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Abstract

Hospitality industry has a long history for providing accommodation along with recreation facilities to its patrons. Resorts are a more recent phenomenon in offering similar services. The similarity stops there as the people who use resorts have different expectations and motives to be there. While hotels are mainly used by the business people and are busier during the weekdays, resorts are generally used for vacation and rest and are busy during holiday season. The difference in the clientele’s motivations makes it difficult for the resort marketers to effectively position and market the property to the right segment. There have been many studies done primarily on hotel clients, while resorts have largely been neglected.

This study investigates the role of beliefs held by the clients and their previous experience of resort usage, when they choose resort accommodation for their vacation. The beliefs investigated in this study are based on the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1985, 1991) where he proposed that human behaviour is formed by three beliefs- benefit, normative and control. The Theory of Planned Behaviour is a well established theory and has been used extensively in medical, psychology and marketing disciplines. This study is the first step in evaluating the level of contribution beliefs make when Australian tourists decide on their resort accommodation purchase. To achieve this aim the resort market was segmented and then every segment was tested on the model developed for the study.
In this study, 412 people responded by filling out the questionnaires that were put in their rooms, by the participating resorts they were staying in. The study targeted all states and Territories of Australia. Every possible precaution was taken to maintain the anonymity of the respondents and the participating resorts to avoid compromising their financial interests.

The study found four segments of resort tourists. They were named active conventionalists, young conservatives, elite regulars and veterans. The role of beliefs and past experience in purchase decision was found to be of varying degrees amongst the segments. It was also found that benefit beliefs had the bigger role in resort selection compared to normative beliefs. Control beliefs had the least role in the formation of purchase behaviour. It was also found that while the Theory of Planned Behaviour was incapable of predicting resort accommodation purchase behaviour on its own, the addition of past behaviour to the mix increased the predictability perceptibly.

The main limitation of the research was that the researcher and the respondents were far removed from each other. It is recommended that in future studies; there must be a provision for qualitative data to complement the quantitative approach. Besides this, there are many more important recommendations made relating to design and application of the questionnaire for future studies. The study also stresses that similar studies should be conducted, preferably on longitudinal basis to confirm or reject the findings of the present study.
The present study contributed to the body of knowledge by providing a theoretical framework and suggesting a resort purchase predictability model incorporating beliefs and past experience of resort tourists. It also provided resort marketing planners with practical recommendations and implications in terms of attracting the right clients to their resorts as well as how to position their resorts for the intended market segment to get the best returns on their investment in marketing.
Chapter 1

Introduction
Chapter Overview

This chapter lays down the foundation for the thesis. It discusses the background of the study as there is a difference between a hotel and a resort property. They both provide accommodation but the people who go to these two have different motivations and expectations. The resort operators are forever investigating how to market their properties to get the best returns on their marketing expenditure. The chapter also explains the aims and objects, the limitations and the layout of the whole thesis.
1.1.0 Background and overview of the present study

Tourist resort hotels have been considered as one of the vital, service orientated, leisure tourism products in recent decades. In fact they have come to dominate the accommodation segments in the tourism industry all around the world on the basis of their special services and functions since the mid 1960s. While resorts have been in existence dating back to medieval times, resort hotels have a very short history and their proliferation as an indispensable part of the tourism industry has happened only with the economic boom experienced in many western economies from the 1960s (Papatheodoru, 2004). While tourist resorts are considered hotels as they offer similar services to business hotels, they differ in service expectations (Mill, 2002) as hotels are primarily used by the businessmen who expect the facilities to assist in their work as seen in the existence of business centres in hotels and higher occupancy during the week days compared to the weekends, where as the resort hotels focus mainly on rest and recreation and they are frequented more during the typical holiday periods. Therefore it is not surprising that most of the research has been focused on the hotels. The main reason could be that they form a major part of the hospitality industry as a sector besides they have been in existence for longer period of time as compared to resort hotels.

Tourism is expected to generate $US 10 trillion of economic activity and 328 million jobs worldwide by 2010. According to Tourism Forecasting Council (TFC) Australia is likely to get 9.4 million international visitors in year 2010. Tourism accounts for $A 48.7 billion or 8.6% of Australia’s Gross Domestic Product (Tourism Victoria
Strategic Plan, 2002-2006). Through the 1990s, the tourism industry has been considered to be the largest and fastest growing industry in the world with all levels of government (national, state, local) funding tourism boards to promote their locations. Tourism researchers have primarily focused on travellers, their needs, behaviours and their welfare (Krippendorf, 1987; Sharpley, 1994; Inbakaran, Jackson & Troung, 2004). It has also been stated that tourism is the largest peacetime movement of people and that tourism has had an astonishing high annual growth rate to the year 2000 (Upchurch & Teviane, 2000). A sizeable number of tourists visit various destination and non-destination resorts for their holiday needs while on their international and domestic trips. In many ways tourist resorts of all types assist the tourism destinations to attract the willing tourists with their novel packages and enticing guest activity programming.

Many economies are dependent on the financial benefits that arise from the tourists in the geographical area. To achieve a healthy flow of tourists through a community, they continually seek ways to attract the right type of people to maximise the return on their investment in the infrastructure. A better targeting of right segments result in a better sales revenue. Therefore, it is paramount for resort marketing managers to know who these people are and how do they get to the decision of buying resort products and services. As a result, choice of vacation destination has become one of the primary focuses of tourism management. The research focusing on tourists’ buying behaviour has discovered that individuals seek out the alternatives of the destinations to choose from before deciding on the final one. It is accepted that people first form a set of alternatives for tourism from their memory, then they evaluate each alternative on a set criteria to reach a final decision. This choice set is referred to as
the evoked set, while the whole bank of memory is referred to as the known set or the awareness set (Crompton, 1992; Crompton and Ankomah, 1993; Um and Crompton, 1990, 1992 and Woodside and Lyonski, 1989). To a certain degree, beliefs held by the buyers form the basis of their behaviour to select or reject a product or service. Ajzen (1985, 1991) developed the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) to investigate this phenomenon in the field of consumer behaviour and the psychology associated with purchase. According to Ajzen (1991) human behaviour is guided by three kinds of considerations; beliefs about the likely outcomes of the behaviour and evaluation of these outcomes, beliefs about the normative expectations of others and motivations to comply with these expectations and the beliefs about the presence of factors that may facilitate or impede performance of the behaviour and the perceived power of these factors. Furthermore, there have been suggestions that predictive power of the TPB model can be enhanced by incorporating past experience in the paradigm (Abraham, 2001). Paradoxically some researchers have found TPB model to be too rigid to explain the complex interplay of beliefs in destination selection with changes over time and situations (Hudson, 1999; Litvin and MacLaurin, 2001).

There is very little academic research on tourist resorts and the reasons people choose them. A very important development has taken place recently concerning tourist research in Australia. For the first time, Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) have segmented the domestic tourist market into four main groups. This research project looks into the interrelationship of satisfaction, beliefs and perceptions that form the buying behaviour of the segments proposed by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) in resort hotels.
As mentioned before, the managers of the tourism and the researching academics would like to know the motivating factors that propel a tourist to select a particular destination. This dissertation aims to understand these factors better by applying the theory of planned behaviour as proposed by Ajzen (1991). Specifically, this study will investigate the interplay of the beliefs of the consumers and the past behaviour to create a model that could be utilised by the tourism managers to place their resorts for selection by the prospective buyers.

1.2.0 Aim of the Research

The main objective of the study is

- to segment the tourists using resorts in Australia
- to propose a conceptual model which describes the factors that affect the travellers’ choice of resort hotels based on their beliefs along with the effect of past behaviour and
- to test the model across the segments using multivariate data analysis techniques.

1.3.0 Justification of the Study

Tourism generates a significant amount of revenue for many communities and localities thus they continually keep searching for new ways of attracting potential tourists as suppliers of such services are well aware of the competition they have from other available; similar or dissimilar choices. The more they can tap into the potential market, the better the returns are in terms of revenue. Therefore, it is justifiably critical for the marketing managers of resort accommodation to know the segment of the population who may be more attuned to and positively motivated to
avail their type of resort accommodation and the attractions they offer. This knowledge is crucial for their marketing efforts.

Psychology based researchers on tourists’ destination choice behaviour in the past have found that people usually consider different options before settling down for the final destination choice. The investigation of the beliefs held by the prospective consumers along with their past experience could be a very good predictor of their behaviour.

1.4.0 Significance of the Study

This study captures the current research gaps and deficiencies in resort tourist segmentations and the addition of psychographics to the published demographic model. Its significance lies in both academic and practical aspects.

On the academic level, the outcome of the study may contribute to the current body of knowledge in three areas,

- Firstly, as discovered and discussed in the literature review that research in this area is very limited. This can be partially explained by the obvious lack of suitable theoretical frameworks in the study area as this sector of tourism is relatively new. Furthermore, this is the first study to employ theory of planned behaviour in the context of a tourist’s buying behaviour for resort hotels. The successful completion may enhance the understanding of resort hotels from customer beliefs point of view and contribute a theoretical model suitable to understand and predict the resort accommodation purchase behaviour in other geographical settings.
- Secondly, the introduction of past experience will provide more comprehensive understanding of purchase intention behaviour in resort hotels.
• Thirdly, the model that evolves out of this study will be used for further confirmation or replication in future studies.

• Finally, it will strengthen interest in the sector and provide a platform to conduct further studies by other scholars.

In practical aspects the study will contribute in the following areas.

• Firstly, this study will help the operators of resort hotels to understand the tourist segments for their specific factors that mould their purchase intention behaviour.

• Secondly, the operators will be able to make required changes and position their products to suit the needs of the specific segment they want to attract.

• Finally, they will be able to market their property to the right segment, based on the existing attributes, thus saving on unnecessary developments / modifications their marketing budget and getting the optimum returns on their marketing expense.

1.5.0 Research Questions

• What is the composition of resort tourist segments on the basis of their demographics, reasons for visiting a resort and the activities they indulge in?

• To what degree the normative beliefs held by of the resort vacationer segments’ decision to purchase their leisure resort accommodation?

• How do the behavioural beliefs affect the accommodation buying intentions of the resort tourists segments in Australia?

• Do the perceived behavioural control beliefs of the resort market segments, at times, by-pass their behaviour intentions when making the purchases?
• What is the effect of past purchases of resort hotel facilities on the future purchase intentions of such facilities?

1.6.0 Limitations of the Scope of the Study

There are many limitations to the study. The primary one is that the industry itself is not homogenous. The most difficult one to fathom is the effect of the ownership structure and the cultural orientation of the owners. This study also does not investigate the factor whether the resort hotel belongs to a chain or is a stand alone property. This factor is important as they are usually operated with different perspectives. The resort industry spans across the globe. The multinational resort chains have a very broad customer base as they market their hotels to the customers in various countries. Similarly, an Australia based resort chain may have a completely different customer profile that uses its offerings in Australia, as compared to the one that may patronise its resort located in Europe, Asia or Americas. This contributing factor is beyond the scope of this study.

The study focuses only on the resorts in Australia. Australia being a large continent, it will be imprudent to assume that what is being offered in the northern parts of the country will be similar to what is being offered in the southern parts as well as they operate in completely different climatic conditions. Besides this geographical difference, the differences of the location of the resort in one area will differ according to altitude, local tourist interests, purpose of visit and the season of their utilisation. These factors individually or collectively alter the way a resort is perceived by the consumers. This study has a very broad scope and it is not considering the resorts according to their classification, geographical or based on a star system to be applicable to each and every resort individually.
The major limitation of the study is that its results are based on the questions considered to be important by the researcher and does not have an option to interview the respondents to elicit their specific views that are being left unasked. This limitation is acknowledged and accepted due to the fact that such enquiry will require massive amounts of man hour and budget, way beyond the researcher’s or the university’s resources.

1.7.0 Organisation of the Study

The study is organised in the following sequence. In the first chapter, the definition of resorts, aim, justification and significance of the study are discussed along with the research questions and the major limitations of the effort.

In the second chapter, the existing literature on the segmentation of tourists, theory of planned behaviour and past experience is discussed. The study is focused primarily on

![Figure 1: Theory of Planned Behaviour Model (Ajzen, 1985)](image)

the buying behaviour of tourists in Australia who avail resorts accommodation. To achieve the aim of the study, the literature review focuses on; tourist segmentation, the available literature on beliefs as proposed by Ajzen (1985) and past behaviour. The marketing literature is full of many attempts to study the buying behaviour using different constructs. This project uses the established and studied Ajzen’s (1985)
theory of planned behaviour as the basis to construct buyer beliefs which provides it a
definite aim while giving it the scope, depth and focus and maintains academic rigor.
Although researchers have found positive relationships between buying behaviour and
the stated constructs (beliefs and past experience) individually, this is the first time the
constructs have been used in this combination to investigate resort accommodation
purchase behaviour by Australian tourists. The literature review looks at the
segmentation of tourist market first and then investigates the available literature on
beliefs. Finally, it goes through the previous studies concerning past behaviour. These
variables come together in the proposed model in this chapter. In the same chapter,
the hypotheses are also developed based on the theory. They are as follows.
Hypothesis 1:

Tourists using resorts accommodation can be segmented in various

Hypothesis 2:

Positive attitude toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to
their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.

Hypothesis 3:

Positive subjective norm toward resorts by the tourists is directly
linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.

Hypothesis 4:

Positive perceived behavioural control by the tourists toward resorts is
directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.

Hypothesis 5:

Past experience of resort accommodation purchase by the tourists
positively affects their behaviour intention.

The third chapter explains the research methodology in detail. In total, 348 resorts of
various types were approached for their cooperation for the research. The request
letters were sent to their postal addresses and that was followed up with a phone call
to explain the nature and scope of the research to the managers / owners. Finally, 43
establishments agreed to participate. Each were sent 50 questionnaires with stamped
envelops. After a month, 257 filled out questionnaires were received. Another round
of telephone calls elicited further 178 responses. Out of the total 23 were found to be
The chapter goes on to elaborate the rationale behind the questionnaire construction such as demographics related questions in one section, TPB related questions in the second section and past experience related questions in the third section. SPSS package was used to analyse the data.

The fourth chapter describes the data analysis. A frequency analysis table is presented to describe respondents’ demographic characteristics. The groups were formed from the data using the cluster analysis (K-means). An analysis was conducted to investigate the correlations amongst belief constructs in the TPB model. To model was tested using ANOVA for regression analysis and new model was developed to improve the predictability of resort accommodation purchase behaviour. It also shows how different segments found in the study measure up on the model construct to predict their purchase intention behaviour individually.

The fifth chapter discusses the four clusters that arise out of analysis. Their reasons for going to a resort along with the activities they indulge in. The whole sample was tested on the original model and the proposed model. An improvement in the predictability of their purchase behaviour was noticed. Further, the clusters were separated as individual files and the predictability of the proposed model to explain the variance. The study comes up with interesting and distinguishable clusters which is a good sign as these clusters can be individually approached for marketing purposes. The study proposes the following model as improvement over the TPB model.
Figure 3: Resort Accommodation Purchase Behaviour Model

In chapter six, limitations of the research are discussed as well as further recommendations are made. In short it maintains that the study is limited only to the people who were at a resort at the time of data collection. It would have been better to include the people who have experienced resort accommodation in the past to capture the information based on their reflection. The study does not make any attempt to include the cross cultural comparisons although such differences exist and they do affect range of beliefs. The response rate was low. This could be attributed to the length of the questionnaire as well as the geographical distance between the respondents and the researcher. Further, it was dependent on the interest and degree of support the managers/owners of resorts had for the study as they are generally very parochial about their clients. The study considers two separate measurements of behaviour ‘intention’ and ‘attitude’ which potentially increases statistical error. Finally, as the study investigates the behaviour only at the time of data collection, and not over an extended period of time to study variances that may creep in, the results of
this study should be treated with caution till such time they are replicated in other studies.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Chapter Overview

This literature review prepares the basis for hypotheses development. In this chapter, the definition of resort and its meaning are debated to make the reader understand the scope of study. The chapter then discusses the various attempts made in the field of tourist segmentation. Next, it talks about the available literature on beliefs as proposed by Ajzen (1991) and finally studies investigating past behaviour are examined. This chapter establishes that although academics have found positive relationships between buying behaviour and the stated constructs individually, this is the first time these have been used in this combination to investigate resort accommodation purchase behaviour by Australian tourists. It proposes five hypotheses; one on segmentation of Australian resort tourists, three on the theory of planned behaviour and its relationship with the resort tourists’ accommodation purchase behaviour and intention and one on past behaviour and its impact on the improvement on purchase behaviour predictability.
2.1.0 Defining Resorts in Australia:

The resorts are defined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) as:

‘Establishments which are integrated complexes containing accommodation and a variety of eating and drinking places. These establishments provide facilities / services additional to those commonly provided by hotels or motels. They may encompass some natural physical amenities, a special location, attraction or activity. They provide accommodation on a room / suite / cabin / unit basis. These establishments provide sufficient night life and day time activities to encourage an extended, self-contained, on-site holiday’ ABS (1989).

