The Tourism Industry in Italy during the Great Recession (2008-12): What Data Show and Suggest

Cellini, Roberto and Cuccia, Tiziana

University of Catania, Italy

December 2014

THE TOURISM INDUSTRY IN ITALY

DURING THE GREAT RECESSION (2008-12):

WHAT DATA SHOW AND SUGGEST*

by

Roberto Cellini and Tiziana Cuccia

(University of Catania, Italy - Department of Economics and Business)
Address: Corso Italia 55 – 95129 Catania - Italy
Tel. +39 095 7537728, +39 095 7537741; Fax +39 0957537710
E-mail: cellini@unict.it ; cucciati@unict.it

Abstract – The purpose of this article is to describe the evolution of the tourism industry in Italy during the recent years of the so-called 'Great recession' (2008-12). We highlight the most prominent features of the changes occurred in both the supply and the demand side, over these years. We describe the differences across different categories of accommodation structures, different kinds of destinations and different regions. The issue of "resilience" is used to explain the different degrees of success in responding to the national adverse shock hitting the industry. However, our interpretation is that deep structural changes in the demand and supply sides of the tourism industry, rather than specific resilient adjustments, have occurred in these years of recession.

Keywords: Tourism, Structural changes, Regions, Resilience, Great Recession

THE TOURISM INDUSTRY IN ITALY
DURING THE GREAT RECESSION (2008-12):
WHAT DATA SHOW AND SUGGEST

Abstract – The purpose of this article is to describe the evolution of the tourism industry in Italy during the recent years of the so-called 'Great recession' (2008-12). We highlight the most prominent features of the changes occurred in both the supply and the demand side, over these years. We describe the differences across different categories of accommodation structures, different kinds of destinations and different regions. The issue of "resilience" is used to explain the different degrees of success in responding to the national adverse shock hitting the industry. However, our interpretation is that deep structural changes in the demand and supply sides of the tourism industry, rather than specific resilient adjustments, have occurred in these years of recession.

Keywords: Tourism, Structural changes, Regions, Resilience, Great Recession

1. Introduction

This study inscribes into the tourism economics literature strand which analyses the effect of economic recessionary shock on tourist flows. The interest in this problem has flourished, as a consequence of the world economic contraction in 2009; in that single year, the World GDP per capita decreased by about 3.4%; tourist arrivals in the world declined by about 3.8%, and tourism receipts are estimated to have declined by 9.4% (UN WTO, 2011). In several (Western) countries, the 2009 GDP performance was even worse; and in some countries the recessionary shock has lasted more than one year. In front of these numbers, it is not surprising that a large attention has been devoted to what has happened to the tourism industry as a whole, and to specific case studies. A wide set of recent articles deals with the changes of consumer behaviors, on the demand side, and with the reactions of countries and specific destinations to the recent economic contraction (Richtie et al., 2010, Smeral, 2010, Browne and Moore, 2012, and Eugenio-Martin and Campos-Sorias, 2014, that offer also a review, just to mention a few).

The present study focuses on Italy. We believe that it is particularly worth investigating the Italian case, for two reasons.

First, the recessionary shock in Italy has been particularly long and severe. The aggregate GDP in Italy, between 2008 and 2012 has decreased by around 8%, in real terms. Industrial production has decreased by around 20%. The employment rate, which was among the lowest within the G20 group in 2008, has further decreased over this crisis period, by about 2 percentage points. Investments have dropped by about 15% (all data are from Istat, the Italian Statistic Office and Eurostat). Thus, the label of 'Great recession' –commonly used to denote what has happened in the world over the years following the 2007 American financial crisis– is particularly appropriate for Italy. One has to expect that such a deep recessionary shock has had a deep impact on the tourism industry, in which the domestic segment is around 66% (as measured by total overstays).

Second, the tourism industry in Italy is particularly relevant. The tourist sector represents a share above 10% of the Italian GDP, and a share above 11% of employment (Istat, 2014); both variables steadily display larger values than the world and the European average data. (Recent analyses on the pattern of tourism industry in Italy include Borowiecki and Castiglione, 2014; Massidda and Mattana, 2013; Accardo, 2012, just to mention a few).

However, the dimension of the recessionary shock on the tourism industry is markedly different (i.e., softer in quantitative terms), if compared to aggregate economic data. Moreover, the way in which different segments of the tourism industry in Italy have reacted to the crisis is deeply different. Under this perspective, the concept of '*resilience*' can be very helpful in analyzing the dynamics in different segments of the tourism industry. Resilience is a concept firstly introduced in physics and soon transferred to biology and ecology and –more recently– to social sciences, such as psychology, sociology, and even business administration and economics; it describes the way in which complex entities respond to adverse shocks. A body of studies in business administration aim to understand why different enterprises react differently to the same exogenous shock, and which features or strategies are most suited to minimize the impact of adverse shock and to obtain quick recovery. Resilience is considered also with reference to groups of enterprises (let us think of specific sectors), or territories, like regions or cities.

The specific point of the present study is to evaluate how different segments of tourism industry in Italy have reacted to the Great recession, and to evaluate the resilience degree of different sectors of the Italian tourism industry. A specific attention is paid to regions: Italian regions show an articulated reaction to shock, and significant differences across regions emerge. Since regional inequality is a long-lasting and ever-green theme in economic debate in Italy, and since different regional resilience is a theme of current debate (Cellini and Torrisi, 2014; Di Caro, 2014; Lagravinese, 2014), we believe that the present study can contribute to these alive debates: even in the specific tourism sector, relevant differences across regions emerge, as far as the reactions to crisis are concerned.

It is worth underlining that here we are concerned on economic resilience of different regional tourist systems. Recently, in tourism economics, resilience has been also interpreted as the different reactions of the carrying capacity of tourist destinations to shock in tourism flows (see, for instance, Iannides and Alebaki, 2014, on the case of Greece). The tourism impact on the stock of natural resources, and hence on carrying capacity, affects the tourism sustainability, and hence the future economic performance. Of course, such an issue is interesting and has also to do also with economic resilience, but the analysis perspective is of course a little bit different.

Here we focus on the hotel and, more generally, on the accommodation structures in the supply side of the tourism industry, and we take into consideration the data on arrivals and stays in tourist destinations. Which are the reaction of the accommodation structures to the economic global crisis? We are aware that tourism is a complex phenomenon, and a bundle of several complement goods and services contribute to the tourism product. However, data on accommodation structures, and arrivals and stays, are very representative for the tourism as a whole, and they are more ready available and reliable than other data on different specific goods belonging to the tourist product.

Our guess is that the Great recession has contributed to modify consumers' preference structure: specific attributes of the tourist products have being gaining weight in importance, and some others have been losing weight; however, such change has simply led to an acceleration of the structural variations that were already affecting the tourism sector. Also during the Great recession years, data show that the segments

of the tourism industry which are more ready to innovate, and to react to shock (that is, that are more 'resilient') are able to reach satisfactory outcomes.

Our present analysis on Italia data permits to confirm some points already made by available analyses concerning different case studies, while other points do not receive clear support from the case of Italy. However, the main message, in our own reading of the reported evidence, is that different tourism segments have displayed markedly different reactions to shock, and the aggregation into a general class of "tourism industry" needs a great deal of caution.

