

THE IMPACT OF SELECTED SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC, TRAVEL-RELATED
AND PSYCHOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON TRAVEL EXPENDITURES

by

NICHAKARN PEERAPATDIT
B.A. Assumption University, 1999

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
in the Rosen College of Hospitality Management
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2004

© 2004 Nichakarn Peerapatdit

ABSTRACT

Several researchers have attempted to understand the tourism expenditure patterns from the traveler's perspective (Cai, Hong, and Morrison, 1995; Dardis, et al., 1981; Prais and Houthakker, 1971; Sheldon and Mak, 1987; Jang, et al., 2003). However, an examination of the previous studies indicates that only limited understanding of the traveler's expenditure patterns has been provided either because of only anecdotal evidence in the studies, or because of their failure to examine the impacts of the factors affecting expenditure patterns. This study examined the effects of socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables on travel expenditures. The expenditure patterns included lodging, meals and restaurants, attractions and festivals, entertainment, shopping, transportation, and total expenditures.

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to the body of literature in relation to travel expenditure by examining the variables under each of the three constructs identified in predicting travel expenditures. The results of the study provide a more comprehensive and holistic picture in the search of travel expenditures based on multiple independent variables. This study found that travel-related variables (i.e. number of adult(s) and length of stay) were the most influential variables affecting tourism expenditures per person per day.

From a practical standpoint, this study sheds light by providing information about how the traveler's characteristic effects travel expenditure patterns and destination marketers may use this information to better segment their target market, allocate their marketing dollars more effectively, and tailor their products to compete for tourist's dollars. Since consumer dollars and tourism organizations' marketing budgets are limited, this study may provide information which

will help tourism marketers to develop better strategic marketing tools to satisfy and fulfill those tourists' needs and understand certain reasons behind their spending patterns.

For my mom and sisters who have always been inspiring
and supporting me throughout this journey; and in loving memory
of my dad who always loved and believed in me.

“Leisure is not enjoyed unless it is earned” Anonymous...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although the title page recognizes the single author, many people contributed (in several ways) to the successful completion of this study. First, I would like to thank Dr. Denver Severt, my committee chair, for carefully guiding me through this learning process. His understanding and cheerfulness always helped ease my ongoing stress. In particular, his unique way of encouraging me with research opportunities and praise has benefited me greatly and has guided me in the accomplishment of this study.

For helping me stretch and reach for the best, I'm grateful to Dr. Youcheng Wang for holding me up to the same high standards he sets for himself. His expansive knowledge, statistical expertise, and his firm commitment to supporting this work allowed me to explore and discover on my own. Thank you for vigilantly guiding me and keeping me focus on the right spot. I would also like to thank Dr. Paul Rompf for his probing questions, which were helpful in rectifying unclear location and inconsistency. I truly appreciate his suggestions and sharing pearls of wisdom throughout my research process.

Beyond the committee, a special thanks is extended to the National Laboratory for Tourism and eCommerce for granting me the permission to use the secondary data, which is a great asset for my study.

Last, but not least, I'm thankful for my mom and my sisters. Though thousand miles away from Florida, they have constantly supported, encouraged and believed in me during my overseas study at the Rosen College. I also want to thank my friends at the Rosen College and in Thailand for inspiring and helping me in several ways. Their support is priceless and memorable. This study is possible because of all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF HYPERLINKS	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Tourism Expenditure	2
Conceptual Background of the Study	3
Dependent Variables.....	4
Independent Variables	4
Research Objective	5
Research Significance.....	5
Results.....	7
Chapter Summary	7
CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	8
Socio-Demographic Variables.....	10
Household Income and Expenditure Patterns	10
The Family Life Cycle and Expenditure Patterns.....	15
Age and Expenditure Patterns.....	17
Gender and Expenditure Patterns.....	18
Marital Status and Expenditure Patterns.....	20
Social Class and Expenditure Patterns.....	20
Travel-related Variables	22
Number of Party Size and Expenditure Patterns.....	22
First-time and Repeat Visitation and Expenditure Patterns.....	23
Length of Stay and Expenditure Patterns.....	27
Travel Purpose and Expenditure Patterns	28
Travel Distance and Expenditure Patterns.....	30
Psychographic Variables.....	31
Travel Personality and Expenditure Patterns.....	37
Chapter Summary	39
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	40
Research Framework	40
Research Design	40
Dependent Variables.....	41
Independent Variables	42
Data Source and Sampling Frame	42
Survey Instrument.....	44
Data Collection	44
Review of the Questionnaire.....	45
Variable Selection.....	48
Data Transformation	50
Data Analysis.....	51
Chapter Summary	54

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	55
Multiple Regression Analysis	55
Profile of Respondents	56
Socio-demographic Analysis of Respondents	57
Travel-related Analysis of Respondents	59
Psychographic Analysis of Respondents	61
Expenditure Patterns of Respondents	64
Lodging Expenditures	66
Meals and Restaurants Expenditures	70
Attractions and Festivals Expenditures	73
Entertainment Expenditures	76
Shopping Expenditures	79
Transportation Expenditures	82
Total Expenditures	85
Summary of the Influential Variables	89
Chapter Summary	90
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	91
Discussion of the Research Findings	91
Main Contribution of the study	94
Theoretical Contribution	95
Practical Contribution	96
Limitations of the study	98
Suggestions for future research	99
APPENDIX: MID-WEST TRAVEL SURVEY	101
LIST OF REFERENCES	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Selected Independent Variables.....	41
Table 2: Selected Socio-Demographic Variables	49
Table 3: Selected Travel-related Variables.....	49
Table 4: Selected Psychographic Variables.....	50
Table 5: Variables for Models for Tourism Expenditures	53
Table 6: Socio-demographic Profile of Respondents	58
Table 7: Travel-related Profile of Respondents	60
Table 8: Travel Distance of Respondents	61
Table 9: Psychographic Profile of Respondents	63
Table 10: Average amount spent and Average Expenditure per person per day	64
Table 11: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Lodging Expenditures.....	69
Table 12: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Meals and Restaurants Expenditures	72
Table 13: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Attractions/Festivals Expenditures	75
Table 14: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Entertainment Expenditures	78
Table 15: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Shopping Expenditures.....	81
Table 16: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Transportation Expenditures.....	84
Table 17: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Total Expenditures.....	88
Table 18: Summary of Variables' Effects on Travel Expenditures.....	89

LIST OF HYPERLINKS

http://www.tia.org/Travel/tvt.asp	79
http://www.tia.org/Travel/econimpact.asp	79
http://www.worldtourism.org/statistics/tsa_project/TSA_in_depth/chapters/ch1-2-5.htm	86

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In 2003, the U.S. travel industry received more than \$554.5 billion from domestic and international travelers, excluding international passenger fares (Economic Impact of Travel in U.S., 2003). These travel expenditures, in turn, directly generated more than 7.2 million jobs with over \$158 billion in payroll income for Americans, as well as \$94.7 billion tax revenue for federal, state, and local governments (Economic Impact of Travel in U.S., 2003). The importance of tourism expenditures has been recognized not only by the tourism industry itself but also by local governments. Consequently, understanding tourism expenditure patterns has attracted a great deal of attention both from academic researchers and tourism practitioners.

Several previous travel and tourism marketing industry sources indicated socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables that impact consumer behavioral and motivational differences among different segments of the tourism market. However, such studies are still very limited, and there is a lack of supporting empirical works in the tourism consumer behavior literature (Lawson, 1991). Because of the discretionary nature of expenditures on vacation, it is crucial to understand factors affecting such behavior. Understanding the expenditure patterns and activities of tourists during their visit to a particular destination is a key issue in the strategic planning of facilities and amenities (Mok and Iverson, 2000).

The tourism literature includes previous studies, which use travel expenditures as the segmentation variable. Spotts and Mahoney (1991) proposed that travel expenditures for a given unit of travel activity can vary significantly from one travel party to another. Two types of travelers who spend a vacation in the same area might spend their money in very different ways (Mok and Iverson, 2000). For example, one travel party spending a night in a hotel may purchase

meals, souvenirs, and entertainment as well as a room rental; another may not do any of those things. Similarly, two parties that each spends a certain number of days in a travel promotion region may make widely divergent expenditures during their stay (Spotts and Mahoney, 1991). Therefore, the identification of vacationers' spending levels is a strategic factor in understanding tourism expenditures as a whole.

The nature of tourism expenditures is vital and significant. It yields several economic perspectives for the tourism industry, including marketers, strategic planners, and for travelers themselves. Therefore, this research was an attempt to identify different factors that affect tourism expenditures. Specifically, the major selected socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables were examined in this study.

Tourism Expenditure

The Tourism organizations at different levels tend to define tourism expenditures in different ways. Mules (1998) defines the expenditure as a predictor and input to describe the functioning of the national economy, and to estimate the impacts on such variables as Gross Domestic Product, employment, and wage income.

Tourism expenditure is defined as "the total consumption expenditure made by a visitor on behalf of a visitor for and during his/her trip and stay at destination" (United Nations/World Tourism Organization, 1994).

The World Tourism Organization descriptively defines tourism expenditures as "the total consumption expenditures made by a visitor or on behalf of a visitor for and during his/her trip and stay at destination." This definition allows that (a) the consumption of the good and service

may not necessarily be by the visitor. While in most cases the consumption is by the visitor, in some cases the consumption is by a friend or relative, as in the case of a gift or souvenir purchased by the visitor on the trip, (b) the expenditure may not necessarily be undertaken by the visitor him/herself. In the case of a group, such as a family, expenditures may be undertaken by one person, such as a parent, on behalf of another, or for a dependent child (World Tourism Organization, 2001).

This study defines tourism expenditure as total expenses of all individuals in travel party that may be incurred during the trip from lodging, meals, attractions (if any), entertainment, shopping (including souvenir), transportation (including gas commuting from residence to destinations), and total expenditures.

Conceptual Background of the Study

According to Olsen (1995), the hospitality industry is operating in a complex and dynamic business environment in which an ever-growing number of businesses compete. One aspect that has significant impacts on the tourism growth is expenditure patterns while traveling. The World Tourism Organization quoted the importance of tourism expenditures as “the most important indicators required by policy makers, planning officials, marketers and researchers for monitoring and assessing the impact of tourism on the national economy” (Statistics on Tourism Expenditure, 1993).

Americans are spreading their vacations more evenly throughout the year, thus smoothing the seasonal variation seen in patterns of travel (Janini, 2003). Once a household or individual has decided to travel, they have decided, consciously, or unconsciously, how much tourism

expenditures may be (Eugenio-Martin, 2003). Although households spent the same share of total expenditures on vacations, they allocated their travel dollars differently. Therefore, this research examined the different spending patterns of individuals to increase the understanding of the holistic picture of tourism expenditure patterns and the impact of selected socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables on tourism expenditures.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were expenditures on lodging, meals and restaurants, attractions/festivals, entertainment, shopping (other than food), transportation (including gas) and total expenditures. The total expenditures included the entire travel party expenses counting cash and credit to Northern Indiana. In the survey, expenditures were categorized into the overall trip expenditures and expenditures in Northern Indiana. However, this current study utilized expenditure patterns of travelers per person per day to Northern Indiana as the dependent variables.

Independent Variables

The independent variables being studied in this study consisted of the socio-demographic variables including gender, age, marital status, number of children 17 years of age or younger living in the household, and total annual household income (from all sources) before taxes. Travel-related variables included number of visiting party (including adults and children), number of adult(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, length of stay, nature of the trip, and travel distance. The psychographic variables consisted of traveler personalities,

what travelers value most while traveling: stability/excitement, self/family, being passive/being active, learning/dropping out, and following tradition/trying new thing.

Research Objective

The central purpose of this study was to understand the influential determinants affecting tourism expenditure patterns of travelers and the impact of selected socio-demographic, travel-related and psychographic variables on tourism expenditures.

Specifically, this current research aimed to provide the meaningful perspectives to answer the primary research objective:

- To identify the most influential variables among the selected socio-demographic travel-related, and psychographic variables affecting tourism expenditures.

Research Significance

With the significant growth in tourism, expenditures on recreation have also increased and expanded constantly from time to time since travelers find more ways to be exposed to travel more or to new exciting sightseeing places. Consumer or traveler expenditures directly or indirectly impact the national economy as a whole and also the local or domestic economy.

Given the magnitude and economic effects of travel spending, much emphasis has been placed on gathering travel expenditure data. Most of the research has been motivated by the practical consideration of documenting the economic impacts of tourism (Mok and Iverson, 2000). The present study was an attempt to identify influential determinants affecting tourism

expenditures by examining three groups of variables (i.e., socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic) and their impacts on travel expenditure patterns.

From the theoretical perspective, this research intended to understand factors affecting tourism expenditures and the impact of selected tourism determinants on tourism expenditures. The current body of research literature, in the area of tourism expenditures, would gain further understanding of tourism expenditure patterns. The expenditure patterns encourage the tourism marketers to better develop strategic marketing tools to satisfy and fulfill those tourist's needs and understand certain reasons behind their spending patterns. The research also hoped to contribute to the hospitality literature by providing evidence of certain other significant and influential factors driving tourism expenditures. Conducted in November and December 2001, Mid-west Travel Survey designed and developed by the National Laboratory for Tourism and eCommerce at University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign contained a set of rich and detailed questionnaires including both open-ended and closed-ended questions with satisfactory numbers of sample size, several tourism expenditure indicators were examined and investigated.

From a practical standpoint, this research hoped to provide destination marketers insightful perspectives to improve their destination attractiveness and to provide tourism products or services worthwhile to tourists. This research may benefit the tourism marketers who strategically plan to segment the appropriate target groups and to understand factors that influence tourists' spending patterns. As the consumer dollars are limited as well as the organization's marketing budget, tourism marketers should properly target the right market and segment the right travelers so that the marketing budget will be appropriately spent.

Results

This study found that travel-related variables played an important role in explaining several tourism expenditure patterns more than socio-demographic and psychographic variables. Though psychographic variables were found to be significant in certain expenditure patterns, as past literature indicates that it was likely to explain mental desire or reasons behind travel activities rather than the spending patterns.

Chapter Summary

With the rapid growth of globalization, the consumer market has been expanding in different ways. Certain changes from different aspects such as demographic, psychographic, social and economic changes in the U.S. have impacted certain areas of consumer behavior and consumer spending patterns, which eventually impacts their expenditure patterns while traveling.

The strength of this study is that it examines the effects of selected socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables in predicting travel expenditures. This study was one of few to examine the comprehensive impacts of the three major selected variables on tourism expenditure patterns. The findings of this study suggest some important marketing implications and challenges both to the academic researchers and industry practitioners.

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The purpose of this chapter is to review relevant and related literature on tourism expenditure patterns. The discussion is divided into three primary independent variables: socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographics variables. The chapter summary closes the chapter.

A previous study by Bryant (1992) noted that among all the possible combinations of goods available to households, they would choose the combination that makes them better off or more satisfied. Basically, how households make such choices depends upon three elements in the model: (1) budget constraints; (2) relative price; and (3) preference. The economic theory of consumer behavior stated that the demand for a good or service might be expressed as a function of tastes and preferences, income, and market prices. Consumer expenditures on tourism products are also affected by tastes and preferences, which may vary from household to household (Cai, Hong, and Morrison, 1995).

The tourism research literature shows that demographic, socioeconomic and travel trip characteristics have been influential in predicting vacation choices (Sheldon and Mak, 1987). They presented a model that explained traveler's choices of independent travel versus package tours on travel to Hawaii. The results showed that traveler's decisions were related to specific demographic, socio-economic and travel trip characteristics. Several previous studies revealed similar findings that demographic, socioeconomic, and travel-related characteristics all impact the visitor's intention to visit and willingness to spend money on vacations (Dardis *et al.*, 1981; Cai, Hong, and Morrison, 1995; Fish and Waggle, 1996; Agarwal and Yochum, 1999; Jang *et al.*, 2003).

Substantial research has been done on the topic of tourism demand, which is the foundation on which all tourism-related business and policy-making decisions ultimately rest. However, the determinants of household demand for tourism products and services have rarely been investigated (Cai, Hong, and Morrison, 1995). Therefore, the literature review for this study is ordered according to the variables that are being examined in this study. It examines the previous studies that investigated the market segmentation and consumer demand in travel and tourism products that relate to their expenditure patterns.

Specifically, the review includes the tourism dependent variable studies relevant to household expenditures on lodging, meals and restaurants, attractions/festivals, entertainment, shopping (other than food), transportation (including gas), and total expenditure and its relation to socio-demographic, tourism-related, and psychographic variables. The independent variables in this study consisted of: (1) studies relevant to household socio-demographic variables including gender, age, marital status, number of children 17 years of age or under living in the household, and total annual household income before taxes, (2) studies relevant to travel-related variables including number of visiting party, first-time and repeat visitation, length of stay, nature of trip, and travel distance, and (3) studies relevant to psychographic variables including twelve travel personality traits that best described their personality, what travelers valued most while traveling: stability/excitement, self/family, being passing/being active, learning/dropping out, and following tradition/trying new thing.

Socio-Demographic Variables

A previous study by Dardis *et al.*, (1981) revealed the factors influencing recreation expenditures by U.S. households. They cited several empirical studies on household demographics, social, economics, econometrics, and leisure characteristics which were categorized into four sets: (1) household disposable income or household total expenditure as alternative; (2) family life cycle variables including age of household head, marital status, family size, and gender; (3) a social class variable represented by occupation and education; and (4) location including geographic region and urbanization. They concluded that socio-demographic characteristics, such as income, family size, education, and occupation, were important in describing household recreation expenditure behavior. In this study, the literature review of selected socio-demographic variables were ordered according to household income, the family life cycle, age, marital status, social class, and travelers' sources of information.

Household Income and Expenditure Patterns

From the economic theory of consumer behavior the demand by a single consumer for a good or service may be expressed as a function of tastes and preferences, income, and market prices (Dardis *et al.*, 1981). Substantial research has been done on the topic of consumer demand. The demand theory as applied in tourism suggests the quantity of tourism demanded is closely related to population, income, prices, consumers' taste, marketing, other social, cultural, geographic and political factors (Witt and Witt, 1991). Among these explanatory variables, income is the single most important determinant of tourism demand (Crouch, 1994)

In regards to tourism expenditure, a study by Dardis *et al.* (1981) investigated two income measures; disposable income and total household expenditure income. The use of total expenditures has been defended on the basis of the permanent income hypothesis and the fact that it is a better measure of the household's permanent income than disposable income which may fluctuate over a short period of time. Thus, Prais and Houthakker (1971) argue that while total expenditures may depend in a complicated way on income expectations and the like, the distribution of expenditures among the various commodities depends only on the level of total expenditures. Houthakker and Taylor (1970) also concluded that the determination of the appropriate income measure depended as much on statistical as on theoretical considerations. To support the literature, Davies and Mangan (1992) suggested an approach to identify how tourism spending was affected by income by using quantitative estimates of the income/spending relationship at different levels of income. The authors indicated that a small change of income at the bottom end of the scale brought a large proportionate change in tourist spending.

According to the 2000 Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES), 58 percent of consumer units with reported incomes over \$50,000 took a trip or vacation in 2000. This was almost double the share of consumer units with reported income of less than \$25,000. With more discretionary income at their disposal, higher income consumer units would be expected to spend more on travel and trips than lower income groups. Consumer units in the highest income bracket, \$75,000 or more, significantly outspent those in all other income groups and almost doubled the average spending on trips and vacations of the next highest income bracket, those reporting income ranging from \$50,000 to \$75,000. Not surprising, consumer units with reported incomes of \$75,000 or more accounted for 41 percent of aggregate trip expenditures in 2000, whereas the

travel expenditure of all of the other reported income groups combined was 53 percent. The classifications by income are based on complete reporters only, which account for 74 percent of all of consumer units. Overall, household consumer units reporting incomes of \$35,000 or more, accounted for 76 percent of total travel expenditures, while making up only 35 percent of the population.

According to the literature, Fish and Waggle (1996) stated that in macroeconomics the higher income families were clearly expected to have higher trip expenditures than lower income families. They concluded that family decisions regarding vacation and pleasure travel are based on their income. They stated that vacation and pleasure travel is certainly considered to be a luxury which means greater proportional spending on the item by families at higher income levels. This luxury item definition is realized with the permanent income proxy but not with the current income. While an average family spent \$1,234 on trips in 1990, families in the lowest earnings quintile averaged spending of only \$436 compared with \$2,688 for the highest earnings quintile. Nevertheless, spending on vacation and pleasure trips as a percentage of income before taxes decreased as income increased. The lowest income group spent 6.1% of their income on trips compared with 3.4% for the highest income group (Legohere1,1998). This helps explain that while upper-income families spent more in absolute terms on travel, they spent a lower relative amount of their total earnings on travel.