However, resorts are defined and identified differently by the industry. Weigh and Gibbings (1991) while reviewing the performance of the accommodation sector focused on hotels, motels and caravan parks yet alluded to the future role of resorts identified as destinations and genuine contenders for product development. In general the academic definition of resorts has tended to be pragmatic. Gunn (1988:108) defines resorts as ‘complexes providing a variety of recreations and social settings at one location’. This does not refer to tourism or tourists specifically. Another definition by Burkart and Medlik (1985:14) is still very general but does refer to tourism when they say that ‘gradually the term resort has come to acquire its literal meaning to denote any visitor centre to which people resort in large numbers’. The authors then proceed to include capital cities within the definition on account of their role of centres of commerce. Leiper (2004:7) refers to resorts as ‘a destination,
normally not far away, for recreational purposes – for rest, relaxation and / or entertainment’ which people visit temporarily.

Although governments have tried to define resorts such as in case of Queensland’s Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 and its subsequent amendment in 1987 which was later elaborated into the state-wide Integrated Resort Development Act 1987, the primary concern and aim of such effort has been the investors only. The responsibility of defining and classifying resorts has fallen on the private sector. The major contributors are the motoring organisations, tour operators and the resorts themselves. This situation has given rise to the application of different standards to classify an accommodation provider as a resort. ‘As there are no legal or regulatory restrictions on what a property may call itself, or what a tour operator can describe a property as. Even a caravan site can describe itself as a resort and in fact, many do’ (King and Whitelaw, 2003: 60).

White (1985) acknowledges that motels can be resorts as well. His definition of the resort motel depends on what facilities are available around it rather than the facility being a part of an integrated complex. He defines resort motels as follows

‘A resort motel caters for travellers wishing to stay on extended time in one locality in order to take full advantage of the local attractions … Ideally a resort motel should be located near large, open, public spaces such as parks, golf courses, lakes, rivers, beaches or man made attractions.’ (pp. 108-9)
A stricter definition is provided by the Royal Automobile Club of Victoria which specifies what must be included ‘on the premises’ to merit resort categorisation. Resorts are described as those establishments as ‘A property in spacious grounds … providing meals and a wide range of recreational activities. It should have full time activities staff / guides, a tour activities desk and a variety of eating outlets’ (Source: RACV Accommodation Guide 06/07:25). It includes hotels, motels and caravan parks under this classification. The guide gives some pointers as to what could be classified as a resort, however, this does not preclude a property from calling itself a resort or advertising itself as a resort in the guide to take advantage of consumer perceptions for marketing purposes.

Facing such a dilemma, the study focuses on the star rating sources and picks various properties from all states and territories of Australia. This approach captures both self-drive tourists and the ones who are transported to the accommodation by airline and coach companies. Although, due care has been taken and extensive study of the resort properties has been done, it is still possible that a hotel or a motel may be referred to as a ‘resort’ by the respondents. However, the perception should not have a major effect on the final data as the respondents were approached at an establishment identified at a resort by the researcher.

2.2.0 Tourist Market Segmentation:

The concept of market segmentation to the field of marketing was introduced by Smith (1956:6). He provides the definition of market segmentation as ‘market segmentation … consists of viewing a heterogenous market (one characterized by
divergent demand) as a number of smaller homogenous markets’. The aim of segmenting a market is to identify or put groups of people in clusters on predefined parameters. This helps in studying them in depth as a single entity. In case the group or segment is of considerable size then the marketing mix of product or service offered could be modified to cater for the needs of the said market. Thus the biggest benefit of market segmentation is to acquire a competitive advantage in the market place as the product / service is positioned knowing reasonably well in advance that it will be bought by the identified group while maintaining advertising efficiency. Kotler et al. (2004:345) maintain that ‘markets consist of buyers, and buyers differ in one or more ways’. As the buyers differ in their requirements, disposable income, area, attitudes to a product and the way they buy them, each segment has unique needs and wants, thus it is important to research them and package the products and services tailored especially for them.

There have been over 50 attempts to segment the tourism market in general but there has been minimal published research on resort visitors (Jackson et al, 2003). The fact segmentation assists in marketing to the needs of a particular group (Dodd and Bigotte, 1997, Snepenger, 1987), lowers the costs and increases effective penetration of appropriate promotional material (Dodd and Bigotte, 1997). Tourist segmentation, in the general sense, has been done on the basis of demographics (Dodd and Bigotte, 1997, Field, 1999, Jeffrey and Xie, 1995 and Kim et al, 2003), geographic (Formica and Uysal, 1998, Frew and Shaw, 1999, Moscardo et al, 2000, Spotts and Mahoney 1993), psychographic (Coupal et al, 2001, Galloway, 2002) and behaviour (Bonn et al, 1999, Cordoso et al, 1999 and Park et al, 2002).
Australia has a holiday culture but there has been very limited research done in this country. In reviewing the available literature of the last ten years it was found that very limited study has been done on Australian tourists. Of the 50 articles considered, only six were based in Australia (Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002; Dolnicar, 2005; Inbakaran and Jackson, 2005; Inbakaran, Jackson and Chettri, 2004; Kim et al., 2003 and Mohsin, 2005).

The following table depicts the recent segmentation studies in different countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inbakaran et al (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dolnicar, 2002; Dolnicar and Leisch, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ibrahim and Gill, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carmichael and Smith, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Islands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diaz-Perez, Bethencourt-Cejas and Alvarez-Gonzalez, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orth and Tureckova, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jung, 2004; Lee, Morrison and O’leary, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baloglu and Uysal, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mok and Iverson, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>McKercher and du Cros, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trunfio et al, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beh and Bruyere, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mehmetlogue, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Liu, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frochot, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bigne and Andreu, 2004; Diaz-Martín, Iglesias, Vazques and Ruiz, 2000; González and Bello, 2002; Juaneda and Sastre, 1999; Molera and Albaladeja, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bloom, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hong, Kim and Kim, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chang, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Phetvaroon, 2006; Hoontrakul and Sahadev, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alvarez and Asugman, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goulding, 1999; Prentice et al, 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Baloglu, Weaver and McCleary, 1998; Brown, 2003; Hu and Yu, 2007; Hudson and Ritchie, 2002; Leisen, 2001; Littrell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present study investigates resort tourists that are of Australian origin and thus fill the gap in the body of knowledge.

Scholars have considered various attributes to segment the tourist market such as online / offline tourism information search behaviour (Alvarez and Asugman, 2006), push and pull (Baloglu and Uysal, 1996), senior residents (Baloglu et al, 1998, Goulding, 1999, Litterll et al., 2004, Kim et al, 2003 and Mathur et al, 1998), wildlife and nature (Beh and Bruyere, 2007, Mehmetoglu, 2007, Prentice et al, 1998 and Hong et al, 2003), emotions (Bigne and Andreu, 2004, Gonzalez and Bello, 2002), Aboriginal culture and culture (Chang, 2006, Kim and Jogarathnam, 2003, McKercher and du Cros, 2003 and Dolnicar, 2002), wine tourism (Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002), quality expectations (Diaz-Martin et al, 2000), expenditure (Diaz-Perez et al 2005, Lee et al, 2006), fear (Dolnicar, 2005), rural life (Frochot, 2005, Molera and Albaladeja, 2006), shopping (Hu and Yu, 2007, Lee et al, 2006, Littrell et al., 2004), perceptions (Ibrahim and Gill, 2005) lifestyle (Inbakaran et al, 2004) image (Leisen, 2001 and Zafar, 1996) benefits and value for money (Mykletun et al, 2001, Moskowitz and Krieger, 2003) and vacation style typology (Orth and Tureckova, 2002) to name the major ones. None have made a concerted effort to explore segmentation on the basis of beliefs and only one study has been undertaken on past behaviour (Phetvaroon, 2006) to classify the tourist market. This study has been designed to fill the gap left by scholars in the field of tourism.
Studies conducted in the field of tourism are as diverse as the topics discussed above. The authors have considered a variety of sample sizes from as small as 146 (Littrell et al., 2004) to as large as 333,428 (Carmichael and Smith, 2004) or in the 5,000’s (Dolnicar and Leisch, 2004, Spencer and Holecek, 2007). Most of the researchers have used questionnaires while some have used structured interviews (Baloglu and Uysal, 1996, Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002, Dolnicar, 2002, Hudson and Ritchie, 2002, Juaneda and Sastre, 1999, Lee et al, 2006, Prentice et al, 1998, Spencer and Holecek, 2007), on-site observation and focus group interviews (Goulding, 1999) and secondary or historical data (Carmichael and Smith, 2004, Myklestun et al, 2001 and Peterson and Malhotra, 2000). The present study used a questionnaire and is based on responses from 412 individuals.

The segmentation of tourists in the present environment is unique, more complex and multi-dimensional than in the past. Demographics based on sex, age and income were the primary tools of the researchers to classify the market segments. Liu, 1999:5, rightly says that these days, one has to be much more sophisticated when segmenting markets. ‘Specifically, cluster segments of the vacation market must be catered for based on arrays of multi-opinioned needs and consumer characteristics’. This view is transformed in the approach where the choice is not between ‘sun or fun holidays; young or old; male or female; but rather, creative holiday combinations which incorporate a cluster of market requirements’. The individual’s behavioural beliefs are a strong motivating factor as found by many scholars (Alvarez and Asugman, 2006; Baloglu et al, 1996; Beh and Bruyere, 2007; Bigne and Andreu, 2004;
Dolnicar, 2005; Gonzalez and Bello, 2002; Ibrahim and Gill, 2005; Mohsin, 2005 and Peterson and Malhotra, 2000). The resort industry faces the challenge of understanding the components and composition of the segments to decide which cluster to approach to gain a competitive advantage over other suppliers of similar products and services.

Personal characteristics are widely used as predefined segmentation criteria for market segmentation. These could include socio-demographics such as students verses retired people, behavioural variables such as repeat visitors verses first time visitors and psychographic variables such as tourists interested in the local population verses tourists attending a major sporting event (Dolnicar, 2008).

Market segments can be created in different ways. There are two popular and established approaches. The first is *a priori* or commonsense segmentation (Alvarez and Asugman, 2006; Dolnicar, 2004 and Inbakaran et al 2004). In this approach the personal characteristics used to segment buyers are decided in advance. In other words the groups are formed according to a criterion that is expected to cause heterogeneity of responses among the customers. A typical example of this is the tourists’ country of origin. On the other hand a ‘response based’ approach forms groups by identifying patterns of responses given by customers (Dolnicar, 2004).

The terms used to describe response based approaches can be *post priori* (*post hoc*) or data-driven segmentation (Carmichael and Smith, 2004; Dolnicar, 2004; Hoontrakul and Sahadev 2008; Mykletun *et al* 2001 and Spencer and Holecek, 2007). Numerous publications list and evaluate these approaches in a comprehensive manner (Arabie *et
al., 1996; Baumann, 2000; Dickinson, 1990 and Punj and Stewart, 1983). In the response based approach multiple variables are used to form market segments. These could be a set of ten tourism motives or a set of six behaviours related to tourism. These variables provide a base for the segmentation and are used to create groups of similar respondents. The resulting segments have to be interpreted and understood well before they are named. This approach is fundamentally an exploratory data-driven one. In tourism, cluster analysis is usually employed to identify or construct segments (Alvarez and Asugman, 2006; Beh and Bruyere, 2007; Bigne and Andreu, 2004; Brown, 2003; Carmichael and Smith, 2004; Chang, 2006). A typical example of this approach is benefit segmentation.

The use of the *a priori* approach is favoured to split customers into homogenous sub-groups in terms of customer response if it is known from prior research or experience as to what variables to use as it is simple to use and provides answers for the problem at hand. If that is not the case then tourism managers need to explore the ways in which homogenous response sub groups can best be constructed to form the data at hand. According to Dolnicar (2004) the grouping techniques are dependent on many considerations. The selection of variables those are included in the researching procedure. The grouping technique is to be employed. The similarity of measures those are appropriate and uniform. The number of groups or clusters to be achieve in the final solution. This could lead to either too few segments, that would be difficult to reach once they are identified or too many segments that lose their individual identity and are thus impossible to tap in the marketing effort. Finally, the researcher should be confident that the grouping chosen is not purely a random solution.
While as a researcher the above points are pertinent, as a marketer there are a few more considerations to be sought. Kotler (1991) states that the segments must be mutually exclusive meaning that they must have recognisable attributes that set them apart. The segments must be exhaustive so that they justify the marketing budget. The segments also should be measurable. These are always considered while segmentation of a population is undertaken. Additionally, they must be accessible and at the same time substantial, so that returns on marketing investment are positive. Most importantly, the segments should respond in a different manner to a marketing strategy, that is, to marketing mix variables controlled by the marketer.

2.3.0 Focus of Study in Recent Tourist Segmentation Literature:

2.3.1 Search Behaviour:

An individual’s environment exerts strong influence on the way one searches for information in the decision making process (Smith, 1994). Many researchers have suggested that an individual’s physical, cultural and social environment along with his / her direct or indirect relations to this environment has a strong influence on the decision making process (Mitchie, 1986). Goodall (1991) says the decision making process is very much dependent on context. The desire to search for tourism information for travel purposes can be brought about by activities such as viewing advertisements, watching a movie containing holiday information, recommendation of friends or a sudden inheritance (Nichols and Slepenger, 1988). The consumer behaviour literature has made a distinction between internal, such as memory search and information retrieval, based on prior consumption or information experience
(Engel, et al 1993) and external search processes that provide extra information needed to make the decision. The cost one is ready to pay for such information depends on the cost of information uncertainty (the possible consequences of not knowing) and importance of the decision (Jenkin, 1978).

The composition of travellers in terms of individual verses family or other social grouping with the type of decision and information search have been studied by Gitelson and Crompton (1983) and Nichols and Snepenger (1988). The destination choice, including information search behaviour while with family or friends at the vacation destination, was investigated along with the influence of friends and relatives on information search behaviour, was investigated by Gitelson and Crompton (1979). Snepenger et al (1990) studied the information search strategies of ‘destination naives’. The strong association between previous destination experience and its impact on information search intensity was observed by Woodside and Ronkainen, (1986). The Internet is more recent phenomenon and it is being used by marketers in increasing numbers. The uptake of on-line information by the consumer has been strong probably because there is negligible cost associated with it (Moe and Fader, 2004). With this increase the researchers have also started segmenting the market based on on-line purchase behaviour (Jainszeewski, 1998; Chen and Cooper, 2001; Moe and Fader, 2004). In 2006, Alvarez and Asugman segmented the tourism market in Turkey on the basis of their search behaviour. They formed two specific segments risk-takers and risk-averse. Risk-takers were found to use less information sources to plan their holidays and value the experimental aspects of the holiday and are more likely to return to previously visited destinations. Another interesting study of on-line search behaviour focusing on Thailand was conducted by Hoontrakul and Sahadev
They profiled the customers and provided some suggestions to convert the inquiry into purchase by altering the supply side variables such as providing more attractive room rates, enrolling more hotels etc.

2.3.2 Motives:

Many scholars have studied motives as a basis of segmentation. Most of them have been around the concept of ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors. This concept was explained by Uysal and Hagan (1993) as a force that pushes or pulls people to take travel decisions. The concept of push has traditionally been explained as the desire for travel while pull has been the destination choice (Crompton, 1979; Christensen, 1983). They are further explained by Uysal and Hagan (1993). The ‘push’ factors are intangible or intrinsic desires of the traveller such as the desire to escape, rest and relaxation, health and fitness, adventure, prestige and social interaction. On the other hand, ‘pull’ are tangible factors such as beaches, recreational facilities and historic resources as well as travellers’ expectations and perceptions. While Crompton (1979) identified nine motivations to travel, Yuan and McDonald (1990) studied twelve factors, Pyo et al (1989) investigated four dimensions, and Oh et al (1995) studied five factors. Some scholars have looked at motives as ‘benefit seeking’ (Driver et al, 1987, 1991; Manning 1986; Haggard and Williams, 1991), some have gone in search of legacy and culture (Ivnko, 1996; Silverberg, 1995; McCain and Ray, 2003; Chang, 2006), while others have studied motives such as rural shopping (Oppermann, 1995; Kastenholz et al., 1999; Murdoch et al, 2003; Carmichael and Smith, 2004), green, rural and cultural experience tourism (Richards, 1996; Blackwell, 1997; Miller, 1997; Prentice et al. 1998; Kemmerling Clack, 1999; Frochot and Morrison, 2000; Ryan et
al. 2000; McKercher and du Cros, 2003, Hong et al, 2003 Frochot, 2005; Mehmetoglu, 2007) and recreation (Rothschild, 1984; Selin and Howard, 1988; McIntyre, 1989; Beckman and Crompton, 1989; Robinson, 1992; Park et al, 2002).

In a recent study, Beh and Bruyere (2007), investigated eight visitor motivations; general viewing, nature, culture, adventure, mega-fauna, escape, learn and personal growth to segment the market in three wild-life reserves of Kenya. They analysed 465 questionnaires and found three segments who they labelled escapists, learners and spiritualists.