The outline of the present article is as follows. Section 2 describes what has happened to the accommodation structures in Italy over the crisis period 2008-12; Section 3 deals with tourist arrivals and stays; Section 4 analyses the dynamics of occupancy rate. Section 5 is a digression about the pricing behavior of accommodation structures over the crisis years. Section 6 offers a theoretical interpretation for what has happened during the years of the Great recession in the Italian tourist industry, and in the hotel sector more specifically. Section 7 puts forwards some indications for private subjects and policymakers, along with concluding remarks.

2. Basic facts: data concerning the supply side

Table 1 provides data about the supply side of the tourism industry in Italy, focusing on the number of units and available beds in the accommodation structures.

The number of hotels has slightly decreased (-1.25%), but the bed-places (beds, in what follows) have increased, consistent with an enlargement of the average size of hotels (a tendency started in the 1980s). This is also consistent with a structural change in the industry, documented in Table 1, which shows a significant increase of the 4 and 5 star hotels, and a decrease of the number of 1 and 2 star hotels; since 4 and 5 star hotels have typically a larger size as compared to the 1 and 2 star ones, it is unsurprising to observe the increase in the average size of hotels. The number of extra-hotel structures have significantly increased (in particular, more detailed data show that the largest increase pertains to the number of B&B). Also these two tendencies, that is, the increase of the number and share of B&B and agri-tourism structures, and the increase

in the number of high-level hotels (and their share within the hotel sector), have been starting in Italy thirty years ago, so that we can say that such facts are in line with long-term trends, rather than the outcome of the domestic economic crisis.

Table 1

As the distribution of the accommodation structures across the Italian regions, Tables 2.A,B,C show that the number of extra-hotel structures has increased in all regions; their largest percentage increases pertain to Campania, Molise and Lombardia (it is not strange that these three regions belong to Southern, Central and Northern Italy, to support the point that this tendency is general). The share of the hotel structure (on the population of accommodation structures) has decreased in all regions, and particularly in Campania and Lombardia.

As to the hotel structures, generally speaking, the number of hotels has decreased in the Northern regions, while it has increased in the Southern regions. The most interesting evidence concerns the structural evolution: in all regions the share of 1-2 star hotels has decreased, and the share of the 4-5 star hotels has increased. A "very rough" index of variation in the structural composition of the hotel population according to the star level is computes, as the sum of the absolute variation in the share of 4-5 star hotels and in 1-2 star hotels, occurred between 2008 and 2012; according to such an index, the largest changes, in all, have occurred in Sicilia, Puglia and Marche, while Lazio and Emilia R. are the regions with the smallest structural change in the quality composition of the hotel population.

Table 2.A,B.

3. Basic facts: data concerning the demand side

Table 3 provides the data concerning arrivals, overnights and average stays of tourists in Italy. The Table clearly displays the occurrence and the dimension of the domestic economic crisis: the total arrivals and overstays have increased, but the positive trend of arrivals, and especially of overstays, is totally due to the foreigner tourists: the arrivals of domestic tourists have only very slightly increased, while domestic overstays display a decrease. However, the dimension of the contraction in overnight stays of domestic tourists (-5.4% over the years of the Great depression, that is, in 2012 with respect to 2008) is quite limited, if compared to the contraction of the domestic economy (with the real GDP shrinking above 8%). The tourism industry as a whole was able to compensate this adverse domestic shock, by gaining numbers of international tourists. Note also that arrivals have increased at a larger speed than overstays, consistently with a shortening of the average stay of tourists (also this trend, common to domestic and foreign tourism, is of long-run nature, rather than specific to the crisis years; by the way, it is common to most countries - see Barros and Machado, 2010; Wang et al. 2012 among many others).

Table 3

We suggest to read the facts that domestic arrivals have increased, and domestic overstays have decreased at a more limited pace than the aggregate economy, over the years of the Great recession, as a sign that the consumers preference have been changing in this period. Moreover, the performances strongly differ across different types of accommodation structures, different regions, and different type of destinations. Details concerning the percentage variation of data, investigated along these lines, are provided by Tables 5, 6 and 7.

As to the performance across different types of accommodation, the performance of hotel accommodations is worse than the performance of extra-hotel structures; within the hotel structures, the best performance pertains to the high quality hotels: Table 4 shows that 5 and 4 star hotels experienced an increase of both arrivals and overnight stays, and this holds for both the foreign and the domestic tourist flows. In line with the

difficulties of the domestic demand, the increase of the domestic segment is more limited than the foreign segment. A slight shortening of the average stays regards both the Italian and the foreign tourists. In 3 star hotels a contraction of the domestic segment has occurred, which is in a large part counterbalanced by foreign tourists; at the end, the total contraction in arrivals is around 1% and the contraction of overnight stays is about 5%. A marked decrease of both arrivals and stays has occurred for 1 and 2 star hotels; the decrease is larger for the Italian part of the demand.

Table 4

In general, the increase of total arrivals in Italian hotels –entirely due to foreign tourists, in front of a stable domestic component– did not translate into an analogous increase in total stays, due to the contraction of average stays. The movement from lower level hotels toward higher quality hotels is clear and pretty strong. Arrivals and, to a lesser extent, overnight stays increased in extra-hotel accommodation, also in this case especially thanks to international tourist flows.

The economic crisis in Italy exerted its largest effect on the low-quality accommodation hotel structures, especially because the fall of arrivals. This fact can be partly explained by the modification of income distribution (the richest classes were affected in a more limited way by the Great recession than average- or low- income classes), but we believe that a more convincing explanation can be represented by a modification of consumers' preferences. To have a vacation is a "must", and its income elasticity is likely lower when income shrinks (as the stability of domestic arrivals shows) as compared with the case of income increase. Here we are pointing out that not only domestic tourism demand has a lower income elasticity than foreign tourism demand (as it is well known by available literature – see Crouch, 1994, 1995; Candela and Figini, 2012 for general review; Cortez-Jumenez et al, 2009, on outbound Italian tourism) but that asymmetry in elasticity does exist in front of positive or negative income variation, as already documented by some empirical analyses on different case studies –see Smeral and Song (2013). Possibly, the vacation time is shorter, if budget constraints are more severe as a consequence of a negative economic shock.

Notice that the contraction of average stays appear to regard both the domestic and the foreign tourism, but its dimension is quite different: -7,69% and -4.25%, respectively. Thus, we can say that the Great recession has amplified, in Italy, the contraction of average stay, that is a structural tendency of the tourism demand at the world level, as already mentioned (Barros and Machado, 2010).

Table 5.A concerns the data about regional destinations. In particular, it reports the percentage variation rates of total arrivals and stays between 2008 and 2012, considering all structures (the data concerning the arrivals and stays in hotels only are qualitatively very similar). The regions are ordered according to the success in varying the arrivals and overnight stays. If we limited ourselves to observe the total overnight stays, we would conclude that Lombardia, Puglia and Piemonte had the best performance, and Molise, Sardegna and Liguria the worst. However, the performances are strongly determined by the contraction of domestic demand.

