

# NIPE



Universidade do Minho

Documentos de Trabalho  
Working Paper Series

*"UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Analysis"*

J. Cadima Ribeiro  
José Viseu  
Tânia Delalande  
Cristina Rodrigues

**NIPE WP 15 / 2004**

NÚCLEO DE INVESTIGAÇÃO EM POLÍTICAS ECONÓMICAS  
UNIVERSIDADE DO MINHO

## **“UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Analysis”**

**J. Cadima Ribeiro  
José Viseu  
Tânia Delalande  
Cristina Rodrigues**

**NIPE\* WP 15 / 2004**

**URL:**

<http://www.eeg.uminho.pt/economia/nipe/documentostrabalho.php>

---

\* NIPE – *Núcleo de Investigação em Políticas Económicas* – is supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology through the *Programa Operacional Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação* (POCTI) of the *Quadro Comunitário de Apoio III*, which is financed by FEDER and Portuguese funds.

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND MANAGEMENT  
ECONOMIC POLICIES RESEARCH UNIT

WORKING PAPER

**UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Analysis**

**J. Cadima Ribeiro  
José Viseu  
Tânia Delalande  
Cristina Rodrigues**

University of *Minho*, December 2004

## **1. Introduction**

On the occasion of the World Tourism Day, celebrated worldwide on September 27<sup>th</sup>, the Secretary General of the World Tourism Organization (WTO) and the President of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) produced a joint message. In this message, both enhanced the role of major and minor competition and leisure sports events in the improvement of “the tourism image of the host destination”. Sport and tourism stimulate the “investment in infrastructure such as airports, roads, stadiums, sporting complexes, hotels and restaurants”. The same infrastructure is as well “enjoyed by the local population”, benefiting tourism and sport as factors of economic growth, employment and revenue as well as bringing people together and helping to “forge strong personal relationships”.

Historically speaking, sport has played a minor role in tourism supply opportunities and options, “Tourism has usually been studied in terms of travel patterns, typology, financial implications, general activity movements, as well as the demand-supply equation and service developments. Travel motivation studies often refer to pleasure, religion, culture, business and the like” (Zauhar 2004, p.6)

Sport tourism is a recent cultural phenomenon. Billions of Euro and many hundreds of thousands of visitors are involved every year in it. Sport tourism is one of the service industry elements that have shown best growth rates over the past decades. One of the most important reasons behind this fact is the increase of global interest and attention paid to sport events and mass media coverage. But, sport tourism events do not only fascinate tourists and spectators, they also have the potential of attracting “non-resident media, technical personnel, athletes, coaches and other sports officials” (Zauhar 2004, p.16).

As stated by Zauhar (2004), sport tourism can be divided into five different categories: (i) sports tourism attractions like parks, mountains, wildlife, museums or buildings with sports-related activities as their principal focus; (ii) sports tourism resorts that includes resort complexes with sports as their primary focus and marketing strategy; (iii) sports tourism cruises that designates boat trips that have sports or sporting activities as their principal marketing strategy; (iv) sports tourism tours that range from incentive travel with sports interests themes to sport team travel with chartered transportation and accommodations; (v) sports tourism events that refer to those sports that attract tourists of which a large percentage are spectators.

Once the scientific community noticed the importance of sport tourism, with all its effects and impacts, several studies started to arise. The research lines within the area grew considerably, being approached in its “psychological, physiological, cultural, social, economic, climatic, entrepreneurial and political dimensions” as well as in terms of “visitors, destinations and active and passive participatory practises” (Zauhar 2004, p.17). The present major sport event, the UEFA Euro 2004, embraces at least two academic fields: sport and tourism. But both fields are also studied by a number of multidisciplinary research lines: geography, economics, psychology, sociology, philosophy, history, etc. As we need to look at sport tourism as a multibillion Euro business, the field of planning and management sciences also applies.

Within all these research categories and academic fields, this paper focuses on the category of sports tourism events, spotlighting visitors as spectators with specific travel destinations and budgets as well as individual passive participatory performance. This approach fills the existing lack of knowledge in the profiling of foreign visitor attendance and respective income import to the event region. It is a specific topic of sport tourism and sport event research lines that has been underdeveloped.

The purpose of this paper is to profile the foreign visitor attendance of the UEFA Euro 2004 in Portugal, namely in the region of *Braga* and *Guimarães*. We analysed (i) the visitor’s socio-economic characteristics, (ii) their travel conditions and respective budgets, (iii) their regular sport consumption behaviour as well as (iv) their image about the event and the country.

To profile the foreign visitor attendance of the UEFA Euro 2004 in *Braga* and *Guimarães*, we collected data through a one-to-one inquiry. The survey instrument includes innovating aspects, like e.g. the distinction between the visitors’ nationalities and their usual residence country or the featuring of the visitors’ past consumption behaviour in terms of returning active, media audience and live attendance sport habits.

Finally, by asking directly the visitors about their overall expenses to attend the event, we contour the methodological problems arising from econometric simulation and statistical forecast based upon multipliers and its effects, which do not reflect the true performance of the interrelated different variables.

**In the next section, we refer to the theoretical framework. In section three, we present the methodology used in this paper and the hypotheses to be verified. In section four, we**

**approach the results and describe the sample characteristics, the tourists' sport consumption behaviour, their travel conditions, the budgets involved, the image of Portugal and, eventually, we verify the stated hypotheses. The following paper sections are referred to the discussion of the results and to a brief conclusion.**

## **2. Theoretical framework**

As stated by Barreto (1995, p.72), basing upon the work of Wahab (1977), who analyzed the tourism sector in the 70's, international tourism is a worldwide economic activity that has shown its irreplaceable role in international trade as an invisible export industry of goods and services.

Tourists are consumers and the “consumer's action at any moment depends on his assets, his current and expected future income, and current and expected future prices and interest rates” (Duesenberry 1967, p.10). These are the economic factors that define how consumers behave. In the theory of consumer behaviour, however, consumer preferences are also taken into consideration, as the consumer has a set of preferences motivated by external factors – factors existing outside the strict rational assumptions and logical reasoning – that are related e.g. to culture, education and individual taste, among other things.

Consumer preferences can be defined as a set of subjective individual tastes measured by the utility that each consumer attributes to a certain good<sup>1</sup> – as every manual of economic theory defines – and the term ‘utility’ is nothing else than the given satisfaction that a consumer gets from the consumption of a specific good. Even though preferences are independent of income and prices, the consumers are constrained in their individual choice by their income and the prices they pay for the good and other goods.

The different goods can be classified by the way the consumer reacts to changes in his income and changes in the goods' price. When the demand increases with an increase in the consumers' income, the good is said to be a normal good. This is the general case for available goods, but not for all of them. There are other goods which demand decreases with an income increase, the so-called inferior goods. At last, there are some goods demand increases with a price increase and therefore called luxury goods.

---

<sup>1</sup> When referring to goods we are always referring to commodities and services.

Consumption is the use of resources, goods or services to satisfy wants and needs. Therefore, a tourist is a consumer of tourism, being tourism a good that satisfy a consumers' need (e.g.) for recreation. In order to consume leisure and tourism is necessary that the individuals have, in the first place, their essential needs fulfilled. So, there is only leisure and tourism consumption if there is some money left after the individual satisfy his essential needs (Barreto 1995, p.61).

According to Barreto (1995, pp.9-13), from the moment that the scientific community started to develop scientific studies on tourism, many definitions have been developed since the first one in 1911 (by *Hermann von Schullern zu Schattenhofen*). The author notices that all definitions are common in some aspects, like the time permanence, the non profit purpose of the trip and a less explored issue that is the pursuit of pleasure by the tourists. The formal definition on tourism accepted by the World Tourism Organization (WTO) is that tourism is the “sum of relations and services that result of a temporary and voluntary change of residence motivated by reasons other than professional ones or business” (De la Torre 1992, p.19).

Quoting Zauhar (2004, pp.8-9), people are travelling more to “place, indulge and satiate in a sporting environment”. This phenomenon is noticed in all levels and ages. Sport seems to represent an “universal need” and there are several ways of satisfying this need, by practising sports, watching, reading or listening to sports, by live attending sports or by simply consume sports as a way of life (life style sport consumption or sport image culture consumption).

Zauhar (2004, pp.12-13) states that nowadays sport is looked at as the “world’s largest social phenomenon” (based on the work of Schwartz in 1973) and assumes that tourism will become the world’s biggest industry. The author states that the term “sport tourism” was used for the first time in order to better understand the use of sports as a “touristic endeavour”.

The role played by sport tourism events in promoting tourism worldwide has been remarkable, the importance of spectators to sport is today much greater than they have ever been in the past (MacPherson & Curis 1989, quoted by Zauhar 2004, p.9). Unknown cities, without an public acknowledged recognition as a tourism product have taken the short cut sport events towards a global detection and audience, as “Recognition effects are often a major rationale for hosting such events” (Ashworth and Goodall 1988, quoted by Jones 2001, p.241). “The decision to host a mega event usually is a political one made by a governing authority and as such is not often subject to balanced analysis”, so Jones (2001, p.242, based on the work of Gamage and Higgs, 1997). “The construction of an objective view can be

hampered by party politics, conflicting interests within the host society and the potentially biased viewpoint of the event organisers and corporate sponsors” (Jones 2001, p.242 based on the work of Boyle 1997)”.