2.3.3 Emotions:

Tourism as a leisure activity is based on emotions. Studies have shown that interaction with service providers increases the satisfaction in the buyers (Mittal and Baker, 1998; Winsted, 2000). Over two decades ago, consumer behaviour researchers started addressing the role of emotions in consumption (Peterson et al, 1986). Many academics have studied emotions within the marketing discipline (Bagozzi, 1997; Dube and Menon, 2000; Smith and Bolton, 2002) with its theoretical and practical implications. The use of emotions as a segmentation base is still a relatively new approach (Hirschman and Stern, 1999, Liljander and Strandvic, 1997; Westbrook and Oliver, 1991). Bigne and Andreu, 2004 segmented the tourists on the basis of emotions. They collected 400 questionnaires from tourists in Spain and named their segments, angry-satisfied; unhappy-happy; dissatisfied-very pleased; sad-joyful; disappointed-delighted; bored-entertained; depressed-cheerful; calm-enthusiastic; passive-active and indifferent-surprised. This was a very good example of
segmentation based on consumer emotions evoked by the enjoyment of leisure and tourism services. Their findings were that when people experience greater pleasure and arousal emotions transformed the experience into a greater level of satisfaction, thus increase loyalty and the willingness to pay more.

2.3.4 Fear and Risk Taking in Tourism:

Fear as an element of perceived risk was first studied in a consumer behaviour context by Bauer (1960) Zuckerman (1964) studied the opposite of fear in sensation seeking in a study which is still being used in the adventure tourism area. The idea is based on the premise that the perception of risk is related to tourists’ competence or investigated from a thrill – seeking perspective or the level of risk / thrill sought by an individual. The concept of intrinsic risk was proposed by Bettman (1972) which can not be managed by information search and risk reduction techniques when a consumer makes a decision. Bettman’s (1972) typology makes the basis of studies in fear and consumer behaviour. Developing on the previous work Bouter et al (1988) investigated the downhill skiers. It was thought that people who seek thrill will be more prone to injury but their findings were found to be the contrary. The reason for such finding was thought to be based on the assumption that thrill seekers were more experienced skiers. Adventure tourists in search of sensation were investigated by Cronin (1991). It was found that the mountain climbers score high on the scale. Roehl and Fesemnaier (1992) studied risks and found seven categories; equipment risk, financial risk, physical risk, psychological risk, satisfaction risk, social risk and time risk. Cossens and Gin (1994) found a direct link between fear of HIV infection and destination choice. An association amongst past behaviour, and perceived risks was
seen by Sommez and Graefe (1998) while studying the intention to travel to certain destination. Pizam et al (2002) found strong empirical evidence for the association of risk and sensation seeking with travel behaviour and the choice of leisure activities.

In an interesting study, Dolnicar, 2005 used fear, a human emotion, as a segmentation basis. She studied 373 Australian tourists and came up with four segments namely; high-fear, thrill-seekers, overseas sceptics and low-fear. In the present state of fear where the tourists are constantly made aware of the possibilities of both physical harm, in the shape of a terrorist attack, or equipment risk, where the tourists could be harmed by infections such as bird flu, AIDS or Hepatitis C. The marketing approach based on fear is a real tool that can be used for marketing opportunities for the domestic Australian tourists.

2.3.5 Expectations:

In a recent study Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) made an exhaustive study on resort patrons within Australia. The holidaying resort guests were interviewed in various tourist resorts. A total of 1,100 resort tourists were interviewed and 774 were considered. The focus of the study was to segment the domestic resort tourists’ in distinguishing groups on the basis of their demographics and reasons for choosing the particular resort. The resultant resort tourist segments were compared on reasons for resort selection in general, resort preferences, resort vacation opinions, resort service expectation and overall satisfaction. The author generated four distinct cluster groups of domestic resort tourists and named them as romantics,immersers, tasters and
veterans. The clusters differed on the basis of age, education, lifecycle and duration of patronage.

The subjective interpretation of resort tourist segments and labelling by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) needs to be investigated as the labels have been their own assumptions and it is expected the addition of psychographics to this clustering scheme will deliver different segments as they have not objectively tested if these differences are indeed present / occur in their clustering scheme. Although this was the first attempt at segmenting the Australian market, the segmentation scheme was based on demographics. The segments were labelled based on a speculation of the likely lifestyles of the groups that were clustered on the basis of demographic variables. This study will take this further by testing them against the proposed variables.

**Hypothesis 1:**

*Tourists using resorts as a destination can be segmented into various groups.*

**2.4.0 Role of Beliefs in Buying Behaviour:**

Since the focus of this thesis is on consumer decision making, it will draw on the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) (Ajzen, 1985, 1991) which has been a dominant paradigm in the consumer behaviour and psychology areas. According to Ajzen (1991), human behaviour is guided by three kinds of considerations: beliefs about the likely outcomes of the behaviour and evaluations of these outcomes (behavioural beliefs), beliefs about the normative expectations of others and motivation to comply
with these expectations (normative beliefs), and beliefs about the presence of factors that may facilitate or impede performance of the behaviour and the perceived power of these factors (control beliefs). In their respective aggregate, behavioural beliefs produce a favourable or unfavourable attitude toward behaviour, normative beliefs result in perceived social pressure or subjective norm and control beliefs give rise to perceived behavioural control.

**TPB** is defined as a tendency to evaluate an object with some degree of favour or disfavour (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). Attitude held by people as a predictor of human behaviour has been studied under this theory to a great extent. Researchers have focused on the travellers’ attitude towards a destination and the relationship between this attitude and their actual behaviour. It has been generally believed people, who have a positive attitude, are more likely to engage in supporting or approaching the target of such attitude.

The theory of reasoned action (TRA) has been used to express the relationship model stream of attitude-behaviour (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen and Driver, 1992). This theory
suggests that the intention is a precursor of behaviour; therefore it is the determinant factor for behaviour. At the same time the same theory suggested that intention is influenced by personal beliefs about the behaviour and by social influence. To put it in other words, intention refers to a person’s willingness or motivation to carry out behaviour, and this behavioural intention is determined by attitude and subjective norms (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Attitude is a cognitive evaluation of behaviour and subjective norms as what an individual thinks and whether or not others in the social or family circle condone such behaviour (Chiou, 2000). Taylor and Todd (1995) believe that attitude and subjective norms are related to belief structures, and each belief is combined with the importance of the desirability of outcomes from performing the behaviour and the importance of following others’ opinions concerning the behaviour.

The above theory is supported by empirical studies that showed a high correlation between the intention to engage in chosen acts and the combination of attitude toward behaviour and subjective norms (Albarracin et al. 2001; Conner and Armitage, 1998). However, several researchers have found that there is a weak relationship between intention and behaviour if there are some impediments to performance (Ajzen, 1991). When these conditions prevail, the theory of reasoned action becomes impractical in predicting the relationship between intention and behaviour because the theory assumes that there should be no obstacles in the way (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993).

The theory of reasoned action was extended to become a theory of planned behaviour just to counter such problems raised by the presence of the obstacles. The perceived behaviour control was added by Ajzen (1991) as the third component. The perceived
behavioural control (PBC) refers to the extent to which a person believes that he or she can perform the behaviour or the perceived amount of resources and control which he or she has over the behaviour. Thus Ajzen (1991) proposed that intention can be predicted not only from attitudes and subjective norms but also from perceived behavioural control which directly influences the action. The addition of this third element provided some excellent results in predicting human endeavours: pollution reduction behaviours of managers (Cordano and Frieze, 2000), ethical behaviours of sales persons (Kurland, 1996), physical activity participation by elementary school children (Mummery et al. 2000), smoking, drinking and drug use by adolescents (Grube and Morgan, 1990), purchase behaviour by students (Chiou, 2000), drinking behaviours of university students (Wall et al. 1996), recreation behaviour of students (Ajzen and Driver, 1992) and behaviours of hunters (Hrubes et al. 2001).

When Ajzen (2001) proposed that attitude is based on expectancy – value model, he acknowledged that overall attitude can be automatically accessed without cognitive efforts when a target is related to a previously stored object. In addition he agreed that while attitude is not stable, contexts or current-activated goals can vary the accessibility of beliefs, saying that ‘various contextual factors can temporarily make certain beliefs more readily accessible (p. 32)’ and ‘people evaluate objects in relation to currently active goals (p. 35).’ Similarly, Duran and Trafimow (2000) also suggested that people may have an entire set of ‘for’ and ‘against’ criteria to evaluate the entire concept. These may access the underlying attitude first before contacting self-beliefs.
Although one advantage of the TPB is its economical approach to purposive behaviour, its sufficiency has been questioned. For example, researchers proposed additional components to address self identity processes (Sparks and Shephard, 1992), moral norms (Parker et al, 1995), distinction between perceptions of control and perception of self-efficacy (Armitage and Conner, 1999) and anticipated emotions (Parker et al., 1995). Having said that, the TPB has been widely used with satisfactory sufficiency in social psychology, and the model has been supported by many studies.

In the context of hospitality and tourism, the TPB has been employed to predict individual’s behaviours to hotel marketing and social psychology studies (Ajzen and Driver, 1992; Oh and Hsu, 2001; Lam and Hsu, 2005), but seldom used in social science research related to domestic tourists’ attitudes and behavioural intentions, particularly in an Australian setting. Hence TPB in the form of beliefs has been proposed to be a part of the present study.

Table 2.1.0 Summary of TPB Application in Hospitality and Tourism Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Ajzen and Driver</td>
<td>Leisure choice</td>
<td>(BI+PBC)-B</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BI-B</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PBC-B</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(AT+SN+PBC)-BI</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AT-BI</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN-BI</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PBC-BI</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Oh and Hsu</td>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>BI-B</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AT-BI</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN-BI</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PBC-BI</td>
<td>-.39~.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PB-BI</td>
<td>.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PB-BI</td>
<td>1.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Lam and Hsu</td>
<td>Travel destination choice</td>
<td>AT-BI</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SN-BI</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PB-BI</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitude refers to the degree to which a person has a favourable or unfavourable approach to the behaviour intention in question. According to Ajzen, 2001, it is captured in attributes such as good-bad, harmful-beneficial, pleasant-unpleasant and likeable-dislikeable. Rosenberg and Hovland, 1996:47, describe it as ‘all responses to a stimulus object are mediated by the person’s attitude toward the object’. In combination, attitude toward the behaviour, subjective norm and perception of behavioural control lead to the formation of a behavioural intention. Behavioural intention is defined as ‘the degree to which a person has formulated a conscious plan to perform or not to perform specified future behaviour’ Warshaw and Davis, 1985:237. Warrington and Shim (2000) showed that behavioural intentions are a precursor to the actual behaviour. Prislin and Quelette (1996) found highly embedded attitudes were more strongly related to behavioural intention than lowly embedded attitudes. Ajzen and Driver, 1992 opined that leisure choice intentions can be predicted with considerable accuracy from attitude toward behaviour. Indeed there is much evidence that suggests attitudes predict behaviour toward the target objects (Albarracin et al., 2001). Hence, if the previous studies have shown a positive relationship between attitude and behavioural intention, the same should be true for the tourists’ attitude toward resorts and their behaviour intentions to use such facility for their vacations. Therefore it is hypothesized that tourists that have a good attitude toward resorts are more likely to use resorts for their vacation destination.

**Hypothesis 2:**

*Positive attitude toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention*
Subjective norms are the perceived pressure applied by a person’s beliefs or his / her social circle’s expectations. They are social in nature as discovered by Hee (2000). They are used by individuals to measure their conformity to the reference group (Moutinho, 1987). The perception of social pressure refers to how an individual performs or does not perform a specific behaviour. The more an individual feels others expect of him / her in relation to a specific behaviour, the more he / she will intend to indulge in such behaviour intention. Many studies have supported the role of subjective norm to predict behavioural intention. While exploring the intention to use Internet use to plan meetings, Vanucci and Kerstetter (2001) found a significant relationship between subjective norms and behavioural intentions. In another study, Buttle and Bock (1996) found a similar relationship in the hotel choice process of business travellers. As recently as in 2005, Lam and Hsu found a similar relationship while studying destination choice behaviour. As a general rule, the more favourable the attitude and subjective norm, the stronger should be the person’s intention to perform the behaviour in question. On the basis of the previous studies, it is hypothesized that the more positive the normative beliefs of a person, the higher is the possibility of behaviour intention while purchasing resort accommodation for their vacation.

**Hypothesis 3:**

*Positive subjective norm toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention*
Finally, given a sufficient degree of actual control over the behaviour, people are expected to carry out their intentions when the opportunity arises. The degree of perceived behavioural control refers to a person’s belief as to how easy or difficult a specific behaviour is. This belief is created with past experience of similar or related acts as well as perceived difficulties and obstacles in performing such behaviour intention (Lam and Hsu, 2005). Chiou (1998) in his study found that the perceived behaviour control reflects the beliefs a person has as to availability and access to resources and opportunities for performance of a behaviour intention. An additional increase of a clear 6% in prediction of behaviour intention by considering perceived behavioural control was found by Armitage and Conner (1999). While studying gambling behaviour, Oh and Hsu (2001) also found a strong correlation between perceived behavioural control and behaviour intention. Similar deductions were made by Ajzen and Driver (1992) while studying leisure choice behaviour. Many other studies investigating human behaviour with TPB have found a positive and direct association between perceived behavioural control and behaviour intentions. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed.

Hypothesis 4:

*Positive perceived behavioural control by the tourists toward resorts is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.*

2.5.0 Past Behaviour:
It was suggested by Conner et al. (2001) that additional construct will enhance the predictive power of TPB. Many studies have used additional constructs with significant improvement in behaviour intention and actual behaviour prediction. Including anticipated regret improved the prediction for playing the lottery and precautionary sexual behaviour (Richard et al. 1998; Sheeran and Orbell, 1999). The addition of personal or normal norms also improved the prediction of environmentally relevant behaviour (Harland et al. 1999; Manstead, 2000). While the addition of personality traits improved the predictive power for Courneya et al. (1999), the addition of demographic variables failed to improve predictive power for Alderighi and Cento (2004). However Ajzen (2001) found the inclusion of additional constructs to be of minor importance and their applicability in other domains is yet to be established. While Sparks and Guthrie (1998) support the sufficiency of the original constructs of TPB, Norman et al. (1999) argue in support of additional constructs. As early as in 1979, Bentler and Speckart strongly suggested that past behaviour can impact on the formation of behaviour intentions. Revisiting this stand; Ajzen (1991) also believed that past behaviour can be used to test the sufficiency of a model because it provides a control for at least some of the omitted variables.

The results from these studies are supported by Ajzen (1991) who stresses that ‘the theory of planned behaviour, in principle, opens to the inclusion of additional predicators if it can be shown that they capture a significant proportion of the variance in intention or behaviour after the theory’s current variables have been taken into account.’ Likewise, Conner et al. (1998:629) indicated that ‘since this TPB model only covers the basic account of behaviour,’ additional variables are encouraged if these variables can show ‘the theoretical description of their roles’ referring to
specification of ‘the process by which the new variable influences intentions and behaviour, its relationship to existing components of the TPB, and the range of conditions over which such a variable might be expected to have an impact.’

Previous tourism studies have included the extra variables in predicting purchase behaviour such as agreement within a party (Um and Crompton, 1990, 1992), social influence and travel party influence (Basala and Klenosky, 2001), choice context (Lawson and Thyne, 2001), interpersonal constraints (Hawkins et al., 1999; Iwasaki, 2000), cost, accessibility, political stability and value (Russell et al. 1995; Somez and Graefe, 1998; Um and Crompton, 1990, 1992), for elderly their income, health and mobility (Zimmer et al. 1995) and children as a type of inhibitor against the participation in an activity or choosing a destination (Woodside and Lysonski, 1989).

There have been discussions about what past behaviour might represent. Human behaviour theorists believe that best predictor of the behavioural intention is the frequency of past relevant behaviour (Somez and Graefe, 1998). A meta-analysis examined 64 studies that found the frequency of past behaviour had an effect on both intention and future behaviours (Quellette and Wood, 1998). When behaviour is well practiced in a constant environment, the frequency of past behaviour reflects the habit strength and therefore has a direct effect on future behaviour. However, when behaviour is not well exercised or when it is carried out in an unstable context, the frequency of past behaviour contributes indirectly through intentions because people are likely to form favourable intentions about the acts they have frequently performed in the past (Quellette and Wood, 1998). It has also been found to be a predictor variable of behavioural intention and future behaviour (Aarts, 1998; Ajzen, 2002; Oh
Thus it is reasonable to assume that the frequency of past behaviour could guide future behaviour. In this study, it is hypothesized that the frequency of past purchase of resort hotel products and services can affect future *resort accommodation* buying intention.