Table 5.A,B

It is interesting to study how the regions react to the drop in domestic demand, by serving foreign tourists. To this end, the evidence of Table 5.A is re-arranged in Table 5.B, which classifies the regions (as tourism destinations), according to the fact that they have a better or worse performance than the national Italian data. Thus, it is possible to say that the behavior of the worst performers according to the aggregate data (Molise, Sardegna, Liguria, Marche, Abruzzo) is very different, in terms of reaction to negative shock originating in the domestic demand. In fact, in Abruzzo the domestic shock was not so adverse as in other regions, and the "bad" performance is due to a very poor result in the international tourism segment. In the other four regions, the domestic shock was severe, but Marche and Molise were not able to provide a significant answer in the international tourism segment, while Liguria and especially Sardegna were able to provide a significant positive answer in the international segment of tourism market. In particular, the data concerning Sardegna are impressive: the contraction in domestic arrivals and overnight stays was -20.3% and -23.4%, respectively, but the increase in foreign arrivals (+9.0%) and stays (+13.4%) notably out-performed the national data.

Table 6.A reports arrivals and stays in 2012 (and its percentage change with respect to 2008) for types of destinations. A caveat note is necessary to this regard. Indeed, Istat, the Italian Statistics Office, has adopted a classification of destinations (generally considering the municipalities as the reference units) which is highly debatable. For instance, cities like Trento or Bolzano are classified as "mountain destination" (while it could be tenable that these cities have an historical and cultural interest); much more debatable is the fact that cities like L'Aquila or even Matera (the European capital of culture 2019!) are not included by Istat in the list of cultural destinations. In any case, that said about the debatable choice of classification of different destinations, it is clear that the seaside destinations continued to play the largest role, in terms of overnights, even if the historical and artistic cities have led in terms of arrivals. This piece of evidence is consistent with the fact that the average stay is much longer in sea-side destinations (5.2) than in artistic and historical cities (2.6); both data concerning the average stays are lower than the data of 2008 (5.6 and less than 2.8, respectively), in line with the already mentioned tendency to shorter stays. The sharper decrease of average stay is associated to mountain destinations, where arrivals have increased by 7.7%, and overnight stays have decreased by 2%.

The sea-side destinations are the type of destination in which the increase of arrivals was the most limited; the largest increase in arrivals pertains to the historical and artistic cities, while the largest increase in overstays pertains to lake and thermal destinations (followed by historical and artistic cities).

The articulation of data according to the domestic or international provenience of tourists confirms what we already noted. The general contraction of domestic stays was counterbalanced by international stays. It is of interest, however, to note that the only destination type where domestic overstays have increased is represented by historical and artistic cities. In other words, also along this dimension of analysis, innovations seems to be worthwhile. Sea-side and mountain, for different reasons, show the worse performance, while artistic and historical destinations are the best performers in a long-term perspective. However, from the classification provided by Table 6.B, it is clear that seaside and mountain destinations showed a worse performance (as compared to national data) in overnight stays, in both the domestic and in the international segment; historical cities and hills showed a better performance in both segments; while

lake and thermal sites were able to have a better-than-the-average performance in the foreign tourism segment, in front of a worse performance in the domestic segment.

Table 6.A,B

Table 7 proposes a picture of regions, according to their typological "orientation". The Table provides the data (still from Istat, with the already-said caveat note) on the share of total overstays in two types of destination, that is, the sea-side and the cultural destination (the former being the destination type with the poorest performance over the years under consideration, and the latter with the best performance). The data reported in Table 7.A clearly show that the share of sea-side tourism has declined (as we already noted) in the national datum, but not in any single region. Similarly, the increase in the share of cultural tourism is far from being homogeneous across regions. The data of Table 7.A are re-arranged in Table 7.B, which classifies the regions according to whether the variation in the share of sea-side and cultural tourism has been larger or smaller (in absolute value) as compared to the national datum.

Table 7.A,B

4. Basic facts: data on occupancy rates

The combination of what has happened in the supply and demand sides leads to the evidence concerning the evolution of occupancy rates of hotels; data are reported in Table 8. The Table can be informative about the efficiency in the use of available structures, and its evolution over the crisis years. We recall that the net occupancy rate evaluates the occupancy during the period in which the hotel structure is open to the public, while the occupancy rate (or whole occupancy rate) considers the structures over the whole year; a discrepancy between occupancy and net-occupancy rate is due to the period in which hotel remains closed –for seasonal closure or other temporary closures for decoration, or by police order, and so on; such closures affect the potential number of beds to be occupied. A high difference between net- and whole- occupancy rate is a

sign of efficient choosing of closing period, but is partly due also to the structural characteristics of tourism in a region; Emilia R., Trentino and Sardegna are leading in this list: they are regions in which the summer or/and the winter tourism peaks are very clear, so that "efficient" seasonal closure is easy. At the bottom part of the list, Lazio and Umbria appear, where tourism flows are less seasonal (than in regions like Emilia, Sardegna or Trentino) and there are no clear periods of "optimal closure" for hotels.

Table 8

As to the variation of occupancy rates over the crisis years, a clear North-South divide emerges from the Table. In particular, the Northern regions have been performing better than the Southern ones. A possible explanation is the fact that the accumulation of new capacity has been larger in Southern regions, in front of the modest performance of tourist flow. The worsening of Sardegna can be entirely attributed to the dramatic drop of domestic arrivals. A note of appreciation has to be spent for Piemonte and Veneto, that display the best variation data; in these regions overstays have increased, and the number of hotels and beds has decreased (hence producing a larger occupancy rate). To complete the report about this point, it can be interesting to note that also Campania displays a good performance in hotel occupancy rate; however, in this region (total) overnight stays have slightly decreased and the number of hotel structures has increased; thus the improvement in hotel occupancy rate is explained by the very poor performance of extra-hotel structures (complete data are not reported, for the sake of easiness, but Campania has shown the largest decrease in overnight stays in extra-hotel structures, among the Italian regions: about -26%; this has occurred in the presence of an increase in the available extra-hotel bed-places in this region, equal to about +29%).

5. The pricing behavior

So far we have not dealt with pricing behavior of accommodation structures. This is due to the difficulty of having reliable data on prices, on the one side; on the other side, the pricing behavior does not seem to represent a key variable to understand what has been happening in this sector, at a first sight at the available data. Here we provide two different sets of data concerning accommodation prices (see Table 9). The first source is Unioncamere (2013), an Italian public (governmental) subject that publishes an Annual Report, based on a wide sample of hotels which provide their prices; the sample is representative of the hotel distribution, according to location and category. The second source is the Hotel Price Index provided by Hotels.com, the popular website for hotel reservation, that builds its index on the paid prices through the website services. The absolute data are quite different in size, but this discrepancy is understandable, since Unioncamere considers all hotels (included the 1 star hotel) while the hotels that are present in Hotels.com is not representative of all hotel population (e.g., 1 star hotels typically do not use Hotels.com service; hotels in superstar destinations are over-represented in Hotels.com, and so on) . Apart from the difference in price *levels* across the samples of Unioncamere and Hotels.com, however, the price *dynamics* are very similar: accommodation prices in Italian hotels have decreased at the beginning of the crisis (the variation in 2009 with respect to 2008 is equal to -8.8% or -11.8% according to Unioncamere or Hotels.com, respectively) and then have been slowly recovering over the subsequent years. Specifically, between 2009 and 2012, the hotel sector has increased prices by 3.4% (included between +3.6% for 1-2 star hotels and +0.09 for 4-5 star hotels), according to Unioncamere and has increased by 3.8% according to Hotels.com. Extra-hotel accommodation has increased the unit price by about 3.2% (reference price is a one-night double-room). In all cases, the price increases between 2009 and 2012 are lower than the consumption price index growth (which has been about +7.4% in the same three-year period). In other words, the accommodation sector has limited its nominal price increases at a lower level than inflation, that means a reduction of price in real terms. Nominal (and real) price are still below the levels of 2008. This could help explain the (relatively) good performance of the sector over the

crisis years, in terms of tourism flows. However, the (nominal and real) revenues have been likely shrinking, as the result of these price and quantity movements.