Spending on trips as a percentage of total expenditures contrasts sharply with the above observation using income before taxes as a base. The trip spending percentages increased monotonically with higher total expenditure levels. Families in the lowest expenditure group

spend an average of 3.2% of their total expenditures on trips, while families in the highest expenditure group paid an average of 5.3% of total expenditure.

To support the literature, Agarwal and Yochum (1999) conducted their study on tourist spending measuring total party expenditure, party expenditure per day, and expenditure per person per day in Virginia Beach. The results showed that an increase in visiting party income of 10% will result in a total party spending increase of 0.95%. Even though the increase in spending percentage is not high, the study supported that income is one of the most important determinants of tourist spending.

In a study by Cai, Hong, and Morrison (1995) about tourism expenditure, the proposed model had been focused but the independent variables were expanded and related to tourism expenditures for each of four tourism product categories (i.e. food, lodging, transportation, and sightseeing/entertainment) by a household to its disposable income, and other socio-economic and demographic factors. Besides disposable income, other factors are categorized into three groups: (1) family life cycle variables, including age and marital status of household head, number of children under the age of 16, and number adults at the age of 16 and above; (2) social class variables, including occupation and education of household head; and (3) cultural and geographical variables, including race of household head, and region and location of residence. They found that (1) there was a strong relationship between income and each of the four expenditure categories; (2) demographic factors contribute to explain a household's tourism expenditure behavior to varying degrees; for instance, there was a significant relationship between the number of adults and expenditure of food and lodging while the impact of number of children is negative on all the expenditure groups, and marital status had a positive influence

on the tourism products, except for entertainment expenditure; (3) other socioeconomic factors account for variations of tourism expenditures as well; for instance, the amount of education a household head had received was positively related to the amount of household expenditures on all four categories; (4) the differences in tourism expenditure patterns were significant in some circumstances both between the races. Blacks are found to spend less on some tourism products than Whites and other races; (5) the significance of independent variables and their impact on tourism expenditures differ from one category to another. No matter how the tourism industry is defined, each component was characterized by its unique consumer expenditure pattern.

A recent study by Cai (1998) investigated and analyzed the household food expenditure patterns on trips and vacations. The results showed that household income had been found to be a significant and positive factor accounting for variations of household vacation food expenditure or the demand for food on vacation was income inelastic and affected by the composition of income sources. A previous study by Cai, Hong, and Morrison (1995) referred to income as the personal income of all persons in the household less federal, state, and local taxes. Several previous studies concluded income as positively related with expenditures on tourism products such as studies by Thompson and Tinsley (1979) and Dardis *et al.* (1981,1993), on food by Gieseeman and Moulton (1986), and hotels and holidays by Davies and Mangan (1992). In a study by Dardis, Soberon-Ferrer, and Patro (1994), income was found to be an influencing factor in explaining variations of household expenditures on entertainment category.

In most recent study, Jang, Bai, Hong, and O'Leary (2003) examined travel expenditure patterns of Japanese pleasure travelers to the United States by income level. The findings indicated that the high-income travelers spend significantly more than the others. The results also

showed that the higher the income, the longer the travelers stay. They also concluded that age was a significant factor in the high-income group as well with older travelers tending to spend more. Gender was not found to be an influencing factor in travel spending. High-income earners tended to be heavier spenders and they tended to use credit cards more frequently, and first-time travelers spend more in the non-high income group and in the overall sample.

All in all, the results showed that income level is obviously a major contribution factor in a family's travel plans. Findings revealed that families with higher income levels tended to take more trips and spend more per trip than families with lower income levels. Therefore, previous research findings revealed that there was a significant relationship between traveler's income and travel spending.

The Family Life Cycle and Expenditure Patterns

The changes in household composition and shifts in the population have been accompanied by changing consumer spending behaviors (Jacobs and Shipp, 1990; Kotler, 1995). Among the items to which household have allocated increasing amounts of their dollars are recreation and travel-related goods and services (Dardis *et al.*, 1981; Gray, 1992; Jacobs and Shipp, 1990; Kotler, 1995). The differences in family composition and size have different influences on demand depending on the good and service in question. Further, a change in family size or composition alters the family's preferences for goods and services (Cai, Hong and Morrison, 1995).

The family life cycle is used to explain variations in travel patterns through life, starting with single individuals and ending with the death of the last partner. This pattern depends not

only on age but also on other factors such as marital status, family size, employment status, and income (Collins and Tisdell, 2002). The pioneers of family life cycle theory were Wells and Gubar (1966). They divided the family cycle into nine stages: bachelor, newly married, full nest I (preschool children), full nest II (school-age children), full nest III (older/dependent children), empty nest I (still working), empty nest II (retired), solitary survivor in labor force, and solitary survivor retired.

However, the type of family has changed considerably. Currently, Bureau of Labor Statistics conducted Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) Anthology, 2003 categorizing consumers according to different types of family: Husband-and-wife families (including husband and wife only, husband and wife with children, and other husband-and-wife families), one parent, own children, single consumers, and other families. Therefore, according to the previous literature on family life cycle, consumer of traveler's family life cycle has changed drastically. Oppermann (1995) also raised the possibility that life cycle patterns may alter in the long term. He felt that travel destinations varied and thus experiences gathered by the younger generations of today are different from those of a few generations ago, and as younger generations get older, they will display different patterns of travel to the older generation of today. In addition, alterations in any unique characteristics associated with a population cohort will influence future travel patterns. For example, more comfortable and speedier transport, as well as better health for older persons, may mean that they retain their ability and motivation to travel for a longer time (Collins and Tisdell, 2002).

Oppermann's Travel Life Cycle (1995) considers several of the approaches to the life cycle concept in tourism studies. Oppermann maintains that family structure changes and

changes in travel patterns represent unique parameters for each generation. However, other researchers challenge this cycle approach. Recent work on leisure spending, although controversial, indicates that senior citizens continue to travel in ways comparable to their travel in younger years. Theories of aging, such as Atchley's (1989, 1993), suggest that individuals tend to sustain consistent patterns of behavior and are not prone to major shifts in likes, dislikes, and general activities. Research by Searle, Mactavish, and Brayley (1993) showed that patterns of leisure decision-making were consistent over life spans. Continuers are the term used by the researchers to refer to people who continue the pattern of leisure they established at an early stage of adult development when life-styles evolve. In the conclusion to his article "Patterns of Tourist Expenditure and Types of Vacation across the Family Life Cycle, Lawson (1991) comments that the analysis revealed strong and consistent patterns of tourist behavior through the stages of the life cycle which it is believed are of potential use for marketers in formulating segmentation strategies.

Age and Expenditure Patterns

A previous study by Rapoport and Rapoport, 1975 revealed that the age factor is expected to be a major determinant of leisure spending behavior. Statistics from the Consumer Expenditure Survey (2000) on Travel Expenditures revealed the significant relationship between age of traveler and their expenditure patterns. In regards to numbers of trips taken, the highest percentage of trip takers was posted by the group aged 45 to 54 with 38 percent reporting a trip. The lowest percentage was that of the group aged 65 and older who made up 27 percent. This group, however, had the highest average expenditures on trips of any of the age groups. It is

interesting to note that the group consisting mainly of retirees spent an average of 4 percent of its total average annual expenditures on trips and vacations. This is about twice the share spent by most of the other age groups. However, the 65-and-older group did not account for the highest share of aggregate trip expenditures. That distinction went to the group age 35 to 44 who spend almost as much, followed by the 65-and older group at 19 percent, with the groups ages 25 to 34 and 55 to 64 each accounting for 15 percent. The group age 25 and under spent the least accounting for only 4 percent of total trip expenditures.

However, in relation to spending volume, recent statistical data from the Consumer Expenditure Survey (2000) by age revealed that the highest spenders, on average, were age 65 and older, while the lowest were under the age of 25. The youngest group did not spend much, on average, on trips, but did have a relatively high percentage of trip takers. By comparison, the group age 65 and older had the lowest percentage of trip takers, but spent the most money on average trips. When expenditure shares were compared with population shares, the age groups older than 35 had similar overall travel expenditures and habits. The group 35 and under had far lower expenditure shares compared with their population shares. Even though single consumer units made up 43 percent of the population, they accounted for just 22 percent of aggregate expenditures. By contrast, husband-and-wife consumer units and single consumer units accounted for 40 percent of the population, but 58 percent of aggregate expenditures.

Gender and Expenditure Patterns

Spending patterns of men and women vary in different ways. According to the literature, several studies found gender not significant in tourism expenditure since much travel and

tourism behavior is group (especially family) and not individual in nature thus sex is probably not such an important segmentation variable for the tourism industry as for many other products Lawson (1994).

However, men and women may travel with different purposes. Walters (1988) concluded from a U.S. study that even though men still dominate the business travel market, the same is not true for the leisure market, with women taking as many and sometimes even more holidays than men (Collins and Tisdell, 2002). Furthermore, preferences for travel experiences differ by gender. Men traditionally seek action and adventure and are not scared of taking risks, while women are more likely to be searching for cultural and educational experiences with security being a priority (Mieczkowski, 1990). For example, a man is more likely to travel abroad to watch a sporting event or to travel to Southeast Asia for “sex tourism” (Hall, 1992, 1994).

In contrast, a woman is more likely to travel on a package tour or visit a destination for shopping or to visit friends and relatives (VFR)(McGehee, Loker-Murphy, and Uysal, 1996). Studies by Dardis *et al.* (1981) and Cai, Hong, and Morrison (1995) revealed that the marital status of the household head was found to be a significant factor in tourism expenditure behavior.

Marshment (1997) claimed that unlike markets for so many other goods and services (clothes, cosmetics, magazines and so on), the holiday market is not constructed along gender lines. Nevertheless, the proportion of single-person households rose from 17% in 1970 to more than 24% in 1992, while that of married couples with children younger than 18 declined from 50% to 37%. The size of household was smaller, with 2.6 persons in 1990 as compared to 3.14 twenty years earlier. The proportion of households maintained by women rose from 10.6% to 16.5% (Cai,1998).

Marital Status and Expenditure Patterns

Statistics from the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) 2000 reported the composition of the consumer unit consisting of husband-and wife-only consumer units, husband and wives with children younger than 17, single-persons, and one-parent consumer units. Forty-two percent of husband-and-wife-only consumer units reported taking a trip compared with 20 percent of single-person units. Thirty-six percent of the husband-and-wife consumer units with children under 17 reported taking a trip, as did 24 percent of one-parent consumer units. Even though single consumer units made up 43 percent of the population, they accounted for just 22 percent of aggregate expenditures. By contrast, husband-and-wife consumer units accounted for 40 percent of the population, but made over half (58 percent) of aggregate trip expenditures in 2000.

Social Class and Expenditure Patterns

Occupation and education were used to represent social class. Dardis *et al.* (1981) stated that education enhances many types of recreation activities such as foreign travel and tours. In addition, education may provide training and preparation for some types of recreation activities. The impact of education on broadening one's perspective towards leisure pursuits has been noted by Burdge (1969).

The household head's level of education is ranked into different groups representing no education, elementary, high school without diploma, high school graduate, and college with no degree, college graduate, and more than 4 years of college education. Cai, Hong, and Morrison (1995) concluded that the amount of education a household head received is expected to have a

positive relationship with the expenditures on all four-product categories. Another study by Cai (1999) also supported a positive relationship between level of education and lodging expenditure. The relationship between occupation of the head of household and all expenditure categories is still uncertain, even though it is expected that white-collar professionals would be likely to spend more while traveling in general (Cai, Hong, and Morrison, 1995). A previous study by Burdege (1969), cited in Dardis *et al.* (1981) noted that expenditures on recreation are likely to increase with the level of occupational prestige.

Dardis *et al.* (1981) concluded that social class has a significant impact on recreation expenditures. Education is positively related to recreation expenditures while there are no definite trends with respect to occupation. The findings from Cai (1998) also indicated that the amount of vacation food spending rose as the household's education level increased, and it was positively related to home ownership and marriage. Food spending decreased as the number of children increased, but was not affected by number of adults. The household's age affected the amount of spending, and time-constraint factors had no adverse impact on the amount spent. In addition, seasonality was present and substantial.

Previous demand studies usually reported expenditure differences between Caucasians and African Americans. It is possible that because of the growing proportions of Asians, Hispanics, and other ethnic people in the U.S. population, they have become more expressive in their own cultural identities and in such characteristics as consumption behaviors. Previous studies by Craig (1972), and Dardis *et al.* (1981), found that whites are likely to spend more on tourism expenditure than other races. However, a more recent study by Agarwal and Yochum

(1999) found that overnight visitors spend about the same regardless of their race while the most important determinant of tourist spending is visitor income.

Travel-related Variables

Some tourism research found that travel-related variables are also important in accounting for travel expenditures (Jang *et al.*, 2003). According to previous studies, the travel-related characteristic is one of the most influential variables affecting tourism expenditure patterns. Several travel-related characteristics are discussed in this current study including: number of party size, first-time and repeat visitation, duration of stay, travel purpose such as business-related trip or visiting friends and relatives (VFR) travel, and travel distance.

Number of Party Size and Expenditure Patterns

The findings by Dardis, Soberon-Ferrer, and Patro (1994) indicated that the number of adults had a significant impact on recreation expenditures. Later study by Hsieh, Lang, and O’Leary (1997) found that travel-related characteristics often contributed to an explanation of total expenditures more than socio-demographic variables for the foreign travel market. By studying four foreign travel markets to Canada including France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom, the study suggested that travel party is one of the most important factors positively affecting the level of travel expenditure and that the number of children in the travel party has a negative impact on the expenditure for French and German travelers. However, no significant variables were found in the Japanese model.

The number of children is expected to have a negative impact on food expenditures according to Smallwood (1981), whereas the number of adults in a household had a positive impact on food expenditures (Giesebrand and Moulton 1986). A study by Cai *et al.* (1995) suggested the number of children in their study may reflect the time constraints of the parent taking care of the children. Trips could be fewer or shorter because of school schedules or childcare demands. In the worst scenario, people could not take trips since children are too young and they have to fully take care of the children at home. Therefore, the family with more children appeared to need larger or more rooms, more food and also spent more on transportation, even though it did not show a significant difference. A study by Legohérel (1998) also found that the presence of children in the group did not seem to be linked with the level of expenditure. However, the variable “presence of children” is strongly correlated to the variable size. The groups of three or more individuals that included children spent significantly less than childless couples.

On the other hand, Jang *et al.* (2003) revealed that the numbers of adults in the travel party was not an important factor to explain variances in the three travel expenditure models. In addition, the number of children had a positive relationship with level of expenditures but did not have a significant impact on travel spending.

First-time and Repeat Visitation and Expenditure Patterns

In the marketing literature, but also the tourism literature, repeat purchase and/or visitation often is taunted as something to be desired (Oppermann, 2000). The reduced costs of marketing to the repeat consumers have been repeatedly given as a reason (e.g., Haywood, 1989;

Rosenberg and Czepiel, 1983). In addition, the earning potential of reducing consumer attrition has been mentioned (e.g., Reicheld and Sasser, 1990). Obviously, from an operator or destination perspective, repeat visitation has been intuitively used as an indicator of the positive perception of the product in question, with repeat purchase indicating a positive attitude. Along with this positive attitude comes a positive word-of-mouth effect, which should not be underestimated, considering that friends and relatives (and previous-own experience) regularly constitute if not the most then one of the most often-sought information sources and equally also one considered to be the most reliable (Oppermann, 2000). Yet, interestingly enough, very few studies have specifically inquired into the repeat visitation phenomenon and the first-time travelers and the relationships between their expenditure patterns. The difference in spending allocation of each sector of both first-time and repeat visitors would enable the tourism industry to balance the tourism economy of scale to attract new visitors while maintaining the existing ones.

Therefore, the relationships between first-time and repeat visitors and their expenditure during the trips would be interesting to study and taken into consideration since both groups constitute the two types of tourist who may visit a destination. Both first-time and repeat travelers play a fundamental role in the overall well-being and success of a destination. It is for this reason that, collectively, destination professionals strive to achieve a balance between first-time and repeat visitation (Oppermann, 1997).

Woodside and Lysonski's (1989) model of traveler destination choice specifically included previous destination experience in the variables that influence a traveler's destination awareness and destination preferences. Hence, previous experience, in addition to some other demo-socioeconomic variables (i.e., life cycle, income, age, lifestyle, value system) had a dual

influence on the destination choice process. Woodside and Lysonski (1989) also specifically hypothesized that previous travel to a destination relates positively to inclusion of the destination in a consumer's consideration set versus other mental categories (inert, inept and unavailable sets) of vacation destinations.

According to the literature, first-time visitors represent new consumers who are discovering a destination for the first time. An undersupply of new visitors is usually an indication of destination in decline. Prospective first-time visitors may choose to visit or avoid destinations for a variety of reasons that have little to do with the actual quality of experiences available. Repeat visitors, on the other hand, represent a stabilizing influence for most destinations (Oppermann, 2000). These tourists are used to the destination and satisfied with the experiences offered. In addition, the repeat visitors provide and support a stable income source that enables businesses and destinations to invest in new market development or local employment. Most importantly, by reducing marketing costs, which often reach multimillions for many national tourism organizations by generating repeat business, would be substantially lower than those of attracting new clientele (Pacific Asia Travel Association, 1997). In addition, the expected positive word of mouth generated by satisfied customers (those who come back obviously must have been happy with the previous purchase) would serve as a further marketing incentive (Oppermann, 1998).

Despite the importance of the repeat-visitor segments and the heavy reliance of many attractions and tourist destinations on it, comparatively little research has been conducted on this topic (Gitelson and Crompton, 1984; Reid and Reid, 1993). However, a number of studies have recently discussed the importance of previous experience with destination and activity decision

making and/or differences between first-time and repeat vacationers (i.e., Gyte and Phelps, 1989; Mazursky, 1989; Opperman, 1997; Watson, Roggenbuck, and William, 1991). Most of these stress the differences between the first-time and repeat visitors although not all variables differed significantly (Oppermann, 1998). These studies also suggested that previous customer experience leads to a much more diversified and detailed demand for information and level of awareness. None of these studies, however, actually looked into the issue of how multiple repeat visits and the length of time between successive visits affects the tourist's behavior and their spending patterns. Moreover, it remains unclear as to exactly why people undertake repeat visits and why they spend money differently from the first time they visited.

From an economic point of view, repeat visitors not only represent a stable source of tourist revenue, they also act as information channels that informally link networks of friends, relatives, and other potential travelers to a destination. If satisfied with the quality of service they receive, they would effectively use word-of-mouth communication to promote destination awareness and encourage prospective travelers to become visitors to a destination (Reid and Reid, 1993). Moreover, they are more easily accessible than first-time visitors in terms of direct marketing approach or record retaining. This knowledge permits supplier or intermediaries to precisely target the repeat segment and solicit direct responses to promotions (Reid and Reid, 1993).

Oppermann (1996) examined the travel expenditure patterns of repeat versus first-time visitors to Rotorua, New Zealand. The results revealed that repeat visitors are much more concentrated in fewer locations and exhibit a different spending pattern. Repeat visitors have lower per day expenditures than first-time visitors. He also argued that expenditure patterns for

both groups across the different travel goods and services do not vary significantly, whereas the first-time visitors tend to spend more on souvenirs than repeat visitors. Furthermore, it showed that the first-time visitors were visiting many more attractions within the destination area and not only the best-known sites.

Length of Stay and Expenditure Patterns

Agarwal and Yochum (1999) conducted the survey data on overnight visitors at Virginia Beach during the summer of 1997. The finding reported that duration of stay was found to be a significant determinant of visitors' expenditures. Also, the longer the respondents stayed, the more they spent more on total expenditures. Jang *et al.* (2003) revealed that the number of nights staying in the United States was found to be a positive and significant effect on the purchase level of travel goods and services for all models tested. This may be because travelers who stay longer have to use hotel rooms more often, have more meals, and use more transportation services.

In addition, according to previous research, Jang, Yu, and Pearson (2003) examined socio-demographic, trip-related characteristic and travel behaviors of the Chinese outbound tourists to the U.S. The findings revealed that the duration of stay had a relationship with nature of trip. Nature of trip varied according to visiting family and friends, business, etc. Business travelers spent more money by staying in lodging facilities, with an average stay of 19 nights in the US, whereas the VFR travelers spent less money by living with their relatives for an average of two and a half months.

