Does the repeat tourist spend more than the first time? A contribution to the literature

O turista repetido gasta mais do que um turista inédito? Uma contribuição para a literatura

¿El turista repetido gasta más que un turista inédito? Una contribución a la literatura

Jean Max Tavares [1]
Stanislav Ivanov [2]
Cihan Cobanoglu [3]

Abstract: There isn´t a consensus about the impact of a first time or a repeat tourist on local economy since that the findings of studies comparing the amount of money spent by the two categories of tourists are inconclusive. We interviewed 500 people who went to any tourist destination more than once through a virtual platform in Brazil. This article uses Principal Component Analysis to analyze this issue. The results identified four types of repeat tourists, who tend to spend less than first-time tourists, but who may influence people to visit the destination due to their high degree of satisfaction. A recommendation for future research would be to use the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to confirm the measurement model after conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA).

Key words: Impact; Spending; Repeater Tourist; First-Time Tourist; Principal Component Analysis.

Resumo: Não há consenso sobre o impacto do turista inédito ou de um turista repetido sobre a economia local, uma vez que os resultados de estudos comparando o montante de dinheiro gasto pelas duas categorias de turistas são inconclusivos. Usando uma plataforma virtual, foram entrevistadas 500 pessoas no Brasil, as quais nunca tinham ido a qualquer destino turístico mais de uma vez. Este artigo utilizou da Análise de Componentes Principais para analisar esse problema. Os resultados identificaram quatro tipos de turistas repetidos que tendem a gastar menos do que os turistas inéditos, mas que podem influenciar as pessoas a visitarem o destino devido ao seu alto grau de satisfação. Uma recomendação para pesquisas futuras seria usar a Análise Fatorial Confirmatória (CFA) para confirmar o modelo de medição após a realização da Análise Fatorial Exploratória (EFA).

Palavras-Chave: Impacto; Gastos; Turistas Repetidos; Turistas Inéditos; Análise De Componentes Principais.

Resumen: No hay presupuesto sobre el impacto del turista inédito o de un turista repetido sobre una economía local, dado que los resultados de los estudios comparados o montantes del gasto del gasto de las categorías de turistas no concluyentes. Usando uma plataforma virtual, foram entrevistadas 500 pessoas no Brasil, como quais nunca tinham ido a qualquer destino turístico mais de uma vez. Este artículo utiliza el análisis de componentes principales para analizar este problema. Los resultados identificables como los tipos de turistas repetidos que tienen un gastar menos que los turistas iniciados, más que influyen las personas para que visite el destino devuelto a su alto grado de satisfacción. Una recomendación para pesquisas futuras seria usar a Análise Fatorial Confirmatória (CFA) para confirmar o modelo de medição após a realização da Análise Fatorial Exploratória (EFA)..

Palabras clave: Impacto; Gastos; Turistas Repetidos; Turistas Inéditos; Análisis De Componentes Principales.

---

[1] Pós doutorado em Economia do Turismo – Universidade Nova de Lisboa. PUC Minas e UECE - Universidade do Estado do Ceará. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6440-829X. E-mail: jeanpucminas@uol.com.br.

[2] PhD in Tourism Economics, University of Economics – Varna, Bulgaria. Associate Professor in Tourism Economics - Varna University of Management. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6851-5823. E-mail: stanislav.ivanov@vumk.eu.

[3] Ph.D, Hospitality Management in Oklahoma State University. University of South Florida - Sarasota-Manatee. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9556-6223. E-mail: cihan@cihan.org.

1 Introduction

The principal objective of economic activity is the profit maximization. For this, it is essential to obtain the most significant volume of revenue possible from the sale of products and services. In the case of tourism, this revenue is associated with the behavior of the tourist as a consumer, which can vary if the tourist is repeated or first-time, among other factors.

For example, Freytag (2010) have found that the number of times that tourists climbed the Eiffel Tower or visited the Louvre fell more than 60% after the third visit to Paris, while the drop was 50% for the Versailles Garden. Indeed, this behavior influences the revenue of a tourist destination. Furthermore, empirical evidence shows that repeated tourists are more price sensitive and more interested in looking for lower prices that first-time tourists (Li et al., 2008). A recent study made by IFT Tourism Research Centre (ITRC (2017), in Macao, showed that the average spending of first-time visitors is 14% higher than repeat visitors. Saladié, Clavé & Gutiérrez (2016) have identified that friends or relatives accommodated 27.7% of the repeat tourists while 58.5% of first-time tourists chose to stay in a hotel. It surely has a positive impact on the local economy.