**Hypothesis 5:**

*Past experience of resort accommodation purchase by the tourists positively affects their behaviour intention.*

TPB has been used in various contexts to study behaviour intentions. It has been used for studying drinking alcohol (Morrison *et al.* 1996; Traffimow and Finlay, 1998), engaging in physical activity (Courneya *et al.* 1999), smoking (Norman *et al.* 1999; Morrison *et al.* 1996), safe-sex behaviour (Boldero *et al.* 1999; de Vroome *et al.* 2000), choosing a career (Vincent *et al.* 1998), receiving hormone replacement therapy (Quine and Rubin, 1997), wearing a helmet (Quine *et al.* 1998), choosing restaurants (Simone *et al.* 2004) and choosing a travel destination (Lam and Hsu, 2006). Time and again literature has validated the predictive power of TPB therefore it is being used in the present study to investigate the application of beliefs and past *resort accommodation* behaviour in predicting the purchase behaviour intentions of resort tourist segments.
Chapter 3

Methodology
Chapter Overview

The chapter begins with the explanation of construct reliability and its validity. It then explains the source of data and the sampling procedure. The sample size achieved for this study is explained and justified on the basis of previous studies for both cluster and regression analysis. The questionnaire was developed on the basis of a previous study by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) and Ajzen (2001). The study required ethics clearance from the Human Research Ethics Sub Committee of RMIT Business Portfolio. The committee sent the application back to the researcher and asked to furnish some more details. The chapter goes through the detailed reasons that were supplied to get a clearance to proceed with data collection. The chapter goes on to explain the plain language statement that accompanied the questionnaire and the main attributes of the questionnaire. The elements relating to the TPB and past experience are explained and their internal reliability has been discussed. Finally, it explains how the data analysis was undertaken.
3.1.0 Research Design and Method

This study is designed to examine the beliefs that form behaviour intentions for ultimate resort accommodation purchase behaviour in each segment of the population. The units of analysis are the beliefs and the observed units are the resort vacationers. During the pre-test, 20 subjects from the place of work were asked to rate the appropriateness of the items in each scale, the format of the scale and the length of the instrument. Some items and scales were changed and the language simplified to remove ambiguity. The questionnaire was formatted in a way that fit it into three pages to reduce respondent fatigue.

3.2.0 Construct Reliability and Validity:

It is of paramount importance for the research instrument to have a high level of validity and reliability. As Newman (2003) states, “reliability and validity are central issues in all measurement. Both concern how concrete measures are connected to constructs”. He further says that, “reliability and validity, the salient feature constructs in social theory are often ambiguous, diffuse and not directly observable”. Perfect reliability and validity are virtually impossible to achieve. Rather, “they are ideals researchers strive to achieve” Newman (2003). Reliability means that the process is repeated or recurs under similar or identical situations and there are no erratic, unstable or inconsistent results. The pilot testing showed a high level of internal reliability with Chronbach’s $\alpha$ higher than 0.70 (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).
Validity is the concept that means there is a match between the construct and how the researcher has conceptualized the idea into a definition and measure. “It refers to how well the idea about reality “fits” with actual reality”, according to Newman (2003). The instrument has a high validity as the TPB was measured based on the sample questionnaire suggested by Ajzen (2001) which has been used by other researchers. Researchers can establish construct validity by correlating a measure of construct with a number of other measures that should be associated with it, also known as convergent validity (Nunnally and Berstein, 1994). The standardised loadings and the squared multiple correlations for the measurement items and the constructs were investigated as a confirmation convergent validity (Bollen, 1989). Large factor loadings for a specified construct suggest evidence of convergent validity, demonstrating that indicators for a given construct are strongly correlated among themselves.

3.3.0 Source of Data and Sampling Procedure:

Australia is a sun filled continent with its population positively attuned to the pursuit of leisure activities. With the result there is large swath of the population that has already experienced time away from home on a holiday. The industry has reacted to the demand by offering various forms of accommodations in resort format. There are different types of accommodations available for the users from a humble cabin in a caravan park to rooms in five star deluxe multi national hotels, all providing a wide spectrum of activities, services and facilities to help the guest enjoy their resort experience They may encompass some natural physical amenities such as pools, tennis courts, walking tracks or forest, a special location such as the beach, snow, the
tropics, alpine or arid zones, attractions such as hot sulphur springs or activities such as water, nature or snow based leisure pursuits. These establishments provide sufficient night life in the shape of restaurants, bars, karaoke lounges and night clubs, as well as day time activities specially designed around the type of people that frequent the resort to encourage an extended, self-contained, on-site holiday. The decision to approach these establishments to administer the survey for the study was considered to be the best option to capture a wide range of resort users.

Industry associations such as the Australian Hotel Association, hospitality chains, Holiday Inn Hotels and resorts and Best Western Hotels and various tourism boards of different states and territories were approached. An internet search was also conducted to identify and obtain contact details of a fair distribution in terms of location, attractions, activities and physical amenities. In total, 348 different resort establishments were identified for the study as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Name of the State</th>
<th>No of Resorts</th>
<th>Location of Resorts-(Mountain, Lake, Coastal, Wilderness etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Ski, Beach and Outback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>River, Beach and Lakeside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Rainforest, Beach and Outback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Beach and Ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Heritage, Outback, Wild Life Reserve and Ecological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Ski, Beach and Outback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Australia wide</td>
<td>348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest concentration of resorts was found in Queensland with 125 properties, followed by New South Wales 71, closely followed by Victoria with 68. Only 10
properties could be identified as ideally suited for the study in the Northern Territory. Australian Capital Territory was not included in the study as no hospitality accommodation was classified as a resort there. Considering the nature of the populace and the availability of attractions in the form of activities, which had already been captured by research in other states close to Canberra, it was thought to negate any perception of neglect and complacence.

A letter addressed to the owner / manager was sent to the postal addresses, followed by a phone call to explain the aims and objects of the study and what was required of them to help administer the survey. Many declined to participate outright on the basis of either their fears about commercial confidentiality or lack of time and inclination. After repeat telephone calls, 43 resort establishments agreed to participate in data collection. They were each sent 50 questionnaires with postage paid envelopes with instructions to put the questionnaires in guestrooms and reception lobbies for a month and send back the filled out ones after the said period. The sampling frame consisted of the resort residents in the establishment. The restrictions of placing the self-administered questionnaires in the guest rooms and the lobbies were a compromise as the establishments did not want the researcher to approach their clients directly. This arrangement suited the researcher as it allowed truly volunteer participation by the resort users. After a month, 257 completed questionnaires were received. The contact persons in the resorts were again called by phone to have the rest of the questionnaires completed and they were given a further two weeks. Another 178 questionnaires were received. Out of the total 435 questionnaires received, 23 were found to be unusable due to being incomplete thus bringing the usable instruments tally to a final 412. The final completion rate was 20.23% with 19.16% usability up from 11.95% after the
first round. There are three possible reasons for the low participation rate. One, the people who go to a resort look for peace, quiet and relaxation and there could have been respondent apathy as this could have been perceived as an unwelcome chore. Secondly, the guests may have been busy in activities outside their rooms to have reasonable time to engage in the survey. Finally, the resort operators themselves may not have encouraged the guests to participate in the survey sufficiently lest it should be seen as disturbing the guests’ pursuit of leisure.

3.4.0 Sample Size:

There are many different approaches to decide on the sample size. Newman (2003) suggests a principle that the smaller the population, the bigger the sampling ratio has to be for an accurate sample. Larger populations permit smaller sampling ratios for equally good samples. This is because as the population size grows, the returns in accuracy for sample size shrink. Zikmund (2000) provides a sample size of 322 for a population size of 500,000 - ∞ (the most appropriate band to reflect ABS figures) with ± 5% reliability. Burns and Bush (1995) provide a different approach for the basic sample size where they consider three factors; The amount of variability believed to be in the population, the desired accuracy and the level of confidence required in the estimates of the population values. To obtain 95% accuracy at 95% confidence level, the formula is

\[ n = Z^2 \frac{pq}{e^2} \]

\[ = 1.95^2 \frac{0.5*0.5}{0.05^2} \]

\[ = 385 \]
Where, \( n \) = sample size, \( Z \) = standard error associated with chosen level of confidence (95%), \( p \) = estimated variability in the population 50% (The amount of variability in the population is estimated to be 50%, a figure widely used in social research. From a practical standpoint, most researchers choose the 50% level of \( p \) because it results in the most conservative sample size according to Burns and Bush, 1995), \( q \) = \((100 - p)\) and \( e \) = acceptable error \(\pm \) 5%. Based on this formula there should be 385 data sets to achieve a desired confidence level and accuracy.

Zikmund (2000) also suggests getting to a sample size on the basis of judgement. “Using sample size similar to the sample size used in the previous studies provides the inexperienced researcher with a comparison of other researchers’ judgement”.

Following is a table of tourism segmentation studies in recent times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Researchers and Sample Sizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goulding (1999) – 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>901-1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table clearly illustrates that the majority of the studies have been done on less than 500 cases. In light of the above researchers in the tourism segmentation field, it can be said with confidence that a sample size of 412 should be sufficient to segment the resort tourist market.

3.4.1 Sample Size for Factor and Cluster Analyses:

The study employs factor and cluster analyses to segment the resort tourist market. Literature does not provide a specific number of cases to conduct a factor analysis and methodologists differ. There is near universal agreement that factor analysis is inappropriate when sample size is below 50, preferable sample size should be 100 or larger (Hair et al, 2006). However the following are arbitrary ‘rule of thumb’ numbers proposed by various authors:

- Rule of 10. There should be at least 10 cases for each item in the instrument being used (Hair et al, 2006).

- STV ratio. The subjects-to-variables ratio should be no fewer than 5 (Bryant and Yarnold, 1995).

- Rule of 100. The number of subjects should be greater than 5 times the number of variables, or 100. Even more subjects are needed when communalities are low and / or few variables load on each factor (Hatcher, 1994).

- Rule of 150. 150 – 300 cases are recommended, more toward 150 end, when there are few highly correlated variables, as would be the case when collapsing highly multi-collinear variables (Hutcheson and Sofroniou, 1999).
• Rule of 200. There should be at least 200 cases regardless of STV (Gorsuch, 1983).

• Rule of 300. There should be at least 300 cases (Norusis, 2005).

• Significance rule. There should be 51 more cases than the number of variables, to support chi-square testing (Lawley and Maxwell, 1971).

There are 13 items and 60 variables in the instrument. According to the above, the number of cases should be between the 111 and 300 band to be considered valid. The study was done using 412 cases, a very statistically acceptable number.

Although the figure of > 1000 cases is historically recommended as clustering is much less computer-intensive, Garson (2007) suggests hierarchical clustering with sample size < 250, whereas K-mean cluster analysis assumes a large sample size of > 200 (Kaufman and Rousseeuw, 1990).

3.4.2 Sample Size for Regression:

Cohen et al (2003) provided a sample size of 136 for a priori regression with alpha level of 0.05, number of predictors 8, anticipated effect size ($f^2$) of 0.15 being medium, with a desired statistical power level of 0.8.

A rule of thumb for testing $\beta$ coefficient is to have $N > 50 + 8 \cdot m$, where $m =$ number of independent variables (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Another rule of thumb is that there must be at least 20 times as many cases as independent variables. Garson (2007) suggests that $N \geq 40 \cdot m$ rule of thumb since step wise regression methods can train to
noise too easily and not generalise in a smaller dataset. However, Stevens (1996) recommends that for social science research, about 15 subjects for every predictor are needed for a reliable equation.

3.5.0 Questionnaire Construction Approach:

The questionnaire was developed with the respondents’ perspective in mind. A pre-testing was done to remove any confusion and ambiguous questions. As discussed earlier the question of validity and reliability was considered so that the respondents understand the questions and their replies are meaningful. The researcher is mindful that the respondents are heterogeneous in this research and it is impossible to have questions that are equally clear, relevant and meaningful to all respondents. The jargon, slangs and abbreviations were consciously avoided. Ambiguity, vagueness and confusion were removed by passing it to the initial group of people. As the resorts come at different levels of prestige, they were not mentioned as such to remove prestige bias. There were no double-barrelled, double-negative, leading questions or ones beyond the respondents’ capabilities. This was achieved by getting the questionnaire proof read by the project supervisors who have many years of research experience. The only criticism of the questionnaire that can be made is that it requested answers to the questions pertaining to future intentions. This could not be avoided as the study involves exploring intention under the TPB.
3.6.0 Ethics and Approval:

The study fell in the Risk Level 1 category as stipulated by RMIT as the study came under the University’s definition of a ‘non invasive project where there is no apparent risk to the participants beyond the everyday norm and where participants are not identified’. An approval was sought from RMIT Business Portfolio Human Research Ethics Sub Committee on the following basis:

- Subjects will not be identified and will thus remain anonymous. Confidentiality of data will be maintained and only the investigator and the supervisors will access the original data.
- The subjects will undertake no invasive procedures or experiments.
- There will be no manipulation of subjects with respondents receiving clear instructions relating to the voluntary nature of the investigation and the relevance of the research being undertaken.
- No subjects in this study will be asked to reveal any embarrassing, confidential or compromising details. Questions asked will focus on socio-demographics information and general characteristics such as their beliefs and their intentions to use resort accommodation.
- The project does not involve the use of any equipment, which uses electrical supply in any form e.g. Audiometer, biofeedback, electrical stimulation etc.
- The project does not involve a fertilised human ovum or any samples of body fluid or body tissue.
- None of the subjects will be finger printed or DNA ‘finger printed’.
• None of the subjects are related or in any sort of dependent relationship to the investigator.

• The project does not include the use of ‘no-treatment’ or ‘placebo’ control conditions.

• The data will be held for five years.

The Business Portfolio Human Research Ethics Sub Committee required clarification on the procedures to manage, monitor and report adverse and/or unforeseen events relating to the collection, use or disclosure of information. The following reply was given:

The participants have been informed of the following potential concerns and how they are addressed, in the plain language statement letter accompanying the questionnaire.

1. Anonymity of the participants
   a. The respondents will remain anonymous as they will not be identified in any way.

   b. The participants have the right to have any unprocessed data withdrawn and destroyed, provided it can be reliably identified, and provided that doing so does not increase the risk for the participant.

2. Pressure to participate in the study
   a. The participants are randomly selected and they have an option to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate in the study.
b. The participant has the right to have any questions answered at any time by calling the investigator or the supervisor.

c. The PLS that accompanies the questionnaire, also includes the Email addresses of the investigator and the supervisor along with the address, phone number and Email address of the Secretary, Human Research Ethics Sub Committee, Business Portfolio, RMIT University in case a participant wants to lodge a complaint or put a question directly in writing.

3. Security of the survey material
   a. The research data will be kept securely at RMIT for a period of 5 years before being destroyed and will be seen by the researcher and his supervisors only.
   b. The research data will be coded by the investigator only.

4. Disclosure of information to the third party
   a. The information that is provided in the questionnaire will be disclosed only if (1) it is to protect the participant and others from harm, (2) a court order is produced, or (3) the participant provides the researcher with written permission.

The ethics approval was given on the basis of the above additional explanation.

3.7.0 Questionnaire Design and Construct:

The questionnaire was designed and constructed in the following manner.
3.7.1 Plain Language Statement:

A plain language statement was created to accompany the questionnaire. This statement was printed on RMIT University Business letterhead. It had the names and contact details of both the investigator and the project supervisor. The letter was an invitation to participate in the study. The investigators with their background and the purpose of the study were explained. The aim of the study and the reason the person was approached to participate was clearly written out. Furthermore, it explained what the participant was required to do and any advantages or disadvantages associated with participation. The anonymity and confidentiality related to the participation and procedure in case the participant wanted to complain about any aspect of the study was clearly provided in the letter.

3.7.2 Demographics:

The demographic questions were based on the study conducted by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) in resort hotels. The questions were based on gender (male / female), age group (in blocks of 10 years, lowest ‘below 20’ and highest ‘61+’), education (primary, secondary, TAFE or technical and university), marital status (single or couple with or without children) and age of youngest child, occupation (professional, clerical, managerial, unemployed, student and other), language (English or other), resort visitation (first experience – years ago and average length of stay in number of days).
The primary reason for visiting a resort and the activities undertaken when at a resort were also taken from the Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) study. The options for reasons were scenic location, safety and security, recreational activities, range of available accommodation, distance, information availability, ecology and surrounds, weather and cost. The activities were horse riding, trekking, water based activities, sun bathing, tennis, golf, meditation, skiing, bird and wildlife watching, night life such as clubs, bars or pub etc. and fishing. The options were tested on a seven-point Likert scale with the lowest being extremely unimportant to the highest, extremely important.

3.7.3 TPB:

The section dealing with the theory of planned behaviour was based on Ajzen’s (1988, 1991, 2006) directions as to construction. Behavioural beliefs (BB), normative beliefs (NB), control beliefs (CB), attitude toward the behaviour (AB), subjective norm (SN), perceived behavioural control (PBC) and behavioural intention (BI) were assessed directly by means of standard scaling procedures. The scales were developed to be directly compatible with the behaviour in terms of action, target, context and time elements. There were five questions each to test the items. The questions were randomly dispersed in the section to get as honest response as possible. The set of items used showed a high correlation with each other (the measure of high internal consistency). Cronbach’s coefficient $\alpha$ in the acceptable level of 0.70 (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).
Methodologists simply use a rule-of-thumb that there must be a certain minimum number of classes in ordinal categories (Achen, 1991), argues for at least 5. Berry (1993) states five or fewer is ‘clearly inappropriate’. However, it must be noted that use of 5-point Likert scales in regression is extremely common in the literature. For the present study, all items were scaled on a seven-point Likert scale. This was done as Nunnally (1978) recommended that

‘As the number of scale steps is increased from 2 up through 20, the increase in reliability is very rapid at first. It tends to level off at about 7, and after about 11 steps, there is little gain in reliability from increasing the number of steps’.

3.7.3.1 Behavioural Intention:

Behavioural Intention (BI) of choosing a resort accommodation was measured by five questions with a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree (7) to strongly disagree (1). The reliability analysis came up with final Cronbach’s $\alpha$ 0.871 after removing 2 items. The final 3 items were ‘I intend to stay in a resort accommodation in the forthcoming year’, ‘I will stay at a resort accommodation on my next vacation’ and ‘I plan to stay at a resort accommodation on my next holiday’.

