

Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research

Edited by

**Daniel R. Fesenmaier,
Joseph T. O'Leary and
Muzaffer Uysal**



Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research

This page intentionally left blank

Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research

**Daniel R. Fesenmaier
Joseph T. O'Leary
Muzaffer Uysal
Editors**

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
New York London

Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research has also been published as *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, Volume 5, Numbers 1/2 & 3 1996.

© 1996 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, microfilm and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

The development, preparation, and publication of this work has been undertaken with great care. However, the publisher, employees, editors, and agents of The Haworth Press and all imprints of The Haworth Press, Inc., including The Haworth Medical Press and Pharmaceutical Products Press, are not responsible for any errors contained herein or for consequences that may ensue from use of materials or information contained in this work. Opinions expressed by the author(s) are not necessarily those of The Haworth Press, Inc.

First published by

The Haworth Press, Inc., 10 Alice Street, Binghamton, NY 13904-1580 USA

This edition published 2013 by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Recent advances in tourism marketing research / Daniel R. Fesenmaier, Joseph T. O'Leary, Muzaffer Uysal.

p. cm.

"Recent advances in tourism marketing research has also been published as 'Journal of travel & tourism marketing', volume 5, numbers 1/2 & 3 1996"

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 1-56024-836-X (alk. paper)

I. Tourist trade—Marketing—Research. I. Fesenmaier, Daniel R. II. O'Leary, Joseph T. III. Uysal, Muzaffer. IV. Journal of travel & tourism marketing.

G155.A1R42 1996

338.4'791—dc20

96-32039

CIP

Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research

CONTENTS

Preface—The Year 2000: Issues and Challenges <i>David L. Edgell, Sr.</i>	xiii
Introduction <i>Daniel R. Fesenmaier</i> <i>Joseph T. O'Leary</i> <i>Muzaffer Uysal</i>	1
Capturing the Moments: Concerns of <i>In Situ</i> Leisure Research <i>William P. Stewart</i> <i>R. Bruce Hull IV</i>	3
Revealing Socially Constructed Knowledge Through Quasi-Structured Interviews and Grounded Theory Analysis <i>Roger Riley</i>	21
Tourists' Images of a Destination—An Alternative Analysis <i>Graham M. S. Dann</i>	41
Modeling Vacation Destination Decisions: A Behavioral Approach <i>Ercan Sirakaya</i> <i>Robert W. McLellan</i> <i>Muzaffer Uysal</i>	57
Consumer-Defined Dimensions for the Escorted Tour Industry Segment: Expectations, Satisfaction, and Importance <i>Charles R. Duke</i> <i>Margaret A. Persia</i>	77

Major Determinants of International Tourism Demand for South Korea: Inclusion of Marketing Variable <i>Choong-Ki Lee</i>	101
A Neural Network Approach to Discrete Choice Modeling <i>Giann-Min Jeng</i> <i>Daniel R. Fesenmaier</i>	119
SURE Estimation of Tourism Demand System Model: U.S. Case <i>Sung Soo Pyo</i> <i>Muzaffer Uysal</i> <i>John T. Warner</i>	145
Leisure Market Segmentation: An Integrated Preferences Constraints-Based Approach <i>Marcus P. Stemerding</i> <i>Harmen Oppewal</i> <i>Theo A. M. Beckers</i> <i>Harry J. P. Timmermans</i>	161
Conjoint Analysis of Downhill Skiers Used to Improve Data Collection for Market Segmentation <i>Barbara A. Carmichael</i>	187
Performance-Importance Analysis of Escorted Tour Evaluations <i>Charles R. Duke</i> <i>Margaret A. Persia</i>	207
Importance-Performance and Segmentation: Where Do We Go from Here? <i>Jerry J. Vaske</i> <i>Jay Beaman</i> <i>Richard Stanley</i> <i>Michel Grenier</i>	225

The Respondent Specific Method:	
A New Approach to Conversion Research	241
<i>Stanley C. Plog</i>	
<i>Anne Adams</i>	
A New Direction	253
<i>Gordon D. Taylor</i>	
Index	265

ABOUT THE EDITORS

Daniel R. Fesenmaier, PhD, is Associate Professor of Tourism in the Department of Leisure Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He has served as chair of the Committee for Marketing Models, Canadian Taskforce for Tourism Data and as a consultant to several tourism marketing and development projects in the United States, Canada, Korea, and Africa. Dr. Fesenmaier is the author of a number of research articles dealing with the economics and marketing of tourism and a monograph on community tourism development entitled *Developing and Marketing Tourism Resources*. He is also the co-editor of *Recreation Planning and Management* and *Communication Systems in Tourism Marketing*.

Joseph T. O'Leary, PhD, is Professor of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of Forestry and Natural Resources at Purdue University. He also holds an appointment in the Department of Restaurant, Hotel, Institutional and Tourism Management. Previously, he was Co-coordinator and Marine Advisory Services Leader for the Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant Program. Dr. O'Leary has published research articles in various journals including the *Journal of Forestry*, the *Journal of Leisure Research*, *Leisure Sciences*, *Tourism Management*, and the *Journal of Travel Research*. His research interests include the social behavior and travel patterns of domestic and international recreation consumers, secondary analysis of major national travel, and recreation related data.