Travel Purpose and Expenditure Patterns

This study investigates the determinants of the tourist expenditure patterns at the household level on vacation or holiday travel, as vacation or holiday travel is one of the most important activities in the United States (Fish and Waggle, 1996), which captured 53% of an overall traveler's visitation. Specifically, Mules (1998) found the share in real expenditure by purposes of visit with between 1985 and 1995 being holiday 53%, visiting friends and relatives (VFR) 16%, business 13%, and other 18%. More increasingly, current statistics from the Travel Industry Association of America (TIA) reported total domestic U.S. person-trips, 2003 and the purpose of visit with Leisure travel accounted for 82%, Business/convention 12%, and combined business and pleasure 6%, (Domestic Research: Travel volume and Trends, 2003).

Considering the purpose of travel, men dominated business and work-related travel, and women were dominant in leisure travel-namely, holiday and VFR travel (Collins and Tisdell, 2002). Jang, Yu, and Pearson (2003) examined Chinese business and VFR travelers to the United States. A significant difference was identified for the size of the travel party, travel companion, length of stay, making hotel reservations before departure and travel expenditure per person between the two groups. Business travelers spent more money by staying in lodging facilities, with an average stay of 19 nights in the US, whereas the VFR travelers spent less money by living with their relatives for an average of two and a half months. When considering the daily per-person expenditure (\$US165) of business travelers, economy and mid-priced hotels would be primary beneficiaries of the Chinese travel dollars.

The traditionally marginal interest in the visiting friends and relatives (VFR) market has been replaced by a recent upsurge of research about these travelers (Lehto, Morrison, and

O'Leary, 2001). Researchers and destination marketers have now realized that the VFR market is not only substantial about also exerts more of an economic influence on receiving communities than previously assumed. Moreover, it has been found that visiting friends and relatives' travelers (VFRs) have unique characteristics in terms of their information search behaviors, trip planning, trip types, vacation activities, and spending patterns (Lehto, Morrison, and O'Leary, 2001).

Traveling spending patterns have always been a focus of great research interest in tourism (Lehto, Morrison, and O'Leary, 2001). However, the VFR market has traditionally been assumed to have secondary status when measured in economic terms. Because of VFRs' limited use of commercial accommodation, they have been regarded by many tourism destinations as not economically variable enough to warrant marketing emphasis. (Lehto, Morrison, and O'Leary, 2001). However, recent research stated that the economic value of the VFR market has been underestimated (Jackson, 1990). Paci (1994) noted that VFRs made substantial contributions to local economies and made significant use of restaurants, tourism attractions, commercial recreation organizations, and national airlines. Navarro and Turco (1994) found that VFRs used accommodation and restaurants and attended spectator and cultural events, contributing positively to the local economy.

Using data collected for Tourism Canada on long-haul travelers from the Netherlands, Yuan *et al.* (1995) explored the role of VFRs in the international travel market. They covered that Dutch VFRs represented a sizable segment of the market traveling to the United States and Canada and made an economic contribution. Meis, Joyal, and Trites (1995) observed in their study of the U.S. VFRs to Canada that VFRs tended to spend more during their travel life cycles

since they repeatedly visited Canada. In contrast, Seaton and Palmer (1997) found support for the common assumption that the VFR market is of lesser value in economic terms, with VFRs spending significantly less on commercial accommodation and packages. However, the differences in expenditure on food, lodging, shopping, and travel were less, and in some cases VFRs spent more than other traveler groups. Lehto, Morrison, and O'Leary (2001) examined the international VFR market to the United States. Their findings supported a definite relationship between VFRs' total expenditures and their spending on individual categories (lodging, food and beverages, transportation, gifts/souvenirs, and entertainment). When VFRs' total expenditures went up, the expenditures levels in each category also increased. Beioley (1997) found that VFRs accounted for 13% of total tourism spending in the United Kingdom in 1995 and that besides spending considerable amounts of money on entertainment and travel, they stimulated additional spending on the part of their local hosts. Mules (1998) found that VFRs accounted for about 16% of the total expenditures by travelers in Australia from 1985 to 1995.

Travel Distance and Expenditure Patterns

Another household characteristic used to capture the effects of cultural differences are the household residency. Previous studies on household consumption behaviors included this characteristic in models and often reported significant spending differences from region to region and between urban and rural locations. However, a study by Cai (1998) about food expenditure on trips and vacations found no significant spending differences from location to location.

Research by Dardis *et al.* (1981) examined the cross-section studies of recreation expenditure in the United States. The results showed the location of the household was

significant. Urban households spent more than rural households while households located in the Western region spent more than other households. These patterns may reflect different lifestyles as well as different recreation opportunities.

Some previous study stated the significance between the distance of respondents, destination, and the mode of transportation. The study by Prideaux (2000) revealed the dynamic relationship between the categories of holiday expenditure and the tourist's point of origin. Findings showed that as distance increased, the transport element of holiday costs increased and assumed greater importance.

Lee (2001) investigated the determinants of recreational boater expenditures on trips using data from the 1998 Michigan boating survey. The findings indicated the distance on total expenditures that boaters would spend US\$ 15 more with an increase of 100 miles to the destination from home, all else remaining constant. In a study of demand for ecotourism, Leones, Colby and Crandall (1998) found that nature tourists spent more money than any other visitors to natural sites. Nature tourist and number of sites visited had positive and significant effects on expenditures. Additionally, visitors who live within 150 miles of the nature area were likely to spend money.

Psychographic Variables

The literature review suggested that individual travelers differ in important ways apart from demographics. Understanding these differences may have a considerable impact on tourism marketing and planning. Therefore, there is practical value in examining the influence of psychographic factors on traveler's destination decision-making processes (Lehto, O'Leary, and

Morrison, 2002). In addition, the way tourists perceive travel destination has a basic influence on their travel decisions. By understanding travel decisions and vacation behaviors, tourism professionals would better understand why and how travelers select a pleasure vacation.

Psychographics seek to describe the human characteristics of consumers that may have a bearing on their responses to products, packaging and advertising. Such variables, according to Demby (1974), may span from self-concept and lifestyle to attitudes, interests and opinions, as well as perceptions of the product attributes. The recognition of the value of psychographic research could be tracked back to Lazarsfeld (1935) who suggested that any research aimed at understanding consumer behavior must involve an interplay among three broad sets of variables: predisposition, influences and product attributes. In recent years, lifestyle analysis and psychographic research have become important areas in the analysis of marketing activity because of the increased recognition of their predictive power in consumer behavior (Kahle and Chiagouris, 1999; Wells, 1974; Kahle, 1999).

Psychographics was a term first introduced by Demby (1974), putting together ‘psychology’ and ‘demographics’. Demby felt the need to put more psychological flesh on the purely geodemographic bones, to add the richness of the social and behavioral sciences to demographics, in order to enhance the understanding of consumer behavior and to develop more adequate advertising strategies. Indeed, demographic segmentations provide relatively hollow classifications of consumers, which reveal nothing about the motives underlying their consumption decisions (Vyncke, 2002). Compared with demographic and socioeconomic variables, psychographics concepts supposedly offer the highest predictive power for consumer behavior (Zins, 1998).

Researchers also acknowledge that demographic and socioeconomic attributes alone are not enough in understanding vacation destination choices, as people with the same demographic and socioeconomic characteristics may choose different destinations. And understanding of psychological factors and their contribution to destination choice may be more revealing than focusing solely on these characteristics (Lehto, O’Leary, and Morrison, 2001). Psychological factors can actually determine whether people will travel to their destinations, how they get there and what they do after they arrive (Mayo and Jarvis, 1981; Um and Crompton, 1990). Consequently, it has been suggested that psychographic variables are more predictive and can be used to support such tourism decisions as the development of destinations and supporting services, product positioning, advertising, promotions and packaging (Lehto, O’Leary, and Morrison, 2001).

The application of psychographics in tourism has also gained in popularity since the 1970s (Lehto, O’Leary, and Morrison, 2001). Woodside and Pitts (1976) suggested that lifestyle information might be more useful in predicting foreign and domestic travel behavior than demographic information. Schul and Crompton (1983) found that travel-specific psychographics were more effective than demographic and socio-economic variables for predicting traveler’s external search behaviors. Woodside and Lysonski (1989) proposed that traveler perceptions and preferences should be the basis for tourism marketing and consumer policy. They stated that the affective associations were usually positive for destination travelers who would consider visiting and negative for destinations travelers would not consider visiting. A study by Brayley (1995) attempted to identify an appropriate model for the relative attractiveness of Texan vacation destinations to the state resident travel market. The research analyzed the destination preferences

and vacation travel behavior of different travel groups based on demographic and psychographic variables. The results revealed the theoretical relationships between the destination elements in a vacation traveler's cognitive domain and the destination attributes considered important to the potential traveler's cognitive choice process.

However, some researchers argued that psychographics has not achieved broad use in the world of business and academia for several reasons (Plog, 2002). Plog suggested that little research evidence exists to support the overall utility of psychographics. For travel suppliers, media uniformly use demographics to describe their audiences, not psychographics. Another problem Plog stated that psychographic systems lacked a conceptual foundation. In these situations, researchers throw a number of questions at a subject population, conduct a factor analysis to determine a set of grouping among answers to these questions, and then apply names to the factors that appear. Such systems are bound to have limited utility since no underlying theoretical structure supports the factors discovered. When factor analysis is used to coalesce a disparate set of question items into an unrelated grouping of variables, it usually is difficult to explain the underlying behaviors behind these factors or the related motivations and lifestyle characteristics of individuals (Plog, 2002).

Choosing a pleasure vacation might differ from selecting daily consumer products. For instance, Gitelson and Crompton (1984) stated that selecting a pleasure vacation differed from retail store purchase in at least three ways. First a pleasure vacation is a relatively expensive product. It is generally held that the greater the cost of a product, the greater will be a consumer's ego involvement (Engel, Kollat, and Blackwell, 1978). Thus, when considering destination alternatives, more time is likely to be spent on deliberation and overt search activity. Secondly,

destination decisions are not likely to be spontaneous or capricious. The expenditure is often anticipated and budgeted through savings made over a time period of perhaps several months. Experience with the destination may be limited with a considerable financial commitment, thus creating high psychological stakes in correct selection. These conditions suggest that this is an extended problem solving situation. Third, in most retail store purchase decisions, a buyer is informed of the existence, availability, or usefulness of a brand by both the physical product itself and in symbolic ways through promotional communications (Howard and Sheth, 1968). However, the initial decision to select a vacation destination often has to be made on the basis of symbolic communication alone. This is because the destination decision is intangible. It is not possible to touch, smell or taste it before making the purchase decision. Such symbolic communications are limited in their capacity to represent a destination and are more complex and ambiguous than communication gained from direct exposure to the destination (Gitelson and Crompton, 1984). The symbolic communications might be differently interpreted by a traveler's perceptions. These perceptions can result from various factors, for example what the tourists have learned from their own cultural and social background, personal interests, experiences, and images that various destinations are able to establish on the global marketplace (Jensen and Korneliussen, 2002).

Several previous studies attempted to understand the different types of psychographic patterns. Kahle (1984) developed a list of values (LOV) within the framework of his social adaptation theory. The nine LOV items (Self-Respect, Self-Fulfillment, Sense of Accomplishment, Being Well Respected, Fun and Enjoyment, Excitement, Warm Relationship with others, Security, and Sense of Belonging) represent a reduced set of terminal values

(Rokeach, 1973). Several attempts have been made to further condense the LOV items to fewer dimensions into a value system. Homer and Kahle (1988) found three dimensions: individual, interpersonal, and external values. Similar results are documented by Giannelloni and Valette-Florence (1991) and include an individual orientation, a social orientation, and a hedonistic orientation. Zins (1998) examined four psychographic constructs in explaining travel behavior including personal values, lifestyle, vacation style, and benefits. He suggested a four-factor value system comprising enjoyment, achievement, egocentrism, and external (Madgrigal and Kahle, 1994). Zins(1998) supported that the psychographics were related to travel behavior variables. These behavior aspects involve various travel characteristics, such as destination choice, type of holiday, mode of transportation, type of resort or accommodation, and so forth.

Following the conceptual work of Kahle (1984), personal values are regarded as highly abstract beliefs that help organize attitude formation in view of drives, emotions, and needs (Zins, 1998). Their work was used to measure the concept of lifestyle and vacation style as attitudinal in nature representing push factors for the travel decision (Pizam, Neumann and Reichel, 1979; Crompton, 1979). The lifestyle approach compiles more general dispositions, whereas the vacation-style approach illustrates the relation of a person to a particular situation or context. The splitting of cognitions into motives as lasting dispositions and motivations as situation-person interactions (Heckhausen, 1989) may encounter the criticism to reduce attitudes to its functional role (Gnoth, 1994). Benefits represent destination attributes that are perceived and valued by tourists (Brayley, 1990). They act as pull factors responding to and reinforcing push factors and therefore may be interrelated (Uysal and Hagan, 1993).

Travel Personality and Expenditure Patterns

It is believed that if a tourism marketing researcher aspires to begin to understand tourist satisfaction and dissatisfaction, it is imperative to consider the personality of the tourist, particularly in regard to the tourist's destination preference as one of the most importance sources of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction to measure and control.

Plog (1987) conducted the research examining personality type in the context of tourist behavior. Plog developed and empirically tested a continuum that helps classify travelers by personality type. The travel personality classification is based on the dimension of personality referred to as centrim (i.e., personality focus or personality interest). The categories established by Plog are psychocentric, near-psychocentric, mid-centric, near-allocentric, and allocentric travel personality types.

On the end of the scale are psychocentric. Psychocentric travelers prefer resting and relaxing on vacation, spending most of the vacation time in one location, returning to the same spot regularly, and often prefer packaged tours. Psychocentrics also tend to be passive travelers rather than active travelers who pay little attention to detail on vacation. This group tends to travel less, in general, and usually travels because it is expected.

On the other end of the scale are the allocentrics. Allocentrics enjoy excitement, become actively engaged and involved in the event at the vacation site, and relish novelty and change. This personality prefers undiscovered destination and likes to visit new and exciting places each vacation. Also, allocentrics are likely to prefer traveling tourism, that is, not staying in one place, but travel from place to place during the vacation. Additionally, allocentrics are more likely to enjoy international travel, whereas psychocentrics are more apt to prefer domestic travel.

Between the two extremes are the mid-centrics. Travelers fitting into this group are likely to enjoy variety on vacations. They enjoy relaxing and resting at times on vacations but doing exciting things and being on the go at other times. Mid-centrics would likely enjoy traveling to popular international tourist destinations, major cities, and well-liked vacation spots, as long as they have not been spoiled by too much tourism (Plog, 1991). This group tends to be moderately involved with travel activities. These individuals are not usually labeled as passive tourists nor are they viewed as interested and involved to the extent that allocentrics are. Rather, mid-centrics tend to become involved and interested in activities central to their interests but remain passive to peripheral activities. Plog indicated that most individuals are classified as near-allocentrics, mid-centrics, or near psychocentrics. According to Plog, pure psychocentrics make up approximately three percent of the traveling population, which is also true for allocentrics (Plog, 1987).

Plog (2002) also examined the predictive power of the venturesomeness concept versus household income. Briefly, venturers reach out and explore the world around them with anticipation and excitement. Plog stated that business travel also relates to income and venturesomeness, that is, rising as incomes go up and as a person is more venturesome. That finding might be expected for income since persons who receive larger salaries in companies also represent their organizations with clients or at other senior meetings. Findings also suggested that income has a somewhat stronger relationship with spending on the last leisure trip and total travel spending over the past 12 months. Also, high-income earners have more money to spend on all discretionary purchases, including travel, yet venturers do not take the most expensive trips. They are willing to rough it more than others to enjoy a more natural feeling of

their surroundings. The key findings suggested that household income, as would be expected, correlates with the amount of travel of individuals, as does venturesomeness. Income does a better job of predicting spending while on a trip, but psychographics is more effective at predicting the total number of trips taken and the kinds of activities that people pursue when traveling. Using both variables together increases the predictive power for leisure travel.

In this study, twelve travel personality traits were explained and analyzed. Other travel characteristics being analyzed in this study included keep going to the destination I know, enjoy taking chances by visiting new destinations, enjoy exploring places that are not typical vacation destinations, do a lot of things when I travel, and level of satisfaction was also added to the analysis.

Chapter Summary

The tourism research literature shows that demographic, socioeconomic and travel trip characteristics have been the most used to predict vacation choices (Lehto, O'Leary, and Morrison, 2001). Researchers also acknowledge that demographic and socioeconomic attributes alone are not enough in understanding vacation destination choices, as people with the same demographic and socioeconomic characteristics may choose different destinations.

This chapter included the previous literature relevant to socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables in relation to tourism expenditure patterns.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Framework

The preceding chapters presented the proposed area of research for this study and relevant research in the areas of tourism expenditure patterns. The primary objective guide the present research:

- To identify the most influential variables among the selected socio-demographic travel-related, and psychographic variables affecting tourism expenditures.

Research Design

The possible determinants of tourism expenditures can be characteristics of either the visitor population or the trip itself (Mak, Mancur and Yonamine, 1977). This current research focused on visitor population characteristics that examined the importance of socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables.

The formula used in the current study was:

$$EXP = f(G, AI, M, NI, I, N2, N3, N4, F, L, T1, T2, P, V1, V2, V3, V4, V5)$$

where

EXP = Expenditures in Northern Indiana

Independent variables used in this study were explained in Table 1.

Table 1: Selected Independent Variables

Socio-demographic Variables		Travel-related Variables		Psychographic Variables	
Measure	Variable	Measure	Variable	Measure	Variable
G	Gender	N2	Number of persons in travel group	P	Travel Personalities
A1	Age	N3	Number of adult(s)	V	Value most: Stability/Excitement
M	Marital Status	N4	Number of children	V1	Value most: Self/Family
N1	Number of children 17 years living in the household	F	First-time and repeat visitation	V2	Value most: Passive/Active
I	Total annual household income	L	Length of stay	V3	Value most: Learning/Dropping out
		T1	Trip Purpose	V4	Value most: Following tradition/Trying new things
		T2	Travel Distance		

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were expenditures on lodging, meals and restaurants, attractions/festivals, entertainment, shopping (other than food), transportation (including gas), and total expenditures. The total expenditures included the entire travel party expenses counting cash and credit to Northern Indiana. In the survey, tourism expenditures were categorized into

the overall trip expenditures and expenditures in Northern Indiana. However, this current study utilized expenditure patterns of travelers per person per day to Northern Indiana as the dependent variables.

Independent Variables

The independent variables being studied in this study consisted of the socio-demographic variables including gender, age, marital status, number of children 17 years of age or younger living in the household, and total annual household income (from all sources) before taxes. Travel-related variables included number of visiting party (including adults and children), number of adult(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, length of stay, nature of the trip, and travel distance. The psychographic variables consisted of traveler personalities, what travelers value most while traveling: stability/excitement, self/family, being passive/being active, learning/dropping out, and following tradition/trying new things.

Data Source and Sampling Frame

Direct observation of travel expenditures and business receipts for travelers by Frechtling (1987) suggested that there appear to be two ways to apply the direct observation approach to estimating travel expenditures. One is to actually observe the traveler purchasing food, gasoline, lodging, and other items, either by following him around or by asking the seller to keep records. It would, of course, be quite expensive to follow the traveler even if he/she would allow this. Moreover, this method could distort travel spending patterns that would occur in the absence of the observer, as the traveler reacts to the observer. The second and most popular direct

observation method is to survey travelers either while traveling or in their homes. The results from questions on expenditures can then be projected to produce estimates of business receipts in various types of businesses.

However, tourism expenditure data are more difficult to measure because the tourism industry consists of so many component subindustries. Data collection is usually the responsibility of the national tourism office, a government statistical agency, or the central bank. The three most commonly used methods of tourist expenditure data collection are bank records of foreign exchange transactions, surveys of tourist, and surveys of tourism establishments (Sheldon, 1993).

Several previous studies used the interview data of the Consumer Expenditure Survey (CES) conducted annually by the U.S. Bureau of the Census under contract to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) or the In-flight Survey of International Air Travelers compiled by the US Tourism Industries, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce (i.e., Cai, Hong, and Morrison, 1995; Fish and Waggoner, 1996; Jang *et al*, 2003). Data upon which studies are frequently based are obtained from existing secondary data on recreation expenditures. Such data do not generally exist in a form useful for determining consumer expenditure associated with a specific type of recreation activity. Since government data available on personal consumption activity are obtained from the general public, recreation expenditure analyses based on these data usually include population level variables such as household socioeconomic characteristics (Lee, 2001).