Table 9

Note also that, within the hotels, the most limited price increase pertains to high level hotels, while nominal price has increased at the largest pace in 1-2 star hotel, where the performance is the worst. However, the price changes are in all cases pretty limited, over the three-year period, and across the different segments of accommodation; thus, they do not permit to associate any specific effect in the market performance to price behavior. A similar inconclusive sentence holds as far as a cross-regional evaluation is concerned. Hotels.com provides data on specific destinations, which are not reported here for the sake of brevity. However, if one considers (non super-star) destinations across different Italian regions, the pieces of evidence are very similar: generally speaking, in all available regions, average prices have decreased in 2009 with respect to 2008, but have then been slightly increasing; however, the pre-crisis price levels are not yet recovered again All these conclusions are based on the data from Hotel Price Index by Hotels.com (2008 to 2012). Thus, structural factors in the demand and supply side, rather than (modest) price changes, seem to be the reason of the different performances across different regions. In other words, price strategies do not seem to be a key part of a more or less resilient behavior in the accommodation industry in Italy.

6. Theoretical interpretations and concluding remarks

The "Great recession" is an aggregate shock hitting the entire world economy, starting in 2008. As far as Italy is concerned, the drop in the GDP has been particularly severe and long-lasting: real GDP has dropped in Italy by about 8% between 2008 and 2012. This article has investigated what has happened in the Italian tourism industry in these years.

The first point of the present investigation is that, *the tourism industry as a whole has been more resilient to economic crisis than other industries.* For instance, manufacture has shrunk about 20% over the four year period under consideration. The service sector has faced a more limited contraction, and within the service sector, the tourism industry as a whole, is even questionable that has faced a contraction - as long as total stays have being increasing between 2008 and 2012. Under this perspective, the present evidence supports the position held by Smeral (2010), rather than the position of Eugenio-Martin and Campos-Sorias (2014). These two analyses deal with the effect of the economic crisis on tourism; they refer to different data, but the latter suggest that the tourism is a sector which is particularly sensible to economic crisis; the former has a more optimistic position. The case study of Italy shows that the tourism industry has been able to substitute domestic demand with foreign demand, thus limiting the negative effect of a very severe domestic crisis. These pieces of evidence testify also that open sectors are more resilient than closed sectors: the possibility to substitute different geographic sources of demand represents a way to counteract the negative consequences of aggregate shocks This channel can be added to the other causes already listed by Smeral (2010, p. 36) to explain why crisis in tourism has been softer than in other sectors.

However, the aggregate dimension of analysis about the shock impacts on tourism is very partial, since the dimension of the adverse shock has not been the same across different destinations and different segments of the Italian tourist industry. This is due to the fact that the demand has been structurally changing. Lower-level hotels have faced a deeper negative shock than higher-level accommodation structures. Regions in which the sea-side tourism was more relevant have faced deeper adverse shock. If we interpret the resilience as the ability of providers to change their orientation and specialization in front of a negative shock, we have to state that *different Italian regions have shown markedly different degrees of economic resilience.* In part, this depends on the "structural endowment" of the regions: clearly, not all regions have the same possibility, say, of "substituting" sea-side product with cultural products; in large part, however, the appropriate reaction is a matter of institutional and political nature. In our present case-study, central Adriatic regions in Italy have shown great difficulties in substituting sea-side tourism with other tourist products. Such a substitution has been

easier and more successful in regions like Veneto, Toscana and Sicilia. Moreover, the ability of specific hotels to up-grade, is a variable able to explain different degrees of resilience: the demand contraction was particularly severe for lower-level accommodation structures; even if hotel up-grading is a common tendency for the whole country, not all destinations have shown the same intensity in this up-grading process. Our present analysis has shown that the more intense the structural change in the qualitative supply, the better the registered performance: once again, the tourist industry shows that flexibility and ability to change is a key factor in explaining resilience.

A final consideration is worth developing about the market structure of tourism. The tourist market can be interpreted as a differentiated oligopoly market. It is an oligopoly because there are clear interdependency links between the behavior of different suppliers; it is differentiated because the products are clearly differentiated (See Candela and Cellini, 2006, or Candela and Figini, 2012, Chs 10 and 14 for models in which the tourism market is represented in terms of differentiated oligopoly). Our present analysis suggests that at least three directions of differentiation can be considered: a geographical differentiation (regions are different); a typological differentiation (sea-side tourism, cultural tourism, etc.); a quality differentiation of accommodation (trivially, 4-5 star hotel *vs* lower level accommodation); the first and the second dimensions of differentiation represent horizontal differentiation, while the third one captures an element of vertical differentiation. These dimensions interact in the tourism product demand and supply. They interact in the demand side, because the consumers choose simultaneously where to go, and which accommodation to choose. They interact in the supply side, because a destination (or even a single hotel) has to clearly design its target, combining the different elements of horizontal and vertical differentiation.

Here we suggest that the importance of these dimensions has changed in the consumers' preference in the years of the Great recession. The fact that recessionary conditions modifies consumer preference –and the resource distribution across sectors– has been suggested by several scholars for different fields; see, e.g., Fisman et al. (2014); Margalit (2014); Foster et al. (2013). These mentioned contributions, among others, suggest that the recessionary condition intensifies the consumer efficiency

orientation in the resource distribution across consumption goods and services. These general trends hold also in the tourism sector. However, tourism is an experience goods, and its relational content is of primary importance. Also for these reasons, we have no surprise in front of the fact that the behavior of the Italian domestic tourists in the years of the Great Recession appears to fit with the principle that "to go is more important than to stay". This holds for the tourism as a whole (remember that total domestic arrivals have increased, even if domestic overstays have decreased), and holds for specific tourism segments in a very marked way –let us think, for instance, of cultural tourism. Cultural tourism (which is likely perceived as 'more demonstrative' than sea-side tourism) and experiential tourism have increased; in these cases, the type of accommodation plays a less important role in consumer choice. Domestic trips to sea-side, on the opposite, decrease, as far as their demonstrative content is less important, and people have been cutting this type of expenses in recession years.

