

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254379059>

# Consumer Behavior and Tourism

Article in *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* · February 1995

DOI: 10.1300/J073v03n03\_03

CITATIONS

55

READS

10,841

2 authors, including:



**Frederic Dimanche**

Toronto Metropolitan University

88 PUBLICATIONS 3,242 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Involvement in leisure, recreation and tourism [View project](#)



Creating Experience Value in Tourism [View project](#)

# Consumer Behavior and Tourism: Review and Extension of Four Study Areas

Frédéric Dimanche  
Mark E. Havitz

**SUMMARY.** Consumer behavior research constitutes a cornerstone of marketing strategy and practice, and an increasing number of tourist behavior studies have been published in the past few years. This paper examines the current literature related to four prevalent topical areas associated with consumer behavior in recreational and touristic contexts: Ego involvement, loyalty and commitment, family decision-making, and novelty seeking. The paper's primary focus is on conceptual and measurement issues, but implications of each of these areas to marketing practice are also considered.

Solomon (1992) defined consumer behavior as the study of the processes involved when individuals or groups select, purchase, use, or dispose of products, services, ideas, or experiences to satisfy needs and desires. Van Raaij (1986, p. 2) posited that "Consumer research on tourism should be a cornerstone of marketing strategy." Indeed, an understanding of consumer behavior is required in order to make adequate

---

Frédéric Dimanche is affiliated with the School of Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Administration, College of Business, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, LA 70148.

Mark E. Havitz is affiliated with the Department of Recreation and Leisure Studies, University of Waterloo.

[Haworth co-indexing entry note: "Consumer Behavior and Tourism: Review and Extension of Four Study Areas." Dimanche, Frédéric, and Mark E. Havitz. Co-published simultaneously in the *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* (The Haworth Press, Inc.) Vol. 3, No. 3, 1994, pp. 37-57; and: *Economic Psychology of Travel and Tourism* (ed. John C. Crofts, and W. Fred van Raaij). The Haworth Press, Inc., 1994, pp. 37-57. Multiple copies of this article/chapter may be purchased from The Haworth Document Delivery Center (1-800-3-HAWORTH; 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. (EST)).

marketing decisions (Moutinho, 1987). Typically, consumer behavior has attempted to explain the decision making processes of consumers facing several alternatives or choices. Consumer behavior research has attained increasing prominence in the leisure literature in the past decade, but relatively few tourist-based consumer behavior studies have been conducted in the past years, with some exceptions such as satisfaction and motivation research (e.g., Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981; Mansfield, 1992; van Raaij & Francken, 1984). A large segment of academic research is dedicated to tourism marketing, and it seems that more studies have focused on describing or segmenting tourists rather than understanding and explaining their consumption behavior. The tourism experience, although unique because of its nature, can be related to consumption behavior (Dimanche & Sandahl, 1991; Urry, 1990), and specific studies examining the interactions between the many elements and processes involved in consumer behavior should be conducted in the context of tourism.

The purpose of this paper is to review and synthesize current literature related to four topical areas associated with consumer behavior in recreational and touristic contexts: Ego involvement, loyalty and commitment, family decision-making, and novelty seeking. The implications of each of these areas to marketing practice will also be considered although this paper's primary focus will be on conceptual and measurement issues. These four topics do not represent the breadth of all consumer behavior research, nor are they necessarily the highest priority area for future study. However, they have been well covered in the consumer behavior and marketing literature and have recently received growing attention in the travel and leisure literature. Because of their intrinsic importance in the tourist's decision-making process, each shows promise for better understanding recreational and touristic behavior. With regards to involvement theory, Stewart and Slynnes have contributed to this edition with a paper titled "Toward a dynamic model of complex tourism choices: The seasonal home location decision." Also, Gjelsten and Kerstetter added to this edition's treatment of family decision-making with their article on "The influence of non-family members in travel decision making."

### EGO INVOLVEMENT

Among these four topics, the largest body of leisure and tourism research is related to involvement. Consumer involvement with products has been the object of a long line of research in the consumer behavior literature, and it is now widely recognized as a significant variable by marketing scholars and practitioners. The following will outline the state of

involvement research in touristic and recreational contexts and indicate recommendations for future studies (a selection of major findings related to involvement in tourism and leisure contexts appears in Table 1).

Involvement can be defined as an unobservable state of motivation, arousal, or interest, evoked by a particular stimulus or situation, and that has drive properties. Its consequences are types of searching, information-processing, and decision making (Rohschild, 1984). Most of the involvement research in leisure and tourism contexts has initially focused on conceptual and measurement concerns (e.g., Dimanche, Havitz, & Howard, 1991; Havitz & Dimanche, 1990; McIntyre, 1989; Selin & Howard, 1988; Watkins, 1987). These conceptual and methodological studies paved the way for considering involvement as a multidimensional construct. Most involvement researchers (e.g., Dimanche et al., 1991; Laurent & Kapferer, 1985; McIntyre & Pigram, 1992; McQuarrie & Munson, 1987) agree that multi-

TABLE 1. Selected leisure and tourism-related research with involvement (inv.).

