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The United States experienced an economic recession starting in 2008, which affected the local people, businesses, gas prices and the ability to travel and spend money on luxury goods (Fox, 2009). Americans wanted to continue to travel and began taking a ‘staycation’ as an alternative solution (Sharma, 2009). For the purposes of this study a staycation is defined as “taking one overnight leisure trip/vacation within a 50-mile radius of one’s home” (Yesawich, 2010). Because there are no empirical studies on staycations to date, the current study analyses the lifestyle profiles of staycation travelers by using Activities, Interests, and Opinions statements to segment and profile staycation travelers, then create travel packages for lodging providers to market. A total of 297 students were surveyed at a Midwestern university. Results showed six factors were extracted from factor analysis and created four clusters. Travel packages were created for the four clusters and limitations and future research were discussed.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

When the U.S. economy experienced a downturn in 2008, it affected the local people, businesses, gas prices and the ability to travel and spend money on luxury goods (Fox, 2009). Since it would be “un-American” not to travel, people had to find alternative solutions (Sharma, 2009). One alternative to traveling became something known as a ‘staycation’. The term was first used in 2003 by Terry Massey in the Myrtle Beach Sun-News. He was describing the nine days he spent at home in Myrtle Beach watching sports and setting up a nursery for a new baby he and his wife were expecting (Doll, 2013). The word has been documented in other articles from 2004-2006 but it did not become popular until 2009 after the recession occurred in 2008 (Doll, 2013).

According to Fox (2009), a staycation is “a vacation that is spent at one’s home enjoying that entire home and [all] one’s home environs have to offer” (p.3). Sharma (2009) defines a staycation as a “neologism that refers to the activity of making a vacation out of staying at home.” Yesawich (2010) provides a clearer definition of a staycation stating it consists of at least one overnight leisure trip/vacation within a 50-mile drive radius of their home.

Due to the increasing popularity of staycations, cities and states have begun promotions to attract customers and keep people spending their money in the country instead of overseas. The U.S. wants to give people the feeling of “being away” while staying in their home state or city. For example, New Orleans has had a hard time getting
businesses to come down for conferences during the peak hurricane season in August and September after Hurricane Katrina hit (Stein, 2012). Since then they have been offering more programs and promotions to attract local consumers. One program includes “Coolinary” which offers guests three course dinners for less than $34 at select restaurants throughout the city (Stein, 2012). According to Bracco (2013), tourism bureaus were promoting package vacations to people in their city and surrounding states which centered on local tourist attractions such as the zoo and museums. Hotels also have begun to offer staycation discounts by partnering with local businesses (Bracco, 2013). For example, the Fairmont Hotels used social media to spread the word and use the promotion posing the question “Spring is a great time for a staycation. Did you know many hotels offer special resident rates/discounts for locals?” (Bracco, 2013). Forming partnerships with local businesses can help promote the area and generate more interest.

For instance, the Utah Valley Convention and Visitor’s Bureau had offered a “Ski & Stay” package at Robert Redford’s Sundance Resort which included 20% off hotel and 10% off lift tickets (Bracco, 2013). Being able to offer a package to travelers requires them to do less planning and more enjoying especially while on vacation during difficult times.

The demand for staycations increased after the recession hit the U.S. economy. Local tourism is often overlooked by marketers; however, when the recession started, staycations were marketed to the middle class because they were affordable and within driving distance (Kay & Yawei, 2010). The distance between the destination and the consumer has a significant impact on the number of travelers going to that specific
location (Crampon, 1966). The “gravitation model” created by Crampon (1966) is based on the concept that a measurable relationship exists between the number of visitors arriving at a given destination from specific markets and a series of independent variables. The two most important variables are the size of the population of the market area and the distance between the destination and that market. Promoting staycations to the middle class was an innovative way to keep people traveling and spending money but within a short distance and on a small budget.

Some authors have set parameters on the distance of travel, whereas others leave the distance of travel very vague or up to interpretation. According to Yesawich (2010), the Ypartnership/Harrison Group 2010 Portrait of American Travelers poll found 1 in 4 U.S. travelers with an annual household income of more than $50,000 took at least one overnight leisure trip/vacation within a 50-mile drive radius of their home during the previous 12 months as an alternative vacation. The poll considered travel within a 50-mile radius from the traveler’s home as a staycation. On the other hand, Sharma (2009) states that when taking a staycation the family’s home undergoes various changes to accommodate a vacation-style environment, free of chores and days packed with activities. In this case the distance is minimal and the staycation takes place directly at the family or person’s home rather than an outside environment. Based on Fox’s (2009) and Sharma’s (2009) definitions, a staycation can be at the vacationer’s home itself or involve only a few miles of travel.