Muzaffer Uysal, PhD, is Professor of Tourism in the Department of Hotel, Restaurant and Institutional Management at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg. Dr. Uysal has extensive experience in the travel and tourism fields and has authored or co-authored research articles and several book chapters related to different aspects of tourism marketing, demand/supply interaction, and international tourism. He is Associate Editor for *Leisure Sciences* for tourism related areas and methods. He also serves on the editorial boards of four international tourism and marketing journals and on the Education Advisory Council of the National Tour Foundation.

Preface— The Year 2000: Issues and Challenges

INTRODUCTION

Since the industrial revolution and throughout the last century, and indeed through the two World Wars, we have measured the wealth of nations almost entirely on the development of tangible goods: mining and manufacturing, agriculture and livestock and on the construction of infrastructure: highways and dams and oceanliners, railroads, and other vehicles which transport people and tangible assets from place to place around the world.

In recent years, scientific and technological discoveries have overwhelmed many of our older industries. A bright new world of innovation has already flooded mankind with services . . . consumer services—from telephones to facsimiles to a new century of computers, from cameras and movies to radio and television, from satellites to the universe of telecommunications. In this expanding new world of technological devices and services we have founded one grand new service which is hardly recognized as a serious industry at all: an activity known today as tourism; an industry which encompasses many of these innovations, making startling changes in the world's economy, transforming the globe throughout more than a hundred developed and developing nations. How we market tourism in an ever changing world will be a major challenge for the travel and tourism industry.

To better understand and accept this industry's ability to market and promote global tourism in the future will depend on solid market research. Often such research must be conducted in a chaotic world, hammering out new innovative and creative approaches which may be different from traditional guidelines for marketing research. In brief, tourism marketing

[Haworth indexing entry note]: "Preface—The Year 2000: Issues and Challenges." Edgell, David L., Sr. Published in *Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research* (ed: Daniel R. Fesenmaier, Joseph T. O'Leary, and Muzaffer Uysal). The Haworth Press, Inc., 1996, pp. xiii-xvii. Single or multiple copies of this article are available from The Haworth Document Delivery Service [1-800-342-9678, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. (EST). E-mail address: getinfo@haworth.com].

methodology must be flexible and resilient enough to foster the development of new tourism products and services in a rapidly changing world. The result may be to revolutionize the way we manage and market the tourism industry.

This introduction to the special volume will position international tourism within the broader context of the worldwide services economy. This article will focus on the significance of changing tourism issues and trends which will drive future marketing strategies.

THE NEW TOURISM HORIZON

Tourism has the potential to engage and change the economic, political and ecological dimensions of future lifestyles. In this perception, the highest purpose of the principles of tourism market research will be to integrate the economic, political, cultural, intellectual and environmental benefits of tourism for people, destinations and countries towards a higher quality of life. Such research will likely change our traditional travel and tourism marketing strategies.

As we approach the millennial threshold, the dynamic progress that has been made in international tourism will continue to accelerate. The last half of the twentieth century has already witnessed tremendous changes in transportation and communication technology, the twin engines which have propelled enormous changes in worldwide tourism. What has been clear in the past will also be true in the future, that peace and prosperity are the keys which best open the door to tourism growth.

A look at travel and tourism within this context mandates that marketing executives must understand the need for developing wide-ranging strategies which can be adjusted as worldwide conditions mature. They must be knowledgeable about market trends and flexible enough to adjust marketing plans in the face of rapidly changing market forces. In summary, marketing within the new tourism horizon must fully comprehend the complex nature of tourism and the immense mechanics of its implementation.

WORLDWIDE IMPORTANCE OF TOURISM

The twentieth century has seen a giant leap in leisure time for millions of people in both the developed and developing countries. Shorter working hours, greater individual prosperity, faster and cheaper travel and the impact of advanced technology have all helped to make the leisure and

travel industry the fastest growing industry in the world. The significance of tourism as a source of income and employment, and as a major factor in the balance of payments for many countries, has been attracting increasing attention on the part of governments, regional and local authorities, and others with an interest in economic development.

New research by the World Travel and Tourism Council indicated that tourism in 1995 already generated direct and indirect employment for approximately 212 million people worldwide, or about one in every nine workers. According to the report, global tourism (both domestic and international) is a \$3.4 trillion industry that will continue to grow in the future. Equally important, is the fact that tourism, as an export, is of critical importance to both industrialized and developing destinations. As an economic factor, tourism is growing faster than the rest of the world economy in terms of export output, value added, capital investment, and employment.

While tourism has been growing rapidly since World War II, and will likely continue its dynamic growth in the foreseeable future; this does not mean the industry will necessarily grow smoothly. There is reason to believe that there will be occasional structural, economic, political, and philosophical impediments in the path of progress. Also, in past years, there has been inadequate public understanding of the economic and social importance of tourism. Recently, however, the "worldwide importance of tourism" has been better understood, which is increasing the pressure for greater tourism market research to support new marketing strategies.