| Authors and dates           | Purpose or findings                                                                                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Selin & Howard (1988)       | Conceptual presentation of inv. to explain attachment between individuals and leisure pursuits.                 |
| Bloch et al. (1989)         | Sport equipment inv. found to significantly influence spending levels and opinion leadership.                   |
| Fesenmaier & Johnson (1989) | Behavioral measure of inv. found useful to segment tourists.                                                    |
| McIntyre (1989)             | Empirical study showing the multidimensional nature of inv.                                                     |
| Havitz & Dimanche (1990)    | Conceptual argument and propositions for using multidimensional inv. in leisure and tourism studies.            |
| Dimanche et al. (1991)      | Translated inv. Profile scale and tested its validity and reliability in recreational and touristic contexts.   |
| Norman (1991)               | Inv. and previous vacation experience better predictor of travel intentions than other psychological variables. |
| Madrigal et al. (1992)      | Relationships between level of inv. with family vacations and selected personal variables were found.           |
| McIntyre & Pigram (1992)    | used inv. profiles to differentiate between campers.                                                            |
| Dimanche et al. (1993)      | Inv. profiles shown useful as tourism segmentation tool.                                                        |
| Feld & Crompton (1993)      | Conceptual argument and propositions for studying involvement's relationships to 5 decision-making paradigms.   |

dimensional conceptualizations which consider antecedent dimensions of the construct are more accurate and useful than simple high-low involvement distinctions. For further review of the involvement construct in the consumer behavior literature, the reader is referred to Laurent and Kapferer (1985) and Zaichkowsky (1985). Most consumer behavior research has been conducted in product contexts, whereas recreation and tourism research has focused more on activity contexts.

Dimanche et al. (1991) translated from French, then tested for reliability and validity the Involvement Profile (IP) scale (Laurent & Kapferer, 1985). This scale, designed to measure four facets of involvement (i.e., importance-pleasure, sign value, risk consequences, and risk probability) in recreational and touristic contexts, was subsequently used in studies of activities where involvement was either a dependent or an independent variable. For example, Dimanche, Havitz, and Howard (1993) showed that involvement could be used in touristic contexts as a basis for market segmentation, responding to Felsenmaier and Johnson's (1989), and Havitz and Dimanche's (1990) recommendations. Their segmentation study demonstrated that involvement profiles, revealing the facets of involvement, provided more information about a person's relationship to a touristic activity than a single involvement score. Dimanche et al. (1993) noted that the practical application of involvement segmentation extends well beyond promotional implications to program development, pricing, and distribution strategies.

A future challenge for involvement researchers will be to measure tourists' involvement with destinations. Measuring people's involvement profiles with various vacation destinations would have relevance for businesses such as airlines, tour-operators, travel agencies, or for organizations such as conventions and visitors bureaux, state or national tourism agencies, etc.

At least two directions of tourism destination involvement research have been suggested to date. Brown (1991) explored tourism place-identity from the perspective of guests (tourists), whereas Ap (1992) examined destination involvement from the perspective of hosts (local residents). Both directions offer promise for improving the quality of experiences for both host and guest populations, and they also allow for tests of theory. Brown's symbolic interaction-based inquiry was qualitative and did not utilize any of the standardized instrumentation common to much of the research cited in this section. However, specific facets of involvement such as importance and sign (Havitz & Dimanche, 1990) were central to tourists' descriptions of place. Also, Ap found that destination involve-

ment was an important component of the social exchange model developed to study host-guest relations.

Another potentially important area of research that has been neglected by consumer behavior researchers and which could make a significant contribution to tourism marketing is the study of consumer involvement with services. To date, involvement researchers' focus has been on products and activities, despite the economic importance of the service sector, and the distinction between products and services (Zeithaml, Parasuraman, & Berry, 1985). Geluch and Longfellow (1992) used a multidimensional conceptualization of involvement to initiate this line of research in the context of services such as life insurance, medical services, or restaurants. Tourism researchers certainly should further develop the study of tourist involvement with touristic services.

Researchers continue to explore the relationship between enduring and situational involvement (Howard & Havitz, 1993; Richins, Bloch, & McQuarrie, 1992), as well as the importance of involvement in pricing, communication (advertising and promotion), and product development strategies. Richins et al. found that the relationship between situational and enduring (ego) involvement was better described by an additive model rather than an interactive model. That is, situational involvement did not increase or decrease exponentially based on individuals' levels of enduring involvement. Rather, situational and enduring components seemed to operate relatively independent of each other, both contributing to overall involvement with purchase decisions. Howard and Havitz found general support for Laurent and Kapferer's (1985) conceptual argument that importance and pleasure represent enduring facets and that sign and risk consequences fluctuate based on situational considerations. In this case the situational contexts were represented by in-season, off-season, and pre-season measurements of involvement with golfing, skiing, and windsurfing. Contrary to predictions, scores appeared to be stable (enduring) across seasons for the risk probability facet.

Involvement is generally acknowledged in the consumer behavior literature as a major factor in the decision making process; therefore, exploring the relationships between the involvement facets and specific behaviors such as information search, receptivity to promotional stimuli, or brand loyalty should be tourism researchers' next priority. For example, researchers could explore how to increase tourists' levels of involvement with destinations or tourism services. An involved consumer is more likely to understand and memorize promotional stimuli, and to purchase the product or service that raised his/her level of involvement. Though none have been conducted to date, numerous opportunities for controlled exper-

imental studies exist in this area. The relationship between involvement and perceptions of service quality should also be examined as has been done with loyalty research (Veldkamp & Backman, 1992) and complaint behavior research (Twyman, 1993). The study of service quality became more sophisticated with the development of standardized measurement tools resulting from the pioneering efforts of Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985, 1988). The nature of the relationship between involvement and perceptions of service quality appears to be an area needing exploration. For example, high involvement services may have different service quality definitions than low involvement services. Specific relationships could be found between the facets of involvement and the dimensions of service quality. Better comprehension of these constructs could help marketers understand their role in the formation of purchase intentions. Although service quality-involvement linkages are yet to be explored, researchers have begun to link involvement research with other social-psychological constructs.