3.7.3.2 Attitude toward the Behaviour:

Semantic differential was incorporated in the questions as they were dispersed in the questionnaire. The bi-polar objectives were reached by the scaling from ‘strongly agree’ to strongly disagree’ on the Likert scale. There were five questions reworded around ‘my stay in a resort accommodation will be …..’ with variations of
beneficial, pleasant, good, valuable and enjoyable. The acceptable level of Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) of 0.742 did not require removal of any items.

### 3.7.3.3 Behavioural Beliefs:

Behavioural beliefs (BB) consisted of two components: (a.) perceived likelihood of outcomes of the behaviour, and (b.) evaluation of those outcomes. TPB assumes that the belief strengths and outcome evaluations for the different accessible beliefs provide substantive information about the attitudinal considerations that guide people’s decisions to engage or not to engage in the behaviour under consideration. Thus, the perceived likelihood and the outcome evaluation (OE) are multiplicatively combined. A five items scale was developed with a seven-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly agree* (7) to *strongly disagree* (1). A representative item of the BB was ‘It is fun to stay at a resort accommodation’ and that of the OE was, ‘Experiencing resort experience is important’. The reliability analysis improved with the removal of one item to 0.713. The final items in scale were ‘*It is normal for people to stay in a resort accommodation*’, ‘*It is fun to stay at a resort accommodation*’, ‘*It is safe to stay in a resort accommodation*’ and ‘*It is convenient to stay in a resort accommodation*’.

### 3.7.3.4 Subjective Norm:

The social pressure one feels to conform to behaviour was measured by statements such as, ‘most people who are important to me think that I should stay in a resort accommodation’. Items such as the above have an *injunctive* quality, consistent with the concept of subjective norm. Ajzen (2006) suggests that ‘responses to such items are often found to have low variability because important others are generally
perceived to approve of desirable behaviours and disapprove of undesirable behaviours’. To remedy this problem, items were included questions designed to capture descriptive norms i.e. whether important people to the subject themselves perform the behaviour in question. This was addressed by the items, ‘most people who are important to me use resort accommodation’ and ‘my friends tell me that it is good to stay at a resort for vacation’. The reliability analysis achieved a final Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.768 after deleting two items. The final three items were, ‘Most people who are important to me think that I should stay in a resort accommodation’, ‘My friends tell me that it is important to go to a resort hotel to have a good vacation’, and ‘I am expected to go to and stay at a resort accommodation in future’.

### 3.7.3.5 Normative Beliefs:

The assessment of normative beliefs (NB) followed the logic similar to that involved in the measurement of behavioural beliefs. It has two components (a.) normative belief strength and, (b.) motivation to comply. The perceived normative pressure in a given population is a measure of normative belief strength and motivation to comply with respect to each referent. The representative items of NB were ‘my family thinks that we should use a resort accommodation for our next vacation’, ‘the people in my life whose opinion I value would approve of my resort accommodation choice’ and ‘I will use a resort accommodation for a vacation if it was suggested to me by my friends’. The reliability analysis came up with a low level of NB. Three items were removed and Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.677 was achieved after removing them. This was lower than .7 but very close to the acceptable level. The final two items left on the scale were ‘Most people who are important to me use resort accommodation’ and ‘The people in my life whose opinion I value stay in a resort accommodation’.
3.7.3.6 Perceived Behavioural Control:

Five statements were used to measure perceived behavioural control (PCB), with a seven-point Likert scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The reliability analysis showed a Cronbach’s α of 0.549 a poor reliability level. The reliability did not improve significantly even after removing items so the scale was left with all five items. They were, ‘If I wanted to, I could stay in a resort accommodation in future’, ‘I believe I have a complete control over where I stay’, ‘I always have fun at a resort because I want to’ and ‘It is mostly up to me to decide on the type of accommodation I use’ and ‘I can refuse to go to a resort if I do not feel like it’.

3.7.3.7 Control Beliefs:

Control beliefs (CB) consist of two components (a.) frequency of occurrence of the facilitator or inhibitors of the behaviour, and (b.) perception of the strength of the facilitator or inhibitors or power (P). Statements of these two components were again multiplied and combined to obtain the overall level of CB. A sample of CB statements was ‘using resort accommodation is expensive’ with a seven-point Likert scale from strongly agree (7) to strongly disagree (1) and corresponding power (P) statement was ‘the cost of resort accommodation would influence my buying decision’, again ranging from strongly agree (7) to strongly disagree (1). The reliability analysis came up with a Cronbach’s α of 0.391, showing no internal reliability. However, the item ‘I mostly select resort accommodation to suite my needs’ strongly associated with total behaviour and total intention, thus left in the scale.
3.8.0 Past Behaviour:

The questions on past behaviour were constructed based on Quellette and Wood (1998). This was measured in two ways. One by asking the respondents the number of times they have used resort accommodation in the past three years along with the average length of stay with six frequency categories ‘less than 1 day’, ‘1-5 days’, ‘6-10 days’, ‘11-15 days’, ‘16-20 days’ and ‘20+ days’. This was enriched with statements such as ‘I feel comfortable going to a resort as I have experienced it before and liked it’ and ‘I have taken my family/friends to a resort that I have been before’ on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly agree (7) to strongly disagree (1). The reliability analysis showed the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of 0.669, a level very close to the acceptable level thus all five items were left in the scale. They were ‘I have revisited a resort after being there with family or friends’, ‘I feel comfortable revisiting resorts as they bring happy memories’ and ‘I have been to the same resort hotel that I have visited with my parents when I was young’.

3.9.0 Data Screening:

Once the data has been coded and collected, it should be checked for errors to maintain its accuracy and analysis prior to commencing analyses (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). To ensure the accuracy of the data, all questionnaires were thoroughly examined. Results from the questionnaires were then cross examined with the SPSS data file to ensure that data entry had been completed without errors. Steven (1996) has noted that there are many possible sources of data errors within research from the
initial data collection to the final coding and entry hence it is important that errors be kept at a minimum. Scrutiny of questionnaires and use of SPSS removed the possibility of such an occurrence.

3.10.0 Data Analysis:

The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used for descriptive and inferential analyses to provide respondents’ profile, correlations and Cronbach’s reliability. Internal consistency and construct validity were performed by applying the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ test and exploratory factor analysis respectively. In order to ascertain whether tourists who buy resort accommodation are homogenous or not, this process was employed. It is a common approach in tourism research to segment tourists into clusters according to certain travel attributes. In this case, benefits and reasons for travel they seek in a resort accommodation and test the first hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 1:**

*Tourists using resort accommodation can be segmented in various groups.*

Benefit segmentation was introduced in a general marketing context by Hailey (1968) as a technique for identifying market segments by casual factors, in order to provide a better understanding of a particular market’s needs. It has been widely used in travel and tourism research (Alvarez and Asugman, 2006; Balgolu et al, 1998; Beh and Bruyere, 2007; Chang, 2006; Dolnicar, 2005; Frochot, 2005; Frochot and Morrison,
Cluster analysis was then used to search for relatively homogenous groups of shared characteristics within given populations. Cluster analysis is a statistical technique that places respondents into groups or clusters, so that those within each group are more similar to each other than they are to members of other groups. Cluster analysis is often used for its ability to produce a classification where there is little a priori knowledge about the members of the categories that will be formed and who the members of these categories will be (Churchill, 1995; Hair et al. 2006). Cluster analysis has been used in numerous tourism studies and a review of literature reveals that the method has been employed to segment tourists by activity (Lang et al., 1993), participation (Morrison et al., 1995), perceptions (Fodness, 1990; Roehl and Fesenmaier, 1992), benefits sought (Locker and Perdue 1992), emotions (Bigne and Andreu, 2004), experience patterns (Hull et al. 1992), equestrian activities (Brown, 2003), green tourism (Hong et al. 2003), motivation (Loker-Murphy, 1996), information search strategies (Alvarez and Asugman, 2006; Fodness and Murray, 1998), rural tourism (Frochot, 2005), tourist role typology (Mo et al. 1994), wild life reserve visit (Beh and Bruyere, 2007) and wine tourism (Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002). For this study, the 20 variables used came from the questions that asked respondents to indicate how much influence a list of certain factors had on their resort selection decision.

A K-means method of cluster classification was employed to manipulate the resort selection data and a series of solutions ranging from two clusters to five clusters.
Ultimately four clusters were created and examined. Additional analysis, in the form of discriminate analysis, which essentially tests the accuracy of the cluster classification by estimating likelihood, was conducted to determine which cluster solution provided the most useful market segments.

Regression analysis was used to test the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 2:

*Positive attitude toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.*

Hypothesis 3:

*Positive subjective norm toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.*

Hypothesis 4:

*Positive perceived behavioural control by the tourists toward resorts is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.*

Hypothesis 5:

*Past experience of resort accommodation purchase by the tourists positively affects their behaviour intention.*
Regression was employed to test the hypotheses as it is employed to predict the variance in an interval dependent, based on linear regression. Its utility has been proven many times in the fields of biology, behavioural and social sciences to describe relationships between variables. Regression has been used for predictions – that include forecasting of time series data, inference, modelling of casual relationships and hypothesis testing. While Berk (2004) and Freedman (2005) have criticised the procedure as it could be misused to uphold the assumptions that can not be appropriately verified. In this case, the TPB has a valid foundation and its assumptions have been tested many times. Therefore, the criticism is not applicable in this case.
Chapter 4

Data Analysis
Chapter Overview

This chapter provides the results of data analysis to be used and discussed in the next chapter as well as hypothesis testing. First, descriptive statistics are reported from a respondent profile. Then the correlations among the constructs are looked at. A regression analysis is conducted on the original TPB model. This is done to test H2, H3 and H4. Furthermore, another regression analysis is conducted on the proposed model that incorporates TPB elements and past experience to see if behaviour intention could be explained better. This is done to test H5. A cluster analysis is conducted to create segments of the respondents using demographics and is explained. Cluster differences are investigated using post-hoc analysis based on their reasons, activities, beliefs and past experience. This tests H1. Finally individual clusters are tested on the proposed model to discuss implications of this study in the next chapter.
4.1.0 Sample Profile

This section provides an overall profile of the sample using descriptive statistics in terms of demographic characteristics and resort usage status.

Table 4.1: Frequency Analysis of Respondents’ Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (N = 412)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group (N = 412)</td>
<td>Under 30 years old</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 31 and 50 years old</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 51 years old</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level (N = 412)</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAFE* or Technical</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family status (N = 412)</td>
<td>Singles with or without children</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couples</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Couples with children</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the youngest child (N = 412)</td>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 6 and 15 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older than 15 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation category (N = 412)</td>
<td>Managers and administrators</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade and related workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clerical, sales and service workers</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian residency status (N = 412)</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home (N = 412)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other language</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort visits in last 3 years (N = 411)</td>
<td>Less than 5 times</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 times</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First resort experience (N = 412)</td>
<td>Less than 1 year ago</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 – 5 years ago</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 – 10 years ago</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 – 15 years ago</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 – 20 years ago</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20 years ago</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual length of resort stay (N = 412)</td>
<td>Less than a week</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1 and 2 weeks</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 2 weeks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TAFE – Technical and Further Education
4.1.1 Gender

The sample represented a male population of 48.1% to a female population of 51.9%. This is very close to the reality as the national figure is 0.99 male(s) / female (2003 est.) (http://esa.un.org/nnpp/index.asp?panel=2).

4.1.2 Age Group

The data demonstrated the population percentage of people under 30 years old as 33.7%, very close to the national average of 42.3%. The 31 to 50 year olds bracket came up with 53.6% observed population which is in reality only 29.7% of society. A similar anomaly was observed for the 51 and above age group as represented in the observed population. It came to 12.6%, while, it is 27.9% in the wider population (http://www.ms.unimelb.edu.au/~moshe/moshe/australia.html).

4.1.3 Education Level

The largest group to be represented in the sample was university educated on 60.4%, a figure more than double the country’s real number of 23.2%. Similarly, the people who responded as having secondary education were under represented on 12.6% when the actual number of secondary educated people is 42.6% (ABS, 2006) (http://jobsearch.gov.au/training/default.aspx?pageld=information#EduPro).

4.1.4 Family Status

The large percent of the population indicated that they are either couples or couples with children. This 63.1% representation is much higher than the national figure of 42.7%. Singles were also over represented at 36.9% as compared to the national figure of 28.9% (ABS, 2003).
4.1.5 Age of Youngest Child
The data under this category represented some interesting facts. The group who indicated that there were no children living with them were the largest at 57.3%, whereas the people who indicated that there is a child of any age living in the household came to 42.7%. According to ABS (2003), although in Australian families with both dependent and independent children make up to 60%, only 45% of families have at least one child aged 0–17 years. The sample was a very close representation of the society at large (www.abs.gov.au/4442.0).

4.1.6 Occupation Category
Almost half of the sample was made up of managers, administrators and professionals at 49.8%. This group was closely followed by a significantly large group comprising of clerical, sales and service workers at 34.0%. A quick cross tabulation of this group with sex showed that it was made up predominantly by women.

4.1.7 Australian Residency Status
The sample was predominantly made up of Australian residents.

4.1.8 Language Spoken at Home
The majority of respondents indicated that they speak English at home.
4.1.9 Resort Visitation in the last Three Years

This section showed that most of the people visited resorts less than 5 times over the past three years.

4.1.10 First Resort Experience (History)

The response to this question elicited a well dispersed response showing almost equal numbers in each category. The smallest group was made up of the people who said that their first resort experience took place less than 1 year ago at 9.5%.

4.1.11 Usual Length of Stay

The responses indicated that predominantly, people stay at a resort for 1-2 weeks or less.

4.2.0 Investigating the correlations between beliefs constructs

In the previous chapter, the various constructs of beliefs were checked for internal consistency. Cronbach’s coefficient $\alpha$ in the acceptable level of 0.70 was considered while deciding to keep the particular question or discard it. After collection and tabulation of the questionnaires, the high ranking items were added together to get a total item. A Pearson’s correlation analysis was run using SPSS to check their multiple relationships. This was done to find the strength of relationships in the model so that the model proposed by Ajzen (1991) could be tested and the addition of the past experience could be made. Once the desired model was achieved, it could be used to see if it is strong by running regression analysis.
The matrix (Table 4.2) showed some very interesting relationships. Every item showed a significant relationship (p < 0.01 level, 2-tailed) with another, except where perceived control and subjective norms were concerned. In their case, the Pearson Correlation was at 0.066 with 2-tail significance at 0.182. Perceived behavioural control correlated relatively low with intention and the behaviour as well, being 0.172 and 0.192 respectively. This relationship anomaly has already been noticed by Ajzen (1993) as he depicts this in the original TPB model in the form of a dotted line.

The first model considered appeared as in (Figure 4.1). In the model there was a strong link between attitude and intention that was observed to predict the behaviour. The proposed past experience variable also came high in significance which gave credence to a proposed addition to the TPB model. The perceived behaviour control variable came at the lowest and its correlations with other elements were also not as significant.

**Figure 4.1:**
Correlations in the TPB Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total intention</th>
<th>Total Behav</th>
<th>Total Attitude</th>
<th>Total Sub Norms</th>
<th>Total Cont Bel</th>
<th>Total Perc Cont</th>
<th>Total Past Exp</th>
<th>Total Norm Bel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Intention</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.799(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Behav</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.737(**)</td>
<td>.781(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Attitude</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.586(**)</td>
<td>.488(**)</td>
<td>.625(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sub Norms</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.765(**)</td>
<td>.619(**)</td>
<td>.666(**)</td>
<td>.567(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cont Bel</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.765(**)</td>
<td>.619(**)</td>
<td>.666(**)</td>
<td>.567(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Perc Cont</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.372(**)</td>
<td>.392(**)</td>
<td>.494(**)</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.574(**)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Past Exp</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.638(**)</td>
<td>.565(**)</td>
<td>.536(**)</td>
<td>.539(**)</td>
<td>.630(**)</td>
<td>.440(**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Norm Bel</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.529(**)</td>
<td>.512(**)</td>
<td>.624(**)</td>
<td>.665(**)</td>
<td>.562(**)</td>
<td>.470(**)</td>
<td>.475(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
The testing of the variables was conducted next using statistical process and multiple regression to find out the equation that represents the best prediction of a dependent variable, in this case intention, from several independent variables, for example, past experience, attitude, subjective norms and perceived behavioural control. The assumption that the variables relate to each other came from the work of Ajzen (1991) and his established model. The choice of regression was made primarily as the variables were of a continuous nature. The secondary objective was to run a few models and come up with the best model that predicts resort purchase behaviour.

Table 4.3 (a)

Step 1: Regression Behaviour on Intention and Perceived Behaviour Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.606(a)</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>2.68517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), TotalPercCont, TotalIntention
b Dependent Variable: TotalBehav

ANOVA(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1710.981</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>855.490</td>
<td>118.651</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2948.951</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>7.210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4659.932</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), TotalPercCont, TotalIntention
b Dependent Variable: TotalBehav

Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalIntention</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>14.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalPercCont</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>2.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: TotalBehav
The second regression analysis was done on TPB model as in Figure 5.1.