Over the last years of economic crisis (and consumer preference modification) in Italy, we have guessed that market size has enlarged for high-level accommodation structures, and, in general, for 'elite' tourism destinations like cultural tourism destinations, while it has decreased for mass-tourism destinations, like, generally speaking, sea-side destinations, and lower level accommodation structures. Differentiation has enlarged its importance, and the cross-price elasticity coefficients have probably decreased. Admittedly, this means that the market structure is now nearer to monopolistic competition than homogeneous oligopoly. Although the sensitivity of demanded quantity to its own and other prices is out of the goal of the present research. what we have seen in our preliminary analysis of price behavior, indeed, is the fact that price behaviors do not seem to play an important role in explaining the recent history of the tourism industry in Italy. Real prices of accommodation have fallen, but it is hard to see a relevant space for successful price competition in this industry, even in the years after the Great Recession.

REFERENCES

Accardo F.M. (2012). Observations on the state of tourism in Italy. *International Business Research*, 5: 67-70.

Barros C. P. & L. P. Machado (2010). The length of stay in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37: 692-706.

Bille, T. & G. G. Schulze (2008). Culture in urban and regional development. In V. A. Ginsburgh and D. Throsby (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, Amsterdam: North Holland - Elsevier.

Bonet, L. (2003). Cultural Tourism. In R. Towse (Ed.), *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Borowiecki K.J. & C. Castiglione (2014). Cultural participation and tourism flows: An empirical investigation of Italian provinces. *Tourism Economics*, 20: 241-62.

Browne R. & W. Moore (2012). How quickly do Caribbean tourists arrivals rebound after exogenous shocks. CBB Central Bank of Barbados w.p. 2012.

Candela, G. & R. Cellini (2006). Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 35: 41-58.

Candela, G. & P. Figini (2012). *The Economics of Tourism Destinations*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Cellini, R. (2011). Is UNESCO recognition effective in fostering tourism? A comment on Yong, Lin and Han. *Tourism Management*, 32: 452-54.

Cellini, R. & G. Torrisi (2013). Regional public spending for tourism in Italy: An empirical analysis. *Tourism Economics*, 19: 1361-1384.

Cellini, R. & G. Torrisi (2014). Regional resilience in Italy: A very long-run analysis. *Regional Studies*, 48: 79-96.

Cooke, P. & L. Lazzaretti, Eds. (2008). *Creative Cities, cultural clusters and local economic development*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Cortes-Jumenez I., R. Durbarry & M. Pulina (2009). Estimation of outbound Italian tourism demand: a monthly dynamic EC-LAIDS model. *Tourism Economics*, 15: 547-65.

Crouch G.I. (1994). The study of international tourism demand: A review of findings. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33: 12-23.

Crouch G.I. (1995). A Meta-Analysis of Tourism Demand. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22: 103-118.

Cuccia, T. & I. Rizzo (2010). Tourism Seasonality in Cultural Destinations: Empirical Evidence from Sicily. *Tourism Management*, 32: 589-95.

Di Caro (2014). Recessions, Recoveries and Regional resilience: evidence on Italy. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, forthcoming.

Eugenio-Martin J.L. & J.A: Campos-Sorias (2014). Economic crisis and tourism exenditure cutback decision. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44(1): 53-73.

Fisman, R., P. Jakiela & S. Kariv (2014). How Did Distributional Preferences Change During the Great Recession?, NBER w.p. 20146.

Foster L., C. Grim, & J. Haltiwanger (2013). Reallocation in the Great Recession: Cleansing or Not?, w. p. 13-42, Center for Economic Studies, U.S. Census Bureau.

Ioannides D. & M. Alebaki (2014). Resilience thinking: A Drive for Innovative Approaches in tourism. Mimeo, presented at the February 2014 RSA Catalonia Conference.

Istat (2014) Annuario Statistico Italiano 2013, Roma: Istat.

Lagravinese R. (2014). Crisi economiche e resilienza regionale. *EyesReg*, 4(2):48-55.

Margalit Y. (2014), Explaining Social Policy Preferences: Evidence from the Great Recession. *American Political Science Review*, forthcoming

Massidda C. & P. Mattana (2013). A SVECM Analysis of the Relationship between International Tourism Arrivals, GDP and Trade in Italy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52: 93-105.

Patuelli R., M. Mussoni & G. Candela (2014). Cultural offer and distance in a spatial interaction model for tourism. *Economics and Susiness Letters*, 3: 96-108.

Richtie J.R.B., C.M.A. Molinar & D. Frechtling (2010). Impacts of the world recession and economic crisis on tourism: North America. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49: 5-15.

Ryan, C. & G. Huimin, Eds. (2009). *Tourism in China: Destination, Cultures and Communities*, London: Routledge.

Smeral E. (2010). Impacts of the world recession and economic crisis on tourism: Forecasts and potential risks. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49: 31-38.

Smeral E. & H. Song (2013). Varying elasticities and forecasting performance. *International Journal of Tourism Research,* doi: 10.1002/jtr.1972.

Wang E., B.B. Little, & A. DelHomme-Little (2012). Factors contributing to tourists' length of stay in Dalian northeastern China: A survival model analysis. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 4: 67-72.

Yang, C.H., H.L. Lin & C.C. Han (2019). Analysis of international tourist arrivals in China: The role of World Heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 31: 827-37

Websites for data:

Hotel.com: http://press.hotels.com/en-us/hotel-price-index/ (as accessed on October 3rd 2014)

Istat: http://dati.istat.it/ (servizi --> turismo) (as accessed on October 3rd 2014)

Unioncamere – Camere di commercio d'Italia (2013), *Impresa Turismo*, http://www.ontit.it/opencms/opencms/ont/it/documenti/02970 (as accessed on October 3rd 2014).

TABLES

TABLE 1 - Accommodation structures

	2008			2012		
	Structures	Beds	Average size	Structures	Beds	Average size
Hotel						
Total hotels	34155	2201838	64.46	33728 (-1.25%)	225070 (+2.21%)	66.73
5 star	315	56,208	178.45	393 (+24.76%)	64,106 (+14.05%)	163.12
4 star	4,623	635,901	137.55	5354 (+15.81%)	736,311 (+15.79%)	137.52
3 star	15,160	974,995	64.31	15,243 (+0.54%)	962,662 (-1.26%)	63.154
2 star	7,196	234,330	32.56	6,509 (-9.55%)	209,944 (-10.41%)	32.25
1 star	4,299	101,152	23.53	3,438 (-20.03%)	80,606 (-20.31%)	23.44
Extra-hotels						
Total extra-hotel	106108	2447212		123500 (+13.69%)	2511897 (+2.61%)	
B&B	18,189	93,544	5.17	25,241 (+38.77%)	129,035 (+37.93%)	5.11
Camping	2,595	1,360,935	524.44	2,670 (+2.89%)	1,358,044 (-0.14%)	508.63
Agritourism	15465	191099	12.36	17,228 (+13.40%)	226,538 (+18.52)	13.15

Note: Data are from Istat. The sum of the 1 to 5 star hotels does not give the total number of hotel structures, since the latter includes also hotel residence structures. Similarly, extra-hotel structures also includes other types of accommodation beyond the listed ones, like private houses for rent or holidays, youth-hostels, mountain-refuges.

