321	154	149	..	584	5	9	3	..	..	..	80	..	17	433	53	200	16	241
	322	58	35	109	..	11	49	215	1214	166	38	..	601	13	15	8	29	150	79	80	11	7	15	582	488	385	..
	20	7	6	2	13	..	82	7	..	16	..	..	31	63	32	1	..	..	..	32	..	..	3	2	..	17	..
	81	34	28	41	65	833	..	102	281	130	39	..	251	80	35	3	..	..	..	59	76	6	8	15	394	226	106
	500	1154	43	49	251	242	19	83	1366	777	140	682	9449	19	23	115	86	669	187	663	99	33	62	4754	137	2449	..
	10706	815	402	1348	2526	84	246	2961	..	11217	529	554	9303	98	106	107	126	2848	1128	702	185	132	194	7662	749	2387	..
	78	29	51	51	..	3	8	128	166	..	35	..	345	3	3	2	..	..	..	13	18	36	4	7	187	12	185
	442	27	19	8	103	..	3	9	203	46	..	..	351	3	4	2	..	..	..	48	18	76	51	55	..	10	202
	59	42	10	12	28	..	2	7	219	141	41	..	365	4	4	3	..	..	..	42	150	8	7	8	806	15	1253
	1068	258	21	333	174	23	62	2753	1524	693	183	359	..	33	28	23	18	214	443	195	330	145	54	412	2843	144	1959
	16	9	3	1	9	..	73	20	8	..	9	..	..	33	67	1	..	..	..	43	..	..	5	4	..	12	..
	23	15	4	3	45	..	34	11	18	..	16	..	63	85	1	..	..	..	..	100	..	..	13	3	..	13	..
	54	84	2	3	5	..	1	2	120	215	11	..	64	1	1	..	..	..	..	4	11	1	0	1	78	4	..
	5	6	1	4	2	..	0	0	12	..	4	..	59	0	0	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	2	..	..	..
	1618	1934	35	34	194	324	12	69	1708	3918	388	90	131	1851	18	10	161	33	106	337	38	19	59	2065	240	1036	..
	347	84	103	20	351	92	20	26	207	604	240	156	..	888	27	136	6	..	..	79	37	162	33	452	60	1412	..
	32	39	5	3	27	..	2	8	286	120	20	..	239	3	2	8	..	..	..	20	..	9	3	7	1387	12	310
	261	37	191	10	51	..	1	6	103	..	..	208	..	..	3	2	3	..	..	25	21	..	18	19	..	..	..
	135	11	23	5	307	..	2	4	28	..	36	86	..	143	2	2	1	..	..	45	..	8	..	17	..	6	..
	107	9	7	2	24	..	1	3	17	..	33	23	..	206	1	1	..	..	..	9	..	6	12	..	..	..	..
	275	342	12	7	196	153	17	50	2189	843	159	..	417	1868	16	15	14	..	..	439	127	1419	61	17	34	..	..
	198	73	27	106	85	1337	81	291	225	859	285	58	..	575	61	20	6	37	113	103	82	11	12	14	940	89	1890
	731	870	164	712	369	722	36	154	5290	1987	1116	208	2115	2676	40	35	51	415	1556	356	989	72	41	68	9028	288	..
	18175	6026	1287	1361	4244	5797	1276	1252	19665	16282	6158	2291	4371	26990	592	561	688	984	7475	2937	5210	996	1107	1339	32877	2636	14440
	20043	6310	1813	1665	5261	8128	1502	1922	22203	20610	7697	2927	5471	32383	828	781	727	1045	8787	9897	5552	1152	1220	1709	35660	4143	17387
	1961	816	143	149	1073	1297	62	397	7298	6265	1499	535	1778	11411	50	59	66	287	2096	438	887	191	107	160	7523	808	12593
	22004	7126	1956	1814	6334	9425	1564	2319	29501	26875	9196	3462	7249	43794	878	840	793	1332	10883	4135	6439	1343	1327	1869	43183	4951	29980
	83	85	66	75	67	62	82	54	67	61	67	66	60	62	67	67	87	74	69	71	81	70	83	72	76	53	48
	91	89	93	92	83	86	96	83	75	77	84	85	75	74	94	93	92	78	81	89	86	86	92	91	83	84	58

**Table 1 – Number of guests registered in all types of accommodation commercial services (countries of the EU, 2010, thousands)**

Source: WTO, Yearbook 2012

Notes: 1. France (only guests in hotels and similar); 2. Bulgaria, Ireland and UK (number of overnights corrected by the length of stay, respectively 5,4, 7,3 and 7,6 days – see: [www.nationsencyclopedia.com/worldstats/UNCITAD](http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/worldstats/UNCITAD))

- a) although with significant differences in the values, all EU countries have in Europe, and in particular in the other Union countries, the main focus of their international tourism demand; the relatively low values of the United Kingdom, which are exceptional in this context, are due to its universal centrality and accessibility, with particular reference to the U.S., Middle and Far East and Oceania;
- b) in addition to the UK, in the other countries where there is a smaller share of international tourism demand within the EU this is due to i) the condition of being also a major economic and cultural focus with universal attraction (Germany, Italy, France), ii) a peripheral geographical location in Eastern Europe, with a strong appeal of the 'other side' (Bulgaria, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania), iii) a strong regional concentration that is not limited in the EU, such is the case of the Scandinavian countries (Denmark, Finland, Sweden), which are strongly marked by Norway.