**Figure 4.2:**

**Model Depicting Relationships past Intention**

![Diagram of Model Depicting Relationships past Intention]

**Table 4.3 (b):**

**Step 2: TPB Second Step Model Regression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), TotalSubNorms, TotalPercCont, TotalAttitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Predictors: (Constant), TotalSubNorms, TotalPercCont, TotalAttitude
b: Dependent Variable: TotalIntention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Regression Intention on Perceived Behaviour Control, Attitude and Subjective Norms:

1. Significant at 0.0001 with \(R^2 = 31.9\%\) variance explained

2. Attitude contributes 44.5\%, followed by Subjective Norms at 19.5\%, followed by Perceived Behaviour Control, which is not significant and only contributes 2.8\%.

The regression explained the model to 31.9\%. Past experience was added to this TPB model as shown in Figure 4.3. The regression results are shown in Table 4.3.

**Figure 4.3:**

**Correlations in the Proposed Model**
The model appears as shown in Figure 4.5 where correlations are shown. The model also takes into consideration the relative strengths of correlations after the reorganisation of the elements. A stepwise regression analysis was conducted again in different stages. The first one was done on behaviour with attitude and intention as shown in Figure 4.5.

**Figure 4.4 (a):**

**Step 1: First Step of the Proposed Model**

![Diagram of Step 1: First Step of the Proposed Model](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a: Predictors: (Constant), TotalIntention, TotalAttitude*

**ANOVA(b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

82
Regression Behaviour on Attitude and Intention:

1. Significant at 0.0001 with \( R^2 = 45.4\% \) variance explained.

2. Intention contributes 40.3\% while Attitude, another 38.5\%.

**Figure 4.4 (b):**

**Step 2: Second Step of Proposed Model**
Table 4.5 Regression Second Step of Proposed Model (a)

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.534(a)</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>3.40309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Predictors: (Constant), TotalPercCont, TotalSubNorms, TotalPastExp

ANOVA(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1888.777</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>629.592</td>
<td>54.364</td>
<td>.000(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4725.058</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>11.581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6613.835</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Predictors: (Constant), TotalPercCont, TotalSubNorms, TotalPastExp
b: Dependent Variable: TotalAttitude

Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.447</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>4.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalSubNorms</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>8.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalPastExp</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>4.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TotalPercCont</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>5.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: Dependent Variable: TotalAttitude

Regression Attitude on Perceived Control, Subjective Norms and Past Behaviour:

1. Significant at 0.0001 with \[R^2 = 28.6\%\] variance explained.

2. Subjective Norms contribute 36.3\%, followed by Perceived Control 22.3\%, followed by Past Experience 19.5\%. 
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Figure 4.4 (c):

Step 3: Third Step of Proposed Model

![Diagram of model with nodes: Past Experience, Subjective Norms, Perceived Behaviour Control, Intention]

Table 4.6:

Regression Second Step of Proposed Model (b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Adjusted R Square</td>
<td>Std. Error of the Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.529(a)</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>3.33301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a: Predictors: (Constant), TotalPercCont, TotalSubNorms, TotalPastExp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA(b)

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
Regression Intention on Past Experience, Subjective Norm and Perceived Control:

1. Significant at 0.0001 with \( R^2 = 28.0\% \) variance explained

2. Past Experience contributes 35%, followed by Subjective Norms at 29.8%, followed by Perceived Control, which is not significant and only contributes 6.9%.

Model 2 is the best option available as it makes further improvement in bringing the regression predictability to 45.4% at 0.0001 significance, an improvement on the original TPB model, by 13.5%.

Table 4.7:
Final Clusters by Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family status</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of the youngest child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the last three years, I have been to resorts ( ) times.

I have been using resorts for ( ) years.

My usual length of stay at a resort is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>134.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>142.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>411.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.0 Rational for above variables

The reason for choosing the demographic factors such as gender, age group and education level was to create a physically identifiable profile. Family status, age of the youngest child living with the respondent and their occupation were chosen to investigate if the variables predicted any disposable income, availability of time and willingness to indulge in such activities. The last three items were used to see the familiarity with resort visitation and their frequency and length of stay.

Table 4.8:

Number of Cases in each Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>134.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>142.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>411.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9:

Clusters Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters by Demographics</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender ( % males)</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 411</td>
<td>N=197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-squ = 30.08 (df = 3)</td>
<td>p &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under 20</th>
<th>5.1%</th>
<th>14.3%</th>
<th>9.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>N=21</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>N=117</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>N=122</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>N=99</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 years</td>
<td>N=29</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=411
Chi-squ = 298.38 (df = 3) p <0.0001

### Education Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N=1</th>
<th>0.2%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>1.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>N=1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>N=51</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE or Technical</td>
<td>N=111</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>N=248</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=411
Chi-squ = 84.35 (df = 9) p <0.0001

### Family Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N=136</th>
<th>33.1%</th>
<th>3.2%</th>
<th>82.8%</th>
<th>6.3%</th>
<th>19.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>N=136</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single with Children</td>
<td>N=15</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>N=108</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with Children</td>
<td>N=152</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 411
Chi-squ = 329.95 (df = 9) p <0.0001

### Age of Youngest Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N=73</th>
<th>17.8%</th>
<th>38.1%</th>
<th>1.5%</th>
<th>33.1%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>N=73</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 6-15 years</td>
<td>N=47</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 15</td>
<td>N=56</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>N=235</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 411
Chi-squ = 209.46 (df = 9) p <0.0001

### Occupation Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N=82</th>
<th>20.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>11.9%</th>
<th>45.8%</th>
<th>1.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Administrators</td>
<td>N=82</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>N=122</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer and Related Workers</td>
<td>N=122</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N = 411
Chi-squ = 293.03 (df = 15) P<0.0001

**Resort Visitation in last 3 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>&lt; 5 times</th>
<th>6-10 times</th>
<th>&gt; 10 times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 364</td>
<td>N = 39</td>
<td>N = 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 411
Chi-squ = 5.35 (df = 6) p<0.499

**History of Resort Visitation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First visit within N years ago</th>
<th>9.5%</th>
<th>12.6%</th>
<th>21.6%</th>
<th>1.4%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years ago</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td><strong>34.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.8%</strong></td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years ago</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td><strong>39.7%</strong></td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years ago</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td><strong>19.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 years ago</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td><strong>33.1%</strong></td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years ago</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td><strong>54.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 411
Chi-squ = 258.06 (df = 15) P <0.0001

**Usual Length of Stay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>0.2%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.7%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a week</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.7%</strong></td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 weeks</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td><strong>65.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 weeks</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3+ weeks</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 411
Chi-squ = 31.88 (df = 12) p < 0.001

**4.4.0 Clusters Description**
The clusters created by K-means clustering technique created 4 healthy sized clusters based on demographics. The following is a short description of the clusters:

4.4.1 Cluster 1 (Active Conventionalists)

This cluster comprised of a predominantly female population of 21-30 years of age (36.5%). There were some small but significant other age groups that were sorted into an age group of 31-50 years, representing 47.9% of the cluster. Their education level was equally dispersed between TAFE or technical (39.7%) and University (39.7%). Most of the group members were a couple with a child (44.4%). Majority of them had a child below 6 years of age (38.1%), while a smaller number of people said that they did not have a child (28.6%). An overwhelming number of people were working in clerical, sales and service positions (71.4%). Most (85.7%) of the cluster members have been to a resort less than 5 times in the last three years. The majority (74.6%) had visited a resort for the first time less than 10 years ago. Their usual length of stay at a resort was 1-2 weeks (65.1%).

4.4.2 Cluster 2 (Young Conservatives)

This group was gender balanced, made up of males (52.2%) of between 21-30 years (58.2%). They were predominantly university educated (52.2%). They were single (82.8%) with no children (96.3%). They were employed as professionals (34.3%) or in the service industry (35.1%). As in Cluster 1, they had visited resorts less than 5 times in the last 3 years (88.1%). However, unlike the members of the above cluster, they had a shorter first time resort visitation 1-5 years ago (35.8%). Another distinguishing feature was that most (50.0%)
stayed at a resort for less than a week while a significant number of people (42.5%) stayed for 1-2 weeks at a resort.

4.4.3 Cluster 3 (Elite Regulars)
This cluster had older, 31-50 year old (84.5%) males (61.3%) who were university (87.3%) educated. Most of the members (73.9%) indicated that they were a couple however the age of their youngest child was varied with the largest (33.1%) indicating that the age of the youngest child is below 6 years. Of all the groups, this one indicated the highest employment category with 45.8% as managers and administrators and 47.2% as professionals. They were similar in their resort visitation at less than 5 times in the last 3 years (91.5%) like other clusters. The majority (55.6%) had experienced a resort for the first time 16 years or more ago. While the majority (54.9%) stayed at a resort for 1-2 weeks, a substantial number (43.7%) indicated a shorter stay at less than a week.

4.4.4 Cluster 4 (Veterans)
This cluster was made up of mature 41+ year old (82.0%) females (66.7%). Although their education levels differed, from secondary (26.4%) and TAFE or technical (31.9%), a significant number was university (40.3%) educated. A large number (54.2%) were couples with no child (76.4%) living with them. Most were employed in clerical, sales and service positions (54.2%), while a good number of them indicated their employment as other (30.6%) that included home duties. This cluster had the longest resort visitation history with 54.2% indicating
that they visited a resort over 20 + years ago for the first time and they stay for 1-2 weeks (76.4%) at a resort when they visit one.

### Table 4.10:

**Clusters by Reasons, Activities, Past Experience and TPB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factoring Variable</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>Mean Score for Each Cluster</th>
<th>Cluster differences detected from post-hoc analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=.603 (df=3, 407) Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=3.908 (df=3, 407) p = 0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=12.855 (df=3, 407) p &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=5.861 (df=3, 407) p = 0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from Home Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=7.708 (df=3, 407) p &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=0.174 (df=3, 407) Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology and Surrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=6.720 (df=3, 407) p &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=8.041 (df=3, 407) p &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=3.036 (df=3, 407) p = 0.029</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=2.597 (df=3, 407) p = 0.052</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trekking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=2.232 (df=3, 407) p = 0.084</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None
Water Activities  
F=7.020 (df=3, 407) p < 0.0001  
2.64  2.9  2.23  2.82  2.81  2 ≠ 1, 3, 4

Sun Bathing  
F=0.163 (df=3, 407) p = 0.921  
3.14  3.1  3.22  3.07  3.14  None

Tennis  
F=1.019 (df=3, 407) p = 0.384  
3.85  4.16  3.76  3.87  3.67  None

Golf  
F=2.307 (df=3, 407) p = 0.076  
4.09  4.48  4.26  3.92  3.75  None

Meditation  
F=4.710 (df=3, 407) p = 0.003  
4.29  4.29  4.3  4.63  3.6  3 ≠ 4

Skiing  
F=3.838 (df=3, 407) p = 0.010  
4.31  4.84  3.99  4.35  4.31  1 ≠ 2

Bird or Wild life Watching  
F=0.677 (df=3, 407) p = 0.567  
4.13  4.1  4.26  4.18  3.88  None

Night Activities  
F=15.395 (df=3, 407) p < 0.0001  
3.64  3.27  2.92  4.14  4.25  1 ≠ 3, 4  2 ≠ 3, 4

Fishing  
F=3.836 (df=3, 407) p = 0.010  
4.93  5.11  4.51  5.15  5.13  2 ≠ 3

Items from the Proposed Model  
Intention  
F=6.256 (df=3, 407) p < 0.0001  
8.61  8.59  8.75  7.75  10.14  3 ≠ 4

Behaviour  
F=8.128 (df=3, 407) p < 0.0001  
9.88  10.19  9.16  9.36  11.46  4 ≠ 2, 3

Attitude  
F=5.190 (df=3, 407) p = 0.002  
13.14  11.56  13  13.52  14.07  1 ≠ 3, 4

Subjective Norms  
F=6.948 (df=3, 407) p < 0.0001  
11.98  10.41  11.56  12.98  12.24  3 ≠ 1, 2

Control Beliefs  
F=8.710 (df=3, 407) p < 0.0001  
2.29  2.32  2.54  1.84  2.69  3 ≠ 2, 4

Perceived Control  
F=2.752 (df=3, 407) p = 0.042  
11.09  10.08  11.28  11.52  10.83  None

Past Experience  
F=0.394 (df=3, 407) p = 0.757  
17.27  16.61  17.42  17.33  17.5  None

Normative Behaviour  
F=2.547 (df=3, 407) p = 0.056  
6.85  6.27  6.63  7.16  7.22  None

4.5.0 Cluster Description on Reasons, Activities, Past Experience and TPB

4.5.1 Cluster 1
The cluster scored high on outdoor activities such as trekking, water based sports, tennis, golf and skiing. They did not care about safety and security (unlike Cluster 3), range of accommodation (unlike Cluster 2 and 3), distance to the resort from home (unlike the rest of the clusters), ecology and surrounds (unlike Cluster 3) and weather (unlike Cluster 3).

They scored lowest for attitude, subjective norms, perceived control, past experience and normative beliefs.

### 4.5.2 Cluster 2

This cluster scored highest on scenic location of the resort, the distance to the resort from their home town, available information about the resort, sun bathing and wildlife and bird watching. This cluster was least interested in availability of recreational activities (unlike Cluster 4), water activities (unlike Clusters 1, 3 and 4), skiing (unlike Cluster 1) and fishing (unlike Cluster 3).

They scored lowest on behaviour.

### 4.5.3 Cluster 3

This cluster scored highest on their need for safety and security, availability of accommodation range, ecology and surrounds, weather, horse riding, meditation and fishing. They were similar to Cluster 1 for their low interest in the scenic location of the resort which is unlike Cluster 2.

They scored high on subjective norms and perceived control.
4.5.4 Cluster 4

This cluster scored highest in their need for the range of available recreational activities, cost and night activities such as going to pubs and restaurants. They were least interested in trekking (unlike Cluster 1), tennis (unlike Cluster 1), golf (unlike Cluster 1), meditation (unlike Cluster 3) and wildlife watching (unlike Cluster 2).

They had the highest scores for intention, behaviour, attitude, control beliefs, past experience and normative behaviour.

Table 4.11:

Final Regression Cluster Number by Behaviour to Intention and Attitude

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Number</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Intention β</th>
<th>Attitude β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>-.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>P &lt; 0.0001</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression Behaviour on Intention and Attitude was run individually and the results achieved are displayed above in Table 4.11. First, the clusters were sorted and saved as four different files. Once this was achieved, only one type of cluster was allowed to remain on individual files. A regression analysis was conducted on each file using Linear Regression with Mahalanbis distances option.

All clusters showed a high significance at 0.0001 with a varying degree of [R²] variance explained. Cluster 4 was the most predictable at [R² = 80.8%] variance explained. In this Cluster the contribution of Attitude was the highest at 52.7%,
followed by Intention 47.8%. This is good as the cluster makes 17.5% of the total population. In the case of Cluster 3, whose membership represented 34.6% of the sample, the variance was 67.4% explained. For this Cluster, Intention contributes higher at 47.8% followed by Attitude 45.7%. Cluster 3 represents 32.6% of the total sample. A healthy variance \([R^2]\) was explained at 53.6%. In this case the Attitude contributes at 47.4%, followed by Intention at 35.6%, similar to Cluster 4. The smallest number of sample population is represented in Cluster 1 at 15.3%. This cluster is the least predictable as the \([R^2]\) is only 28.8% explained. Although Intention contributes a healthy 59.5% the Attitude is not significant at –13.9%. 
Chapter 5

Discussion and Implications
Chapter Overview

This chapter presents the summary of findings in relation to segmentation of resort tourists: How the theory of planned behaviour relates to predicting resort accommodation purchase behaviour intentions along with the contribution of past behaviour to the theory. Practical implications of the study are discussed and recommendations are made. The major findings reported in the previous chapter are summarised in the research context of the research objectives at the outset. Out of the five hypotheses proposed for the study, three were supported by the data, one was partially supported and one was rejected.
5.1.0 Resort tourists segmentation:

The four clusters identified in the research, active conventionalists, young conservatives, elite regulars and veterans differ statistically in terms of gender ratio, age, level of education, family status, occupation, frequency of visits, the history of resorts visitation and usual length of resort stay. Each of these cluster groups were then compared in terms of reasons for choosing a particular resort, activities they indulge in while staying in a resort, past experience and items specific to the theory of planned behaviour. The expanded cluster profiles can now be described.

Resort tourists belonging to cluster one (N = 63 or 15.33% of the total respondents), active conventionalists, are predominantly educated young women with at least one child and in a relationship. Their main occupation is clerical, sales or service. They visit a resort at least once a year and their first visit to a resort was less than 10 years ago. The main activities they indulge in are very action orientated such as trekking, swimming, tennis, golf and skiing. They are not interested in horse riding, fishing or bird watching. This could mean that they have children to look after and can only indulge in activities that take less time away from looking after the children. In the same way they are moderately interested in meditation and sun bathing. They are not very concerned about safety and security or range of available accommodation. Interestingly, they are also not effected by the distance it takes to travel to their resort destination. This could mean that either they are not the designated drivers or they fly to the destination, thus reducing the negativity associated with the distance to the resort to a great degree in their responses. On the psychological front, their behaviour in purchasing resort accommodation is least formed by their attitude toward it,
control belief, past experience or normative beliefs. This leads to the assumption that they are not the primary deciders of the type of resort accommodation they use. Over all, this segment seems to be interested in activities that do not take a long period of time and focuses on the ones who accompany another person who decides on the choice of the resort accommodation. This group resembled ‘romantics’ as proposed by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) in their study of Australian resort visitors.