Jones (2001, p.242, based upon the works of Ritchie 1984, Getz 1991, Hall 1993 and Roche 1994) states that “Major events can have an impact upon the host in terms of the bidding process, social effects on residents, extra expenditure and revenue generation, infrastructure legacy, and longer term effects on tourism and economic activity via media exposure and return visits”.

“A major rationale behind the hosting of hallmark events is the longer term beneficial effect, additional to direct expenditure, which such events may bring. This is hypothesised to occur through both return visits by spectators and, more importantly, through the increased investment and tourism activity that such exposure brings” (Jones 2001, p.244, basing upon the National Heritage Committee writings of 1995).

“Expenditure impact assessments must be careful to distinguish between attendance at an event by those who are resident within and without the defined region. Only spending by the latter can be considered truly additional, unless significant numbers of local residents would otherwise have travelled elsewhere to see the same event, thus constituting a further event benefit”, i.e. resident expenditure leakages are avoided through hosting the event (Gazel and Schwer 1997 quoted in Jones 2001, p.248).

Of the few studies made on sport tourist characteristics, Nogawa conducted a survey on Japanese sport tourists participating in the Honolulu Marathon between 1988 and 1990. The author tried to determine the “characteristics of Japanese sport tourists and their economic impact on the event site, Oahu island” (quoted in Nogawa, Yamaguchi and Hagi 1996, p.47). This study analyses sport tourists participating in sport events, that is, as participants not only as spectators.

McKercher and Wong (2004, p.171) also studied tourism behaviour. They stated that there are two types of tourists visiting a defined destination: “first-time and repeat visitors”. On the other hand, destinations can also serve two roles, the authors stated: “main or secondary destination”. Quoting the work of Gitelson and Crompton (1984), the same authors stated that there are five reasons why people return to a destination: “risk reduction”, “meeting the same kind of people”, “emotional attachment”, “explore the destination more widely” and “expose destination to others”.



“While first time tourists establish their expectations on the basis of information obtained from external sources, such as tourism suppliers, travel intermediaries, or friends or relatives, repeat tourists set their expectations on the basis of previous experiences. They concluded that the critical point for increasing repeat patronage depended on the congruency between external communications of promised benefits or expectations from visiting and the ability of the destination to deliver on these by the experiences provided” (Mckercher and Wong, 2004 p.172, quoting Reid and Reid 1993).

Some reasons have been identified to explain why tourists might take “multidestinational trips”, that is: “the complex pattern of interdependent behaviour between trip participants wanting different needs satisfied; the effect of visiting friends-and-relatives (VFR) travel; the desire to seek variety; the belief that by aggregating attractions and destinations, the risk of a poor trip can be minimized; and that a variety of destinations in different locations may be need to accommodate tourist needs” (Mckercher and Wong 2004, p.172, quoting Lue, Crompton and Fesenmaier 1993).

Once again referring exclusively to sport event tourists, the encountered situation is probably different from those presented as, probably, these kind of tourists are a more homogenous group, as their joint main purpose is to attend a major sport event. In this UEFA Euro 2004 visitor attendance survey, it would be expectable that e.g. the main destination would be directly connected with the sport event and that other destination choices are related to the satisfaction of other sport consumption unrelated individual needs.

### **3. Methodology and hypotheses**

The data allowing us to profile the foreign visitor attendance of the UEFA Euro 2004 in Portugal, namely in *Braga* and *Guimarães*, was collected through personal interviewing.

The survey instrument used in the interviewing was settled departing from the following variables groups: socio-demographics (gender, age, nationality, residence country and marital status), sport consumption behaviour (physical activity practise, sport in the media and sport live attendance), travel conditions (with whom and how many travelling mates, overnight location, number of nights and reasons behind choice), budgets involved (amounts spent in the preparation of the trip and during the stay), image of Portugal (organization, number of previous trips to Portugal, country recommendation to best friend, intention of coming again).

The instrument was the result of the operationalisation process involving questioning and problem definition like, e.g.: Who attended to UEFA Euro 2004? Where did they choose to stay? What were the reasons behind the choice of their overnight location? What is their sport consumption behaviour? How much did they spend? What was their image of Portugal and of the event organization?

These questions raise other more complex ones, e.g.: What is the effect of the sport consumption behaviour of the visitors as participants on major sport event?

Sport consumption can be approached in several ways. In our survey we approached sport consumption by defining physical activity involvement, media consumption of sport contents and sports live attendance in terms of hours per week spent. Since the tourists that we profile attended a major sport event, it is interesting to find out if they have regular habits of sport live attendance or if the perceived behaviour is an exception? Are they usually just spectators or do they also practise regular any sport activity? In this case, they are live spectators but they can also be spectators of sports in the media. Are they?

What is the relation between nationality and residence country of a major sport event visitor and his travel budgets? As we stated before, “In order to consume leisure and tourism is necessary that the individuals have, in first place, their essential needs fulfilled. So, there is only leisure and tourism consumption if there is some money left after the individual satisfy his essential needs (Barreto 1995, p.61). Therefore, it would be expected that sport tourists are individuals with a relatively high income. On the other hand this would also mean that tourists with higher income are willing to spend more in sport tourism.

What are the factors that may influence the return of the visitors of a major sport event to the event’s host country city? One of the reasons behind this question is that one of the motivations behind the hosting of major events is the additional expenditure due to return visits by spectators, among others (Jones 2001, p.244, based on the writings of the National Heritage Committee 1995).

These reasoning led us to the formulation of the following seven main hypotheses groups:

H1. Visitors that usually reside in countries with a higher *per capita* Gross Domestic Product (GDP) spend or are willing to spend more in the event’s host country.

Barreto (1995, p.61) stated that in order to consume leisure and tourism it is necessary that the individuals have their essential needs fulfilled. There is only leisure and tourism consumption

if essential needs are satisfied. So, it would be expected that individuals with higher income would be willing to spend more money in leisure, therefore in sport tourism.

H2. Visitors that usually reside in countries more far away from the host country spend more money preparing the trip, choose more than one overnight location and stay for longer periods of time.

One of the expenses individuals have to support when travelling, is the money spend with transportation, e.g. a flight ticket. One of the determinants of the ticket price is the distance travelled. Therefore, it would be expected that tourists that travel from more distant places would have more costs preparing their tour. Mckercher (1998) argued that “the farther a person travels from the country of origin, the greater the number of destinations passed and the greater the likelihood of stopping”. According to this guideline, it would be expected that visitors that usually reside in far away countries would stay over night in more than one location and for longer periods of time.

H3. The percentage of visitors with regular sport consumption habits is higher than the percentage of visitors who do not have usual sport consumption habits.

**H3(a). The percentage of visitors who practise regular physical activity (e.g. *per week*) is higher than the percentage of visitors who, normally, do not practise this regularly physical activity.**

**H3(b). The percentage of visitors who watch, read or listen to sports in the media is higher than the percentage of visitors who do not watch, read or listen to sports in the media.**

**H3(c). The percentage of visitors who usually attend sports live is higher than the percentage of visitors who usually do not attend to sports live.**

H4. The percentage of visitors indicating the UEFA Euro 2004 tournament as being the main reason for determining their overnight location is higher than the one indicating other reasons.

**H4(a). The percentage of visitors justifying their overnight location by reasons like “halfway between the games I want to attend”, “was decided by the travel agency” or “to follow my team” is higher than those indicating reasons like “cheapest solution”, “I’ve got it recommended” or “to make tourism in the area”.**

Quoting Nogawa, Yamaguchi and Hagi (1996, p.47): “Kudo, Nogawa and Aida (1993) reported that sport tourists in the walking event showed little interest in touristic activities such as sightseeing, souvenir shopping, or a city tour. They concluded that tourists participating in sport events should not be treated as typical tourists by local business people”. So, it would be expected that sport tourists would made their decisions thinking about the sport event and not in other motives as to make cultural tourism, e.g.

H5. The tourists with an average active sport consumption habit of one hour or more *per week* have less potential to return to the UEFA Euro 2004 host country than those with an active sport consumption habit beneath one hour *per week*.

**H5(a).** Tourists with usual active sport consumption habits beneath one hour *per week* have a better image of the host country than the tourists with an usual active sport consumption pattern of one or more hours *per week*.

**H5(b).** The percentage of tourists that say they are willing to come again soon is higher within the tourists with usual active sport consumption habits beneath one hour *per week* than within the tourists with usual active sport consumption pattern of one or more hour *per week*.

**H5(c).** The percentage of tourists stating to recommend Portugal to their best friend is higher within the tourists group of active sport consumption habit beneath one hour *per week* than within those tourists group with an usual active sport consumption pattern of one or more hour *per week*.

H6. The tourists with an usual passive sport consumption of media audience representing over one hour of their weekly time budgets have less potential to return to the UEFA Euro 2004 host country than tourists with an usual passive sport consumption of media audience beneath one hour *per week*.

**H6(a).** Tourists with an usual passive sport consumption through media audience till one hour *per week* have a better image of the host country than the tourists with an usual passive sport consumption through media audience above one hour *per week*.

**H6(b).** The percentage of tourists saying they are willing to come again soon is higher within the tourists group with an usual passive sport consumption through media audience till one hour *per week* than within the tourists group with an usual passive sport consumption through media audience above one hour *per week*.