Table 2.A – Structure distribution across regions

Region	Code	Total			Hotel			Extra-hotel			Share of hotel		
		2008	2012	%Var	2008	2012	%Var	2008	2012	%Var	2008	2012	%Var
Piemonte	PIE	4805	5536	15.21	1567	1540	-1.72	3238	3996	23.41	32.61	27.82	-4.79
Valdaosta	VDA	977	1058	8.29	493	482	-2.23	484	576	19.01	50.46	45.56	-4.90
Liguria	LIG	4024	4184	3.98	1604	1513	-5.67	2420	2671	10.37	39.86	36.16	-3.70
Lombardia	LOM	5670	7039	24.14	2958	2955	-0.10	2712	4084	50.59	52.17	41.98	-10.19
Trentino AA	TAA	13025	13124	0.76	5862	5736	-2.15	7163	7388	3.14	45.01	43.71	-1.30
Veneto	VEN	47741	56631	18.62	3248	3092	-4.80	44493	53539	20.33	6.80	5.46	-1.34
Friuli V.G.	FVG	4633[a]	5089	9.84[a]	739	742	0.41	3894[a]	4347	11.63	15.95	14.58	-1.37
Emilia R.	EMR	8397	8554	1.87	4618	4462	-3.38	3779	4092	8.28	55.00	52.16	-2.83
Toscana	TOS	11369	12415	9.20	2949	2864	-2.88	8420	9551	13.43	25.94	23.07	-2.87
Umbria	UMB	3553	3878	9.15	565	554	-1.95	2988	3324	11.24	15.90	14.29	-1.62
Marche	MAR	3094	3954	27.80	999	888	-11.11	2095	3066	46.35	32.29	22.46	-9.83
Lazio	LAZ	7810	8506	8.91	1914	2002	4.60	5896	6504	10.31	24.51	23.54	-0.97
Abruzzo	ABR	2035	2380	16.95	824	800	-2.91	1211	1580	30.47	40.49	33.61	-6.88
Molise	MOL	317	437	37.85	109	108	-0.92	208	329	58.17	34.38	24.71	-9.67
Campania	CAM	3863	7108	84.00	1626	1697	4.37	2237	5411	141.89	42.09	23.87	-18.22
Puglia	PUG	3612	4807	33.08	924	1011	9.42	2688	3796	41.22	25.58	21.03	-4.55
Basilicata	BAS	610	705	15.57	233	238	2.15	377	467	23.87	38.20	33.76	-4.44
Calabria	CAL	2178	2740	25.80	821	840	2.31	1357	1900	40.01	37.70	30.66	-7.04
Sicilia	SIC	4134	4979	20.44	1208	1291	6.87	2926	3688	26.04	29.22	25.93	-3.29
Sardegna	SAR	3476	4104	18.07	894	913	2.13	2582	3191	23.59	25.72	22.25	-3.47
Italy	ITA	140263	157228	12.10	34155	33728	-1.25	106108	123500	16.39	24.35	21.45	-2.90

Source: ISTAT. Our elaboration on original data. a: Due to a discontinuity in the definition used by Friuli V. G. for the data concerning private houses to rent for tourism purposes, the datum of 2008 has been replaced with the first datum available according the new definition; total data and percentage variations are adjusted accordingly.

Table 2.B Hotel distribution across regions

(1) Region	4-5 star			1-2 star			(8)
	(2) 2008 (share of 4-5* hotels among hotels)	(3) 2012 (%Var of the number of 4-5* hotels)	(4) Variation of the share of 4-5* hotel among hotels	(5) 2008 (share of 1-2* hotels among hotels)	(6) 2012 (%Var of the number of 4-5* hotels)	(7) Variation of the share of 1-2* hotel among hotels	Ruogh index of strucutral variation
Italy	*4938 (14.46)*	*5747 (+16.38%)*	*2.58*	*11495 (33.66)*	*9947 (-13.49%)*	*-4.17*	*6.75*
PIE	185 (11.81)	214 (+15.67%)	2.09	589 (37.59)	511 (-13.24%)	-4.41	6.50
VDA	44 (8.92)	49 (+11.36%)	1.24	188 (38.13)	163 (-13.29%)	-4.32	5.56
LIG	118 (7.36)	129 (+9.32%)	1.16	771 (48.07)	665 (-13.74%)	-4.11	5.27
LOM	543 (18.36)	615 (+13.25%)	2.45	1024 (34.61)	912 (-10.93%)	-3.75	6.2
TAA	480 (8.19)	585 (+21.87%)	2.01	2156 (36.78)	1856 (-13.91%)	-4.42	6.43
VEN	501 (15.42)	551 (+9.980%)	2.39	1242 (38.24)	1030 (-17.07%)	-4.92	7.31
FVG	82 (11.10)	99 (+20.73%)	2.24	304 (41.14)	262 (-13.82%)	-5.83	8.07
EMR	418 (9.05)	441 (+5.50%)	0.83	1501 (32.50)	1319 (-12.15%)	-2.94	3.77
TOS	467 (15.83)	505 (+8.13%)	1.79	884 (29.98)	764 (-13.57%)	-3.30	5.09
UMB	72 (12.74)	80 (+11.11%)	1.69	226 (40.00)	195 (-13.72%)	-4.80	6.49
MAR	94 (9-41)	116 (+23.40%)	3.65	323 (32.33)	232 (-28.17%)	-6.20	9.85
LAZ	399 (20.84)	444 (+11.27%)	1.33	673 (35.16)	677 (0.594%)	-1.34	2.67
ABR	99 (12.01)	109 (+10.10%)	1.61	273 (33.13)	231 (-15.32%)	-4.25	5.86
MOL	22 (20.18)	26 (+18.18%)	3.89	38 (34.86)	33 (-13.16%)	-4.30	8.19
CAM	419 (25.76)	509 (+21.47%)	4.22	398 (24.47)	327 (-17.83%)	-5.20	9.42
PUG	247 (26.73)	343 (+38.86%)	7.19	179 (19.37)	152 (-15.08%)	-4.33	11.52
BAS	41 (17.60)	53 (+29.26%)	4.67	72 (30.90)	62 (-13.89%)	-4.85	9.52
CAL	186 (22.66)	227 (+22.04%)	4.36	158 (19.24)	147 (-6.96%)	-1.74	6.10
SIC	287 (23.75)	379 (+32.05%)	5.59	325 (26.90)	266 (-18.15%)	-6.29	11.88
SAR	234 (26.17)	273 (+16.67%)	3.72	171 (19.13)	143 (-16.37%)	-3.46	7.18

Source: ISTAT. The "rough" index of structural variation in Column (8) is computes as the sum of the absolute value of variations reported in Column (4) and (7).