IN THE GLOBAL TOURISM CONTEXT

As part of the overall growth of services, tourism is finally beginning to be recognized as an important sector in the global economy. Key multilateral governmental organizations such as the World Tourism Organization (Madrid, Spain), Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (Paris, France), Organization of American States (Washington, D.C.), Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (Singapore) and others are providing important research and data to the tourism industry with one of the goals being to link tourism to other sectors of the worldwide economy. The European Community, North America Free Trade Agreement and other regional economic instruments are seeking to break down traditional barriers to conducting tourism services across borders which will ultimately aid international tourism marketing. The World Travel and Tourism Council, Pacific Asia Travel Association and other groups representing private and public interests are already building a higher level of cooperation and coalition-building for tackling broad policy and marketing issues. This is

indicative of progress made in this industry over the past twenty-five years.

The importance of what happened globally in the tourism policy arena in 1994 was manifested by the movement of the world toward implementing the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) as part of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations of the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). These efforts to improve freedom of fair trade (including trade in tourism) will have positive effects on international tourism marketing. The prognosis in early 1996 for implementing the GATS in the categories of: "Tourism and Related Services" and "Recreational, Cultural and Supporting Services" is very promising.

As the world increasingly becomes a "global village" most governments will seek to encourage greater travel to their respective destinations. Most developed and developing countries conduct their national tourism promotion under the aegis of a government tourism policy covering research, marketing, coordination, development and training. Often this is in conjunction with associations of private sector tourism interests, joint public-private consultative bodies, and international and intergovernmental organizations. This kind of cooperation and coordination will become an integral part of national tourism marketing strategies as each country strives to increase the size of its slice of the tourism pie.

TOURISM COMPETITION

The international competition for tourism revenues is formidable. Between 1980 and 1990 tourism arrivals around the world expanded more than 150%. The tourism customers of the 1990s are different from their predecessors in ways that challenge traditional approaches to tourism marketing.

In the eyes of the consumer there are many objectives. Tourists are people, energized by personal wants and needs. Their common denominator is that they are mobile and that by definition they are motivated to leave the place where they reside, to travel to another place or several other places which they would like to visit because of business or pleasure. Collectively, pleasure travelers' desires are endless: sunny hideaways, panoramic vistas, exotic cultures, wilderness adventures, historic sites, and a tremendous variety of indoor events and activities as well: all of these things, each with infinite variations.

While the opportunities for worldwide growth in tourism are prodigious, increased competition between governments and amongst the private sector is unpredictable. Increasing awareness of the relationship of

tourism to political, economic, sociocultural, and environmental factors will emphasize the need for increased professionalism in tourism policy, planning, development and marketing strategies. In order to respond to the dynamic changes taking place in the competitive world of tourism, marketing programs will need to be constantly adjusted and updated to take account of new market research.

CONCLUSION

In summary, tourism today is seen and recognized as the largest service industry in the world. In fact, it has become one of the most productive components in the universe of trade, among all nations. The question is about tomorrow's tourism and what the future of the travel and tourism industry will become.

The tourism industry can be expected to face many challenges. It will need to develop effective plans to deal with political violence and environmental disruptions to the tourism market. New and better technological innovations as well as improved responses to environmental disasters or better approaches in adjusting to currency fluctuations will all have an impact on the growth of tourism. The way in which the industry responds to these challenges as new ones arise will determine the direction and maturity of this giant industry.

This special volume documents the new paradigms for tourism marketing. It recognizes a world that changes rapidly and a tourism product that challenges our traditional ways of conducting tourism business. Ultimately it is the quality of the tourism research input, and the environment in which the tourism industry operates, which will shape future strategies for marketing the tourism product in an ever-changing world.

David L. Edgell, Sr.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Interest in tourism has increased dramatically over the past few years and is reflected by a tremendous increase in the use of tourism as a vehicle for economic development throughout the world. Travel and the resulting industry has also been considered an important vehicle for cultural expression and therefore, has received substantial attention from scholars in a number of disciplines. Research in travel and tourism marketing has also improved dramatically in quality and depth, reflecting the growing maturity of the field and the contributions of a diverse field of scholars and professionals.

The articles included in this volume reflect the explosion in high quality tourism marketing research. The authors come from a number of disciplines and perspectives, ranging from the more traditional programs in Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Management and Leisure Studies to geography, urban and regional planning and sociology. The variety of perspectives is reflected in the issues addressed by the research included in this volume. Qualitative methods in marketing research have grown substantially over the past few years and are now recognized as offering viable alternatives to more traditional quantitative methodologies. Discrete choice/travel demand modeling methods have evolved and matured and now offer several mainstream tools with which to better understand existing and potential markets. Importance-performance analysis, a long standing tool for strategies marketing analysis, has been the focus of much research and now is an even better tool for tourism marketers.

Importantly, research in travel and tourism continues to grow . . . the material presented in this volume reflects only a small portion of the diversity and richness of this effort. The growth in tourism research has produced a number of opportunities for tourism marketers. As suggested by John Naisbitt in *Global Paradox*, recent developments in technology and in society have transformed the fundamental nature of tourism mar-

[Haworth co-indexing entry note]: "Introduction." Fesenmaier, Daniel R., Joseph T. O'Leary, and Muzaffer Uysal. Co-published simultaneously in *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* (The Haworth Press, Inc.) Vol. 5, No. 1/2, 1996, pp. 1-2; and *Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research* (ed: Daniel R. Fesenmaier, Joseph T. O'Leary, and Muzaffer Uysal) The Haworth Press, Inc., 1996, pp. 1-2. Single or multiple copies of this article are available from The Haworth Document Delivery Service [1-800-342-9678, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. (EST). E-mail address: getinfo@haworth.com].

keting. The smallest players are now empowered to compete effectively with those that “dominate” the industry. The arrival of “mega” databases on consumer behavior (including travelers) enable tourism researchers to develop all new and personalized products for the “total journey.” New communication channels are emerging which modify substantially the way travelers can learn about available opportunities and offer the potential for building “relationships” with prospective consumers. This growth also presents a number of new and exciting challenges to tourism researchers that will have broad impacts on our world.