Norman (1991) indicated that level of involvement and previous vacation experience were better predictors of summer travel than were other social psychological variables. Also, the effect of involvement can be related to consumer loyalty towards services. Pritchard (1992) found that involvement levels were positively correlated to psychological commitment with hotels and airlines. Siegenthaler and Lam (1992) found similar results in the context of recreational tennis. These results were consistent with Backman and Crompton's (1990a, 1990b) findings that level of involvement and attitude toward recreational activities such as tennis and golf were the best predictors of whether people would drop-out or continue participation. Madrigal, Havitz, and Howard's (1992) study of married couples' family vacation decision processes reveal relationships between involvement and gender role ideology. Specifically, more modern couples found the process to be more important and pleasurable than did more traditional couples.

The measurement tools to study involvement have been developed. Researchers now need to focus on understanding the relationships between involvement and other constructs in order to provide tourism marketers with practical recommendations that will enhance the tourist's experience.

### LOYALTY AND COMMITMENT

Loyalty represents another construct central to the study of tourist behavior. Service providers (e.g., airlines or hotels) rival with strategies such as frequent user programs in order to create customer loyalty. It is a well-known fact to marketers that keeping customers is less expensive

than creating new ones. The challenge is to understand and appropriately use the factors that will determine customer loyalty (a selection of significant loyalty research in tourism and leisure contexts appears in Table 2).

Similarly to involvement, measurement and conceptual issues have dominated research related to loyalty and commitment (Buchanan, 1985). Day (1969, p. 35) argued that loyalty was based on an evaluative decision and affective orientation which could be considered a "commitment to the brand." This close association characterized most early research which generally did not distinguish between loyalty and commitment. Pritchard, Howard, and Havitz (1992) noted that loyalty and commitment represent but two of the numerous terms in this line of research. An additional

TABLE 2. Selected leisure and tourism-related research with loyalty and commitment.

| Authors and dates          | Purpose or findings                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jarvis & Mayo (1986)       | Developed a two-dimensional (attitudes and frequency of stay) paradigm of hotel loyalty. Seven loyalty types are described                                                                                                   |
| Gyle & Phelps (1989)       | Investigated the pattern of repeat visitation to a vacation destination.                                                                                                                                                     |
| Backman & Crompton (1990a) | Developed a two-dimensional (psychological attachment and behavioral consistency) paradigm of activity loyalty. Four types are described (i.e., low, spurious, latent, and high).                                            |
| Backman & Crompton (1990b) | Behavioral, attitudinal, and composite measures of activity loyalty capture three different dimensions of the phenomenon.                                                                                                    |
| Pritchard et al. (1992)    | Review of commitment and loyalty literature.                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Pritchard (1992)           | Developed and tested an instrument to measure tourist loyalty.                                                                                                                                                               |
| Twyman (1992)              | Correlation between involvement and commitment to hotels and airlines were found.                                                                                                                                            |
|                            | Support found for Singh's model of consumer complaint behavior in travel contexts. Various dimensions of involvement were correlated with propensity to complain about poor service, and with alternative courses of action. |
| Pritchard & Howard (1993)  | Argued that traditional unidimensional measurement of the attitudinal component of loyalty is incomplete. Developed the PCI which measures symbolic consistency, volition, and complexity.                                   |

problem was early researchers' inconsistent and interchangeable use of attitudinal and behavioral measures of loyalty. This confusion was partially clarified when Backman and Crompton (1990a, 1990b) and Jarvis and Mayo (1986) proposed two-dimensional typologies for considering attitudinal and behavioral components of loyalty in recreational activities and travel contexts, respectively. These two-dimensional conceptualizations greatly enhanced our understanding of consumer loyalty. They are not without shortcomings however. For example, Pritchard et al. (1992) provided evidence that both the behavioral and attitudinal components are very complex (i.e., multidimensional) and that numerous measurement options are available. Four types of behavioral loyalty measurement have been commonly used in consumer research: Sequence of brand purchase, proportion of brand purchase, probability of purchase, and combinations of the first three measures (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978). Pritchard's (1992) research suggested that the latter form of measurement is most appropriate in tourism contexts because behavioral loyalty patterns varied widely based on industry types (i.e., lodging, transportation, and attractions). As such, results of even relatively simple behavioral loyalty research are often difficult to compare directly.

The attitudinal component is even more complex and as a result is often ignored in loyalty research or more subject to ad hoc measurement. Pritchard et al. (1992) argued that loyalty and commitment are not interchangeable terms and that commitment should be reserved only for the attitudinal component of loyalty. Pritchard and Howard's (1993) Psychological Commitment Instrument (PCI) provided the first rigorous measure of tourist commitment. The PCI was subjected to a rigorous battery of reliability and validity tests yielding a three-dimensional instrument which measures: (a) symbolic consistency, respondents' overall reluctance to change important associations; (b) respondents' perceptions of complexity, the number of ideas or reasons impacting the decision; and (c) their perceptions of volition, or the component of free choice and control over their preferences. Pritchard tested the PCI in the context of transportation services, hospitality services, and attraction oriented services, in order to ensure that the instrument would be applicable to the broadest possible range of travel services.