The profile of the second cluster (N = 134 or 32.60%), focuses on young conservatives, who as a group, seem to be very concerned about the scenic location of the resort. They also consider the distance they have to travel to reach a resort an important factor when deciding. They actively seek the information about the resort they wish to decide on. They seem to be more interested in sedentary life such as meditation, ecology and surrounds, sun bathing and wild / bird life watching. They seemed moderately interested in tennis and golf. They were least interested in availability and range of activities, night life, water activities and skiing. This group represents the face that matches such preferences. This group is an even mix of males and females in the 21 – 30 years age range. They are predominantly university educated, single and with no dependent children. They were least bothered about the cost. This group indicated that they were either professionals or employed in clerical, sales or service positions. The most distinguishing factor was that they had the shortest length of stay at a resort. The group is very similar to the ‘immersers’ as proposed by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005). This group seems to come from a background of hectic work schedules as they are interested in relaxing and indulging in low impact activities. Another possibility is that this group comes to
the resort for a conference and after their long day at work related activities they 
want to rest. This assumption is based on the fact that their resort utilisation 
history is the shortest along with the length of stay being less than a week.

The third segment (N = 142 or 34.55%), elite regulars, comprised mostly of 
university educated males of the 31 – 50 years age group. The majority of them 
were married or in a relationship with at least one child living with them. They 
were the highest earners as this group represented managers / administrators or 
professionals. They had their first resort stay experience more than 16 years or 
more ago. While the majority stayed for 1 to 2 weeks at a resort, a substantial 
number stayed there for less than a week. This short stay may indicate that they 
may be at the resort for purposes other than mentioned in the questionnaire such 
as attending a conference. Considering their age bracket it is not surprising that 
they were concerned about safety and security. They also scored high on the 
availability of the range of accommodation. While they scored moderately high 
on distance from home, availability of information and cost, they scored highest 
on their preference for ecology and surrounds and weather. Their preference for 
the activities also set them apart as this group was most interested in horse riding, 
meditation and fishing. They also scored moderately high on night life, bird and 
wild life watching and trekking. On the basis of demographics this group 
reflected similar attributes as the ‘tasters’ of Inbakaran and Jackson (2005). On 
the beliefs side, this group scored high on subjective norms and perceived control 
where as on intention and control beliefs they scored lowest. They scored 
moderately high on past experience and attitude. The profile and the preferences 
of the group provide a strong indication that they are interested in activities that 
take them about and increase their interaction with other resort users.
The final segment (N = 72 or 17.52%), veterans, contained women over 41 years of age who were university educated. Although they came from the whole spectrum of education level, a significant number had university education, followed by TAFE or technical that made almost one third of the membership, and finally, a quarter of the total indicated that they had secondary education. A significant majority were in a relationship with no children living with them at home. While over half of the respondents indicated that they were employed in clerical, sales or service positions, a third indicated their employment as other that included home duties. They had the longest history of resort visitation and their stay length at a resort was for 1 – 2 weeks. Their preference was for the availability of the recreational activities variety. This means that they participate most in the activities that are packaged by the resorts. They also indicated that the range of available accommodation along with the cost were important factors in their choice formation. This does not come as a surprise as that age group is generally price sensitive. The distance from home to the resort appeared as a significant factor which could mean that they drive themselves to the resorts. Good weather, scenic location that came with safety and security again correlated well with the age group and the predominant gender of the segment. They liked to socialise in the night activities by going to the restaurants and pubs. Regarding the activities, they like to horse ride and sun bathe. Once again, this group resembled the ‘veterans’ of Inbakaran and Jackson (2005). This group was found to be very interesting in their beliefs and past behaviour set. They had the highest behaviour, intention and attitude. They believed that they can control their experience at a resort. Their past experience helped them form their choice. They also conformed to the beliefs of their family and friends.
The post hoc analysis of the cluster differences provided some very interesting insights. On their reasons for visiting a resort, every segment liked the resort to be situated in a scenic location which may have some implications for the initial resort development phase. There was no significant difference in the need for the availability of information about the resort. Every segment was interested in learning about the resort before embarking on the purchase. Cost was also an important factor.

The activities the tourists indulge in also gave some interesting insights. There was no significant difference between the groups on horse riding, trekking, sun bathing, tennis, golf and bird and wildlife watching. This discussion supports the hypothesis (H1) that ‘tourists using resorts accommodation can be segmented in various groups’.

5.2.0 Beliefs and Resort Tourist’s Accommodation Purchase Behaviour:

The basic aim of this research is to explore the role of beliefs in resort tourists’ accommodation purchase behaviour. The seminal work in this field has been done by Ajzen (1991) in proposing the theory of planned behaviour, a theory used in consumer behaviour and psychology areas. According to Ajzen (1991) human behaviour is guided by three kinds of considerations; beliefs about the likely outcomes of the behaviour and evaluation of these outcomes, namely behavioural beliefs which culminate in attitude, beliefs about the normative expectations of others and motivations to comply with these expectations, normative beliefs which form subjective norms and beliefs about the presence of
factors that may facilitate or impede performance of the behaviour and perceived power of these factors and control beliefs which manifests as perceived behavioural control.

Figure 5.1 in the previous chapter represents the correlations in the TPB model. Although the TPB model has some detractors (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993), intention was found to be a precursor to the behaviour (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1977, Ajzen, 1991 and Ajzen and Driver, 1992). The data analysis of the TPB model on the available responses gave the correlation between behaviour and intention with $\alpha$ of 0.799. The reliability Chronbach’s $\alpha$ showed a high level of internal reliability being above 0.7 for some constructs as suggested to be adequate by McGraw and Wong (1996) and above the conventionally lenient cut-off point of $\alpha$ 0.6.

Present research is using TPB for the first time for the resort tourists therefore there is no precedence to conform to or reject. Wherever possible, similarities are highlighted in findings of this research and other researches done in other disciplines.

The correlations in the original model showed a reliability $\alpha$ of 0.738 between intention and attitude. Attitude refers to the degree to which a person has a favourable or unfavourable approach to the behaviour intention in question. This high level of reliability has been seen in the case of tourism for leisure choice (Ajzen and Driver, 1992), travel mode (Bamberg et al. 2003), restaurant related research in hospitality (Buttle and Bok, 1996; Conner et al., 2001; Lam and Hsu, 2004; Reisinger and Waryszak, 1994) as well as other disciplines to investigate
exercise (Dawns and Hauseblas, 2003), sun-related behaviour (Branstrom et al., 2004) and promotion of whole-grain foods by dieticians (Chase et al. 2003).

While investigating regression intention on attitude it showed a significance of 0.0001 with variance explained \( R^2 = 31.9\% \), attitude contributed 44.5%. The explained variance is low but considering there is no precedence for resort tourist research, Rhodes et al (2005), while summarising previous research applying TPB on exercise behaviour, suggested that TPB explained an average of 30% of attitude and 40% variance in intention. Similarly, in another study on the variety of health related behaviours the TPB explained 27% and 39% of the variance in behaviour and intention respectively (Armitage and Conner, 2001).

This study’s regression explanation for attitude’s contribution is the same as Ajzen and Driver (1991), 0.36 in relation to male and female undergraduate students, Backman (1999) 0.47 in relation to diet and health, Bergen (1996) 0.45 in relation to chronic pain, Blue (1996) 0.52 in exercise and work site employees, Cournya (1995) 0.44 in older adults and muscular activities, Daltroy and Godin (1989) 0.39 in spouses of cardiac patients and improved lifestyle, Godin et al. (1983) 0.42 in relation to barriers to healthy living, Kimiecik (1992) 0.34 for worksite employees and Legg (1987) 0.26 for undergraduate students. The positive relationship found between behaviour intention and attitude in this study supports the hypothesis (H2) that ‘positive attitude toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention’.

The correlation between subjective norms and behaviour intentions was found to be with reliability \( \alpha \) of 0.586, lower than the conventional cut off point of 0.6, but the proximity can not be discounted as it is very close to it and the literature
is full of results that confirm such a relationship. In Table 5.3 (b) regression Intention on Subjective Norms a significance of 0.0001 with \[R^2 = 31.9\%\] variance is explained. Subjective Norms contributed 19.5\%. A similar trend appeared while investigating the level of Subjective Norms in various clusters as shown in Table 5.10. With the exception of Elite Regulars, every other cluster showed a low mean score. This low relationship discovery partially supports the hypothesis (H3) that ‘positive subjective norm toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention’.

In the case of Perceived Behaviour Control, the reliability \(\alpha\) was found to be lowest in relation to other items. For Behaviour it was 0.392; Intention, 0.372, Subjective Norms, 0.066 and Attitude, 0.294 (Table 5.2). It also explained Intention in Table 5.3 (b) to a very low 2.8\%. In the original model, Perceived Behaviour Control is said to be a direct predictor of Intention and an indirect one of Behaviour. In a tourism related study of potential travellers from mainland China to Hong Kong, Lam and Hsu (2004) found that Attitude and Perceived Behaviour Control were related to travel Intentions, however in the present study, Perceived Behaviour Control has been found to be low for all segments and it did not contribute to their Behaviour Intention. This result does not support the hypothesis (H4) that ‘positive perceived behavioural control by the tourists toward resorts is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention’.

5.3.0 Past Experience and Resort Tourists’ Accommodation Purchase Behaviour
Past experience was incorporated in the original TPB model. After a few attempts, streamlining the model was achieved (Figure 5.3) when taking the correlations into consideration. Past Experience correlated strongest to Intention ($\alpha = 0.638$), followed by Attitude ($\alpha=0.536$), Perceived Behaviour Control ($\alpha=0.440$) and Subjective Norms ($\alpha=0.439$). Regression analysis was conducted on the model in three different steps. Step 1, was regression Behaviour on Intention and Attitude, which was found to be significant at 0.0001 with $[R^2 = 45.4\%]$ variance explained, an immediate improvement over the original model that had $[R^2 = 31.9\%]$ variance explained. Furthermore, in Step 2, regression Attitude on Perceived Behaviour Control, Subjective Norms and Past Behaviour showed significance at 0.0001 with $[R^2 = 28.6\%]$ variance explained (Table 5.5). In this case Subjective Norms contributed 36.3%, followed by Perceived Behaviour Control 22.3%, followed by Past Experience 19.5%. In Step 3, regression Intention on Perceived Behaviour Control, Subjective Norms and Past Behaviour showed significance at 0.0001 with $[R^2 = 28.0\%]$ variance explained. In this case, Past Experience contributed 35%, followed by Subjective Norms 29.8%, followed by Perceived Control, which was not significant and only contributed 6.9%. This result is similar to other travel related studies (Ajzen and Driver, 1992; Lam and Hsu, 2006). This also validates that Past Behaviour has a significant impact on Behavioural Intention (Lam and Hsu, 2006). This finding also aligned with Ajzen’s (1991) argument that when people deliberately form conscious intentions, past behaviours are likely to be a contributing factor. Moreover, the finding supports empirical studies, which demonstrated that past behaviour has a direct influence on behavioural intention of different types of acting (Ajzen and Medden, 1986; Bentler and Speckart, 1979). This finding
supports the hypothesis (H5) that ‘past experience of resort accommodation purchase by the tourists positively affects their behaviour intention’.

Table 5.1 Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H 1  Tourists using resorts accommodation can be segmented in various groups.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 2  Positive attitude toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 3  Positive subjective norm toward resorts by the tourists is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 4  Positive perceived behavioural control by the tourists toward resorts is directly linked to their accommodation purchase behaviour intention.</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 5  Past experience of resort accommodation purchase by the tourists positively affects their behaviour intention.</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4.0 Implications

While studying the composition of various clustering groups for marketing purposes, their reasons for utilising a resort accommodation for holiday purpose will give a keen insight into the particular groups for the resort marketing team to target. This is recommended because it is easier to match the segment to the existing facilities than to opt for very expensive modifications to the physical and structural attributes of the facility. At the time when resort management is focusing on traditional and non-traditional markets, it is advisable that they understand the underlying dimensions of resort visitation (Barsky, 1992; Dannaher and Mattsson, 1994; Oh, 1999). Furthermore, the operators of those resorts can offer the activities preferred by the target group at a reasonable cost to
make their stay an enjoyable and memorable one. Chon and Singh (1995) have found that a changing client lifestyle, composition and background along with spending patterns exert enormous market pressure for the resorts all over the world. The growth of an evolving Chinese market is a good example in the Australian context. Therefore, basing demographics as the clustering base and using them to develop guest activity programs and other resort products and services will have limited resource implications (Warnken et al., 2003).

The first cluster, ‘active conventionalists’ seems to represent young couples with or without small children. They also seemed to be the ones who wanted to enjoy their resort stay with minimal difficulties. While this cluster is the smallest, they require a marketing strategy that focuses on the availability of relaxing surrounds with basic facilities such as golf, tennis and swimming and proximity to geography that meets their interest in skiing and trekking. Their need to indulge in such activities seems to be hindered by their obligation to look after the small children. It is recommended that the resorts interested in this segment should invest in child minding facilities and promote such facilities so that these people can indulge in their favoured activities, relax and re-patronise the resort as a regular refuge. International market focused resorts could also market to the lucrative Asian young and honeymooner market although there is a need to be aware of the cross-cultural service issues (Turner et al., 2001; Wei et al., 1989). As this segment is represented by young couples, the resort activity program could focus on couple centred activities that can be made available in secluded surroundings. Boutique resorts that have such facilities would most benefit from this segment as these resorts do not need to invest in huge infrastructure that is mandatory for family and business oriented resort guests. Resorts that are located
in pristine and isolated locations but facing the decline stage of their lifecycle can reposition and rejuvenate themselves toward this cluster with minimal investment.

Implications for the second group, ‘young conservatives’ are opposite. This cluster, the second largest, has no dependent children and is least cost conscious. Most of the resorts entertain and cater to these traditional resort guests. This group of people focuses on facilities and utilities. They seem to be very much interested in rest, recreation and rejuvenation. With this cluster dominated by tourists having traits of an individualistic Australian society (Hofstede, 1980), they are likely to be focused on themselves and very demanding in terms of their own needs (Pearce and Moscardo, 1984). The focus needs to be on the variety and novelty of the activities on offer. The resorts must be well kept and refurbished to maximise their comfort. Resorts that are located in exotic coastal and mountain settings and well maintained will be able to attract this cluster successfully and keep them loyal for a long time.

The third cluster, ‘elite regulars’ is the largest group of people. They are older people. The most distinguishing factor is their need for safety and security and they stay at a resort for the longest period of time. Another requirement for this group is the availability of a range of accommodation. They are the highest educated with a high proportion of them being managers and professionals. Their need to have a wide variety of activities makes them very attractive to the resort managements. This group of people also like to enjoy a good night life that covers going to restaurants, bars and pubs. The resorts must provide an opportunity for this group to enjoy and socialise with other resort users by
offering communal activities. The resort operators must look after this segment well with a consistent service similar to ‘active conventionalists’. Established resorts should target this group (Smith, 2004) as they have resort stay experience and can differentiate good products and services from average ones.

The final cluster, ‘veterans’ comprises of mature couples, mature singles and mature families. This cluster needs special marketing and management focus that differs from the rest of the clusters. This group indicated health, safety and security, recreational activities and cost as major factors while on a resort holiday. The presence of security personnel or a perception of security must be provided by the resorts. The most important suggestion is that since this group is very cost conscious, and tends to stay for longer periods compared to other groups, an offer of ‘all inclusive packaged’ resort stay should be considered. It is also suggested that health and rejuvenation based activities should be offered to this group to maintain their long term loyalty (Warnken et al., 2003).

Although a number of empirical studies have shown that the theory of planned behaviour (TPB) is successful in explaining human behaviour in various disciplines, the theoretical and conceptual foundations for predicting the intention for choosing a resort accommodation by Australian tourists has not been previously investigated. The results of this study demonstrate the partial utility of the theory of planned behaviour as a conceptual foundation for predicting behavioural intention for choosing a resort accommodation by Australian tourists. Findings showed that attitude and intention had a direct impact on the purchase behaviour, while normative beliefs were partially helpful in predicting resort accommodation purchase behaviour. The previous experience of resort stay positively influenced the intention, while it did not contribute to
attitude in the same way. Perceived behaviour control or behavioural beliefs contributed least to every dimension except attitude.

A number of salient implications can be derived from the findings of the study. From a macro-perspective, education, occupation and maturity were three of the most important factors influencing resort accommodation purchase. The resort marketers must consider the professional publications for advertising in Australia to create awareness of their property. This approach will potentially cover all three factors that contribute to purchase behaviour. Repurchase of resort goods and services can also be improved by contributing to the positive attitude of the tourists by good service. The resorts must endeavour to educate and train their personnel so that they know their jobs well as well as providing a welcoming service to the customers. Anecdotally, resorts are reluctant to spend money on employee training and development as there is a high staff turnover rate in the industry as well as the transient nature of the workforce due to the seasonality factor. Trained workers are found to be more productive and they tend to stay for longer with the employer and require less supervision (Gee, 1993). The training will not go waste if it creates future repurchase behaviour. The other implication is that the resort management must reinvest in the property to keep it looking fresh as attitudes do change when the product or service is not as expected.