A Mid-west travel survey used in this study was gathered from Northern Indiana Travel Survey conducted in the fall of 2001 in the Mid-western part of the United States and the data

analysis for this study is based on 551 usable responses obtained from the survey. The survey was designed and developed by the National Laboratory for Tourism and eCommerce at University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign. The purpose of the survey was to capture the consumer traveler market in the Midwest region as a part of the United States.

Survey Instrument

The data used for this were acquired from a survey that was conducted during the Fall, 2001 to develop a profile of those persons interested in traveling to the Northern Indiana area and to understand the nature of travel to the Area. Northern Indiana was chosen as a study site for several reasons including: 1) this area represents a typical Midwestern destination which provides diverse natural and cultural attractions; 2) the area offers diverse opportunities, instead of being dominated by a small number of big attractions, and, thus, facilitates diversified spatial behavior; and, 3) the area attracts visitors from diverse markets including Chicago Metropolitan as well as small Midwestern cities/towns and, therefore, these visitors are expected to be typical of travelers to other destinations in the U.S.

Data Collection

Data were collected during November and December 2001. The survey method followed a three-step process in order to maximize the response rate. A survey packet (i.e., a cover letter, a questionnaire, a postage paid return envelope and a description of the incentives) was sent to a sample of 3,525 individuals who reside in one of five adjacent states (i.e., Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio) and had requested travel information from the Northern Indiana

Tourism Development Commission during the time period from April 15 to September 3, 2001. One week later, postcards were sent out to remind those who had not completed the survey and to thank all respondents for participating in the study. The second survey kit was resent to all non-respondents two week later. The survey effort resulted in 1,436 completed responses for a 42.1 percent response rate. However, the valid sample size in this current study was 551 extracted from the completed responses. Out of the 3,525 individuals, the 551 survey respondents met two selection criteria that they had requested travel information from the Northern Indiana Tourism Development Commission and actually visited Northern Indiana after receiving the information.

Review of the Questionnaire

This instrument contains items intended to measure the traveler market in the Midwest region, specifically focusing on Northern Indian trip expenditures, including socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables and for the purpose of gaining profile and travel history of the typical respondents to Northern Indiana. The questionnaire consisted of 51 descriptive questions in eleven pages including two question types; open-ended questions, closed-ended questions.

The questionnaire was developed into different sections. The first questions were relevant to Midwest Travel History Style including questions about, for instance, total number of pleasure trips in the Midwest United States, how likely the respondents to take a pleasure trip to a destination in the next 12 months ranging from 1= extremely unlikely to 6 = extremely likely. Certain questions asked in detail about the types of activities, features or different aspects the

respondents considered important in deciding where to visit in the Midwest. A few questions asked respondents how far in advance they started planning the Midwest pleasure trips and how they planned their trips. One question asked the respondent to identify and apply the phrases used in tourism advertising with the destination such as “A Great Lake Adventure, We Make Smiles, and Drive Less, Getaway More, etc. The types of activities and features are listed for the respondents to identify which ones they consider important in deciding where to visit in the Midwest, (types of activities such as hike, bike, go boating (power or sail), gamble, etc., types of features such as destination that has beautiful scenery, offer reduced rates, are convenient to my home, etc.) along with 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. In addition, the respondents were asked what Midwest states first come to mind when thinking of pleasure trip which respondents checkmark choices of eight states and other. Some psychographics questions were asked to describe their beliefs about their travel personality that best describes and did not describe their travel style. Twelve travel personality traits were identified in this question. Several open-ended questions asked about how respondents thought and felt about pleasure trips to Midwest destinations. Numerous questions in the open-ended section were used to explain psychographic variables. For example, the respondents were asked to disclose how they thought about the first three things that came to their mind about a pleasure trip in Midwest, to design a perfect Midwest vacation, what they planned to do next after they finish unpacking, what kinds of scents they smelled and what sounds they heard. The first section consisted of twenty-one questions asking about overall Midwest travel and style.

The second section specifically focused on Northern Indiana. At the beginning of the section, several questions inquired about sources of information and whether they received the

information they requested or whether the information was helpful. Some questions asked about travel information whether respondents requested before taking the trips, numbers of trips in Northern Indiana in the past twelve months, numbers of days, nature of the most recent trip, numbers of persons in travel group, and types of person(s) such as spouse or children. A few open-ended questions were asked to state the city and town respondents visited in Northern Indiana, number of hours or days they spent whether overnight or not, and list activities using the letter codes provided in the questionnaire for what they spent in each city and town. If the respondents stayed overnight, they were also asked about the overnight accommodations. A few questions asked respondents to name two things they liked most and least about their visit to Northern Indiana and whether they planned to visit Northern Indian again. The last part of this section inquired about the travel expenditures during the most recent trip to Northern Indiana for the entire travel party including cash and credit in the expense categories. The expense categories were further divided into lodging, meals and restaurants, attractions/festivals, entertainment, shopping (other than food), transportation (including gas), and other (to be specified). The question separated the overall trip expenditures and expenditures in Northern Indian into two columns. In the end of the question, respondents were asked to specify the number of adult(s) and children these expenses covered. The last question in this section asked the respondents to tell their stories about their experience in Northern Indiana and to describe their moment or event that made their trip memorable.

The last section inquired about socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents such as gender, age, marital status, number of children under 17 years old, and their total annual household income before taxes. The last three questions asked respondents to list newspapers,

magazines, and web sites they looked through regularly. Thirteen questions in the Northern Indiana survey section were asked out of fifty-one questions in the entire questionnaire.

Variable Selection

The dependent variable for this study was different categories of tourism expenditure per persona per day in US Dollars. The total expenditures were created by adding the amount of dollars from each category of expenditure including lodging, meals and restaurants, festivals/attractions, entertainment, shopping, and transportation expenditures.

All variables used for the data analysis were taken from the second section of the survey which specifically focusing on Northern Indiana. Since the questionnaire contains several descriptive questions which partly relevant and irrelevant to the objectives of the current study. Therefore, certain questions were selected to meet the requirements and objective for the purpose of the study. This current study aimed to understand the influential factors affecting tourism expenditures among selected socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographics variables. Eighteen out of fifty one questions were used to match these variables in order to answer research objective. Overall, five measures were selected to explain socio-demographic variables, seven measures were selected to explain travel-related variables, and six measures were used to explain psychographics variables.

Table 2: Selected Socio-Demographic Variables

Socio-Demographic Variables	Measure
Gender	Are you female or male?
Age	Your age?
Marital Status	Are you married?
Number of Children 17 years of age or under	How many children 17 years of age or younger are currently living in your household?
Total annual household income before taxes	Please indicate your total annual household income (from all sources) before taxes?

Table 3: Selected Travel-related Variables

Travel-related Variables	Measure
Numbers of persons including adults and children	Number of persons in travel group?
Number of adult(s)	How many adults do these expenses cover?
Number of children	How many children do these expenses cover?
First-time and repeat visitation	How many times have you visited Northern Indiana in the past 12 months?
Length of stay	How many days (or portion of) did you spend in Northern Indiana on this trip?
Trip purpose	What was the nature of your most recent trip to Northern Indiana? (i.e. vacation, special event, get away, visiting friends and family, business, and other)
Travel Distance	What is your zip code area?

Table 4: Selected Psychographic Variables

Psychographic Variables	Measure
Travel Personalities	Please indicate travel personalities that best describe your travel style including: culture creature, city slicker, sight seeker, family guy, beach bum, avid athlete, shopping shark, all rounder, trail trekker, history buff, boater, and gamer
Value most: Stability/Excitement	Stability (1) to Excitement (5)
Value most: Self/Family	Self (1) to Family (5)
Value most: Being passive/Being active	Being passive (1) to Being active (5)
Value most: Learning/Dropping out	Learning (1) to Dropping out (5)
Value most: Following tradition/Trying new things	Following tradition (1) to Trying new things (5)

Data Transformation

The dependent variables for this study were derived from different categories of tourism expenditure per person per day in US Dollars. The total expenditure were created by adding the amount of dollars from each category of expenditure including lodging, meals and restaurants, festivals/attractions, entertainment, shopping, and transportation expenditures. The total expenditures were created and calculated from all six expenditure patterns in the survey and recoded it into a new variable.

The normality test showed that the expenditure variable was not normally distributed. Therefore, the transformation of data was necessary for the dependent variables. Expenditure

variables were transformed to meet the multiple regression assumption for normal distribution of the data. A logarithm was applied to all expenditure variables for normal distribution of data.

In general, Multiple Regression Analysis requires that variables are measured on interval or ratio scale and the relationships among the variables are linear and additive such as “age”, “number of persons in travel group”, “number of adult(s)” in this study. However, these restrictions are not absolute, nominal variable can be incorporated into regression through the use of “dummy coding”, since nonlinear and nonadditive relationships can be handled through transformation of variables (Kim & Kohout, 1975). Therefore, dummy variables were created to include the non-ordinal categorical variables. Gender variable was dummy coded as female was chosen as representative variable. A dummy variable was also necessary for marital status variable when married group was used as a representative group. Dummy coding was also performed on trip purpose variables and travel personalities.

Certain continuous variables were collapsed into groups to divide the sample into equal groups according to the respondent’s scores on some variables. Number of children under 17 years of age, number of persons in travel group, number of adult(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, and length of stay were collapsed and recoded to provide the distribution of scores and descriptive analysis of respondents.

Data Analysis

Several steps were taken to explore the primary research objective:

- To identify the most influential variables among the selected socio-demographic travel-related, and psychographic variables affecting tourism expenditures.

To effectively complete an analysis of the data, a quantitative method of analysis was applied. The usable 551 responses with 352 variables contained in the survey were assessed and analyzed by Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). Data was analyzed by employing Multiple Regression Analysis.

Descriptive statistics was performed on all variables to obtain ranges, frequencies, and measures of central tendency, such as mean, median, and mode. Multiple regression analysis was applied to determine the statistical significance, the difference in variance, and the indication of the relative contribution of each independent variable. In addition, multiple regression analysis was used to investigate the relationship between socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables and the different categories of tourism expenditure variables. Three models were created to explain the impacts of each set of variables on travel expenditures. The first model tested six selected socio-demographic characteristics and its effects on different tourism expenditure patterns. The second model tested a set of socio-demographic variables and seven travel-related variables on travel expenditures. And the last model tested a set of selected socio-demographic, travel-related, and six psychographic variables and its impacts on travel expenditures. The variables used for models for tourism expenditures were explained in Table 5.

Table 5: Variables for Models for Tourism Expenditures

Model I	Model II	Model III
Socio-Demographic Variables	Socio-Demographic Variables	Socio-Demographic Variables
Gender	Gender	Gender
Age	Age	Age
Marital Status	Marital Status	Marital Status
Number of Children 17 years or under living in the household	Number of Children 17 years or under living in the household	Number of Children 17 years or under living in the household
Total Annual Household income before taxes	Total Annual Household income before taxes	Total Annual Household income before taxes
	Travel-related Variables	Travel-related Variables
	Number of visiting party	Number of visiting party
	Number of adult(s)	Number of adult(s)
	Number of Children	Number of Children
	First-time and Repeat visitation	First-time and Repeat visitation
	Length of stay	Length of stay
	Nature of Trip	Nature of Trip
	Travel Distance	Travel Distance
		Psychographic Variables
		Travel personalities
		Valued most:
		Stability/excitement
		Self/family
		Being passive/being active
		Learning/dropping out
		Following tradition/trying new thing

Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the research design and methodology to achieve the objective of the study. In the beginning section of the study, the research framework is proposed. Based on the research framework, primary research objective is addressed. An overview of the research design, data source and sampling frame, data collection, review of questionnaire, and variable selection is also described. The independent and dependent variables used in this study are discussed. Data transformation and data analysis is presented at the end of this chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis using Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) to measure the three models tested. Each model consisted of selected socio-demographic, travel-related and psychographic variables measuring different categories of expenditure patterns per person per day. The dependent variables were comprised of seven expenditure patterns examined in this study including: lodging, meals and restaurants, attractions and festivals, entertainment, shopping, transportation, and total expenditures.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple Regression Analysis is defined as a statistical technique that supports the analysis of the relationship between a single dependent variable and several independent ones. The objective of such technique was to look at the independent's variable value's effects on the dependent variable's (Hair *et al.*, 1987). Multiple Regression Analysis was used in this study to investigate the impacts of socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables on different categories of tourism expenditures.

After selecting the dependent and independent variables, three models were developed for each category of tourism expenditures. Three models were tested where each model consisted of different sets of independent variables measuring different categories of expenditure patterns. In general form the models for tourism expenditure patterns are represented as:

- Model I: The influence of Socio-demographic variables on expenditure patterns.

$$EXP = f(G, AI, M, NI, I)$$

- Model II: The influence of socio-demographic and travel-related variables on expenditure patterns.

$$EXP = f(G, AI, M, NI, I, IN2, N3, N4, F, L, T1, T2)$$

- Model III: The influence of socio-demographic, tourism-related, and psychographic variables on expenditure patterns.

$$EXP = f(G, AI, M, NI, I, IN2, N3, N4, F, L, T1, T2, V1, V2, V3, V4, V5)$$

To aid in the analysis presented, using Multiple Regression Analysis, each category of tourism expenditure was measured individually in three models. The first model was initially measured by five selected socio-demographics, followed by the second model (five selected socio-demographic and seven selected travel-related variables), and third model (five selected socio-demographic, seven selected travel-related, and six psychographic variables). The results and significant differences of each model are presented at the end of the chapter.

Profile of Respondents

The sample consisted of 3,525 individuals who reside in one of five adjacent states (i.e., Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio) and had requested travel information from the Northern Indiana Tourism Development Commission during the time period from April 15 to September 3, 2001. The survey effort resulted in 1,436 completed responses for a 42.1 percent response rate. For the purposes of this study, 551 surveys were extracted from the initial 1,436

completed surveys. Out of the 3,525 individuals, the 551 survey respondents met two selection criteria that they had requested travel information from the Northern Indiana Tourism Development Commission and actually visited Northern Indiana after receiving the information.

Socio-demographic Analysis of Respondents

A initial step of the analysis was to identify socio-demographic variables of the respondents and to test for the significance effect of these five variables on expenditure patterns: The five selected socio-demographic variables being examined in this study included gender, age, marital status, number of children 17 years of age and under living in the household, and total annual household income before taxes.

Females represented 65.8% of the respondents and males represented 34.2%. The majority of respondents were age group between 46-55 years of age (29.7%), 56-65 years of age (26.8%), while less than 21 years of age represented only 1.1% and over 65 years old group represented 18.9% of total respondents. Married and non-married participants represented 76% and 24% of the total study respondents. The majority of respondents (75%) did not have children under the age of 17 and younger living in the same household, while 5.8% had more than 3 children living in the household. In terms of income level, 23.6% of the respondents reported a total annual income before taxes in the range of \$80,000 and over. The second highest reported income was in the range of \$30,000 and \$39,999 comprising 16.5% of the sample and the lowest reported income was the range of less than \$10,000 comprising 1.1% of the sample. A summary of selected socio-demographic characteristics of all respondents is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Socio-demographic Profile of Respondents

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid N
Gender			550
Female	362	65.8	
Male	188	34.2	
Age			549
Under 21 years	6	1.1	
21-35 years	47	8.6	
36-45 years	82	14.9	
46-55 years	163	29.7	
56-65 years	147	26.8	
Over 65 years	104	18.9	
Married			546
Yes	415	76.0	
No	131	24.0	
Number of children 17 years of age or younger			520
0	390	75.0	
1-2	100	19.2	
3 or more	30	5.8	
Total household income before taxes			462
Less than \$10,000	5	1.1	
\$10,000-19,999	15	3.2	
\$20,000-29,999	36	7.8	
\$30,000-39,999	76	16.5	
\$40,000-49,999	64	13.9	
\$50,000-59,999	60	13.0	
\$60,000-69,999	54	11.7	
\$70,000-79,999	43	9.3	
\$80,000 and over	109	23.6	

Travel-related Analysis of Respondents

Travel-related characteristics selected included number of person(s) in travel group, number of adult(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, length of stay, trip purpose, and travel distance.

The majority of respondents (55%) appeared to travel with companions (two people in group), 26.6% reported traveling three or four people, 13.8% of respondents travel with 5 or more people in group, while 4.4% reported taking a trip alone. In relation to number of adult(s) in their travel group, 73% of respondents reported having two adults in their travel group, while 4.3% represented at least 5 adults or more in their travel group. The number of children in the travel party was minimal with 76.5% of respondents reporting no children in their travel group. More than half of respondents reported multiple visitations to Northern Indiana representing 72.4% of repeat visitation, while 27.6% reported first-time visit to the destinations. The respondents (32.2%) reported visiting the destinations within 2 days, while 22.8% reported visiting more than 3 days. Respondents who reported taking a vacation trip, totaled 28.7%, while 71.3% reported traveling for different purposes than vacation such as special event, get away, visiting family and friends, and business meeting. Respondents traveled at least 12 miles from residences and the maximum of 436 miles reported distance traveled. A summary of travel-related variables is presented in Table 7 and 8.

Table 7: Travel-related Profile of Respondents

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid N
Number of persons in travel group			549
1	24	4.4	
2	303	55.2	
3-4	146	26.6	
5 or more	76	13.8	
Number of adults (expenses cover)			486
1	46	9.5	
2	355	73.0	
3-4	64	13.2	
5 or more	21	4.3	
Number of children(expenses cover)			485
0	371	76.5	
1-2	78	16.1	
3 or more	36	7.4	
First-time and repeat visitation			551
1	152	27.6	
2	151	27.4	
3	86	15.6	
4 or more	162	29.4	
Length of stay			549
Less than or a day	113	20.6	
2 days	177	32.2	
3 days	143	24.4	
More than 3 days	125	22.8	
Trip purpose			
Vacation			551
Yes	158	28.7	
No	393	71.3	
Special event			551
Yes	80	14.5	
No	471	85.5	
Get away			551
Yes	328	59.5	
No	223	40.5	
Visit family and friends			551
Yes	126	22.9	
No	425	77.1	
Business meeting			550
Yes	7	1.3	
No	543	98.7	

Table 8: Travel Distance of Respondents

Characteristics	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Travel distance	12.00	436.00	120.38

Psychographic Analysis of Respondents

The psychographic characteristics measured in this study were travel personalities, what they value most while traveling; stability/excitement, self/family, being passive/being active, learning/dropping out, and following tradition/trying new thing.

Psychographic characteristics consisted of travel personalities that best described respondents including: culture creature, city slicker, sight seeker, family guy, beach bum, avid athlete, shopping shark, all around, trail trekker, history buff, boater, and gamer. In relation to travel personalities, 15.1% of the respondents described themselves as the culture creature, 25.5% described themselves the sight seeker, 10.6% expressed themselves as family guy, 30% described themselves the all around, while 9.4% of the total respondents described themselves as trail trekker and history buff.

In relation to what respondents valued most about stability or excitement, 2.2% perceived themselves valued stability most while 17.2% believed that they valued excitement most, and 33.3% ranged themselves in the neutral on what they valued most between stability and excitement. The respondents were asked if they valued self or family most, 6.8% valued themselves most, 27.3% were neutral, while 29.1% valued family most. Regarding to being passive and being active, 1.2% ranged themselves as being passive, 18.5% chose being active, and 34.9% were neutral. In relation to learning and dropping out, respondents 21.4% reported

that they value learning most, 32.2% were neutral, while 6.8% valued dropping out most.

Respondents were asked if they followed tradition or liked to try new things. Of the respondents 27.4% reported that they like to try new things, 24.7% were neutral, and .6% reported that they followed tradition. Table 9 represents a summary of psychographic profile of respondents.