The conceptual and measurement advances made by Backman and Crompton (1990a, 1990b), Buchanan (1985), Jarvis and Mayo (1986), and Pritchard (1992) should pay dividends in the near future. These advances should be especially helpful in clarifying the relationship between loyalty and other social-psychological constructs such as involvement and perception of service quality. Numerous exploratory efforts have been undertaken in the past few years. For example, Twynnam (1993) studied the relation-

ship between complaint behavior and loyalty, and found that dissatisfied travelers used a complex mix of voice (seek redress from the seller), private (negative word of mouth), and third party (e.g., legal action) responses. Hotel patrons were much more likely to switch brands than were airline patrons. Bloch, Black, and Lichtenstein (1989) and Siegenthaler and Lam (1992) examined the relationship between commitment and ego involvement. Bloch et al. found no significant relationship between equipment involvement and behavioral commitment (loyalty), whereas Siegenthaler and Lam found a positive relationship between activity involvement and attitudinal commitment. Backman (1991) found no relationship between social, individual, and price constraints in leisure loyalty. However, transportation- and promotion-related constraints were perceived differently by people in various loyalty-based segments. Veldkamp and Backman (1992) recorded that participants' perceptions of the importance of the tangible dimensions of service quality was related to loyalty types. However, other dimensions of service quality were not related to them. In summary, leisure researchers have established tentative relationships between loyalty and other social-psychological constructs. Nevertheless, few of these studies were conducted in tourism contexts and multiple instruments were used to measure each construct. For example, involvement was measured in three of those studies, each time with a different scale. Replication and extension of these exploratory efforts are needed before definitive conclusions can be established.

### NOVELTY

The concept of novelty seeking is not new or should we say, not novel to tourism researchers. Not surprisingly, of the four consumer behavior topics discussed in this paper, novelty is the one area that is more prevalent in tourism research than in leisure research. Three decades ago, psychologists such as Berlyne (1960) and Hunt (1961) studied people's search for incongruity, uncertainty, novelty and complexity. Theoretically, novelty or the discontinuation of routine leads to higher levels of arousal, and tourists may seek experiences that provide new sources of stimulation. Novelty seeking is often reported as a key motive in tourist motivation studies (e.g., Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981). The literature also seems to indicate that "vacationers taking novel trips differ in several fundamental ways from vacationers taking familiar or common place trips" (Bello & Etzel, 1985). For example, vacationers taking novel trips seek more advice on the destination and spend more time and money during the trip than do

travelers taking commonplace trips (a selection of novelty-related research in tourism contexts appears in Table 3).

Two decades ago, Cohen (1972) and Plog (1974) presented novelty-oriented tourism typologies based on sociological and psychological models respectively. Initially accepted with little challenge, these two widely cited typologies have formed the conceptual basis for much of the recently conducted tourism novelty research. Cohen (1972) tried to differentiate between international tourists based on the degree to which they seek novelty or familiarity in their travel experience, originally proposing four tourist roles: "drifter," "explorer," "individual mass tourist," and "organized mass tourist." He then recommended (1974) that further methodological refinement be used to measure these differences in quantitative terms. Pearce (1985) noted that unfortunately, researchers were slow to follow Cohen's suggestion.

Snepenger (1987) conducted the first empirical test of Cohen's typology using Cohen's roles to segment travelers to Alaska and found partial support for the typology. Three of Cohen's four original tourist roles were evident in the sample: organized mass tourist (54% of the sample), individual mass tourist (20%), and explorer (26%). However, three limitations of Snepenger's work have been pointed out. First, the study only consid-

TABLE 3. Selected leisure and tourism-related research with novelty.

| Authors and dates                  | Purpose or findings                                                                         |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cohen (1972)                       | Conceptual classification of international tourist roles based on novelty seeking.          |
| Bello & Etzel (1985)               | Novelty seekers' behavior differ from familiarity seekers.                                  |
| Snepenger (1987)                   | Found some support for Cohen's typology, using a behavioral measure of loyalty.             |
| Yiannakis & Gibson (1992)          | Developed and tested a Travel Role Preference Questionnaire.                                |
| Lee & Crompton (1992)              | Developed and tested a four-dimensional scale measuring novelty seeking.                    |
| Crooks (1993)                      | Investigated correlations between novelty seeking (measured with behavior) and personality. |
| Fainecke, Flynn & Goldsmith (1993) | Tested a one-dimensional innovativeness scale in the context of travel services.            |
| Mo et al. (1993)                   | Developed and tested a three-dimensional International Tourist Role scale.                  |

ered the behavioral component of novelty, admittedly also an attitudinal construct. Second, a single item was used to operationalize behavior, and third the sample frame included primarily domestic rather than international tourists.

In contrast to the relatively ad hoc nature of most previous quantitative novelty-based instrumentation, Yiannakis and Gibson (1992) developed their Travel Role Preference Questionnaire (TRPQ) with an extensive battery of reliability and validity tests. Their research has advanced considerably researchers' abilities to operationalize the various forms of tourist behavior described in Cohen's (1979) and Pearce's (1982, 1985) work. Yiannakis and Gibson tested the TRPQ with several probability and purposively selected samples and reported 13 distinct tourist roles, a more discriminating set of roles than was reported in either Cohen's early (1972) or latter (1974) efforts. Respondents are asked to consider TRPQ items based on "the degree to which a variety of roles best described their actual behaviors while on vacation" (p. 292).