We hope readers enjoy the articles in this volume. We believe they represent well the quality and depth of market research currently being conducted in tourism.

*Daniel R. Fesenmaier
Joseph T. O’Leary
Muzaffer Uysal*

Capturing the Moments: Concerns of *In Situ* Leisure Research

William P. Stewart
R. Bruce Hull IV

SUMMARY. *In situ* assessments are part of a general diversification from traditional research methods within the social sciences. The need for *in situ* sampling methods in leisure, recreation, and tourism exists because: (1) they distinguish between questions about situations and questions about persons; and (2) their minimum reliance on information associated with the inaccuracies of human memory and cognitive processing. Because of their focus on the present moment, *in situ* designs provide information about recreational situations largely inaccessible with traditional methods. Such information addresses traditional questions from a new perspective and allows exploration of new questions. The limitations of *in situ* designs are discussed regarding: (1) self-report and the alteration of experience; (2) repeated self-report and the alteration of experience; and (3) lack of compliance with the self-administration of self-report. [Article copies available from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-342-9678. E-mail address: getinfo@haworth.com]

Over the past decade or so, there has been a general diversification from traditional research methods within the social sciences. This paper reviews

William P. Stewart is Associate Professor, Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-2261. R. Bruce Hull IV is Associate Professor, Department of Forestry, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061.

[Haworth co-indexing entry note]: "Capturing the Moments: Concerns of *In Situ* Leisure Research." Stewart, William P., and R. Bruce Hull IV. Co-published simultaneously in *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* (The Haworth Press, Inc.) Vol. 5, No. 1/2, 1996, pp. 3-20; and *Recent Advances in Tourism Marketing Research* (ed: Daniel R. Fesenmaier, Joseph T. O'Leary, and Muzaffer Uysal) The Haworth Press, Inc., 1996, pp. 3-20. Single or multiple copies of this article are available from The Haworth Document Delivery Service [1-800-342-9678, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. (EST). E-mail address: getinfo@haworth.com].

recent developments in methods, and in particular, focuses on the adaptation of *in situ* sampling methods to leisure, recreation, and tourism research problems. Since conceptual issues are at the crux of most methodological problems, this essay first discusses the need for *in situ* methods. More specifically, the ability of *in situ* designs to address new and arguably more precise questions about leisure, recreation, and tourism is discussed. Secondly, procedures for the adaptation of *in situ* designs to leisure, recreation and tourism problems are discussed, followed by a critique of potential limitations of *in situ* research.

DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Time, setting, and person interrelate in complex ways to define recreational situations. As one of the parent disciplines, psychology has provided leisure researchers with several world views in which to understand the relationships between time, setting, and person (Ittelson, 1973; Pervin & Lewis, 1977). The interactional approach, which has been the dominant perspective in contemporary psychology (cf. Mannell, 1980), treats time, setting, and person as independent entities with particular characteristics. The focus of investigations is usually on the direct and interactive effects of environmental factors on behavior and psychological processes. To describe the interactional approach, Altman and Rogoff provide the following analogy:

. . . interactional world views treat psychological phenomena like Newtonian particles or like billiard balls. Each particle or ball exists separately from the others and has its own independent qualities. The balls or particles interact as one ball bangs into another ball, thereby altering their locations. The goal of interactional research is to study the impact of certain particles and balls (environmental and situational qualities) on other particles and balls (psychological processes and behaviors). (1987, p. 15)

The transactional approach is another perspective from psychology, used to study the confluence of time, setting, and person. Transactional analysis typically de-emphasizes the cause-effect relationships between factors and directs attention to the ways in which time, setting, and person "jointly define one another and contribute to the meaning and nature of a holistic event" (Altman and Rogoff, 1987, p. 24). To explain the transactional approach, Ittelson argues:

Man is never concretely encountered independent of the situation through which he acts, nor is the environment ever encountered independent of the encountering individual. It is meaningless to speak of either as existing apart from the situation in which it is encountered. (Ittelson, 1973, p. 19)

Although both the interactional and transactional perspectives have been associated with various types of empirical investigations, one could argue that *in situ* methods would be compatible, if not a direct fit, with either of these world views. Both of these perspectives embrace the notion of the person as being part of, or embedded in, an environment. In this sense, both interactional and transactional perspectives, along with *in situ* methods, are focused on the relationships among time, setting, and person.

One could argue that a majority of literature in leisure, recreation, and tourism could be traced to understanding the relationships among time, setting, and persons. More succinctly, two fundamental research questions could characterize much of leisure, recreation, and tourism studies: (1) questions about situations; and (2) questions about person. Although time, setting, and person are intertwined in both of these questions, the former question directs a search for leisure as situationally-derived, and the latter directs a search for leisure as a function of personal characteristics.

