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ABSTRACT

Anticipation is the first travel phase (Clawson & Knetsch, 1966) and consists of the vacation planning process. Tourists may exhibit varying levels of mindfulness during this phase. Mindfulness is associated with analytic decision making through a heightened sensitivity to one’s environment and openness to new information (Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000).

This study considered the influence that mindfulness during the travel anticipation phase has on: search and choice behaviors, search and choice outcomes, and trip evaluations. Analysis was also conducted to determine if there was a significant influence on the relationships based on the mediating effect of the amount of the trip was planned in advance. Moderation was tested to determine if interactions existed based on whether the tourist selected a destination that was novel, and whether the tourist considered that area to be the primary destination for their trip.

The results of the analysis found that mindfulness during the travel anticipation phase had significant positive influences on the source variety, the level of enjoyment, the level of confidence, satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty. Mediation effects found that the amount of the trip that was planned in advance had a significant influence on the relationship between mindfulness and the planning horizon, enjoyment, and satisfaction. Moderating effects were found between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty for people visiting a novel destination, and between mindfulness and planning horizon for people who were in their primary destination. The study confirmed that mindfulness during the anticipation phase influenced the travel experience.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

The tourism industry is growing world wide and achieved a milestone of 1 billion arrivals in 2012 (UNWTO, 2013). The tourism marketplace is also growing more competitive as technology and transportation have allowed tourists access to information about and transportation to reach many previously unattainable destinations, and these destinations are becoming increasingly substitutable (Pike, 2005; Yoon & Uysal, 2003). In order for destinations to stay competitive, the tourism marketers and managers must understand the processes and components of tourist decision making and trip evaluations. Variables that are often considered in the literature on travel planning and decision making include: the window of time spent planning, the number of destinations considered for the trip, the types of information sources sought, and whether the destination chosen had been previously visited. The planning horizon is defined as the length of the planning period (Gitelson & Crompton, 1983). The top three to five choices that are seriously considered as a trip destination are called the choice set (Woodside & Lysonski, 1989). Information sources can vary from internal information that was previously held knowledge or external information which is knowledge found in sources once travel planning has begun (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). Also of interest is whether the tourist chooses a destination where they have previously visited or one that is new or novel and unfamiliar to them (Snepenger, Meged, Snelling, & Worrall, 1990).
Trip evaluations such as satisfaction and loyalty are also prevalent in tourism research. Satisfaction is defined as the consumer’s cognitive comparison of whether their experience with a product or service exceeded their expectations (Oliver, 1980). Loyalty is considered multi-dimensional and a distinction is made between loyalty that is behavioral or attitudinal. Behavioral loyalty is defined as a deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future (Oliver, 1999). Attitudinal loyalty is the psychological commitment or statement of preference for a product or service (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Many studies have empirically tested that tourists who are satisfied with their travel experience are more likely to be loyal and return to the destination again or recommend it to their friends and family (Chen & Tsai, 2007, Chi & Qu, 2008; Kozak, 2003; Prayag, 2008; Prayag & Ryan, 2012).

These studies often look at satisfaction based on the tourists’ experiences when they are in situ, or at the destination. However, the time spent in the destination is only one segment of the travel experience. It has been proposed that the travel experience has five phases: the anticipation before departure, traveling to the destination, time at the destination, traveling home from the destination, and the recollection of the trip after returning home (Clawson & Knetsch, 1966). While it has been established that satisfaction with the experience at the destination can lead to loyalty, tourism research has not fully explored whether the tourist’s experience in other travel phases also influences satisfaction as well as behaviors and attitudes that are indicative of loyalty.

Considering the tourist experience as multi-phasic is particularly salient due to the recent shift towards the experience economy. Previous economies focused on material
purchases based on the acquisition of tangible objects but it is becoming more common to allocate discretionary income toward experiential purchases which are made to acquire life experiences (Van Boven & Gilovich, 2003). Successful businesses strive to engage their customers on an emotional, physical, intellectual and even a spiritual level (Pine & Gilmore, 1998). The customer is an active participant in the creation of the experience, and it is therefore different for each person based on their individual state of mind, motivations, values, emotions, behavior, preferences, interests, and opinions (Pine & Gilmore, 1998; Prat & de la Rica Aspiunza, 2014).

The tourism industry stands to benefit from the experience economy as experiential purchases make consumers happier than material purchases and there is a growing desire to do things rather than have things (Van Boven & Gilovich, 2003). It has even been found that the anticipation phase for an experiential purchase was more enjoyable than for a material purchase (Kumar, Killingsworth, & Thomas, 2014). There is no longer a distinct separation between supply and demand and the tourism experience is no longer consumed in a linear fashion (Prat & de la Rica Aspiunza, 2014). The tourist has become the protagonist in the creation of their travel experience which must be viewed and understood as a holistic evaluation from the entirety of the experience and not only from a single phase (Prat & de la Rica Aspiunza, 2014).

People process information about travel and other consumption decisions based upon their existing level of knowledge about the place or product. For example, once a tourist has experienced need arousal to travel or has given attention to information stimuli, they will determine whether they have enough internal information with what
they already know about the destination or whether they need to continue gathering additional information through external sources (Vogt, Fesenmaier, & MacKay, 1994). The newly acquired external information is added to the existing internal knowledge to support decision making for a future trip (Vogt et al., 1994). Information processing varies for each consumer based on the way that it is categorized, evaluated, organized, and retained (Bettman, 1979).

Dual-processing theory in psychology provides a framework for understanding that people process information through a high-effort route or a low-effort route (Pearce & Packer, 2013). Consumers choose a product to buy or a destination to visit through active or passive deciding depending on variables such as the information sources and alternative choices that they consider in the decision making process (Langer, 1994). Langer (1989) describes active deciding as mindfulness and the natural inclination or propensity for a person to analytically process information that results in the creation of new categories, openness to new information, and awareness of more than one perspective. In contrast, mindless decisions are often automatic and instinctual after only considering a single perspective (Langer, 1989). Mindfulness through the high-effort route uses active deciding that is associated with a deep level of analysis where a person is open to new ideas from multiple perspectives (Carson & Langer, 2006). Mindlessness through the low-effort route is associated with passive deciding at a superficial level of information analysis where a person relies on heuristics such as information from their past experience (Djikic & Langer, 2007).
Mindfulness has appeared in the literature for approximately 30 years (Dutt, 2011) and has proven to be useful in research in the field of education with the development of mindful learning environments (Houston & Turner, 2007; Ritchhart & Perkins, 2000). Studies in psychology have also benefited from the application of mindfulness to psychological concepts such as cultural intelligence, self-acceptance, and social comparison (Carson & Langer, 2006; Djikic & Langer, 2007; Thomas, 2006). Despite only recently being applied in the tourism context, mindfulness has much potential to explain the tourism experience and has been gaining momentum in its application to information processing in the context of tourism (Brown, Ryan, & Creswell, 2007; Pearce & Packer, 2013). Mindfulness has been used to determine the depth of information analysis by travelers at a tourism site and the influence that it has on their experience there (Barber & Deale, 2013; Frauman & Norman, 2004; Ganesan, Noor, & Jaafar, 2014; Kang & Gretzel, 2012; McIntosh, 1999; Moscardo, 1996; Van Winkle & Backman, 2009). However, a gap exists in the literature for the use of mindfulness in the understanding of the travel anticipation phase that takes place while individuals are still searching for and choosing a destination. This study considered whether the information search and destination selection process may be influenced by the tourists’ depth of analysis throughout the anticipation phase. The study set out to discover whether mindfulness influenced search and choice behaviors (e.g. planning horizon, choice set, source variety), search and choice outcomes (e.g. enjoyment, confidence) as well as whether the level of mindfulness as the tourist makes their decisions prior to their trip can
influence their overall trip evaluation in terms of satisfaction and intended behavioral and attitudinal loyalty.

**Problem Statement**

This study sought to fill a gap in the literature and better understand whether mindfulness during the anticipation phase would influence the tourists’ travel experience. Mindfulness occurs when a tourist actively processes available information through a heightened sensitivity to one’s environment and openness to new information (Frauman & Norman, 2004; Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000). Studies have found that mindfulness can influence the tourist’s experience when they are in the destination because they are more actively engaged in their new environment (Frauman & Norman, 2004; Moscardo, 1996; 2009). However, the influence of mindfulness in other travel phases has not yet been examined. The relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction in the fields of education and marketing have had inconsistent results. Langer (1994) argues that mindfulness should lead to higher levels of satisfaction while others have found that heightened consciousness in the decision making stages actually results in lower levels of post-purchase satisfaction (Dijksterhuis & van Olden, 2006). It is also possible that excessive optimism in the anticipation phase may result in disappointment with the overall experience (Clawson & Knetsch, 1966). Mindfulness and loyalty have not been studied together in tourism though the relationship has been found to be significant in research about consumer decision making in the selection of healthcare providers (Ndubisi, 2014). Research is needed to better understand mindfulness and the tourist experience throughout all of the phases.
Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to understand the influence that mindfulness during the anticipation phase may have on search and choice behaviors and outcomes as well as trip evaluations. Specifically, this study asked tourists who were on site in the destination to reflect on their mindful state during the period when they were still planning their trip in the anticipation phase of the travel experience and provide insights into how far in advance they began searching for information, how many destinations they seriously considered for the trip, the variety of information sources that they utilized to make their decision, the level of enjoyment that they experienced while planning, their level of confidence that they chose the best destination for the trip, as well as their satisfaction with the trip, and behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty towards the destination at the time of the survey. This study contributes to the tourism literature by considering whether mindfulness during the anticipation phase can have a significant impact on the behaviors and experience of the tourists. This study explored whether the relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction is significant within tourism as it has shown inconsistent results in other fields, and examined whether mindfulness is related to loyalty within tourism.

Conceptual Model

The following conceptual model shows the relationships that are being measured (Figure 1.1). First, the influence of mindfulness in the anticipation phase on search and choice behaviors (e.g. planning horizon, choice set, source variety) is considered. Second, the influence that mindfulness has on search and choice outcomes (e.g. 
enjoyment, confidence) is examined. Third, the influence of mindfulness in the anticipation phase on trip evaluations (e.g. satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, attitudinal loyalty) is explored. These relationships are also tested for a mediation effect based on how much of the trip was planned in advance and moderating effects based on whether the selected destination had been previously visited and whether the site area is their primary destination.

Figure 1.1. Conceptual Model
Research Objectives

The objective of this study is to understand the influence that mindfulness during the anticipation phase has on the travel experience. Tourists were asked to indicate their level of mindfulness during the anticipation phase as well as other search and choice behaviors that took place during the phase and the outcomes of that phase. In particular, tourists were asked to report their behavior for the following issues that have support in the literature as potential indicators as mindful behavior: how far in advance they began searching for information on the destination (Langer, 1994), the number of destinations they seriously considered for their trip (Carson & Langer, 2006), the variety of information sources they utilized while making their decision (Langer, 1989), how much enjoyment they experienced during the anticipation phase (Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000), and how confident they were in their final destination choice (Kahneman, 2011).

Analysis was also completed to understand the relationships between mindfulness in the anticipation phase and satisfaction with the trip and loyalty to the destination. Examining the influence of mindfulness during the anticipation phase on satisfaction illuminates whether satisfaction is determined by the tourists based only on their experience in situ or whether the evaluation of satisfaction could begin earlier in the anticipation phase. Also, calculating the influence of mindfulness on loyalty reveals whether the behavioral and attitudinal dimensions of loyalty are determined only by their experience in situ or if loyalty could begin earlier in the anticipation phase.

One mediating and two moderating variables were included in the analysis to consider whether the strength of the influence of mindfulness during the anticipation
phase is determined by how much of the trip was planned in advance, whether the
destination selected had been previously visited by the tourist, and whether the tourist
consider the area to be the primary destination for their trip. How much of the trip was
planned in advance was included as a mediator which governs the relationships between
variables and can determine how and why a relationship exists. Visiting a novel
destination and considering the area to be the primary destination for the trip were
included as moderators which determine the strength and direction of a relationship
between variables as well as when or under which conditions the relationship exists.
Perhaps the influence of mindfulness on search and choice behaviors and outcomes, as
well as on satisfaction and loyalty is greatly impacted by whether the trip components
were planned in advance or whether the tourists were still planning elements of their trip
once they had arrived in the destination, as well as if the destination was novel and
unfamiliar to the tourist compared to a place that they had visited in the past, and if the
tourist was visiting the area as their primary destination or one of several places that they
were visiting on their trip.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were developed to understand the influence of
mindfulness in the anticipation phase. The research questions were the drivers for the
statistical analysis.

1. Does mindfulness influence search and choice behaviors during the anticipation
phase: the length of the planning horizon, the number of destinations considered,
and the variety of sources utilized for decision making?
1a. Are the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors during the anticipation phase mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance?

1b. Are the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors during the anticipation phase moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination?

1c. Are the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors during the anticipation phase moderated by whether the area was considered to be the primary destination for their trip?

2. Does mindfulness influence search and choice outcomes during the anticipation phase: the level of enjoyment in planning, and the confidence in the final destination choice?

2a. Are the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes during the anticipation phase mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance?

2b. Are the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes during the anticipation phase moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination?

2c. Are the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes during the anticipation phase moderated by whether the area was considered to be the primary destination for their trip?
3. Does mindfulness during the anticipation phase influence trip evaluations: satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty?

3a. Are the relationships between mindfulness during the anticipation phase and trip evaluations mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance?

3b. Are the relationships between mindfulness during the anticipation phase and trip evaluations moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination?

3c. Are the relationships between mindfulness during the anticipation phase and trip evaluations moderated by whether the area was considered to be the primary destination for their trip?

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were generated to drive the statistical analysis for the relationships in each research question addressing the relationships in the model between mindfulness, search and choice behaviors and outcomes, and trip evaluations.

**Research Question 1**

H1: There is no significant influence of mindfulness on the length of the planning horizon

H2: There is no significant influence of mindfulness on the number of destinations considered

H3: There is no significant influence of mindfulness on the variety of information sources utilized
Research Question 1a

H4: The relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance

H5: The relationship between mindfulness and the number of destinations considered is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance

H6: The relationship between mindfulness and the variety of information sources utilized is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance

Research Question 1b

H7: The relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination

H8: The relationship between mindfulness and the number of destinations considered is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination

H9: The relationship between mindfulness and the variety of information sources utilized is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination

Research Question 1c

H10: The relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination
H11: The relationship between mindfulness and the number of destinations considered is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination

H12: The relationship between mindfulness and the variety of information sources utilized is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination

**Research Question 2**

H13: There is no significant influence of mindfulness on the level of enjoyment in planning

H14: There is no significant influence of mindfulness on the confidence in the final choice

**Research Question 2a**

H15: The relationship between mindfulness and the level of enjoyment in planning is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance

H16: The relationship between mindfulness and the confidence in the final choice is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance

**Research Question 2b**

H17: The relationship between mindfulness and the level of enjoyment in planning is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination

H18: The relationship between mindfulness and the confidence in the final choice is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination
Research Question 2c

H19: The relationship between mindfulness and the level of enjoyment in planning is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination

H20: The relationship between mindfulness and the confidence in the final choice is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination

Research Question 3

H21: There is no significant influence of mindfulness during the anticipation phase on satisfaction

H22: There is no significant influence of mindfulness during the anticipation phase on behavioral loyalty

H23: There is no significant influence of mindfulness during the anticipation phase on attitudinal loyalty

Research Question 3a

H24: The relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance

H25: The relationship between mindfulness and behavioral loyalty is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance

H26: The relationship between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty is not mediated by how much of the trip planning took place in advance
**Research Question 3b**

H27: The relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination.

H28: The relationship between mindfulness and behavioral loyalty is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination.

H29: The relationship between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty is not moderated by whether the participant has previously visited the destination.

**Research Question 3c**

H30: The relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination.

H31: The relationship between mindfulness and behavioral loyalty is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination.

H32: The relationship between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty is not moderated by whether the participant considers the site area to be their primary destination.

**Definition of Terms**

Dual-processing theory: Information is processed through one of two systems: fast thinking which is automatic and instinctual, or slow thinking which is analytical and methodical (Evans & Curtis-Holmes, 2005; Kahneman, 2011)
Mindfulness (a construct): “Mindfulness” as used throughout the document will refer to the mindfulness-mindlessness construct that is anchored by mindfulness and mindlessness as part of the application of dual-processing theory (Langer, 1989)

Mindfulness: Actively processing available information through a heightened sensitivity to one’s environment and openness to new information (Frauman & Norman, 2004; Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000)

Mindlessness: Information processing that is associated with being trapped by categories, automatic behavior, and acting from a single perspective (Langer, 1989)

Search and choice behaviors: Behaviors associated with the information search and destination selection phase of the travel anticipation phase: planning horizon, choice set, and source variety

Planning horizon: The length of the planning period during which the information search stage takes place (Gitelson & Crompton, 1983)

Choice set: The top three to five choices in the destination selection process that have been chosen based on awareness, affection, preference, and intention to visit (Woodside & Lyonski, 1989)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source variety:</th>
<th>The variety of information sources to which travelers are exposed (Baloglu, 2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search and choice outcomes:</td>
<td>Outcomes associated with the experience during the travel anticipation phase: enjoyment and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment:</td>
<td>Mindful attention results in greater liking for a task (Langer &amp; Moldoveanu, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence:</td>
<td>Level of certainty in choice or attitude (Smith, Dijksterhuis, &amp; Wigboldus, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trip evaluations:</td>
<td>Evaluations of the overall travel experience: satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction:</td>
<td>The consumer’s cognitive comparison of whether their experience exceeded their expectations (Oliver, 1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral loyalty:</td>
<td>A deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future (Oliver, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal loyalty:</td>
<td>The psychological commitment or statement of preference for a product or service (Yoon &amp; Uysal, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced planning:</td>
<td>How much of the trip components were planned before arriving in the destination compared to planning that takes place after the trip has begun (Kemperman, Borgers, &amp; Timmerman, 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Novel destination: A location that is visited for the first time by a destination-naïve traveler compared to a destination that has been previously visited (Snepenger et al., 1990)

Primary destination: A destination that is central to the purpose of the trip and not categorized as a side trip, a stop along the way, one of multiple destinations visited in the region, or one of multiple destinations visited in multiple regions (Chancellor & Cole, 2008)

**Limitations of the Study**

Despite the potential for this study to add to the body of knowledge on mindfulness, there are limitations to the results. One such limitation is that two sites were selected for this study so that the data would not be taken from a single source. However, differences existed between the two site locations on key variables showing that there were inconsistencies between the travel experience for the two sample populations. For that reason, a dichotomous variable for the two sites where the data was collected was included in the analysis as a control variable to account for these differences between sites. Another potential limitation is that the tourists were surveyed once they had selected a destination and were in situ, and many questions asked the tourists to reflect upon their anticipation phase and the accuracy of their memories will greatly influence the accuracy of the data. Jacobson and Munar (2012) utilized a similar method of relying on self-reporting of the destination choice that took place well ahead of the time the data was collected. The authors explain that there is a potential for recall
bias but that the underreporting and overreporting is likely to be evenly distributed (Jacobson & Munar, 2012). Snepenger (1987) also addressed the issue of recall bias that occurs when asking tourists to report on behavior or attitudes that occurred in the past. In that study, the potential for recall bias was minimized by gathering information on recent or current information (Snepenger, 1987). This study asks tourists to recall information about the planning of the trip they were currently on, rather than past trips, in an effort to minimize recall bias.

Another limitation is that tourists were asked to evaluate their satisfaction and loyalty for their trip though some tourists had recently arrived in the destination, therefore making it more challenging to evaluate their satisfaction and loyalty when they had not experienced as much of the destination as tourists who happened to take the survey at the end of their trip and were able to better evaluate their overall experience. In order to control for the percentage of the trip that had been completed, the survey included two questions that followed the procedure of Nawijn (2010) and asked the tourists how long their trip would last in days and which day of the trip it was at that moment. From the answers to these questions, the percentage of their trip that had been completed was calculated and included as a control variable when analyzing the model relationships for mindfulness and trip evaluations (e.g. satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, attitudinal loyalty). These statistical measures were implemented to account for the percentage of their trip that they had completed at the time of the survey, however, the study is still limited in that not all of the tourists were at the end of their trip, and the accuracy of their estimates will vary.
Implications

This study has the potential to contribute to the literature on mindfulness within tourism and specifically contribute to the understanding of mindfulness during the anticipation phase that takes place before the tourist has arrived in the destination. A gap exists in the literature for studies that apply mindfulness to the early phases in the travel experience. Ndubisi (2014) studied mindfulness in consumers who were making decisions about healthcare providers. The study found that mindful consumers were more satisfied with their choice and reported higher levels of behavioral and attitudinal loyalty to their healthcare provider. The current study will make a similar contribution to the understanding of the influence that mindfulness during the anticipation phase has on the travel experience. Ndubisi (2014) calls for future research that provides empirical evidence for the marketplace behaviors of high and low mindful consumers and this study has the ability to answer that call in the context of tourism.

An implication for marketers is that the decisions made by tourists may be highly influenced by whether they are actively or passively processing information. It has even been suggested that segmenting markets based on information search behavior may aid marketers in developing effective media to reach their intended target market (Luo, Feng, & Cai, 2004). Understanding the role that mindfulness plays in the anticipation phase may suggest that varying levels of mindfulness can be used as a segmentation strategy for marketers.

Another implication is related to satisfaction as it has been suggested that post-purchase satisfaction levels may differ based on the depth of analysis that occurs in
during the information search and selection phases of consumption (Dijksterhuis & van Olden, 2006). Moscardo (1996) found that mindfulness while on site in the tourism destination led to increased satisfaction, but mindfulness in the tourism anticipation phase has not yet been tested as to whether it influences (increases or decreases) satisfaction. Dijksterhuis and van Olden (2006) found that for consumer products such as cars and sofas, a relationship exists between increased conscious thought about a consumption decision and a decrease in post-purchase satisfaction. While marketers may benefit if mindful tourists are open to many alternatives while searching for destinations, the positive results may be negated if those tourists who are mindful during the selection process are less likely to be satisfied with their trip. The potential for a decrease in post-trip satisfaction informs future research to examine whether the results for conscious thought about decisions to purchase consumer goods (Dijksterhuis & van Olden, 2006) hold true in tourism.