Another recent advance, Mo, Howard, and Havitz' (1993) 20-item International Tourist Role (ITR) scale was designed to capture the novelty related nuances of international pleasure travel as proposed by Cohen (1972). Like the TRPQ, it was subjected to a rigorous battery of reliability and validity tests. The items comprising the ITR scale represent three dimensions. The "Destination-Oriented Dimension" (DOD) represents an individual's preferences for novelty and familiarity especially when choosing among international travel destinations. The "Travel Services Dimension" (TSD) measures the extent to which an individual prefers to travel with or without institutionalized travel services when traveling in a foreign country. The "Social Contact Dimension" (SCD) measures the individual's preferences regarding the extent and variety of social contacts with local people when traveling in a foreign country. Practical application of the ITR scale suggested that it is effective in generating distinct target markets based on novelty seeking attitudes and that the target markets are also socio-demographically and behaviorally distinct (Mo et al., 1993).

The travel preference groups identified by Mo et al. (1993) and Yiannakis and Gibson (1992) share characteristics with, but are not identical to the original four groups proposed by Cohen. For example, Mo et al. reported a universally novelty seeking group (similar to Cohen's drifters) and a universally familiarity seeking group (similar to Cohen's organized mass tourist). But, they also reported several groups with complex novelty seeking preferences that were not analogous to Cohen's middle range (individual mass tourist and explorer) groups. Therefore, the tourist roles described in the two recent studies may be different from Cohen's original

roles because of the more complex multidimensional interpretation of novelty. Cohen's typology is not wrong, but it may oversimplify the reality of tourist roles. Extensions on the original model were also expressed in Cohen's most recent work.

Another rigorously tested novelty seeking scale was developed by Lee and Crompton (1992). Purporting to measure the psychological construct of novelty, this scale comprised four dimensions: thrill, change from routine, boredom alleviation, and surprise. Lee and Crompton confirmed that tourists could be differentiated on the basis of novelty seeking attitudes. Their review of the novelty seeking phenomenon was more comprehensive in scope than was the work of Yiannakis and Gibson (1992) and Mo et al. (1993) who focused primarily on the theoretical works of Cohen (1972) and Pearce (1985). In this sense, Lee and Crompton's scale may have the broadest application potential of the three scales whereas the TRPQ and ITR scales may provide more in-depth information in specific circumstances. Rather than competing with each other, these three scales may be complementary because they were not designed to serve the same purpose. For example, The ITR and TRPQ scales, which were developed in the context of international tourism may find some applications with marketers concerned with attracting international tourists, whereas Lee and Crompton's scale may be used with either international or domestic travelers, and perhaps even in non-touristic leisure contexts. The ITR can be used to study attitudes of experienced international travelers and people who have not traveled internationally whereas the TRPQ assumes some past travel experience.

All three scales were developed in English using American samples. Therefore, their use with markets from other countries and cultures may be limited at this point. Dimanche (in press) and Plog (1991) highlighted the special challenges associated with conducting multicultural research in tourism situations. Nonetheless, the novelty topic and the growth of international travel combine to provide a fertile area for future research. Expanded research agendas using all three of these scales with a variety of international samples represent a logical next step.

Pragmatically, knowledge of the novelty construct can be used by destination marketers who may want to use in their communication strategies some cues that would attract novelty seekers or, in the opposite, familiarity seekers. Less apparent, but equally if not more important, novelty research can help tourism planners develop appropriate facilities and programs, distribution, and pricing strategies that are congruent with the benefits sought by specific markets.

Like Cohen's work, Plog's (1974) typology has also been widely cited.

However, academicians have been slow to apply it and test it. Plog posited that the members of the US population could be classified on a psychographic continuum. At one extreme are psychocentrics, whose concerns are self-centered and relatively narrow. At the other end are allocentrics, whose concerns and interests are varied in nature. Plog (1991) argued that this typology may be helpful in determining an individual's propensity to travel, the type of travel services used, and the type of destinations they would select. His 1974 work suggested that the typology was most accurate in classifying individuals near the poles and less accurate for classifying individuals in between (midcentrics).

Smith (1990a) authored the first independent test of the allocentric-psychocentric typology using international travel markets. He found very limited support for the typology as a predictor of travel destination choice. Following that, Plog (1991) and Smith (1990b) published a series of exchanges in which they clarified their positions regarding the legitimacy of Smith's independent test. More recently, Madrigal's (1993) research also showed limited support for the typology. Using the five-item instrument developed by Plog, Madrigal found some relationship between personality measures (allocentrism and psychocentrism) and personal values as measured with Kahle and Timmer's (1983) List of Values (LOV) scale. However, the personality measures did not differentiate between package group and independent travelers whereas the higher order personal values scores did differentiate between traveler types. Madrigal's dependent variable (travel type) was distinct from Smith's dependent variable (travel destination) although both represent questions addressed in Plog's (1974) research.

Based on Smith's and Madrigal's work, Plog's personality measure has not received the level of empirical support found for the sociological model proposed by Cohen. However, it is apparent that many avenues of novelty research remain untapped and it would be premature to pass final judgement based on so few data sets.

#### FAMILY DECISION MAKING

The issue of family decision making should also be of interest to marketers. In fact, most consumer behavior texts devote an entire chapter to the topic. Nevertheless, family decision making has received relatively little attention by leisure and tourism researchers. Much of the family research published in the leisure literature has focused on the impact of leisure activity on family interaction and cohesion (Orlner & Mancini, 1990), gender roles, and on perceptions of fun and work (Shaw, 1992).