The power of *in situ* methods is in their ability to analytically discriminate between questions about situations and questions about persons using the same data set (Larson & Delespaul, 1990). From the perspective of framing research questions, it is important not to conflate questions about situations with those about persons. One could confuse a momentary satisfied feeling about one's trip, with a trip that was continually satisfactory; or a present set of experiential outcomes with an enduring set of experiential outcomes. Compared to traditional methods, *in situ* designs improve one's ability to provide insight, and perhaps disentangle, the complex interactions of time, setting, and person. The following analysis of research questions is adapted from Larson and Delespaul (1990; see also Samdahl, 1989) for application to leisure, recreation, and tourism research.

Questions About Situations

Clawson and Knetsch's (1966) pioneering work segmented recreation behavior into five phases, known as the "recreation experience continuum." The five phases are chronologically ordered and each phase typically is associated with a different set of situations: (1) The "anticipation" phase generally would be associated with one's home and work situations;

(2) The “travel to the destination” phase would generally be associated with transportation-related situations (i.e., walking, bicycling, inside of cars, airplanes, motels); (3) The “on-site” phase would be associated with the attractions, activities, lodging, facilities, and visitors and staff encountered at the tourist destination(s); (4) The “return travel” phase would be associated with similar types of situations as the “travel to the destination” phase; and (5) The “recollection” phase would be associated with a variety of situations and extend indeterminately into the future.

The five phases of recreation and tourism behavior suggest a dynamic and evolving experience. Several researchers have provided both theory and evidence to support a recreation experience continuum with at least five distinct phases and therefore five distinct sets of situations (Driver and Tocher, 1974; Hammitt, 1980). The independent variables for questions about recreation and tourist situations would include setting attributes, type of service provided at the destination, and other contextual variables. Questions about situations relevant to leisure, recreation, and tourism include:

- What kind of environmental attributes influence positive and negative feelings?
- How is the social setting related to individual experience?
- How does quality-of-service influence users' feelings of satisfaction?
- How are decisions to return influenced by on-site situations?
- How do tourism impacts influence individual experience?
- In what situations are visitors most sensitive to crowding?

Responding to these questions requires comparisons between settings *within individuals*. Patterns of individual experience that systematically differ between situations need to be identified and explained. A comparison between groups of people (who provided a response set at just one point in time) will not allow these patterns to emerge; such a comparison is unable to distinguish whether the responses were properties of the situation or properties of the person.

Questions About Persons

Recreation researchers have a history of inquiry regarding questions about persons. Independent variables typically include demographic characteristics (race, sex), typology frameworks (specialization, involvement, wilderness purism), and personality traits (social responsibility, experience use history). Such questions include:

- Do repeat visitors differ from novices in their leisure experience?
- Do visitors who were highly involved in the destination choice process have a high sense of fulfillment?
- What types of persons frequently participate in leisure activities?
- Are women different than men in their response to visitor services?
- Do visitors who stop at travel information centers have different travel experiences than those who do not stop?
- Are individuals who score high on a social-responsibility scale affected by environmental impacts?

These questions entail comparisons between groups of people in the same situation. In particular, obtaining responses in several situations allows for comparisons between groups of subjects regarding intra-subject difference between situations. If dispositional effects of persons exist, then distinct experience patterns will emerge for each group (i.e., groups distinguished by differences in intra- group variation between situations).

Confusing Questions

Sometimes the direction of research is ambiguous, and it is difficult to untangle whether the issue is about situations, persons, or their interaction:

- Is experiencing solitude associated with travel to remote areas? (Is this question about situations that afford solitude or about persons who seek solitude?)
- Is being relaxed related to recreation places? (Is this question about recreation places that relax or about relaxed persons who visit recreation places?)
- Is feeling crowded correlated with high encounter levels? (Is this question about situations which make one feel crowded or about persons who feel crowded?)
- Is high-involvement related to stopping at a visitor center for information? (Is this question about high-involvement situations or high-involvement persons?)

If the questions are about situations, then the following revisions would clarify the research questions:

- Does travel to remote areas afford better opportunities for solitude than non-remote destinations?
- Do recreation places provide relaxation more than other types of environments?

- Is one most likely to feel crowded at high-encounter levels than at low-encounter levels?
- Is involvement high at visitor centers relative to other en-route travel situations?

If the questions are about persons then the following revisions would clarify the research questions:

- What type of travel destinations are chosen by people who seek solitude?
- Do persons visit recreation places when they are relaxed?
- Are some persons more likely to feel crowded?
- Compared to other types of travelers, are highly-involved persons more likely to stop at visitor centers for information?

These two sets of questions illustrate the differences between questions of situations and questions of persons. Importantly, different questions require different methods. Questions about situations require analyses that examine intra-subject variation across situations; whereas questions about persons would require a search for inter-subject (between group) differences within situations.

In contrast to *in situ* designs, methods that obtain information at just one point in time (i.e., one response per person) have difficulty discerning effects of situations from those of persons. *In situ* procedures are not unique in this ability, however. Experimental or quasi-experimental designs (e.g., Cook and Campbell, 1979; Mannell, 1980) also can compare differences among situations and differences among persons through experimental control. For example, the situation can be controlled by manipulating a treatment variable (such as litter, crowding, or level of service) or by the assignment of subjects to various treatments. *In situ* procedures facilitate comparison among situations, by obtaining repeated observations of the same person within and across situations. In doing so, it allows for intra-subject differences (i.e., individual change) which require explanation. In other words, intra-subject differences are viewed as variance in need of partitioning. Many traditional methods that obtain one response per person do not control factors such as intra-subject differences and therefore must rely on correlational (i.e., cross-sectional) designs to infer causality.