But this result is not a consensus. For example, the study made by Mohamad & Ghani (2014) in Malaysia suggested that first-time visiting tourists are price-sensitive compared to repeat tourists. However, many studies show that the more the tourist repeats a tourist destination, higher the likelihood of the greater the possibility of it returning (Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Badarneh & Mat Son, 2011).

However, the most relevant studies seek to understand the determinants of tourist spending (Brida & Scuderi, 2013; Maroccu, 2015) but only some of them has investigated the differences between "first-time" tourists' and "repeat" tourists from the economic point of view (Petrick, 2004; Robinson & Gammon, 2004; Alegre & Cladera, 2010; Tjørve & Flognfeldt, 2015).

Therefore, the objective of this article is to identify the attitudes, behaviors, and profiles of the repeat tourists to evaluate their effects on the local economy as a result of the found parameters. More specifically, this article seeks to test four hypothesis which, if confirmed, could reveal that the repeat tourist's impacts are more favorable to the local economy than first-time

tourists. The importance of this objective is mentioned for Giraldi (2016) according to which "repeat motivations and the consequent effects have not been thoroughly investigated."

This article desire to reduce the gap existing in the literature about this issue identifying which type of tourist contributes more to the local economy of the tourist destination – first-time tourists or repeat tourists. According to Wahid et al., (2016), the results show that the impact on local economies is inconclusive as well as for Pereda (2013, p.1) according to which "despite the efforts, it remains unclear why people undertake repeat visits and what kind characteristics hold repeat visitors." Besides it, "the study of tourist expenditure is an important thing in the formulation analysis of tourism marketing, strategies, and policies" (Sudanti et al., 2018, p.1). Finally, another contribution is that most of the empirical studies on repeat tourist (and until about travel motivations) have not focused on Latin American countries, such as Brazil, for example.

2 Literature Review

It is only from the 2000s that the analysis of the profile of repeat and first-time tourists began to receive more attention from researchers in Tourism (Lau & Mckercher, 2004; Wang, 2004; Robinson & Gammon, 2004; Craggs & Schofield, 2009; Lee, Lee, & Yoon, 2009; Alegre & Cladera, 2010; Tsitsiloni, Grigouroudis, & Zopunids, 2012; Cheng Chen, & Meyer, 2013; Petrick, 2004; Tjørve & Flognfeldt, 2015; Wahid Et Al., 2016). This fact justifies the need to carry out a broad survey of the existing literature to present the theme with its most diverse approaches.

As previously mentioned, these studies have investigated if there is a difference in terms behavioral incurred between a tourist visiting a destination for the first time and the one who has already been to the destination. However, this article opts for the approach that uses this behavior to make inferences about a possible distinction between the expenses of each one of them (first-time and repeated tourists) and, consequently, and consequently the impact of these expenditures on the local economy.

These studies show that there is a significant difference between the actions of a first time and repeated tourists, mainly concerning visits to tourist attractions, use of public or private transportation, conventional or alternative routes, consumption of souvenirs, etc.

According to Wahid et al., (2016, p.622), in a survey conducted in Malaysia, "there are significant differences and similarities between the first time and repeat tourist's in their demographic characteristics and travel behavior." Robinson & Gammon (2004) suggest that first-time tourists prefer to escape from an environment and repeated tourist wishes to avoid for an environment. Research shows that "the first-time visitor to Tasmania generally spends more than the repeat visitor: in 2014, first-time visitors to Tasmania visited more attractions and participated in more activities than repeat visitors" (Tourism Tasmania, 2015).

In principle, the first-time tourist behavior would be closer to the "conventional tourists" image mentioned for McCabe (2005, p.98), namely as "being a tourist means that you only go sightseeing, without experiencing the people or the flair of the place/country you are visiting (...) a tourist feels extremely insecure when they venture away from the postcard sellers and the "touristic guides".