**H6(c).** The percentage of tourists stating to recommend Portugal to their best friend is higher within the tourists group with an usual passive sport consumption through media audience till one hour *per week* than within the tourists group with usual passive sport consumption through media audience above one hour *per week*.

H7. The tourists with usual passive sport consumption through live attendance of one hour or more *per week* have less potential to return to the UEFA Euro 2004 host country than tourists with usual passive sport consumption through live attendance under one hour *per week*.

**H7(a).** Tourists with an usual passive sport consumption through live attendance under one hour *per week* have a better image of the host country than the tourists with an usual passive sport consumption through live attendance of one hour or more *per week*.

**H7(b).** The percentage of tourists stating they are willing to come again soon is higher within the tourists group with an usual passive sport consumption through live attendance under one hour *per week* than within the tourists group with an usual passive sport consumption through live attendance of one hour or more *per week*.

**H7(c).** The percentage of tourists stating to recommend Portugal to their best friend is higher within the tourists with an usual passive sport consumption through live attendance under one hour *per week* than within the tourists group with an usual passive sport consumption through live attendance of one hour or more *per week*.

The last three hypotheses are reasonable assumptions of the (sport) tourists' usual sport consumption habits, as the UEFA Euro 2004 sport event would have been their main purpose of attendance in Portugal. Sport tourists with no sport consumption habits, specifically e.g. sport live attendance, may have come to Portugal for other reasons but the UEFA Euro 2004 and if they enjoyed their stay they might come back even when no sport event was hosted in our country.

The interviewing took place in the surroundings of the *Braga* and *Guimarães* stadia, between three and one hours before the UEFA Euro 2004 matches. To become interviewed, tourists had to confirm they had: (i) an individual ticket to the respective game, (ii) more than 14 years old and (iii) no residence in Portugal. Our sample is representative, as the method used was random, meaning that everyone in the target group "foreigners attending" had the same probability of being chosen, thus, kept record of their answers.

The sample was composed by 912 individuals and it represents an universe of all present foreign spectators.

A team of ten interviewers was organized. In each match, each interviewer carried 30 script interviews in English and one code card. Four to five hours before the beginning of the competition (as depending on the public transportation logistics for each stadium), a meeting was held within the field research team to settle final field research details, despite all the previous comprehensive training sessions all interviewers attended.

Finally, for the purpose of this paper, we consider 'sport tourism events' as "sports activities that attract tourists of which a large percentage are spectators", having the "the potential to attract non-resident media, technical personnel, athletes, coaches and other sports officials", following the definition of Zauhar (2004, p.16). When referring to sport tourists, we are referring to people who travel to a region (or country), other than they live in, to attend a sport event, in this case, the major sport event UEFA Euro 2004.

## **4. Results**

### **4.1. Sample descriptives**

In this section, we analyse the sample characteristics, namely, the tourists' nationality, gender, age, usual residence country and marital status. Data is presented in table 1.

Danish, Dutch, Italian, Bulgarian, Latvian and English tourists represent about 90% of the tourists attending the UEFA Euro 2004 matches in these two cities.

**Table 1: Sample characteristics**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Born in (n=912)</b>		
Denmark	298	<b>32,7%</b>
Netherlands	184	20,2%
Italy	181	19,8%
Bulgária	95	10,4%
Látvia	44	4,8%
England	20	2,2%
<b>Gender (n=904)</b>		
Male	744	<b>82,3%</b>
Female	160	17,7%
<b>Age (n=904)</b>		
14-19	24	2,7%
20-24	120	13,3%
25-29	231	<b>25,6%</b>
30-34	166	18,4%
35-39	97	10,7%
40-44	100	11,1%
45-49	56	6,2%
50-54	62	6,9%
55-59	24	2,7%
60-64	19	2,1%
65+	5	0,6%
<b>Usual Residence Country (n=909)</b>		
Denmark	285	<b>31,3%</b>
Netherlands	183	20,1%
Italy	136	15,0%
Bulgária	69	7,6%
Látvia	42	4,6%
England	40	4,4%
Switzerland	20	2,2%
Germany	19	2,1%
<b>Marital Status (n=911)</b>		
Single	424	<b>46,5%</b>
Married	331	36,3%
Living together	132	14,5%
Divorced	16	1,8%
Widow	4	0,4%
Separated	4	0,4%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

Notes: We only present representative nationalities and usual residence countries, considering representative when 'n' is at least equal 20. Exceptionally, we also consider Germany (n=19).

Other respondents born in: Germany (n=13), United States of America (n=10), Japan (n=10), China (n=9), Switzerland (n=8), Australia (n=8), United Kingdom except England (n=6), Canada (n=6), Portugal (non-residents in Portugal, n=4), Norway (n=3), France (n=2), New Zealand (n=2), Cyprus (n=2), Finland (n=2), Spain (n=1), Russia (n=1), Israel (n=1), Argentina (n=1) and Ireland (n=1).

Other usual residence countries: United States of America (n=16), France (n=12), Spain (n=11), Australia (n=11), United Kingdom except England (n=11), Japan (n=10), Canada (n=9), China (n=7), Belgium (n=5), Norway (n=5), Luxembourg (n=3), Sweden (n=2), New Zealand (n=2), South Africa (n=2), Cyprus (n=2), Finland (n=2), Hong Kong (n=1), Austria (n=1), Romania (n=1) and Ireland (n=1).

The most frequent nationality is the one of the team playing in both *Braga* and *Guimarães*, namely, Denmark. Regarding the tourists gender, the difference between male and female tourists is remarkable: male foreign tourists have an incidence of 82,3%.

When analysing the tourists age, 25,6% of them had ages between 25 and 29 years and 79% of them had between 20 and 44 years of age.

In relation to “residence country”, Danish are again the most frequent, representing 78,5%.

When comparing the tourists’ nationality with their residence country, we verify that Switzerland and Germany only become significant at the residence country level. Bulgarian tourists represent 10,4% of the total represented nationalities, nevertheless, Bulgaria as residence country only represents 7,6%, meaning that a significant percentage of Bulgarians didn’t come from Bulgaria, that is, they do not usually live there. The opposite happens with English tourists: while 2,2% of the sport event tourists are English, twofold as many sport tourists attending the event are usually living in England. This is possibly connected to the fact that England is a typical european immigrant country.

When looking at the tourists’ marital status, singles and married represent 97% of the total: singles represent 46,5%, married 36,3% and sport event tourists in a ‘living together’ marital relationship 14,5%.

## **4.2. Regular sport consumption behaviour**

Sport consumption can be measured in several ways. In this section, we analyse the tourists’ sport consumption behaviour through the analysis of their weekly spent number of hours in: (i) regular physical activity, (ii) watching, reading or listening to sports in the media and (iii) sport live attendance.

Interestingly, despite the general assumption that regular sport fans must be the greater majority of the total number of attendants within major sport events, 30,4% of the respondents stated that they normally do not attend sports live.

9,3% of all respondents indicated to not practise regular physical activity at all.

Only 1,6% of all respondents do not have any regular consumption contact, within a week time, with sports contents in the media.

**Table 2: Sport Consumption Behaviour**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Hour spend in regular physical activity per week (n=912)</i>		
0	85	9,3%
1-2	227	<b>24,9%</b>
3-4	209	22,9%
5-6	173	19,0%
7-10	147	16,1%
11-19	42	4,6%
20+	29	3,2%
<i>Hours spend watching, reading, listening sports in the media per week (n=912)</i>		
0	15	1,6%
1-4	372	<b>40,8%</b>
5-9	262	28,7%
10-14	171	18,8%
15-20	75	8,2%
21-30	12	1,3%
31+	5	0,5%
<i>Hours spend in sport live attendance per week (n=912)</i>		
0	277	<b>30,4%</b>
]0-1[	83	9,1%
1	210	23,0%
2	220	24,1%
3-4	65	7,1%
5-7	41	4,5%
8+	16	1,8%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

Within the representative nationalities group, Latvian tourists are the ones with the highest mean in hours spend *per week* in regular physical activity; English sport event tourists are the ones that usually spend more time, in average, watching, reading or listening to sports in the media; Danish sport event tourists are the ones spending more time in sport live attendance.

Making the same analysis by residence countries, sport event tourists usually living in Latvia and England maintain the same values. The sport tourists usually living in Germany have the highest sport live attendance rate.

### 4.3. Travelling Settings

In this section, we analysing the tourists' travelling settings. In table 3, data concerning their travel mates and travel group (in table 3); their overnight analysis is presented in the



following table, table 4, with data about the overnight location, figures and reasons behind the choice location.

**Table 3: Travel mates**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Travel mate (n=909)</b>		
None	35	3,9%
Friends	602	<b>66,2%</b>
Family	264	29%
Friends and family	8	0,9%
<b>Size of the group of friends * (n=610)</b>		
1-2	224	<b>36,7%</b>
3-4	187	30,7%
5-6	64	10,5%
7-8	62	10,2%
9-10	18	3%
11-15	14	2,3%
16-20	6	1%
21+	35	5,7%
<b>Size of the group of relatives * (n=272)</b>		
1	134	<b>49,3%</b>
2	60	22,1%
3	36	13,2%
4	20	7,4%
5-8	18	6,6%
9+	4	1,5%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

Notes: \* = figures exclude the respondents themselves.

As it may be seen, there are as good as no sport event tourists travelling alone (only 3,9%) and the absolute greater majority defines their travel mates as ‘friends’.