Another interesting analysis is the one that relates to the concentration level of demand (see Table2): for reasons of geographical and/or cultural proximity, there are countries that rely on a single market in half or more of its demand (Austria, Cyprus, Ireland, Estonia); if we consider the top 3 of demand of each country, seven of them denote a concentration above 70%; if we reach the top 5, only 10 countries have a concentration of less than 70% and there are even 3 that exceed 90%.

Prior to the analysis of a questionnaire launched to characterize some of the features of the tourism demand in the EU, objective that we will accomplish in the next topic, we now present an exercise of comparison between similar countries, one being a Member of the European Union, and the other one being not. In other words, and as a question: with two countries (as much as we can identify) similar in its characterization as tourist destinations, the fact that one is a Member of the European Union, and the other one is not, affects their perception made by the residents in other EU countries? If the answer to this question is positive, why is it that way? Is there more and better information circulating in the European Union on its Member-States in relation to what happens next to other countries? Is there a specific form of cultural identity among the citizens of several Member States which affects their tourist choices? Whilst not all member states are on an equal basis in these matters, what kind of effects may result from:

i) the existence of a single currency, ii) the requirement or not of a visa for entry, iii) procedures more or less extended by the services of Foreign Immigration?

The observation of the present reality of the EU27 compared with other countries (yet?) no-adherent suggested the following three possible cases of study: Austria vs. Switzerland, Ukraine vs. Poland, and Sweden vs. Norway. Let us look for each of these cases.



Back to the indicator "guests registered in all forms of accommodation", as it was referenced earlier and also as it was justified as a choice, Table 3 includes some useful data, although in some of these countries the lack of information in an equivalent basis had forced a process of estimation.

Country		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Austria	A	92	92	92	91	91
	B	83	83	83	84	83
Switzerland	A	90	88	90	90	90
	B	66	65	68	68	65
Sweden	A	67	66	65	65	64
	B	57	56	55	56	53
Norway	A	81	80	80	80	78
	B	72	72	72	72	70
Poland	A	80	80	82	84	79
	B	72	72	74	76	71
Ukraine	A	14	16	15	15	15
	B	14	16	15	15	15

Table 3: Guests registered in all types of accommodation commercial services. Comparative importance of the EU and of Europe in the demand markets (some examples, 2010, %)

A - Percentage in UE26 (not considering the EU Member in comparative analysis) in the total of Europe  
 B - Percentage in UE26 (not considering the EU Member in comparative analysis) in the total of the World

**Switzerland:** guests registered in hotels and similar.

**Norway:** value of overnights divided by an average stay of 2.2 days (as Norway does not report this value in the original source, we used the reference allocated to Sweden and Finland, which is coincident in both countries on the average between 2006 and 2010).

**Ukraine:** amount of tourists divided by 3.27 (as Ukraine does not report the relationship between tourists and guests in the original source, we used the relation assigned to Poland, on the average between 2006 and 2010).

The three cases selected highlight different results:

- a) The comparison between Austria and Switzerland shows, in the indicator A (percentage of demand stemming from the EU compared to Europe's total), almost equal values, which in this case means indifference in the condition of being a member of the EU (Austria); but the indicator B (percentage of demand originating in the EU in the World's total) shows a remarkable difference, suggesting that in the Swiss case the lowest percentage should mean a significant opening of its demand from the other continents, something that is not the case in Austria;
- b) The figures from Sweden and Norway contain an apparent contradiction: in the country which is not a member of the EU (Norway) and that has a more geographically eccentric relation to the Union, the weight of demand inside the EU is



more significant for both indicators A and B; what is happening, in this case, is that the four countries of Scandinavia have a very strong internal circulation, which dominates any regional framework, and, in particular, Sweden is very marked by the Norwegian demand (outside the EU): 1.097 million guests per year on the average of the five years under review; in the case of Sweden, if we cut the total of Europe by the figures related to Norway (to apply the same logic that led to the consideration of a UE26 rather than a EU27), the specific weight of the EU demand in this adapted European total rises substantially to 89-91%, as respect to the indicator A, and 71-74% as regards the indicator B;

- c) Finally, the difference between Poland and Ukraine seems to validate the importance of the condition of being a EU Member for the tourist demand originated in the other Member States, since this is almost irrelevant in Ukraine and very important in Poland; the geographical position of Poland, on the eastern edge of the EU, does admit that this difference in values may be substantially due to it, that is, by hypothesis, more than the condition of being a Member of the EU, what makes Poland more sought by residents of other Member States is its geographical proximity, while Ukraine is more demanded by eastern Countries' residents; however, being this matter of the geographic proximity accepted as strong, the truth is that in 2003, the year immediately before the entry of Poland in the EU, the weight in the European context of its international tourism demand on the part of all current Member States was 69%, whereas in recent years (2006-2010) is standing next to or even above 80%.