In principle, a tourist may revisit a tourist destination because of the level of satisfaction obtained in previous stays and by the opportunity to see or enjoy attractive not previously visited. Moreover, the tourist may spend less due to prior knowledge of the destination or even bring friends and relatives who are unaware of the tourist destination (Wang, 2004; Tjørve & Flognfeldt, 2015). Besides it, Lee et al., (2009) have verified that "first-time visitors associated more strongly with relationships on food value and souvenir value than did repeat visitors."

According to Chen & Xiao (2013), in a survey with repeated tourists, the most important motivation item to return to the destination was "take my family", and the most cited second was "to visit the natural attractions that had not visited before, "in a total of 20 possible motivations available to the respondent. Motivation such as "shopping" and "visit natural, cultural and historical attractions already visited before," weren´t even among the ten most cited. Petrick (2004b, p. 463), however, it is only a hypothesis that repeated tourists are the most desired visitors in a destination. However, the results obtained in the literature are controversial, as the following discussion.

For example, Tsitsiloni et al., (2012), have found that repeated tourists are staying more days and seem to spend more than the first time while Lau & McKercher (2004) have stated that higher the percentage of tourists who already have visited the destination, more would be achieved average expenditure.

121

According to Visiting Britain (2016), an International Passenger Survey 2015 showed that first-time tourist and repeat tourist stay 8.6 and 6.4 nights, respectively, while the spends per visit were £ 623 e £ 578, respectively. Repeated tourists are more price-sensitive and more likely to seek lower prices than first-time tourists (Petrick, 2004). Craggs & Schofield (2009) find consistent evidence that infrequent tourists spend more than repeated tourists. According to Wang (2004, p.108), "repeated tourists visit fewer attractions" while Oppermann (1997), in a study conducted in New Zealand, reports that first-time tourists tend to spend more money than the repeat tourists. According to Tjørve & Flognfeldt, (2015, p.3), "an increasing proportion of repeat visitors have been proposed as an indicator of maturity (and therefore as a symptom of decline), in sea, sand, and sun (3S) destinations, together with low-status visitors, higher degree of seasonality, a decline in length of stay, and ultimately a decline in overall visitations".

Chen & Gursoy (2000) statements that first-time tourists often use more external sources of information to familiarize yourself with your destination and buy fewer products already acquired previously, such as handicrafts, souvenirs, postcards, etc.

The intention of repeating the visit is negatively related to age and previous visits positively associated with spending. Gitelson & Crompton (1984) reports that repeated tourists are more likely to be older people looking to relax or visit and friends and relatives. In general form, repeated tourist tends to be a "tourist independent" (Sheng & Ping, 2006; Jia, 2008; Butler & Hannam, 2012): they use fewer guide services, find restaurants less disclosure, avoid travel agencies and use more public transport (BIN et al., 2009). In according to The Economist (2013), this recent growth in independent tourist is indeed a trend rather than an anomaly.

Lau & McKercher (2004) have verified that first-time tourists go to Hong Kong for fun, adventure and discover the people and lifestyles of a new destination, while repeated tourists come to Hong Kong for more pragmatic reasons for shopping, dinner or spend time with family and friends. Finally, Walid et al., (2016, p.622), "observed that repeated tourists stay longer staying tourists the first time and are more loyal."

Based on the primary purpose of this study and the conceptual framework, four assumptions guided this study:

H_1 - Considerable possibility to spend less due to prior knowledge of the destination (thrifty tourist) (based on WANG, 2004; LI et al., 2008; TJØRVE & FLOGNFELDT, 2015);

H_2 - More likely of the repeated tourist to be an independent tourist - use fewer services guides, more public transport and find fewer disclosure restaurants – (based on Sheng & Ping, 2006; Jia, 2008; Bin et al., 2009; Butler & Hannam, 2012)

H_3 - Repeat tourists are more likely to take less money to the destination because they want to visit fewer paid attractions which have been visited previously (based on Oppermann, 1997; Tourism Tasmania, 2016);

H_4 - Repeat tourists regard highly the possibility of buying fewer products associated with the destination.