**Outline of Dissertation**

This dissertation will be organized into five chapters. Chapter two reviews the literature to provide a background on the research that has been previously documented on dual-processing theory, mindfulness, the anticipation phase, search and choice behaviors, search and choice outcomes, satisfaction, and loyalty. Chapter three outlines the research methods that were utilized in this study including: the survey instrument, description of the research sites, results from the pre-test, survey administration, data collection, and data preparation. The fourth chapter details the results from the statistical procedures that were used to address the research questions including: exploratory factor
analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and structural equation modeling for hypothesis testing. The final chapter discusses the theoretical and practical meaning of the results and the contribution that this study makes to the understanding of mindfulness as well as recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will explore the theory and the key constructs and that are the foundation of the research objectives of the study. First, mindfulness as an application of dual-processing theory will be reviewed to understand its application to tourism and other fields. Next the literature will be reviewed for the five travel phases, with special attention given to the anticipation phase. The information search and destination selection stages will elaborate on the concept of destination image and different models of destination selection will be reviewed as they relate to the research objectives of the study. Then, satisfaction will be outlined with a focus on its application in the tourism literature. The same will be done in the final section for the behavioral and attitudinal dimensions of loyalty.

Mindfulness

It is suggested that individuals have different strategies through which they process information and make consumption decisions. The type of information sought by travelers may be related to the level of cognitive effort that they put towards their decisions and may be similar to the concept of mindfulness. Mindfulness proposes that the activity or passivity of one in their environment can influence how they process the information within it. Mindfulness is characterized by actively processing available information (Frauman & Norman, 2004) or the process of drawing novel distinctions (Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000). This heightened sensitivity to one’s environment and openness to new information would be associated with analytic processing, whereas
mindlessness would be associated with the heuristics used in automatic processing. Much of the academic work on mindfulness was published by Ellen Langer of Harvard University and stems from the theory of dual-processing in psychology (Moscardo, 2009).

The basic principle of dual-processing explains that humans process information through one of two systems: analytic or automatic (Evans & Curtis-Holmes, 2005). Analytic processing is slow and methodical but likely to result in correct or logical decisions while automatic processing can result in bias because it uses fast short-cuts, or heuristics (Evans & Curtis-Holmes, 2005). The concepts of fast and slow processing have some consistencies with mindlessness and mindfulness respectively. However, there is some debate about mindfulness as an independent theory in the literature. It has been argued that mindfulness itself is a construct and that mindfulness is simply an applied variation of dual-processing theory (Moscardo, 2009). There are many different models and theories found in psychology to describe essentially the same cognitive process, that decisions are made through one of two routes (Pearce & Packer, 2013). One is high-effort processing that is rational and extensive while the other involves low-effort processing that is rapid and shallow (Pearce & Packer, 2013; Smith & DeCoster, 2000). Table 2.1 describes the many different models that apply the principles of dual-processing.

The similarities to other models and theories based on dual-processing may weaken the argument that mindfulness is a legitimate theory. Another area of criticism of mindfulness as a theory is that there is a lack of consensus on how mindfulness should be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Name</th>
<th>Key Author(s)</th>
<th>Term for High-Effort Processing</th>
<th>Term for Low-Effort Processing</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heuristic-systematic Model</td>
<td>Chaiken, Lieberman &amp; Eagly, 1986</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Heuristic</td>
<td>Systematic processing involves the active and effortful scrutiny of all relevant information using considerable cognitive capacity. Heuristic processing involves the use of simple, well-learned, and readily accessible decision rules. This is the default processing mode and people will process heuristically unless special circumstances intervene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration-likelihood Model</td>
<td>Petty &amp; Cacioppo, 1983</td>
<td>Central route</td>
<td>Peripheral route</td>
<td>Attitude change through the central route results from a person’s diligent consideration of information. The peripheral route is associated with simple inferences based on positive or negative cues in the persuasion context. People are more likely use the central route if the issue or product is personally relevant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive-Experiential Self-theory</td>
<td>Epstein, 1991</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>The rational system is conscious thought to make judgments and functions using prescribed rules of inference. Most thought takes place below the threshold of awareness in the experiential system which is preconscious, automatic, intuitive, and operates heuristically. The modes operate simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two systems approach</td>
<td>Kahneman, 2011</td>
<td>System 2: Slow thinking</td>
<td>System 1: Fast thinking</td>
<td>Slow thinking allocates attention to the effortful mental activities that demand it, constructing thoughts through an orderly series of steps. Fast thinking operates automatically and quickly and relies on effortless heuristics, impulses, and associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual-processing</td>
<td>Smith &amp; DeCoster, 2000</td>
<td>Associative processing</td>
<td>Rule based processing</td>
<td>Associative processing records information slowly and incrementally to reflect a large sample of experiences. The rule-based processing mode is known as the “quick and dirty” approach arriving at usually reasonable answers efficiently and effortlessly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness-Mindlessness</td>
<td>Langer, 1989</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Mindlessness</td>
<td>Mindfulness is associated with the creation of new categories, openness to new information, and the awareness of more than one perspective. Mindlessness is associated with being trapped by categories, automatic behavior, and acting from a single perspective.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
measured (Brown et al., 2007; Ndubisi, 2014). Bodner and Langer (2001) developed the Mindfulness/Mindlessness Scale (MMS) to measure one’s cognitive process of cues from the external environment (Haigh, Moore, Kashdan, & Fresco, 2011). Specifically, the MMS is a useful tool to evaluate the level of attention that people use to process external stimuli and information in a given environment (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Another scale was developed to measure mindfulness as an internal process. Brown and Ryan (2003) developed the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS) to assess individual states of mindfulness over time. The MAAS has roots in the Buddhist tradition that supposes that conscious attention and awareness are actively cultivated (Brown & Ryan, 2003).

Another instrument called the Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) scale is also founded in Buddhist traditions of inner calm, well-being, self-awareness, and self-respect (Kabat-Zinn, 2003). The MBSR is particularly useful in the health related fields by measuring mindfulness as a coping mechanism for stress (Kabat-Zinn, 2003). The Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory (FMI) is yet another instrument that measures mindfulness but is most relevant to studies in the therapeutic properties of meditation (Walach, Buchheld, Buttenmüller, Kleinknecht, & Schmidt, 2006).

In tourism, Frauman and Norman (2004) applied a seven-item scale from Moscardo (1992) called the Mindfulness Measure (MM) and modified it to evaluate the natural propensity that tourists have for processing information mindfully when they are on site in a tourist destination. They found through factor analysis that the seventh item was unreliable and it was removed from the scale (Frauman & Norman, 2004). A later study by Van Winkle and Backman (2009) also used the MM and found through factor
analysis that the fifth item was unreliable and it was removed from the scale. The authors suggest that additional research is needed to understand and confirm the dimensions of mindfulness (Van Winkle & Backman, 2009). The many scales associated with mindfulness principles have shown to be useful in various fields of research. However, future research is needed to evaluate the parsimony, validity, reliability, and explanatory power of these instruments (Ndubisi, 2014). Brown et al. (2007) agree that the meaning of mindfulness can be nuanced and scales show considerable variation in their content and structure. The greatest challenge for mindfulness researchers in the future will be to develop empirically grounded and theoretical models (Brown et al., 2007). The current breadth of academic knowledge of mindfulness is sparse in terms of practical application and theory development and mindfulness scholars need to address the shortage of empirical research (Ndubisi, 2014).

Despite the criticisms found in the literature, other authors have defended mindfulness as a theory and justified their defense by arguing that mindfulness is still relatively new as a theory with only a 30 year history (Dutt, 2011). Brown et al. (2007) explain that the field of mindfulness studies is still in its early stages and methodological rigor will be necessary in future research to overcome its current limitations. Weaknesses such as the lack of agreement on how it should be measured will be resolved with the additional research that is required and deserved by this theory that has the potential to be very useful in psychology research as well as in other fields (Brown et al., 2007). Demick (2000) argues that mindfulness theory may become one of the most important theories in psychology with the potential to be a grand theory in the field of human
development. Brown et al. (2007) agree that “developing a sophisticated understanding of mindfulness is a worthy endeavor” (p. 231). Within the tourism literature, Pearce and Packer (2013) have identified dual-processing as compelling link between psychology and tourism with potential for future impacts on destination choice and attitude research.

It has been suggested that people in a state of mindfulness have a heightened awareness of multiple perspectives (Carson & Langer, 2006) and focus on the present context as opposed to relying on past experiences (Djikic & Langer, 2007). For this reason, a moderating variable is included in the current study to measure whether the influence of mindfulness depends on whether the tourist selected a destination where they had previously visited or a novel destination. Understanding past experience as a moderator will add depth to the empirical evidence of the application of mindfulness as the literature has not addressed this and other variables that could potentially moderate the influence of mindfulness (Ndubisi, 2014). The principles of increased attention and awareness have also allowed mindfulness to be applied to research in the tourism field.

Previous studies of mindfulness in tourism have been related to satisfaction and learning at tourist sites. Moscardo (1996) developed a model of visitor behavior based on mindfulness and the influence of interpretation at heritage sites on the tourists’ appreciation and understanding of the site. Since the initial conception, the model has been applied in research of heritage sites, interpreters, and attractions (Moscardo, 2009). McIntosh (1999) coined the term “insightful” tourism based on a mindful evaluation of a tourist experience that leads to personal appreciation and meaning. The study surveyed tourists at three British cultural heritage attractions and found that this active processing
of information can result in an increased level of support for the preservation of the site (McIntosh, 1999). Kang and Gretzel (2012) used experimental design to administer four different conditions within a podcast that was distributed to tourists at a national seashore in Texas. The results indicate that tourists assigned to the conditions associated with high mindfulness experienced greater social presence, learning, enjoyment, and escape (Kang & Gretzel, 2012). Another study surveyed visitors to the Melaka World Heritage Site and found that communication factors influence visitor mindfulness (Ganesan et al., 2014). Exhibits and displays that were associated with variety and interactivity increased visitor mindfulness and were likely to result in enhanced learning and responsible tourism behaviors (Ganesan et al, 2014).

The idea of mindfulness influencing responsible tourism has also been applied in the lodging sector. A survey of hotel guests found that those who are highly mindful are also open to information sources that provide message or cues about sustainability practices (Barber & Deale, 2013). There are practical implications for hoteliers to provide guests with information that can educate and promote their sustainable initiatives (Barber & Deale, 2013). The study concludes that mindfulness may help people overcome their habitual thinking and pay more attention to sustainable choices (Barber & Deale, 2013).

Mindfulness has also been applied to event research to understand whether the influence of mindfulness on the tourism experience was still consistent within a context that does not provide formal interpretation programs (Van Winkle & Backman, 2009). The study surveyed attendees at a festival in Canada using Moscardo’s (1992) MM and
found that there was a significant relationship between mindfulness and learning, interest, and satisfaction. Another study used the MM within tourism and looked at mindfulness as a predisposed cognitive style for visitors to four southeastern coastal state parks (Frauman & Norman, 2004). The results indicate that very mindful tourists had a preference for information sources during their visit that were involving, unique, and interactive (Frauman & Norman, 2004). Despite the relationship between mindfulness and information sources, previous studies focused on mindfulness at tourism sites and not during the anticipation phase when tourists are seeking and evaluating information sources.

Despite the wide variety of applications of mindfulness to the processing of external stimuli and information, mindfulness has only been applied to decision making in a limited capacity in the literature. Langer (1994) argues that decisions are most commonly made in a mindless state. Essentially, people are less likely to follow the route of active deciding where they create and modify options and are more likely to follow the route of passive deciding where they choose from previously determined options (Langer, 1994). Information gathering has no natural end point so it makes sense that people have to place boundaries on how much effort they are willing to put forth based on how important the decision is to them (Langer, 1994). Tversky and Kahneman and (1973) argue that heuristics, or cognitive shortcuts, are often utilized in decision making but may result in systematic bias. For example, the availability heuristic is often relied upon when a decision maker only considers options that easily come to mind based on past experience (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). Another example of bias is the affect
heuristic that occurs when a decision maker only considers options that are already associated with an emotional judgment (Slovic, Finucane, Peters, & MacGregor, 2007). Heuristics often play a key role in passive deciding when the decision maker does not consider or create new alternatives.

Another issue that supports the notion that most decisions are made passively is the argument that decision makers have a tendency to adopt the philosophy of satisficing where they reduce the cognitive cost of evaluating alternatives by selecting the first option that achieves a minimum standard rather than continuing the resource intensive evaluation process to find the optimal choice (Simon, 1978). Decrop (2006) explains that individuals are intrinsically rational but they are constrained by limited time and cognitive capabilities so they often make decisions with incomplete information. In satisficing, the decision maker accepts the risk that they may not be making the best choice because there is never a guarantee that additional information would result in a better decision (Langer, 1994). Essentially, decision makers seek to minimize the effort it takes to make a decision and choose the first option that meets the standard that they have established as acceptable (Decrop, 2006). Even in cases when information gathering is pursued after a decision is made, the purpose of the information search is typically to justify the original choice rather than to actively seek alternatives (Langer, 1994). Langer (1994) admits that is impossible to define what constitutes a good decision, however, the best chance of achieving a good decision occurs through active deciding by considering multiple perspectives as opposed to passive deciding that is mechanical and only has the potential to reach a minimum standard.
The Anticipation Phase

A commonly used categorization of travel phases began in the recreation literature. Clawson and Knetsch (1966) defined five major phases of the outdoor recreation experience that have since been applied to the travel experience. The first phase consists of anticipation and the decisions associated with the planning process. The second phase involves traveling to the actual site. The third phase includes the on-site experience. The fourth phase involves traveling back home from the site. The fifth and final phase is a period of recollection that takes place once the previous four phases are completed. The whole recreation experience is dependent upon satisfaction and dissatisfaction in all five phases (Clawson & Knetsch, 1966). The on-site phase is not the only contributor to the enjoyment of the experience and each phase deserves attention in research (Clawson & Knetsch, 1966).

The five phases by Clawson and Knetsch (1966) have been applied and modified in the leisure and recreation literature to better understand multi-phasic experiences. Typically, the phases exist on a continuum and the experience evolves and matures across the five phases (Huberty & Ross, 2012). Hammitt (1980) surveyed the mood of visitors to a bog environment during all five phases. The results show that the experience was multi-phasic and that each phase can have its own level of enjoyment. Hultsman (1998) collected satisfaction data during all five phases of a competitive bike race. The results indicated that satisfaction levels were influenced in each of the phases and that phases may overlap (Hultsman, 1998).
Ideally, research should be conducted during all five phases as exemplified in the studies above (Huberty & Ross, 2012). However, logistical limitations and procedural problems have led to research about the five phases where data is only collected during some and not all of the phases (Hammitt, 1980). For example, Hull, Roggenbuck, and Walker (1998) collected data about the moods of hikers in an Appalachian recreation area during two phases: a questionnaire distributed during the on-site phase and a mailed questionnaire during the recollection phase. The results indicated that on-site evaluations of quality predicted the benefits that were reported during the recollection phase. Borrie & Roggenbuck (2001) modified the five phases by expanding the on-site phase into three sub-phases: entry, immersion, and exit. Data was collected using the Experience Sampling Method (Csikszentmihalyi, Larson, & Prescott, 1977) that randomly beeped visitors and prompted them to complete a survey packet throughout their visit to a wilderness area in Georgia (Borrie & Roggenbuck, 2001). The results of the study indicate that leisure is not simply a state of mind, but rather varying states of mind that are experienced throughout the phases (Borrie & Roggenbuck, 2001). Stewart and Hull (1992) expanded the phases by collecting data about visitor satisfaction within the on-site phase at 12 different points along a hiking trail and then twice during the recollection phase at three and nine months after the hike had been completed. The study concluded that the experiences exist within a continuum and one phase does not come without the other four (Stewart & Hull, 1992).

The original phases representing the outdoor recreation experience were adopted in the tourism literature, and seemed a natural fit for use in tourism, especially because
two of the recreation phases were directly related to travel. Fridgen (1984) considered the relationship between the environment and the five phases of travel. The results indicate that the tourism experience is inseparable from the range of environments in which it occurs (Fridgen, 1984). A recommendation was made that research should focus on the analysis of decisions and behaviors of actual tourists while they are experiencing tourism rather than laboratory subjects in hypothetical scenarios (Fridgen, 1984). Fennel (1998) borrowed a system of time allocation from Bull (1991), and linked the five phases to the three categories of tourists’ time allocation. Pure tourism activities were associated with the third phase of the on-site experience; travel to and from destinations were associated with the second and fourth travel phases, and unallocated time was associated with the first phase of anticipation and the fifth phase of recollection (Fennell, 1998). The results of the study helped build a space-time budget for tourists in the on-site phase in the Shetland Islands based on their travel patterns (Fennell, 1998). Another study by Daniels, Loda, and Norman (2005) found through investigation that the anticipation phase is not necessarily time bound. While travelers who were taking trips in the near future were more likely to recall daily travel occurrences than travelers taking trips in the distant future, travelers in the anticipation stage were able to recall exposure to messages about travel in their daily lives even when their next trip was more than a year away (Daniels et al., 2005). Another application of the five phases of travel was the investigation of the holiday happiness curve (Nawijn, 2010). The study limited the number of phases to three and defined them as the travel phase, the core phase, and the decline phase (Nawijn, 2010). The results of the study confirmed what had previously
been found in the recreation literature (Hammitt, 1980), that mood changes throughout the travel experience and that several phases may even blend together.

In addition to the application in tourism of Clawson and Knetsch’s (1966) model on outdoor recreation, the tourism literature also supports a model of tourism phases proposed by Van Raaij and Francken (1984). This model expanded upon the anticipation phase and divided it into multiple segments. Also using five phases, the first was defined as the need recognition phase when the tourist is deciding whether to travel at all. The second stage involves the information search using internal and external sources. Following the search, the tourist enters phase three which involves destination selection and the choosing of the actual location to visit. The fourth phase is their on-site experience and this is followed by the fifth phase which consists of the post-trip evaluation.

Another interpretation of the multi-phasic experience was proposed by Prat and de la Rica Aspiunza (2014). In an effort to accommodate the shift towards the experience economy in which the tourist is playing a more active role in the creation of their experience, the authors suggest a model that is no longer linear but rather what they describe as a dolphin model that is more cyclical with four stages: launch, immersion, reinterpretation, and evaluation (Prat & de la Rica Aspiunza, 2014). Despite the discrepancies between the models and the names and numbers of phases, there is general consensus that the tourism experience is multi-phasic and that there is value in understanding each phase for the contribution that it makes to the overall experience.
The anticipation phase as it will be discussed in this paper is based on the first phase from the model by Clawson and Knetsch (1966) and consists of the information search stage and the destination selection stage. It should be assumed that the tourist has already made the decision to travel, known as the generic travel decision (Norman, 1995).

Mindfulness within the anticipation phase is of interest because many decisions about the forthcoming trip are made in the context of the home. This “left behind” environment can be an important contributor to the decision making process (Crompton, 1979; Fridgen, 1984). Within the anticipation phase, all variables related to the information search stage will be called “search behaviors” and all variables related to the destination selection stage will be called “choice behaviors.” This section will outline the literature that exists for the dependent and moderating variables related to search behavior (planning horizon, information sources) and choice behavior (choice set, repeat visitation).

**Search and Choice Behaviors**

Search and choice behaviors may be influenced by the reputation of a destination and the impression a tourist has or acquires about a location during the anticipation phase. Destination managers work to build the reputation and develop a strong brand that is based on the idea of place image. Hunt (1971) defines place image as the total set of impressions or overall perception of a place that differs based on the personal factors of individuals so a singular idea of “the place image” does not exist. It may be more appropriate to refer to the common or dominant place image instead of assuming there is one true image (Govers & Go, 2009). The perception of a brand image depends on
holistic principles (Govers & Go, 2009) and can often be subjective (Beerli & Martín, 2004). Place image plays an important role in the information search stage as the number of sources utilized fluctuates based on how much prior knowledge the tourist had of the destination.

In tourism, Gartner (1993) suggests that the process of image formation is fundamental to the destination selection process because tourists naturally seek branding information when looking to select a vacation destination amongst many choices. Tourist destinations ask the consumer to make a considerable financial investment without the ability to pretest the tourism product, and consequently touristic images are typically perceptions instead of reality (Gartner, 1993). Consequently, destinations spend considerable resources to create and enhance a favorable image (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999) in order to be selected with higher frequency than their competition. Iso-Ahola (1980) explains that tourist choice behavior is a frequently investigated scholarly topic because there are many factors influencing why destination images are imperfect predictors of brand success. One issue is that tourists have very limited mindspace available to store perceptions of distant places and they must use short-cuts to keep the information organized (Anholt, 2010). Dominant images of a destination can affect consumer attitudes towards the products and services offered there (Morgan, Pritchard, & Pride, 2010). The tourist will choose a destination from a set of places that they are familiar with so destination image is an important component early in the decision making process (Gartner, 1993). The high risk of a poor choice when selecting a destination requires tourists to carefully evaluate the brand images for all destinations that
are being considered.

When evaluating a potential travel destination, tourists consider internal information such as past experiences, personal motivation and characteristics, in addition to information they receive from external sources (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). Without an adequate base of internal information, consumers rely on external information such as word of mouth and marketing initiatives (Gursoy & McCleary, 2004). Branding is a tool used by destinations to differentiate themselves from their ubiquitous competitors because established brands enter the consumers’ conscious awareness and having this prior product knowledge assists consumers when they are making decisions (Brucks, 1985). The information search stage is different for each tourist based on how much knowledge they have of the destination when the anticipation phase begins. The variety of sources and the amount of time devoted to search activity are considered information search in terms of “degree” (Fodness & Murray, 1997) and both variables are included in this study to better understand search behavior.

For each traveler, the information search process varies in duration based on the extensiveness of the external information search. This length of time is called the planning horizon (Gitelson & Crompton, 1983). Typically, the planning horizon is longer when the tourist is traveling far from home and for a long duration (Gitelson & Crompton, 1983). Fodness and Murray (1997) added to the list of variables that influence the length of the planning horizon with: biological age, trip purpose, transportation mode, number of destinations visited, number of attractions visited, lodging type, and trip expenditures. Dellaert, Ettema, and Lindh (1998) estimated the
average trip planning horizon to be 5.5 months for overnight long-distance trip. However, a more recent study (Huh & Park, 2010) found that trip planning horizons are growing shorter. The causes for why travelers may plan their trip closer to their departure date may include issues such as fluctuations in gasoline prices, threat of terrorism, unstable economic conditions, as well as the rapid development of technology (Huh & Park, 2010). There is also a strong argument that using the internet to efficiently access information sources has led to shorter planning horizons (Pan & Fesenmaier, 2006). Marketers and destination managers should monitor the shifts in the planning horizon and adjust the timing of their promotions accordingly (Huh & Park, 2010). How far in advance the tourist began searching for information for their trip is included as a variable in this study and an additional mediating variable is included based on the amount of the planning that took place in advance compared to planning that took place after the trip had begun.

A positive image perception is an invaluable asset for a destination hoping to make the short list of potential choices for a decision maker. The literature implies that the goal of branding is for the destination to be on the short list of vacation choices. Purchasing tourism products and services is a process that includes many decisions and sub-decisions in different stages (Decrop, 2006). There is some debate in the literature about the specific number of sets and the name of the sets (Decrop, 2010), but essentially there is agreement that destination selection is a process where information is accumulated and analyzed to help the decision maker narrow down their options of potential destinations to the one they ultimately choose. For example, Goodall (1991)
presents a model of the destination selection process to explain how tourists choose where to travel. In Goodall’s (1991) model, an initial opportunity set is composed of the universe of possible destinations that could be selected. That set is narrowed down as the decision maker may not be aware of certain destinations, have other constraints which make some destinations unattainable, or simply prefer some destinations over others. These criteria help condense the list into the decision set of approximately three destination choices before the tourist makes their final selection based on those three choices (Goodall, 1991). Narrowing down the set of all potential destinations is a necessary process that allows tourists to be more efficient with their cognitive resources by evaluating alternatives in a much smaller and more manageable set of choices.