Table 3 – Arrival, Overnights and Average stay: total data

	Total			In hotels		
	2008	2012	%Var	2008	2012	%Var
TOTAL						
Arrival	95546086	103733157	8,568714	77164740	82644781	7,101742
Overnights	373666712	380711483	1,885309	251678307	255610143	1,562247
Av stay	3,910853	3,670104083	-6,15592	3,261571	3,092877	-5,17218
FOREIGN						
Arrival	41796724	48738575	16,6086	33666586	38867517	15,44835
Overnights	161797434	180594988	11,61796	110491709	122700343	11,04937
Av stay	3,871055	3,705380964	-4,27983	3,28194	3,156887	-3,81034
DOMESTIC						
Arrival	53749362	54994582	2,316716	43498154	43777264	0,641659
Overnights	211869278	200116495	-5,54719	141186598	132909800	-5,86231
Av stay	3,941801	3,638840186	-7,68584	3,245807	3,036046	-6,4625

Source: Istat (2014).

Table 4 – Absolute data (and percentage variation w.r.t. 2008) of Arrival and Overnights in different types of accommodation, 2012.

	ALL		FOREIGN		DOMESTIC	
	ARRIVAL	OVERSTAYS	ARRIVAL	OVERSTAYS	ARRIVAL	OVERSTAYS
Total	103,733,157	380,711,483	48,738,575	180,594,988	54,994,582	200,116,495
	(+8.57%)	(+1.88%)	(+16.61%)	(+11.62%)	(+2.32%)	(-5.55%)
In Hotel	82,644,781	255,610,143	38,867,517	122,700,343	43,777,264	132,909,800
	(+7.10%)	(+1.56%)	(+15.45%)	(+11.05%)	(+0.64%)	(-5.86%)
5 and 4 star	39,238,237	106,001,160	20,723,340	59,268,783	18,514,897	46,732,377
	(+20.33%)	(+16.53%)	(+27.40%)	(+22.85%)	(+13.30%)	(+9.39%)
3 star	33517973	108176970	14041253	46235897	19476720	61941073
	(-1.35%)	(-5.35%)	(5.95%)	(4.13%)	(-6.02%)	(-11.37%)
2 and 1 star	7193584	23831962	3010333	10124179	4183251	13707783
	(-13.14%)	(-19.34%)	(-7.87%)	(-12.31%)	(-16.57%)	(-23.85%)
In Extra-hotel	21,088,376	12,510,1340	9,871,058	57,894,645	11,217,318	67,206,695
	(+14.73%)	(+2.55%)	(+21.41%)	(+12.84%)	(+9.42%)	(-4.92%)
Camp	9,057,423	64,598,025	4,390,434	29,914,157	4,666,989	34,683,868
	(+4.93%)	(-0.96%)	(+10.61%)	(+8.08%)	(+0.10%)	(-7.62%)
House	5,485,883	33,488,493	2,964,612	17,280,529	2,521,271	16,207,964
	(+23.17%)	(+0.19%)	(+32.68%)	(+14.73%)	(+13.60%)	(-11.73%)
Agr	2,413,476	10,475,299	987,876	5,658,123	1,425,600	4,817,176
	(+28.48%)	(+19.23%)	(+39.33%)	(+27.54%)	(+21.90%)	(+10.75%)
B&B and other	4131594	16539523	1528136	5041836	2603458	11497687
	(+20.89%)	(+13.63%)	(+25.53%)	(+22.11%)	(+18.33%)	(+10.27%)

Source ISTAT (2014)
Note: The Hotel group includes also Residential structures in hotel, beyond 1 to 5 star hotels.

Table 5.A –Arrival and Overnights across Italian regions: percentage variation rates, 2008-12.

Total					Foreign					domestic			
Arrivals		Overnight stays			arrivals		Overnight stays			Arrivals		Overnight stays	
LOM	26,14	LOM	17,89		LOM	37,52	PUG	33,43		VDA	17,46	LOM	6,07
PIE	23,06	PUG	9,35		PUG	36,64	LOM	28,63		PIE	16,59	PUG	5,12
VDA	17,69	PIE	7,41		PIE	35,98	PIE	25,43		LOM	16,27	BAS	3,13
TAA	11,96	TAA	5,44		FVG	21,32	SIC	13,56		BAS	10,31	VDA	-0,40
VEN	11,95	TOS	3,37		VEN	19,83	SAR	13,37		MAR	6,69	TAA	-1,64
BAS	11,07	VEN	2,88		LIG	18,73	VEN	13,20		TAA	6,42	PIE	-2,44
PUG	10,39	SIC	2,41		VDA	18,15	TOS	13,04		PUG	5,95	LAZ	-3,73
TOS	9,86	VDA	1,70		BAS	17,19	Fvg	13,00		TOS	1,32	UMB	-4,32
MAR	7,29	BAS	1,04		TAA	16,98	LIG	12,64		UMB	0,95	CAL	-4,44
FVG	7,11	FVG	-0,86		EMR	13,25	CAL	12,03		EMR	0,94	ABR	-4,86
EMR	3,85	CAL	-1,59		CAM	12,34	TAA	11,41		VEN	-0,07	SIC	-4,99
SIC	3,02	CAM	-1,67		TOS	10,85	MAR	10,94		SIC	-1,73	EMR	-5,36
CAM	2,61	EMR	-2,55		SIC	10,65	EMR	6,57		CAL	-2,52	TOS	-5,50
LIG	1,75	UMB	-3,08		MAR	10,42	VDA	5,71		CAM	-3,11	CAM	-6,12
UMB	1,74	LAZ	-3,14		SAR	9,00	CAM	4,84		ABR	-3,27	MAR	-7,50
CAL	-1,20	ABR	-4,07		CAL	6,27	ABR	0,99		FVG	-3,34	FVG	-11,10
ABR	-2,95	MAR	-4,81		UMB	3,77	UMB	-0,75		LAZ	-3,66	VEN	-11,89
LAZ	-3,31	LIG	-5,16		ABR	-0,56	LAZ	-2,85		LIG	-7,02	LIG	-12,55
MOL	-8,90	SAR	-11,80		LAZ	-3,12	MOL	-15,79		MOL	-8,71	MOL	-18,26
SAR	-10,37	MOL	-18,08		MOL	-11,18	BAS	-18,32		SAR	-20,28	SAR	-23,42

Table 5.B – Italian regions classified as better or worse performer as compared to the national data in domestic and foreign stays

		Foreign	
		Better	Worse
Domestic	Better	PUG, LOM, PIE, SIC, TOS, CAL	TAA, EMR VDA, ABR, UMB, LAZ, BAS
	Worse	SAR, VEN, FVG, LIG	MAR, MOL, CAM

Table 6.A – Absolute data (and percentage variation w.r.t. 2008) of Arrival and Overnights in selected types of destinations, 2012; average stay and its absolute variation.