#### **4. A SURVEY: OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS**

The previous discussion about the current understanding of tourism in the European Union, including the different conditions of the offer in the Member-States, as well as the reflection on the process of choosing a travel destination, lead us to the main object of study we intend to pursuit in the empirical component of this paper: what is the importance of the condition of a country being a member of the EU in the process of choosing tourist destinations by the citizens that reside in other Member States?

The repercussion of the results in this study is clear. If the fact of belonging to European Union attracts tourists from that area, then this will be one more attraction to countries that are not part of it and intend to join it or, by the opposite, if this membership is not an attraction factor, it will not be a compelling reason to apply for inclusion. On the other hand, this knowledge can be important to inform the conditions and strategies of promoting the tourist destinations among the EU.

The initial question is disaggregated in two specific objectives:

- a) Knowing what factors determine the choice of an international tourism destination in Europe by European citizens;
- b) Knowing what attributes make a European tourist destination more attractive than other.

To get these objectives, it has been designed a measuring instrument – a questionnaire, see annex 1 – consisting of eleven questions organized into 2 blocks. Questions about demographics of the respondents were also included. This questionnaire has been uploaded into the net and also distributed among closed persons to the researchers, asking, in both cases, for a (succeeded) snowball effect. The data collection for the study was undertaken during 2012.

In total, 625 correctly filled out questionnaires were received from citizens who reside in 26 European countries, with 35 different nationalities. In any case, 86.4 percent of the respondents had EU Passport.

The major part of the received questionnaires was from Portuguese, Spanish, Cypriot and Danish citizens, who resided in these countries (see table 4).

Nationality	%	Residence	%
Portuguese	33.3	Portugal	34.7
Spanish	37.0	Spain	37.0
Cypriot	8.2	Cyprus	11.7
Danish	3.7	Denmark	4,0
British	2.6	Nederland	2.4
Dutch	2.1	United Kingdom	2.2
Brazilian	2.1	Italy	1.1
Others	11.0	Others	6.9

Table 4: Nationalities and residence countries of the sample.

The repliers were mostly women – 52.2% – age between 35 and 64 years, high education level, with a Master Degree and an annual household income ranging from 14.000 to 42.000 euros.

As there were no previous studies about these features, the authors had to build a questionnaire that was positively pre-evaluated by experts in the subject. It was formed by closed questions punctuated by two five-point Likert scale blocks: in the first block 1 = Strongly Unimportant and 5 = Strongly Important, and in the second block 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.

#### **4.1. RESULTS OF THE DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS**

Although the sample is admittedly not representative of the universe (namely due to an inadequate distribution by countries and by educational levels), the significant number of collected responses allows the discussion of some interesting results.

To check the results reliability, sample representativeness was analysed for internal consistency with Cronbach's alpha for each group of items that formed block 1 (Know what factors determine the choice of a tourism destination), and block 2 (attributes that make an European tourism destination more attractive than other). The results were 0.804 and 0.758, respectively. Further to the analysis, all the scales were consistent, with Cronbach's alpha values of over 0.7, an indication that the sample was reliable (Cronbach, 1951; Thiétart, 2001).

According to the variables of the first block, related with the *factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination*, it could be appreciated that the condition of *“The country of destination does not require a visa”* and that *“The country of destination has a lower cost of living than the country of origin”* are the most valued, with 3.33 and 3.14 points (over 5) respectively. In the opposite side, *“The use of the same language of the country of destination”* appears 2.03. This indicates that European citizens do not have difficulties to communicate in other languages when they travel, or at least do not value it (see table 5).

<b>Factors</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>
The country of destination is a member of the EU	2.73	3	1.197
The physical proximity of the destination	2.71	3	1.146
Have the same language as the country of destination	2.03	1	1.056
Use the same language in both countries	2.65	1	1.260
The country of destination does not require a visa	3.33	4	1.235
There is not immigration control in the country of destination	2.70	3	1.193
The country of destination has a lower cost of living than the country of origin	3.14	3	1.108

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe.

If we proceed to segment these answers by nationalities according only the nationalities that achieved a minimum of 10 replies for reasons of significance, it could be understood that Greeks and Spanish are the citizens of European Union that give more value to those factors. On the other hand are the Danish, the Dutch and the British. It is interesting to point out the Brazilian citizens who live in the European Union and give quite importance – more than other citizens that were born in EU – to the considered factors as determinants of the choice of a tourism destination in another country of European Union.