In addition to Goodall’s (1991) model, another commonly referenced model that is similar but simplified was proposed by Um and Crompton (1990). The model is based on Crompton’s (1977) two phases of destination choice where travelers first have to decide whether to travel at all, and only then do they decide where they should go. Once the tourist has chosen to travel, they select options from their awareness set to develop an evoked set of destinations that they are considering based on internal and external inputs of information about the destination (Um & Crompton, 1990). In another model, Woodside and Lyonski (1989) offered the term choice set as the equivalent to Goodall’s (1991) decision set and Um and Crompton’s (1990) evoked set. This choice set is made up of only three to five destinations that have been selected based on awareness, affection, preference, and intention to visit (Woodside & Lyonski, 1989). The number of destinations in the choice set of destinations that were seriously considered is included
as a variable in this study to understand the tourists’ choice behavior.

It is not always the case that the result of the anticipation phase will be a trip to a new or novel destination. While some tourists may follow a decision making process that is rational and logical, others may employ a range of biases and emotion-charged heuristics that rely on information they’ve acquired through past experiences (Pearce & Packer, 2013). In this case, it is likely that a tourist may choose a destination where they have previously visited as opposed to choosing a new destination. This likeliness to repeat past behavior is called cumulative inertia (McGinnis, 1968) which suggests that current visitors who are behaviorally loyal are more likely to revisit the destination in the future. Sönmez & Graefe (1998) explain that repeat customers are more likely to repurchase a product or service in the future because there is a lower level of perceived risk when there is an abundance of internal information from their past experience.

Loyalty to a destination has been studied and categorized in many ways and one way is through the understanding of a concept called place attachment. The emotional connection of place attachment has been defined as the person-place bond that evolves from specifiable conditions of a place (Shumaker & Taylor, 1983). Place attachment has also been defined as the extent to which a tourist values or identifies with the destination (Moore & Scott, 2003). Place attachment is the ultimate goal for destination brands as they are able to develop loyal customers by understanding their needs and wants (Chen & Gursoy, 2001). Whether the tourist selected a new destination or a place that they have previously visited is included as a moderating variable in this study.
Search and Choice Outcomes

The outcomes of the anticipation phase are related to the application of mindfulness in the fields of education and psychology. Within education, the role that the instructor plays in the establishment of a mindful learning environment has been studied (Houston & Turner, 2007; Ritchhart & Perkins, 2000). Mindfulness has also been manipulated in studies to research psychological concepts such as cultural intelligence, self-acceptance, and social comparison (Carson & Langer, 2006; Djikic & Langer, 2007; Thomas, 2006). Results from these studies consistently indicate that inducing mindfulness can improve attention, memory, and increase curiosity and liking of the task (Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000). For this reason, a variable is included in the current study to measure how much the tourist enjoyed the planning process for their trip to be able to determine if mindfulness is related to the level of enjoyment the tourist experiences in the anticipation phase.

While it has been argued that active deciding may result in better decisions (Langer, 2004), there is debate in the literature about the limits to cognitive processing. A mindful decision maker is open to multiple sources that may have conflicting information (Carson & Langer, 2006) but there is a natural limit to how much information can reasonably be processed. It may be unrealistic to assume that decision makers have the cognitive ability to evaluate and compare multiple attributes for multiple products or services (Park, 1978) and some researchers have even found that decision makers who evaluate only a single attribute for each alternative make better decisions than those who consider multiple attributes (Dijksterhuis & Nordgren, 2006). However,
limiting the amount of information that is processed when making a decision can result in overconfidence from the phenomenon called “what you see is all there is,” by too easily ignoring what one doesn’t know (Kahneman, 2011). The current study includes a variable that evaluates how confident the tourist was with their destination choice to understand if mindfulness and active deciding is related to higher or lower levels of confidence in their final choice.

Satisfaction

Satisfaction is defined as the consumer’s cognitive comparison of whether their experience exceeded their expectations (Oliver, 1980). This is related to disconfirmation theory explaining that if actual performance is better than their expectations, this leads to positive disconfirmation and the consumer is highly satisfied. A consumer who evaluates that the actual performance is less than their expectations, will experience negative disconfirmation and be dissatisfied (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Oliver (1997) explained that satisfaction can result in pleasurable fulfillment. Having satisfied customers is important because customer satisfaction results in business profitability (Kozak, 2003).

The measurement of satisfaction as a variable is highly debated in the tourism literature. In 2012, Prayag and Ryan posited that there is no standard for the measurement of satisfaction because there are arguments for measuring transaction specific satisfaction as well as overall satisfaction. While many studies measure overall satisfaction with one item (Bigné, Sánchez, & Sánchez, 2001; Chen & Tsai, 2007; Prayag, 2008; Prayag & Ryan, 2012), it has been argued that treating satisfaction as a single, fixed in time, and invariable construct is inadequate (Coghlan & Pearce, 2010).
Therefore studies that use a single item measurement of overall satisfaction are limited in that they may be missing variance caused by particular attributes or service transactions during the travel experience that influence the holistic evaluation of the destination (Chi & Qu, 2008; Kozak, 2003; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000). It is recommended to include items to measure the attributes of transactional satisfaction such as accommodations, dining, attractions, and activities as well as an overall evaluation of satisfaction (Chi & Qu, 2008). Understanding the influence of each attribute on the overall evaluation of satisfaction helps explain the variance and potential future behaviors based on a satisfied or dissatisfied evaluation of a destination.

Satisfaction has been studied along with loyalty which will be outlined in the following section. Several studies have established that satisfaction and destination loyalty are positively correlated in the long-term (Oliver, 1999; Sanchez-Garcia, Pieters, Zeelenberg, & Bigné, 2012; Yoon, & Uysal, 2003). Alexandris (2006) explains that loyalty is developed through satisfactory experiences that reinforce tourists’ positive feelings about a place. This is taken a step further by Oliver (1999) who argues that satisfaction is a necessary condition for loyalty but that perceived product superiority, personal fortitude, and social bonding also influence the potential for loyalty. Ultimately, satisfaction is a good predictor of repurchase behavior (Petrick, 2004). The more satisfied the customers are, the more likely they are to repurchase the product or service and to encourage others to become customers (Chi & Qu, 2008). Based on the tourists’ evaluation of whether they were satisfied with their experience in a destination during a
previous trip, there are implications for loyalty as repeat visitation to that destination may be considered when they are planning future travel.

**Loyalty**

Loyalty is defined as a deeply held commitment to re-buy or re-patronize a preferred product or service consistently in the future (Oliver, 1999). Other definitions categorize loyalty based on its multi-dimensionality as three types of loyalty: behavioral, attitudinal, and composite (Jacoby & Chestnut, 1978). In tourism, behavioral loyalty is often operationalized as repeat visitation or recommendation to others, while attitudinal loyalty is determined in a measurement of the strength of affection toward a destination and composite loyalty combines the two (Yoon & Uysal, 2003). The benefit of loyal visitors is that developing long-term relationships with tourists who make repeat visits may be more efficient than convincing new tourists to make their first visit (Oppermann, 2000).

In consumer research, behavioral loyalty has been measured consistently as the consumers’ intention to continue buying the same product and willingness to recommend that product to others (Hepworth & Mateus, 1994). The same measurements have been applied to behavioral loyalty within tourism (Bigné et al., 2001; Yoon & Uysal, 2003). In addition to the intention to revisit the destination, recommendations to others can provide direct financial benefits to the destination. Promoting the brand to others is also seen in the final stage of the tourism brand continuum which leads consumers through the process of being unaware, then aware, then interested, then convinced, to making a purchase, evaluating their satisfaction with the product, and finally becoming an advocate
of the brand to others (World Tourism Organisation and the European Travel Commission, 2009). The study of behavioral loyalty is common in research (Petrick, 2004), perhaps due to its observable impact on visitation to the destination.

Attitudinal loyalty has a much less direct route to the financial benefits of the destination because it is the psychological commitment or statement of preference for a place (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). There is less agreement on how attitudinal loyalty should be operationalized and it is therefore avoided in some studies about tourist loyalty (Petrick, 2004). Perhaps one reason that attitudinal loyalty is less represented in research is based on the supposition that the attitude should be measured at multiple points in time because a measurement of an attitude at one point in time is not reflective of the actual commitment that is required in loyalty (Oppermann, 1999; Prayag & Ryan, 2012). It has been argued that researchers should only measure behavioral loyalty because it is out of the scope of a typical study to measure attitudes over a long period of time (Prayag & Ryan, 2012). Despite the challenges with measurement, measuring attitudinal loyalty is still recommended because it can assess variance that behavioral loyalty does not explain (Backman & Crompton, 1991). It has been argued that loyalty research must consider more than one dimension of loyalty especially because loyalty and destination selection are both dynamic which can make their relationship difficult to quantify and Petrick (2004) explains that measuring both attitudinal loyalty and behavioral loyalty is an effective approach.

Researchers who only consider attitudinal loyalty neglect the importance of actual repeat purchase behavior (Oppermann, 2000). A tourist may have a strong positive
opinion of a destination but never financially contribute to it in the future. In contrast, researchers who only consider behavioral loyalty could be underestimating the level of commitment that a visitor has to a destination. Novelty may be a primary travel motivation and while a tourist may be emotionally attached to a previously visited destination, it is possible that they could be seeking new experiences when they are choosing a future travel destination (Sanchez-Garcia et al., 2012). This is an example of what Backman and Crompton (1991) categorize as latent loyalty, when a tourist may feel a sense of psychological loyalty to a destination without ever actually revisiting it. Another error could be the overestimation of loyalty when a person is to repeat the purchase of a brand for a reason other than having a positive opinion of the brand in their previous experience. This is an example of spurious loyalty (Backman & Crompton, 1991) where the tourist repeatedly visits a destination because of convenience or reward and not because of actual affection toward the destination (Oppermann, 2000). Repeated purchases may simply be motivated by the desire to exert minimum effort in the decision making process (Quester & Lim, 2003). Another issue that confuses the measurement of behavioral loyalty is that travel for pleasure is often combined with travel for business and the tourist may not have complete control over the destination selection (Oppermann, 1999; 2000). Consequently, repeat purchase behavior is not a true reflection of loyalty to a touristic product (Chen & Gursoy, 2001; Day, 1969).

McKercher and Guillet (2011) argue that previous studies on loyalty in the tourism context have had significant sampling, definitional, conceptualization and scale problems. Many of the studies did not survey on site and those that did survey in
destinations were limited to a single site and point in time (Armario & Ruiz, 2007; Chi & Qu, 2008; Yuksel, Yuksel, & Bilim, 2010). To avoid this limitation, the current study chose to survey on site in the destination and include multiple sites for the sake of comparison and to avoid the limitations of validity that have been reported in similar studies that only collected data from one site. McKercher and Guillet (2011) also recommend that a time dimension needs to be included when using repeat visitation as a proxy for loyalty as an open-ended time frame can produce misleading results for any previous visitors. For that reason, this study asked tourists about their intention to revisit in the general future as well as their intention to revisit in the next three years.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This study administered a survey at two distinct tourism destinations to measure the relationships in the research questions. The purpose of this study was to understand the influence that mindfulness during the anticipation phase may have on search and choice behaviors and outcomes as well as trip evaluations. The analysis is based on the relationship between mindfulness and search and choice behaviors (i.e., length of planning horizon, size of choice set, the variety of information sources), mindfulness and search and choice outcomes (i.e., level of enjoyment in anticipation phase, level of confidence in destination choice), and mindfulness and trip evaluations (i.e., satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty). One potential mediating variable (i.e., the amount of the trip that was planned in advance) and two moderating variables (i.e., choosing a repeated or novel destination, visiting a primary destination or non-primary destination) were included to better understand those relationships. This section will outline the survey instrument and the selection of the scales that were included, the two survey sites, the pre-testing of the instrument, and the sampling procedure associated with survey administration, data collection, and data preparation techniques.

Survey Instrument

Because of its application in previous tourism research, the Mindfulness Measure (MM) was used to measure the level of mindfulness that each study participant exhibited during the anticipation phase. The original MM was developed by Moscardo (1992) and was modified by Frauman and Norman (2004). The original scale was composed of
seven items asking the tourists how much they agree with statements when they are on site. Frauman and Norman (2004) found that the last item did not fit with the others when factor analyzed and removed “I like to feel in control of what is going on around me” from the scale. The modified MM is a one-factor model with a six-item scale and was established as reliable with a Cronbach’s alpha value of .91 (Frauman & Norman, 2004). The current study used the six item scale that was verified as unidimensional by Frauman and Norman (2004) and modified the MM for the anticipation phase. The question asks tourists about their mindfulness as they are “searching for information about a vacation destination” to understand whether the relationship between mindfulness and the information search and destination selection stages is significant and has potential to be useful to tourism marketers. Each item was asked using a seven point Likert scale response option ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

Specifically, when searching for information about a vacation destination I like to...

- Have my interest captured
- Search for answers to questions I may have
- Have my curiosity aroused
- Inquire further about things
- Explore and discover new things
- Feel involved in what is going on around me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The search behavior variables included in the survey were the length of the planning horizon and the source variety. Participants were asked to report the length of their planning horizon in days in order to accommodate the recent shift towards a shortening time period for the anticipation phase (Huh & Park, 2010).
Approximately how many days in advance did you begin searching for information about the Durango/Charleston area for this trip?

Two questions were asked about the information sources that were utilized during the anticipation phase. First, a general list (n=6) of information sources was provided and the participants were asked to indicate which of the sources they used. Second, a list of online information sources (n=6) was provided and the participants were asked to indicate which of the sources they used. In both cases, an “other” option was provided to capture any information source that wasn’t listed. The number of sources that were checked in both questions were added to calculate an overall score for source variety.

Which information sources did you access to gain information about the Charleston/Durango area for your current visit?
- Previous experience
- Word of mouth from friends and family
- Internet websites
- Print media (magazines, newspapers, guidebooks, etc.)
- Television or radio media (advertisements, travel shows, etc.)
- Mobile application (map, food finder, social media, etc.)
- Other _____

Which online information sources did you access to gain information about the Charleston/Durango area for your current visit?
- Social media (i.e. facebook.com)
- Websites about the general Charleston/ Durango area (i.e. discoversouthcarolina.com/durango.org)
- Websites with reviews from other travelers (i.e. tripadvisor.com)
- Websites for accommodations (i.e. marriott.com/strater.com)
- Websites for dining options (i.e. 82queen.com/kenandsues.com)
- Websites for specific area attractions (i.e. scaquarium.org/ durangotrain.com)
- Other _____

The choice behavior variable included in the survey instrument was the size of the choice set. The size of the choice set was determined by asking the participants to report the number of destinations they were seriously considering for their trip.
How many other destinations did you seriously consider for this trip?

0- The Charleston/Durango area was my only choice

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Other _____

The search outcome variable included in the study was the level of enjoyment.

The level of enjoyment in the anticipation phase was asked with a seven point semantic differential question where the participants chose where they fit best between “very little enjoyment” and “very much enjoyment.”

How much enjoyment did you have in the planning process for this trip to the Charleston/Durango area?

Very little enjoyment          Very much enjoyment

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

The choice outcome variable included in the study was the level of confidence in the final choice. The level of confidence with their destination choice was asked with a seven point semantic differential question where the participants chose where they fit best between “not at all confident” and “very confident” for how they felt about the destination that they selected being the best choice for the trip.

How confident are you that the Charleston/Durango area was the best choice for you for this trip?

Not at all confident          Very confident

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
In addition to mindfulness, several variables were considered latent factors because they were included in the questionnaire as multi-item scales. A latent factor is the underlying construct that is being measured by the observed items or questions in a scale (Byrne, 2008). The scales were borrowed from the literature that had been previously tested in the tourism context in the past. Satisfaction has been widely studied but many satisfaction scales only use one item to measure overall satisfaction. In addition to overall satisfaction, three items were included to measure transaction specific satisfaction (Chi & Qu, 2008) and participants were asked to evaluate their level of satisfaction so far on their trip with accommodations, dining, and activities/attractions. The goal with the measurement of satisfaction was to consider satisfaction holistically and avoid the limitation in many other studies from using only a single item to measure overall satisfaction (Prayag & Ryan, 2012). Each item was asked using a seven point semantic differential response option from “not at all satisfied” to “very satisfied.”

*Overall, how satisfied have you been with your trip to the Charleston/Durango area?*

*How satisfied have you been with your accommodations on this trip?*

*How satisfied have you been with your dining experiences on this trip?*

*How satisfied have you been with the attractions and/or activities you’ve experienced on this trip?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loyalty has been measured within tourism from a number of perspectives and disputes over whether loyalty was one dimensional or multidimensional have led to the development of many scales to measure loyalty. Petrick (2004) suggests that reliable composite measures have yet to be operationalized, and the current study adopted the
practice to recognize behavioral and attitudinal measures as distinct and separate factors. The scale selected for this study was borrowed from Yuksel et al. (2010) because it divided loyalty into behavioral and attitudinal loyalty and utilized three items from Back and Parks (2003) representing each dimension. For behavioral loyalty, participants were asked to indicate how much they agree with statements about their intention to revisit the destination in the future, revisit the destination in the next three years, and recommend the destination to others. Each item was asked using a seven point Likert scale response option ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statement?

- I intend to continue visiting the Charleston/Durango area in the future
- I intend to visit the Charleston/Durango area in the next 3 years
- I would recommend the Charleston/Durango area as a vacation destination to others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudinal loyalty was measured by asking participants to indicate how much they agree with statements about whether they love visiting the destination, how much they enjoy their time when they visit the destination, and how much they like the destination compared to other destinations. Each item was asked using a seven point Likert scale response option ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statement?

- I love visiting the Charleston/Durango area
- I enjoy my time when I visit the Charleston/Durango area
- I like the Charleston/Durango area more than other destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mediator for the amount of the trip that was planned in advance (before the trip began) was asked as a seven point semantic differential response where the participant chose where they fit best between “none of the planning” and “all of the planning” in reference to the amount of planning that took place in advance of the departure date as opposed to any planning that took place after the trip had begun.

Think about the planning stage for your current trip and whether you made plans in advance or were still making plans after the trip had begun. Please indicate how much of the planning took place in advance (before the trip began).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of the planning</th>
<th>All of the planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The moderator variable for whether the destination was novel or repeated was determined from a question that asked the participant how many times they had previously visited the area in their lifetime. The continuous data was then computed into a dichotomous variable to distinguish between people who had never visited the destination before and people who were repeat visitors and had previously been to the destination any number of times. Repeat visitors were coded as 0 while novel or first time visitors were coded as 1.

Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Charleston/ Durango area in your lifetime?

- 0 times- This was my first visit
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 times
- 4 times
- 5 times
- 6 times
- 7 times
- Other _____
The other dichotomous moderator was measured by asking the participants if they considered the area to be the primary destination for their trip with a “no” or “yes” response option. An additional question was included in the instrument for people who did not consider the area to be their primary destination but the different trip styles (Chancellor & Cole, 2008; Rozier, 2005) were not included in the model and therefore the responses were not used for analysis purposes.

Was the Charleston/Durango area your primary destination for this trip away from home?

No
Yes

A potential limitation of the survey instrument is that many of the variables were measured using a single item: planning horizon, choice set, enjoyment, confidence, advanced planning, novel destination, and primary destination. However, single item measures have been successfully used for the analysis of variables that are not multi-faceted and can even be a more appropriate measure than multi-item scales that may include too much noise (Psychlopedia, 2008). The single-item measures were intended to efficiently but effectively collect the data necessary for the analysis of the variables.

Survey Sites

The author felt it was important to include multiple sites in the data collection to better support the validity of the results and avoid the limitation of collecting data from a single site. Charleston and Durango were identified as popular tourist destinations and attractions within the areas accepted the invitation to participate in the study. The sites were considered comparable because even though they were geographically diverse
(Figure 3.1), they had similar features as tourism destinations such as offering a variety of natural, cultural, and heritage attractions within a region larger than a single city.

Figure 3.1. Map with Site Locations

Subsequently, the survey defines questions about the “Charleston area” and the “Durango area” based on the knowledge that each city is known for attractions and accommodations that may technically be outside of the city limits and the local tourism organizations are both named for each “area.” For example, statistics for three counties (e.g. Berkeley, Charleston, Dorchester) have been included in tourism research for the Charleston Area Convention & Visitors Bureau (Office of Tourism Analysis, 2013a). The Durango Area Tourism Office (2013) reports statistics for the five counties (e.g. Archuleta, Dolores, La Plata, Montezuma, San Juan) that make up Region 9 of Colorado’s Economic Development Districts.
Charleston, South Carolina

Charleston has been named “Top U.S. City” by Condé Nast Traveler magazine for four consecutive years and is known for its rich history, culture, and hospitality (Charleston Area Convention & Visitors Bureau, 2014). Popular attractions in Charleston include tours of Fort Sumter, tours of historic plantation homes, and the South Carolina Aquarium (Charleston Area Convention & Visitor’s Bureau, 2014). According to the Office of Tourism Analysis in the School of Business at the College of Charleston (2013a), the average visitor spent $205 per day, of which $29 is spent on attractions. Tours, historic sites and attractions are among the Charleston area’s greatest assets along with other elements such as restaurants, shopping, hospitality, and beaches. The most recent data available for the 2012 calendar year indicated the Charleston area experienced 4.83 million visitors who spent $3.58 billion. According to the Office of Tourism Analysis in the School of Business at the College of Charleston (2013b), only 7.3% of visitors come from within the state of South Carolina, 5.7% of visitors are international, and the remaining 87.0% visit from other states in the US. The average length of stay was 4.1 nights.

The specific survey locations within each site were selected based on the opportunity to intercept tourists while they were in a natural waiting period rather than interrupting their tourism experience when they were en route to an attraction. In Charleston, carriage rides are a popular attraction for tourists. Litvin (2007) found that 59% of first-time visitors and 44% of repeat visitors take a carriage tour while they are visiting Charleston. Litvin (2007) reported that carriage tours were the paid activity with
the highest participation percentage for all visitors (51%) compared to walking tours (28%) and boat tours (26%). Five carriage ride companies were identified and contacted to determine their interest in participating in the study. Two tour companies expressed interest and were offered a technical report of the results in return for approved access to survey their customers. Of the five permanent carriage tour companies, three load their carriages in a barn and two load their carriages on the street. Of the two carriage companies that agreed to participate, one loaded carriages in a barn and one loaded on the street. Due to regulations for the health of the horses and to limit traffic in the historic district, the carriage rides could last no longer than 60 minutes for any company.