The size of the travel group is also an interesting aspect to consider, as some might assume that sport event tourists always travel in big fan groups. When travelling with relatives, in 91,9% of the cases the travel groups don’t get bigger than four additional mates (or five, if including the interviewee) as nearly 50% travel with only one single relative. When travelling with friends the figures become different. Only 36,7% travel with a single relative and 67,4% is the incidence of groups with a size of five mates, including the interviewee. The remaining 32,6% represent groups bigger than six elements, including the interviewee.

Going on to table 4, the overnight analysis shows us that only 22,7% of all sport event tourists stayed in more than one overnight location:

**Table 4: Travel Accommodations**

Representative Overnight Locations (Cities)	Frequency	Percentage
Primary location (City) (n=880)		
<i>Porto</i>	169	<b>19,2%</b>
<i>Guimarães</i>	98	11,1%
<i>Braga</i>	92	10,5%
<i>Vigo</i>	84	9,5%
<i>Lisboa</i>	58	6,6%
<i>Viana do Castelo</i>	30	3,4%
<i>P. Varzim</i>	27	3,1%
<i>Esposende</i>	20	2,3%
Secondary location (City) (n=200)		
<i>Lisboa</i>	53	<b>26,5%</b>
<i>Porto</i>	48	24%
<i>Braga</i>	24	12%
Number of overnights		
In primary location (City) (n=881)		
0	5	0,6%
1-2	159	18%
3-4	163	<b>18,5%</b>
5-6	158	17,9%
7-8	119	13,5%
9-10	113	12,8%
11-13	66	7,5%
14-18	57	6,5%
19-28	32	3,6%
29+	9	1%
In secondary location (City) (n=181)		
0	2	1,1%
1-2	63	<b>34,8%</b>
3-4	59	32,6%
5-6	31	17,1%
7-8	19	10,5%
9-13	4	2,2%
14+	3	1,7%
Reasons behind overnight location (City) (n=863)		
Halfway between the games that intend to assist	343	<b>39,7%</b>
Decided by the travel agency	109	12,6%
Cheapest option	97	11,2%
Follow a certain team	69	8%
Make tourism in the area	55	6,4%
Recommended	34	3,9%
Decided by the organization agency	13	1,5%
Other	143	16,6%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

Notes: **Other primary overnight locations:** *Aveiro* (n=18), *Gerês* (n=15), *Coimbra* (n=12), *Peniche* (n=11); *Gaia*, *Espinho* and *Faro* (n=10); *Amarante* (n=9); *Vila do Conde* and *Pontevedra* (n=8); *Figueira da Foz*, *Lamego* and *Ponte da Barca* (n=7); *Amares*, *Ponte de Lima*, *Leiria* and *Albufeira* (n=6); City in *Algarve*, *Régua*, *Chaves*, *Setúbal* and *Valença* (n=5); *Vila Nova de Cerveira*, *Famalicão*, *Fafe*, *Nazaré*, *Torreira*, City in Spain and *Monção* (n=4); *Cúria*, *Bragança*, *Terras de Bouro*, *Arcos de Valdevez*, *Madalena*, *Angeiras*, *Tui* and *Sanxenxo* (n=3); *Viseu*, *Penafiel*, *Vila Real*, *Felgueiras*, *Santo Tirso*, *Paços de Ferreira*, *Estoril*, *Torres Vedras*, *Melgaço*, *Lavra*, *Madrid*, *Santarém*, *Bayona*, *Estela* and *Portimão* (n=2); *Ovar*, *Caminha*, *Vila Moura*, *S. João da Madeira*, *Cabeceiras de Basto*, *Cascais*, *Costa da Caparica*, *Ourém*, *Feira*, *Oliveira de Azeméis*, *Lousada*, *Mealhada*, *Castelo de Vide*, *Mira*, *Sintra*, *Pombal*, *Corunha*, *La Tocha*, *Quarteira*, *Castelo Branco*, *Ermesinde*, *Lagos*, *Valpaços*, *Barcelos*, *Esmoriz*, *Compostela*, *Vidago*, *Montalegre*, *Fátima*, *Fao*, *Gondomar*, *Sever do Vouga*, *S. Pedro de Moel*, *Entroncamento*, *Cortegaça*, *Portonova*, *Bom Sucesso*, City in *Galiza* and *Vila Garcia* (n=1).

**Other secondary overnight locations:** *Guimarães* (n=16), *Faro* (n=7); *Ovar* and *Coimbra* (n=4); *Aveiro*, *Figueira da Foz*, *Póvoa do Varzim* and City in Spain (n=3); *Caminha*, *Ponte da Barca*, *Nazaré* and *Pontevedra* (n=2); *Viana do Castelo*, City in *Algarve*, *Vila do Conde*, *Peniche*, *Esposende*, *Amarante*, *Fafe*, *Vila Real*,

*Cascais, Terras de Bouro, Ourém, Santo Tirso, Oliveira de Azeméis, Tondela, Maia, Mira, Setúbal, Funchal, Compostela, Montalegre, S. Pedro de Moel, Óbidos, Arganil and Portonova (n=1).*

Weirdly, the greater majority of sport event tourists visiting the cities of *Guimarães* and/or *Braga* in order to attend the four UEFA Euro 2004 matches did not overnight in these cities. In fact, only 21,6% considered transforming *Guimarães* and/or *Braga* into their primary overnight location and 12% chose *Braga* as their secondary overnight location.

The cities capitalising more sport event tourists after *Guimarães* and *Braga* together (21,6%) were Porto (19,2%), Vigo (9,5%) and Lisbon (6,6%), for the primary overnight location and Lisbon (26,5%) and Porto (24%), for the secondary overnight location.

It is also remarkable that only 33,4% of the sport event tourists have chosen their primary overnight location within cities of the *Minho* region. Considering the secondary overnight location, this percentage shrinks even more (only 24%!).

Analysing these values by NUT II, 74,6% of the sport event tourists chose cities in the North of Portugal for their main overnight location and the remaining chose equally cities in the South of Portugal (12,7%) and in Spain (12,7%). Considering the secondary overnight location, 63% of the sport event tourists stayed in the North and 33% in the South of Portugal. The sport event tourists choosing Spain, mainly the Vigo area, as secondary location are now a lot less significant.

If we change once again our mode of analysis and regard the overnight in terms of its sea proximity – that is, if the respective city has an direct access to the sea side within its city limits – 61,5% of the cities chosen as primary overnight locations have a direct sea access. This percentage is even more significant when looking at the secondary overnight location decisions of the sport event tourists attending UEFA Euro 2004 matches at *Guimarães* or *Braga*: in 81,7% of the cases sport event tourists chose overnight locations within cities having a direct sea access.

In table 5 we present the same previously presented data, only grouped according to their districts belonging.

As it might be seen, the district of *Braga* was chosen first approximately by only one quarter of all sport event tourists (27,8%) to stay over night. *Porto* and all spanish districts represent 30,5%. In the secondary overnight location analysis, the districts of *Porto* and *Lisbon* have together 54,5% of the preferences, against only 21,5% of *Braga*.

**Table 5: Overnight location by districts**

Primary Location (n=880)			Secondary location (n=200)		
District	Frequency	Percentage	District	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Braga</i>	245	<b>27,8%</b>	<i>Porto</i>	55	<b>27,5%</b>
<i>Porto</i>	245	27,8%	<i>Lisboa</i>	54	27%
<i>Galiza</i>	106	12%	<i>Braga</i>	43	21,5%
<i>Lisboa</i>	66	7,5%	<i>Coimbra</i>	9	4,5%
<i>Viana do Castelo</i>	62	7%	<i>Aveiro</i>	8	4%
<i>Aveiro</i>	43	4,9%	<i>Faro</i>	8	4%
<i>Faro</i>	26	3%	<i>Viana do Castelo</i>	5	2,5%
<i>Leiria</i>	23	2,6%	<i>Leiria</i>	5	2,5%
<i>Coimbra</i>	20	2,3%	<i>Galiza</i>	4	2%
<i>Vila Real</i>	15	1,7%	Oth. Spanish Districts	3	1,5%
<i>Viseu</i>	9	1%	<i>Vila Real</i>	2	1%
Oth. Spanish Districts	6	0,7%	<i>Viseu</i>	1	0,5%
<i>Setúbal</i>	5	0,6%	<i>Santarém</i>	1	0,5%
<i>Santarém</i>	4	0,5%	<i>Setúbal</i>	1	0,5%
<i>Bragança</i>	3	0,3%	<i>Reg. Aut. da Madeira</i>	1	0,5%
<i>Castelo Branco</i>	1	0,1%			
<i>Portalegre</i>	1	0,1%			

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

Moving ahead to table 6, we can see the overnight locations grouped by regional belonging (NUT II):

**Table 6: Overnight location by regions**

Primary Location (n=880)			Secondary location (n=200)		
Region	Frequency	Percentage	Region	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Norte</i>	591	<b>67,2%</b>	<i>Norte</i>	106	<b>53%</b>
<i>Galiza</i>	105	11,9%	<i>Lisboa e Vale do Tejo</i>	58	29%
<i>Lisboa e Vale do Tejo</i>	85	9,7%	<i>Centro</i>	20	10%
<i>Centro</i>	65	7,4%	<i>Algarve</i>	8	4%
<i>Algarve</i>	26	3%	Oth. Spanish Regions	4	2%
Other Spanish Regions	7	0,8%	<i>Galiza</i>	3	1,5%
<i>Alentejo</i>	1	0,1%	<i>Reg. Aut. da Madeira</i>	1	0,5%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

North of Portugal leads both the primary and secondary overnight destinations. Nonetheless, when looking at the following percentages, the spanish region *Galiza* remains important for the primary overnight location choice and in the secondary the portuguese region *Lisboa e Vale do Tejo* prevails.