Because the idea of staycations is relatively new, empirical studies on consumer behavior for this market are unavailable. To keep up with people’s wants and needs,
lifestyle segmentation can be conducted and used to enhance the quality of the product and provide a more in-depth view of the variables influencing consumers’ behavior (Gonzalez & Bello, 2002). Price is one of the underlying factors of taking a staycation, but marketers need to understand the other variables that influence the consumer’s decision to travel locally rather than take a traditional vacation (Fox, 2009; Kruse, 2009; Stein, 2012). According to Thyne, Davies, and Nash (2005), the assumption in marketing is that consumer’s lifestyles will greatly impact and influence their consumption behavior. If lodging providers were to use lifestyle segmentation, it could provide “useful information on the specific consumption [in certain] contexts and general consumption patterns” (Scott & Parfitt, 2005, p. 137).

According to Plummer (1974), lifestyle segmentation classifies people instead of products into different lifestyle types with each type characterized by living styles based on a wide range of activities, interests, and opinions (AIO). Lifestyle was first operationalized by Wells and Tigert (1971) by identifying Activities, Interests, and Opinions (AIO) rating statements (Plummer, 1974). This model measures people’s activities in terms of “(1) how they spend their time; (2) their interests, what they place importance on in their immediate surroundings; (3) their opinions in terms of their view of themselves and the world around them; and (4) some basic characteristics such as their stage in life cycle, income, education and where they live” (Plummer, 1974, p. 33). Understanding the lifestyles of the consumers will help with marketing and communicating more effectively to them. Lifestyle segmentation makes the consumer the focus rather than the product (Plummer, 1974).
Using the AIO model to segment the market comes with many benefits. It can provide new definitions to common demographic and product usage terms because it demonstrates the diversity of the definitions by adding another dimension to the target market (Plummer, 1974). It redefines the target market and can uncover information that would not be found otherwise such as merging certain demographics together to create a new market segment (Plummer, 1974). Gathering lifestyle information from consumers can also create potential for new products. Since the data can show the needs and types of people and the potential population of the market, the existing products can be examined to see if it is meeting the consumer’s needs (Plummer, 1974). It can also explain why a product is doing well or poorly on the market. Understanding a segment’s lifestyle and usage patterns allows marketers to realize why consumers use or do not use a specific product (Plummer, 1974).

Aziz and Ariffin (2009) explain that “lifestyle allows travel marketers to create a travel package that is more compatible with the motivations, attitudes, and opinions of the tourists” (p. 98). These choices can create more options for market segmentation strategies and focus on the fact that a tourist’s chosen lifestyle determines the types of products purchased, as well as the specific brands they choose based on their lifestyle segmentation (Aziz & Ariffin, 2009).

The goal of this study is to understand lifestyle patterns of staycation travelers in order to be able to segment the market and create customized packages for each segment. The specific research objectives are as follows:
1. To understand the lifestyles of staycation travelers using the Activities, Interests and Opinions (AIO) model

2. To segment and profile staycation travelers; and

3. To create staycation packages for each of the identified segments

By understanding the lifestyles of the staycation market, marketers can more effectively and efficiently use their resources to target these specific travelers. It is not enough to know just the demographic and product usage of this segment; the lifestyle component enhances the profile image of the market segment and helps marketers communicate better with the audience (Plummer, 1974). Lifestyle segmentation creates an identity for a market and gathers the common characteristics that create this segment making it easier for marketers to create packages and use the most appropriate ads to attract them (Plummer, 1974; Lin, 2003). The results of this study will improve marketing strategies used towards staycation travelers and could help lodging providers create packages that will attract consumers. Suggestions on the most effective marketing strategies and creation of packages could benefit lodging managers and marketers create another source of revenue from a niche target market. Researchers can also benefit from this study because there is no research done on staycation travelers or the marketing strategies used to target them.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature is divided into two main sections: staycations and lifestyle segmentation. The term ‘staycation’ is a relatively new idea with very little research done on the topic. This section is divided into five subsections; definition and characteristics of staycation, purpose of taking a staycation, economic impact of staycations, staycation market, and promoting staycations. The next section, segmentation, is divided into six subsections; definition of segmentation, purpose and benefits of segmentation, themes related to segmentation, segmentation bases, definition, benefits, and shortcomings of lifestyle segmentation, and lifestyle segmentation research in the hospitality and tourism industry.