Old South Carriage Company has been operating since 1983 and loads their carriages inside a barn. The price for an adult ticket was $22. Customers could purchase tickets in advance or at the check-in desk in the barn. Researchers were trained to wait until customers had checked-in at the desk before approaching them and inviting them to complete a self-administered survey that was loaded on iPads. Depending on the time of day and day of the week, the waiting time for the customers varied based on the business demand and the availability of horses. To protect the horses from adverse health effects in the hot weather, their break time between rides would extend if the outside temperature increased, so the exact wait time for each customer could not be precisely predicted upon check-in. Some participants were able to complete the questionnaire before they were loaded onto the carriage while others would take the iPad onto the carriage and continue answer questions while they waited to depart because often the horse was still on break while the passengers were sitting in the carriage. Based on a promise to the owners of
Old South Carriage Company to not interfere with their operation, researchers would terminate surveys if the participant was unable to complete the survey before the carriage was ready to depart.

Classic Carriage Works also agreed to participate in the study. They have been in operation since 2010 and the price for an adult ticket is $22. Classic Carriage Works loads their carriages on the street. Their customers are required to purchase their tickets in advance and are advised to wait along a wall near the corner where the carriages are loaded. Researchers were trained to ask customers whether they were waiting for Classic Carriage Works or another company to ensure that data collection complied with research approval guidelines. Carriage departure times were estimated but they varied based on the return time for the previous carriage and the break time required for the horses based on the temperature. The carriages did not arrive on the corner to load customers until they were ready to depart so the only surveys collected for Classic Carriage Works were those whose participants arrived early enough to be able to complete the survey before the carriage arrived. There was not enough waiting time once the carriage arrived on the corner to answer any additional questions so those surveys were terminated if the participants were not finished when the carriage arrived.

**Durango, Colorado**

Durango, Colorado is approximately 1,900 miles from Charleston, South Carolina. Despite the geographical difference, Durango is also known for its historic sites and heritage attractions, dining, culture, and outdoor activities (Durango Area Tourism Office, 2014). Popular attractions in the Durango area include: water sports on
the Animas River, skiing at Durango Mountain Resort, visiting Mesa Verde National Park, and riding the historic train with Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad (Durango Area Tourism Office, 2014). Durango also proudly boasts that the area has more restaurants per capita than the city of San Francisco (Durango Area Tourism Office, 2014). According to the Durango Area Tourism Office (2013), the annual economic impact of tourism in the area is $2.51 million and supports 2,900 jobs. The average length of stay for a leisure trip in the state of Colorado is 4.5 nights and the most common pursuits for tourists in Colorado include: shopping, visiting a national or state park, dining, hiking, and visiting a landmark or historic site (Durango Area Tourism Office, 2013). Of the domestic tourists, 38% came from within the state of Colorado (Durango Area Tourism Office, 2013).

In Durango, one of the most popular tourist attractions is the Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad. The Durango Area Tourism Office (2013) estimates that 130,000 visitors to the Durango Area rode the Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad in 2013. It was selected for being popular and for also being a heritage attraction similar to the carriage rides in Charleston and the company agreed to approve access to survey their customers in return for a technical report with the results. Despite the similarities between the attractions, the trip on the railroad required more time and was more expensive for tourists than the carriage rides. The customers had the choice of riding the train in both directions which would make the total tour time approximately nine hours, or take a bus one way and the train the other way which would make the total tour time approximately seven hours. Also, prices for adult tickets ranged from basic
cars with no refreshments or interpretation for $85 to luxury cars that included refreshments and interpretation for $189.

During the summer months, there are three train departures and three bus departures from the station in Durango. Customers were advised to arrive at least 30 minutes in advance for the train departures and at least 20 minutes in advance for the bus departures. This created a natural waiting period when the researcher could intercept the tourists and invite them to participate. For train departures, the researcher waited until customers found their assigned seats on the train before approaching them and inviting them to take the survey at their seat. The customers riding the bus would form a line at the corner where the bus loaded and once they had entered the line, they were invited to participate in the survey. Some participants were able to complete the questionnaire before they boarded the bus and others took the iPad to their seat on the bus to complete the questionnaire. The train and bus departure times were precise and the researcher would have to terminate any survey that wasn’t completed when the departure time arrived based on a promise to the organization that the surveys would not interfere with their operation.

Pre-Test

Three stages of pre-testing took place to determine the appropriate measures to use for the purpose of answering the research questions that guided the study. iPad technology was used to administer the surveys using a mobile application from iSurveysoft. The survey instrument was uploaded in advance and then the survey data were collected without needing a wireless internet connection which was unavailable at
the sites. The data was stored until a wireless internet connection was available when it was uploaded onto the iSurveysoft website to generate reports.

The first stage of pre-testing involved a survey of 61 tourists who were intercepted as they waited for their carriage tours in Charleston on June 8, 2013, two weeks prior to the start of data collection. The key constructs in the model were analyzed for reliability (Table 3.1) using Cronbach's alpha to establish the internal consistency or average correlation of items in the survey. It was established that the scales for all of the constructs exceeded the threshold of 0.70 which is considered acceptable as a good indication of reliability (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Table 3.1. Pre-Test Reliability of Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>α value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first pre-test, notes were taken to address and overcome logistical concerns with sampling and data collection and other observations were made that supported modifications to the instrument. One such observation was that the survey took approximately 5.5 minutes to complete and some customers were unable to complete the survey before their carriage departed. Based on this observation, any questions that were not directly related to the research questions were eliminated. Another observation was made from participants’ comments that the Charleston area was
not necessarily their primary destination. In order to capture variance in the planning process for tourists who were visiting the sites as their primary destination compared to a secondary or tertiary destinations, the question about travel patterns was added.

A second stage of pre-testing evaluated the travel patterns question. The two-part question was developed to establish whether the tourist identified Charleston or Durango as their primary destination and if not, how Charleston or Durango fit in to their overall trip. The response options were borrowed from Rozier (2005) and Chancellor and Cole (2008) and categorized whether the trip to Charleston was a side trip, a stop along the way, one of multiple destinations visited in the region, or one of multiple destinations visited in multiple regions. The survey question was pre-tested in Charleston over a two day period from on June 15-16, 2013, five days prior to the start of data collection. A total of 69 tourists were pre-tested during this stage. In addition to providing feedback about logistical issues for survey administration, it also established that tourists were able to understand the questions that had been added about travel patterns and they were included in the final survey instrument. The question about whether the area was their primary destination was later calculated as a dichotomous moderator for the relationships that mindfulness had with the dependent variables in the model.

After the survey data was collected in Charleston from June 22 to July 5, 2013, a third phase of pre-testing took place in Durango, Colorado. The items on the questionnaire only received minor alterations to reference the “Durango area.” Additional modifications were made to the examples listed in the question about information sources so that the survey included examples of information sources,
accommodations, restaurants, and attractions that were appropriate for the second site location. The third stage of pre-testing occurred in Durango on August 5, 2013, three days before the start of data collection to address and overcome logistical concerns. A total of 15 tourists were surveyed to define sampling and data collection procedures in the second site location, as well as ensure that the questions appropriately referenced the Durango area. The researcher’s notes from the pre-test revealed that the train and bus departures were prompt and that it would interfere with the operation of the business if the researcher were to ask participants to begin the survey too close to the designated departure time. Participants were only invited to participate if the time before the train or bus was to depart exceeded five minutes.

**Survey Administration**

Two sites were selected for data collection based on the limitation of studies that only surveyed at one site (McKercher & Guillet, 2011). A recruitment script (Appendix A), a survey instrument (Appendix B) and its format for iPad administration (Appendix C) were developed to be administered in Charleston, South Carolina over seven days in a two week period in June and July, 2013. Approval letters were received from the two businesses in Charleston that agreed to participate in the study and provide access to their customers in return for a technical report of the study results: Old South Carriage Company (Appendix D) and Classic Carriage Works (Appendix E). The required documents were submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Clemson University and the study was approved (Appendix F). Data collection began immediately after IRB approval and continued until the sample size had exceeded 200 to meet the
standard for analysis in structural equation modeling (Fan, Thompson, & Wang, 1999).

The second site was in Durango, Colorado where a modified survey instrument (Appendix G) and its format for iPad administration (Appendix H) was administered over ten days during a three week period in August, 2013. An approval letter (Appendix I) was received from the Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad, the business in Durango that agreed to participate in the study and provide access to their customers in return for a technical report of the study results. An amended application was submitted to the IRB and approval was received for the additional site (Appendix J). Data collection began immediately after IRB approval was received and continued until the sample size exceeded 200 which is the standard for analysis using structural equation modeling (Fan et al., 1999) and would allow for comparison between sites.

Data Collection

Charleston, South Carolina

Two researchers completed their human subjects research training and were scheduled to survey at the carriage ride companies in Charleston. Both carriage companies operated their daily schedule from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The last tour of the day left at or shortly before 5:00 p.m. One researcher was scheduled (Table 3.2) at each carriage company location from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. or until the last carriage departed to have the ability to intercept tourists during all hours of operation on all days of the week. Researchers were also advised to stagger their 30 minute lunch break each day so that no period of the day went uncovered throughout the study. The pre-test estimated that using four iPads, they could collect eight surveys per hour.
Table 3.2. Charleston Data Collection Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 22</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customers at Old South Carriage Company would check-in and load in the barn at 14 Anson Street. Per the site approval agreement, the researcher waited until after the customers had checked-in to approach one person from each group who was randomly selected to participate in the survey. If the carriage was not available to board immediately and the group was waiting in the lobby, the person standing closest to the loading ramp was identified and invited to participate. If that person declined, no one else in the group was invited to participate. If a carriage was available to board immediately, the first person in the group to walk up the loading ramp was identified and invited to participate. If that person declined, no one else in the group was invited. The sample recruiting area for Old South Carriage Company was located indoors and therefore the sampling procedure did not require modification in inclement weather.

Customers for Classic Carriage Works check-in off site at 10 Guignard Street and load on the sidewalk on the South corner of Guignard Street and Anson Street. One person from each group was randomly selected to participate in the survey as they waited to load the carriage. The person standing furthest West and closest to the corner was identified and invited to participate. If that person declined, no one else in the group was
invited. The sample recruiting area for Classic Carriage Works was located outdoors with no protection. In the case of inclement weather, the researchers continued to survey until the point that there was the potential for the iPads to become compromised. At that point the researcher would seek shelter in the barn for Old South Carriage Company until the weather has passed and surveying could resume.

**Durango, Colorado**

In Durango, one researcher was scheduled to survey at the train depot for Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad. The depot opened at 7:00 a.m. and the last departure left at 12:30 p.m. The researcher was scheduled (Table 3.3) from 7:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. to have the ability to intercept tourists during all hours of operation. The pre-test estimated that using four iPads, the researcher could collect nine surveys per hour.

**Table 3.3. Durango Data Collection Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 9</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>August 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10</td>
<td>August 11</td>
<td>August 12</td>
<td>August 13</td>
<td>August 14</td>
<td>August 15</td>
<td>August 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>August 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>August 20</td>
<td>August 21</td>
<td>August 19</td>
<td>August 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>7:00 a.m.-</td>
<td>August 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customers for the Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad have the option to ride the train both ways to and from Silverton or to ride the train one way and ride a bus the other way to or from Silverton. Customers who were riding the train both ways
would check-in and board the train at the station at 479 Main Avenue. Per the site approval agreement, the researcher waited until after the customers had checked-in to approach them. One person from each group was randomly selected to participate in the survey. There were several styles of seating arrangements in the different train cars. The person in the group who was sitting closest to the aisle or closest to the engine car was identified and invited to participate. If that person declined, no one else in the group was invited. The train cars were covered and therefore the sampling procedure did not require modification in inclement weather. Customers who were riding the bus to Silverton would check-in and board the bus outside the station at 479 Main Avenue. Customers would line up near the corner and the researcher would identify the person standing closest to the corner and invite them to participate in the survey. If that person declined, no one else in the group was invited to participate. The sample recruiting area for the bus was located outdoors with no protection. In the case of inclement weather, the researcher continued to survey until the point that there was the potential for the iPads to become compromised. At that point the researcher waited until the customers were able to board the bus and surveying could resume.

**Data Preparation**

A total of 327 people were intercepted in Charleston as they were waiting for their carriage to depart and 311 people were intercepted in Durango as they were waiting for their train or bus to depart. In Charleston there were 22 people who refused to participate in the study and in Durango there were 43 people who refused to participate. Of the 638
total people who were approached, 573 agreed to participate for an initial response rate of 89.8%.

Two questions were included to make sure that the sample consisted of visitors who were on a trip with the primary purpose of pleasure. One question was included in the survey to filter visitors from residents and participants were asked whether they identified as a resident of or a visitor to the area. Participants who self-identified as local residents of each area were removed from the sample because their proximity to the site invalidates their responses to the questions about the anticipation phase. In Charleston there were 13 local residents and in Durango there were five local residents.

Another question was added to filter out business travelers because Oppermann (1999) argues that when researching destination choice, business travelers can and should be removed from the sample because their anticipation phase is often inconsistent with the anticipation phase of leisure travelers. The question asked participants to categorize their trip to the area as primarily business or primarily pleasure. There were six survey participants in Charleston and four participants from Durango who considered business to be the primary purpose of their trip and they were removed from the sample. People who identified as residents or who were on a business trip were offered an abbreviated survey with demographic questions to include in the technical report that was offered to the tour companies, but these people were removed from the sample for the research study. Out of the 638 total people who were invited to take the survey, 545 pleasure visitors agreed for an adjusted response rate of 85.4%.
Because the carriage, train or bus would sometimes depart before the participant had finished the survey, there were 29 people in Charleston and four people in Durango who ran out of time and did not finish the survey. There were also 57 people in Charleston and 54 people in Durango who answered fewer than 50% of the items for any of the latent factors in the model (mindfulness, satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty). These cases were eliminated for failing to meet the 50% standard required for missing data replacement (Byrne, 2008) and the remaining sample size was 401 people, 200 from South Carolina and 201 from Durango (Table 3.4). The response rate for usable cases was 62.9%.

Table 3.4. Sample Size Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total Intercepted</th>
<th>Refused</th>
<th>Agreed to participate</th>
<th>Local Residents</th>
<th>Business Travelers</th>
<th>Did not finish</th>
<th>Answered fewer than 50%</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outlier Analysis

Additional steps were taken to clean the data and prepare it for analysis. For the remaining cases, mean replacement was used for all missing data on model variables. A mean was calculated for each variable and imputed into the cells that were missing data. The next stage included testing to look for outliers within the data (Gaskin, 2013a). Descriptive analysis was checked to make sure that all values were within a reasonable range. Next, Mahalanobis Distance was recorded to determine whether cases were
outliers in terms of leverage for relationships in the model between mindfulness, search and choice behaviors (e.g. planning horizon, choice set, source variety), search and choice outcomes (e.g. enjoyment, confidence), and trip evaluations (e.g. satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, attitudinal loyalty). A data point that is an outlier in terms of leverage may have an undeserved influence on the overall data set if the analysis is skewed by a single respondent. Following Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), the Chi² chart was checked to see if the Mahalanobis value exceeded the cutoff point for one independent variable. Six cases exceeded the cutoff value of 10.828 for any of the relationships in the model between mindfulness, search and choice behaviors, search and choice outcomes, and trip evaluations (Table 3.5).

### Table 3.5. Cases Exceeding Mahalanobis Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>13.162*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>31.896*</td>
<td>31.896*</td>
<td>31.896*</td>
<td>31.896*</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>10.862*</td>
<td>11.308*</td>
<td>14.488*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>43.349*</td>
<td>43.349*</td>
<td>43.349*</td>
<td>43.349*</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>11.308*</td>
<td>21.009*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Exceeds 10.828 value

Before any cases were removed, studentized deleted residuals were recorded to determine whether any cases created problems with outliers due to discrepancy for any of the relationships in the model. Studentized deleted residuals reflect the distance between the observed value for a given case and its predicted value if it were to be removed from the data set. There were 32 cases that exceeded +/- 3 which is the standard cutoff recommended for large sample sizes (Table 3.6).
Table 3.6. Cases Exceeding Studentized Deleted Residual Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-0.507</td>
<td>-0.730</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>-0.170</td>
<td>-3.355*</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>-0.647</td>
<td>-0.668</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>-3.572*</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>-0.598</td>
<td>-0.730</td>
<td>-1.243</td>
<td>-3.103*</td>
<td>-0.668</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
<td>-0.944</td>
<td>-0.698</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>-3.101*</td>
<td>-2.317</td>
<td>-1.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>-0.482</td>
<td>-0.352</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>-5.950*</td>
<td>-6.274*</td>
<td>-6.480*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.111*</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td>-0.306</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>-0.370</td>
<td>-0.756</td>
<td>-1.173</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>-3.051*</td>
<td>-0.407</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>-0.740</td>
<td>-0.769</td>
<td>-0.618</td>
<td>-1.918</td>
<td>-4.881*</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>-2.894</td>
<td>-5.406*</td>
<td>-1.107</td>
<td>-1.264</td>
<td>-0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.134*</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>-0.515</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>-0.821</td>
<td>-0.0551</td>
<td>-1.170</td>
<td>-0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.663</td>
<td>-4.251*</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>1.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.035*</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.860</td>
<td>-2.235</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>1.460</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>5.497*</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.925</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>-1.208</td>
<td>-3.381*</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>-0.732</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>3.352*</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>-0.222</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>0.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>7.306*</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>-1.945</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>0.549</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>2.222</td>
<td>1.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>4.070*</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>4.101*</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>1.465</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>-0.543</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>-0.689</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>-4.256*</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>-0.700</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>-0.756</td>
<td>-3.103*</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>7.513*</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>-0.860</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>-0.812</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>1.726</td>
<td>1.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>7.681*</td>
<td>-0.833</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>-1.739</td>
<td>-1.338</td>
<td>-0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.208*</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>-1.139</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-3.549*</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>-0.322</td>
<td>10.390*</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>-0.711</td>
<td>-1.208</td>
<td>-0.994</td>
<td>-0.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>4.158*</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>-0.968</td>
<td>-2.377</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>-1.485</td>
<td>-1.283</td>
<td>-1.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>2.851</td>
<td>2.186</td>
<td>-7.558*</td>
<td>-6.222*</td>
<td>-5.544*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>4.044*</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>3.260*</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.709</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>-0.428</td>
<td>-0.680</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>-3.974*</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>-3.024*</td>
<td>-3.373*</td>
<td>-3.315*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td>-0.795</td>
<td>-1.071</td>
<td>-3.198*</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>-0.753</td>
<td>-0.973</td>
<td>-0.660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Exceeds +/- 3 value

Cook’s D was then recorded to determine if any cases were considered outliers in terms of global influence. The metric of Cook’s D considers the effect of deleting a given data point. Cases were considered to be outliers in terms of global influence if they had a Cook’s D value greater than 1. There were no cases that were outliers based on global influence. Based on the lack of cases that were outliers in terms of global influence, a decision was made to be conservative about deleting outliers. Four cases were identified as outliers for both leverage and discrepancy and were removed from the sample: 90, 127, 133, 347. The remaining sample size was 397 people, 197 from
Charleston and 200 from Durango. The final adjusted response rate was 62.2% for the entire sample, 60.2% from Charleston and 64.3% from Durango (Table 3.7).

Table 3.7. Final Adjusted Response Rate Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total Intercepted</th>
<th>Pleasure Visitors</th>
<th>Outliers</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Adjusted Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durango</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonresponse Analysis

Analysis was conducted to determine whether the sample who completed the survey (n=397) were statistically different on key variables compared to the people who participated in the study but were excluded from the sample (n=144) because they did not have time to complete the survey (n=33) or did not complete at least 50% of the items for the scaled latent variables (n=111). The results of the MANOVA analysis indicate the study sample and the participants who were excluded from the sample for not completing the survey or for not completing enough items for the scaled latent variables were significantly different for the overall model with a Wilk’s Lambda value of F=3.341 and for three of the model variables: source variety, confidence, and satisfaction (Table 3.8). The people in the study sample used a larger variety of sources, were more confident in their destination choice, and were more satisfied with their trip than the participants who were excluded. However, the analysis indicates that the study sample and those excluded from the sample were not significantly different on the independent variable, mindfulness.
Table 3.8. *Nonresponse Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (SD) Included in Sample</th>
<th>Mean (SD) Excluded from Sample</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Model</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.341</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>58.42</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Horizon</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Set</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>11.624</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Variety</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>4.474</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.498</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

A series of statistical techniques were used to analyze the data. First, descriptive statistics were run for the scaled latent variables and non-scaled variables in the model. Next, exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factory analysis were conducted to develop a valid and reliable model that could be used for hypothesis testing. A test of the statistical differences between the two site locations using MANOVA analysis was then conducted to compare multivariate means of the two groups. Next, the hypotheses were analyzed using structural equation modeling which is a technique recommended for hypotheses related to relationships with latent variables (Gallagher, Ting, & Palmer, 2008). Structural equation modeling was utilized to understand the direct relationships as well as the mediated and moderated relationships of mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors, search and choice outcomes, and trip evaluations.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were run for the control variable of how much of the trip was complete at the time the tourist was invited to participate in the survey. This metric was calculated into a percent based on the total duration of the trip and the day of the trip that it was at the time of the survey. The smallest percent of the trip that was complete at the time of the survey was 12.5% and the largest percent of the trip was 100%. The average percent of the trip that was complete at the time of the survey was 63.9% with a standard deviation of 19.6%. 
The model includes four latent factors that were measured using a scale (mindfulness, satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, attitudinal loyalty). The four latent factors were associated with items in the questionnaire based on their theoretical relationships. Mindfulness was associated with six items; satisfaction with four items; behavioral and attitudinal loyalty were both with three items. Each item was measured using a seven point scale. The means were calculated from the average of the associated items.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the latent factors and their items (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1. Descriptive Statistics for Scaled Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent factor</th>
<th>Survey question</th>
<th>Item label</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>(1- Strongly Disagree…7- Strongly Agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to have my interest captured</td>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to search for answers to questions I may have</td>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to have my curiosity aroused</td>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to inquire further about things in the destination</td>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to explore and discover new things</td>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to feel involved in what is going on around me</td>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>(1- Not at all satisfied…7- Very satisfied)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, how satisfied have you been with your trip?</td>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied have you been with your accommodations so far on this trip?</td>
<td>SatAccommodations</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied have you been with your dining experiences so far on this trip?</td>
<td>SatDining</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How satisfied have you been with the activities and/or attractions you’ve experienced so far on this trip?</td>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>(1- Strongly Disagree… 7- Strongly Agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I intend to visit the destination in the future</td>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I intend to visit the destination in the next three years</td>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would recommend the destination to others</td>
<td>BLoyRecommend</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>(1- Strongly Disagree… 7- Strongly Agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I love visiting the destination</td>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy my time when I visit the destination</td>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like the destination more than other destinations</td>
<td>ALoyLike</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive statistics were also analyzed for the dependent variables that were not measured as latent variables using a scale of items. These were considered the non-scaled dependent variables and included: the search and choice behaviors (e.g. planning horizon, choice set, source variety), and search and choice outcomes (e.g. enjoyment, confidence), (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. Descriptive Statistics for Non-Scaled Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search and Choice Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon (in days)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>58.46</td>
<td>76.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices (number of destinations)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources (number of source types)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search and Choice Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy (1-Very little enjoyment…7-Very much enjoyment)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence (1- Not at all confident… 7- Very confident)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics were also run for the mediator of how much of the trip was planned in advance and for the two moderating variables of whether the tourist was visiting a novel or repeat destination and whether the tourist considered the area to be the primary destination for their trip (Table 4.3). For the mediator, tourists were asked on a seven point scale how much of the trip was planned in advance compared to planning that took place after the trip had begun. For the moderator variables, tourists were asked if they had previously visited the area or whether it was a novel destination for them. Tourists were also asked whether they felt the area was the primary destination for their trip or if they considered another area on the trip to be their primary destination. The moderating variables were coded as dichotomous for yes (1) or no (0) responses as to
whether the destination was novel and for whether the area was considered the primary destination for their trip. For the novel variable, there were 209 (52.6%) tourists who reported that they had previously visited the destination and 188 (47.4%) tourists who reported that it was the first time they had visited the destination. For the primary variable, there were 235 (59.2%) tourists who said that the area was the primary destination for their trip and 162 (40.8%) tourists who said that the area was not the primary destination for their trip. The majority of the tourists were repeat visitors who were visiting their primary destination.