Analysing the distance from the overnight location to *Braga* district, where the games were played, we conclude that for the primary overnight location decision the sport event tourists preferred to be nearer to the *Braga* district.

Indeed, as shown in the next table (table 7), concerning primary overnight location decisions, 63,4% of the tourists stayed in *Braga* district and in districts frontier to *Braga* district as main location.

**Table 7: Overnight location by proximity to *Braga* District**

Primary Location (n=880)			Secondary location (n=200)		
	Frequency	Percentage		Frequency	Percentage
<i>Braga</i> District	245	27,8%	<i>Braga</i> District	43	21,5%
Frontier to <i>Braga</i> District	322	<b>35,6%</b>	Frontier to <i>Braga</i> District	62	<b>31%</b>
One District Away from <i>Braga</i> District	161	18,3%	One or Two Districts Away from <i>Braga</i> District	27	13,5%
Two or Three Districts Away from <i>Braga</i> District	115	13,1%	Three or More Districts Away from <i>Braga</i> District	68	34%
Four or More Districts Away from <i>Braga</i> District	37	4,2%			

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

If we consider the secondary location the results are quite different, since the tourists staying in *Braga* district and in districts frontier decrease to 52,5%.

#### **4.4. Involved budgets**

The following analyses present the amounts sport event tourists say to have spent in their residence countries in order to prepare the sport event trip as well as those amounts concerning the money they spent (or are willing to spend) in their stay.

In tables 9, 10 and 11, some further analyses are presented; the data allow us to make more detailed analyses involving the tourists' usual residence countries as well as their nationalities.

**Table 8: Sport event tourists' budgets**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Amount spend in residence country to prepare trip (without sport tickets) (n=912)		
0 €	7	0,8%
1-200 €	118	12,9%
201-400 €	167	18,3%
<b>401-600 €</b>	170	<b>18,6%</b>
601-900 €	150	16,4%
901-1000 €	125	13,7%
1001-2000 €	118	12,9%
2001-3000 €	28	3,1%
3001+ €	29	3,2%
Amount spent (or intend to) during the sport event stay (without sport tickets) (n=912)		
0 €	1	0,1%
<b>1-300 €</b>	298	<b>32,7%</b>
301-600 €	271	29,7%
601-1000 €	208	22,8%
1001-2000 €	91	10%
2001-3400 €	19	2,1%
3401+ €	24	2,6%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

As seen in the previous table, the individual budget to prepare the trip is quite similar to the one sport event tourists are intending to spend during their stay. In average, 53,3% of the respondents stated to have spent between 200 and 900 Euro to prepare the trip and 52,5% spent (or were willing to spend) between 300 and 1000 Euro in during their stay.

**Table 9: Average amount spent to prepare the trip (by usual residence country)**

Usual residence country	Average amount spent to prepare the trip (without sport tickets)
<b>Bulgaria (n=69)</b>	<b>1.175,80 €</b>
Denmark (n=283)	941,22 €
Latvia (n=42)	929,76 €
England (n=40)	926,38 €
Switzerland (n=20)	869,00 €
Italy (n=134)	692,63 €
Netherlands (n=175)	649,34 €
Germany (n=19)	616,47 €

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

Note: Average amount spent to prepare the trip of other residence countries: Australia=4.650€ (n=11), United Kingdom except England= 3.109,09€ (n=11), Japan=2.810€ (n=10), Canada=2.222,22€ (n=9), USA=1.253,13€ (n=16), China=885,71€ (n=6), Spain=809,09€ (n=11), Norway=720€ (n=5), Belgium=630€ (n=5).

Analysing the average amounts spent in the residence countries to prepare the trip, we verify that tourists usual living in Bulgaria were the ones that spent more (1.175,80 Euro), followed

closely by the ones living in Denmark (941,22 Euro), in Latvia (929,76 Euro) and in England (926,38 Euro).

**Table 10: Average amount spent/willing to spend during stay**

Average amount spent/willing to spend during stay by usual residence country		Average amount spent/willing to spend during stay by nationality	
Usual residence country	Average amount <sup>2</sup>	Nationality	Average amount <sup>2</sup>
<b>England (n=40)</b>	<b>1.239,38 €</b>	<b>English (n=20)</b>	<b>1.355,00 €</b>
Denmark (n=283)	964,74 €	Danish (n=295)	976,77 €
Switzerland (n=20)	877,50 €	Italian (n=179)	757,25 €
Germany (n=19)	631,58 €	Bulgarian (n=94)	659,57 €
Bulgaria (n=69)	611,76 €	Dutch (n=184)	610,46 €
Netherlands (n=175)	608,50 €	Latvian (n=44)	587,50 €
Latvia (n=42)	598,81 €		
Italy (n=134)	596,85 €		

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

Notes: Average amount spent/willing to spend by other resident countries: Australia=1.927,27€ (n=11), Americans=1.256,25€ (n=16), Canada=1.255,56€ (n=9), France=806,67€ (n=12), Norway=800€ (n=5), China=750€ (n=7), Spain=588,18€ (n=11), United Kingdom except England=586,36€ (n=11), Japan=580€ (n=10), Belgium=560€ (n=5).

Average amount spent/willing to spend by other nationalities: Australian=1.937,5€ (n=8), Americans=1.510€ (n=10), Portuguese (non resident in Portugal)=1.475€ (n=4), Canadians=1.300€ (n=6), Swiss=1.118,75€ (n=8), Japanese=580€ (n=10), Germans=571,54€ (n=13), Chinese=375,56€ (n=9), British except English=316,67€ (n=6).

Considering the average amount the tourists spent or were willing to spend during their stay, the tourists living in England were evidently the ones that spent or were willing to spend more (1.239,38 Euro), followed more closely by the tourists residing in Denmark (964,74 Euro) and the ones residing in Switzerland (877,50 Euro).

If we consider the tourists' nationality instead of their usual residence country (please go back to table 7), we notice that Switzerland and Germany residing sport event tourists' budgets become non-representative as well as sport event tourists residing in Italy spending few Euro suddenly, evaluated by nationality, become the third foreign nationality to spend more during their stay.

At his time, along our paper we have used the average total expenditures (or total budgets). Now, we are going to use the average daily expenditure (or daily budget).

In table 11, we find that the previous results weighted results, weighted in terms of number of nights stayed, change. Sport event tourists usually living in Switzerland have the highest *per*

<sup>2</sup> Without sport tickets.

day value (150,96 Euro), being followed closely by the sport event tourists residing in Italy (150,27 Euro).

**Table 11: Average daily expenditure**

Average daily expense during stay by usual residence country		Average daily expense during stay by nationality	
Usual residence country	Average expense <sup>2</sup>	Nationality	Average expense <sup>2</sup>
Switzerland (n=20)	<b>150,96 €</b>	Italian (n=179)	<b>150,07 €</b>
Italy (n=134)	150,27 €	Danish (n=295)	145,05 €
England (n=40)	137,88 €	Dutch (n=184)	134,38 €
Netherlands (n=175)	135,96 €	English (n=20)	131,70 €
Denmark (n=283)	134,20 €	Latvian (n=44)	110,74 €
Latvia (n=42)	111,07 €	Bulgarian (n=94)	94,11 €
Bulgaria (n=69)	92,03 €		
Germany (n=19)	78,30 €		

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

Notes: Average daily expense in Portugal by non representative usual residence countries: China=492,86€ (n=7), USA=353,54€ (n=16), Australia=255,48€ (n=11), Japan=175,81€ (n=10), Canada=132,13€ (n=9), Spain=127,42€ (n=10), France=116,6€ (n=12), Belgium=106,67€ (n=5), Norway=106,35€ (n=5), United Kingdom except England=83,94€ (n=11).

Average daily expense in Portugal by non representative nationalities: Americans=505,86€ (n=10), Australians=231,7€ (n=8), Japanese=175,81€ (n=10), Swiss=166,19€ (n=8), Canadians=146,94€ (n=6), Portuguese (non residents in Portugal)=114,15€ (n=4), Chinese=91,85€ (n=9), Germans=71,82€ (n=11), British except English=58,33€ (n=6).

Considering the nationalities, Italians spend more *per day* (150,07 Euro), followed closely by the Danish (145,05 Euro).

#### 4.5. Image scaling

The personal satisfaction sport event tourists have from a site is of vital importance to the later potential returning to the same site. In our case, we decided to measure indirectly satisfaction by asking the interviewees to cite their own opinions on the image of the event's organization and the country as well as if they were thinking on coming again soon and if they were willing to recommend Portugal to their best friend.

The evaluation was bordered within '1' (awful image) and '10' (stunning image).

When regarding Portugal and the event organization, the general idea caught is that foreign sport event visitors had a globally better image of the country (mean of 8,3 mark) than of the sport event organization (mean of 7,8 mark).