Nationality		The country of destination is a member of the EU	The country of destination is not far from my country of residence	The country of destination uses the same language as mine	The country of destination uses the same currency with my country of residence	The country of destination does not require a visa	There is no immigration control	The country of destination has lower standards/cost of living
<b>Portuguese</b>	N	208	208	208	208	208	208	208
	Mean	2.71	2.70	1.95	2.66	3.14	2.56	3.21
	Mode	3	3	1	2	4	3	3
	St. Dev.	1.123	1.137	1.008	1.240	1.226	1.111	1.059
<b>Spanish</b>	N	231	231	231	231	231	231	231
	Mean	3.02	2.86	2.22	3.01	3.42	2.79	3.24
	Mode	4	3	2	4	4	3	4
	St. Dev.	1.181	1.145	1.090	1.200	1.238	1.205	1.104
<b>British</b>	N	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
	Mean	1.94	1.88	1.94	1.81	3.38	2.38	2.06
	Mode	1	1	2	1	2	2	1
	St. Dev.	0.929	0.957	0.772	1.109	1.310	1.025	1.063
<b>Brazilian</b>	N	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
	Mean	2.62	2.46	2.23	2.00	3.85	3.31	3.00
	Mode	1	3	3	1	3	3	3
	St. Dev.	1.660	1.127	1.013	1.000	0.801	1.032	1.291
<b>Danish</b>	N	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
	Mean	1.35	1.96	1.26	1.35	3.00	2.04	3.13
	Mode	1	1	1	1	4	2	3
	St. Dev.	0.573	0.825	0.689	0.775	1.206	0.878	1.217
<b>Dutch</b>	N	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
	Mean	1.69	2.62	1.54	1.69	3.08	1.69	2.15
	Mode	1	2	1	1	4	1	1
	St. Dev.	0.751	1.044	0.877	0.855	1.188	0.751	0.987
<b>Greek</b>	N	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Mean	2.91	3.18	2.45	2.91	3.55	3.36	3.64
	Mode	3	3	1	3	4	4	3
	St. Dev.	1.044	1.168	1.214	1.136	1.036	1.120	1.027
<b>Cypriot</b>	N	51	51	51	51	51	51	51
	Mean	2.82	2.71	2.12	2.67	3.61	3.25	3.24
	Mode	3	3	1	3	5	3	3
	St. Dev.	1.126	1.137	1.107	1.160	1.266	1.197	1.069

Table 6: Segmentation, by nationalities, of the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe.

If it is segmented by age, curiously youngest (less than 19 years old) and oldest respondents value more the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe. Specifically, the youngest respondents give more importance to “*The country of destination is a member of the EU*” and to “*The country of destination uses*

J. Umbelino; J.M. Rodríguez-Antón; M.S. Celemín-Pedroche; R. Filipe; E. Amorim and M.A. Carranca  
*the same currency of my country of residence*". On the other hand, the senior citizens give more importance than other segments to *"The country of destination is not far from my country of residence"*, *"The country of destination uses the same language as mine"*, *"The country of destination does not require a visa"*, *"There is no immigration control"* and *"The country of destination has lower standards/cost of living"* (see Table 7).

AGE		The country of destination is a member of the EU	The country of destination is not far from my country of residence	The country of destination uses the same language as mine	The country of destination uses the same currency with my country of residence	The country of destination does not require a visa	There is no immigration control	The country of destination has lower standards/cost of living
<b>Less than 19</b>	N	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Mean	3.25	2.75	2.00	3.50	3.25	2.75	2.75
<b>19-34</b>	N	267	267	267	267	267	267	267
	Mean	2.91	2.70	1.99	2.69	3.41	2.76	3.21
<b>35-64</b>	N	338	338	338	338	338	338	338
	Mean	2.57	2.69	2.04	2.58	3.24	2.62	3.06
<b>More than 65</b>	N	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
	Mean	3.00	3.00	2.56	3.13	4.06	3.31	3.69

Table 7: Segmentation, by age, of the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe.

In the segmentation for educative levels, it is observed that although average values of the answers are very similar, the respondents with a lower educational level – High school – are the most who valued the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe. In opposition the respondents with more education level – PhD – are those who give less importance to these factors when they have to choose a destination in Europe (see table 8).

EDUCATION		The country of destination is a member of the EU	The country of destination is not far from my country of residence	The country of destination uses the same language as mine	The country of destination uses the same currency with my country of residence	The country of destination does not require a visa	There is no immigration control	The country of destination has lower standards/cost of living
		High school	N Mean	71 2.83	71 2.77	71 2.28	71 2.85	71 3.24
Higher diploma	N Mean	90 3.02	90 2.90	90 2.13	90 2.84	90 3.53	90 2.77	90 3.37
Bachelor degree	N Mean	129 2.83	129 2.74	129 2.06	129 2.71	129 3.41	129 2.75	129 3.14
Master degree	N Mean	182 2.57	182 2.59	182 1.97	182 2.48	182 3.20	182 2.59	182 3.08
PhD	N Mean	153 2.60	153 2.67	153 1.90	153 2.59	153 3.35	153 2.72	153 3.03

Table 8: Segmentation, by education level, of the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe.

Finally, it is interesting to determine if there are differences between the opinions given by interviewed men and women. As it can be observed in table 9, absolutely, for all the factors that determines the choice of a tourism destination in Europe, the valuation given by men is higher than women.

GENDER		The country of destination is a member of the EU	The country of destination is not far from my country of residence	The country of destination uses the same language as mine	The country of destination uses the same currency with my country of residence	The country of destination does not require a visa	There is no immigration control	The country of destination has lower standards/cost of living
		Male	N Mean	299 2.80	299 2.85	299 2.06	299 2.75	299 3.50
Female	N Mean	326 2.66	326 2.57	326 2.00	326 2.56	326 3.18	326 2.66	326 3.10

Table 9: Segmentation, by gender, of the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe.