Leisure serves as an independent variable in this type of research. In contrast, a primary contribution of consumer researchers is to conduct research in which leisure (including leisure travel) is the dependent variable and variables such as gender role and involvement become independent variables. This type of research is vitally important. For example, knowing who makes the decision about travel destinations in a household, and which family members influence this decision could contribute greatly to the effectiveness of communication strategies and other marketing decisions (a selection of family decision-making research appears in Table 4). Jenkins' (1978) early work provided evidence of dominance by some spouses in travel decision-making. Changing lifestyles and increasing participation of women in the work force may alter family decision-making processes, and therefore, these processes should be monitored and better understood (Nichols & Snepenger, 1988). Family life cycle stages are also thought to be influential in the decision process. For example, Cosenza and Davis (1981) indicated that to each step in the life cycle corresponded a specific dominance type in the couple's decision making process. Also related to family life cycle stages is the importance of the children. Jenkins noted their influence on sub-decisions in traveling contexts. Industry researchers are now paying more attention to children and teenagers than ever before. Not only are children and teens future paying customers, but many already possess some discretionary income, and their role as a market of influencers is now recognized (Neal, 1992). In tourism contexts, an increasing number of communication strategies are now targeting children directly, or parents with children. The need for better understanding children's influence in travel decisions should justify further research in that area.

Early travel related family research tended to focus on husband and wife's (and to a lesser extent, children's) decision making roles (Filiatrault & Ritchie, 1980; Myers & Moncrief, 1978; Nichols & Snepenger, 1988). The consensus of these studies suggested that joint decisions were more common than husband dominant or wife dominant decisions. The target marketing and marketing mix implications of such research are generally quite straightforward although they can be complicated by issues such as changing gender norms and family roles over time. To date, no longitudinal data have ever been collected on this topic. More recently, Madrigal (1990) found that although most decisions were shared, issue salience, gender role ideology, and personal resources of various actors also affected decisions. Building on that research, Madrigal et al. (1992) found relationships between several facets of involvement, gender role ideology, and socio-demographic characteristics.

TABLE 4. Selected leisure and tourism-related research with family decision-making (DM).

| Authors and dates          | Purpose or findings                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jenkins (1978)             | Found evidence of some spouse dominance dependent on sub-decisions. Influence of children recognized.                                                                                                                                |
| Cosenza & Davis (1981)     | Influence and decision structures varied across stages of the family life cycle.                                                                                                                                                     |
| Nichols & Snepenger (1988) | Joint DM couples had different DM processes than did one-spouse dominant couples.                                                                                                                                                    |
| Neal (1992)                | The importance of children as an "influence" market is stressed                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Madrigal (1992)            | Issue salience was a significant predictor of vacation DM among married couples. Couples with traditional gender roles ideologies exhibited different DM processes from couples with modern gender role ideology.                    |
| Shaw (1992)                | Time-budget and interview-based methods revealed difference in perceptions of work and leisure components of family based leisure. Women were more likely to perceive family time as work when compared with the perceptions of men. |

An interesting challenge faced by family researchers relates to the collection and interpretation of data from multiple individuals (e.g., dyads, triads) rather than from individual subjects. Howard and Madrigal (1990) acknowledged these difficulties in an exploratory study in which respondents (primarily mothers) were asked to judge the perceptions of other family members regarding purchase decisions for recreation services. Madrigal's (1991) exploration of married couples' family vacation decisions used a more sophisticated dyadic approach.

#### *METHODOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS*

Research discussed in this paper is dominated by survey methodology and at least two alternative methodologies have potential to contribute to future consumer behavior investigations. Some of the questions that remain to be asked demand different methodological approaches. For example, Shaw (1992) provided convincing evidence of the utility of qualitative techniques when researching family decisions. Indeed, qualitative meth-

odologies should not be ignored for studying any of the four topics discussed in this paper. Much of the conceptual work supporting theory development in these areas has been conducted using qualitative methodologies. The Experience Sampling Method (ESM) which has gained prominence among leisure behaviorists (e.g., Samdahl, 1988) may also provide a promising tool for studying family decision making. This technique consists of providing respondents with an electronic pager and a block of self report forms with open-ended and scaled items. Respondents are then paged at random times throughout the day, and information on moods, feelings, and activities are collected at those times. Open-ended questioning and in-depth interviews could contribute to understanding the various meanings of risk and the directionality of sign value (positive or negative) in involvement. For example, data collected using the IP scale may indicate that taking a cruise says something about the respondents. We need to further investigate with interviews whether those perceptions of sign value are positive or negative. Another benefit of some qualitative research methods such as in-depth interviews is that they provide opportunities for reciprocal benefits to participants. Participants immediately gain insight into their own behaviors, attitudes, or motivations. In contrast, in most studies, individual results are rarely communicated to respondents.

Similarly, survey data are inadequate for understanding the relationship between mediating variables such as involvement and commitment, and outcomes such as decision-making, purchase behavior, or participation patterns. Controlled laboratory experiments and field experiments provide better opportunities for responding to such research questions. Finally, all four constructs discussed in this paper must be understood in relation to time. However, most studies conducted to date have measured the construct at one point in time. Therefore, future research agendas should include longitudinal methods such as time series, or panel survey methods where multiple data sets are collected over time.