Staycation

Staycation Definition and Characteristics

Americans have been taking summer vacations since the early 1900s and it started out with auto-camping. Soon it turned into more extravagant trips where people would fly to their destinations instead of drive (Fox, 2009). Starting in 2008, since many Americans could not afford a typical vacation due to a receding economy, increasing gas prices, and unaffordable air travel, people began taking what is called a “staycation” (“Vacations are on the rise”, 2011). Due to this, more cities began targeting local consumers by advertising and promoting what they have to offer and making this a more appealing option for travel.
To fully understand the term ‘staycation’ it needs to be more clearly defined. Wixon (2009) defines a staycation as “a vacation in which the vacationer stays at home, or near home, while creating the environment of a traditional vacation” (p. 2). Vackova (2009) provides a similar definition stating a staycation is where travelers stay at home rather than travel to another destination and use that time to explore the local environment; such as staying in a city hotel or exploring the countryside near their home. Some authors have set parameters on the distance of travel, whereas others leave the distance of travel very vague or up to interpretation. According to Yesawich (2010), research was conducted by the Ypartnership/Harrison Group to find out if people were actually taking staycations. The study concluded “one in four U.S. leisure travelers with an annual household income of more than $50,000 took at least one overnight leisure trip/vacation within a 50-mile drive radius of their home during the previous 12 months as an alternative to vacationing in a farther destination” (Yesawich, 2010, p. 25). On the other hand, Sharma (2009) stated when taking a staycation, the family’s home undergoes various changes to accommodate a vacation-style environment that includes days free of chores and packed with activities. People should refrain from checking their work e-mail accounts while at home because it defeats the purpose of being on vacation (Alban, 2008). In this case the distance is minimal and the staycation takes place directly at the family or person’s home rather than an outside environment. For the purposes of this study, the definition provided by Yesawich (2010) will be used. Gaining a better understanding of the term ‘staycation’ can help marketers decide which strategies to use such as source of media, type(s) of activities to focus on, and willingness to pay by
consumers (Alexander, Lee & Kim, 2011). Also, understanding the distance traveled by staycation travelers can make marketing more effective and aimed directly at the market segment (Alexander et al., 2011). Various promotion strategies such as slogans and discount packages have been used by states and cities to attract consumers on a budget.

**Purpose of Taking a Staycation**

In 2009, the idea of taking a vacation at home started to become popular due to the drastic increase in gas prices and an economy in recession (Sharma, 2009). The author discussed stillness and how it has resulted in people being stuck in front of their television. Americans are used to being able to move about freely and with gas being expensive it was more difficult for people to get where they needed to go. Since people were not leaving their houses and not spending any money it essentially put a stop to the economy (Sharma, 2009). The staycation provided a way for Americans to get the feeling of being mobile while saving money and having the comforts of home.

In 2011 to help keep visitors in the United States and spending their money here instead of globally, Corporation for Travel Promotion, a public-private partnership created by Congress, provided a job opening to ‘Brand USA’ (Ives & Klaassen, 2011). The purpose of this position was to create a better reputation of the United States worldwide and attract more visitors on a $200 million budget. The United States has been missing out on tourism revenue due to the fact that it cannot keep pace with the growth of the international travel market. According to Ives and Klaassen (2011), “Our failure to simply keep pace with this growth has cost the U.S. an estimated $68 million ‘lost’ arrivals, $509 billion in total spending, $32 billion in direct tax receipts and
441,000 travel-related jobs that could have been created or sustained in the years over the past decade” (p. 2). To capitalize on the fact that people were staying in the U.S., promoting staycations could help bring in more revenue for the country (Cole, 2008; Kruse, 2009; Sharma, 2009; VisitEngland, n.d.). Most people do not take the time to discover what is in their own city and are quick to jet-set off to another destination (Bracco, 2013; Cole, 2008).