According to the questions related with the attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other, it is clear that *“The condition of not having customs and the use of the same currency”* is important for choosing a tourist destination – 3.30. It has been followed by *“The facilities of the tourist’s information gotten for travelling to another member of the EU – 3.25*. However:

“The condition of a country being a member of EU” is not a determinant factor when a tourist destination is chosen – 2.51 (see table 10).

Attributes	Mean	Mode	Standard deviation
The condition of a country being a member of EU is a preference factor against another European country that is not	2.51	3	1.117
The condition of a country being a member of EU improves the tourist information gotten from others Member-States	3.25	4	1.075
There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member-States of the EU	2.82	3	1.074
The condition of not having customs and the use of the same currency is decisive in the choice of selecting tourist destinations	3.30	4	1.041

Table 10: Descriptive statistics of attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other.

However, the opinions are not homogeneous according to the nationalities of the respondents. If it is only considered, as it has been made before, the nationalities of which has achieved a minimum of ten responses, Greeks, Portuguese and Spanish are the repliers who give the highest value to the *attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other*. British give the least importance to these attributes (see table 11).



NATIONALITY		In a situation in which one of the travel options is a Member State and the other is not, even if they are similar, as is the case of Finland/Norway, Poland/Ukraine or Austria/Switzerland, I always prefer the first	The condition of a country being a Member of the EU improves the circulation of information about it, especially among the residents in the other Member States	There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism	The facilities granted to mobility within the European Union, in some cases extended to neighboring countries - the Schengen Area and the use of a single currency (Euro) are good examples - are decisive in the selection of tourist destinations
<b>Portuguese</b>	N	208	208	208	208
	Mean	2.51	3.39	2.81	3.40
	Mode	3	4	3	4
	St. Dev.	1.108	1.011	1.025	0.983
<b>Spanish</b>	N	231	231	231	231
	Mean	2.67	3.31	3.00	3.38
	Mode	3	4	3	4
	St. Dev.	1.129	1.033	1.119	1.055
<b>British</b>	N	16	16	16	16
	Mean	1.50	2.06	2.13	2.38
	Mode	1	1	2	3
	St. Dev.	0.816	1.124	1.025	.719
<b>Brazilian</b>	N	13	13	13	13
	Mean	3.00	2.77	2.62	2.85
	Mode	2	3	3	3
	St. Dev.	1.291	0.927	1.261	1.214
<b>Danish</b>	N	23	23	23	23
	Mean	1.65	2.74	2.39	2.57
	Mode	1	1	3	3
	St. Dev.	0.832	1.356	1.033	0.992
<b>Dutch</b>	N	13	13	13	13
	Mean	2.00	2.54	2.23	2.69
	Mode	2	3	2	2
	St. Dev.	0.816	0.967	0.927	.947
<b>Greek</b>	N	11	11	11	11
	Mean	3.00	3.55	2.64	3.55
	Mode	3	4	3	4
	St. Dev.	0.632	0.522	1.027	1.036
<b>Cypriot</b>	N	51	51	51	51
	Mean	2.73	3.31	2.75	3.20
	Mode	3	4	3	3
	St. Dev.	1.021	1.140	1.017	1.040

Table 11: Segmentation by nationalities of the attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other.

If it is segmented by age, the youngest and the oldest respondents are again who give more relevance to these attributes, except in the case of “*There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member-States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism*”. For this last attribute, the respondents between 19 and 34 years consider it more relevant than the rest of interviewed (see table 12).

AGE		<b>In a situation in which one of the travel options is a Member State and the other is not, even if they are similar, as is the case of Finland/Norway, Poland/Ukraine or Austria/Switzerland, I always prefer the first</b>			
		<b>The condition of a country being a Member of the EU improves the circulation of information about it, especially among the residents in the other Member States</b>	<b>There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism</b>	<b>The facilities granted to mobility within the European Union, in some cases extended to neighboring countries - the Schengen Area and the use of a single currency (Euro) are good examples - are decisive in the selection of tourist destinations</b>	
N		4	4	4	4
	Mean	3.00	2.75	2.50	3.25
<b>19-34</b>	N	267	267	267	267
	Mean	2.58	3.43	2.98	3.45
<b>35-64</b>	N	338	338	338	338
	Mean	2.44	3.11	2.69	3.14
<b>More than 65</b>	N	16	16	16	16
	Mean	2.94	3.44	2.88	3.94

Table 12: Segmentation, by age, of the attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other.

According to the segmentation by education level of the respondents, it could check that those that have a highest education level – PhD and Master degree – are who give less importance to the *attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other* (see table 13).