3   Methodology

Initially, the questionnaire was available on an online platform, which came to the respondents' knowledge through e-mail and mainly, in social networks. Although it has reach throughout Brazil, certainly most respondents would be resident in the State of Minas Gerais (Brazil), a fact observed after the conclusion of the research via identification of the place of origin (IP of the equipment). After the survey reaching the number of 500 respondents, the questionnaire became unavailable. The inquiry has been applied from February to March 2017.

This questionnaire has six questions: the first three questions are related to the general identification of respondents; the fourth question concerns the type of tourism practiced when the destination is repeated; the fifth question seeks to investigate the reasons which made him repeat the tourist destination; the sixty question concerns the possibility for repeat tourist to do actions or to present certain behaviors, such as taking less money to the tourist destination, visiting fewer free tourist attractions, using more public transport, among others. The answers are based on a Likert scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means "no chance," and 5 means "total possibility."

This article uses the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) as the main methodology - Wang (2004) has used this method to a similar purpose. In the PCA, a set of variables is transformed into another set and called the principal component. According to Mingoti (2005), principal component analysis's major objective is to "explain the variance and the covariance of a random vector, composed of a p-variable random, through the linear combination of the original variables, which are called principal components." Then, in this article, the main purpose of

applying principal component analysis was to construct – based on the principal component responsible for most of the data variability – different profiles of tourists concerning their actions in a tourist destination, naming them according to these actions. In the multivariate statistical literature, there are three methods commonly used to choose the number of key components to be considered. In the method of Kaiser and scree plot, the other method is the percentage of the total variability explained. In it, a limit is set, and it appears the number of eigenvalues needed to achieve it. This study chose this method: this limit was close to 70%, because, according to Alves & Souza (2007, p. 5) "if the number of major components is too small can be an exaggerated reduction of dimensionality and much information can be lost."

On the other hand, the objective of the technique of factorial analysis is "to replace the initial set of determinant characteristics, for others of a smaller number, but that keep significant original explanation of the problem, in order to raise the latent dimensions in the original variables of the phenomenon, aiming to give a more comprehensible interpretation according to common directions" (Maxwell, 2015, p.33).

It is necessary to highlight the difference between the PCA versus Factorial Analysis Exploratory (EFA). Both techniques seek to produce linear combinations of variables that capture as much as possible the variance of observed variables. In the PCA all variance is used. In EFA only the shared variance (Dancey & Reidy, 2004). Tabachnick & Fidell (2007, p.608) argued that "if you are interested in a theoretical solution uncontaminated by error variability, the factorial analysis should be your choice. If you only want an empirical summary of the data set, the principal component analysis is a better choice". For Garson (2009), the PCA is preferred for data reduction purposes while factorial analysis is generally preferred when the purpose of the search is to detect the structure of the data or the causal modeling. According to Hair et al., (2006), in most cases, both the PCA and the EFA reach the same results if the number of variables exceeds 30 or if the communalities exceed 0.60 for most of the variables.

Besides, factor loadings indicate when a factor explains a variable. The factor loadings may range from -1 to 1. Some variables may have high factor loadings on multiple factors. Following Hair et al., (2006), this study has adopted 0.40 as the acceptable limit of the contribution of the variable in the creation of the factor to avoid the problem of the indetermination of the relationship between variables and factors. Finally, this study used rotation

by the Varimax Criterion, which tries to minimize the number of variables strongly related to each factor. The collected material was tabulated and analyzed using the statistical package MATLAB for Windows. The questionnaires were tabulated, processed and analyzed the collected data using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 11.5 for Windows.

4   Results

The sample included 500 respondents (55.4% are men and 44.6% female), and 64.2% of them were born between 1992 and 1998. Concerning family income, 37.6% and 35.60% receive up to U$ 1.210.00 and between U$ 1.211.00 to U$ 2.420.00, respectively. 70.3% of respondents prefer the sun tourism & mar as favorite, followed by cultural tourism/history (11.0%). Concerning the reasons which have returned to the tourist destination, 43.2% said it the "affordable" is the main motivation, followed by the "quality of the 1st visit" (35.6%).

The variables "to user fewer guide services,” "seek more involvement with the local community" and "use more public transport" were the items most likely to occur in return on the destination. On the other hand, the variables "less free to visit tourist attractions," "spend less time on destination" and "take less money to target" were items less likely to occur (Table 1).