**Table 12: Image**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Image of the sport event organization (n=909)		
1	1	0,1%
2	6	0,7%
3	5	0,6%
4	15	1,7%
5	33	3,6%
6	56	6,2%
7	175	19,3%
<b>8</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>43,6%</b>
9	140	15,4%
10	82	9%
Image of Portugal (n=912)		
1	0	0%
2	3	0,3%
3	1	0,1%
4	4	0,4%
5	21	2,3%
6	39	4,3%
7	125	13,7%
<b>8</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>36,5%</b>
9	193	21,2%
10	193	21,2%
Previous trips to the country (n=912)		
<b>0</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>69,7%</b>
1	146	16%
2	59	6,5%
3	29	3,2%
4+	42	4,6%
Intention of coming again soon (n=900)		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>87%</b>
No	117	13%
Recommend Portugal to best friend (n=912)		
<b>Yes</b>	<b>887</b>	<b>97,3%</b>
No	25	2,7%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Database

Latvian tourists were the ones with the better image of both analysed items. Latvia residents had the best image of Portugal, while Germany residents had the best image of the sport event organization. An also very interesting result is that almost 70% of the tourists came to Portugal for the first time.

#### 4.6. Hypotheses verification

*Hypothesis 1* states that visitors that usually reside in countries with a higher *per capita* GDP spend or are willing to spend more during their stay in the event's host country. Therefore, it would be expected that, grouping all resident countries in two groups, one with countries

where the *per capita* GDP is lower than, e.g., 27 USD and another where it is higher, the first group would spend or would be willing to spend more than the second group.

**Table 13: *Per capita* GDP**

Countries with <i>per capita</i> GDP higher than 27 USD (n=558)			Countries with <i>per capita</i> GDP lower than 27 USD (n=310)		
Country	<i>Per capita</i> GDP (PPP US\$)	Frequency	Country	<i>Per capita</i> GDP (PPP US\$)	Frequency
Luxembourg	61,19	3	Japan	26,94	10
Norway	36,60	5	France	26,92	12
Ireland	36,36	1	Italy	26,43	136
USA	35,75	16	Finland	26,19	2
Denmark	30,94	285	UK	26,15	11
Switzerland	30,01	20	Sweden	26,05	2
Canada	29,48	9	New Zealand	21,47	2
Austria	29,22	1	Spain	21,46	11
Netherlands	29,10	183	Israel	19,53	1
Australia	28,26	11	Cyprus	18,36	2
Belgium	27,57	5	South Africa	10,07	2
Germany	27,10	19	Látvia	9,21	42
			Bulgária	7,13	69
			Romania	6,56	1
			China	4,58	7

Source: Human Development Report 2004, published for the United Nations Development Program

As the result of this exercise, the average amount spent (or willing to spend) by sport event tourists during their stay are: 733,64 Euro for visitors living in the first group of countries (those having a *per capita* GDP lower than 27 USD) and 861,92 Euro for visitors living in the second group (countries having a *per capita* GDP higher than 27 USD).

Indeed, sport event tourists usually living in countries with a higher *per capita* income spent (or were willing to spend) more 128,28 Euro (nearly 17,5%) than those residing in countries with a lower *per capita* GDP. **Thus, we do not reject the H1.**

**Hypothesis 2** (H2) states that visitors usually residing in countries more far away from the host country spend more preparing their sport event trip, choose more than one overnight location and stay more time.

In order to test this hypothesis, we need to establish the distances between the UEFA Euro 2004 host country and the sport event tourists' countries of origin that we considered to be their usual residence country. The distances were settled according to each countries capital: Lisbon and the other countries' capitals (distances that can be seen in table 14).

**Table 14: Distance between the capital of the visitors' residence country and Lisbon**

Countries with distance lower than 4.000 km (n=808)			Countries with distance higher than 4.000 km (n=101)		
Country	Distance (km)	Frequency	Country	Distance (km)	Frequency
Spain (Madrid)	871	11	Israel (Tel Aviv)	4.013	1
France (Paris)	1.458	12	Canada (Toronto)	5.394	9
UK (London)	1.589	11	USA (Washington)	5.746	16
Ireland (Dublin)	1.645	1	South Africa (Pretoria)	8.196	2
Belgium (Bruxels)	1.711	5	Latvia (Riga)	8.229	42
Luxembourg (Luxembourg)	1.713	3	China (Beijing)	9.678	7
Switzerland (Zurich)	1.726	20	Japan (Tokyo)	11.159	10
Italy (Rom)	1.864	136	New Zealand (Wellington)	16.599	2
Netherlands (Amsterdam)	1.868	183	Australia (Sydney)	18.155	11
Austria (Viena)	2.302	1			
Germany (Berlin)	2.305	19			
Denmark (Copenhagen)	2.480	285			
Norway (Oslo)	2.616	5			
Bulgaria (Sofia)	2.758	69			
Romania (Bucarest)	2.978	1			
Sweden (Stockholm)	2.993	2			
Finland (Helsinki)	3.365	2			
Cyprus (Nicosia)	3.768	2			

Source: <http://www.export911.com/convert/distaCalc.htm>

In average, sport event tourists that usually reside in countries with a capital staying less than 4.000 km away from Lisbon spent 861,29 Euro preparing the trip, while those over 4.000 km spent 1.901,49 Euro. The difference is remarkable, 1.040,20 Euro, about 120,77% more.

Amazingly, data showed us also that sport event tourists travelling from more than 4.000 km spent or were willing to spend more during their stay (35,6% more) and had an higher daily expense rate (54,3% more), always excluding sport tickets.

H2 also states that visitors usually residing in countries more far away from the host country choose more than one overnight location. In table 15, we present the total number of tourists by distance and number of overnight sites.

**Table 15: Visitor that, besides the main location, chose a secondary location**

	Total Visitors	Visitors that chose a secondary location	Percentage of total
Distance less than 4.000 km	796	150	18,84%
Distance more than 4.000 km	101	28	27,72%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

The result shows us that 27,72% of the sport event tourists travelling from a distance over 4.000 km stayed in more than one overnight location and that only 18,84% of those travelling from less than 4.000 km did the same, that is, have chosen at least a secondary location stay over night.

When looking at the next table, the average number of nights that tourists stay over night in one or more sites by travelled distances is seen. As it can be seen, even though the difference is slight, sport event tourists whose usually reside closer to the event hosting country stay 8,55 against 8,14 nights of the others. That is, sport event tourists residing closer to the hosting country stay a little bit more time.

**Table 16: Average number of overnights**

	Total	Primary location	Secondary location
Distance less than 4.000 km	8,55	4,55	3,99
Distance more than 4.000 km	8,14	4,71	3,43

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

This result may seem to be conflicting with our hypothesis, but this is probably due to our research instrument. It asks the sport event tourists only about two overnight locations and, as a result, we only have the number of nights tourists stated to prevail in two locations.

As suggested by Mckercher (1998, p.172), “the farther a person travels from the country of origin, the greater number of destinations passed and the greater the likelihood of stopping”. Thus, if we would have asked for more than two overnight locations, the results could have been different, who knows, more consistent with the stated in the literature.

**Table 17: Average number of overnights in secondary location**

	Average number of overnights
Distance less than 4.000 km	4,10
Distance between 2.000 and 4.000 km	3,84
Distance between 4.000 and 10.000 km	3,58
Distance more than 10.000 km	3,43

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

Finally, if we analyse the average number of overnights that sport event tourists stated to stay in their secondary location (see table 17), we confirm that the farther a person usually lives,

less time he or her spends in the secondary location. Following the idea of the former paragraph, this could mean that the farther a sport event tourist travels from the country of origin, the greater are the number of locations they want to visit and the less time they are willing to spend in each one. In order to verify this assumption, we would have needed to have asked details on more than two overnight sites. This is definitely something to assess in future research. **Therefore, we reject H2.** <sup>3</sup>

**Hypothesis 3** states that the percentage of visitors with regular sport consumption habits is higher than the percentage of those with no such habits. The event tourists' sports habits may be seen in table 18.

**Table 18: Hours spent in sport consumption behaviour**

	Frequency	Percentage
Hours spend in regular physical activity <i>per week</i> (n=912)		
0 hours	85	9,32%
1-2 hours	227	24,89%
More than 2 hours	600	65,79%
Hours spend watching, reading or listening to sports in the media <i>per week</i> (n=912)		
0 hours	15	1,64%
1-2 hours	187	20,50%
More than 2 hours	710	77,85%
Hours spend in sport live attendance <i>per week</i> (n=912)		
0 hours	277	30,37%
1 hour	293	32,13%
2 hours and more	342	37,50%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

H3(a) states that the percentage of visitors practising regular physical activity *per week* is higher than the percentage of visitors that, normally, do not practise regular physical activity. As it might be seen in table 18, only 9,32% of the tourists do not practise regularly any kind of physical activity *per week*, while 24,89% spend up to two hours and 77,85% spend more than two hours. We do not reject H3(a).

H3(b) states that the percentage of visitors watching, reading or listening to sports in the media is higher than the percentage of visitors that don't. Indeed, the percentage of tourists not consume sport contents in the media is insignificant (1,6%). Almost 78% spend do consume sport contents in the media regularly. We do not reject H3(b).

<sup>3</sup> Although visitors usually residing in countries more far away spend more preparing the trip and choose more than one overnight location.