EDUCATION		<p><b>In a situation in which one of the travel options is a Member State and the other is not, even if they are similar, as is the case of Finland/Norway, Poland/Ukraine or Austria/Switzerland, I always prefer the first</b></p> <p><b>The condition of a country being a Member of the EU improves the circulation of information about it, especially among the residents in the other Member States</b></p> <p><b>There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism</b></p> <p><b>The facilities granted to mobility within the European Union, in some cases extended to neighboring countries - the Schengen Area and the use of a single currency (Euro) are good examples - are decisive in the selection of tourist destinations</b></p>			
<b>High school</b>	N	71	71	71	71
	Mean	2.66	3.18	2.99	3.27
<b>Higher diploma</b>	N	90	90	90	90
	Mean	2.74	3.33	3.12	3.47
<b>Bachelor degree</b>	N	129	129	129	129
	Mean	2.51	3.50	2.87	3.45
<b>Master degree</b>	N	182	182	182	182
	Mean	2.49	3.19	2.66	3.27
<b>PhD</b>	N	153	153	153	153
	Mean	2.34	3.11	2.69	3.11

Table 13: Segmentation by education level of the attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other.

Finally, it has been analysed if gender was a factor that influenced in the valuation of *the attributes than make a European tourist destination more attractive than other*. In this way, men and women have valued in a similar way the four considered attributes (see table 14).

GENDER		<p><b>In a situation in which one of the travel options is a Member State and the other is not, even if they are similar, as is the case of Finland/Norway, Poland/Ukraine or Austria/Switzerland, I always prefer the first</b></p> <p><b>The condition of a country being a Member of the EU improves the circulation of information about it, especially among the residents in the other Member States</b></p> <p><b>There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism</b></p> <p><b>The facilities granted to mobility within the European Union, in some cases extended to neighboring countries - the Schengen Area and the use of a single currency (Euro) are good examples - are decisive in the selection of tourist destinations</b></p>			
<b>Male</b>	N	299	299	299	299
	Mean	2.57	3.25	2.79	3.34
<b>Female</b>	N	326	326	326	326
	Mean	2.47	3.26	2.84	3.26

Table 14: Segmentation by gender of the attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other.

The results of these and others segmentations must be understood with some caution because the target sample data from each category is reduced, which decreases the representativeness. This could be a weak point in the results of segmentation by nationality (except in Spanish, Portuguese and Cypriot) and by age (except for respondents aged between 19 and 64).

#### 4.2. FACTORIAL ANALYSIS

To conclude this case study, a factorial analysis has been done concerning the *seven factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe* (how effectively do they work for this purpose?) and the *four attributes that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other* (do they work in a complementary way to the other factors or do they represent different things?).

From the possible seven factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe, only one has been significant. It has been called Factor of choice of a tourist destination in Europe. This explains the 46.229% of the total variance (see table 15).

Factor	Initial auto values			Square of extraction of saturation sum square		
	Total	% of the Variance	% Accumulated	Total	% of the Variance	% Accumulated
1	3.236	46.229	46.229	2.649	37.842	37.842
2	0.945	13.496	59.725			
3	0.816	11.650	71.375			
4	0.648	9.251	80.625			
5	0.578	8.263	88.888			
6	0.434	6.204	95.092			
7	0.344	4.908	100.000			

Table 15: Factorial analysis: Total variance explained by the possible factors.

The factorial analysis related with the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe have been right. That is why the goodness of fit test has had a Chi-square of 145.166 with 14 degrees of freedom and a Sig. of 0.000, and in regard to other goodness tests, KMO test and Bartlett test of sphericity have had values very positives (see table 16).

<b>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy</b>		<b>0.814</b>
Bartlett test of sphericity	Approximated Chi-square	1223.678
	gl	21
	Sig.	0,000

Table 16: KMO and Bartlett test of sphericity.

In the factorial analysis the maximum likelihood method was used, and after four iterations, it resulted in a factorial matrix with the factor loadings of the seven considered variables that form the only factor resulting. As it can be appreciated in the table 15, all the variables have a high value, especially, *“The country of destination uses the same currency with my country of residence”*, with 0.809; *“The country of destination is a member of the EU”*, with 0.661 and *“There is no immigration control”*, with 0.621. The variable with lower loading is *“The country of destination has a lower standards/cost of living”*, with 0.415.

Variables	Factor 1
• The country of destination is a member of the EU	0.661
• The country of destination is not far from my country of residence	0.593
• The country of destination uses the same language as mine	0.572
• The country of destination uses the same currency with my country of residence	0.809
• The country of destination does not require a visa	0.565
• There is no immigration control	0.621
• The country of destination has lower standards/cost of leaving	0.415

Table 17: Factorial matrix.

On the other hand, from the possible four factors that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other, only one has been significant. It has been called Factor of attractiveness of European tourist destinations. This explains the 57.661% of the total variance (see table 18).

Factor	Initial auto values			Square of extraction of saturation sum square		
	Total	% of the Variance	% Accumulated	Total	% of the Variance	% Accumulated
1	2.306	57.661	57.661	1.753	43.820	43.820
2	0.647	16.180	73.841			
3	0.536	13.407	87.248			
4	0.510	12.752	100.000			

Table 18: Factorial analysis: Total variance explained by the possible factors.

The factorial analysis related with the factors that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other have been right. That is why the goodness of the fit test has had a Chi-square of 915.226 with 6 degrees of freedom and a Sig. of 0.000, and in regard to other goodness tests, KMO test and Bartlett test of sphericity have had values very positives (see table 19).

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy		0.773
Bartlett test of sphericity	Approximated Chi-square	915.226
	df	6
	Sig.	0.000

Table 19: KMO and Bartlett test of sphericity.