## CONCLUSION

This paper presented four topics related to the study of tourist behavior which are showing great promise for better understanding the consumption of tourism, as well as for contributing to the practice of tourism marketing. As the industry matures and becomes increasingly competitive, successful marketing practices must be based on a solid knowledge of consumer behavior. Our growing comprehension of tourist behavior will likely shed some light on the consumption of tourism and travel services, and the mechanisms that underlie the economics of destinations. Research

on involvement, loyalty-commitment, novelty, and family decision-making has been more exploratory than confirmatory. As a group, consumer researchers have largely avoided the temptation to answer practical questions without adequate conceptualization and without the benefit of reliable and valid instrumentation. This is especially characteristic of much of the research published in the last five years. Consequently, many of the recent studies are long on internal validity and short on external validity. Future academic and applied studies should benefit from this solid theoretical foundation.

## NOTE

1. The symbolic meaning of an activity or product.

## REFERENCES

- Ap, J. (1992). *Understanding host resident perceptions of the impacts of tourism through social exchange theory*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Backman, S. J. (1991). Exploring the relationship between perceived constraints and loyalty. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 332-344.
- Backman, S., & Crompton, J. (1990a). Differentiating between high, spurious, latent, and low loyalty participants in two leisure services. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 9(2), 1-17.
- Backman, S., & Crompton, J. (1990b). The usefulness of selected variables for predicting activity loyalty. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 205-220.
- Bello, D. C., & Eitzel, M. J. (1985). The role of novelty in the pleasure travel experience. *Journal of Travel Research*, 23, 20-26.
- Berlyne, D. E. (1960). *Conflict, arousal, and curiosity*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bloch, P. H., Black, W. C., & Lichtenstein, D. (1989). Involvement with the equipment component of sport: Links to recreational commitment. *Leisure Sciences*, 11, 187-200.
- Brown, G. P. (1991). *Tourism and place-identity* (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1990). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 51, 3516A.
- Buchanan, T. (1985). Commitment and leisure behavior: A theoretical perspective. *Leisure Sciences*, 7, 401-420.
- Celuch, K. G., & Longfellow, T. A. (1992). Consumers' service involvement: An exploratory examination. *Psychological Reports*, 71, 959-970.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Towards a sociology of international research. *Social Research*, 39, 164-182.
- Cohen, E. (1974). Who is a tourist? *Sociological Review*, 22(4), 527-533.
- Cohen, E. (1979). A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology*, 13, 179-201.
- Cosenza, R. M., & Davis, D. L. (1981). Family vacation decision making over the

- family life cycle: A decision and influence structure analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 20(2), 17-23.
- Crompton, J. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 6, 408-424.
- Crotts, J. C. (1993). Personality correlates of the novelty seeking drive. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 1(3), 7-29.
- Dann, G. M. (1981). Tourist motivation: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187-219.
- Day, G. S. (1969). A two-dimensional concept of brand loyalty. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 9, 29-35.
- Dimanche, F. (in press). Cross-cultural tourism marketing research: An assessment and recommendations for future studies. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*.
- Dimanche, F., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1991). Testing the Involvement Profile (IP) scale in the context of selected recreational and touristic activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23(1), 51-66.
- Dimanche, F., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1993). Consumer involvement profiles as a tourism segmentation tool. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 1(4), 33-52.
- Dimanche, F., & Sandahl, D. (1991, October). *Leisure as symbolic consumption: A conceptualization and prospects for future research*. Paper presented at the NRPA Symposium on Leisure Research, Baltimore, MD.
- Fesenmaier, D. R., & Johnson, B. (1989). Involvement-based segmentation: Implications for travel marketing in Texas. *Tourism Management*, 10(4), 293-300.
- Filiatrault, P., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1980). Joint purchasing decisions: A comparison of influence structure in family and couple decision making units. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 7, 131-140.
- Havitz, M. E., & Dimanche, F. (1990). Propositions for testing the involvement construct in recreational and touristic contexts. *Leisure Sciences*, 12, 179-195.
- Howard, D. R., & Havitz, M. E. (1993, October). *How enduring is enduring involvement?* Paper presented at the NRPA Symposium on Leisure research, San Jose, CA.
- Howard, D. R., & Madrigal, R. (1990). Who makes the decision: The parent or the child? The perceived influence of parents and children on the purchase of recreation services. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22, 244-258.
- Hunt, J. (1961). *Intelligence and experience*. New York: The Ronald Press.
- Jacoby, J., & Chestnut, R. W. (1978). *Brand loyalty measurement and management*. New York: Wiley.
- Jarvis, L. P., & Mayo, E. J. (1986). Winning the market share game. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 27(3), 73-79.
- Jenkins, R. L. (1978). Family decision-making. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 2-7.
- Kahle, L. R., & Timmer, S. G. (1983). A theory and method for studying values. In L. R. Kahle (Ed.), *Social values and social change: Adaptation to life in America* (pp. 43-69). New York: Praeger.