Lastly, H3(c) states that the percentage of visitors usually attending sports live is higher than the percentage of visitors not attending sports live. Once again analysing table 18, we find that, effectively, 30,37% of the visitors usually do not attend sports live. The percentage of tourists that spend one hour and two hours or more attending sports live *per week* is 32,13% and 37,50%, respectively. Thus, we do not reject H3(c).

After analysing all H3 sub-hypothesis, **we conclude that we do not reject H3**, that is, the percentage of visitors with regular sport consumption habits is higher than the percentage of those with no sport consumption habits.

**Hypothesis 4** states that the percentage of visitors overnighing in a location directly motivated by the tournament is higher than the percentage of visitors with other reasons.

According to table 19, the reasons directly related to the UEFA Euro 2004 were pointed out by 49,25% of the interviewees, while the reasons not directly related with UEFA Euro 2004 were pointed out by only 21,55%. **Thus, we do not reject H4.**

**Table 19: Reasons behind overnight location**

Reasons (n=863)	Frequency	Percentage
Reasons directly related with UEFA Euro 2004	425	49,25%
Halfway between the games that intend to assist	343	39,76%
Decided by the organization agency	13	1,51%
Follow a certain team	69	7,99%
Reasons not directly related with UEFA Euro 2004	186	21,55%
Cheapest option	97	11,24%
Recommended	34	3,94%
Make tourism in the area	55	6,37%
Other reasons	252	29,2%
Decided by the travel agency	109	12,63%
Other	143	16,57%

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

**Hypothesis 5** has three sub-hypothesis.

H5(a) states that sport tourists with regular active sport consumption beneath one hour *per week* have a better image of the host country than sport tourists practising one or more hours.

Indeed, sport event tourists with an usual active sport consumption pattern beneath one hour *per week* evaluated, in a scale from 1 to 10, the image of the country with a 8,39 mark. Those with one or more hours practice *per week* gave an 8,29 mark. We do not reject H5(a).

H5(b) and H5(c) state that the percentage of tourists that say that are willing to come again soon and that would recommend Portugal to their best friend are higher within the tourists with usual active sport consumption under one hour *per week* than within the tourists with usual active sport consumption of one and more hours *per week*.

**Table 20: Data to verify H5(b) and H5(c)**

	Yes		No		Total
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Intention of coming again soon					900
Under 1 hour <i>per week</i>	73	82,02%	16	17,98%	89
One hour <i>per week</i> or more	710	87,55%	101	12,45%	811
Recommend Portugal to best friend					912
Under 1 hour <i>per week</i>	88	95,65%	4	4,35%	92
One hour <i>per week</i> or more	799	97,44%	21	2,56%	820

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

Table 20 gives us an idea about the resolution of H5(b) and H5(c): 82,02% of the tourists with usual active sport consumption habits beneath one hour *per week* state they are willing to come again soon; this percentage becomes higher within the tourists practising one or more hours (up to 87,55%). H5(b) is rejected.

We also reject H5(c). The percentage of tourists stating to recommend Portugal to their best friend is higher within the tourists with usual active sport consumption behaviour of one or more hours, 97,44%, against 96,65% of those beneath one hour.

**This leads us to reject H5.** This brings us to the assumption that, likely, tourists being active sport consumers under one hour *per week* have less potential to return to the UEFA Euro 2004 host country (Portugal) than tourists consuming actively sport for one or more hours *per week*.

**Hypothesis 6** has three sub-hypothesis too.

H6(a) states that tourist with usual passive sport consumption habits through media audience of one or less hours *per week* have a better image of the host country than the tourists with usual passive sport consumption habits through media audience over one hour *per week*.

**H6(a) is rejected.** Tourists with usual passive sport consumption through media audience of one or less hours *per week* evaluated Portugal, in a scale from 1 to 10, with a mark of 8,26 against 8,30 of those tourists with a media audience of sport contents over one hour *per week*.

H6(b) and H6(c) state that the percentage of tourists willing to come again soon and recommending Portugal to their best friend are higher within the group of tourists with a passive sport consumption through media audience of one or less hours *per week* than within the group with an audience over one hour *per week*.

Analysing table 21, we verify that 85,19% of the tourist with usual passive sport consumption through media audience habits of one or less hours *per week* state they are willing to come again soon. This percentage is higher (87,18%) within the tourists with an audience of more than one hour *per week*. Therefore, we reject hypothesis H6(b).

**Table 21: Data to verify H6(b) and H6(c)**

	Yes		No		Total
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Intention of coming again soon					900
Under 1 hour <i>per week</i>	69	85,19%	12	14,81%	81
One hour <i>per week</i> or more	714	87,18%	105	12,82%	819
Recommend Portugal to best friend					912
Under 1 hour <i>per week</i>	81	100%	0	0%	81
One hour <i>per week</i> or more	806	96,99%	25	3,01%	831

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

Regarding H6(c), the percentage of tourists stating to recommend Portugal to their best friend is indeed higher within the tourists with usual passive sport consumption through media audience with one or less hours *per week* (100%) than within tourists with usual passive sport consumption through media audience over one hour *per week* (96,99%), meaning that we do not reject H6(c).

**The presented results make us reject H6.** This brings us to the assumption that, likely, tourists being passive sport consumers of sport contents in the media above one hour *per week* have less potential to return to the UEFA Euro 2004 host country (Portugal) than tourists consuming passively sport contents in media for less than one hour *per week*.

**Hypothesis 7** has also a threefold statement.

H7(a) states that tourist with usual passive sport consumption through live attendance under one hour *per week* have a better image of the host country than the tourists with an usual passive sport consumption through live attendance of one or more hours *per week*. This hypothesis cannot be rejected, because tourists with usual passive sport consumption through live attendance under one hour *per week* gave, in a scale from 1 to 10, evaluated Portugal by



giving a mark of 8,33, being higher than the mark given by tourist consuming sport passively through live attendance of one or more hours *per week* (=8,28).

H7(b) and H7(c) state that the percentage of tourists willing to come again soon and recommending Portugal to their best friend are higher within the tourists group usually consuming passively sport through live attendance less than one hour *per week* than within the other group consuming it for one or more hours *per week*.

When analysing table 22, we find that 82,87% of the tourist with usual passive sport consumption through live attendance beneath one hour *per week* state that they are willing to come again soon. This percentage is of 89,69% within the tourists with usual passive sport consumption through live attendance of one or more hours *per week*. Then, we reject H7(b).

**Table 22: Data to verify H7(b) and H8(c)**

	Yes		No		Total
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Intention of coming again soon					899
Under 1 hour <i>per week</i>	295	82,87%	61	17,03%	356
One hour <i>per week</i> or more	487	89,69%	56	10,31%	545
Recommend Portugal to best friend					911
Under 1 hour <i>per week</i>	352	97,78%	8	2,22%	360
One hour <i>per week</i> or more	534	96,91%	17	3,09%	551

Source: UEFA Euro 2004 Visitors Database

Regarding H7(c), the percentage of tourists that recommend Portugal to their best friend is, indeed, higher within the tourists with usual passive sport consumption through live attendance under one hour *per week* (97,78%) than within tourists attending sport live for one or more hours *per week* (96,91%). We do not reject H7(c).

**All the results bring us to reject H7.** We assume that, likely, sport event tourists normally being passive sport consumers through live attendance of one hour or more *per week* have less potential to return to the UEFA Euro 2004 (Portugal) than tourists attending sport live beneath one hour *per week*.

## 5. Discussion

Naturally, the most frequent nationalities and residence countries in our sample were those belonging to countries playing in *Braga* and *Guimarães*, that is: Denmark, Netherlands, Italy, Bulgaria and Latvia. They represented, respectively, 88% and 78,5% of the foreign tourists attending to the UEFA Euro 2004 matches played in these two cities.

Comparing the tourists' nationalities with their residence countries, we identified differences: Switzerland, Germany and England became more significant as residence countries, in our opinion due to the fact that they are immigrant nations. The opposite happened with Bulgaria. Bulgarian sport event tourists came from several other residence countries than their own, it is typically an emigrant country.

Regarding sport consumption as one possible explanation source for major sport event attendance, physical activity practise, media audience of sport contents and sport live attendance helped us to disaggregate the won data base figures.

Surprisingly, (i) 30,4% of the sport event tourists do not have the habit to attend sport live and unsurprisingly, (ii) the sedentary among UEFA Euro 2004 attendants is lower than 10% and (iii) the sport event tourist not consuming sport contents in media is residual (1,6%).

In terms of those public expectations indicating a potential of having a greater majority of foreign match attendants overnighing in the *Braga* and *Guimarães* area, we must state that only a few, 33,4%, chose the *Minho* region for their primary overnight. This figure is corrected down in the case of the secondary site (24%). 74,6% of the foreign sport event tourists chose sites in the North of Portugal to remain as primary location. This figure decreases when looking at the secondary location (63%).

When looking at the sea proximity of the chosen overnight sites, 61,5% of the primary chosen cities have a direct sea access and 81,7% of the secondary chosen.

The spanish region *Galiza* becomes competitive within the primary site location choice. In the secondary site choice *Lisboa e Vale do Tejo* becomes more important after the North of Portugal.

The same "rule" seems to influence primary and secondary options regarding the distances to the *Braga* district, wherein all matches took place. The primary choice is nearer by than the secondary site location choice.