Table 4.3. Descriptive Statistics for Mediator and Moderator Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator Variable</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.43(1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1- None of the planning… 7- All of the planning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator Variable</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Destination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Primary Destination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive statistics were also run to establish the frequencies for the different sources included in the questions related to information source variety (Table 4.4). The variable for source variety was computed by adding each of the sources that the participant indicated that they utilized in their search from a question that included general information sources and a question that included electronic information sources.
Table 4.4. *Descriptive Statistics for Source Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet Websites</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website about the General Area</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website with Traveler Reviews</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website for Attraction and/or Activity</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website for Accommodations</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Media</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Application</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website for Restaurant</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV or Radio</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Agent</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Analysis**

Before hypothesis testing began, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) established whether the items for each scale were a good fit for their associated latent variables. EFA was conducted to establish whether the items used in the scales to measure the constructs were appropriate. Four latent factors were included in the model: mindfulness, satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty. The survey instruments (Appendix B and Appendix G) included six items to measure mindfulness, four items to measure satisfaction, three items to measure behavioral loyalty, and three items to measure attitudinal loyalty. Utilizing the Dimension Reduction analysis in SPSS 21, a scree plot was generated for Eigenvalues greater than one and the diagram confirms that the model is composed of four factors (Figure 4.1) because there are four components with an eigenvalue higher than 1.0.
Next, the 16 items in the model were extracted using the Maximum Likelihood technique with Promax rotation and the number of fixed factors was set to four. The pattern matrix (Table 4.5) revealed that the six items for mindfulness all had loadings above .5 on the same factor. The four items for satisfaction also all had loadings above .5 for the same factor. Behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty had items that were discrepant. One of the items (BLoyRecommend) measuring behavioral loyalty was incorrectly loading on the factor associated with attitudinal loyalty. One of the items (ALoyLike) measuring attitudinal loyalty was incorrectly cross-loading on the two factors associated with attitudinal loyalty and behavioral loyalty.
Table 4.5. *Initial EFA: Pattern Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td></td>
<td>.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAccommodations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatDining</td>
<td></td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyRecommend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyLike</td>
<td></td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The item (BLoyRecommend) that was incorrectly loading from behavioral loyalty and the item (ALoyLike) that was incorrectly cross-loading from attitudinal loyalty were removed from the model and the analysis was run again. The resulting pattern matrix (Table 4.6) includes six items that load on the mindfulness factor, four items that load on the satisfaction factor, two items that load on behavioral loyalty, and two items that load on attitudinal loyalty. The model was tested for convergent validity by checking whether all items were loading highly on their factor. Anything above 0.3 for a sample size over 350 is adequate but the average for all items on a factor should be above .7 (Gaskin, 2012). Three of the factors passed the test for convergent validity but satisfaction had an average loading of .656 and failed to meet an adequate standard for convergent validity. This indicates that the satisfaction factor needs further review.
Table 4.6. *EFA Revision 1: Pattern Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td></td>
<td>.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAccommodations</td>
<td></td>
<td>.556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatDining</td>
<td></td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.661</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: .736, .656, .849, .918

The model was also tested for discriminant validity by determining that there were no cross-loadings (Table 4.6) and that there were no factor correlations (Table 4.7) that were higher than 0.7 (Gaskin, 2013b). The current model passed the test for discriminant validity.

Table 4.7. *EFA Revision 1: Factor Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness (M)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (S)</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty (BL)</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty (AL)</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goodness of fit describes how well the model fits the set of observations. The test was significant (Table 4.8) which indicates that the fit is poor although the large sample size may inhibit the goodness of fit test from accurately evaluating the fit even after the model is respecified and meets other standards of fit (Gaskin, 2013b) and this test should not be relied upon as a basis for rejecting the model (Gallagher et al., 2008). The reproduced correlations indicate that the nonredundant residual (Table 4.8) is at 5% and should be less than 5% (Gaskin, 2013b). The revised model was tested for adequacy which is determined by KMO and Bartlett’s test, total variance explained (Table 4.8), and communalities (Table 4.9). The output (Table 4.8) revealed that sphericity was significant and the KMO value exceeded the standard of 0.8 (Gaskin, 2013b). Also, the cumulative percentage in the total variance explained table (Table 4.8) should be above 60% (Gaskin, 2013b) and test result only narrowly exceeded the standard. These results indicate that the factors need further review and the model may not yet have achieved appropriate specification.

Table 4.8. *EFA Revision 1: Factor Testing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-redundant Residual</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variance Explained</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>&gt;60.0</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer Olin</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>&gt;.8</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Sphericity</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communalities are the squared factor loadings measuring the percentage of variance that is explained by the associated latent construct (Gallagher et al., 2008). All of the communalities (Table 4.9) exceeded the standard of 0.3 (Gaskin 2013b).

Table 4.9. EFA Revision 1: Communalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAccommodations</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatDining</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td>.911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised model was tested for reliability to ensure that the Cronbach’s alpha exceeded .7 for each of the factors (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). It was established (Table 4.10) that mindfulness, satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty all exceeded the .7 threshold.

Table 4.10. EFA Revision 1: Reliability of Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>$\alpha$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The decision was made to remove SatAccommodations based on the average loadings for Satisfaction failing to exceed the .7 standard for the average loading. A second revision of the model was run. The output offers several clues that the model still has not achieved good fit and it is likely that Satisfaction needs to be respecified again. The pattern matrix (Table 4.11) shows that Satisfaction still fails to meet the .7 standard for convergent validity (Gaskin, 2013b) and has an average loading of .693. Based on the pattern matrix (Table 4.11) it appears that SatOverall and SatAttractions are loading well together and SatDining is the poorest loading item.

Table 4.11. EFA Revision 2: Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td></td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatDining</td>
<td></td>
<td>.557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average:</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the poor loading in the second revision of the pattern matrix, a third revision was made to the model to exclude SatDining. The new model was analyzed again and found to meet all the standards for the tests for validity, adequacy, and
reliability and was the recommended model for CFA. The model passed the test for convergent validity and the average loadings for all four factors was above .7 (Table 4.12) (Gaskin, 2013b). This result indicates that items that should be related are related.

Table 4.12. EFA Revision 3: Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td></td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td></td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model also passed the test for discriminant validity because there were no cross-loadings (Table 4.12) and there were no factor correlations (Table 4.13) that were higher than .7 (Gaskin, 2013b), indicating that items that should not be related are not related.

The goodness of fit test (Table 4.14) was significant which still indicates poor fit but as expected, the large sample size may make it difficult to rely on this test as a measure of good fit and the recommendation was followed to report the goodness of fit test but to rely on other fit indices to determine good fit (Gallagher & Brown, 2013). The
Table 4.13. EFA Revision 3: Factor Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness (M)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (S)</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty (BL)</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty (AL)</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reproduced correlations indicate that the nonredundant residual is now less than 5% (Table 4.14) which had improved from previous models (Gaskin, 2013b). There was improvement in the cumulative percentage in the Total Variance Explained (Table 4.14). The measurement now well exceeds the threshold of 60% (Gaskin, 2013b). The revised model also passed the test for adequacy based on the results of the KMO and Bartlett’s test, total variance explained, and communalities (Gaskin, 2013b). The output (Table 4.14) revealed that sphericity was significant and the KMO value exceeded the standard of .8 (Gaskin, 2013b). The third revision has achieved appropriate specification.

Table 4.14. EFA Revision 3: Factor Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-Fit</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-redundant Residual</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>&lt;5.0</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variance Explained</td>
<td>65.27</td>
<td>&gt;60.0</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer Olin</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>&gt;.8</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s Sphericity</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The items passed the communalities test (Table 4.15) as all of the values exceed the threshold of 0.3 (Gaskin, 2013b) and were improved from the previous model.
Table 4.15. *EFA Revision 3: Communalities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Extraction Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised model was also tested for reliability to ensure that the Cronbach’s alpha exceeded .7 for each of the factors (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). It was established (Table 4.16) that mindfulness, satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty all exceeded the .7 threshold.

Table 4.16. *EFA Revision 3: Reliability of Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>α value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third revision of the EFA was the recommended pattern matrix (Table 4.12) utilized for CFA. Three of the latent factors only have two items which is the minimum
number of acceptable items per latent factor (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). The literature advises the inclusion of more than two items per factor so long as the items are unidimensional and only share variance with one factor (Raubenheimer, 2004). There is the likelihood that reliability will decrease with fewer items per factor (Marsh, Hau, Balla, & Grayson, 1998). However, the benefits of having a large number of items per factor diminish as the sample size gets larger (Marsh et al., 1998). Also, in the case of the current model that has more than two latent variables, the model can be correctly specified with only two items on the same factor as long as their error terms are not covaried indicating that the items are too similar (Wuensch, 2009). Based on the large sample size and the improved reliability scores with the smaller number of items, the model was recommend to proceed to CFA despite having two items per factor for three of the factors.

The measurement model for CFA was developed from the third revision in EFA and was analyzed to determine how well the observed items or indicator variables represent the unobserved latent variables (Gallagher et al., 2008). The model (Figure 4.2) was created in AMOS 21 and included six observed indicators for mindfulness, two observed indicators for satisfaction, two observed indicators for behavioral loyalty, and two observed indicators for attitudinal loyalty.

The model fit was found to meet standards for each metric: Chi-square/df (<3), CFI (>0.95), NFI (>0.95) SRMR (<0.09), RMSEA (<0.05), and PCLOSE (>0.05) (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010; Gaskin, 2013e). The results from model fit were Chi-
square/df= 1.843, CFI= .983, NFI= .964, SRMR= .033, RMSEA= .046, and PCLOSE= .645. The results indicate that the model shows good overall fit.

Figure 4.2. CFA Model

To test for reliability, the average of the standardized loadings (Table 4.17) on each factor and the correlations between factors (Table 4.18) were calculated.
Table 4.17. CFA Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Standardized Loading</th>
<th>Average Loading</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Mcapture</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Msearch</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mcuriosity</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minquire</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexplore</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mfeel</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>SatOverall</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SatAttractions</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>BLoyFuture</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLoyThree</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>ALoyLove</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALoyEnjoy</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The model was determined to be reliable because all of the average standardized loadings on the factors exceeded 0.7 and all of the correlations between factors did not exceed 0.7 (Gaskin, 2013e). The model was also tested and found to exceed the standards required for convergent and discriminant validity (Hair et al., 2010). Convergent validity was tested to determine the extent to which indicators share variance in common (Gallagher et al., 2008). The Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each factor was above 0.5 and that the Composite Reliability (CR) exceeded the AVE for each factor (Table 4.17). These results indicate that the model has achieved convergent validity.
Table 4.18. *CFA Factor Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>BL</th>
<th>AL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness (M)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (S)</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty (BL)</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty (AL)</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discriminant validity was tested to determine the degree to which the constructs were distinct and not measuring the same variables (Gallagher et al., 2008). The AVE exceeded the Maximum Shared Variance (MSV) and Average Shared Variance (ASV) (Table 4.19). The results indicate that the model has achieved discriminant validity.

Table 4.19. *CFA Discriminant Validity Tests*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>MSV</th>
<th>ASV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Comparison**

Before beginning hypothesis testing, a comparison between the two research sites was conducted to compare the participants at the different sites in terms of their demographic and trip characteristics. In studies that collect data from multiple sites, minor differences can be expected (McKercher & Guillet, 2011). The demographic characteristics that were significantly different between participants in Charleston and
Durango were age and citizenship (Table 4.20). Visitors to Charleston were younger (t=4.29, p<.001) with an average age of 43.4 years old than visitors to Durango with an average age of 49.3 years old. Visitors to Charleston were more likely ($x^2=13.89$, p<.001) to be American citizens with 98.3% being United States citizens while 88.5% of the visitors to Durango were United States citizens.

Table 4.20. Site Differences on Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Charleston Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Durango Mean (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>In Years</td>
<td>43.44 (12.12)</td>
<td>49.32 (14.02)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Charleston % (n)</th>
<th>Durango % (n)</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Status</td>
<td>Traveling with Children</td>
<td>36.59 (71)</td>
<td>33.33 (66)</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.79 (113)</td>
<td>55.05 (109)</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>98.29 (173)</td>
<td>88.48 (169)</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to demographic information, respondents were asked about their trip characteristics. The trip characteristics that were significantly different between groups were length of stay in days, number of previous visits, and distance traveled in miles (Table 4.21). Visitors to Charleston stayed for a significantly longer duration ($t=3.47$, p<.001) on average of 3.96 days compared to the average length of stay for visitors to Durango who stayed an average of 3.33 days. Visitors to Charleston were more likely to have previously visited Charleston ($t=2.60$, p=.010) on average of 3.21 times while visitors to Durango were only likely to have visited Durango 1.53 times previously.
Visitors to Charleston traveled a shorter distance ($t=6.89$, $p<.001$) on average at 604.18 miles compared to visitors to Durango who traveled 966.86 miles on average. The longer distance traveled by visitors to Durango may be related to the mode of transportation utilized by the tourists, which was not included as a variable in the questionnaire.

Table 4.21. *Site Differences on Trip Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Charleston Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Durango Mean (SD)</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>In Days</td>
<td>3.96 (2.05)</td>
<td>3.33 (1.53)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Size</td>
<td>Number of People</td>
<td>3.60 (2.33)</td>
<td>3.33 (1.71)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Visits</td>
<td>Number of Visits</td>
<td>3.21 (8.58)</td>
<td>1.53 (2.92)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Traveled</td>
<td>In Miles</td>
<td>604.18 (462.24)</td>
<td>966.86 (493.59)</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step was to evaluate whether the model variables differed significantly in the samples from Charleston and Durango. A MANOVA was run to determine if there were significant differences between the two sites on the model as a whole rather than only testing each variable individually. The analysis included the variables in the model: mindfulness, planning horizon, choice set, information sources, level of enjoyment, level of confidence, satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty (Table 4.22). The overall model and four of the eight dependent variables were significantly different. The Wilks’ Lambda test for the overall model indicated that the two sites were significantly different ($F=9.34$, $p<.001$). Visitors to Charleston had a significantly shorter ($F=5.88$, $p=.016$) planning horizon (48.93 days) compared to visitors in Durango (67.65 days.)
Visitors to Charleston considered significantly fewer (F=57.08, p< .001) destinations in their choice set (0.96 destinations) compared to visitors in Durango (2.77 destinations).

Visitors to Charleston reported that their behavioral loyalty was significantly higher (F= 27.24, p< .001) on a scale of 1-7 (5.99) compared to visitors in Durango (5.43). Visitors to Charleston also reported that their attitudinal loyalty was significantly higher (F= 15.24, p< .001) on a scale of 1-7 (6.14) than visitors in Durango (5.80). It was determined that there were no significant differences in the model’s independent variable, mindfulness (F=.88, p=.348).

Table 4.22. Site Differences on Model Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Charleston Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Durango Mean (SD)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Model</td>
<td>6.03 (.77)</td>
<td>6.10 (.68)</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>48.93 (64.01)</td>
<td>67.65 (86.70)</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Horizon</td>
<td>.96 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.77 (3.08)</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Set</td>
<td>4.38 (2.07)</td>
<td>4.15 (1.85)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Variety</td>
<td>5.27 (1.49)</td>
<td>5.28 (1.67)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>6.29 (.91)</td>
<td>6.24 (.92)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>6.19 (.74)</td>
<td>6.17 (.73)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.99 (.99)</td>
<td>5.43 (1.01)</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>6.14 (.78)</td>
<td>5.80 (.76)</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these significant differences in model variables, a control variable for the site location was included in the analysis of the hypotheses so that the relationships could be appropriately tested despite these differences between the site locations. The samples from the two sites were combined into one data set for hypothesis testing. The
dichotomous variable was coded for Charleston (0) and Durango (1) and included in the model to control for the site differences while testing the relationships between variables.

**Hypothesis Testing**

The hypotheses were tested using Structural Equation Modeling and included all of the relationships in the research questions as well as two control variables for the site differences and the percent of the trip that had been completed at the time of the survey.

**Structural Model**

A structural model was developed in AMOS 21 to proceed with structural equation modeling (SEM) for the analysis of the hypothesized relationships. An advantage of SEM over traditional statistical techniques is that the analysis accounts for measurement error rather than imposing an unrealistic assumption that variables have been measured perfectly (Gallagher & Brown, 2013). The structural model (Figure 4.3) was analyzed to determine the strength of interrelationships amongst the unobserved latent constructs (Gallagher et al., 2008). The model includes: mindfulness as the independent variable, search and choice behaviors (planning horizon, choice set, source variety) as dependent variables, search and choice outcomes (level of enjoyment, level of confidence) as dependent variables, trip evaluations (satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty) as dependent variables, the amount of the trip planned in advance as a mediator variable, and the site location and the percent of the trip that had been complete at the time of the survey as the two control variables. The site location was a control variable in all of the hypothesized relationships and the percent of the trip that had been completed at the time of the survey was included as a control for the relationships related
to the influence of mindfulness on trip evaluations (satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, attitudinal loyalty). The two moderator variables (whether the destination was repeated or novel, and whether the area was their primary or non-primary destination) were not included in the structural model because they are dichotomous and were tested as multi-group moderators rather than having direct paths in the model (Gaskin, 2013d). Analysis was conducted for the moderating variables by comparing the model based on conditions for each dichotomous group.

The initial test for model fit was poor and modification indices were evaluated to determine if the model should be adjusted to improve fit. Modification indices indicate the reduction in $\chi^2$ if a constraint between two variables is removed (Gallagher et al.,
The analysis recommended that twelve covariances (Table 4.23) between error terms be added to improve the fit because their modification index was above the 4.0 conservative threshold (Gallagher et al., 2008; Gaskin, 2013c).

Table 4.23. Initial Model Modification Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariance</th>
<th>Modification Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e7 &lt;-&gt; e8</td>
<td>92.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6 &lt;-&gt; e8</td>
<td>81.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5 &lt;-&gt; e6</td>
<td>70.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e6 &lt;-&gt; e7</td>
<td>48.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4 &lt;-&gt; e6</td>
<td>37.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5 &lt;-&gt; e8</td>
<td>35.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4 &lt;-&gt; e5</td>
<td>28.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1 &lt;-&gt; e7</td>
<td>27.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e2 &lt;-&gt; e7</td>
<td>14.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e5 &lt;-&gt; e7</td>
<td>13.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e4 &lt;-&gt; e8</td>
<td>11.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e1 &lt;-&gt; e3</td>
<td>4.912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twelve covariances were included in the model for the remaining hypothesis testing. The model fit exceeded the standards for the fit indices indicating the structural model achieved good fit. The results from model fit were Chi-square/df= 1.674, CFI= .980, NFI= .955, SRMR= .037, RMSEA= .041, and PCLOSE= .732. This structural model was used for the remaining hypothesis testing based on achieving appropriate values for good fit.

**The Influence of Mindfulness on Search and Choice Behaviors**

The structural model was used to analyze the relationships between mindfulness and the three dependent variables related to search and choice behaviors when controlling...
for the site location. The results indicate that there was a significant relationship between mindfulness and one of the dependent variables (Table 4.24).

Table 4.24. *Mindfulness and Search and Choice Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>Failed to reject H1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>Failed to reject H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject H3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence of mindfulness during the anticipation phase on the length of the planning horizon was not significant (p=.918) indicating that the level of mindfulness does not influence the length of the window of time that visitors spent searching for travel information about their destination. As a result, H1 failed to be rejected. The influence of mindfulness was also not significant on the number of destinations in the choice set (p=.220) revealing that visitors who were mindful during the anticipation phase did not seriously consider a significantly different number of destinations than visitors who were less mindful. As a result, H2 failed to be rejected. Mindfulness was found to have a significant positive influence on information source variety (p< .001) and the variety of information sources used during the phase increased as the level of mindfulness during the anticipation phase increased. As a result, H3 was rejected meaning that an increase in mindfulness is associated with an increase in source variety.

These relationships were then tested to discern whether the amount of the trip that was planned in advance would mediate the influence of mindfulness and the search and
choice behaviors (Table 4.25). Mediation is the process where the effect of one variable on another variable occurs through an intervening variable (Gallagher & Brown, 2013).

Table 4.25. Advanced Planning Mediating Search and Choice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Mediating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Source Variety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bootstrapping analysis was applied to test for mediation using a resampling and replacement procedure. The results indicate that the amount of the trip that was planned in advance significantly mediated one of the three relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors (Table 4.26). The mediation was significant for the relationship between mindfulness and the length of the trip horizon (p=.007). As previously described, H1 failed to be rejected and the direct influence of mindfulness on the length of the planning horizon was not significant. However, an increase in the amount of the trip that was planned in advance weakens the relationship between mindfulness and the planning horizon. As a result, H4 was rejected meaning that advanced planning significantly mediated the relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon. The influence of mindfulness was not significantly mediated by advanced planning for the size of the choice set (p=.336), or the variety of information sources (p=.743). As a result, H5 and H6 failed to be rejected, revealing that advanced planning did not influence the relationships between mindfulness and the size of the choice set or the variety of sources.
Table 4.26. *Bootstrapping Results for Search and Choice Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Direct Without Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Direct With Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Indirect With Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Bootstrapping Significance</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>.025 (.615)</td>
<td>.005 (.918)</td>
<td>.154 (.004)</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>Reject H4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>-.052 (.266)</td>
<td>-.058 (.220)</td>
<td>.045 (.377)</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>.496 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.483 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.098 (.039)</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two dichotomous moderating variables were tested to determine whether the influence of mindfulness on the search and choice behaviors was caused by certain conditions. Categorical moderators are evaluated by using multiple group models and testing for statistical differences (Gallagher & Brown, 2013). Multi-group moderation analysis was conducted to determine differences in the influence of mindfulness on the search and choice behaviors based on the tourists’ placement into the moderating conditions. The novel destination variable was the first moderator testing the relationship of mindfulness with each of the search and choice behaviors (Table 4.27).