Table 1 – Descriptive Analyses of the Variables

Variables	Average	References
To visit less free tourist attractions	2.37	Oppermann (1997)
To spend less time in the destination	2.52	Tsitsiloni et al (2012)
To take less money to the destination	2.67	Freitag (2010)
To visit less paid tourist attractions	3.07	Lau and McKercher (2004)
To find less publicised restaurants	3.20	Anwar and Sohail (2004)
To buy fewer products (handicrafts, souvenirs, etc.)	3.24	Chen and Gursoy (2000)
To use more public transport	3.27	Wang (2004)
To seek more involvement with the local community	3.45	Wang (2004)
To use less guided services	3.57	Freitag (2010)

Source: Authors, 2018. SPSS

The results show that the first four factors account for 61.7% of the variability of data (Table 2).

Table 2 – Percentages of Variance Explained

Proportional	24.787	15.107	11.115	10.685	8.792	8.221	7.854	7.025	6.425
Accumulative	**24.787**	**39.893**	**51.008**	**61.693**	70.485	78.706	86.560	93.585	1

Source: Authors, 2018. SPSS

The loadings of the variables associated to the four most significant factors (of the largest variances explained) are presented below (Tables 3 and 4).

Table 3 – Percentages of Variance Explained

Proportional	24.787	15.107	11.115	10.685	8.792	8.221	7.854	7.025	6.425
Accumulative	**24.787**	**39.893**	**51.008**	**61.693**	70.485	78.706	86.560	93.585	1

Source: Authors, 2018. SPSS

Table 4 – Factorial Analyses – Components Matrix

Variables	1	2	3	4	Communalities
Visit less free tourist attractions	**0.429**	- 0.332	**0.539**		0.628
Spend less time in the destination	**0.554**	**- 0.450**			0.586
Take less money to the destination	**0.487**	**- 0.415**	- 0.307	**0.502**	0.502
Visit less paid tourist attractions	**0.519**		**- 0.457**		0.608
Find less publicised restaurants	**0.556**		**- 0.441**		0.576
Buy fewer products (handicrafts, souvenirs, etc.)	**0.628**			- 0.329	0.518
Use more public transport	**0.486**	**0.481**			0.556
Seek more involvement with the local community	**0.511**	0.396			0.476
Use less guided services		**0.592**		**0.675**	0.853

Note: Loadings in bold are higher than 0.40 – An acceptable limit of the contribution of the variable in the creation of the factor.
Source: Authors, 2018. SPSS

The first factor underlying the set of attributes associated with respondents' behaviour is significantly represented namely by four original variables: "buy fewer products (handicrafts, souvenirs, etc.)"; "Find restaurants less disclosed"; "Stay less time on tourist destination" and "visit less paid tourist attractions" However all the variable have loadings above than 0.40. In the same way, as in the first main component, this factor represents the tourist who seeks to minimize his travel expenses and does so, mainly, buying fewer products and getting less time in the tourist destination. Therefore, this tourist could receive label "tourist repeated independent and thrifty"

The second underlying factor is representing predominantly and positively by the variables "seek more involvement with the local community" and "use more public transport". On the other hand, the variables "visit less free tourist attractions" and "stay less time on tourist destination" are significant but in the inverse direction. Therefore, this tourist could receive the designation of "social, independent and economically engaged tourist".

The variables "Take less money to the destination" (positive signal) and "visit less paid tourist attractions" (negative signal) represent, significantly, the third factor. In this way, this tourist could receive the designation of "thrifty repeated tourist.".

Finally, the fourth and last factor considered is significantly represented by two variables, namely, "seek more involvement with the local community" and "visit less free tourist attractions." Therefore, this tourist could receive the designation of "social and economically engaged tourist".

The KMO value of the sample is 0.695, i.e., higher than the critical threshold of 0.60 (Hair et al., 2006). Likewise, the Bartlett Test of Sphericity (BTS) - as suggested by Field (2005) - test is statistically significant because of $p < 0.000$ (Table 5) and therefore it satisfies $p < 0.05$.

Table 5 – KMO and Bartlett´s Test of Sphericity

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)	0.695
Bartlett´s Test of Sphericity	**0.000**

Source: Authors, 2018. SPSS

In both cases, the tests suggest that the data are suitable for factor analysis. Regarding the correlation pattern between the variables, the correlation matrix should display most of the coefficients with a value above 0.30.