- Laurent, G., & Kapferer, J. N. (1985). Measuring consumer involvement profiles. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 22 (February), 41-53.
- Lee, T. H., & Crompton, J. (1992). Measuring novelty seeking in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 732-751.
- Madrigal, R. (1990). *An investigation of spouses' relative influence as it pertains to vacation decision making*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Oregon, Eugene.
- Madrigal, R. (1993, October). *Personal values, personality, and tourist behavior*. Paper presented at the 1993 NRPA Symposium on Leisure Research, San Jose, CA.
- Madrigal, R., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1992). Married couples' involvement with family vacations. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 287-301.
- Mansfield, Y. (1992). From motivation to actual travel. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 399-419.
- McInyre, N. (1989). The personal meaning of participation: Enduring involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 21(2), 167-179.
- McInyre, N., & Pigram, J. J. (1992). Recreation specialization reexamined: The case of vehicle-based camps. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 3-13.
- McQuarrie, E. F., & Munson, J. M. (1987). The Zaitchowsky Personal Involvement Inventory: Modification and extension. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 14, 36-40.
- Mo, C., Havitz, D. R., & Howard, M. E. (1993, June). *Segmenting travel markets with the International Tourist Role (ITR) scale*. Paper presented at the 24th annual TTRA conference, Whistler, BC.
- Mo, C., Howard, D. R., & Havitz, M. E. (1993). Testing an international tourist role typology. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 319-335.
- Moutinho, L. (1987). Consumer behavior in tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(10), 5-44.
- Myers, P. B., & Moncrief, L. W. (1978). Differential leisure travel decision making between spouses. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5, 157-165.
- Neal, J. U. (1992). *Kids as customers: A handbook of marketing to children*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Nichols, C. M., & Sniepenger, D. J. (1988). Family decision making and tourism behavior and attitudes. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(4), 2-6.
- Norman, B. (1991). The influence of constraints on the generic decision of whether or not to take a summer vacation. In C. Sylvestre & L. Caldwell (Eds.), *Abstracts from the 1991 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 59). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Administration.
- Orthner, D. K., & Mancini, J. A. (1990). Leisure impacts on family interaction and cohesion. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22, 125-137.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(Fall), 41-50.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V., & Berry, L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item

- scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(Spring), 12-40.
- Pearce, P. L. (1982). *The social psychology of tourist behavior*. New York: Pergamon.
- Pearce, P. L. (1985). A systematic comparison of travel-related roles. *Human Relations*, 38(11), 1001-1011.
- Plog, S. C. (1974). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 14(4), 55-58.
- Plog, S. C. (1990). A carpenter's tools: An answer to Stephen L. J. Smith's review of psychocentrism/allocationism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(Spring), 43-45.
- Plog, S. C. (1991). A carpenter's tools revisited: Measuring allocentrism and psychocentrism properly . . . the first time. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29(4), 51.
- Plog, S. C. (1991). *Leisure travel: Making it a growth market . . . Again!* New York: Wiley.
- Pritchard, M. (1992). Development of the psychological commitment instrument for measuring travel service loyalty (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1991). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52, 4408A.
- Pritchard, M., & Howard, D. R. (1993). Measuring loyalty in travel services: A multi-dimensional approach. *Proceedings of the World Marketing Congress*, 6, 115-119.
- Pritchard, M., Howard, D. R., & Havitz, M. E. (1992). Loyalty measurement: A critical examination and theoretical extension. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 155-164.
- Reid, I. S., & Cronpton, J. L. (1993). A taxonomy of leisure purchase decision paradigms based on level of involvement. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25, 182-202.
- Reinecke Flynn, L., & Goldsmith, R. E. (1993). Identifying innovators in consumer service markets. *The Service Industries Journal*, 13(3), 97-109.
- Richins, M. L., Bloch, P. H., & McQuarrie, E. F. (1992). How enduring and situational involvement combine to create involvement responses. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 1(2), 143-153.
- Rothschild, M. L. (1984). Perspectives on involvement: Current problems and future directions. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11, 216-217.
- Sandahl, D. M. (1988). A symbolic interactionist model of leisure: Theory and empirical support. *Leisure Sciences*, 10(1), 27-39.
- Selin, S. W., & Howard, D. R. (1988). Ego involvement and leisure behavior: A conceptual specification. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(3), 237-244.
- Shaw, S. M. (1992). Dereifying family leisure: An examination of women's and men's everyday experiences and perceptions of family time. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 271-286.
- Siegenthaler, K. L., & Lam, T. C. M. (1992). Commitment and ego-involvement in recreational tennis. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 303-315.
- Smith, S. L. (1990a). A test of Plog's allocentric/psychocentric model: Evidence from seven nations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(Spring), 40-43.
- Smith, S. L. (1990b). Another look at the carpenter's tools: A reply to Plog. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29(Fall), 50-51.

- Sprenger, D. J. (1987). Segmenting the vacation market by novelty-seeking role. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26(2), 8-14.
- Solomon, M. R. (1992). *Consumer behavior*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Twynam, G. D. (1993). An analysis of the extent and response forms of complaint behavior and those factors which influence consumers to complain within travel contexts (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1992). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53, 2983A.
- Urry, J. (1990). The 'consumption' of tourism. *Sociology*, 24(1), 23-35.
- Veldkamp, C. A., & Backman, S. J. (1992). Examination of the relationship between service quality and user loyalty. In L. Caldwell & C. Riddick (Eds), *Abstracts from the 1992 Symposium on Leisure Research* (p. 52). Arlington, VA: National Recreation and Park Association.
- van Raaij, W. F. (1986). Consumer research on tourism: Mental and behavioral constructs. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, 1-9.
- van Raaij, W. F., & Francken, D. A. (1984). Vacation decisions, activities and satisfactions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11, 101-112.
- Watkins, M. (1987). The influence of involvement and information search on consumers' choice of recreation activities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 3560A.
- Yiannakis, A., & Gibson, H. (1992). Roles tourists play. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 287-303.
- Zacharkowsky, J. L. (1985). Measuring the involvement construct. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12(December), 341-352.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Parasuraman, A., & Berry, L. (1985). Problems and strategies in services marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 49, 33-46.