Table 4.27. *Novel Destination Moderating Search and Choice Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Source Variety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis (Table 4.28) revealed that whether the tourist had previously visited the destination was not a significant moderator for any of the
relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors. The results of the multi-group moderation support that H7, H8, and H9 failed to be rejected and no significant relationships existed for the conditions of the destination being repeated or novel. Whether the tourist had previously visited the destination did not influence the relationship between mindfulness in the anticipation phase on search and choice behaviors: planning horizon, choice set, and source variety.

Table 4.28. Results for Novel Destination on Search and Choice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Repeat Destination (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Novel Destination (p)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>-1.708 (.858)</td>
<td>4.054 (.705)</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>-.287 (.329)</td>
<td>-.240 (.474)</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>.761 (.003)</td>
<td>.700 (.008)</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary destination variable was the second moderator tested to determine whether it influenced the relationship between mindfulness with each of the search and choice behaviors (Table 4.29).

Table 4.29. Primary Destination Moderating Search and Choice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Source Variety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis (Table 4.30) revealed that whether the tourist considered the area to be their primary destination was only a significant moderator for
one of the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors. The standardized estimate for the relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon was positive (23.649) for tourists who were visiting a destination where they considered to be their primary destination. The standardized estimate for the relationship for mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon was negative (-10.879) for tourists who were visiting a destination that they did not consider to be their primary destination.

As previously discussed, the result of the analysis for H1 indicated that there was not a significant influence of mindfulness on the planning horizon. The result of the multi-group moderation analysis indicates that the relationship between mindfulness and the planning horizon is significantly moderated by whether the tourist considered the area to be their primary destination and as a result, H10 was rejected. The group differences represented by the positive relationship for repeat visitors and negative relationship for novel or first time visitors may explain why H1 failed to find a significant influence for the direct relationship between mindfulness and the planning horizon. The non-significant finding for H1 may be due to the moderating variable as the relationship between mindfulness and planning horizon depends on whether the tourist is in their primary destination or if they consider another area to be the primary destination for their trip. None of the other moderation effects were found to be significant and H11 and H12 failed to be rejected meaning that whether the tourist was in their primary destination did not moderate the relationships between mindfulness and choice set or mindfulness and source variety.
Table 4.30. *Results for Primary Destination on Search and Choice Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Non-Primary Destination (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Primary Destination (p)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>-10.879 (.163)</td>
<td>23.649 (.097)</td>
<td>-2.124*</td>
<td>Reject H10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>-.126 (.439)</td>
<td>-.829 (.096)</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>.804 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.603 (.056)</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

**The Influence of Mindfulness on Search and Choice Outcomes**

The next set of research questions examined the relationship of mindfulness with search and choice outcomes: the level enjoyment of the anticipation phase (enjoyment) and the level of confidence with the final choice (confidence) when controlling for the site location. The results indicate that mindfulness had a positive and significant relationship with both of the search and choice outcome variables (Table 4.31). The analysis found a significant positive relationship between mindfulness and the level of enjoyment during the anticipation phase (p < .001). This indicates that the more mindful a tourist is while they are planning the trip, the more likely they are to enjoy the planning process. Also significant was the positive relationship between mindfulness and confidence in the destination choice (p < .001). The more mindful the tourist is during the anticipation phase, the higher their confidence level will be that they selected the best destination for their trip. As a result, both H13 and H14 were rejected, indicating that a higher degree of mindfulness is associated with a higher degree of enjoyment during the planning process and a higher degree of confidence that the destination selected was the best choice for the trip.
Table 4.31. *Mindfulness and Search and Choice Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject H13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject H14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These relationships were then tested to discern whether the amount of the trip that was planned in advance would mediate the influence of mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes (Table 4.32).

Table 4.32. *Advanced Planning Mediating Search and Choice Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Mediating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the bootstrapping analysis indicate advanced planning significantly mediated one of the two relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes (Table 4.33). The influence of mindfulness on the level of enjoyment is significantly decreased by an increase in the amount of the trip planned in advance ($p = .010$). As a result, H15 was rejected demonstrating that the influence of mindfulness on the level of enjoyment is still significant but weakened with a larger amount of the trip planned in advance. The influence of mindfulness on the level of confidence in the destination choice was not significantly mediated by the amount of trip planned in
advance (p=.254). As a result, H16 failed to be rejected signifying that advanced planning did not mediate the relationship between mindfulness and confidence.

Table 4.33. *Bootstrapping Results for Search and Choice Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Direct Without Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Direct With Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Indirect With Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Bootstrapping Significance</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td>.293 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.258 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.269 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>Reject H15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
<td>.206 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.200 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.042 (.432)</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-group moderation analysis was conducted to establish whether there were differences in the influence of mindfulness on the search and choice outcomes was based on the tourists’ placement into the conditions of whether the destination was novel and whether the area visited was considered the primary destination for the trip. The novel destination variable was the first moderator testing the relationship of mindfulness with each of the search and choice outcomes (Table 4.34).

Table 4.34. *Novel Destination Moderating Search and Choice Outcomes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H17</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis (Table 4.35) revealed that whether the tourist had previously visited the destination was not a significant moderator for the relationships between mindfulness and enjoyment or confidence. The moderating effect of novel
destination did influence the relationship between mindfulness and the level of enjoyment in the anticipation phase but only at a significance level of p< .10. The results of the multi-group moderation support that H17 and H18 failed to be rejected and no significant relationships existed for whether the destination was repeated or novel on the relationships between mindfulness, enjoyment and confidence.

Table 4.3. Results for Novel Destination on Search and Choice Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Repeat Destination (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Novel Destination (p)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H17</td>
<td>1.028 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.519 (.011)</td>
<td>-1.799</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H18</td>
<td>.464 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.214 (.087)</td>
<td>-1.465</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary destination variable was the second moderator tested for the relationship of mindfulness with each of the search and choice behaviors (Table 4.36).

Table 4.36. Primary Destination Moderating Search and Choice Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H19</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis (Table 4.37) reveal that whether the tourist considered the area to be their primary destination was not a significant moderator for either of the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes. The relationship between mindfulness and the level of enjoyment and the level of confidence were not
influence by whether the area was the visitor’s primary destination for the trip. As a result, H19 and H20 failed to be rejected establishing that primary destination did not significantly influence the relationship between mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes.

Table 4.37. Results for Primary Destination on Search and Choice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Non-Primary Destination (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Primary Destination (p)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H19</td>
<td>.757 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>.807 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>-1.174</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H20</td>
<td>.286 (.009)</td>
<td>.468 (&lt;.001)</td>
<td>-1.045</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Influence of Mindfulness on Trip Evaluations

Mindfulness was found to have a significant influence on all three of the tested relationships related to trip evaluations (Table 4.38). This analysis included variables to control for the differences in the site location and the percent of the trip that had been completed at the time the tourist was intercepted and invited to participate in the survey. Mindfulness had a significant positive influence on satisfaction (p< .001), behavioral loyalty (p< .001), and attitudinal loyalty (p< .001). These results indicate that the more mindful a tourist is during the anticipation phase, the more likely they are to report being satisfied with their trip as well as their intentions to display behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty towards that destination. As a result, H21, H22, and H23 were rejected signifying that a higher degree of mindfulness is associated with a high degree of satisfaction for the trip, behavioral loyalty to the destination, and attitudinal loyalty to the destination.
Table 4.38. *Mindfulness and Trip Evaluations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H21</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject H21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H22</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject H22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H23</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject H23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These relationships were then tested to discover whether the amount of the trip that was planned in advance would have a mediating effect on the influence of mindfulness and the trip evaluations (Table 4.39).

Table 4.39. *Advanced Planning Mediating Trip Evaluations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Mediating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H24</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H25</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H26</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Amount of Trip Planned in Advance</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the bootstrapping analysis indicate that the amount of the trip planned in advance significantly mediated one of the three relationships between mindfulness and trip evaluations (Table 4.40). The amount of the trip planned in advance was a significant (p=.049) mediator for the influence of mindfulness on satisfaction. The influence of mindfulness on satisfaction is significant though the positive relationship is significantly decreased by an increase in the amount of the trip planned in advanced. As a result, H24 was rejected meaning that the larger amount of the trip that was planned in advance weakens the influence of mindfulness on satisfaction. The influence of
mindfulness on loyalty was not significantly mediated at the p=.05 level by the amount of
the trip that was planned in advance for behavioral loyalty (p=.394) and attitudinal
loyalty (p=.080). As a result, H25 and H26 failed to be rejected meaning that advanced
planning did not mediate the relationships between mindfulness and behavioral loyalty or
attitudinal loyalty.

Table 4.40. *Bootstrapping Results for Trip Evaluations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Direct Without Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Direct With Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Indirect With Mediator (p)</th>
<th>Bootstrapping Significance</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H24</td>
<td>.496 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.483 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.098 (.039)</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>Reject H24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H25</td>
<td>.246 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.249 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>- .030 (.558)</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H26</td>
<td>.524 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.532 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>-.059 (.198)</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-group moderation analysis was conducted to establish whether there were
differences in the influence of mindfulness on trip evaluations based on whether the
tourist had previously visited the destination. The novel destination variable was the first
moderator tested for the relationship of mindfulness with each of the trip evaluation
variables (Table 4.41).

Table 4.41. *Novel Destination Moderating Trip Evaluations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H27</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H28</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H29</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Novel Destination</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the analysis (Table 4.42) reveal that whether the tourist had previously visited the destination was a significant moderator for one of the relationships between mindfulness and the trip evaluation variables. Whether the tourist had previously visited the destination did not significantly moderate the relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction or mindfulness and behavioral loyalty. As a result, H27 and H28 failed to be rejected indicating that novel destination did not moderate the relationships between mindfulness and satisfaction or behavioral loyalty. The moderating effect of novel destination was significant for the relationship between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty. As previously reported, the results of the analysis for H23 indicate that mindfulness during the anticipation phase has a significant positive influence on attitudinal loyalty. The results of the multi-group moderation for H29 indicate that the influence of mindfulness on attitudinal loyalty was positive and significant for both new and repeat visitors, though the positive influence was significantly higher for those who were visiting the destination for the first time. While mindfulness has a positive influence on attitudinal loyalty for repeat visitors, mindfulness during the anticipation phase has the potential to have a stronger influence on attitudinal loyalty for tourists who are visiting a novel destination. As a result, H29 was rejected demonstrating that novel destination moderated the relationship between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty.

The primary destination variable was the second moderator tested for the relationship of mindfulness with each of the trip evaluation variables: satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty (Table 4.43).
Table 4.42. Results for Novel Destination on Trip Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Repeat Destination (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Novel Destination (p)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H27</td>
<td>.548 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.549 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H28</td>
<td>.547 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.573 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H29</td>
<td>.603 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.937 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>2.801*</td>
<td>Reject H29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

Table 4.43. Primary Destination Moderating Trip Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H30</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H31</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H32</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Primary Destination</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis (Table 4.44) revealed that whether the tourist considered the area to be their primary destination was not a significant moderator for any of the relationships between mindfulness and the trip evaluation variables. The influence of mindfulness during the anticipation phase on satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty did not depend on whether the tourist considered the area to be the primary destination for their trip or if another area was a primary destination for the trip. As a result, H30, H31, and H32 failed to be rejected signifying that primary destination did not moderate the relationships between mindfulness and the trip evaluation variables: satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty.
Table 4.44. Results for Primary Destination on Trip Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Non-Primary Destination (p)</th>
<th>Standardized Estimate for Primary Destination (p)</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H30</td>
<td>.563 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.524 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H31</td>
<td>.537 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.607 (.003)</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H32</td>
<td>.772 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.771 (&lt; .001)</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>Fail to Reject H33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Hypotheses**

The results of the hypothesis testing revealed that 11 of the 32 hypotheses were rejected by significance at a level of p< .05 (Table 4.45). Significant findings were found for: mindfulness and source variety (RQ1, H3), advanced planning mediating the relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon (RQ1a, H4), primary destination moderating the relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon (RQ1c, H10), mindfulness and the level of enjoyment in the planning process (RQ2, H13), mindfulness and the level of confidence (RQ2, H14), advanced planning mediating the relationship between mindfulness and the level of enjoyment in the planning process (RQ2a, H15), mindfulness and satisfaction (RQ3, H21), mindfulness and behavioral loyalty (RQ3, H22), mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty (RQ3, H23), advanced planning mediating the relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction (RQ3a, H24), and novel destination moderating the relationship between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty (RQ3b, H29).

When considering the unmediated and unmoderated direct effects between mindfulness and the dependent variables, six of the eight hypotheses were significant
Table 4.45. *Summary of Hypothesis Testing*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Mediating or Moderating Variable</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Source Variety</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Source Variety</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Source Variety</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Choice Set</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Source Variety</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Behavioral Loyalty</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>Attitudinal Loyalty</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
revealing that mindfulness during the travel anticipation phase has a positive and significant influence the travel experience for source variety, enjoyment, confidence, satisfaction with the trip, behavioral loyalty to the destination, and attitudinal loyalty to the destination. Five out of the 24 hypotheses testing mediation and moderation effects were significant: advanced planning on the relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon, the level of enjoyment, and the level of satisfaction; novel destination and the relationship between mindfulness and attitudinal loyalty; and primary destination and the relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon.

**Significant Findings**

Research Question 1 analyzed the relationship between mindfulness and search and choice behaviors. Mindfulness during the anticipation phase was found to have a significant positive influence on the variety of information sources utilized. The hypotheses that tested the relationships between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon and the size of the choice set failed to find significant results. These relationships were further tested to determine if the influence was dependent on mediating or moderating variables. Research Question 1a considered whether the amount of the trip that was planned in advance would influence the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice behaviors. The amount of the trip that was planned in advance had a significant negative mediating effect on the influence of mindfulness on the length of the planning horizon. The larger the amount of the trip that was planned in advance, the weaker the influence mindfulness had on the length of the
planning horizon. Research Question 1c considered if whether the tourist was visiting their primary destination had a significant moderating effect on the influence of mindfulness on search and choice behaviors. Mindfulness had a significant positive influence on the length of the planning horizon for tourists who considered the area to be their primary destination and a significant negative influence for visitors who did not consider the area to be their primary destination.

Research Question 2 examined the relationships between mindfulness and search and choice outcomes. Mindfulness during the anticipation phase was found to have a significant positive influence on the search outcome (the level of enjoyment) and the choice outcome (the level of confidence in the destination choice) during the anticipation phase. Research Question 2a considered whether the relationships between mindfulness and the search and choice outcomes might be mediated by how much of the trip was planned in advance. The amount of the trip that was planned in advance was found to have a significant negative mediating effect on the influence of mindfulness on the level of enjoyment in the anticipation phase. The larger the amount of the trip that was planned in advance, the weaker the influence mindfulness had on the level of enjoyment.

Research Question 3 considered the relationship between mindfulness and trip evaluations. It was found that mindfulness during the anticipation phase had a significant positive influence on trip evaluations: satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty. Research Question 3a looked at whether the relationships between mindfulness and trip evaluations may be mediated by the amount of the trip that was planned in advance. It was found that the amount of the trip planned in advance had a significant
negative influence on the relationship between mindfulness and satisfaction. The more of
the trip planned in advance, the weaker the influence was of mindfulness on satisfaction.
Research Question 3b explored if whether the tourist had previously visited the
destination moderated the relationship between mindfulness and the trip evaluations.
Whether the tourist was a repeat visitor to the destination had a significant moderating
effect on the influence of mindfulness on the attitudinal loyalty. The significant positive
influence of mindfulness on attitudinal loyalty was stronger for people who were visiting
the area for the first time.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Consumers are playing an increasingly important role in the tourism industry as they are active participants of experiences rather than passive consumers of tangible goods. Tourists in particular are co-creating their travel experience in each of the travel phases (Prat & de la Rica Aspiunza, 2014). It has been argued that through the advancement of technology, the tourist’s role has dramatically changed which is intensifying the competition for tourism destinations (Prat & de la Rica Aspiunza, 2014). It is imperative for these destinations to develop a holistic understanding of the travel experience by considering tourists’ behavior and evaluations during each of the five phases. The anticipation phase is the point when destination managers have the opportunity to reach potential tourists with persuasive information before they have made decisions about their itinerary and spending. While all phases are necessary to understand, the anticipation phase is absolutely crucial to the success of tourism organizations because it is the only opportunity to convince the tourists to choose the specific destination over the competitors for that particular trip. This study proposed that mindfulness may vary amongst tourists in the anticipation phase and that it has the potential to influence tourists’ search and choice behavior and outcomes and their evaluations of the travel experience. Mindfulness has successfully been applied to the on-site phase previously, and this study reveals that mindfulness during the anticipation phase also has a significant influence on tourist’s search and choice behavior and outcomes and the evaluation of their travel experience.
The purpose of this study was to understand the influence that mindfulness during the anticipation phase may have on search and choice behaviors and outcomes as well as trip evaluations. The results of the study help begin to fill a gap that exists in the literature on how mindfulness influences the different phases of the tourism experience. The study utilized a quantitative survey that was administered at two tourism sites and analysis was conducted to understand the statistical differences between the data collected at the two locations. The results indicated that mindfulness, the independent variable, was not significantly different between the responses collected in Charleston and Durango. However, several of the dependent variables were significantly different: the length of the planning horizon, the size of the choice set, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty. A control variable for the site location was included in the hypothesis testing to account for these differences.

**Theoretical Implications**

Several of the findings from this study were consistent with the results that were expected based on the literature. The principles of dual-processing theory have been applied to the psychological study of decision making (Hastie & Dawes, 2010) and been extended into the field of consumer behavior (Dijksterhuis & van Olden, 2006). The current study takes a further step to apply dual-processing theory to the anticipation phase in tourism. The significant findings reveal that the theory of information processing through an analytic route or an automatic route that exists in consumer behavior for tangible goods also holds true in the tourism industry as well. Dual-processing theory should continue to be applied to all phases of the travel experience to understand how
information is being processed and how it ultimately influences tourists’ choices and experiences.

There are also theoretical contributions of this study for mindfulness as an application of dual-processing theory. There were several results that were unexpected based on previous research in mindfulness and decision making. Two hypotheses related to search and choice behaviors failed to find significant results. Mindfulness during the anticipation phase did not have a significant influence on the length of the planning horizon and the size of the choice set. The literature is inconsistent with these findings. As an operationalization of dual-processing theory, mindfulness is expected to be associated with slow and analytical processing while mindlessness is associated with quicker decision making (Moscardo, 2009). The literature suggests that an increase in mindfulness should be associated with an increase in the length of the planning horizon exemplifying the slow and analytical style of information processing. This study was unable to find a significant relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon. While this study asked tourists the number of days that they spent searching for information, there was no measurement of the number of hours per day or other test of intensity that would help distinguish mindful from mindless tourists. Although mindful tourists did not spend a significantly longer number of days searching, the study is not able to conclude whether the time spent per day was actually longer for mindful tourists which is what would be expected from the literature. There may be other variables such as financial or vacation time constraints that do not allow mindful tourists to begin planning their trip further in advance but the literature would suggest that the
intensity would be higher for mindful tourists even with a planning horizon that is statistically the same length as mindless tourists.

Mindfulness has also been documented to be associated with an openness to new and potentially conflicting information (Carson & Langer, 2006). Theoretically, a mindful tourist would be open to the consideration of different destinations during the anticipation phase and consequently have a larger choice set. The expectation from the literature would be that an increase in mindfulness would be associated with an increase in the number of destinations considered in the choice set, however, this study failed to find a significant relationship. Further research is needed to understand the variability of the size of choice sets as this study did not conclude that it was related to mindfulness in the travel anticipation phase.

Studies of the influence of mindfulness on the tourist’s experience while they are on site at the destination conclude that mindfulness is associated with interest in a variety of information sources (Ganesan et al., 2014) and the results from this study are consistent with the results found on the influence of mindfulness on information sources in the third travel phase and extend the findings to the influence of mindfulness on information sources in the first travel phase. The results are also consistent with mindfulness research in other fields that have found a significant relationship between mindfulness and openness to information from a variety of sources (Langer, 1989; Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000).

Previous research has shown that increased mindfulness is linked to an increase in the liking of a task (Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000). The results of this study confirm that
an increase in mindfulness was associated with an increase in the level of enjoyment that the tourist experienced during the anticipation phase.

A research question that found unexpected results was related to the influence of mindfulness during the anticipation phase on the level of confidence that the tourist reported in their destination choice. This study found a significant positive relationship between mindfulness during the anticipation phase and the level of confidence in the destination choice. In contrast, previous work in decision making has argued that mindlessness which is associated with limited or superficial information processing can result in “what you see is all there is” (Kahneman, 2011, p. 86) with an increased likelihood for overconfidence. This literature on confidence and decision making suggests that the more mindlessly a decision is made, the more likely a customer is to report that they are confident in their choice because they use limited information that matches their pre-existing opinion (Kahneman, 2011). However, previous research has never considered mindfulness and confidence with travel decisions and the results of this study found a significant positive influence of mindfulness on confidence.

This inconsistency with previous research is closely related to another discrepancy with the influence of mindfulness in the anticipation phase on satisfaction. Langer (1994) and Moscardo (1996) have argued that mindfulness should be associated with higher levels of satisfaction though studies on consumer goods found that an increase in conscious thought resulted in decreased satisfaction of the purchased good (Dijksterhuis & van Olden, 2006). Consumers who utilized slow or analytical processing during decision making considered the positive and negative attributes of many product
options. Even after choosing the best product, the consumers still had a heightened awareness of the negative traits of their choice and this ultimately led to lower levels of post-purchase satisfaction compared to consumers who had not put much thought into their purchase (Dijksterhuis & van Olden, 2006).

This study sought to determine whether an increase in conscious thought (mindfulness) during the anticipation phase would also result in decreased satisfaction. The results indicate that tourism decisions are different from decisions about consumer goods due to the finding that an increase in mindfulness during the anticipation phase had a significant positive influence on satisfaction as expected from the literature by Langer (1994) and Moscardo (1996). The experience economy has been a dramatic shift from earlier economies such as: agrarian, goods-based, and service-oriented (Pine & Gilmore, 1998). Because the consumer participates in the creation of the experience, perhaps satisfaction for experience based purchases such as tourism is not simply an evaluation of the negative traits (Pine & Gilmore, 1998). Within the experience economy, the tourist has the opportunity to positively influence the experience and consequently be more satisfied with their trip.