**Economic Impacts**

Staycations brought in a number of positive impacts to the economy all over the United States and Europe. Some of the attractions that are considered staycation attractions include: county fairs, festivals, camping, and promotions for local restaurants and hotels (Alexander, Lee, & Kim, 2011; Anderson, 2009; Bloom, Johnson, & Yurdakul, 2009; Ellis, 2010; Lacho, & Kiefer, 2008). Developing these attractions and promoting them during the recession generated more interest for people to travel locally and save money while still vacationing (Alexander et al., 2011). A description of some staycation attractions along with their economic impact is discussed below.

**County fairs and festivals.** In 2009, more than 77,000 people went to the Common Ground festival in Lansing, Michigan generating $5 million dollars for the city (Bloom et al., 2009). The attendance was down by five percent from the year before but the city was still able to bring in a few million dollars during the recession. The San Diego County Fair in California attracted 1.3 million people by selling half price “season tickets” for the fair (Bloom et al., 2009). Even during the recession, people still found ways to go to the fair, and some went because they could not afford a long vacation...
(Bloom et al., 2009). The Clark County Fair in Washington put their fairgrounds management staff together to create events all year round and capitalize on the recession (Anderson, 2009). All together the fairgrounds totaled 293 event days between the county fair, amphitheater, exhibition hall and equestrian arena for a total attendance of 545,850 and an economic impact of $40 million from direct and indirect sources (Anderson, 2009). Generating that amount of money for the city is tremendous especially during the recession. The challenge is to keep the sales up and people coming to the fair and events in order to cover operating costs and generate income for the city. A study done by Alexander et al. (2011) found a relationship between the likelihood of festival visitors staying overnight, distance of travel, and the average amount of money spent at the festival. It was found that visitors traveling 100 miles or more to the festival were more likely to stay overnight and spend an average of $181.58 on retail items (Alexander et al., 2011). Knowing this information can help other festival directors target their market more effectively and bring in more revenue for the city. Festivals and fairs are a huge revenue booster for cities because each one is unique and often a tradition for most families (Bloom et al., 2009). It promotes local travel and brings people together while supporting local businesses as well as the economy.

**Camping.** In the United Kingdom, there was an increase in camping and caravanning in 2008 when the recession hit (Ellis, 2010). Camping alone accounted for 4.21 million trips, 14.55 million overnight stays, and an overall spending of 513 million pounds (Ellis, 2010). Caravanning brought in 3.89 million trips, 19.14 million overnight stays and 556 million pounds in spending (Ellis, 2010). There was an 8% increase in
occupancy rates from 2008 to 2009, and the overnight stays for caravanning nearly doubled to 6 million in 2009. Needless to say, the camping and caravanning sector in the UK brought in a large amount of revenue for the country and in some ways began new lifestyles for some families (Ellis, 2010).

**Attraction promotions.** Various attractions such as museums, restaurants and hotels brought in revenue for cities. In an effort to bring in revenue to the city of New Orleans, a study was done by Lacho and Kiefer (2008) to develop a low cost promotion budget with the assistance of trade associations and boost the economy after Hurricane Katrina hit. The New Orleans Metropolitan Convention and Visitors Bureau (NOMCVB) and the Louisiana Restaurant Association (LRA) were the two trade associations who helped develop a promotion strategy for the city (Lacho & Kiefer, 2008). It included a $5.2 million national summer campaign aimed towards staycation and leisure travelers in the city and surrounding cities. Another major promotion was the Creole Skillet fine dining restaurant was being promoted through the NOMCVB website offering discounts (Lacho & Kiefer, 2008). Overall the total cost for promotion was $1,600 which was very cost effective for the restaurant and benefited both the NOMCVB and restaurant. Using the services from the NOMCVB cut down on major costs for the Creole Skillet restaurant and helped bring in money to the economy (Lacho & Kiefer, 2008).

Museums around the country also benefited from the recession and caused people to travel locally and take staycations (Rega, 2011). The MoMA in New York City in 2009 saw its membership grow to 120,000 people setting a record for the museum.
Between 2008 and 2009 the museum had its top attendance at 2.8 million people which was astounding especially because it is one of the most expensive museums at $20 per person for admission (Rega, 2011). Overall, it brought in a total of $56 million to the city and helped the economy during the recession (Rega, 2011). The increase in membership was due to the local people traveling locally and seeing what was in their own backyard, which is what a staycation focuses on. The museum took note of all the local business and began creating other promotions such as special exhibits to attract these consumers and generate more revenue.