Table 9: Psychographic Profile of Respondents

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid N	Mean (SD)
Travel personality			470	3.2(1.53)
Culture Creature	71	15.1		
Sight Seeker	120	25.5		
Family Guy	50	10.6		
All Rounder	141	30.0		
Trail Trekker	44	9.4		
History Buff	44	9.4		
Stability/Excitement			505	3.6(0.95)
Stability	11	2.2		
2	48	9.5		
Neutral	169	33.5		
4	190	37.6		
Excitement	87	17.2		
Self/Family			501	3.6(1.20)
Self	34	6.8		
2	50	10.0		
Neutral	137	27.3		
4	134	26.7		
Family	146	29.1		
Passive/Active			502	3.7(0.87)
Being passive	6	1.2		
2	26	5.2		
Neutral	175	34.9		
4	202	40.2		
Being active	93	18.5		
Learning/Dropping out			500	2.6(1.18)
Learning	107	21.4		
2	121	24.2		
Neutral	161	32.2		
4	77	15.4		
Dropping out	34	6.8		
Traditional/Trying new things			510	3.9(0.92)
Following tradition	3	.6		
2	33	6.5		
Neutral	126	24.7		
4	197	38.6		
Trying new things	151	29.6		

Expenditure Patterns of Respondents

The dependent variables for this study were different categories of tourism expenditures per person per day in US Dollars. The total expenditures were created by adding the amount of dollars from each category of expenditures including lodging, meals/restaurants, festivals/attractions, entertainment, shopping, and transportation expenditures. The total expenditures were created and calculated from all six expenditure patterns in the survey and recoded it into a new variable. Expenditure variables were transformed to meet the multiple regression assumption for normal distribution of the data. A summary of average amount spent by total respondents and average expenditure per person per day is presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Average amount spent and Average Expenditure per person per day

Northern Indiana Expenditure Category	Average amount spent by Total Respondents (\$) (N=398)	Average Expenditure /Person/Day (\$) (N= 394)
Lodging	349.47	98.72
Meals/Restaurants	169.35	43.12
Attractions/Festivals	78.73	37.83
Entertainment	88.88	29.62
Shopping	315.05	142.83
Transportation	52.79	25.73
Total Expenditures	771.96	242.77

According to Consumer Expenditure Survey on travel expenditures in 2000, consumer units went on trips in the year 2000 spent an average of \$875 in travel expenses. The total amount spent on travel by all consumers was roughly \$32 billion (Janini, 20003). This study found that travelers who traveled to Midwest destination in 2001 spent approximately \$349.47 on lodging, \$169.35 on meals and restaurants, \$78.73 on attractions and festivals, \$88.88 on entertainment, \$315.05 on shopping, \$52.79 on transportation, and \$771.96 on total expenditures which was approximately hundred dollars less than the year 2000 according to Consumer Expenditure Survey. In relation to average expenditure per person per day, travelers spent approximately \$98.72 on lodging, \$43.12 on meals and restaurants, \$37.83 on attractions and festivals, \$29.62 on entertainment, \$142.83 on shopping, \$25.73 on transportation, and \$242.77 on total expenditures.

A previous study by Jang *et al.*, (2003) stated that it was not surprising to learn that lodging made up the biggest component of the travel bill since lodging accommodation was the necessity on a trip. In addition, this study also found that shopping expenditures also made up the biggest component for this sample group. It is also interesting to learn that transportation made up the almost the smallest component of this sample group. This may be because the respondents were those who reside in one of five adjacent states (i.e., Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio), which were close to Northern Indiana. Therefore, they might travel by private cars or buses instead of traveling by plane that might cost more.

Lodging Expenditures

Three models were tested to explain lodging expenditures. Model I consisted of socio-demographic variables including gender, age, marital status, number of children 17 years of age and under, and total annual household income before taxes. Model II consisted of five selected socio-demographic and numbers of persons in travel group, number of adult(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, length of stay, trip purpose, and travel distance. Model III consisted of five selected socio-demographic, seven selected travel-related variables, and six selected psychographic variables.

Consistent with prior research (Lawson,1991;Marshment,1997; Jang *et al.*, 2003), gender was not found to be significant in all three model tested for lodging expenditures. In terms of the age variable, this study revealed that age was not significant in all three models tested, which is contrary to the prior study by Rapoport and Rapoport (1975) and Jang *et al.*, (2003). They found that age was found to be significant for travel expenditures. However, it is interesting to note that the tourism expenditure variables in this study were examined individually by seven categories. Therefore, the influencing factors might be different from other previous studies. Marital status was found to be significant in model II and III at .011 and .008 consecutively, while marital status was not significant in model I. Further, it is interesting to note that marital status alone in model I was not an influencing factor in explaining lodging expenditures, whereas it was found to be significant in accordance with other travel related and psychographic variables. Number of children 17 years old and under living in the household was not found to be the influencing factors in either model for lodging expenditures. However, total annual household income, as expected, was found to be significant in all three models for lodging expenditures which was

consistent with a study by Cai (1999) on relationship of household characteristics and lodging expenditures on leisure trip. The first model representing socio-demographic only explained 2.5% of the variation in lodging expenditures which was fairly low. It implied that the first model alone did not successfully explain the lodging expenditures well.

In model II, seven selected travel-related variables were incorporated into the first model in Multiple Regression Analysis. Number of person(s) in travel group and number of adult(s) were found to be significant to explain lodging expenditures, which was consistent with previous study, by Dardis, Soberon-Ferrer, and Patro (1994). This may be because the larger size of party requires more rooms or lodging facilities. Number of children was not found to be an influencing factor in explaining lodging expenditures. Length of stay was found to be significant for lodging expenditures. In terms of first-time and repeat visitation, this study found that whether traveler was first-time or repeat did not have a significant impact on lodging expenditures. In addition, trip purpose as represented by dummy variables was not found to be significant on lodging expenditures. It was inconsistent with study by Jang, Yu, and Pearson (2003) who found that VFR travelers might spend less on lodging as a study by Jang, Yu, and Pearson (2003) which found that business travelers spent more money by staying in lodging facilities, with an average stay of 19 nights in the US, whereas the VFR travelers spent less money by living with their relatives for an average of two and a half months. However, this study found no significant relationship between trip purpose and lodging expenditures. Travel distance was not found to be significant in all three models to explain lodging expenditures. The second model explained 43.5% of the variation explaining that travel-related variables in accordance with socio-

demographic variables contribute to a better explanation of lodging expenditure than socio-demographic variables alone.

In model III, psychographic variables consisting of travel personalities, what respondents value most while traveling to Midwest destinations including stability/excitement, self/family, being passive/being active, learning/dropping out, and following tradition/trying new things were adjoined into model III as researchers acknowledged that psychological factors can actually determine whether people will travel to the destinations, how they get there and what they do after they arrive (Mayo and Jarvis, 1981; Um and Crompton, 1990). In model III, this study found that being passive/being active variable had a significant impact on lodging expenditures. Model III explained 47% of the variation, implying that psychographic variable slightly contributed to explanation of lodging expenditures. A summary of three models tested and lodging expenditures is present in Table 11.

Table 11: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Lodging Expenditures

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Socio-Demographic						
Gender ^a	.050	.444	.003	.955	-.005	.923
Age	.078	.296	.051	.383	.045	.451
Marital status ^a	-.091	.182	-.136	.011*	-.143	.011*
Number of children 17 years or younger	.018	.810	-.010	.879	-.018	.780
Total annual household income	.151	.027*	.170	.001***	.181	.001***
R ²		2.5%				
Travel-related						
Number of persons in travel group			.353	.000***	.369	.000***
Number of adult (s)			.277	.000***	.280	.000***
Number of children			-.019	.759	-.026	.677
First-time and repeat visitation			-.092	.081	-.096	.072
Length of stay			.408	.000***	.411	.000***
Trip purpose ^a			.052	.310	.047	.354
Travel distance			-.028	.593	-.034	.517
R ²				43.5%		
Psychographic						
Travel Personalities ^a					.064	.204
Stability/Excitement					.061	.287
Self/family					.064	.250
Passive/Active					-.180	.001***
Learning/Dropping out					-.037	.469
Traditional/Trying new things					.021	.712
R ²						47.0%

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

^a refers to a variable used as a reference group.

Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Marital Status: Non-married = 0, Married = 1;

Trip Purpose: Vacation = 1, Get away = 2, Business meeting = 3, Special events = 4,

Visit family and friends = 5; Travel Personalities: Culture Creature = 1, Sight Slicker = 2, Family Guy = 3, All
Arounder = 4, Trail Trekker = 5, History Buff = 6.

Meals and Restaurants Expenditures

Consistent with prior research (Dardis *et al.*, 1981; Davies and Mangan, 1992; Fish and Waggle, 1996; Jang *et al.*, 2003), this study found that there was a significant relationship between traveler's income and meals and restaurants expenditures in all three models tested. In addition, a recent study by Cai (1998) investigated and analyzed the household food expenditure patterns on trips and vacations. The results revealed that household income had been found to be a significant and positive factor accounting for variations of household vacation food expenditures or the demand for food on vacation. In model I, only the income variable was found to be an influencing factor to explain meals and restaurants expenditures. The other four socio-demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, and number of children 17 years or under) did not have a significant impact on meals and restaurants expenditures in the first model. This may explain that income is the significant predictor to determine how much respondents would spend on dining activities. For a second time, the first model (socio-demographic variables only) explained 4.7% of the meals and restaurants expenditures, entailing that socio-demographic variables alone were not sufficient to explain meals and restaurants expenditures.

Travel-related variables were incorporated into model II contributing to a better explanation of meals and restaurants expenditures. Number of person(s) in travel group was not found to be significant for meals and restaurants expenditures. However, number of adult(s) had a significant impact on meals and restaurant expenditures, which was consistent with study by Giesebrand and Moulton (1986) that the number of adults in a household had a positive impact on food. Number of children did not have an impact on meals and restaurants expenditures which supported the study by Smallwood (1981) that the number of children was expected to have a

negative impact on food. First-time and repeat visitation variable did not have a significant impact on meals and restaurants expenditures for both model II and III. Length of stay played an important role to explain meals and restaurants expenditures with the significant level at .000 for both model II and III. Trip purpose and travel distance did not have a significant impact on meals and restaurant expenditures. Socio-demographic and travel-related characteristics explained 41.1% of the variation explaining that travel-related variables are significant factors in explaining meals and restaurants expenditures.

Model III consisted of five socio-demographic, seven travel-related, and six selected psychographic variables. In this model, travel personalities had a significant impact on meals and restaurants expenditures while the rest of psychographic variables were not significant in this model. This may imply that the way travelers spend their money on meals and restaurants services can be explained by the different personalities. There was only 2.1% increase in the R^2 from model II to model III for meals and restaurants expenditures. This may explain that psychographic variables did not play an important role in explaining respondents' dining expenditures while traveling. A summary of three models tested and meals and restaurants expenditures is illustrated in Table 12.

Table 12: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Meals and Restaurants Expenditures

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Socio-Demographic						
Gender ^a	.046	.415	.028	.528	.024	.600
Age	.045	.478	.015	.765	.019	.724
Marital status ^a	.025	.667	-.041	.388	-.024	.630
Number of children 17 years or younger	.043	.492	.090	.113	.097	.103
Total annual household income	.202	.001***	.197	.000***	.194	.000***
R ²	4.7%					
Travel-related						
Number of persons in travel group			.000	.995	-.001	.988
Number of adult (s)			.343	.000***	.342	.000***
Number of children			-.090	.094	-.108	.056
First-time and repeat visitation			-.080	.086	-.096	.046
Length of stay			.503	.000***	.492	.000***
Trip purpose ^a			-.020	.659	-.014	.757
Travel distance			.040	.380	.046	.326
R ²	41.1%					
Psychographic						
Travel Personalities ^a					-.102	.024*
Stability/Excitement					.108	.036
Self/family					.001	.988
Passive/Active					.027	.588
Learning/Dropping out					.029	.530
Traditional/Trying new things					-.023	.643
R ²	43.2%					

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

^a refers to a variable used as a reference group.

Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Marital Status: Non-married = 0, Married = 1;

Trip Purpose: Vacation = 1, Get away = 2, Business meeting = 3, Special events = 4,

Visit family and friends = 5; Travel Personalities: Culture Creature = 1, Sight Slicker = 2, Family Guy = 3, All
Arounder = 4, Trail Trekker = 5, History Buff = 6.

Attractions and Festivals Expenditures

Three models were tested to examine attractions and festivals expenditures. Attractions and festivals expenditures was not significantly influenced by any of the socio-demographic variables in model I, except total annual household income before taxes. Total household income before taxes was significant at .030 in model I, .020 in model II, and .028 in model III consecutively. This may clarify that total annual household income before taxes alone could determine tourism expenditures on attractions and festivals, while other four selected socio-demographic variables in this study did not have a significant impact on attractions and festivals expenditures. Socio-demographic variables only explained 4.9% of the variation for attractions and festivals expenditures.

In model II, seven selected travel-related variables were incorporated with the socio-demographic variables in the first model. Length of stay was the only variable found to be significant for attractions and festivals expenditures, while other items including number of person(s), number of adult(s), number of children, trip purpose, and travel distance were not significantly related to the attractions and festivals expenditures. In terms of first-time and repeat visitation, a previous study by Oppermann (1996) found that repeat visitors were much more concentrated in fewer locations and exhibit a different spending pattern. Repeat visitors had lower per day expenditures than first-time visitors. He also argued that expenditure patterns for both groups across the different travel goods and services did not vary significantly, whereas the first-time visitors tended to spend more on souvenirs than repeat visitors. Furthermore, previous study revealed that the first-time visitors were visiting many more attractions within the destination area and not only the best-known sites. However, this study found no significant

relationship between first-time and repeat visitation and attractions and festivals expenditures.

Model II (socio-demographic and travel-related variables) explained 19.9% of the total variance for attractions and festivals expenditures.

Travel personalities and what respondents value most while traveling were incorporated into model III to examine the significance level of psychographic impacts on attractions and festivals expenditures. Socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables explained 21.4% of the total variance for attractions and festivals expenditures. This might explain that psychographic variables did not contribute to a better explanation of attraction/festival expenditures. The relationship between three models tested and attractions and festivals expenditures is presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Attractions/Festivals Expenditures

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Socio-Demographic						
Gender ^a	.017	.828	.029	.699	.025	.752
Age	-.064	.483	-.070	.417	-.061	.504
Marital status ^a	.053	.524	.033	.675	.059	.493
Number of children 17 years or younger	.010	.913	-.047	.623	-.031	.759
Total annual household income	.181	.030*	.185	.020*	.181	.028*
R ²		4.9%				
Travel-related						
Number of persons in travel group			-.136	.080	-.134	.099
Number of adult (s)			.118	.141	.119	.157
Number of children			.159	.081	.155	.111
First-time and repeat visitation			.084	.284	.070	.394
Length of stay			.287	.000***	.283	.000***
Trip purpose ^a			.021	.778	.025	.748
Travel distance			-.052	.498	-.052	.522
R ²				19.9%		
Psychographic						
Travel Personalities ^a					-.068	.384
Stability/Excitement					.106	.233
Self/family					-.039	.652
Passive/Active					-.011	.901
Learning/Dropping out					.002	.985
Traditional/Trying new things					.049	.915
R ²						21.4%

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

^a refers to a variable used as a reference group.

Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Marital Status: Non-married = 0, Married = 1;

Trip Purpose: Vacation = 1, Get away = 2, Business meeting = 3, Special events = 4,

Visit family and friends = 5; Travel Personalities: Culture Creature = 1, Sight Slicker = 2, Family Guy = 3, All
Arounder = 4, Trail Trekker = 5, History Buff = 6.

Entertainment Expenditures

For the whole sample for entertainment expenditures in model I, only gender was found to be significant for entertainment expenditures. One reason may be that different gender has different ways of entertaining themselves. Therefore, female and male may allocate their entertainment dollars differently while they are traveling. Apart from gender, all four selected socio-demographic variables were not statistically significant for entertainment expenditures. This may explain that socio-demographic variables alone in this study were not sufficient to determine how much tourists would spend on entertainment activities. Socio-demographic variables only explained 5.2% of the variation in the entertainment expenditures.

Travel-related variables were incorporated into model II to determine entertainment expenditures. The results showed that number of persons in travel group and number of adult(s) were the important factors to explain variances in entertainment expenditures. Interestingly, number of children was not found to be significant effect on the purchase level of travel goods and services for entertainment expenditures. This was, however, consistent with study by Legohérel (1998) that the presence of children in the group did not seem to be linked with the level of expenditure. Entertainment expenditures was not significantly influenced by first-time or repeat visitation, length of stay, trip purpose, and travel distance. This may explain that the purchasing level of entertainment goods and services could not be explained by number of times visited, number of nights stayed, the purpose of the trip, and distance travelers travel from their residence. Overall, Socio-demographic and travel-related variables explained 26.4% of the total variance for entertainment expenditures.

Psychographic variables consisting of six selected variables were analyzed for Model III. Stability/Excitement variable was found to be significant on entertainment expenditures. This may imply that travelers who value excitement may spend their budgets differently on different entertainment products and services. Model III which included psychographic variables explained 32.4% of the variation for entertainment expenditures. This can be inferred that the psychographic variables in this study slightly contributed to a better explanation for entertainment expenditures. A summary of three models tested and entertainment expenditures is presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Entertainment Expenditures

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Socio-Demographic						
Gender ^a	.199	.045*	.165	.070	.157	.106
Age	.151	.182	.139	.182	.138	.221
Marital status ^a	-.035	.733	-.085	.373	-.087	.416
Number of children 17 years or younger	-.008	.943	.012	.916	.005	.965
Total annual household income	.065	.527	.069	.467	.078	.442
R ²		5.2%				
Travel-related						
Number of persons in travel group			.231	.015*	.231	.023*
Number of adult (s)			.315	.001***	.323	.002**
Number of children			-.042	.703	-.092	.441
First-time and repeat visitation			.083	.377	.049	.625
Length of stay			.089	.324	.074	.442
Trip purpose ^a			-.119	.194	-.106	.276
Travel distance			.026	.781	.023	.816
R ²				26.4%		
Psychographic						
Travel Personalities ^a					-.062	.514
Stability/Excitement					.225	.041*
Self/family					.115	.283
Passive/Active					-.090	.396
Learning/Dropping out					.043	.656
Traditional/Trying new things					-.072	.500
R ²						32.4%

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

^a refers to a variable used as a reference group.

Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Marital Status: Non-married = 0, Married = 1;

Trip Purpose: Vacation = 1, Get away = 2, Business meeting = 3, Special events = 4,

Visit family and friends = 5; Travel Personalities: Culture Creature = 1, Sight Slicker = 2, Family Guy = 3, All
Arounder = 4, Trail Trekker = 5, History Buff = 6.

Shopping Expenditures

First model was tested to determine the influencing factors for shopping expenditures. Only total annual household income before taxes was found to be an influencing factor for shopping expenditures. The results was not consistent with prior study by Lee (2001) on boater expenditure, he found that grocery expenditure was not significantly influenced by income levels. The findings supported the literature according to gender and tourism expenditure that spending patterns of men and women vary in different ways. According to the literature, several studies found gender not significant in tourism expenditure since much travel and tourism behavior is group (especially family) and not individual in nature, sex is probably not such an important segmentation variable for the tourism industry as for many other products Lawson (1991). Age was also not found to an important indicator to explain shopping expenditures. Socio-demographic variables only explained 2.8% of the total variance for shopping expenditures, Therefore, shopping expenditures was not successfully explained by socio-demographic variables alone.

The seven selected travel-related variables were included into model II for shopping expenditures. Similar to entertainment expenditures, number of adult(s) was found to be significant variable for two models tested. Contrary to a previous study by Jang *et al.* (2003), they found that the numbers of adults in the travel party was not an important factor to explain variances in the three travel expenditure models (high income, non-high income, and total). However, this study found that number of adult(s) was significant for both shopping and entertainment expenditures. However, number of person(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, and trip purpose did not have significant impact on shopping expenditures.

Length of stay was significant at .019 significance level in model II, and .029 in model III. In relation to travel distance and shopping expenditures, the results showed that travel distance was significant at .010 in model II, and .009 in model III. One reason may be that as people travel far from home, they are likely to spend more on souvenirs or gifts for families and friends or items that are not available in their hometowns. Model II which included travel-related variables explained 12.1% of the total variance, whereas model III (incorporated by six selected psychographic variables) explained 14.9% of the variation for shopping expenditures. Learning/Dropping out variable was found to be significant at .036 in model III. This, again, implies that psychographic variables in this study did not contribute to a better explanation for the shopping expenditures. The relationship between the three models and shopping expenditures is presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Shopping Expenditures

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Socio-Demographic						
Gender ^a	.041	.504	.040	.501	.037	.533
Age	.012	.859	-.005	.937	-.026	.703
Marital status ^a	-.011	.865	-.045	.472	-.059	.369
Number of children 17 years or younger	-.034	.616	-.034	.645	-.044	.574
Total annual household income	.170	.008**	.161	.010**	.166	.008**
R ²		2.8%				
Travel-related						
Number of persons in travel group			-.036	.558	-.039	.528
Number of adult (s)			.191	.003**	.197	.002**
Number of children			.029	.686	.010	.895
First-time and repeat visitation			.080	.192	.070	.264
Length of stay			.139	.019*	.131	.029*
Trip purpose ^a			-.064	.286	-.059	.328
Travel distance			.158	.010**	.162	.009**
R ²				12.1%		
Psychographic						
Travel Personalities ^a					.029	.617
Stability/Excitement					.019	.777
Self/family					.079	.233
Passive/Active					-.053	.414
Learning/Dropping out					.126	.036*
Traditional/Trying new things					-.051	.438
R ²						14.9%

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

^a refers to a variable used as a reference group.

Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Marital Status: Non-married = 0, Married = 1;

Trip Purpose: Vacation = 1, Get away = 2, Business meeting = 3, Special events = 4,

Visit family and friends = 5; Travel Personalities: Culture Creature = 1, Sight Slicker = 2, Family Guy = 3, All Around = 4, Trail Trekker = 5, History Buff = 6.

Transportation Expenditures

It is interesting to note that five selected socio-demographic variables were not found to be significant at all in the first model. Socio-demographic variables only explained 0.6% of the total variance for transportation expenditures, which did not explain transportation expenditure well. Therefore, transportation expenditures was not successfully explained by any of socio-demographic variables in this study.

Model II incorporated six travel-related variables including number of persons in travel group, number of adult(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, and length of stay, trip purpose, and travel distance. Number of persons in travel group, number of adult(s), length of stay, and travel distance were statistically significant for Model II and III for transportation expenditure. Number of persons in travel group and number of adult(s) may help explain what type of vehicles were needed while traveling. The more people in the travel group, the larger the vehicle needed to accommodate a big group. In addition, in relation to length of stay, the results were consistent with a study by Jang *et al.*, (2003)'s finding that the number of nights staying in the United States of Japanese pleasure travelers had a positive and significant effect on the purchase level of travel goods and services for all models tested (high income, non-high income, and total). They explained that this might be because travelers who stay longer have to use hotel rooms more often, have more meals, and use more transportation services. Trip purpose did not play an important role in explaining transportation expenditures. Travel distance was significant at .019 in model II, and .025 in model III. One reason may be that tourists would determine how much they are willing to spend on modes of transportation from their residences to destinations as traveling by planes might be required if the destination is far from home. Therefore,

transportation expenditures was statistically influenced by travel distance. Model II which included travel-related variables explained 24.4% of the total variance for transportation expenditures.

Psychographic variables were incorporated into model III. This study found that six selected psychographic variables were not statistically significant for transportation expenditures in model III. This may be because transportation expenditures were measured by the necessity of travel such as distance and time constraints than the psychological needs. Model III which incorporated by psychographic variables explained 26.2% of the variation for transportation expenditures. The relationship between transportation expenditures and three models tested is illustrated in Table 16.

Table 16: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Transportation Expenditures

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Socio-Demographic						
Gender ^a	-.052	.378	-.040	.447	-.044	.411
Age	-.020	.762	-.043	.469	-.035	.571
Marital status ^a	.013	.827	-.022	.689	-.003	.957
Number of children 17 years or younger	.001	.988	-.005	.942	-.004	.959
Total annual household income	-.063	.303	-.078	.150	-.078	.150
R ²	0.6%					
Travel-related						
Number of persons in travel group			-.150	.006**	-.146	.009**
Number of adult (s)			.165	.003**	.162	.005**
Number of children			.054	.393	.061	.357
First-time and repeat visitation			.018	.740	.015	.791
Length of stay			.300	.000***	.397	.000***
Trip purpose ^a			-.067	.200	-.069	.196
Travel distance			.125	.019*	.124	.025*
R ²			24.4%			
Psychographic						
Travel Personalities ^a					-.026	.618
Stability/Excitement					.064	.286
Self/family					-.023	.702
Passive/Active					-.034	.564
Learning/Dropping out					-.060	.268
Traditional/Trying new things					.092	.118
R ²					26.2%	

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

^a refers to a variable used as a reference group.

Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Marital Status: Non-married = 0, Married = 1;

Trip Purpose: Vacation = 1, Get away = 2, Business meeting = 3, Special events = 4,

Visit family and friends = 5; Travel Personalities: Culture Creature = 1, Sight Slicker = 2, Family Guy = 3, All
Arounder = 4, Trail Trekker = 5, History Buff = 6.

Total Expenditures

The total expenditures were created by adding the amount of dollars from each category of expenditure including lodging, meals and restaurants, festivals and attractions, entertainment, shopping, and transportation expenditures.

Consistent with a previous study by Marshment (1997), he claimed that unlike markets for so many other goods and services (clothes, cosmetics, magazines and so on), the holiday market is not constructed along gender lines. In this study, gender was also not found to be significant indicator for total expenditures. Age factor did not have a significant impact on total expenditures contrary to the previous study by Rapoport and Rapoport (1975) that the age factor was expected to be a major determinant of leisure spending behavior. Age factor was not significant at .529 in model I, .171 in model II, and .221 in model III consecutively. For total expenditures, marital status was not found to be an influencing factor for all three models tested. This might be because much travel and tourism behavior is group (especially family) (Lawson, 1991). Therefore, total expenditures could not be determined by marital status alone. Number of children 17 years and under living in the household did not have a significant impact on total expenditures for all three models tested, which was inconsistent with a previous study by Cai *et al.* (1995). They suggested the number of children in their study might reflect the time constraints of the parent taking care of the children. Trips could be fewer or shorter because of school schedules or childcare demands. In the worst scenario, people could not take trips since children are too young and they have to fully take care of the children at home. Therefore, the family with more children appeared to need larger or more rooms, more food and also spent more on transportation, even though it did not show a significant difference. Total annual

household income was found to be significant for total expenditures in all three models, the significant level at .006, .002, and .002 consecutively. This was consistent with several previous studies Dardis *et al.*, (1981), Prais and Houthakker (1971), Fish and Waggle (1996), Agarwal and Gilbert (1999), Cai, Hong, and Morrisson (1995), etc.) that income was an influencing factor to determine total expenditures. Socio-demographic variables only explained 3.1% of the total variance for total expenditures, implying that socio-demographic variables alone did not successfully explain total expenditures well. In other words, travel-related variables often contributed to an explanation of total expenditures more than socio-demographic variables for the foreign travel market according to a previous study by Hsieh, Lang, and O'Leary (1997). This study found that travel-related variables played an important role in explaining several tourism expenditure patterns more than socio-demographic and psychographic variables for domestic travel market.

Model II was incorporated into the Multiple Regression Analysis for total expenditures. Number of adult(s) and length of stay were found to be significant at .000 for two models tested. This, again, supported the previous study by Dardis, Soberon-Ferrer, and Patro (1994) that the number of adults had a significant impact on recreation expenditures. In terms of the length of stay, the result supported the previous findings by Agarwal and Yochum (1999). They conducted the survey data on overnight visitors at Virginia Beach during the summer of 1997. They found that length of stay was found to be a significant determinant of visitors' expenditures. Number of persons in the travel group and number of children did not have a significant impact on total expenditures. First-time and repeat visitation also was not an influencing factor to determine total expenditures for this study as well as the trip purpose. Travel distance did not play an important

role in explaining total expenditures in this study. Model II which included travel-related variables explained 32.6% of the variation for total expenditures supporting that travel-related variables contributed to a better explanation of total expenditures more than socio-demographic variables alone.

Psychographic variables were incorporated into model III for total expenditures. The results showed that what respondents value most between stability and excitement had a significant impact on total expenditures in model III. The other five selected psychographic variables did not contribute to a better explanation for total expenditures in this model. Model III incorporated by psychographic variables explained 34.8% of the total variance for total expenditures implying that psychographic did not contribute to a better explanation for total expenditures in this study. The relationship between total expenditures and three models is illustrated in Table 17.

Table 17: Examination of Model I, II, & III and Total Expenditures

Variables	Model I		Model II		Model III	
	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.	Beta	Sig.
Socio-Demographic						
Gender ^a	.020	.716	.010	.821	.005	.922
Age	-.039	.529	-.072	.171	-.066	.221
Marital status ^a	.036	.520	-.008	.862	-.001	.984
Number of children 17 years or younger	-.011	.851	.018	.758	.024	.695
Total annual household income	.157	.006**	.149	.002**	.153	.002**
R ²		3.1%				
Travel-related						
Number of persons in travel group			.015	.751	.021	.657
Number of adult (s)			.238	.000***	.241	.000***
Number of children			-.060	.280	-.079	.167
First-time and repeat visitation			-.025	.600	-.042	.387
Length of stay			.480	.000***	.476	.000***
Trip purpose ^a			-.009	.842	-.004	.928
Travel distance			.071	.129	.068	.157
R ²				32.6%		
Psychographic						
Travel Personalities ^a					-.081	.078
Stability/Excitement					.133	.011*
Self/family					.026	.611
Passive/Active					-.072	.160
Learning/Dropping out					-.010	.837
Traditional/Trying new things					-.032	.526
R ²						34.8%

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

^a refers to a variable used as a reference group.

Gender: Male = 0, Female = 1; Marital Status: Non-married = 0, Married = 1;

Trip Purpose: Vacation = 1, Get away = 2, Business meeting = 3, Special events = 4,

Visit family and friends = 5; Travel Personalities: Culture Creature = 1, Sight Slicker = 2, Family Guy = 3, All
Arounder = 4, Trail Trekker = 5, History Buff = 6.

Summary of the Influential Variables

Table 18: Summary of Variables' Effects on Travel Expenditures

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables (Influencing Factors Effecting Travel Expenditures)
Lodging Expenditures	Marital Status Total annual household income before taxes Number of persons in travel group Number of adult(s) Length of stay Being passive/being active
Meals and Restaurants Expenditures	Total annual household income before taxes Number of adult(s) Length of stay
Attractions and Festivals Expenditures	Total annual household income before taxes Length of stay Travel personality traits
Entertainment Expenditures	Gender Number of persons in travel group Number of adult(s) Stability/excitement
Shopping Expenditures	Total annual household income before taxes Number of adult(s) Length of stay Travel distance Learning/dropping out
Transportation Expenditures	Number of persons in travel group Number of adult(s) Length of stay Travel distance
Total Expenditures	Total annual household income before taxes Number of adult(s) Length of stay Stability/excitement

Chapter Summary

Multiple Regression Analysis was used to examine whether differences exist between socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic characteristics and the tourism expenditure variables. Three models were created based on different characteristics. The effects of independent variables on tourism expenditures were examined.

In model I, socio-demographic (gender, age, marital status, number of children 17 years of age and under living in the household, and total annual household income) were used to predict the tourism expenditures. Next in model II, travel-related (number of persons in travel group, number of adult(s), number of children, first-time and repeat visitation, length of stay, trip purpose, and travel distance) were included to see if improvement was made in the model. Next in model III, psychographic variables (travel personalities and what they value most when traveling) were included to test the effects of overall independent variables on tourism expenditures.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Chapter 5 discusses the findings which include results and submits conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data. Next, implications for tourism planning, development, and marketing are discussed, the contributions of this study are considered and finally recommendations for further tourism studies focusing on tourism expenditures are provided.

Discussion of the Research Findings

This research study offers another piece in the puzzle of hospitality marketing. Founded on consumer behavior and based on a mid-west travel survey, this study examined the impacts of selected socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables on tourism expenditure patterns. Multiple Regression Analysis yielded three different sets of results according to three models. The first model and third model suggested that a few socio-demographic (i.e. total annual household income before taxes) and psychographic variables (i.e. value most: stability/self) could explain a variation of tourism expenditure patterns among different categories of a variable, while model II indicated several (number of adult(s), length of stay, number of persons in the travel group) travel-related variables were influential in explaining tourism expenditures.

Multiple regression analysis distinguished eighteen independent variables as significantly contributing to explaining the variations of tourism expenditure patterns per person per day. The major findings are summarized as follows:

First, in relation to how much travelers spend on lodging expenditures, marital status, total annual household income before taxes, number of persons in travel group, number of

adult(s), length of stay, and being passive/being active were found to be the influencing factors in explaining lodging expenditures per person per day.

Second, the findings showed that total annual household income before taxes, number of adult(s), length of stay, and travel personalities influenced how travelers decide to spend on meals and restaurant expenditures per person per day.

Third, it was found that amount of money spent per person per day on attractions and festivals expenditures could only be explained by total annual household income and length of stay.

Fourth, gender, number of persons in travel group, and number of adult(s) and stability/excitement variable were the important determinants in explaining how much travelers were willing to spend on entertainment expenditures per person per day while traveling.

Fifth, the findings showed total annual household income before taxes, number of adult(s), length of stay, travel distance, and learning/dropping out variable were the major determinants influencing tourist's shopping expenditures per person per day.

Sixth, transportation expenditures per person per day could be explained by number of persons in travel group, number of adult(s), length of stay, and travel distance.

Finally, total expenditures per person per day in the trip to Northern Indiana were successfully explained by total household income before taxes, number of adult(s), length of stay, and stability and excitement variable.

All in all, three major independent variables found to be the most significant factors to explain different categories of expenditure patterns were total annual household income before taxes, length of stay, and number of adult(s). These results supported previous literature that

socio-demographic variables such as income and travel-related variables such as length of stay and number of adult(s) were the important variables affecting tourism expenditures. Total annual household income before taxes was found to be an influential predictor to explain lodging expenditures, meals and restaurants expenditures, attractions and festivals expenditures, shopping expenditures and total expenditures. Number of adult(s) was found to be significant for lodging expenditures, meals and restaurants expenditures, entertainment expenditures, shopping expenditures, transportation expenditures and total expenditures. Length of stay was a significant factor to explain lodging expenditures, meals and restaurants expenditures, attractions and festivals expenditures, shopping expenditures, transportation expenditures and total expenditures. Though psychographic variables were found to be significant in certain expenditure patterns, it was likely to explain reasons behind tourists' activities while traveling rather than predicting tourists' expenditure patterns.

To answer the research question, according to three models tested by Multiple Regression Analysis, out of eighteen independent variables, three major variables were identified to explain several tourism expenditure patterns per person per day. Total annual household income before taxes was identified to explain five tourism expenditure patterns. Number of adult(s) and length of stay were found to be the influencing factors to determine six out of seven of the tourism expenditure categories examined in this study.

Several expenditure patterns were examined using simple regression models. First as past literature has suggested (Dardis *et al.*, (1981), Prais and Houthakker (1971), Fish and Waggle (1996), Agarwal and Gilbert (1999), Cai, Hong, and Morrisison (1995), etc.) socio-demographic variables were selected to observe their effects on the various types of expenditures. Second, a

previous study by Hsieh, Lang, and O'Leary (1997) has stated to that travel-related variables help to explain expenditures more when combined with socio-demographic variables. This was confirmed in this study by the R^2 of model I (Socio-demographic variables) was very low in most expenditure patterns (i.e. 2.5% in lodging expenditures, 4.7% in meals and restaurant expenditures, 4.9% in attraction and festival expenditures, 5.2% in entertainment expenditures, 2.8% in shopping expenditures, 0.6% in transportation expenditures, and 3.1% in total expenditures). However, the travel-related variables helped improve the model. Third, when psychographic variables were incorporated, results were mixed and small increases to R^2 were made. This may imply that psychographic variables were not sufficient in predicting travel expenditures.

Therefore, this supported the findings by Hsieh, Lang, and O'Leary (1997) that travel-related characteristics often contributed to an explanation of total expenditure more than socio-demographic variables for the foreign travel market. Further, this study found that travel-related variables played an important role in explaining several tourism expenditure patterns more than socio-demographic and psychographic variables. Though psychographic variables were found to be significant in certain expenditure patterns, it was likely to explain mental desire or reasons behind travel activities rather than spending behaviors.

Main Contribution of the study

The present study makes a number of important contributions. The results of this study offered both theoretical and practical contributions of the impacts of socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables on tourism expenditure patterns. The first model supplies

the academic researchers and tourism professionals with valuable information to understand the impacts of selected socio-demographic variables on tourism expenditure patterns. The second model provides a better analysis of socio-demographic and selected travel-related variables and its effects on tourism expenditure patterns. The final model increases an understanding of the impacts of the three important influencing factors: socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables on tourism expenditure patterns. All three models, individually and collectively, provide a more comprehensive and holistic picture in the search of travel expenditure predictors and their impacts on tourist's spending patterns.

Theoretical Contribution

This study contributes to the body of literature in relation to travel expenditure by examining not only the variables under each of the three constructs identified but also the impacts of these variables in predicting travel expenditures. The results of the study provided a more comprehensive and holistic picture in the search of travel expenditure predictors and the effects of three independent variables. Among the selected socio-demographic, travel-related and psychographic variables, travel-related variables were found to be the most influential variable affecting tourism expenditures.

This study confirmed that travel-related variables are the most influential factors affecting different categories in tourism expenditure. Even though household income was found to be a significant predictor in several tourism expenditure patterns, it was the only influential factor in overall selected socio-demographic variables that affected tourism expenditure patterns. This single indicator did not account for the contribution of socio-demographic variables on

different tourism expenditure patterns. Number of adult(s) and length of stay, on the other hand, contributed to a better explanation of several activities in tourism expenditure patterns.

Incorporated with other travel-related items such as number of persons in travel group and travel distance, travel-related variables were the most influential factors across all expenditure patterns in this study. Psychographic variables were likely to explain reasons behind travel activities or types of activities they would take while traveling to certain destinations rather than spending behaviors.

Practical Contribution

From a practical standpoint, this study may help regional destination markets to better segment their target market, allocate their marketing dollars more effectively and tailor their products to compete for tourist's dollars. It provides information that destination marketers can apply to aid in their understanding of the tourist consumer. Since consumer dollars and tourism organizations' marketing budgets are limited, this study may provide guidelines for tourism marketers to develop better strategic marketing tools to satisfy and fulfill those tourist's needs and understand certain reasons behind their spending patterns.

The strength of this study is that it examines the effects of selected socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables in predicting travel expenditures. This study was one of few to examine the comprehensive impacts of the three major selected variables on tourism expenditure patterns. The findings of this study suggest some important marketing implications and challenges both to the academic researchers and industry practitioners.

First, in terms of tourism spending behavior, it is interesting to note that lodging and shopping expenditures made up the biggest components of the travel bills to Northern Indiana. More efforts should be made to find out if Northern Indiana could be developed to be one of the shopping places to generate more tourists' dollars to the destination as well as to attract more shoppers. Second, the length of stay is a key issue for increasing tourist spending. If the destination marketers find more ways to attract tourists to stay longer, the destination itself might generate more income to improve its attractiveness to generate more first-time and repeat visitors. Third, number of persons in the travel group is another key factor in different tourism expenditure patterns. Therefore, destination marketers may increase the tourist's receipts by increasing numbers of travelers such as group tours or package tours.

These findings should help tourism marketers and managers to understand the influential factors that affect tourist's budgets while traveling. Understanding different influential factors can help destination managers and marketers develop target-marketing communication more effectively. Attracting travelers to stay longer and increasing number of persons in the travel group are likely to increase tourism expenditures to the destinations. In addition, household income is one of the most important factors affecting tourism expenditures. Therefore, it is important for destination marketers to identify which groups of traveler's income levels they want to capture or best suitable for destinations. After identifying target market, destination marketers would be able to tailor their promotional mix according to the target group.

Limitations of the study

As with any study, the present study has its limitation. First, perhaps the most troubling limitation is that almost all variables were based on data from self-reported sources. Thus, common-method bias might have inflated the parameter estimates along the variables. Typically, this may affect the measurement of attitudes in self-reported surveys, which contain both dependent and independent variables (Williams, Cote, and Buckley, 1989; Williams and Brown, 1994).

The second limitation is this study is that the validity of data collected, especially on expenditure data, is a consequence of the respondents understanding of the questions and willingness to answer them truthfully. Even though the respondent's profiles were kept confidentially, invalid data may be collected in any mail survey because the questions might be easily misunderstood. This also relates to recall biases in traveler spending surveys, as this issue confronting tourism researchers is how accurately travelers recall their expenditures related to their travel activity accurately.

Third, with the limitation of secondary data, the purpose of the survey was predominantly made up to develop a profile of those persons interested in traveling to the Northern Indiana area and to understand the nature of travel to the Area. Therefore, certain socio-demographic, travel-related and psychographic profiles of respondents (i.e. ethnic groups, level of education, and occupations) are needed to better understand the entire aspect of tourism expenditure patterns and might be insufficient in this study. Conclusions drawn from this study based on regional tourism information going to Northern Indiana might not be applicable to travelers going to a different region in United States.

Finally, this research could not avoid limitations due to the missing values in the expenditure data. However, the treatment with the mean expenditure for missing values minimized this deficiency.