Several examples of *in situ* applications to leisure, recreation, and tourism research serve to illustrate their utility. In their investigations of everyday life situations, Kubey and Csikszentmihalyi (1990) examined feelings during various activities and found that feelings of challenge, use of skills, and positive moods (e.g., alert, cheerful, active) were highest during lei-

sure activities and lowest during TV viewing. Hull et al. (1992) examined day hikers' moods at 12 different points along a trail. Their results indicate that recreationists' experiences (moods) could be differentiated by the effects of situations (i.e., stage of hike, environmental attributes). They further suggested that the nature of recreation may entail distinctive patterns of situationally-derived experiences, in contrast to traditional methods associated with static conceptions of expected benefits or outcomes. In a related study, Stewart and Hull (1992) found a small and decreasing relationship between the on-site and various recollection phases of a recreation experience. They found that hikers' images of their recreation experiences evolved over nine months "separately and distinctively from the present moments of the on-site experience" (p. 207). That is, not only was the on-site experience different from post-activity recollections, but post-activity recollections changed over time. The possibility of situational reinterpretation implies that one's experiences cannot be fully understood by a one-time assessment. In addition, Lee et al. (1994) provide evidence of "experience transformation" and argue that humans have the ability to reinterpret situations "in accordance with what is important to them at the time of interpretation" (p. 208). Such findings converge with the speculation of Mannell that "the recollected (on-site) experience may take on new meaning and emotional tone—in fact, it may be reconstructed and remembered very differently" (1980, p. 85).

Thus, with the application of research designs that explicitly recognize the dynamic nature of leisure, recreation, and tourism experiences, questions can be asked that recognize its dynamic and situationally-dependent nature. Such questions include: What on-site situations have the most enduring influence? What on-site situations have an effect on future choice behavior? What types of persons are sensitive to on-site setting attributes? Are "high" points in the trip more likely to influence future trip decisions compared to "low" points in the trip? How does one identify high and low points of a leisure experience? These and many related questions have implications for the investment and management of the destination and to off-site investments regarding destination-image management. On balance, *in situ* designs facilitate and/or promote the asking of a different class of (arguably more precise) research questions. However, there are other reasons for considering *in situ* methods besides their analytical potential.

LIMITATIONS OF HUMAN COGNITIVE PROCESSES

Researchers have explored various concepts associated with recreation and tourism experiences and destination choice processes. Popular con-

cepts have included: motivations, expectations, satisfaction appraisals, crowding, and substitution. The study of such concepts often assumes the ability for extensive cognitive processing and accurate recall. Theoretical frameworks, associated with the above concepts typically characterize travelers as being rational consumers of information, with efficiency as a behavioral objective. Such frameworks have included: importance-performance analysis, discrepancy theory, theory of reasoned action, multiple-satisfactions approach, and cost-benefit trade-off frameworks.

Imposed Need to Reconstruct

Within the leisure, recreation, and tourism literature, many theoretical frameworks depict leisure as a state of mind. Yet it is not unusual for such studies to employ a survey design (i.e., one-time post-activity assessment), and thus require respondents to reconstruct previous states of mind. As an example, the application of expectancy theory coupled with a survey design *requires extensive cognitive processing capabilities* on the part of sampled recreationists. The basic tenet of expectancy theory is that one's expected and desired psychological benefits will be one's actual psychological benefits. It assumes that humans are knowledgeable about the consequences of their behavior and that the desire for certain psychological benefits motivates the search for an activity/environment that will provide such benefits. The expectancy theory framework indicates that one's expectations for various outcomes concur with one's actual outcome. For instance, if one wants solitude through a recreation activity, then expectancy theory's framework suggests that one will find the setting that provides for solitude. In a survey design typical of most recreation studies, if one reports having experienced solitude, it is thought that one must have been motivated to recreate by the desire for solitude in one's pre-trip decision-making process. Such framework and application explicitly characterizes the human mind as having memory and computational abilities similar to the processing of a computer.

Like the application of several frameworks in leisure, recreation, and tourism studies, the above illustration of expectancy theory depicts tourists as consumers who are unaffected by an (implied) static touristic experience. In contrast, leisure, recreation, and tourism theorists have developed several perspectives that depict leisure as a psychologically dynamic and creative endeavor (e.g., Brightbill, 1961; DeGrazia, 1962; Mannell, 1980; Kelly, 1987). Following from this contrasting perspective, some important and related questions emerge: (1) Can the "re-created" person provide valid reports (i.e., reconstructions) of previous states-of-mind regarding decision-making criteria, motivations, experiences, perceptions, and so

on? (2) Given its evolving nature, what methods are most suitable for capturing a leisure-travel experience? (3) What degree of cognitive processing is implied in each alternative method, and would such a degree be expected to provide valid self-reports? A growing body of literature has begun to investigate the dynamic nature of the leisure, recreation, and tourism experience, and consequent questions regarding the required degree of cognitive processing implicit in research methods. Some studies have indicated that the on-site experience may influence the post-activity report of experiential outcomes (e.g., Peterson & Lime, 1973; Manfredo, 1984; Ewert, 1993). In addition, empirical studies have been undertaken to document the experiential differences between pre-activity, on-site, and post-activity phases (Hammitt, 1980).