While this study suggests that mindfulness during the anticipation phase does play an important role in the travel experience, it is certainly not the only variable that may have a significant influence on behavior, outcomes, and evaluation. For that reason, this study considered one mediating and two moderating variables to determine whether certain conditions enhanced or weakened the influence of mindfulness in the hypothesized relationships. The amount of the trip that was planned in advance was
tested as a mediating variable. The relationships that were significantly influenced by the amount of the trip planned in advance were between mindfulness and the planning horizon, the level of enjoyment, and the level of satisfaction. In each case, the positive influence of mindfulness was weakened with an increase in the amount of the trip planned in advance. This suggests that the benefit of being mindful during the anticipation phase for increasing the length of the planning horizon, the level of enjoyment, and the level of satisfaction is reduced simply by planning more of the trip in advance regardless of whether the tourist is mindfully or mindlessly planning. For destination managers, increasing the amount of the trip planned in advance may offer similar benefits to an increase in mindfulness while planning, especially if their goal is for tourists to be satisfied with their experience.

Tourism literature has discovered that the travel experience is different for repeat visitors compared to those who are visiting a destination for the first time especially in terms of their level of awareness for what is offered in the destination as well as their diversified demand for information about the destination (Oppermann, 1998). For that reason, this study included whether the tourist had previously visited the destination as a moderating variable to see if repeat visitation would influence the hypothesized relationships. The results indicated that whether the tourist had previously visited the destination had a significant impact on the influence of mindfulness on attitudinal loyalty. The positive influence of mindfulness on attitudinal loyalty was strengthened for tourists who were visiting a novel and unfamiliar destination. Perhaps repeat visitors already had a strong attitudinal commitment to the destination and therefore their level of mindfulness
during the anticipation phase for this particular trip was not as powerful as it was for tourists who had never visited the area before. In the case of first time visitors, mindfulness and actively searching for information and planning the trip resulted in higher degrees of attitudinal loyalty towards the destination.

Another moderating variable that was included was whether the tourist considered the area to be the primary destination for their trip. This question was included based on verbal feedback during the pre-test stages for tourists who admitted that the Charleston or Durango area was not their primary destination or interest during the anticipation phase. For that reason, a question was included to determine whether the area was their primary destination or whether they considered the area to be categorized differently such as: a side trip, a stop along the way, one of multiple destinations visited in the region, or one of multiple destinations visited in multiple regions (Chancellor & Cole, 2008; Rozier, 2005). The results of the multi-group moderation analysis indicated that whether the tourist considered the area to be their primary destination significantly influenced the relationship between mindfulness and the planning horizon. The higher degree of mindfulness for tourists who were visiting their primary destination was associated with longer planning horizon, revealing that they started to plan for the trip earlier than mindless tourists. The higher degree of mindfulness for tourists who were not visiting their primary destination was associated with a shorter planning horizon, meaning that they started planning closer to their departure date. Therefore, the relationships between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon depended on whether the tourist was in an area that they considered to be their primary destination.
Practical Implications

Destinations and tourism organizations strive to stay competitive in a global market. To do so, they must build and maintain a strong destination brand to survive the culling of potential destinations and make the short list of vacation choices. Previous research in mindfulness has provided support for the use of mindful information sources when the tourists are on site in the destination. Research has found that mindful tourists are more actively engaged in the destination (Frauman & Norman, 2004) experience greater learning and enjoyment (Kang & Gretzel, 2012), and exhibit more responsible tourism behaviors (Ganesan et al, 2014). The results of this study extend research on mindfulness to include the influence of mindfulness in the anticipation phase.

Destination managers are encouraged to promote mindfulness about their destination while tourists are still planning their trip. The precise methods for managers to promote mindfulness are outside the scope of this study. While the results of this exploratory research explain the benefits of tourists being mindful during the anticipation phase, explanatory research is necessary to understand and identify practical strategies that will help destination managers elicit mindfulness in their tourists. However the literature on the experience economy suggests strategies to promote active participation from customers to connect with the experience that is being promoted. For example, Pine and Gilmore (1998) identify five principles for designing memorable experiences: theme the experience, harmonize impressions with positive cues, eliminate negative cues, mix in memorabilia, and engage all five senses. Developing a promotional strategy that follows these principles has the potential to increase mindfulness during the anticipation phase.
In addition to promoting mindfulness and customer participation during the anticipation phase, there is also the possibility of introducing different market segments based on the tourist’s level of mindfulness during the anticipation phase and matching appropriate promotional strategies to each segment.

The results of this study show that the more mindful the tourists are during the anticipation phase, the more positive their trip evaluations will be in terms of satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty. Satisfaction has been shown to result in business profitability (Kozak, 2003) and developing relationships with loyal tourists who make repeat visits is shown to be more efficient than convincing tourists to make their first visit (Oppermann, 2000). Destination managers may underestimate the long-term importance of providing information sources that engage tourists while they are still in the anticipation phase and are narrowing down their options. While there is a direct link between effective marketing that convinces the tourists to choose their destination over others, this study suggests that there is an indirect link in that the overall trip evaluations are influenced by the tourism experience that begins in the first phase. If the goal is to develop relationships with satisfied and loyal tourists, this study encourages destination managers to begin building those relationships with tourists before they have arrived in the destination by promoting mindfulness in the information sources that they are distributing to the tourists in the anticipation phase. Research is needed to understand and identify the strategies for enhancing mindfulness for tourists who are in the anticipation phase.
Understanding the role that mindfulness plays in the anticipation phase will become increasingly important as the tourist has become a more active participant in the creation of their travel experience. Tourism in the post-modern world is transitioning through the use of new information technologies to allow for more flexible forms of accumulation (Ioannides & Debbage, 1997). Until the 1970s, Fordism focused on economies of scale through the mass production of homogenous goods (Ioannides & Debbage, 1997). There has been a paradigm shift in the post-Fordist mode of production, and more sophisticated tourists are now demanding novelty and product differentiation that meets the needs of specialized market niches (Ioannides & Debbage, 1997). While mindless tourists may still be interested in pre-packaged options that limit the cognitive cost of having to search for and bundle trip components, mindfulness during the anticipation phase may be associated with this desire for alternative experiences and the willingness to exert the effort required to plan a specialized trip that emphasizes their individuality and autonomy. Post-Fordism is associated with the balance between production and consumption where the tourists are no longer passive consumers of products and services that are created without their input. Rigid and standardized packages are no longer meeting the needs of mindful tourists in the post-Fordist era (Ioannides & Debbage, 1997).

This is consistent with the argument that post-Fordism and postmodernism are associated with the increasing heterogeneity of tourist behavior patterns (López-Bonilla & López-Bonilla, 2009). Postmodern consumers are no longer willing to accept a life that was constructed without their participation, but rather are willing to actively
transform their reality to match their preferred way of life (López-Bonilla & López-Bonilla, 2009). Specifically for tourists, access to the Internet has allowed them to participate in the creation of their travel experience. One study found that 26% of tourists reported behavior that was consistent with the postmodern profile of making travel arrangements themselves, searching for a variety of information sources, and reporting a high degree of satisfaction with their trip (López-Bonilla & López-Bonilla, 2009). It could be argued that these postmodern behaviors share similarities with tourists in the current study who reported a high degree of mindfulness while they were in the travel anticipation phase.

Another study elaborates on the importance of the Internet in trip planning. The shift towards postmodern behavior is reflected in the demand for less biased information and willingness to seek a variety of information sources in order to form a judgment based on the evaluation of multiple perspectives (Xiang, Wang, O’Leary, & Fesenmaier, 2014). The Internet has increased access to a variety of information sources along with the opportunity to be more mindful in the travel anticipation phase. The importance of traditional information sources is diminishing, particularly websites for Destination Management Organizations (Xiang et al., 2014). It has been argued that Destination Management Organizations must reestablish their online identity to become more relevant (Xiang et al., 2014). The results of this study suggest that carefully creating tourist information that promotes mindfulness could be a way for these websites to stay relevant in the postmodern world. Actively engaging tourists who are in the anticipation
phase may offer long term benefits in terms of satisfaction with the trip and loyalty to the destination.

**Limitations**

The intentions of the study were to apply appropriate scientific techniques to report reliable results. There were some areas of the study that limited the research from being a perfect measurement of the research questions. Previous research on the five travel phases has suggested that the optimal time to research each phase is when the tourist is in the phase in question (Huberty & Ross, 2012). Logistically, this study was unable to intercept the sample while they were still in the anticipation phase. The opportunity to survey tourists was available once they were already in the destination. The tourists were asked to reflect upon their experience in the anticipation phase and this presented the challenge of recall bias as the responses were only as accurate as the memories of the tourists. The study attempted to minimize recall bias by following common practices in tourism research and only asked about the anticipation phase for their current trip based on the assumption that recent or current information would be reported with less bias or inaccuracies (Jacobson & Munar, 2012; Snepenger, 1987).

Another limitation of the study was that the survey included questions about trip evaluation and tourists were asked to report their level of satisfaction with components of the trip and their intended behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty towards the destination. Ideally, the members of the sample would all be asked the evaluation questions at the same point near the end of their trip. The logistical opportunity to intercept the tourists at the site locations meant that the tourists could be completing the
survey at any point during their trip. Without being able to regulate at which point the tourist would complete the survey during their trip, the researcher created a control variable to account for the potential differences. Following the procedure outlined by Nawijn (2010), the tourists were asked the duration of their trip and which day of the trip it was at the moment they were completing the survey. A variable was then computed to determine the percentage of the trip that was completed at the time the survey was administered and this was used as a control variable while testing the hypotheses related to satisfaction, behavioral loyalty, and attitudinal loyalty.

Despite the benefit of collecting data from multiple sites (McKercher & Guillet, 2011), the two sites included in the study were significantly different on many of the variables included in the model. The length of the planning horizon and the size of the choice set were both significantly larger in Durango compared to Charleston. Behavioral loyalty and attitudinal loyalty were rated significantly higher in Charleston than Durango. While tourism destinations should be expected to vary in terms of what they offer, their target markets, and how they promote the destination to those segments, this study is limited in the fact that the two sites were not homogenous. Statistical techniques had to be utilized to account for the inconsistencies between the sites and a control variable was included in the hypothesis testing to maintain validity in the analysis of the relationships.

The study also had the potential for technological limitations because the surveys were administered using iPads. Statistical records were not kept to understand how many of the tourists who were approached and refused to complete the survey did so because they were uncomfortable using the iPad. Based on the researcher’s observations, some
comments were made that tourists had not brought their eyeglasses and could not read the survey, though this issue would have still been a problem if the survey had been administered on paper. An issue that was specific to the iPad was for tourists who were wearing prescription sunglasses that were polarized as the polarization would distort the iPad screen and they would be unable to complete the survey if they required their prescription glasses for reading. There were other issues with usability as some tourists seemed unfamiliar with how the touch screen functioned, how to advance pages, or how to populate open-ended boxes by tapping in the space to have the keyboard appear. The researcher witnessed one tourist turning the iPad over and around to look for a physical keyboard. The potential limitations for using iPads for survey administration must be balanced with the opportunities it offers in terms of its flexibility. The ability to collect data from a large sample without having to carry paper surveys and the ability to upload the data without having to worry about data entry errors were certainly indicative that the iPad offers many benefits for efficiency and sustainability.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study has been able to establish the importance of additional research on the influence of mindfulness in all phases of the tourism experience. Previous research has explored the influence of mindfulness in the third travel phase when the tourist is in the destination and this study has determined that mindfulness has a significant influence on the experience in the first travel phase, the period when the tourist is still planning for the trip and has not yet begun their travels. Future research should consider the influence of mindfulness during the three travel phases that have not yet been considered: the second
phase when the tourist is traveling to the destination, the fourth stage when the tourist is traveling home from the destination, and the fifth stage when the tourist is recollecting on their travel experience.

As previously mentioned, the most appropriate time to question tourists about their experience in a travel phase is when they are actually in that travel phase so researchers are encouraged to intercept travelers while they are at home and still planning their trip, while they are traveling to and from their destination, as well as reaching out to them once they have returned home and are in the recollection phase. Sampling techniques may be used to recruit tourists who are planning their trip during the anticipation phase by partnering with destinations and compiling contact information from tourists who have requested information. Another possibility would be to use social media monitoring to search for tourists who are posting messages online that reveal that they are in the anticipation phase with comments about how they are planning for or looking forward to their trip. Gaining permission from transportation hubs would allow researchers to gain access to tourists who are in the second and fourth stages involving the travel to and travel from the destination. Access to the travelers when they are utilizing transportation such as airlines, trains, busses, and rental cars would help capture a sample while they are in the phase in question. Partnering with hotels may open opportunities to recruit participants in the recollection phase as many hotels have automated feedback systems where previous guests are sent guest satisfaction surveys. A possibility exists to combine an invitation to participate in an academic research study within those messages. The recollection phase may be another opportunity to utilize
social media monitoring to search for tourists who are posting messages or photos online that indicate that they have recently returned from a trip.

Unexpected results were found related to the influence of mindfulness on the length of the planning horizon and the size of the choice set. Future research is encouraged to consider these relationships further to understand the inconsistent results between this study and previous research. Future studies are also encouraged to format questions related to the length of the planning horizon and the size of the choice set by providing forced choice nominal response categories. The questions in this study were formatted to promote open-ended numerical responses and perhaps the question style was a reason why the results failed to find a significant relationship between mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon and the size of the choice set. Another potential reason why the study failed to find a significant relationship with mindfulness and the length of the planning horizon is that they survey did not include additional question about trip characteristics. Fodness and Murray (1997) suggest that transportation mode or the number of destinations visited during the trip may have a significant influence on the length of the planning horizon. Future research should include questions about the mode of transportation and total number of destinations visited as these responses may be mediating the influence of mindfulness on the length of the planning horizon.

Another area that needs additional research is the understanding of advanced planning and the planning horizon. The results of this study support recent literature that claims that the planning horizon is growing shorter (Huh & Park, 2010). Additional research is needed to understand if there is a difference in the types of information
sources used for tourists with a long planning horizon compared to those with a shorter planning horizon. The variables necessary to analyze this relationship were not included in the research questions but are included in the existing data set. An extension of the current study will be to investigate the relationship between the length of the planning horizon and the various information sources. The proliferation of online tools and mobile applications may drive the planning horizon to continue to shrink, though research should consider which segments of the trip are still planned in advance compared to the segments of the trip for which tourists are willing to wait until they are in the destination to make a decision. Asking about planning horizons and advanced planning would benefit from the additional detail of understanding whether the recent shifts apply to all segments or whether transportation and accommodation are still planned in advance while dining and attractions may be more likely to be arranged after the tourist has arrived in the destination.

Future research should consider additional variables that were included in the data set but not included in the research questions for the current study. For example, the duration of the trip may be considered as a mediating variable as the influence of mindfulness on the travel experience may be governed by the length of the trip in days. Another consideration for a moderating variable would be the status of the traveler as a domestic or international traveler. The strength of the relationship between mindfulness and the travel experience may depend on whether the tourist was visiting from an international place of origin. Similarly, the distance traveled in miles was included in the data set and would help establish whether there is some variation in the domestic trips
depending on whether the traveler was visiting from a short or long distance. Another variable that could influence the relationship between mindfulness and the anticipation phase would be the status of the traveler as retired. Perhaps the anticipation phase is different for people who have potentially fewer constraints on their free time and have the opportunity to plan more mindfully by not having to navigate as many obstacles.

Repeat visitation also has the possibility of influencing behavior and outcomes of the anticipation phase. While some repeat visitors may have preferred that particular destination, others may simply have been spuriously loyal and chosen the destination because it saved them the cognitive cost of having to search for and evaluate a novel and unfamiliar destination (Backman & Crompton, 1991). This study did not distinguish between repeat visitors who are genuinely loyal and those who are spuriously loyal. Future research on the anticipation phase should make a distinction between repeat visitors based on whether destination was selected because of convenience or actual affection and commitment (Oppermann, 2000). It is likely that even within a set of repeat visitors, search behaviors and outcomes as well as trip evaluations could be different. Questions should be included to establish whether the repeat visitor is genuinely or spuriously loyal based on their varying motivations to revisit the destination.

While this study concluded that mindfulness during the anticipation phase influences the travel experience, the results do not provide support for specific strategies for promoting mindfulness in tourists. Future research should consider recommendations to managers for strategies that can be used to develop opportunities for tourists to be more mindfully engaged with promotional material during the anticipation phase. One
type of study that may be able to make such a contribution would be the use of
experimental design that divides subjects into groups and shows participants a variety of
promotional material using different strategies to determine whether advertising or
marketing initiatives have the ability to engage customers to the point when they become
more mindful. The subjects could be asked about their level of mindfulness before and
after viewing the promotional materials and experimental design would allow the
researchers to distinguish which types of promotions had the strongest positive change in
the level of mindfulness due to the marketing intervention. There is a need for research
to test marketing material that varies based on its verbal, visual, or mixed orientation to
determine which is preferred based on the tourists’ level of product knowledge, planning
capabilities, and the nature of the trip being planned (Vogt et al., 1994). The research by
Dijksterhuis and van Olden (2006) established that increasing conscious thought during a
consumption decision can be promoted by employing a prudential algebra technique
where the consumer identifies traits of a product and gives a numerical score to each trait
before making a purchase. Marketing strategies that incorporate prudential algebra and
other cognitively engaging techniques should be included as interventions in the
experimental design and the results should be compared to control groups to determine
whether such techniques have the ability to increase mindfulness more than traditional
marketing strategies.

The use of technology in future research will likely continue if not escalate as new
systems and devices are created. This study recommends the use of iPads or similar
technologies for data collection based on their flexibility and efficiency with large
samples. However, researchers are recommended to statistically track how many of the survey refusals are based on the technological administration. Depending on the sample, researchers may be encouraged to carry a limited number of paper surveys for those who are not technologically savvy or have difficulties reading the iPad screen. In this case, the sample size may be maximized though differences between results on the iPad and the paper surveys should be calculated and the possible inclusion of a control variable for the type of survey administration should be considered for hypothesis testing.
Appendix A

Recruitment Script

Good morning/afternoon, how are you today? I am doing research about tourism in Charleston/Durango for Clemson University. Would you mind please completing a survey while you wait for your carriage/train? Are you over the age of 18? Thank you and please let me know if you have any questions about the questions or how to work the iPad.
Appendix B

Survey Instrument

Charleston Text Version

1. How would you categorize yourself?
   a. I am a resident of the Charleston area (skip to 30)
   b. I am a visitor to the Charleston area

2. How would you categorize this trip to the Charleston area?
   a. Primarily business (skip to 30)
   b. Primarily pleasure

3. How long will you be staying in the Charleston area for this visit?
   a. 1 day/0 nights (skip to 6)
   b. 2 days/1 night
   c. 3 days/2 nights
   d. 4 days/3 nights
   e. 5 days/4 nights
   f. 6 days/5 nights
   g. 7 days/6 nights
   h. 8 days/7 nights
   i. Other ________________

4. Today is which day of your trip to the Charleston area?
   a. Day 1
   b. Day 2
   c. Day 3
   d. Day 4
   e. Day 5
   f. Day 6
   g. Day 7
   h. Day 8
   i. Other ________________

5. Are you paying for accommodations or staying with friends or family?
   a. Paying for accommodations
   b. Staying with friends and family
   c. Both
   d. Other ________________
6. Was the Charleston area your primary destination for this trip away from home?
   a. No
   b. Yes (skip to 8)

7. Which statement best categorizes your trip to the Charleston area?
   a. I stopped in the Charleston area on my way to or from my primary destination
   b. I stopped in the Charleston area as a side trip from my primary destination
   c. The Charleston area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in the region
   d. The Charleston area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in multiple regions
   e. Other ________________

8. How many people total are in your group for this visit to the Charleston area?
   a. 1 person (skip to 10)
   b. 2 people
   c. 3 people
   d. 4 people
   e. 5 people
   f. 6 people
   g. 7 people
   h. 8 people
   i. Other ________________

9. Are you traveling with children under the age of 18?
   a. No
   b. Yes

10. Approximately how many days in advance did you begin searching for information about the Charleston area for this trip?
    a. _______days

11. Think about the planning stage for your current trip and whether you made plans in advance or were still making plans after the trip had begun. Please indicate how much of the planning took place in advance (before the trip began) for each category. (sliding scale: None of the planning…All of the planning)
    a. Overall trip
    b. Accommodations
    c. Dining
    d. Attractions/Activities
12. Think about the planning stage for your current trip and whether you personally made the plans or whether someone else made the plans. Please indicate how much of the planning you personally did for each category. (sliding scale: None of the planning…All of the planning)
   a. Overall trip
   b. Accommodations
   c. Dining
   d. Attractions/Activities

13. Which information sources did you access to gain information about the Charleston area for your current visit?
   a. Previous experience
   b. Word of mouth from friends and family
   c. Internet websites
   d. Print media (magazines, newspapers, guidebooks, etc.)
   e. Television or Radio media (advertisements, travel shows, etc.)
   f. Mobile application (map, food finder, social media, etc.)
   g. Other _________________

14. Which online information sources did you access to gain information about the Charleston area for your current visit?
   a. Social media (i.e. facebook.com)
   b. Websites about the general Charleston area (i.e. discovercarolina.com)
   c. Websites with reviews from other travelers (i.e. tripadvisor.com)
   d. Websites for accommodations (i.e. marriott.com)
   e. Websites for dining options (i.e. 82queen.com)
   f. Websites for specific area attractions (i.e. scaquarium.org)
   g. Other _________________

15. How many other destinations did you seriously consider for this trip?
   a. 0- The Charleston area was my only choice
   b. 1
   c. 2
   d. 3
   e. 4
   f. 5
   g. 6
   h. 7
   i. Other _________________

16. How much enjoyment did you have in the planning process for this trip to the Charleston area? (slider scale)
   Very little enjoyment…Very much enjoyment
17. How confident are you that the Charleston area was the best choice for you for this trip? (slider scale)  
   Not at all confident…Very Confident

18. In general, how much do you agree with the following statements? (Strongly Disagree…Strongly Agree)  
   a. I like to investigate things  
   b. I am always open to new ways of doing things  
   c. I “get involved” in almost everything I do  
   d. I am very creative  
   e. I attend to the “big picture”  
   f. I am very curious  
   g. I try to think of new ways of doing things  
   h. I like to be challenged intellectually  
   i. I like to figure out how things work

19. Specifically, when searching for information about a vacation destination I like to… (Strongly Disagree…Strongly Agree)  
   a. Have my interest captured  
   b. Search for answers to questions I may have  
   c. Have my curiosity aroused  
   d. Inquire further about things in the destination  
   e. Explore and discover new things  
   f. Feel involved in what is going on around me

20. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements? (Strongly Disagree…Strongly Agree)  
   a. I intend to continue visiting the Charleston area in the future  
   b. I intend to visit the Charleston area again in the next 3 years  
   c. I would recommend the Charleston area as a vacation destination to others  
   d. I love visiting the Charleston area  
   e. I enjoy my time when I visit the Charleston area  
   f. I like the Charleston area more than other destinations

21. Overall, how satisfied have you been with your trip to the Charleston area? (slider scale)  
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied

22. How satisfied have you been with your accommodations so far on this trip? (slider scale)  
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied
23. How satisfied have you been with your dining experiences so far on this trip? (slider scale)
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied

24. How satisfied have you been with the attractions and/or activities you’ve experienced on this trip? (slider scale)
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied

25. How does the Charleston area, in general, rate compared to what you expected? (slider scale)
   Much worse than I expected…Much better than I expected

26. How would you rate the Charleston area as a vacation destination compared to similar places that you may have visited? (slider scale)
   Much worse…Much better

27. Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Charleston area in your lifetime?
   a. 0 times- This is my first visit (skip to 23)
   b. 1 time
   c. 2 times
   d. 3 times
   e. 4 times
   f. 5 times
   g. 6 times
   h. 7 times
   i. Other ________________

28. Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Charleston area in the last three years?
   a. 0 times
   b. 1 times
   c. 2 times
   d. 3 times
   e. 4 times
   f. 5 times
   g. 6 times
   h. 7 times
   i. Other ________________

29. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other ________________
30. What is your ethnicity?
   a. White, Caucasian
   b. Black, African American
   c. Hispanic, Latino
   d. Asian
   e. American Indian
   f. Other _________________

31. What is the highest grade of education that you’ve achieved?
   a. Grade school or some high school
   b. High school diploma or GED
   c. Technical, vocational or trade school
   d. Some college (includes junior college)
   e. Four year college (B.A., B.S., B.F.A.)
   f. Professional school (M.B.A, M.D., J.D.)
   g. Graduate School (M.A., M.S., Ph.D.)