Suggestions for future research

Although the research questions of this study were successfully investigated, the results of this study raise a number of important questions for further investigation. It is anticipated that the results of this study will serve as an indicator in encouraging future research into the relationship of other influential variables that might have a significant impact on traveler's spending patterns. It is recommended that tourism expenditure patterns be applied to different regions in the United States so that results can be compared. In addition, to better understand the impacts of socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables, other psychographic variables may deserve further research efforts. Due to the limitation of secondary data, certain socio-demographic, travel-related, and psychographic variables in this study might be insufficient. For instance, psychological needs and wants to travel and willingness to spend money on tourism activities may be interesting to investigate for further study. Attitudes and perceptions toward destinations and the impacts on spending patterns should also be examined in future studies.

Moreover, different perspectives on global changes and tourists' spending behaviors might be taken into consideration. Due to globalization, social changes might be expected to increase recreation expenditures in the future. Destination marketers need to employ a marketing strategy to capture the changing markets. For instance, the change of household or family life

cycle, rising level of education and increased participation in the labor force by single individuals might change the way people spend on leisure activities. Knowing the direction of such changes and attempting to explain the reasons that cause them would allow the tourism industry to adopt a predictive rather than a reactive attitude (Hsieh, Lang, and O'Leary, 1997). Moreover, it would be interesting to learn how to capture the future retired travelers including approximately 80 millions baby boomers who will retire by 2010 since they would have a big spending power and time to visit different places in the world. Understanding the changing demographic, social and economic or other relevant characteristics and their relationships with consumer's choice of tourism products and services is, and will remain, a challenge, as well as an opportunity, to the industry's researchers and marketers (Chon and Whelihan, 1992).

Chapter Summary

This chapter discusses the results of the study and the managerial implications of those results for tourism planning, development, and marketing as well as theoretical perspectives on tourism expenditure patterns. The results of this research also provided some explanation for different activities of tourism expenditure patterns. Three major determinants in tourism expenditures were identified: total annual household income before taxes, number of adult(s), and length of stay. Though psychographic variables were found to be significant in certain travel expenditure patterns, as past research has suggested it may be more likely to explain the reasons behind travel activities rather than how much travelers spend on tourism activities.

APPENDIX: MID-WEST TRAVEL SURVEY

Midwest Travel History and Style

Please read each question carefully before responding. Your responses will vary from section to section: fill in, check or circle the appropriate answer in the designated space. Thank you for your help!

1. In the past twelve months, how many pleasure trips (including short overnight trips and long overnight vacations) have you taken within the Midwest United States? The Midwest United States includes the states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin. Please fill in a number.

_____ Total number of pleasure trips in the Midwest United States

2. How likely are you to take a pleasure trip to a destination within the Midwest United States in the next 12 months? Please circle a response.

Extremely Unlikely	Quite Unlikely	Slightly Unlikely	Slightly Likely	Quite Likely	Extremely Likely
1	2	3	4	5	6

3. Below are five phrases used in tourism advertising. Please v the **one** destination that you believe uses each phrase in its advertising.

	"A Great Lake Adventure"	"We Make Smiles"	"Drive Less, Getaway More"	"Season-to-Season, Shore-to-Shore"	"It's a Great Time in ..."
Door County, WI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Detroit, MI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Northern Indiana, IN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rockford, IL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ottawa County, OH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Don't know	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. There are many ways or styles people take vacations. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements. Please circle a response for each statement.

I tend to ...	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
a. keep going to destinations I know.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. enjoy taking chances by visiting new destinations.....	1	2	3	4	5
c. visit more than one destination during a trip.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. stay overnight at one destination and visit other places in the area...	1	2	3	4	5
e. visit other places on the way to my main destination.....	1	2	3	4	5
f. enjoy touring a region with overnight stays at different places.....	1	2	3	4	5
g. combine places and activities that are similar and offer the same types of experiences.....	1	2	3	4	5
h. enjoy exploring places that are not typical vacation destinations.....	1	2	3	4	5
i. do a lot of different things when I travel.....	1	2	3	4	5

5. We are interested in the activities you consider important in deciding where to visit in the Midwest. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about the importance of activities in your destination decision. *Please circle a response for each type of statement.*

I most often visit Midwest destinations where I can...	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
a. hike, bike, etc.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. attend a cultural site/event (museum, play, concert).....	1	2	3	4	5
c. attend a festival, craft fair, etc.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. participate in outdoor activities (hunting, fishing, etc).....	1	2	3	4	5
e. go boating (power or sail).....	1	2	3	4	5
f. visit a beach/waterfront area.....	1	2	3	4	5
g. gamble.....	1	2	3	4	5
h. visit a historic site.....	1	2	3	4	5
i. go shopping.....	1	2	3	4	5

6. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about the importance of features in your Midwest destination decision. *Please circle a response for each type of statement.*

I most often choose Midwest destinations that...	Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree
a. offer lots of things to see and do.....	1	2	3	4	5
b. have interesting historic sites.....	1	2	3	4	5
c. are great for outdoor activities.....	1	2	3	4	5
d. offer quality accommodations.....	1	2	3	4	5
e. have beautiful scenery.....	1	2	3	4	5
f. have attractive lakes and rivers.....	1	2	3	4	5
g. offer reduced rates.....	1	2	3	4	5
h. are a nice quiet place.....	1	2	3	4	5
i. are convenient to my home.....	1	2	3	4	5
j. offer good value for my time and money.....	1	2	3	4	5
k. are a quaint town or village.....	1	2	3	4	5
l. have good festivals and special cultural events.....	1	2	3	4	5
m. have lots of activities for children.....	1	2	3	4	5
n. offer good/different types of food.....	1	2	3	4	5
o. offer good shopping.....	1	2	3	4	5
p. provide a unique experience.....	1	2	3	4	5

7. How important are the following aspects for you when you go on a Midwest vacation? *Please circle a response for each statement.*

I travel to the Midwest to ...		Strongly disagree		Neutral		Strongly agree
a.	visit family/friends.....	1	2	3	4	5
b.	relax and do nothing.....	1	2	3	4	5
c.	meet other people.....	1	2	3	4	5
d.	experience new things and learn a lot.....	1	2	3	4	5
e.	spend more time with my children.....	1	2	3	4	5
f.	get some excitement into my life.....	1	2	3	4	5
g.	do things I usually do not have time to do.....	1	2	3	4	5
h.	get away from work and daily life.....	1	2	3	4	5
i.	be physically active and/or practice sports.....	1	2	3	4	5

8. Which of the following Midwest states first come to mind when thinking of pleasure travel? *Please v a response for each state that comes to your mind.*

☐ Illinois ☐ Michigan ☐ Ohio
☐ Indiana ☐ Minnesota ☐ Wisconsin
☐ Iowa ☐ Missouri ☐ Other (please list) _____

9. How far in advance do you (and/or members of your travel group) usually start planning your Midwest pleasure trips? *Please v one.*

☐ During the trip ☐ 3 – 8 weeks in advance
☐ Day of departure ☐ 2 – 3 months in advance
☐ 1 - 6 days in advance ☐ 4 – 6 months in advance
☐ 1 – 2 weeks in advance ☐ More than 6 months in advance

10. How do you plan your Midwest pleasure trips? The following provide 5 descriptions of ways one might plan a pleasure trip to Midwest destinations. *Please v the one statement that best describes your planning style.*

☐ I like to plan my pleasure trips in great detail and do not enjoy changing these plans during the trip.
☐ I plan everything in advance but am open to minor changes during my trip.
☐ My planning concentrates on the major aspects of the trip such as city and attractions. More specific things like what to do and where to eat are decided during the trip.
☐ I keep my advance planning to a minimum and leave a lot of room open for spontaneous changes.
☐ I make all trip related decisions while on vacation.

11. What information sources do you typically use when planning your Midwest pleasure trips? *Please v all that apply.*

☐ Television ☐ Internet ☐ City/County tourism office
☐ Radio ☐ AAA ☐ Family/Friends
☐ Newspapers ☐ Travel agent ☐ Other (please list): _____
☐ Magazines ☐ State tourism office

The Midwest offers a lot of different travel experiences. This section will ask you about your personal travel styles and values so that we can learn more about what you expect from a pleasure trip to the Midwest.

12. Below are 12 different travel personalities. Pick a travel personality that "best" describes you as you travel in the Midwest United States; then, choose one that does not describe your personal travel style at all. *Please select only one for each category.*

A. Culture Creature

Loves everything cultural – theater, shows, museums, festivals and fairs and local culture, too!

E. Beach Bum

Somebody who has to lay around on the beach with little umbrellas pitched in their drinks.

I. Trail Trekker

If it's outdoors – you're there. Hiking, walking, parks, forests, mountains, birdwatching, etc.

B. City Slicker

An urban creature who goes where the action is. Loves clubs, meeting people and needs the pulse of the city.

F. Avid Athlete

Always on the court or the course. Always in the game... whatever game it is.

J. History Buff

Travels back in time. Your vacation is a learning experience that focuses on historic facts and sites.

C. Sight Seeker

Always ready to stop for that landmark, event or attraction.

G. Shopping Shark

Stopped looking for a cure for your shopaholism?

K. Boater

Your world is the lake and your boat is your home. Feeling the breeze is what you really care about.

D. Family Guy

The destination is not what counts, it is the time you spend with your family that makes your vacation.

H. All Arounder

You need to have it all. You go where there is lots to do and see.

L. Gamer

Electrifying slots and skill-testing table games, fantastic fare and nightly entertainment are a crucial part of your trip.

Travel personality that "best" describes you (A – L): _____

Travel personality that does not describe you at all (A – L): _____

13. The following list includes word-pairs that can be used to describe what one values most when traveling to Midwest destinations. *Please indicate what you value most when you travel to Midwest destinations by circling a response for each word-pair.*

Stability	1	2	3	4	5	Excitement
Self	1	2	3	4	5	Family
Being passive	1	2	3	4	5	Being active
Learning	1	2	3	4	5	Dropping out
Following tradition	1	2	3	4	5	Trying new things

We would like to learn more about the way you think and feel about pleasure trips to Midwest destinations.

14. When you think about a pleasure trip in the Midwest, what are the three things (feelings) that first come to your mind?

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

15. If you could design a perfect Midwest vacation, what experiences would this trip include?

16. *Imagine* that you have just arrived at the Midwest destination of your choice. You walk inside the hotel room, you open the window ... what do you see?

17. *Now imagine* that you have finished unpacking. What are you going to do?

18. *You are ready for dinner.* The waitress comes to your table to take your order. What are you going to order?

19. *Close your eyes* and think about a vacation in the Midwest. What color dominates your mental image? *Please be as detailed as possible (for example, brick red; light blue, snow white).*

20. *What kinds of scents* would you like to smell during this pleasure trip to the Midwest? *Please describe the type of scent (for example, freshly cut grass, lake breeze, fresh fish, popcorn, autumn leaves, farms, etc.).*

21. *What sounds do you hear?* *Please indicate the type(s) of sound(s) you may expect to hear during your trip (for example, birds, traffic, firewood cracking, music, children playing, etc.).*

Northern Indiana

22. Have you requested tourist information from Northern Indiana within the past year? Please v one.

☐ Yes (Continue) ☐ No ➔ PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION # 44)

If YES, which of the following reasons describe why you requested tourist information about Northern Indiana? Please v all that apply.

- ☐ To help decide whether or not to travel to Northern Indiana
- ☐ Learn about attractions and other places to visit during my trip
- ☐ Select specific places to visit
- ☐ To collect/obtain information about the area
- ☐ Learn about activities or other things I might do during my visit to the area
- ☐ Learn about special events such as festivals or concerts
- ☐ Learn about prices of hotels or other overnight accommodations
- ☐ Find bargains or coupons
- ☐ Be able to use my vacation time more effectively
- ☐ To see how beautiful the place is before my visit
- ☐ Collecting information is an enjoyable part of trip planning

23. How did you contact the Northern Indiana Tourism Office to request this tourist information? Please v one.

☐ Over the phone ☐ By E-mail ☐ Other (please specify)
☐ Mail ☐ Website

24. Did you receive the information you requested?

☐ Yes ☐ No ➔ PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION # 44)

25. How helpful was the travel information you received? Please circle one.

Not at all Helpful		Somewhat Helpful		Extremely Helpful
1	2	3	4	5

26. Did any of the vacations or pleasure trips (1 day or longer) indicated above in Question # 1 include travel to or through Northern Indiana? Please v one.

☐ Yes ☐ No ➔ PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION # 44)

If YES, how many times have you visited Northern Indiana in the past 12 months?

_____ Number of trips

27. We are interested in finding out when you first decided to take your trip(s) which included travel to/through Northern Indiana. *Please v the one statement which best describes your situation.*

I decided to travel to/through Northern Indiana...

- ☐ Before I saw any advertising about Northern Indiana.
- ☐ After I saw Northern Indiana advertising, but before I received the informational travel brochures I requested.
- ☐ After I received the informational travel brochures I requested.

28. How much has the Northern Indiana travel information you received influenced various aspects of your travel planning? *Please circle one response for each statement.*

How much did the Northern Indiana travel information influence...	No influence		Moderate influence		Very high influence
The length of stay on your pleasure trip to/through N. Indiana	1	2	3	4	5
The number of places visited on your pleasure trip to/through Northern Indiana.....	1	2	3	4	5
The number and types of attractions visited on your pleasure trip to or through Northern Indiana.....	1	2	3	4	5

The next set of questions asks about your most recent pleasure or vacation trip that included travel to or through Northern Indiana.

29. In total, how long was your trip that included a visit to Northern Indiana? *Please fill in the blank.*

_____ Number of days(or portion of)

30. How many days (or portion of) did you spend in Northern Indiana on this trip? *Please fill in the blank.*

_____ Number of days(or portion of)

31. What was the nature of your most recent trip to Northern Indiana? *Please v all that apply.*

- ☐ Vacation ☐ Get away ☐ Business meeting
- ☐ Special event ☐ Visit family or friends ☐ Other (please specify) _____

32. How many persons were in the travel group on your most recent visit to Northern Indiana? *Please fill in the blank.*

_____ Number of persons in travel group

33. Please check the type(s) of person(s) that accompanied you on your most recent visit to Northern Indiana. *Please v all that apply.*

☐ Spouse ☐ Friend(s)/Relative(s) ☐ Part of a tour group
☐ Children ☐ Business associate(s) ☐ Traveled alone

34. What cities or towns did you visit on your most recent pleasure trip which included travel to or through Northern Indiana?

Please list all the places (cities/towns) you visited in Northern Indiana in the order of visitation. Please see the attached map of Northern Indiana.

Then, indicate how long you stayed and whether you stayed overnight at any of these destinations. Also, please specify whether this stop was planned in advance (before going on the trip). Last, please indicate the activities in which you participated during your visit using the following letter codes for each type of activity.

A. Antique shopping	L. Hunting/fishing
B. Beach/waterfront	M. Museum/play/concert
C. Biking	N. Nightlife
D. Bird watching	O. Overnight stay
E. Boat/auto/antique show	P. Restroom stop
F. Boating	Q. Shopping
G. Dining	R. Sightseeing
H. Festival/special event	S. Visit historic site
I. Gambling	T. Visiting friends/relatives
J. Golfing	U. Other
K. Hiking	

Northern Indiana city/town (start with the place you visited first)	How long did you stay?	Please V if you stayed overnight	Please V if you planned stop before taking trip	Please list as many activities as applicable using the letter codes provided above
	Please indicate whether you refer to hours or days by circling the appropriate unit.			
1. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
2. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
3. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
4. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
5. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
6. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
7. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
8. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
9. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
10. _____	_____ hour/day(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

35. What type(s) of overnight accommodations did you use on this trip to Northern Indiana? Please v all that apply.

☐ Please V if you did not stay overnight in Northern Indiana.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hotel | <input type="checkbox"/> Bed & Breakfast | <input type="checkbox"/> Family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Motel | <input type="checkbox"/> Camping | <input type="checkbox"/> Friends |

36. Overall, how satisfied are you with your visit to Northern Indiana? Please circle one.

Not at all Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

37. Would you encourage others to visit Northern Indiana because of your most recent trip? Please v one.

☐ Yes ☐ No

38. What are the two (2) things you liked most about your visit to Northern Indiana? Please fill in the blanks.

1. _____
2. _____

39. What are the two (2) things you liked least about your visit to Northern Indiana? Please fill in the blanks.

1. _____
2. _____

40. Do you plan to visit Northern Indiana again? Please v one.

☐ Yes ☐ No

if YES, what would you want to see or do? _____

The next questions ask about your travel expenditures during your most recent trip to Northern Indiana.

41. In total, how much did your entire travel party spend (including cash and credit) on your most recent trip to Northern Indiana for the following items? *Please estimate to the best of your ability.*

Expense Categories	Overall Trip Expenditures	Expenditures in Northern Indiana
Lodging	\$ _____	\$ _____
Meals and restaurants	\$ _____	\$ _____
Attractions / Festivals	\$ _____	\$ _____
Entertainment	\$ _____	\$ _____
Shopping (other than food)	\$ _____	\$ _____
Transportation (including gas)	\$ _____	\$ _____
Other (please specify) _____	\$ _____	\$ _____

42. How many adults and children do these expenses cover? *Please fill in a number for both.*

_____ Number of adult(s)

_____ Number of children

43. **Tell us your story!** We would like to learn more about your experience in Northern Indiana. We invite you to describe a special moment or event that made your most recent trip to Northern Indiana memorable. *Please describe in your own words using the space provided below.*

ABOUT YOURSELF

This last section of the survey asks for information about you and your family, and will be kept in the strictest confidence and used for statistical purposes only.

44. Are you? Please v one.

☐ Female

☐ Male

45. Your age? Please v one.

☐ Under 21 Years

☐ 36 - 45 Years

☐ 56 - 65 Years

☐ 21 - 35 Years

☐ 46 - 55 Years

☐ Over 65 Years

46. Are you married? Please v one.

☐ Yes

☐ No

47. How many children 17 years of age or younger are currently living in your household? Please fill in number.

_____ Number of children 0 to 18 years old

48. Which of the following statements best describes your total annual household income (from all sources) before taxes? Please v one.

☐ Less than \$10,000

☐ \$30,000 to \$39,999

☐ \$60,000 to \$69,999

☐ \$10,000 to \$19,999

☐ \$40,000 to \$49,999

☐ \$70,000 to \$79,999

☐ \$20,000 to \$29,999

☐ \$50,000 to \$59,999

☐ \$80,000 and over

49. Please list all the newspapers you read or look through during a typical week.

50. Please list all the magazines you read or looked through recently, whether at home or elsewhere.

51. Please list as many Web sites as possible that you look at regularly.

Thank you for your participation in this very important study!
Northern Indiana Tourism Office

**Don't forget to return your questionnaire for an opportunity to win
your choice among three different Northern Indiana Getaway Packages and a \$200 shopping spree.
The drawing will be held November 30, 2001.**

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Agarwal, V.B., & Yochum, G.R. (1999). Tourist Spending and Race of Visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38,173-176.
- Atchley, R.C. (1989). Continuity Theory of Normal Aging. *The Gerontologist*, 29(2), 183-190.
- Atchley, R.C. (1993). Continuity Theory and the Evolution of Activity i Later Adulthood. *In activity and Aging*, edited by J. Keily. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 5-16
- Beane, T., & Ennis, D. (1987). Market Segmentation: A Review. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(5), 20-42.
- Becker, C. (1992). Lebenslanges Urlaubsreiseverhalten-Erste Ergebnisse einer Pilotstudie (Lifelong Hosliday Behavior – First Results of a Pilot Study). *Materialien zur Fremdenverkehrsgeographie*, 25, 70-82.
- Beioley, S. (1997). Four Weddings, a Funeral and a Holiday: The Visiting Friends and Relatives Market. *Insight*, 8(July), B1-B15.
- Bryant, W.K. (1992). *The Economic Organization of the Household*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brayley, R.E. (1993). Psychographic Segmentation. *In VNR's Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism*, edited by M. Khan, O. Olsen, & T. Var. New York: Van Nostrand Rienhold, 902-909.
- Brayley, R.E. (1995). An Analysis of Destination Attractiveness and the Use of Psychographics and Demographics in Segmentation of the Within-stage Tourism Market, Ph.D dissertation, Texas A&M University.
- Buhalis, D. (1999). Marketing the Competitive Destination of the Future. *Tourism Management*, 21, 97-116.
- Burdge, R.J. (1969). Levels of Occupational Prestige and Leisure Activity. *Journal of Leisure Resarch*, 1(3), 267-274.
- Cai, L.A. (1998). Analyzing Household Food Expenditure Patterns on Trips and Vacations: A tobit model. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 22(4), 338 – 358.