Table 6 shows, in a summarized way, the results of the EFA. Note that the most common characteristics of repeated tourists are "thrifty" and "independent."

Table 6 – PCA and EFA results

	Profile
1ª component	Independent and Thrifty
1◦ Factor	Independent and Thrifty
2ª component	Conventional and Thrifty
2º Factor	Independent and Economically Engaged
3ª component	Independent
3º Factor	Thrifty
4ª component	Independent and Thrifty
4º Factor	Independent and Economically Engaged

Source: Authors, 2018. SPSS

Table 7 shows the results of the hypothesis tested based on EFA analysis.

Table 7 – Results of the Hypotheses Tested

Hypothesis	Result
H_1 - A considerable possibility of spending less due to a prior knowledge of the destination (a thrifty tourist)	Confirmed
H_2 - The opportunity to see or enjoy attractions that were not previously visited was an important motivation to return to the destination	Rejected
H_3 - It is more likely that the returning tourist would be an independent tourist – using less guided services, more public transport, and finding less publicised restaurants	Confirmed
H_4 - Returning tourists are more likely to take less money to the destination, because they want to visit fewer paid attractions which they have visited previously	Confirmed
H_5 - Returning tourists highly regard the possibility of buying fewer products that are associated with the destination (handicrafts, souvenirs, postcards, and so on.)	Confirmed

Source: Authors, 2018. SPSS

5   Conclusions

The revenue from a tourist destination is associated with the behavior of the tourist as a consumer, which may vary if the tourist is repeated or first-time, among countless other factors. This study has found that repeated tourists adopt certain behaviors to return to the destination that may contribute to spending less than first time tourist.

The five hypotheses presented the following results. H.1 has been confirmed in this article (repeated tourist tends to spend less in reason to prior knowledge of the destination and, therefore, he would spend your money more efficiently) – as obtained by Li et al., (2008) and Tjørve & Flognfeldt (2015). The H.2 has been confirmed. It means that the repeat tourist tends to be "more independent" (use fewer services guides, more public transport and find fewer disclosure restaurants). This behavior certainly implies decreasing expenses during your trip, and it follows the results obtained by Bin et al., (2009); Butler & Hannam (2012). H.3 also has been confirmed. The results showed that tourists repeat more inclined to take less money to the destination because they want to visit a smaller number of private attractive (and, therefore, to pay for tickets) but previously visited. About it, Fallon & Schofield (2004) have found that this kind of tourist prefers more social activities such as dining, and visiting friends and relatives, while the first-time tourist prefer visiting main-iconic attractions (in most of them the tourist pays for a ticket). Finally, the H.5 has been confirmed. It means that the tourists repeat consider as

high the possibility of buying a smaller number of products associated with the destination (handicrafts, souvenirs, postcards, etc.) as found by Petrick (2004) and Lee, Lee, & Yoon (2009).

The key features of this repeated tourist are those of being predominantly "independent and thrifty," which certainly negatively impacts the local economy of a destination repeatedly visited by the tourist. The results for both the 1st component and the 1st factor - the parameters of greater weight in the analysis - are the same, reinforcing this conclusion. However, it should be emphasized that for the second and third factors, the results indicate an independent but economically engaged repeated tourist profile, that is, behaviors that contribute to the local economy.

Therefore, it seems there is a relation between the repeated tourist and impact on the local economy. If it prevails this sort of tourist, it needs to encourage them to go back to paid tourist attractions, preferably, as well as to consume local products, and to hire private transport services (transfer, city tour, tours of the region, etc.). If it prevails the first-time tourists, it is essential to invest in receivership since the first visit quality is entirely responsible for the tourist return induction. The more critical issue of this article can be verified in Wahid et al., (2016) according to the which "tourism managers need to make a clear distinction between the marketing strategies for first-time and repeat visitors."

A recommendation for future research would be to use the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to confirm the measurement model after conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA).

References

Alegre, J., & Cladera, M. (2010) Tourist expenditure and quality: why repeat tourists can spend less than first-timers. *Tourism Economics*, 16(3), 517-533.