Some travelers were not as willing to give up their vacation but instead used the cheese slicing method as suggested by Bronner and Hoog (2012). This method describes travelers in 2008 and 2009 who began cutting back on travel expenditures by seeking cheaper accommodations and airfare (Bronner & Hoog, 2012). One example on the micro scale is taking a staycation where travelers are staying local and saving money (Bronner & Hoog, 2012). On a macro scale, holiday trips in places such as the Netherlands increased, but the expenditure decreased (Bronner & Hoog, 2012). On either the micro or macro level, people were still traveling and putting money back into the economy. Attractions, accommodations and airlines need to target tailored promotions to both micro and macro travelers in order to generate revenues from both groups (Bronner & Hoog, 2012).

**Staycation Market**

The market for staycations became more prevalent in 2008 when the recession started (Vacations are on the rise, 2011). Local tourism is often overlooked by marketers
but when the economy dipped into a recession, the middle class was the first group to be targeted for staycations because they were affordable and within driving distance (Kay & Yawei, 2010). Ypartnership/Harrison Group 2010 Portrait of American Travelers poll found that staycations were popular among adults living together who are not married, with 37% taking at least one staycation in 2009 versus 25% of those who are married (Yesawich, 2010). Of the adults polled 32% who had children took at least one staycation in 2009 compared to 21% without children (Yesawich, 2010). This poll brought in some insight as to who the staycation traveler market may be; those who are single or have a family with children.

The Ypartnership/Harrison Group Portrait of American Travelers poll found that staycations were slowly decreasing in demand (Martin, 2012). The staycation rate dropped from 30% in 2009 to 25% in 2012. In addition, in 2011, 15% of vacationers preferred luxury hotels compared to 26% in 2012 (Martin, 2012). These changes suggest that people are reverting to their normal vacation ways, although many Americans were and still are considering taking a staycation. According to TripAdvisor’s 2013 survey “TripBarometer by TripAdvisor”, 65% of U.S. travelers plan to lower their travel budgets and spend less on travel in 2014 (TripAdvisor, 2013). The survey also showed that 91% of U.S. travelers traveled in their home market in 2013 and almost one-third of Americans are planning to take more trips in 2014. The reason participants plan to travel in their home market in 2014 is to discover their own country (42%), visit family (38%), and save money (39%) (TripAdvisor, 2013). About 22% of U.S. travelers are planning more short vacations than longer ones, making staycations a viable option for those on a
strict budget and those who would rather take more shorter frequent vacations than one long one (TripAdvisor, 2013).

According to TripAdvisor (2013), 88% of American travelers are making sacrifices to save money for travel. Americans cut down on spending on the following activities: nights out (54%), meals out (48%), clothes, etc. (42%), cigarettes (33%), gifts (29%), home improvements (23%), charity (18%), and groceries (15%) (TripAdvisor, 2013). According to Tuttle (2012), the U.S. Travel Association conducted a survey which found that more than a third of respondents said that they would be driving to closer destinations to save on gas. Even though gas prices were increasing, it did not stop people from traveling; rather it caused them to change their travel arrangements.

Understanding the staycation market is crucial for marketers to ensure advertisements and sales promotions are attracting the consumers and giving them the feeling of being on a vacation.

**Promoting Staycations**

States have begun marketing historic sites and events to keep people’s money within the country and use it to get the economy back on its feet (Cole, 2008; Snyder-Bulik, 2012). Also, the U.S. is attempting to give people the feeling of “being away” while staying in their home state. Each state is competing for every dollar it can get from customers because for each dollar spent in that state, it gets between $4 and $10 in taxes (Snyder-Bulik, 2012). Most states have created a tagline to attract visitors, such as Illinois’ “Mile after magnificent mile” or California’s “Find yourself here” (Snyder-
Bulik, 2012). Providing services and attractions that other states cannot offer will set that state apart from the competition.

According to Bracco (2013), tourism bureaus are promoting package vacations to people in their city and surrounding states which center on local tourist attractions such as the zoo and museums. Hotels are offering staycation discounts and partnering with local businesses such as the Priory’s Hotel in Pittsburgh, PA (Bracco, 2013). The Priory’s Hotel has been offering staycation packages since 2008 making planning easier for the travelers (Bracco, 2013). Fairmont Hotels used social media to promote “Spring is a great time for a staycation. Did you know many hotels offer special resident rates/discounts for locals?” (Bracco, 2013). Forming partnerships with local businesses can help promote the area and generate more interest. For instance, the Utah Valley visitor’s bureau had offered a “Ski & Stay” package at Robert Redford’s Sundance Resort which included 20% off hotel and 10% off lift tickets (Bracco, 2013).