Although normative beliefs appeared not to contribute as much as attitude toward resort accommodation purchase behaviour in this study, their effect on attitude itself was found to be a significant factor. It is crucial for the resort promoters to facilitate the development of a positive attitude among resort tourists’ potential referent groups. For instance advertising proximity to shopping, availability of
beauty and spa products for the female referent groups at a particular resort will positively influence the attitude of the principal purchaser. A place to take a break from busy schedule and availability of activities for the children will also positively contribute to the attitude.

The study showed an increased predictability with the introduction of past behaviour to the mix of factors. This means that as the number of visits to resorts increases, resort tourists’ accommodation purchase behaviour becomes stronger. Apparently, tourists who have had good experiences are more likely to re-patronise and help encourage potential tourists to resorts through favourable word-of-mouth. This can be done in two ways. Firstly, the training and retraining opportunities for the staff to enhance the quality of the service provided. Secondly, by offering short familiarisation stays to the referent groups. As the study suggests, a person who has had a positive experience of resort stay will more probably revisit the resort for a longer period as well as positively influencing the people in their social circle.

Introduction of past behaviour to the theory of planned behaviour has positive implications as it increased the predictability of veterans to 80.8% and elite regulars to 67.4% as well as a healthy 53.6% for young conservatives. It only predicted active conventionalists to 28.8% which is a small consolation as they themselves make the smallest of the resort tourists segments. Therefore, it is expected that past experience will play an important role in predicting resort accommodation purchase behaviour in future marketing approaches.
Chapter 6

Limitations and Recommendations
Chapter Overview

A few limitations were observed in this study. They related to questionnaire design, data collection method or data analysis.

The limitations are discussed that generate recommendations for future at the same time. The chapter goes on to recommend to the marketers where to go on to from this point to get maximum return on their marketing budget.
6.1.0 Limitations

This study began by questioning what the role of beliefs is in forming the accommodation purchase behaviour intentions of Australian resort tourists using the theory of planned behaviour and the contribution of past experience on their beliefs. This dissertation proposed and tested theoretical explanations for these questions using questionnaires developed by Inbakaran and Jackson (2005) and Ajzen (1991). Some limitations need to be acknowledged relating to the research instrument, how it was administered, the role of resort managements where it was administered and the respondents themselves.

6.1.1 Length of the questionnaire

The questionnaire was too long. An effort was made to keep the actual questionnaire to three pages so that respondents do not reject the instrument by just looking at it. To achieve the goal, the font size was reduced. However, as there were 40 questions related to the TPB and past behaviour, 11 related to demographics, 11 each to investigate reasons for resort selection as well as activities; it still made it a lengthy one to answer. Although it is acknowledged as a major drawback, reducing the length would have seriously compromised the instrument.

6.1.2 Did not take into consideration the ‘off / on season’ factor

The data collection was done over a short period of time, at the time of their stay at a resort. Thus, the results reflect only the people who were using the resort at that time. People who travel to a resort during ‘on’ and ‘off’ periods have a different point of view as to the reason why they travel such as price, activity or seeking different type of resort users. To overcome this limitation
the study should be conducted over an extended period of time to cater for such differences.

6.1.3 Post code was not included

No provision was made to obtain the residential post code of the respondent. This is a limitation because the marketers of resorts who wish to use the study can not focus their attention on a specific geographical area to attract them to their resort. The future study must overcome this so that it could be used in a meaningful way and not remain just an academic exercise.

6.1.4 Purchase initiator / driver was not identified

The person who initiated the trip was not identified. This is a major drawback as the beliefs of the respondent may be completely different from the person who initiates or drives the purchase behaviour intention. It is good to know about the person who is responding to the questionnaire but as a marketing activity this is a futile exercise, especially if it involves a family. The results of such a study will divert the marketing dollars in the direction of people who do not have any say in the purchase decision, thus are wasted on the audience. Although it is an important factor and acknowledged here, overcoming this limitation will prove to be very difficult because of logistical reasons unless the quantitative approach is supplemented with a qualitative instrument.
6.1.5 No differentiation made on the type of resort – geographically, star rating wise or available attributes

This is one limitation that needs to be addressed in future studies. People who go to a beach resort go there for different motivations than the ones who go to a mountain resort. People who can afford a five star deluxe accommodation have a different approach to the ones who use cheaper alternatives. It is important that one type of resort should be studied in future so that the model can be tested and refined to create specialised marketing tools.

6.1.6 Response rate was dependent on the goodwill of the resort management

The study suffered from the universal problem of data collection. To keep the anonymity of the resorts, the return envelope was not marked in any way. It was observed that some resorts sent more filled questionnaires as compared to others. This leads to the assumption that some of the resorts’ management were more proactive than others by placing the questionnaires in the guest rooms, collecting them and sending them back to the researcher. The only way to overcome this limitation is to study similar types of resorts so that the results reflect the reality.

6.1.7 Not a longitudinal study

This study was not longitudinal therefore the results should be interpreted with caution. Ideally, the research should have been conducted over two seasons or more to study the groups of people ‘cohort’ as that provides a better understanding of the beliefs. This was not possible for this study as it is part of an academic exercise with strict timelines. It is recommended that the
future studies of resort tourists are conducted over time to confirm or reject the results.

6.1.8 Reliability of the respondents’ motives

The use of self-reporting measures of tourist behaviour intention may be limited in terms of reliability, a limitation to consider as self-evaluation may have inflated some parts of the hypotheses tested. The respondents may have had different points of view. It is possible that in this respondent population positive attitude may have been over represented compared to the ones with unfavourable attitude. In addition the respondents had to interpret questions with regard to their personal experience and understanding. Another consideration is that behaviour intentions may change after it has been measured. To overcome this limitation the researcher or a representative should be available to the respondents. Furthermore, a longitudinal study would help in this regard too.

6.1.9 Cultural differences not recognised or catered for

The scope of the study was limited to anyone using a resort at the time of data gathering and as the majority of respondents indicated English as their language spoken at home, it assumes that most of the respondents came from a western cultural background. The results of the study should be used with caution if they have to be used for different ethnic groups

6.1.10 Only intrinsic factors examined to study purchase behaviour

In this study only the intrinsic factors such as demographics, beliefs and past behaviour were examined to investigate resort tourists’ purchase behaviour
intentions. The influence of extrinsic factors such as rating of a resort, economic life cycle of a resort or macro-economic conditions were not explored due to time constraints.

Conclusively, this current study provides a theoretical foundation for understanding the past behaviour and the theory of planned behaviour on resort tourists’ accommodation purchase behaviour intention. In addition this study is a good first step in research about knowledge of tourism because although the theory of planned behaviour has provided many answers in different disciplines, the theory has been used for the first time in understanding resort tourists in Australia. While the study has answered a few questions, it has failed to provide clarity to some of the research questions. Given this is the first time the constructs have been tested a further study based on the present study is necessary to add clarity and validity to the findings.

**6.2.0 Recommendations:**

Despite the contributions of the present study to explore the role of beliefs and past experience in forming the resort accommodation purchase behaviour of Australian tourists, some results require further examination. Such a recommendation is made because the field of study is important. The success or failure of advertising and marketing can have a profound impact on the survival of a resort in the medium to long term as an accounting entity and this study could possibly become the foundation for such effort.
The study investigated the behaviour in the context of present behaviour as it was conducted on the resort tourists who were using the facility at the present moment. This present behaviour can potentially be changed by the time the same tourists make the purchase decision in future. The marketer would be interested in finding out about the future as that is the intent of their being. Therefore, it is recommended that in the next study the future purchase intentions are studied so that the results provide a basis for the marketing of resorts.

It is recommended that a segmentation study should be conducted using the latest statistical analysis method *m-plus* since the current procedure takes many steps. At one stage the researcher contemplated using SEM to investigate the beliefs and the market segmentation but the procedure does not cater to such a requirement. As it is, the jury is still out to confirm the benefits of using SEM over tried and tested regression methods. It is therefore recommended that *m-plus* should be explored for future use as it can segment as well as provide differing value models for the segments along with the predictability threshold.

More studies should be conducted to segment resort tourists by socio-demographics and then link them to attitude and intention as this study was conducted on the basic demographic features. Such an approach will provide more depth and clearly identify the segments to be used for marketing.

Another important recommendation is that the model developed in this study is applied to different geographically located resorts, seasons and cultures for validation and generalisation. This recommendation is made to counter the major limitation felt in the study.
It is recommended that in future studies the model’s reliability and validity is tested on other types of extrinsic moderating factors such as personality, seasonality and economic forces. This approach will not only enrich the model but also provide some keen insights into purchase behaviour intention from a different perspective.

Future studies must be done on a longitudinal approach for the measurement of ‘behaviour’ on a sufficient smaller sample size to test the predictive power of the model.

The effect of subjective norms (control beliefs) and perceived behavioural control on intention was not found to be related to intention as was expected initially. A possible explanation could be that the tourists are not concerned about the construct when they are personally involved in the purchase behaviour and the control belief is supplemented by other factors not investigated in this study. Therefore, it is recommended that in future studies such modifying factors are explored and investigated in the resort tourists’ context. Park (1991) hypothesised that those different contexts define consumption goals, triggering different attributes.

Finally, a concerted effort should be made to get a resort association onboard so that the difficulties of data collection and industry cooperation could be overcome.
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Appendix A

Request to participate in the study letter sent to resorts
Ms XXXXX XXXXX  
Director of Sales  
Cable Beach Club Resort Broome  
Suite 411, 566 St Kilda Road  
Melbourne, 3004  

22 March 2007  

Dear XXXX  

Recently I was speaking to my colleague Ms XXXXX XXXX, at William Angliss Institute, about my PhD project and she suggested that I should send my questionnaire to you to get your views on the topic.  

I am investigating the beliefs that drive tourists to choose a particular type of resort accommodation through School of Management, RMIT University.  

If you agree to participate in the study, the questionnaire should not take you more than 10 minutes to complete. Once you finish, please put it in the attached envelope and mail it back to me without identifying yourself or the hotel you represent.  

Further, I am also looking at the possibility of putting this questionnaire in your guestrooms. There are very strict rules governing privacy and anonymity at RMIT University. Your hotel will not be identified in any manner if you choose to participate. Please call me on 9606 2400 if you are happy to further support this academic research.  

Thanking you  

Yours truly,  

Mukesh Sharma  
Senior Educator – Tourism  
William Angliss Institute of TAFE  
555, La Trobe Street  
Melbourne, VIC 3000
Appendix B

Questionnaire
Dear Sir/Madam,

You are invited to participate in a research project being conducted by RMIT University. This information sheet describes the project. Please read this sheet carefully before you agree to participate. If you have any questions about the project, please ask either the investigator or the project supervisor.

Who is involved in this research project? Why is it being conducted?

This research is being conducted as a part of Ph.D. degree and has been approved by the RMIT Human Research Ethics Committee. The project investigates the resort selection processes by Australian tourists. By filling out this questionnaire, you will help us gain invaluable insights into how resorts are viewed by current patrons and how services can be improved for future patrons.

What is the project about and why you have been approached?

The Australian cultural expectation is that people will take time off from their busy schedules to pursue leisure activities. Most people have had some experience in staying at ‘resort accommodation’ which covers a wide range of products (ranging from a caravan park to a 5-star resort hotel). You have been randomly selected to participate in this study.

If you agree to participate, what will you be required to do?

If you were to participate in the study, you would be required to complete the attached questionnaire which will take you approximately 10 minutes. You should read the attached document before deciding if you would like to proceed with.

What are the risks or disadvantages associated with participation?

There are no risks or disadvantages associated with participation. You are not being identified in any way and your views will remain anonymous. The information you provide will only be seen by the investigator and the project supervisor. If you are unduly concerned about your responses to any of the questionnaire items or if you find participation in the project distressing, you should immediately stop participating and contact Dr Robert Inbakaran on (03) 9925 1534 at your convenience. Dr Inbakaran will discuss your concerns and suggest appropriate follow-up.

What are the benefits associated with participation?

There are no immediate direct benefits to the participants; however the study will help improve future products and services provided by the resort industry.

What will happen to the information you provide?
The information you provide will remain anonymous throughout the study as you are not identified in any manner. The research data will be coded by the researcher and kept secure at RMIT for a period of 5 years before being destroyed. The results of this study will be disseminated in the PhD thesis and in papers for publication and conference presentation. Any information that you provide can be disclosed to a third party only if (1) it is to protect you or others from harm, (2) a court order is produced, or (3) you provide the researcher with written permission.

**What are your rights as a participant?**

You have the right to withdraw your participation at any time, without prejudice, the right to have any unprocessed data withdrawn and destroyed, provided it can be reliably identified and provided that so doing does not increase the risk to you. You also have the right to have any questions answered at any time.

**Who should you contact if you have any questions?**

Please contact the investigator, Mukesh Sharma on (03) 9606 2400.

**What other issues should you be aware of before deciding whether to participate?**

We believe that there are no ethical issues that you should be concerned about.

Yours sincerely

Mukesh Sharma  
M Business (Hospitality Management), B Sc (Biology), Diploma of Hotel Management, Catering & Nutrition, Diploma of Teaching (TAFE)

Any complaints about the participation in this project may be directed to the Secretary, Portfolio Human Research Ethics Sub Committee, Business Portfolio, RMIT, GPO Box 2476V, Melbourne, 3001. The telephone number is (03) 9925 5594 or email address, rhu@rmit.edu.au. Details of the complaints procedure are available from the above address or http://www.rmit.edu.au/council/hrec
1. Deciding on accommodation, be it a cabin at a caravan park or a deluxe room in a five star resort hotel, is an important step when planning holidays. I am listing some of the factors that people like you may consider when choosing an accommodation. Please indicate how important each option is by placing a tick (π) in the space provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Some what Important</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Some what Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Extremely Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Scenic location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Safety and Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Recreational activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Range of accommodation available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Distance from my city / town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Available information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Ecology and surrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. While staying at this holiday accommodation, how important is each of the following activities for you? Please indicate your response by placing a tick (π) for every activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Some what Important</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Some what Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Extremely Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Horse riding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Trekking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Water based activities (boating, swimming, canoeing, snorkelling, surfing etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Sun bathing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Meditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Skiing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Bird and wild life watching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Night life such as night club, bar or pub etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please indicate your views by placing a tick (π) in the appropriate box for every statement. Please be aware that some statements may seem like repetition of a previous one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Some what agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Some what disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is normal for people to stay in a resort accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I intend to stay in a resort accommodation in the forthcoming year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It will be beneficial for me to stay in a resort accommodation in the forthcoming year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most people who are important to me think that I should stay in a resort accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most people who are important to me use resort accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If I wanted to, I could stay in a resort accommodation in future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is important for me to control the choice of ‘where I stay’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have been to the same resort hotel that I visited with my parents when I was young.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is fun to stay at a resort accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I will try to stay in a resort accommodation on my next vacation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. For me to stay in a resort accommodation would be a pleasant experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Some times I ask people I value, for information on resorts I should stay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It is important for me to stay with my family when at a resort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I believe I have a complete control over where I stay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I can stick to an acceptable routine when I go to a resort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I have taken family/friends to a resort that I have been to before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It is safe to stay in a resort accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I plan to stay in a resort accommodation on my next holiday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. For me to stay in a resort accommodation is good.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My friends tell me that it is important to go to a resort hotel to have good vacation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It is important for the young people to stay in a resort hotel where their parents have stayed in the past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I always have fun at a resort because I want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I believe I can control the amount of money I spend at a resort accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I feel comfortable revisiting resorts as they bring happy memories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. One can meet interesting people at a resort accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Before my next vacation, I will investigate resort accommodation available at the intended destination whether I use it or not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. For me to stay at a resort accommodation would be valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am expected to go to and stay at a resort accommodation in future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The beliefs of people I value are important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. It is mostly up to me to decide on the type of accommodation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My family/friends usually go to the accommodation, I decide on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I feel comfortable going to a resort as I have experienced it before and liked it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions about you.

4. What is your gender?
   a. Male  □  b. Female  □

5. What is your age group?
   a. Under 20  □  b. 21-30  □  c. 31-40  □  d. 41-50  □  e. 51-60  □  f. 61+  □

6. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   a. Primary  □  b. Secondary  □  c. TAFE or technical  □  d. University  □

7. Please circle the category that best describes your household.

8. Age of the youngest child living with you.
   a. Less than 6 years  □  b. Between 6 and 15 years  □  c. Older than 15 years  □  d. None  □

9. What is your occupation?  
   ____________________________________________

10. Are you an Australian resident?  
    a. Yes  □  b. No  □

11. What language do you speak at home?
    ____________________________________________

12. How many times have you used a holiday accommodation in the past 3 years?
    ____________________________________________

13. How long have you been using such accommodation for (in years)?
    a. Less than 1  □  b. 1-5  □  c. 6-10  □  d. 11-15  □  e. 16-20  □  f. 20+  □

14. On average, how long do you stay at a holiday accommodation?
    a. 1 day  □  b. Less than a week  □  c. 1-2 weeks  □  d. 2-3 weeks  □  e. 3+ weeks  □

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.