Alves, D. B. M. & Souza M. E. (2007). Métodos de Agrupamento e Componentes Principais: Teoria e Aplicações. In: *XXX Congresso Nacional de Matemática Computacional*, 2007, Florianópolis. Anais do XXX Congresso Nacional de Matemática Computacional.

Badarneh, M. B., & Mat Som, A. P. (2012). *Factors Influencing Tourists' Revisit Behavioral Intentions and Loyalty*. Retrieved from http:/ /www.wbiconpro.com/426-Badarneh.pdf.

Bin W., Chunyou,. W., & Zhendong, L. (2009), A Comparative Analysis of First-time and Repeat Visitors' Behavior. *Areal Research and Development*, 28(3), 68-70.

Brida J. G., & Scuderi, R. (2013). Determinants of tourist expenditure: a review of microeconometric models. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6, 28-40.

Butler, G., & Hannam, K. (2013). Independent tourist's automobilities in Norway. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 10(4), 285-300.

Chanin, Y. (2011). The Investigation of Destination Choice, Satisfaction and Loyalty Intentions of International Tourists. In: *The 2011 Barcelona European Academic Conference*, Barcelona Spain, 277-284.

Chen, C., & Chen, F. (2010). Experience Quality, Perceived Value, Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions for Heritage Tourists. *Tourism Management,* 31, 29-35.

Cheng K-L., Chen, C-M., & Meyer, T. J. (2013). A comparison study of travel expenditure and consumption choices between first-time and repeat visitors. *Tourism Management*, 35, 275-277.

Chen J and Gursoy D (2000), Cross-cultural comparison of the information sources used by first-time and repeat travelers and its marketing implications. *International Journal of Hospitality Management,* 19(20), 191-203.

Chen, G., & Xiao, H. (2013), Motivations of Repeat Visits: A Longitudinal Study in Xiamen, China. *Journal of Travel Tourism Marketing*, 30(4), 350-364.

Craggs, R., & Schofield, P. (2009). Expenditure-based segmentation and visitor profiling at the Quays in Salford, UK. *Tourism Economics*, 15(1), 243-260.

Dancey, C., & Reidy, J. (2006). Estatística Sem Matemática para Psicologia: Usando SPSS para Windows. Porto Alegre, Artmed.

Field, A. P. (2005). Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. 2nd Edn., SAGE Publication Ltd., London.

Freytag, T. (2010). Deja-vu: tourist practices of repeat visitors in the city of Paris. Social *Geography*, 5, 49-58.

Giraldi, A., & Cesareo, L. (2016) Understanding the Motivation of Repeat Visitors to Rome. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(4), 197-205

Gitelson, R. J., & Crompton, J. (1984), Insights into the repeat vacation phenomenon. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11(2,) 199-217.

Hair Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. (2006), Multivariate Data Analysis. 6ª edição. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hui, T., Wan., D & Ho, A. (2007). Tourists' Satisfaction, Recommendation and Revisiting Singapore. *Tourism Management*, 28, 965-975.

IFT Tourism Research Centre (ITRC (2017), Macao Visitor Profile Survey 2016. Retrieved from https://www.fantiniresearch.com/images/pdf/Macau_Visitor_Profile_Survey.pdf

Jia, C, M. (2008). The rise and development of the full independent tourist. *Science & Technology Information*, 30, 499-500.

Joppe, M. D., Martin, W., & Waalen, J. (2001), Toronto's Image as a Destination: A Comparative Importance-Satisfaction Analysis by Origin of Visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(3), 252-260.

Jurdana, D. S., & Frleta, D. S. (2015), Offseason Tourist Expenditure in the Sun and Sea Destination. *Advances in Business and Economic Development*, 193-200.

Kozak, M. (2000). Comparative assessment of tourist satisfaction with destinations across two nationalities. *Tourism Management*, 22(4), 391-401.

Kozak, M., & Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain as an off-season holiday destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 260-269.

_____. (2001). Repeaters' behaviour at two distinct destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), 784-807.

Lau, A. L. S., & Mckercher, B. (2004). Exploration versus Acquisition: A Comparison of First-Time and Repeat Visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(3), 279-285.

Lee, J. S., Lee, C-K., & Yoon, Y. (2009). Investigating differences in antecedents to value between first-time and repeat festival-goers. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 26(7), 688-702.