32. What is your current employment status?
   a. Employed full-time
   b. Employed part-time
   c. Student
   d. Homemaker
   e. Retired
   f. Not employed
   g. Other

33. What is your current marital status?
   a. Single
   b. Married
   c. Living with partner
   d. Divorced or separated
   e. Widowed
   f. Other

34. What is your age?
   a. ______ years

35. If you live in the United States, please enter your home zip code? __________

36. If you do not live in the United States, please enter the name of your home country __________
Appendix C

Survey Instrument

Charleston iPad Version

Welcome to the survey. Touch the Start button to continue.

How would you categorize yourself?

☐ I am a resident of the Charleston area
☐ I am a visitor to the Charleston area

How would you categorize this trip to the Charleston area?

☐ Primarily business
☐ Primarily pleasure
How long will you be staying in the Charleston area for this visit?

- 1 day/0 nights
- 2 days/1 night
- 3 days/2 nights
- 4 days/3 nights
- 5 days/4 nights
- 6 days/5 nights
- 7 days/6 nights
- 8 days/7 nights
- Other

Today is which day of your trip to the Charleston area?

- Day 1
- Day 2
- Day 3
- Day 4
- Day 5
- Day 6
- Day 7
- Day 8
- Other

Are you paying for accommodations or staying with friends or family?

- Paying for accommodations
- Staying with friends and family
- Both
- Other
Was the Charleston area your primary destination for this trip away from home?

☐ No  ☐ Yes

Which statement best categorizes your trip to the Charleston area?

☐ I stopped in the Charleston area on my way to or from my primary destination
☐ I stopped in the Charleston area as a side trip from my primary destination
☐ The Charleston area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in the region
☐ The Charleston area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in multiple regions
☐ Other

How many people total are in your group for this visit to the Charleston area?

☐ 1 person  ☐ 2 people  ☐ 3 people  ☐ 4 people  ☐ 5 people  ☐ 6 people  ☐ 7 people  ☐ 8 people  ☐ Other
Which information sources did you access to gain information about the Charleston area for your current visit?

- Previous experience
- Word of mouth from friends and family
- Internet websites
- Print media (magazines, newspapers, guidebooks, etc.)
- Television or Radio media
- Mobile application (map, food finder, social media, etc.)
- Other

Which online information sources did you access to gain information about the Charleston area for your current visit?

- Social media (i.e. facebook.com)
- Websites about the general Charleston area (i.e. discoversouthcarolina.com)
- Websites with reviews from other travelers (i.e. tripadvisor.com)
- Websites for accommodations (i.e. marriott.com)
- Websites for dining options (i.e. 82queen.com)
- Websites for specific area attractions (i.e. scaquarium.org)
- Other
In general, how much do you agree with the following statements?

- I love to investigate things
- I am always open to new ideas
- I am very curious
- I like to think of new ways of doing things
- I like to be surprised
- I like to figure out how things work

Specifically, when searching for information about a vacation destination I like to...

- Make the Internet captured
- Search for answers to questions I have
- Make my curiosity aroused
- Investigate what things in the destination
- Impulse buy more than things in the destination
- Return readings from the destination

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements?

- I intend to continue visiting the Charleston area in the future
- I intend to visit the Charleston area again in the next 3 years
- I would recommend the Charleston area as a vacation destination to others
- I love visiting the Charleston area
- I plan to visit Charleston in the near future
- I like the Charleston area more than other destinations
Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Charleston area in your lifetime?

- [ ] 0 times - This is my first visit
- [ ] 1 time
- [ ] 2 times
- [ ] 3 times
- [ ] 4 times
- [ ] 5 times
- [ ] 6 times
- [ ] 7 times
- [ ] Other
Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Charleston area in the last three years?

- [ ] 0 times
- [ ] 1 time
- [ ] 2 times
- [ ] 3 times
- [ ] 4 times
- [ ] 5 times
- [ ] 6 times
- [ ] 7 times
- [ ] Other

What is your gender?

- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female
- [ ] Other

What is your ethnicity?

- [ ] White, Caucasian
- [ ] Black, African American
- [ ] Hispanic, Latino
- [ ] Asian
- [ ] American Indian
- [ ] Other
What is the highest grade of education that you've achieved?

- Grade school or some high school
- High school diploma or GED
- Technical, vocational or trade school
- Some college (includes junior college)
- Four year college (B.A., B.S., B.F.A.)
- Professional school (M.B.A., M.D., J.D.)
- Graduate School (M.A., M.S., Ph.D.)

What is your current employment status?

- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Student
- Homemaker
- Retired
- Not employed
- Other

What is your current marital status?

- Single
- Married
- Living with partner
- Divorced or separated
- Widowed
- Other
What is your age?

Thank you for completing the survey.
Appendix D

Old South Carriage Site Letter

Old South Carriage Company <info@oldsouthcarriage.com>
To: llobasc@clemson.edu

Dear Lorraine Lobascio,

Old South Carriage Tours agrees to allow you to use iPads to survey our customers in the waiting area of our barn in Charleston, SC for the current study you are conducting on tourism management for Clemson University. Per our conversation, you will provide us with a technical report of the results of the study in return for having access to our customers.

Sincerely,

Debbie Compton
Owner
Old South Carriage Company
14 Anson Street, Charleston, SC 29401
Phone: 843-723-9712
Fax: 843-722-2553
www.oldsouthcarriagetours.com
Appendix E
Classic Carriage Works Site Letter

Lorraine Lobascio <llobasc@g.clemson.edu>  
To: bjc@classiccarriage.com

Good afternoon Broderick,
I am a PhD student at Clemson University studying Travel and Tourism Management. I am looking to collect survey data for my dissertation at tourist sites in Charleston this summer. I am wondering if it would be possible to station myself at your location and ask your customers to complete a survey on an iPad while they wait to board their carriage. The survey will take no longer than 5 minutes and will ask questions related to how many times they have visited Charleston and what information sources they used to learn about Charleston. In return for having access to your customers, I would be happy to provide you with a copy of the final report so you can see the results. Please let me know if this something that you would be interested in. Thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Lorraine Lobascio  
Graduate Assistant  
Clemson University  
Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management  
128 McGinty Court  
267 Lehotsky Hall  
Clemson, SC 29634  
mobile: 302.353.0868  
email: llobasc@clemson.edu

"Education's purpose is to replace an empty mind with an open one." - Fortune Cookie
Broderick Christoff <bjc@classiccarriage.com>  
To: Lorraine Lobascio <llobasc@g.clemson.edu>  

Hello. That would be fine with me and sounds interesting as well. When would you like to do it?

Broderick Christoff  
Classic Carriage Works, LLC.  
GM/DO  843.853.3747  
classiccarriage.com

Lorraine Lobascio <llobasc@g.clemson.edu>  
To: Broderick Christoff <bjc@classiccarriage.com>  

Hi Broderick,

Thank you for your quick response and I appreciate your consideration. I have to get formal approval from the research board at Clemson before I move forward but I am looking at June 9-13 or June 18-22. Please let me know if you have any conflicts with these days and I will keep you posted when the approval comes through.

Thanks again,  
Lorraine

Broderick Christoff <bjc@classiccarriage.com>  
To: Lorraine Lobascio <llobasc@g.clemson.edu>  

Either is fine with us. Just let me know...
Appendix F

IRB Approval Letter

Nalinee Patin < NPATIN@clemson.edu>            Thu, Jun 20, 2013 at 9:34 AM
To: William Norman <WNORMAN@clemson.edu>
Cc: Lorraine Lobascio <llobasc@g.clemson.edu>

Dear Dr. Norman,

The Clemson University Office of Research Compliance (ORC) reviewed the protocol identified above using exempt review procedures and a determination was made on June 20, 2013 that the proposed activities involving human participants qualify as Exempt under category B2, based on federal regulations 45 CFR 46. This exemption is valid for all organizations with a research site letter on file. Your protocol will expire on May 31, 2014.

Please note that Lorraine Lobascio’s CITI training will expire on August 20, 2013. Ms. Lobascio has to complete the refresher course for “Group1 Investigators Conducting Social and Behavioral Science Research (SBR) at Clemson University” before the expiration date. The course is available online at www.citiprogram.org. As of June 1, 2013, the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) started assign expiration dates to all IRB exempt protocols. The expiration date indicated above was based on the completion date you entered on the IRB application. If an extension is necessary, the PI should submit an Exempt Protocol Extension Request form, http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/forms.html, at least three weeks before the expiration date. Please refer to our website for more information on the new procedures, http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/guidance/reviewprocess.html.

No change in this approved research protocol can be initiated without the IRB’s approval. This includes any proposed revisions or amendments to the protocol or consent form. Any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects, any complications, and/or any adverse events must be reported to the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) immediately. All team members are required to review the “Responsibilities of Principal Investigators” and the “Responsibilities of Research Team Members” available at http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/regulations.html.

The Clemson University IRB is committed to facilitating ethical research and protecting the rights of human subjects. Please contact us if you have any questions and use the IRB number and title in all communications regarding this study.
Good luck with your study.

All the best,
Nalinee
Nalinee D. Patin
IRB Coordinator
Clemson University
Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Voice: (864) 656-0636
Fax: (864) 656-4475
E-mail: npatin@clemson.edu
Website: http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/
IRB E-mail: irb@clemson.edu
Confidentiality Notice: This message is intended for the use of the individual to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify us by reply mail and delete the original message.
Appendix G

Survey Instrument

Durango Text Version

1. How would you categorize yourself?
   a. I am a resident of the Durango area (skip to 30)
   b. I am a visitor to the Durango area

2. How would you categorize this trip to the Durango area?
   a. Primarily business (skip to 30)
   b. Primarily pleasure

3. How long will you be staying in the Durango area for this visit?
   a. 1 day/0 nights (skip to 6)
   b. 2 days/1 night
   c. 3 days/2 nights
   d. 4 days/3 nights
   e. 5 days/4 nights
   f. 6 days/5 nights
   g. 7 days/6 nights
   h. 8 days/7 nights
   i. Other ____________________

4. Today is which day of your trip to the Durango area?
   a. Day 1
   b. Day 2
   c. Day 3
   d. Day 4
   e. Day 5
   f. Day 6
   g. Day 7
   h. Day 8
   i. Other ____________________

5. Are you paying for accommodations or staying with friends or family?
   a. Paying for accommodations
   b. Staying with friends and family
   c. Both
   d. Other ____________________
6. Was the Durango area your primary destination for this trip away from home?
   a. No
   b. Yes (skip to 8)

7. Which statement best categorizes your trip to the Durango area?
   a. I stopped in the Durango area on my way to or from my primary destination
   b. I stopped in the Durango area as a side trip from my primary destination
   c. The Durango area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in the region
   d. The Durango area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in multiple regions
   e. Other _________________

8. How many people total are in your group for this visit to the Durango area?
   a. 1 person (skip to 10)
   b. 2 people
   c. 3 people
   d. 4 people
   e. 5 people
   f. 6 people
   g. 7 people
   h. 8 people
   i. Other _________________

9. Are you traveling with children under the age of 18?
   a. No
   b. Yes

10. Approximately how many days in advance did you begin searching for information about the Durango area for this trip?
    a. ________days

11. Think about the planning stage for your current trip and whether you made plans in advance or were still making plans after the trip had begun. Please indicate how much of the planning took place in advance (before the trip began) for each category. (sliding scale: None of the planning...All of the planning)
    a. Overall trip
    b. Accommodations
    c. Dining
    d. Attractions/Activities
12. Think about the planning stage for your current trip and whether you personally made the plans or whether someone else made the plans. Please indicate how much of the planning you personally did for each category. (sliding scale: None of the planning…All of the planning)
   a. Overall trip
   b. Accommodations
   c. Dining
   d. Attractions/Activities

13. Which information sources did you access to gain information about the Durango area for your current visit?
   a. Previous experience
   b. Word of mouth from friends and family
   c. Internet websites
   d. Print media (magazines, newspapers, guidebooks, etc.)
   e. Television or Radio media (advertisements, travel shows, etc.)
   f. Mobile application (map, food finder, social media, etc.)
   g. Other __________________

14. Which online information sources did you access to gain information about the Durango area for your current visit?
   a. Social media (i.e. facebook.com)
   b. Websites about the general Durango area (i.e. durango.org)
   c. Websites with reviews from other travelers (i.e. tripadvisor.com)
   d. Websites for accommodations (i.e. strater.com)
   e. Websites for dining options (i.e. kenandsues.com)
   f. Websites for specific area attractions (i.e. durangotrain.com)
   g. Other __________________

15. How many other destinations did you seriously consider for this trip?
   a. 0- The Durango area was my only choice
   b. 1
   c. 2
   d. 3
   e. 4
   f. 5
   g. 6
   h. 7
   i. Other __________________

16. How much enjoyment did you have in the planning process for this trip to the Durango area? (slider scale)
   Very little enjoyment…Very much enjoyment
17. How confident are you that the Durango area was the best choice for you for this trip? (slider scale)
   Not at all confident…Very Confident

18. In general, how much do you agree with the following statements? (Strongly Disagree…Strongly Agree)
   a. I like to investigate things
   b. I am always open to new ways of doing things
   c. I “get involved” in almost everything I do
   d. I am very creative
   e. I attend to the “big picture”
   f. I am very curious
   g. I try to think of new ways of doing things
   h. I like to be challenged intellectually
   i. I like to figure out how things work

19. Specifically, when searching for information about a vacation destination I like to… (Strongly Disagree…Strongly Agree)
   a. Have my interest captured
   b. Search for answers to questions I may have
   c. Have my curiosity aroused
   d. Inquire further about things in the destination
   e. Explore and discover new things
   f. Feel involved in what is going on around me

20. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements? (Strongly Disagree…Strongly Agree)
   a. I intend to continue visiting the Durango area in the future
   b. I intend to visit the Durango area again in the next 3 years
   c. I would recommend the Durango area as a vacation destination to others
   d. I love visiting the Durango area
   e. I enjoy my time when I visit the Durango area
   f. I like the Durango area more than other destinations

21. Overall, how satisfied have you been with your trip to the Durango area? (slider scale)
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied

22. How satisfied have you been with your accommodations so far on this trip? (slider scale)
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied
23. How satisfied have you been with your dining experiences so far on this trip? (slider scale)
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied

24. How satisfied have you been with the attractions and/or activities you’ve experienced on this trip? (slider scale)
   Not at all satisfied…Very Satisfied

25. How does the Durango area, in general, rate compared to what you expected? (slider scale)
   Much worse than I expected…Much better than I expected

26. How would you rate the Durango area as a vacation destination compared to similar places that you may have visited? (slider scale)
   Much worse…Much better

27. Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Durango area in your lifetime?
   a. 0 times- This is my first visit (skip to 23)
   b. 1 times
   c. 2 times
   d. 3 times
   e. 4 times
   f. 5 times
   g. 6 times
   h. 7 times
   i. Other ___________________

28. Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Durango area in the last three years?
   a. 0 times
   b. 1 times
   c. 2 times
   d. 3 times
   e. 4 times
   f. 5 times
   g. 6 times
   h. 7 times
   i. Other ___________________

29. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other ___________________
30. What is your ethnicity?
   a. White, Caucasian
   b. Black, African American
   c. Hispanic, Latino
   d. Asian
   e. American Indian
   f. Other ___________________

31. What is the highest grade of education that you’ve achieved?
   a. Grade school or some high school
   b. High school diploma or GED
   c. Technical, vocational or trade school
   d. Some college (includes junior college)
   e. Four year college (B.A., B.S., B.F.A.)
   f. Professional school (M.B.A, M.D., J.D.)
   g. Graduate School (M.A., M.S., Ph.D.)

32. What is your current employment status?
   a. Employed full-time
   b. Employed part-time
   c. Student
   d. Homemaker
   e. Retired
   f. Not employed
   g. Other

33. What is your current marital status?
   a. Single
   b. Married
   c. Living with partner
   d. Divorced or separated
   e. Widowed
   f. Other

34. What is your age?
   a. ______ years

35. If you live in the United States, please enter your home zip code? _________

36. If you do not live in the United States, please enter the name of your home country _________
Appendix H

Survey Instrument

Durango iPad Version

Welcome to the survey. Touch the Start button to continue.

How would you categorize yourself?

- I am a resident of the Durango area
- I am a visitor to the Durango area

How would you categorize this trip to the Durango area?

- Primarily business
- Primarily pleasure
How long will you be staying in the Durango area for this visit?

- 1 day/0 nights
- 2 days/1 night
- 3 days/2 nights
- 4 days/3 nights
- 5 days/4 nights
- 6 days/5 nights
- 7 days/6 nights
- 8 days/7 nights
- Other

Today is which day of your trip to the Durango area?

- Day 1
- Day 2
- Day 3
- Day 4
- Day 5
- Day 6
- Day 7
- Day 8
- Other

Are you paying for accommodations or staying with friends or family?

- Paying for accommodations
- Staying with friends and family
- Both
- Other
Was the Durango area your primary destination for this trip away from home?

- No
- Yes

Which statement best categorizes your trip to the Durango area?

- I stopped in the Durango area on my way to or from my primary destination
- I stopped in the Durango area as a side trip from my primary destination
- The Durango area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in the region
- The Durango area is one of multiple destinations that I am visiting in multiple regions
- Other

How many people total are in your group for this visit to the Durango area?

- 1 person
- 2 people
- 3 people
- 4 people
- 5 people
- 6 people
- 7 people
- 8 people
- Other
Are you traveling with children under the age of 18?

- No
- Yes

Approximately how many days in advance did you begin searching for information about the Durango area for this trip?

Enter Number

Information

[Table showing the planning process with sliders for Overall Trip, Accommodations, Driving, and Attractions/Activities]
Which information sources did you access to gain information about the Durango area for your current visit?

☐ Previous experience
☐ Word of mouth from friends and family
☐ Internet websites
☐ Print media (magazines, newspapers, guidebooks, etc.)
☐ Television or Radio media (advertisements, travel shows, etc.)
☐ Mobile application (map, food finder, social media, etc.)
☐ Other

Which online information sources did you access to gain information about the Durango area for your current visit?

☐ Social media (i.e. facebook.com)
☐ Websites about the general Durango area (i.e. durango.org)
☐ Websites with reviews from other travelers (i.e. tripadvisor.com)
☐ Websites for accommodations (i.e. strafler.com)
☐ Websites for dining options (i.e. kerandsues.com)
☐ Websites for specific area attractions (i.e. durangotrains.com)
☐ Other
How many other destinations did you seriously consider for this trip?

- 0: The Durango area was my only choice
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- Other

How much enjoyment did you have in the planning process for this trip to the Durango area?

How confident are you that the Durango area was the best choice for you for this trip?
In general, how much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like to investigate things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am always open to new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get bored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the big picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very curious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to think of new ways of doing things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is an adventure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to figure out how things work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, when searching for information about a vacation destination I like to...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More day-to-day captured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend time researching brands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More city socially engaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More细节 about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More details about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More things to see</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like to continue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to discuss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More details about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reasons to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More details about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reasons to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Durango area in your lifetime?

- 0 times - This is my first visit
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 times
- 4 times
- 5 times
- 6 times
- 7 times
- Other
Not including your current visit, approximately how many times have you previously visited the Durango area in the last three years?

- 0 times
- 1 time
- 2 times
- 3 times
- 4 times
- 5 times
- 6 times
- 7 times
- Other

What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other

What is your ethnicity?

- White, Caucasian
- Black, African American
- Hispanic, Latino
- Asian
- American Indian
- Other
What is the highest grade of education that you've achieved?

- Grade school or some high school
- High school diploma or GED
- Technical, vocational or trade school
- Some college (includes junior college)
- Four year college (B.A., B.S., B.F.A.)
- Professional school (M.B.A., M.D., J.D.)
- Graduate School (M.A., M.S., Ph.D.)

What is your current employment status?

- Employed full-time
- Employed part-time
- Student
- Homemaker
- Retired
- Not employed
- Other

What is your current marital status?

- Single
- Married
- Living with partner
- Divorced or separated
- Widowed
- Other
What is your age?

Thank you for completing the survey.

Finish
Appendix I

Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad Site Letter

Clemson University

Andrea Seid <aseid@durangotrain.com>  Mon, Jul 29, 2013 at 3:54 PM
To: Lorraine Lobascio <llobasc@g.clemson.edu>

Dear Lorraine Lobascio,

The Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad & Museum agrees to allow you to survey our customers on our site for the current research study you are conducting about tourism through Clemson University. Per our agreement, you will provide us with a technical report based on the results of the study in return for having access to our customers on our site.

Andrea Seid
Marketing Manager
479 Main Ave.
Durango, CO 81301
970-385-8829
Fax: 970-385-8877
www.durangotrain.com
Dear Dr. Norman,

Your amendment to add another site to the study has been approved. You may begin to implement this amendment. No change in this approved research protocol can be initiated without the IRB’s approval. This includes any proposed revisions or amendments to the protocol or consent form. Any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects, any complications, and/or any adverse events must be reported to the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) immediately. We also ask that you notify the ORC when your study is completed or terminated. Please let us know if you have any questions and use the IRB number and title in all communications regarding this study.

All the best,
Nalinee

Nalinee D. Patin
IRB Coordinator
Clemson University
Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Voice: (864) 656-0636
Fax: (864) 656-4475
E-mail: npatin@clemson.edu
Website: http://www.clemson.edu/research/compliance/irb/
IRB E-mail: irb@clemson.edu

Confidentiality Notice: This message is intended for the use of the individual to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify us by reply mail and delete the original message.
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