Limitations on the Ability to Reconstruct

A theoretical framework which has provided insight to the limitations of human mental processing is cognitive dissonance theory. The major tenet being that individuals react to social and environmental circumstances in terms of psychological adjustments. Individuals strive to maintain cognitive consistency; when confronted with situations which are different than expected, individuals change themselves (e.g., their expectations, desired outcomes) rather than changing their environmental circumstance. Rationalization, as a coping mechanism, allows subjects to accommodate the environment thereby maintaining psychological consistency. Recognition of cognitive dissonance theory has a long, albeit not well-integrated, history of development in recreation and tourism literature (Ewert, 1993; Stewart, 1992; Manning, 1985; Heberlein & Shelby, 1977).

In depicting individuals as being psychologically flexible and accommodating of external situations, dissonance theory casts a shadow on the traditional method of recreation and tourism research: the post hoc survey design.¹ If expectations, motives, satisfactions, and other such appraisals are fluid, then assessing such constructs in a post hoc fashion may not provide valid information regarding antecedent states, and would not be representative of the total recreation experience and decision-making process. Using the self-initiated-tape-recording-method, Lee et al. (1994) provide insight to the transitory potential of leisure experience, and concomitant limitations of human cognitive processing when describing the consequences of a leisure experience. When comparing subjects' retrospections with immediate recollections of a leisure experience, subjects exhibited varying degrees of transformations. Perhaps the extreme was a subject whose immediate recall of the experience indicated distraction and disengagement, yet three months later the experience was reported as

being relaxed and fun (p. 206). In addition, Mannell and Iso-Ahola (1987) have doubted the human ability to access high-order cognitive processes related to leisure. In their critique of various perspectives of leisure, they questioned the ability for individuals to be aware of their needs, to be able to report their needs, and to judge the fulfillment of their needs.

The accommodating nature of human cognitive processes has come to light in a number of different arenas in the social science literature. There has been an accumulation of studies that have provided argument and evidence regarding the limited ability for individuals to recall previous mental states and behavior. In their often cited review, Nisbett and Wilson (1977) concluded that humans are often inaccurate regarding the report of stimuli that influenced their decisions and inaccurate about the stability of their own attitude or behavior (i.e., unaware of their own responses to stimuli). In a subsequent review of human cognitive processes, Ericsson and Simon (1980) also provided argument and evidence regarding the inaccuracy of human memory, and consequent reliance on misleading inferences; their discussion concludes that *reports of current mental states are among the most valid* and that researchers needing experiential data should direct their designs at the assessment of current states (see also Fiske, 1980; Mischel, 1981; Bernard, Killworth, Kronenfeld, & Sailer, 1984; Bradburn, Rips, & Shevell, 1987). This is the intent of *in situ* research.

IN SITU PROCEDURES

There are various ways to assess individual experience. The experience sampling method (ESM) requires a signalling device (or beeper) that randomly indicates when subjects should complete a questionnaire (Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983). The questions usually are directed at obtaining information regarding the subject's momentary situation and psychological state. A brief self-report questionnaire is designed to assess the subjects' situation and state in less than three minutes. Respondents typically carry a sufficient number of forms in a booklet. The general purpose of the ESM is to study the subjective experience of persons in their natural (or *in situ*) situation. Conceptually, the objective of the ESM is to expose patterns in the characteristics of a person's psychological state and the systematic effects of different settings on these states (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1987). Numerous studies by Csikszentmihalyi and colleagues further developed and refined the method in their studies of leisure, flow, and everyday life experiences (Kubey & Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Larson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1983). ESM is not new to recreation

and leisure research, and most recently has been employed by Samdahl (1991) to compare theoretical and connotative meanings of leisure.

Other *in situ* procedures are closely related to ESM. One adaptation of the ESM has been employed by Hull et al. (1992) who used markers along a trail instead of beepers. Each subject encountered the same set of markers which allowed the researchers to assess the effects of the sampled settings (i.e., the environment around the markers) across the sampled subjects. The advantage of this adaptation is that it provided control over the situation being sampled and it allowed the experimenters to describe and measure aspects of the situation. With the original procedures of ESM, subjects do not necessarily share the same environments (upon being beeped), so the assessment of the effects of situational attributes is problematic for two reasons: (1) assessment of within subject effects of situational attributes may be limited due to reliance on self-report to provide information about attributes; and (2) assessment of between subject differences regarding effects of situational attributes is limited due to subjects being in different situations upon being "beeped." The major difference between the basic ESM and the adaptation by Hull et al. is that all subjects respond within the context of nearly the same situational attributes. Such an adaptation may be useful in the study of research *questions about situations*.