Li, X. R., Cheng, C-K., Kim, H., & Petrick, J. F. (2008), A systematic comparison of first-time and repeat visitors via a two-phase online survey. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 278-293.

Marcussen, C. H. (2011). Determinants of tourist spending in cross-sectional studies and at Danish destinations. *Tourism Economics*, 17(4), 833-855.

McCabe, S. (2005). Who is the tourist? *Tourist Studies,* 5(1), 85–106.

Mingoti, S. A. (2005), Análise de dados através de métodos de estatística multivariada: uma abordagem aplicada. Belo Horizonte: UFMG.

Mohamad, M., & Ghani, N. I. A. (2014). Destination Image Differences Between First-Time and Repeat-Visit Tourists: The Malaysian Case. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 14, 2476-2486.

Oppermann, M (1997). First-time and repeat visitors to New Zealand. *Tourism Management*, 18(3), 177-181.

_____ (2000), Tourism destination loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 78-84.

Pereda, M. H. (2003). *Repeat visitors of a tourist destination*. Retrieved from http://www.esade.edu/cedit2003/pdfs/peredamelena.pdf.

Petrick, J. F. (2004). Are loyal visitors the desired visitors? *Tourism Management*, 25(5), 463-470.

Robinson, T., & Gammon, S. (2004), A question of primary and secondary motives: Revisiting and reapplying the sport tourism framework. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 9, 221-233.

Roscoe, J. T. (1975). *Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Saladié, O., Clavé, S. A., & Gutiérrez, A. (2016) Measuring the influence of the Camp de Tarragona high-speed rail station on first-time and repeat tourists visiting a coastal destination. *Belgeo* [Online], 3, 1-21.

Schawb, A. J. (2007). *Eletronic Classroom. [Online].* Retrieved from http://www.utexas.edu/ssw/eclassroom/schwab.html

Sheng, H, H., & Ping, Z. Y. (2006). Development's discussing about China's full independent tourist". *Journal of Jiangxi University of Finance and Economics*, 96-100.

Subanti, S., Hakim, A. R., Handajani., S. S., & Hakim, I. M. (2018). The determinant of household tourism expenditure in Central Java Province, Indonesia. In: *International Conference on Mathematics, Science and Education 2017 (ICMSE2017)*. Retrieved from http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/983/1/012073/pdf

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). Using multivariate statistics (5th ed.). Boston, Ma: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.

Tjørve, E. L. G., & Flognfeldt, T. (2015). Properties of first-time vs. repeat visitors: lessons for marketing Norwegian ski resorts. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-25.

Tourism Tasmania (2015). *First Time and Repeat Visitor*. Retrieved from http://www.tourismtasmania.com.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0019/36550/First-time-and-repeat-visitor-snapshot.pdf

Tsitsiloni, M., Grigouroudis, E., & Zopunids, C. (2012). Service quality evaluation in the tourism industry: A SWOT analysis approach. In: *1st International symposium and 10 st Balkan conference on operational research*, Thessaloniki, Greece.

VISIT BRITAIN (2016). *First-time and Repeat Visits to Britain Foresight* – issue 149. VisitBritain Research. Retrieved from https://www.visitbritain.org/sites/default/files/vb-corporate/Documents-Library/documents/foresight_149_-_frequency_of_inbound_tourism_to_britain_feb2017.pdf

Wang D (2004), Tourist behaviour and repeat visitation to Hong Kong. *Tourism Geography*, 6(1), 99-118.

Wahid, S. D. M., Aliman., N. K., Hashim., S. H., & Harudin, S. (2016). First-time and Repeat Visitors to Langkawi Island, Malaysia. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 35, 622-631.

Wu, L., Zhang, J., & Fujiwara, A. (2013). Tourism participation and expenditure behavior: analysis using a scobit based discrete continuous choice model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 40, 1-17.

Wilde, S., & Cox, C. (2008). Principal factors contributing to the competitiveness of tourism destinations at varying stages of development. In: S Richardson, L Fredline, A Patiar and M Ternel (eds) *CAUTHE 2008: tourism and hospitality research, training and practice; "Where the 'bloody hell' are we?"*, Griffith University, Gold Coast, Qld, 115-118.