Convention and Visitor Bureaus (CVB) should try and target potential travelers who are within a certain distance to maximize revenue for the city, especially from those who stay overnight and have similar trip characteristics as staycation travelers (Alexander, Lee, & Kim, 2011). The United Kingdom’s tourism bureau “Visit England” used the campaign “Holidays at Home are GREAT” to attract visitors and locals and inspire them to book a vacation in England (VisitEngland, n.d.). Being able to offer a package to travelers requires them to do less planning and more enjoying of their vacation especially in difficult times.
Local travel within the U.S. has also prompted restaurant chains to adopt the staycation idea. According to Kruse (2009), chefs have been responding to staycations by offering specials inspired by American cuisine and local favorites. For example, Red Lobster created dishes that included New Orleans shrimp jambalaya and a Maine lobster-and-crab bake. Even Steak N Shake marketed to staycation travelers by featuring the Wisconsin Buttery Steakburger and a Western barbecue-and-bacon Steakburger in the summertime (Kruse, 2009). It gave consumers the feeling of eating food from a different part of the country in their hometown. IHOP encouraged people to take staycations and submit them into their “Staycation Stories” contest for a chance to win a “Hawaiian Pancation” trip (Kruse, 2009). Celebrating previous staycation adventures for a chance to win an out-of-state vacation is both creative and beneficial to IHOP. Non-chain restaurants in Media, PA offered a 13-week dining and entertainment extravaganza where curbside dining with music was offered once a week (Fox, 2009). The event was called “Dining Under the Stars” and also provided shopping, scenic walking paths, and free parking. More than 500 people came every Wednesday night for this event (Fox, 2009). The hospitality and tourism industry are continuing to find innovative ways for consumers to have a unique experience while staying on a budget.

Along with marketing staycations in the hospitality and tourism market, certain merchandise stores or “box stores” such as Wal-Mart were offering discounts on products related to staycations (Sharma, 2009). Wal-Mart “rolled back prices” on items such as portable DVD players, mosquito repellent, baked beans and barbecue sauce. Target and Kohl’s offered discounts on patio furniture, grills and air fresheners which are items a
staycation traveler may need (Sharma, 2009). It was convenient for people because the merchandise was discounted and all of the items were usually up front and on display for consumers to buy. These stores were targeting those people who were actually staying at their home for vacation and enjoying the comforts of staying at home.

Lifestyle Segmentation

Segmentation Definition

According to Smith (1956), segmentation focuses on the demands of the market using the best marketing strategies and presenting a better product that meets the demands of the consumers. It also draws attention to those segments that have not been previously identified (Smith, 1956). According to Pesonen (2013), segmentation is defined as “the process of subdividing a market into distinct subsets of customers that behave in the same way or have similar needs” (p. 14). There are different approaches that can be taken when segmenting a market (Assael & Roscoe Jr., 1976). The approaches most frequently used to develop segments included demographics as a single criteria, consumer behavior towards a product at a specific point in time, and consumer behavior towards a product over an extended period of time. By gathering this information, researchers can create segments based on the information provided by consumers (Assael & Roscoe Jr., 1976). Assael and Roscoe Jr. (1976) concluded that market segmentation will vary depending on whether the segments are formed based on a given set of marketing stimuli or based on the responses to the changes in levels of the marketing stimuli. It is also dependent on whether segmentation is based on one or more behavioral standards and if the researcher is looking to develop a typology of the
consumer or profile the consumer segments based on characteristics that describe the behavior. Overall, it depends on what the researcher wants to achieve with the study and which information will be the most useful in obtaining the goal.