In terms of average daily expenditure by residence country, sport event tourists living in Switzerland spent the most, 150,96 Euro *per day*, closely followed by Italy residents (150,27 Euro). In terms of nationalities, Italian spent the most 150,07 Euro *per day*, closely followed closely by Danish (145,05 euros).

Considering the total amount sport event tourists spent or were willing to spend during all their stay, the sport events tourists living in England evidently had the biggest budget, in average, 1.239,38 Euro, followed closely by those living in Denmark (964,74 Euro) and in Switzerland (877,50 Euro).

Sport event tourists retained a globally better image of Portugal (mark of 8,3) than of the event organization (mark of 7,8), as 70% of the tourists came to Portugal for the very first time. This might reinforce the publicly announced idea that Portugal a great number new people were potential new tourists and prognostic marketing strategies should concentrate on those. If we add the fact that sport event tourists with an higher *per capita* GDP spent more money at the UEFA Euro 2004 in Portugal, we obtain that the maximum revenue of a major sport tourism event is fostered when all these aspects are taken into account.

As seen in the hypotheses verification, tourists usually residing in countries farther than 4.000 km from Portugal spent 36% more in the destination country (or 54,3% more by each day spend!). In the first place, tourists travelling from greater distances already spent huge amounts of money in preparing the trip. When they reach the host country, they do not worry with “saving” money and they have a completely different sense for the value of the Euro. Secondly, since the trip is expensive, only individuals with higher incomes are able to afford it, bringing bigger budgets.

Tour operators should also attend the routines of distance travellers. Our results show that sport event tourists coming from farther away have a 28% chance to choose more than one site to stay, against 19% of those coming from nearer sites. This is a valuable information for package tours, as they should supply different stays for customers traveling from greater distances.

When we analyse the average number of nights tourists stay in their secondary location, we verify that the farther a person usually lives, the least time is spent in the secondary location. Once again, this seems to reinforce the idea of the previous paragraph. Nevertheless, further examination needed as our study only asked about two overnights.

One innovative aspect of this paper is the attempt to link regular sport consumption behaviour to the sport event tourists' characteristics: (i) practising physical activity, (ii) watching, reading or listening to sport contents in the media and (iii) attending to sports live served the end of settling a trend for attending visitors at the UEFA Euro 2004 in Portugal. Our final and main conclusion brings us up to the point where we state that sport event tourists with regular active and passive sport consumption habits were more represented.

In our pursuit of clearance of the overnight site location choices, we could identify 50% of sport event tourists pointing out reasons related directly to the tournament, that is: 'halfway between the matches', 'to follow my team' or 'decision of the organization agency'. At least 22% chose their overnight site basing on 'cheapest', 'recommended' or 'to make tourism in the area'. Of all the reasons, 'halfway between the matches' was the most chosen answer (with almost 40%). These results give us an idea about the demand for coordination between the tournament's sporting settings and the warrant of accommodation in the involved cities and regions (and consequently the intended short term socioeconomic impact!). As a consequence: only 6,4% of the sport event tourists chose an overnight site as to make tourism in the area.

According to the travel rate of the competing teams between matches, the higher or lower is the impact over local and regional tourism economy. This was easily observable in the UEFA Euro 2004. Transportation and communication were intensively stressed during the tournament, because teams had to travel across the country since the first round. The sport event tourists mainly settled themselves within the most efficient site to easily access all match sites of the teams they wanted to see playing.

Settling a set of games in the same region for at least the first round, would possibly serve the purposes of an higher local and regional economic impact and its decentralising.

Finally, we tried to evaluate the potential return of sport event tourists in the near future. Although the answer may only be approached correctly by evaluating long-run figures, it seemed reasonable to state that sport event tourists with no sport consumption habits would be those willing to return, whereas sport fans travel where ever the sport event will travel. Therefore, analysing the statements concerning the countries 'image', its 'recommendation' to a friend and the 'willing to' return soon, we had to reject the assumption. Sport event tourists are motivated by complex reasons and influence factors – some could successfully be specified here! –, their motivational responses seem to have different sources.

## 6. Conclusion

In this research, we found that sport event tourists usually living in countries with higher *per capita* GDP spent or were willing to spend more in the UEF Euro 2004 in Portugal. The same tourists spent significantly more in Portugal, namely in *Braga* and *Guimarães* and stayed more frequently in more than one overnight location site. Tourism operators should focus on these results and conceive according travel program packages.

Other valuable information for both tourism operators and tournament managers is that the most sport event tourists decided to overnight on sites with efficient and direct accesses to the matches. They also may be characterised as usual sport consumers in terms of active and passive sport consumption behaviour, that is, media audience of sport contents and sport live attendance.

The potential to return to the site, where the UEFA Euro 2004 took place (Portugal), remains unsolved. Future studies should concentrate on community reimbursement and mid/long term benefits.

## 7. References

Barreto, Margarida (1995), *Manual de Iniciação ao Estudo do Turismo*, Campinas, SP: Papirus Editora.

Duesenberry, James S. (1967), *Income, Saving, and the Theory of Consumer Behaviour*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Human Development Report 2004 *Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*, Published for the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

Jones, Calvin (2001), "Mega-events and Host-region Impacts: Determining the True Worth of the 1999 Rugby World Cup", *International Journal of Tourism Research* 3, pp.241-251.

Mckercher, Bob and Wong Donna Y.Y. (2004), "Understanding Tourism Behaviour: Examining the Combined Effects of Prior Visitation History and Destination Status", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 43, November 2004, pp.171-179.

Nogawa, Haru, Yamaguchi, Yasuo and Hagi Yumiko (1996), “An Empirical Research Study on Japanese Sport Tourism in Sport-for-All Events: Case Studies of a Single-Night Event and a Multiple-Night Event”, *Journal of Travel Research*, Fall 1996, pp.46-54.

Siegfried, John and Zimbalist, Andrew (2002), “A Note on the Local Economic Impact of Sports Expenditures”, *Journal of Sports Economics*, Vol. 3 No. 4, November 2002, pp.361-366.

World Tourism Day 2004, Joint Message from the WTO Secretary General (Francesco Frangialli) and the IOC President (Jacques Rogge) for the World Tourism Day 2004.

Zauhar, John (2004), “Historical Perspectives of Sports Tourism”, *Journal of Sport Tourism* 9(1), 2004, pp.5-101.

## *Most Recent Working Papers*

NIPE WP 15/2004	<b>Ribeiro, José Cadima, José Viseu, Tânia Delalande and Cristina Rodrigues</b> , UEFA Euro 2004 Visitor Analysis, 2004.
NIPE WP 14/2004	<b>Ribeiro, José Cadima, José Viseu, Tânia Delalande and Cristina Rodrigues</b> , UEFA Euro 2004 Tourism Impact Analysis, 2004.
NIPE WP 13/2004	<b>Pereira, Nuno, J. Cadima Ribeiro and José Viseu</b> , Sport Tourism: Regional Promotion Strategies, 2004.
NIPE WP 12/2004	<b>Monteiro, Natália Pimenta</b> , Using propensity matching estimators to evaluate the impact of privatisation on wages, 2004.
NIPE WP 11/2004	<b>Monteiro, Natália Pimenta</b> , The Impact of Privatisation on Wages: Evidence from the Portuguese Banking Industry, 2004.
NIPE WP 10/2004	<b>Monteiro, Natália Pimenta</b> , Regulatory Reform and the Portuguese Banking Labour Market: two decades later, October 2004.
NIPE WP 9/2004	<b>de Freitas, Miguel Lebre</b> , Currency Substitution, Portfolio Diversification and Money Demand, October 2004.
NIPE WP 8/2004	<b>Coelho, Cesar</b> , Elections and Governments` Behaviour – An Application to Portuguese Municipalities, 2004.
NIPE WP 7/2004	<b>Conraria, Luís Aguiar</b> , Public vs Private Schooling in a Endogenous Growth Model, July 2004.
NIPE WP 6/2004	<b>Silva, João Carlos Cerejeira da</b> , Estimating the employer size-wage Premium in a panel data model with comparative advantage and non-random selection, May 2004.
NIPE WP 5/2004	<b>Conraria, Luís Aguiar and Yi Wen</b> , Foreign Trade and Equilibrium Indeterminacy, May 2004.
NIPE WP 4/2004	<b>Veiga, Linda Gonçalves and Francisco José Veiga</b> , Political Business Cycles at the Municipal Level, May 2004.
NIPE WP 3/2004	<b>Ribeiro, José Cadima and José de Freitas Santos</b> , Portuguese olive oil and the price of regional products: does designation of origin really matter?, February 2004.
NIPE WP 2/2004	<b>Mourão, Paulo Reis</b> , As disparidades regionais em Portugal: uma sugestão a partir de índices sintéticos, January 2004.
NIPE WP 1/2004	<b>de Freitas, Miguel Lebre</b> , The Dynamics of Inflation and Currency Substitution in a Small Open Economy, 2004.
NIPE WP 13/2003	<b>Veiga, Francisco José</b> , The Political Economy of Failed Stabilization, 2003.

NIPE WP 12/2003	<b>de Freitas, Miguel Lebre</b> , Revisiting Dollarisation Hysteresis: Evidence from Bolivia, Turkey and Indonesia, March 2003.
NIPE WP 11/2003	<b>de Freitas, Miguel Lebre</b> , Currency Substitution and money demand in Euroland, September 2003.