Within their adaptation of ESM, the specific procedures of Hull et al. (1992) were as follows: Twelve environments (or views) along a day-hiking trail were marked by a temporary post, topped with a 20 cm. square placard. A number with an arrow pointing toward the landscape to be evaluated was painted on each placard. Hikers were instructed to stand behind each placard, face in the direction of the arrow, and complete one of the self-report questionnaire forms (see Appendix) that was contained in a booklet that was issued to them at the beginning of their hike. Potential subjects were recruited at the trailhead and asked whether they would be willing to participate in a research project. Persons were screened to insure their intent was to hike the full length of the trail associated with the study. Before describing the instructions in detail, the magnitude of the task was explained and potential subjects were told they would be rewarded with a candy bar at the beginning and end of their hikes and \$25 after they completed the full requirements of the study. If subjects agreed to participate, they were given a questionnaire booklet and detailed instructions on its use (about a 5 minute task). At each step in the process of subject recruitment, subjects were given the chance to decline to participate. Less than half of the subjects did so.

Other *in situ* designs also have been successfully employed. In pre-test/post-test studies, Ewert (1993) used agency personnel at trailhead stations to

administer questionnaires; Stewart (1992; see also, Manfredo, 1984) collected *in situ* data through on-trail interviews. Shaw's (1986) methods were tied to time-diary designs and required subjects to complete a series of questions at researcher-specified junctures in their time or behavior. Lee et al. (1994) issued a tape-recorder to each subject and required them to respond orally to a series of questions immediately following leisure activity.

In situ designs usually involve repeated measures; however, the number of repeated measures (i.e., situational assessments) vary widely. For practical reasons, there is typically an inverse relationship between number of repeated measures and number of subjects. As an example, if 10 subjects are called upon 10 times to complete 10 items, the researcher has 1000 data points with which to work; if 20 subjects complete 20 items 20 times, the researcher has 8000 data points. Other than pre-test/post-test designs, *in situ* research usually yields large amounts of data on a comparatively small number of individual subjects.

There is not a standard accepted method for the analysis of data collected through *in situ* designs. Because *in situ* methods typically collect many data on any given subject, it allows for extended analyses of individual cases as well as for useful aggregation over cases (Hormuth, 1986; Epstein, 1983; see also Petrinovich and Widaman, 1984, for the use of these designs in habituation studies). Thus, *in situ* designs potentially allow for the combination of two contrasting methodological approaches: the idiographic and the nomothetic. The idiographic approach would focus interpretation on individual change across various situations, whereas nomothetic analyses would search for similarities (in individual change) for aggregation purposes (Runyan, 1983; Samdahl, 1989).

In short, *in situ* designs provide a powerful framework to investigate questions about situations, persons, and their interaction. *In situ* methods explicitly recognize the varying influence of situations on individuals. However, any single method can not fully capture a phenomenon; and *in situ* designs are not without their limitations. The following discussion suggests some boundaries.

CRITICISMS OF IN SITU DESIGNS

Criticism 1. Self-report and the alteration of experience. Methods based on self-report can potentially alter the nature of the experience and the perception of the situation. Responding to questions about one's own mental state may affect that mental state. A question may serve as a prompt or stimulus that influences subjects' reports, and possibly affects reports to subsequent questions asked.

This criticism is not only directed at *in situ* designs, but also to most other methods in leisure, recreation, and tourism. One could argue that invasiveness to the on-site experience is higher with *in situ* compared to traditional methods (i.e., mail-back questionnaire) and hence, more likely to alter experience. However, due to the *ex situ* nature of traditional methods, one also could argue that the degree of invasiveness during the off-site recall of the on-site experience (i.e., recalling the on-site experience for the purposes of completing a questionnaire) is higher compared to *in situ* methods and hence, more likely to alter the experience. The point is that the potential for alteration of experience is a threat associated with any method that requires subjects to respond to questions. As a discipline, leisure, recreation, and tourism scholars have been tolerant of this threat. If self-report is required, then the threat of altering the leisure experience exists regardless of the timing of the asking of the question.

Criticism 2. Repeated self-reports and the alteration of experience. Repeatedly asking questions may enhance self-focused attention and make subjects abnormally self-aware. In doing so, it could promote conformity with perceived norms and alter the context and experience of the situation being studied (Wicklund, 1975; Hormuth, 1982). However, some researchers have argued that increased self-awareness is welcome because it improves the accuracy of self-reports (Hormuth, 1986; Brandstatter, 1983). Evidence from the self-awareness literature indicates that experimental inducement of self-awareness actually increases the validity of self-reported information (Franzoi & Brewer, 1984; Gibbons, 1983; Pryor et al., 1977). In a review of this literature, Hormuth concluded that the influence of periodic interruptions of ESM "does not seem to be strong enough to change the situation nor increase the accuracy of perception" (1986, p. 286). In their preliminary examination of self-awareness and leisure experience, Samdahl and Kleiber (1989) suggest that the intensity of self-awareness is not relevant to the quality of one's leisure experience; however, their approach to "self-awareness" was directed at "public self-awareness" rather than cognizance of internal states (pp. 8-9). One could argue that the nature of some leisure experiences demands total involvement of perceptual faculties (cf. Csikszentmihalyi, 1975) and hence, periodic interruptions and their potential for increased self-awareness would significantly alter the experience and concomitantly affect self-report. To the extent that this argument is valid would be a limitation of the application of *in situ* designs.

Criticism 3. Lack of compliance with the self-administration of self-report. The procedures for *in situ* designs, particularly ESM-related designs, usually require subjects to carry a packet of self-report questionnaire