In the factorial analysis the Maximum likelihood method was used, and after three iterations, it resulted in a factorial matrix with the factor loadings of the four considered variables that form the only factor resulting. As it can be appreciated in the table 20, all the variables have a high value, especially:

*“There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism”, with 0.704. The variable with lower loading is “In a situation in which one of the travel options is a Member State and the other is not, even if they are similar, as is the case of Finland/Norway, Poland/Ukraine or Austria/Switzerland, I always prefer the first”, with 0.569.*

Variables	Factor 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In a situation in which one of the travel options is a Member State and the other is not, even if they are similar, as is the case of Finland/Norway, Poland/Ukraine or Austria/Switzerland, I always prefer the first</li> </ul>	0.569
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The condition of a country being a Member of the EU improves the circulation of information about it, especially among the residents in the other Member States</li> </ul>	0.675
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism</li> </ul>	0.704
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The facilities granted to mobility within the European Union, in some cases were extended to neighboring countries - the Schengen Area and the use of a single currency (Euro) are good examples - and are decisive in the choice of selecting tourist destinations</li> </ul>	0.691

Table 20: Factorial matrix.

## **5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS**

The topics discussed in this paper are no doubt complex but important for the future of tourism within the Member-States of European Union. Without being exhaustive, these topics include: the global scenario of tourism worldwide and the role it is playing in the EU as a whole and as the sum of the individual actions of the MS; the different impacts in different types of destinations that may occur by the increasing of EU intervention in this domain; the complexity of the mechanisms of tourist consumer's choice and the weight on these mechanisms arising from the condition of being a MS. The in-depth treatment of these issues requires, obviously, other context and means that are not present in this paper.

It is not possible to draw definitive conclusions on all the matters under analysis in the empirical topic, both because the subjects are complex and the sample has some

limitations, but anyway it is possible to consider them as contributions of this research:

- a) in the process of choosing an international destination within the EU, by citizens resident in other MS, the fact that one or more of the alternatives could be MS is negligible; it seems not to be present a recognition of an outstanding tourist information within the Union, or a special empathy between the territories and peoples of the MS; even the more *practical* aspects of travelling under that condition are not valued in an assertive and generalized way, i.e., as opposed, Europeans and other residents in the EU seem to see themselves in a position of important freedom of choice, not seeing the tourist destinations within the Union as something intrinsically valuable and in a condition of influencing their decisions; this indicates, for example, that European citizens do not have difficulties to communicate in other languages when they travel, or at least do not value it;
- b) notwithstanding the previous, there are some more specific findings of the questionnaire that deserve to be highlighted: practical aspects of travelling, directly or indirectly related to the EU, such as “*The country of destination does not require a visa*”, are really appreciated; in terms of segmentations, when this is done by nationalities it can be seen that the attention paid by the citizens to those matters is not equal around Europe – the ones coming from less developed countries, and even more the foreigners living in Europe, seem to give more value to the membership condition; on the other hand, those that have a highest education level – PhD and Master degree – are who give it less importance; curiously, youngest (less than 19 years old) and oldest respondents value more these factors, probably for different reasons (lower income versus safety concerns); it is also to note that the valuation given by men is higher than by women;
- c) the factorial analysis related with the factors that determine the choice of a tourism destination in Europe have been right and indicates that exists only one factor that explains the 46.229% of the total variance. The variables that have a high value are especially “*The country of destination uses the same currency with my country of residence*”, with 0.809, and “*The country of destination is a member of the EU*”. The other factorial analysis, related with the factors that make a European tourist destination more attractive than other, have been right too and indi-



J. Umbelino; J.M. Rodríguez-Antón; M.S. Celemín-Pedroche; R. Filipe; E. Amorim and M.A. Carranca states that exists only one factor that explains the 57.661% of the total variance. The variable with the highest value is “*There is a special empathy between the citizens of the Member States and their respective territories, including their role in tourism*”.

The major limitation of this study, in terms of methodology, is the characterization of the sample in respect to the distribution of the respondents across countries (higher levels of incidence in the cases where the authors were able to have a greater direct intervention) and between levels of education (with a very high presence of the top levels, Master and PhD). For this reason, and despite the high number of replies, the results must be understood with some caution.

Although the aim of this work and the context in which it should be appreciated have been clearly marked out, it must also be recognized that the interpretation of the European Union’s territory as an object of possible tourist offer (and its assessment as such) is lacking not only a more representative sample but also new approaches and new research strategies.