	ALL			FOREIGN			DOMESTIC		
	ARRIVAL	OVERSTAYS	AV STAY	ARRIVAL	OVERSTAYS	AV STAY	ARRIVAL	OVERSTAYS	AV STAY
Seaside	22,142,899	116,180,554	5.2	8,025,204	42,353,805	5.3	14,117,695	73,826,749	5.3
	(+3,26%)	*(-1,53%)*	*(-0.3)*	*(+14,38%)*	*(+10,11%)*	*(-0.1)*	*(-2,15%)*	*(-7,16%)*	*(-0.3)*
Mountain	10,553,869	47,925,330	4.6	4,246,504	20,584,521	4.9	6,307,365	27,340,809	4.3
	(+7,72%)	*(-2,02%)*	*(-0.4)*	*(+15,72%)*	*(+8,69%)*	*(-0.3)*	*(+2,93%)*	*(-8,78%)*	*(-0.8)*
Histor & artist Cities	37,001,817	98,040,546	2.6	2,200,7351	6,029,1761	2.7	14,994,466	37,748,785	2.5
	(+12,04%)	*(+7,6%)*	*(-0.1)*	*(+16,75%)*	*(+12,18%)*	*(-0.1)*	*(+5,77%)*	*(+1,07%)*	*(-0.1)*
Lake and thermal sites	9,824,532	41,730,557	4.2	5,950,506	28,203,420	4.8	3,874,026	13,527,357	3.6
	(+10,54%)	*(+8,06%)*	*(-0.1)*	*(+17,82%)*	*(+18,53%)*	*(-0.1)*	*(+0,96%)*	*(-8,74%)*	*(-0.1)*
Hills	4,131,339	14,719,489	3.6	1,970,409	9,044,260	4.7	2,160,930	5,675,229	2.7
	(+6,44%)	*(+6,74%)*	*(-0.0)*	*(+17,84%)*	*(+14,25%)*	*(-0.0)*	*(-2,20%)*	*(-3,39%)*	*(-0.0)*

The Table reports the arrival and overnight stays in 2012, ant its percentage variation w.r.t. 2008; the table also report the average stay in 2012, and its absolute variation w.r.t. to 2008.

Table 6.B – Italian destination types classified as better or worse performer as compared to the national data in domestic and foreign overstays

		Foreign	
		Better	Worse
Domestic	Better	Historical and artistic cities Hills	
	Worse	Lake and thermal sites	Seaside Mountain

Table 7.A - Typological destinations in regions

	% of overstays in historical/ cultural sites			% of overstays in sea-side destinations		
	2008	2012	Variation	2008	2012	Variation
Italy	*24.38*	*25.75*	*1.37*	*31.58*	*30.52*	*-1.06*
PIE	19.62	21.53	+1.91	0	0	0
VDA	7.23	5.34	-1.89	0	0	0
LIG	10.14	10.85	+0.71	85.36	84.15	-1.21
LOM	32.57	33.87	+1.30	0	0	0
TAA	0	0	0	0	0	0
VEN	33.06	34.47	+1.41	32.78	30.59	-2.19
FVG	8.37	10.28	+1.91	61.13	62.33	+1.20
EMR	19.48	20.17	+0.69	66.76	68.56	+1.80
TOS	34.32	36.64	+2.32	40.28	37.97	-2.31
UMB	52.34	53.75	+1.41	0	0	0
MAR	22.50	23.48	+0.98	62.38	61.78	-0.60
LAZ	75.96	79.39	+3.43	6.53	6.93	+0.41
ABR	0.00	0.00	0	57.81	60.68	+2.88
MOL	0.00	0.00	0	30.33	28.47	-1.86
CAM	13.35	16.46	+3.10	34.07	39.99	+5.92
PUG	7.52	8.65	+1.13	27.08	26.89	-0.18
BAS	0	0	0	9.77	11.39	+1.62
CAL	0	0	0	61.64	62.36	+0.72
SIC	16.72	18.52	+1.80	33.16	30.65	-2.51
SAR	0.00	0.00	0	39.74	40.08	+0.34

Table 7.B Performance of regions concerning the variation of share in sea-side and cultural destinations

		Sea-side	
		Larger (negative) variation than the national datum	Smaller (negative) variation than the national datum (or non-negative variation)
Cultural	Larger variation than the national datum	VEN, TOS, SIC	(PIE), (UMB) FVG, LAZ, MOL, CAM
	Smaller variation than the national datum	LIG	(VAA), (LOM), (TAA), [ABR], [BAS], [CAL], [SAR], EMR, MAR, PUG

Note: regions in parentheses have no sea-side destinations, so that their share is constant and equal to zero; regions in squared parentheses have no municipalities classified by ISTAT as cultural destinations, so that their share is constant and equal to zero.

Table 8 - Net and whole occupancy rate in hotels

	2009			2011			2011-2009 Variation	
	Whole	Net	Net-whole	Whole	Net	Net-whole	Whole	Net
Italy	*30.4*	*38.8*	*8.4*	*31.3*	*40.2*	*8.9*	*0.9*	*1.4*
Piemonte	23.7	27.5	3.8	27.2	32.2	5	3.5	4.7
Valle d'Aosta	25.6	35	9.4	26.5	36	9.5	0.9	1
Liguria	34.3	40.6	6.3	34.7	41	6.3	0.4	0.4
Lombardia	32.8	36.7	3.9	35.7	40	4.3	2.9	3.3
Trentino AA	36.1	53.3	17.2	36.6	54.7	18.1	0.5	1.4
Veneto	36.4	46.9	10.5	39.2	51.6	12.4	2.8	4.7
Friuli-V Giulia	24.9	30.8	5.9	26.2	33	6.8	1.3	2.2
Emilia-R	28.3	46.2	17.9	28.3	46	17.7	0.0	-0.2
Toscana	28.2	32.1	3.9	30.8	34.7	3.9	2.6	2.6
Umbria	27.8	29.5	1.7	29.8	31.5	1.7	2	2
Marche	22.9	26.5	3.6	22.6	29.4	6.8	-0.3	2.9
Lazio	46.6	47.2	0.6	46.9	47.5	0.6	0.3	0.3
Abruzzo	25.1	28.7	3.6	26.3	30.3	4	1.2	1.6
Molise	16.7	18.6	1.9	17.3	18.8	1.5	0.6	0.2
Campania	31.2	36.1	4.9	35.1	39.6	4.5	3.9	3.5
Puglia	24.6	29.9	5.3	24.5	29.2	4.7	-0.1	-0.7
Basilicata	16.3	23.6	7.3	16.4	23.5	7.1	0.1	-0.1
Calabria	18.8	31.1	12.3	18.2	28.4	10.2	-0.6	-2.7
Sicilia	27.2	31.9	4.7	26	29.8	3.8	-1.2	-2.1
Sardegna	23.3	37.8	14.5	19.9	37.1	17.2	-3.4	-0.7

Table 9. Accommodation structure prices in Italy according different sources

	Source	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	% Var 2009-12
Hotel	HPI	118	104	105	105	108	+3.8%
Hotel	UC	84.0	76.6	65.3	78.5	79.2	+3.4%
Extra-hotel	UC	na	60.3	58.6	56.6	62.3	+3.2%
1-2 star	UC	61.1	57.8	57.5	59.4	59.9	+3.6%
3-star	UC	84.1	74.6	74.1	75.3	76.7	+2.8%
4-5 star	UC	133.6	124.3	121.0	124.4	124.4	+0.1%

Note: Sources are: HPI - The Hotel Pirce Index by Hotels.com (issues 2008 to 2012, Tables 12 or 13 according to the different editions) - and UC Unioncamere (2013, p. 18). HPI source reports an index based on the average value of payment per night through Hotels.com; UC considers average price (in Euro) for a double room; the annual data are computed as average among the quarterly data provided by Unioncamere. See further discuss in text about the differences between the two sources.