- Cai, L.A., Hong, G., & Morrison, A.M. (1995). Household Expenditure Patterns for Tourism Products and Services. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 4(4), 15 – 40.
- Cai, L.A., Morrison, A.M., Braunlich, C. & O’Leary, J.T. (1996). Analyzing the US Pleasure travelers to China/Hong Kong: A classification model. *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, 4(2), 49-60.
- Cai, L.A., Hu, B., & Feng, R. (2001). Domestic Tourism Demand in China’s urban centres: Empirical analyses and marketing implications. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8(1), 64-75.
- Chon, K.S., & Whelihan, W.P. (1992). Changing Guest Preferences and Marketing Challenges in the Resort Industry. *FIU Hospitality Review*, 10(2), 9-16.
- Church (1969). A Proposed Model for Estimating and Analyzing Travel Expenditures. *Western Council for Travel Research Bulletin*, 8 (Summer), 1-6.
- Craig, W. (1972). Recreation Activity Patterns in a Small Negro Urban Community: The Role of the Cultural Base. *Economic Geography*, 48, 107-115.
- Crompton, J.L. (1979). Motivations of Pleasure Vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-24.
- Crouch, G.L. (1994). The Study of International Tourism Demand: A Review of Findings’. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23(1), 12-23.
- Collins D., Tisdell C., (2002). Gender and Differences in Travel Life Cycles. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41, 133-143.
- Cook, Jr., V.J., & Mindak, W.A. (1984). A Search for Constants; The Heavy User Revisited. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 1, 79-81.
- Dardis, R., Derrick, F., Lehfeld, A., & Wolfe, K. E. (1981). Cross-Section Studies of Recreation Expenditures in the United States. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 13(3), 181-194.
- Dardis, R., Soberon-Ferrer, H., & Patro, D. (1994). Analysis of Leisure Expenditures in the Unites States. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(4), 309-321.
- Davies, B., & Mangan, J. (1992). Family Expenditure on Hotels and holidays. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 691-699.

- Demby, E. (1974). Psychographics and from Whence it came, in W.D. Wells (ed.), *Lifestyle and Psychographics*. American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL, p.13.
- Domestic Research: Travel volume and Trends (2003). *Travel Industry Association of America*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.tia.org/Travel/tvt.asp>
- Economic Research: Economic Impact of Travel and Tourism in U.S. 2003 (2004). *Travel Industry Association of America*. Retrieved August 31, 2004, from <http://www.tia.org/Travel/econimpact.asp>
- Eugenio-Martin, J.L. (2003). Modelling Determinants of Tourism Demand as a Five Stage Process: A Discrete Choice Methodological Approach. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(4), 341-354.
- Fish, M., & Waggle, D. (1996). Current Income versus Total Expenditure Measures in Regression Models of Vacation and Pleasure Travel. *Journal of Travel Research*, 35, 70-74.
- Frechtling, D.C. (1987). Assessing the Impacts of Travel and Tourism-measuring Economic Costs. In: Brent Ritchie, J.R. and Goeldner, C., Editors, 1987. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 353-361.
- Frechtling, D.C. (1994). Assessing the Impacts of Travel and Tourism-measuring Economic Benefits. In: Brent Ritchie, J.R. and Goeldner, C., Editors, 1994. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 437-450.
- Gray, M.B. (1992, May). Consumer Spending on Durables and Services in the 1980's. *Monthly Labor Review*, 18-26.
- Giannelloni, J.L., & Valette-Florence, P. (1991). La mesure de l'efficacité? De la Communication Par l'événement: Une Approche Structurale. In *actes de Congrès*, edited by Association Française de Marketing, 252-276.
- Gieseman, R.W., & Moulton, B.R. (1986). *Estimates of the Income Elasticity of Expenditures for Food in 1985*. Washington DC: Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Gitelson, R.J., & Crompton, J. L. (1984). Insights into the Repeat Vacation Phenomenon. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11, 199-217.
- Gnoth, J. (1994). Expectations and Satisfaction in Tourism: An Exploratory Study into Measuring Satisfaction. Ph.D. diss., University of Otago, New Zealand.

- Goodall, B. (1991). Understanding Holiday Choice. In: C. Cooper, Editor, *Progress in Tourism, Recreation and Hospitality Management*, Belhaven, London (1991).
- Gyte, D.M., & A. Phelps (1989). Patterns of Destination Repeat Business: British Tourist in Mallorca, Spain. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(1), 24-28.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. & Black, W. (1992). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*, Third edition, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hall, C.M. (1992). Sex Tourism in South-east Asia. *In tourism and the Less Developed Countries*, edited by David Harrison. London: Belhaven, 64-74.
- Hall, C.M. (1994). Gender and Economic Interests in Tourism prostitution: The Nature, Development and Implication of Sex Tourism in South-east Asia. *In tourism: A Gender Analysis*, edited by Vivian Kinnaird and Derek Hall. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 142-163.
- Haywood, K.M. (1989). Managing Word-of-Mouth Communications. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 3(2), 55-67.
- Heckhausen, H. (1989). *Motivation and Handeln*. 2d ed. Berlin: Springer.
- Houthakker, H.S., & Taylor, L.D. (1970). *Consumer Demand in the United States*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Howard, D.R., Lankford, S.V., & Havitz, M.E. (1991). A Method for Authenticating Pleasure Travel and Tourism Expenditure. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29(1), 19-23.
- Howard, J. & Sheth, J.N. (1968). *The Theory of Buyer Behavior*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hsieh, S., Lang, C., & O'Leary, J.T. (1997). Modeling the Determinants of Expenditure for Travelers from France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom to Canada. *Journal of International Hospitality, Leisure & Tourism Management*, 1(1), 67-79.
- Jacobs, E., & Shipp, S. (1990, March). How Family Spending has changed in the U.S. *Monthly Labor Review*, 20 – 27.
- Jackson, R.T. (1990). VFR Tourism: Is It Underestimated? *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1(2), 10-17.

- Jafari, J. (1983 May). Anatomy of the Travel Industry. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 71-77.
- Jang, S., Bai, B., Hong, G.S., & O'Leary, J. (2003). Understanding Travel Expenditure Patterns: a Study of Japanese Travelers to the United States by Income Level. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 331-341.
- Jang, S., Morrison, A., & O'Leary, J. (2002). Benefit Segmentation of Japanese Pleasure Travelers to the USA and Canada: Selecting Target Markets based on the Profitability and Risk of Individual Market Segments. *Tourism Management*, 23, 367-378.
- Jang, S., Yu, L., & Pearson, T.E. (2003). Chinese Travellers to the United States Comparison of Business and Travel and Visiting Friends and Relatives. *Tourism Geographies*, 5(1), 87-108.
- Janini, G. (2003). Travel Expenditure in 2000. *Consumer Expenditure Survey Anthology 2003*. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 79 –81.
- Jensen, O., & Korneliussen, T. (2002). Discriminating Perceptions of a Peripheral 'Nordic Destination' among European Tourists. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3(4), 319-330.
- Kahle, L.R.I, ed. (1984). *Attitude and Social Adaptation: A Person-Situation Interaction Approach*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Kahle, L.R. (1999). Cross-national Consumer Psychographics. *International Business Press*, New York.
- Kahle, L.R., & Chiagouris, L. (1999). *Values, Lifestyles, and Psychographics*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Kim, J., & Kohout F.J. (1975). Multiple Regression Analysis: Subprogram Regression. *Statistical Package for the Social Science*, 2nd edition, N.Y.:McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Kotler, P. (1995). *Marketing Management Analysis, Planning, Implementation, and Control* (Vol.8). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, P. (1999). *Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, Implementation, and Control* (10th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc..
- Kotler, P., Haider,D.H. & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing Places*. New York: The Free Press.

- Lansing, J.B. & Morgan, J.N. (1971). *Economic Survey Methods*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 430 pp.
- LaPage, W.F. (1969). *Campground marketing: The Heavy-Half Strategy*. USDA Forest Service Research Note NE_93. Upper Darby, PA: North-eastern Forest Experiment Station.
- Lau, A.L.S., & McKercher, B. (2004). Exploration Versus Acquisition: A Comparison of First-Time and Repeat Visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 279-285.
- Lawson, R. (1991 Spring). Patterns of Tourist Expenditure and Types of Vacation across the Family Life Cycle. *Journal of Travel Research*, 12-17.
- Lawson, R. (1994). Demographic Segmentation. In *Tourism, Marketing and Management Handbook*, 2nd ed., edited by Stephen F. Witt and Luiz Moutinho. New York: Prentice Hall, 311-315.
- Lazersfeld, P.F. (1935). The Art of Asking Why. *National Marketing Review*, 1(1), 5-8.
- Lee, H.-C. (2001). Determinants of Recreational Boater Expenditures on Trips. *Tourism Management*, 22, 659-667.
- Legoherel, P. (1998). Toward A Market Segmentation of the Tourism Trade: Expenditure Levels and Consumer Behavior Instability. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7(3), 19-39.
- Lehto, X., O'Leary, J.T., & Morrison, A.M. (2001). Do Psychographics influence Vacation Destination Choices? A comparison of British travelers to North America, Asia and Oceania. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8(2), 109-125.
- Leones, J., Colby, B., & Crandall, K. (1998). Tracking Expenditures of the Elusive Nature Tourists of Southeastern Arizona. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36, 56-64.
- Madrigal, R., & Kahle, L.R. (1994). Predicting Vacation Activity Preferences on the Basis of Value-System Segmentation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32 (winter), 22-28.
- Mak, J., Moncur, J., & Yonamine, D. (1977). Determinants of Visitor Expenditures and Visitor Length of Stay: A Cross Sectional Analysis of U.S. Visitors to Hawaii. *Journal of Travel Research*, 15(3), 5-8.
- Mak, J., Moncur, J. & Yonamine, D. (1977). How or How Not to Measure Visitor Expenditure. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(Summer), 1-4.

- Marshment, M. (1997) *Gender takes a holiday. In Gender, Work and Tourism*, edited by M. Thea Sinclair. London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 16-34.
- Mayo, E.J. & Jarvis, L.P. (1981). *The Psychology of Leisure Travel: Effective Marketing and Selling of Travel Services*. CBI Publishing Company, Boston, MA.
- Mazursky, D. (1989). Past Experience and Future Tourism Decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16, 333-344.
- McGehee, N.G., Loker-Murphy, L., & Uysal, M. (1996). The Australian International Pleasure Travel Market: Motivation from a Gendered Perspective. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 7(1), 45-57.
- Meis, S., Joyal, S., & Trites, A. (1995). The US Repeat and VFR Visitor to Canada: Come Again, Eh! *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 6(1), 27-37.
- Mieczkowski, Z. (1990). *World Trends in Tourism and Recreation*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Mok, C., & Iverson, T.J. (2000). Expenditure-based Segmentation: Taiwanese Tourists to Guam. *Tourism Management*, 21, 299-305.
- Moutinho, L. (1987). Consumer Behaviour in Tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(10), 3-44.
- Mules, R.(1998). Decomposity of Australian Tourist Expenditure. *Tourism Management*, 19(3), 267 – 271.
- Murphy, P. (1985). *Tourism: A Community Approach*, Methuen, New York (1985)
- Navarro, R.L., & Turco, D. (1994). Segmentation of the Visiting Friends and Relatives Market. *Visions in Leisure & Business*, 13(1), 4-16.
- Nevans, R. (1976). The Serious Business of Play. *Financial World* 145, (June 1, 1976), 6-8.
- Okubo, S. & Planting, M.A. (1998). U.S. Travel and Tourism Satellite Accounts for 1992. *Survey of Current Business*, 78(7), 8-22.
- Oppermann, M. (1995). Travel Life Cycle. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(3), 535-552.

- Oppermann, M. (1996). Visitation of Tourism Attractions and Tourist Expenditure Patterns; Repeat Versus First-time Visitors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 1(1), 61- 68.
- Oppermann, M. (1997). First-Time and Repeat Visitors to New Zealand. *Tourism Management*, 18(3), 177-181.
- Oppermann, M. (2000). Tourism Destination Loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 78-84.
- Oppermann, M., & Chon, K.S. (1995). Time-series Analysis of German Outbound Travel Patterns. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 2(1), 39-52.
- Orlando/Orange County Convention and Visitors Bureau (2003). *Annual Research Report, Executive Summary*. Orlando, FL.
- Paci, E. (1994). The Major International VFR Markets. *Travel & Tourism Analyst*, 6, 36-50.
- Pacific Asia Travel Association (1997, April). *Issues of Trends, Pacific Asia Travel*. San Francisco: Author.
- Park, M., Yang, X., Lee, B., Jang, H-C, & Stokowski, P.A., (2002). Segmenting Casino Gamblers by Involvement Profiles: a Colorado Example. *Tourism Management*, 23(1), 55-65.
- Pearce, D. (1988). Tourist Time-budgets. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 106–121.
- Pearce, P. (1993). Fundamentals of Tourist Motivation. In *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges*, edited by D.G. Pearce and R.W. Butler. London: Routledge, 113-134.
- Perdue, R. (1986). The Influence of Unplanned Attraction Visits on Expenditures by Travel-through Visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(1), 14-20.
- Phlips, L. (1974). *Applied Consumption Analysis*. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishing Co.
- Pizam, A., & Neumann, Y., & Reichel, A. (1979). Tourist Satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(2), 195-197.
- Pizam, A., & Reichel, A. (1979). Big Spenders and Little Spenders in US Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 18(2), 42-43.

- Plog, S.C. (1987). Understanding Psychographics in Tourism Research. *In Travel, Tourism, and Hospitality Research*, edited by Ritchie, J.R.B. & Goeldner, C.R. New York: John Wiley, 203-213.
- Plog, S.C (1991). Leisure Travel: Making It a Growth Market... Again! New York: John Wiley.
- Plog, S.C. (2002). The Power of Psychographics and the Concept of Venturesomeness. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40, 244-251.
- Prais, S.J., & Houthakker, H.S. (1971). *The Analysis of Family Budgets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prideaux, B. (2000). The Role of the Transport System in Destination Development. *Tourism Management*, 21(1), 53-63.
- Pyo, S.S., Uysal, M., & McLellan, R.W. (1991). A Linear Expenditure Model for Tourism Demand. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18, 443-454.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R.N. (1975). *Leisure and the Family Life Cycle*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Reid, L.J., & Reid, S.D. (1993). Communicating Tourism Supplier Services: Building Repeat Visitor Relationships. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 2 (2/3), 3-20.
- Ritchie, J.R.B (1975). Some Critical Aspects of Measurement Theory and Practice in Travel Research. *Journal of Travel Research*, 14(Summer), 1-10.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.
- Rosenberg, L.J, & Czepiel, J.A. (1983). A Marketing Approach for Customer Retention. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 1, 45-51.
- Schmidhauser, H. (1976 – 1977). Neue Erkenntnisse? Ber Gesetzm? Ssigkeiten bei der Wahl des Reiseziels (New Insights in the Regularities in Destination Choice. *Jahrbuch f? r Fremdenverkehr*, 24/25, 86-102.
- Schul, P., & Crompton, J.L. (1983). Search Behavior of International Vacationers: Travel-specific Lifestyle and Socio-demographic Variables. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22, 25-30.

- Searle, M.S., Mactavish, J.B., & Brayley, R.E. (1993). Integrating Ceasing Participation with Other Aspects of Leisure Behavior: A Replication and Extension. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(Fall), 389-404.
- Seaton, A.V., & Palmer, G. (1997). Understanding VFR Tourism Behavior: The First Five Years of the United Kingdom Tourism Survey. *Tourism Management*, 18(6), 345-355.
- Sheldon, P.J. (1993). Forecasting Tourism: Expenditures versus Arrivals. *Journal of Travel Research*, 32(1), 13-20.
- Sheldon, P.J. & Mak, J. (1987). The Demand for Package Tours: A Mode Choice Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(3), 13-17.
- Smallwood, D. (1981). *The Impact of Household Characteristics on Food Away From Home Expenditures*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Advancement of Food Service Industry Research, Beltsville, Maryland.
- Spotts, D.M., & Mahoney, E.M. (1991). Segmenting Visitors to a Destination Region based on the Volume of Their Expenditure. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29(4), 24-31.
- Statistics on Tourism Expenditure (1993). *World Tourism Organization*. Retrieved July 30, 2004, from http://www.worldtourism.org/statistics/tsa_project/TSA_in_depth/chapters/ch1-2-5.htm
- Steel, B.F. (1981). Measuring Tourist Expenditures – A discussion Paper, unpublished manuscript, New Zealand Tourist and Public Department, 11.
- Stynes, D.J., & Mahoney E.M. (1980). Michigan Downhill Ski Marketing Study: Segmenting Active Skiers. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station Research Report 391.
- Swarbrooke, J., & Horner, S. (1999). *Consumer Behaviour in Tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Thompson, C.S., & Tinsley, W.A. (1979). Income Elasticities for Recreation: Their Estimation and Relation to Demand for Recreation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 10(4), 265-270.
- Twedt, D.W. (1964). How Important to Marketing Strategy is the “Heavy User?” *Journal of Marketing*, 28, 71-72.
- Um, S. & Crompton, J.L. (1990). Attitude Determinants in Tourism Destination Choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 432-448.

- United Nations (UN) Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis and World Tourism Organization (WTO) (1994). *Recommendations on Tourism Statistics*. New York: United Nations.
- US Travel Data Center (1989). *The 1988-89 Economic Review of Travel in America*. Washington DC: US Travel Data Center.
- Uysal, M., & Hagan, L.A.R. (1993). *Motivation of Pleasure Travel and Tourism*. In *VNR's Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism*, edited by M.Khan, O.Olsen, and T.Var. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 798-813.
- Vyncke, P. (2002). Lifestyle Segmentation: From Attitudes, Interests and Opinions, to Values, Aesthetic Styles, Life Visions and Media preferences. *European Journal of Communication*, 17(4), 445-463.
- Water, S.R. (1993). *U.S. International Travel Industry World Yearbook – The Big Picture 1993 – 1994*. N.Y.: Child & Waters, Inc.
- Waters, S. (1988). *Travel Industry World Yearbook*. New York: Child and Waters.
- Watson, A., Roggenbuck, J.W., & Williams, D.R. (1991). The Influence of past Experience on Wilderness Choice. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23(1), 21-36.
- Wells, W.D. (1974). *Lifestyle and Psychographics*. American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL.
- Wells, W.D., & Gubar, G. (1966). The Life Cycle Concept in Marketing Research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 3(4), 355-363.
- Wetzel, J.R. (1990, March). American Families: 75 years of Change. *Monthly Labor Review*, 4-13.
- Wicks, B.E., & Schuett, M.A. (1993). Using Travel Brochures to target Frequent Travelers and “Big-spenders” *Journal of Travel And Tourism Marketing*, 2, 77-90.
- Williams, L.J. & Brown, B.K. (1994). Method Variance in Organizational Behavior and Human Research: Effects on Correlations, Path Coefficients, and Hypothesis Testing, *Organization Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 57, 185-209.
- Williams, L.J., Cote, J.A., & Buckley, M.R. (1989). Lack of Method Variance in Self-Reported Affect and Perceptions at Work: Reality or Artifact? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 462-468.

- Witt, S.F. & Witt, C.A. (1991). *Modeling and Forecasting Demand in Tourism*, London, Academic Press; Song, H. and Witt, S.F. (2000). *Tourism Demand Modeling and Forecasting: Modern Econometric Approaches*, Amsterdam, Pergamon.
- Woodside, A.G. & Pitts, R.E. (1976). Effects of Consumer Life-styles, Demographics, and Travel Activities on Foreign and Domestic Travel Behavior. *Journal of Travel Research*, 14(2), 13-15.
- Woodside, A.G., Mazanec, J.A. (2000). *Consumer Psychology of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure*. Oxon: Wallingford.
- Woodside, A.G. & Lysonski, S. (1989). A General Model of Traveler Destination Choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27, 8-14.
- World Tourism Organization (WTO) (2001). *Travel Industry Yearbook, The Big Picture*, 2001, 4.
- Yuan, T.F. Fridgen, J.D., Hsieh, S., & O'Leary, J.T. (1995). Visiting Friends and Relatives Travel Market: The Dutch Case. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 6(1), 19-26.
- Zhou, Z. (2000). The Impact of Memory on Expenditures Recall in Tourism Conversion Studies. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 303-307.
- Zins, A.H. (1998). Leisure Traveler Choice Models for Theme Hotels Using Psychographics. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(4), 3-15.