## References

Buhalis, D., & Costa, C. *Tourism: Business Frontiers*. Oxford. Elsevier. 2006. ISBN: 978-0-7506-6377-9

Coles, T. & Hall, D. *Tourism and European Union Enlargement. Plus ça change?*, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol.7(2), 2005, pp.51-61. ISSN: 1099-2340

Cooper, C., Fletcher, J., Fyall, A., Gilbert, D., & Wanhill, S. *Turismo: Princípios e Práticas*. Porto Alegre. Bookman. 2001. ISBN: 978-8-5778-0014-8

Cronbach, L. J. Coefficient Alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, Vol. 16(3), 1951, pp. 297-334. ISSN: 0033-3123

EC – European Commission. Commission Communication to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “Working together for the future of European tourism”, COM (2001) 665 final,

J. Umbelino; J.M. Rodríguez-Antón; M.S. Celemín-Pedroche; R. Filipe; E. Amorim and M.A. Carranca  
Brussels, 13.11.2001. Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2001:0665:FIN:EN:PDF>

EC – European Commission. Commission Communication to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “Basic orientations for the sustainability of European tourism” COM (2003) 716 final, Brussels, 21.11.2003. Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0716:FIN:EN:PDF>

EC – European Commission. Commission Communication to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions “Agenda for a sustainable and competitive European tourism”, COM (2007) 621 final, Brussels, 19.10.2007. Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52007DC0621:EN:HTML>

EC – European Commission. *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Europe, the world's N° 1 tourist destination – a new political framework for tourism in Europe*, COM (2010) 352 final. Brussels. 30.06.2010. Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:0352:FIN:EN:PDF>

EC – European Commission. Communication from the Commission: EUROPE 2020, “A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth”, COM (2010) 2020 final. Brussels. 03.03.2010 Available at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2010:2020:FIN:EN:PDF>

EC – European Commission. *Communication to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Implementation and development of the common visa policy to spur growth in the EU*, COM (2012) 649 final. Brussels. 07.11.2012. Available at

[http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/pdf/communication\\_on\\_visa\\_policy\\_to\\_spur\\_growth\\_com\\_2012\\_649\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-is-new/news/pdf/communication_on_visa_policy_to_spur_growth_com_2012_649_en.pdf)

EC – European Commission. Working Document on the implementation rolling plan of tourism action framework (COM (2010) 352). Brussels. Update 06.05.2013. Available at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/files/communications/com\\_implementation\\_rolling\\_plan\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/tourism/files/communications/com_implementation_rolling_plan_en.pdf)

EU - Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007, Official Journal of the European Union, 2007/C 306/01 (17 December). Available at <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/cg00014.en07.pdf>

Fesenmejer, D., & Werthner, W. H. *Destination Recommendation Systems: Behavioral Foundations and Applications*. Oxfordshire/Cambridge: CAB International. 2006. ISBN: 978-0-8519-9023-1

Go, F. & Rovers, R. Integrated quality management for tourist destinations: a European perspective on achieving competitiveness. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 21(1), 2000, pp. 79-88. ISSN: 0261-5177

Hudson, S. *Tourism and Hospitality Marketing: a Global Experience*. London. Sage. 2008. ISBN: 978-1-4129-4686-5

Jansen-Verbeke, M., Vandenbroucke, S. & Tielen, S. Tourism in Brussels, capital of the New Europe. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 7(2), 2005, pp. 109-122. ISSN: 1099-2340

Kotler, P., Bowen, J., & Makens, J. *Marketing for Hospitality and Tourism*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Essex. Prentice Hall / Pearson Education. 2010. ISBN: 978-0-1350-4559-6

Kozak, M., & Baloglu, S. *Managing and Marketing Tourist Destinations: Strategies to gain a Competitive Edge*. New York / Oxon. Routledge. 2001. ISBN: 978-0-2038-4230-0

Lickorish, L. European tourism: Future prospects 1980–1990. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 7(4), 1980, pp. 613-615. ISSN: 0160-7383

Marrocu, E. & Paci, R. They arrive with new information. Tourism flows and production efficiency in the European regions. *Tourism Management*, Vol. 32(4), 2011, pp. 750-758. ISSN: 0261-5177

Middleton, V. *Marketing de Turismo: Teoria e Prática*, 3ª ed. Rio de Janeiro. Campus Editora. 2002. ISBN: 978-8-5352-0987-7

Moutinho, L. (ed.). *Strategic Management in Tourism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxfordshire / Cambridge. CAB International. 2011. ISBN: 978-1-8459-3588-7

O'Byrne, D. On passports and border controls. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 28(2), 2001, pp. 399-416. ISSN: 0160-7383

Pearce, D. Tourism and regional development in the European community, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 9(1), 1988, pp. 13-22. ISSN: 0261-5177

Pearce, P. *Tourist Behaviour: Themes and Conceptual Schemes*. New York. Channel View Publications. 2005. ISBN: 978-1-8454-1022-3

Rudež, H. & Bojnec, Š. Impacts of the Euro on the Slovenian Tourism Industry. *Managing Global Transitions*, Vol. 6(4), 2008, pp. 445-460. ISSN: 1581-6311

Szivás, E., Coles, T. & Hall, D. European Union accession: passport to development for the Hungarian tourism industry?" *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 7(2), 2005, pp.95-107. ISSN: 1099-2340

Thietart, R. (ed.) *Doing management research: a comprehensive guide*. London. Sage. 2001. ISBN: 978-0-7619-6517-6

Weidenfeld, A Tourism and cross border regional innovation systems, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 42(3), 2013, pp. 191-213. ISSN: 0160-7383

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors want to thank to Dr. Sotiroula Liasidou (Intercollege Limassol - University of Nicosia, Cyprus) for her help in the first period of the research.

---

Article info: Received 25/02/14. Accepted 01/07/14. Refereed anonymously.