**Purpose and Benefits of Segmentation**

The purpose of segmentation is to identify customers who are similar in some respect and also differ from each other based on a certain factor (Pesonen, 2013). Pesonen (2013) suggests a company can gain a competitive advantage by selecting and choosing the most appropriate segments. Various market segmentation techniques have been developed to better understand consumers’ psychological and behavioral differences and effectively identify alternative target markets (Lyu & Lee, 2013). For example, Bruwer and Li (2007) focused their study on improving the wine-related lifestyle (WRL) instrument and compare and contrast wine market segments in previous studies. Wine drinking residents in South Australia were used and information was collected by computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) with 401 random households used as the sample (Bruwer & Li, 2007). Only people who were the primary wine buyer of the household and consumed wine six months prior to the survey were interviewed. Five segments were created after factor analysis was completed. The segments were conservative, knowledgeable wine drinkers; enjoyment-oriented, social wine drinkers; basic wine drinkers; mature, time-rich wine drinkers; and young professional wine drinkers (Bruwer & Li, 2007). The first three segments were consistent with previous literature and the last two were new and identified from the study. This information is
helpful to marketers because each segment is involved with wine at various levels affecting the marketing strategy used.

It is important for marketers to select the appropriate market segmentation criterion along with other variables such as geographic, sociodemographic and behavioral, and psychological factors in order to efficiently implement marketing strategies (Lyu & Lee, 2013). There are various levels of segmentation from mass market (full coverage) to customization (individuals as a segment) and between these levels, multiple segments and single segments are included, giving marketers the choice to target as much or as little of the potential market (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Brey, So, Kim, and Morrison (2007) discuss the need to investigate the effective use of permission marketing and e-behavior of consumers in the lodging industry. The authors were interested in segmenting consumers into groups based on the levels of permission they supply to websites and analyze the differences in socio-demographics, trip characteristics, online habits/behaviors, and website design preferences among each group. Permission marketing is used in various lodging websites to help personalize the consumer’s experience by promoting more relevant messages, provide a direct line of communication, and lower marketing costs (Brey et al., 2007). An online survey was administered with 2,470 respondents. Three distinct consumer segments resulted: recurrent, typical and occasional.

**Themes Related to Segmentation**

After reviewing the past literature on market segmentation, a variety of authors have concentrated on the following themes: targeting (Kotler & Keller, 2012; Uzama,
2012); positioning (Kotler & Keller, 2012; Moutinho, 2000); and packaging and programming (Choi & Tsang, 2008; Kim & Chalip, 2010). Each theme serves as a platform for segmenting the market effectively, creating a competitive advantage and using time and resources to its full potential (Morritt, 2007).

**Targeting.** Market segmentation helps marketers target different consumer groups more effectively and make them more profitable (Triantafillidou & Siomkos, 2014). If marketers choose the wrong segment(s) to target it will waste time, money and take attention away from profitable segments (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Evaluating segments before targeting them can eliminate risk factors such as segments that are unethical, too controversial or too risky (Kotler & Keller, 2012). The target market is defined by Kotler and Keller (2012) as the “part of the qualified available market the company decides to pursue” (p. 40). Marketers are faced with the challenge of deciding which consumers to target and aim their marketing strategy towards. The marketers must decide whether or not the company will attempt to target all those consumers who would potentially buy their product, or select one or more subgroups instead (Moutinho, 2000).

It is crucial to understand the product market in order for marketers to make their targeting decision. In order for the market to be targeted correctly and effectively, it must be done after the market has been segmented (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Segmentation is important for targeting the market because it ensures the strategic marketing plan is focused on the proper consumers. Several variables are combined to identify smaller, better-defined target groups by marketers (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Combining these
variables has caused some marketers to adopt the needs-based market segmentation approach (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Uzama (2012) conducted a study focused on the market segmentation of foreign tourists in Japan. The author used a qualitative research method to provide a deeper insight of who the tourists are to aide in future research and help Japanese marketers when targeting international tours. The sample was selected from four cities in Japan and two international tour destinations. A total of 135 respondents from Japan, 8 from London, and 20 from Vancouver were interviewed for the study. Respondents were asked to list their motivations for traveling to Japan, what places they had already visited, what activities they participated in, how much time was spent there, and their feelings about the destination as a whole (Uzama, 2012). A content analysis was completed for all interviews and five clusters emerged to create various tourist typologies. Understanding the differences in tourist segments will help tour marketers correctly target consumers based on their motivations, activity interests, and feelings towards the destination (Uzama, 2012).

**Positioning.** Following targeting, marketers need to appropriately position the brand or product to the consumers for them to purchase, experience, and create revenue. Without proper and carefully selected segmentation, the positioning of a product or service will not be effective. Positioning is “the act of designing a company’s offering and image to occupy a distinctive place in the minds of the target market” (Kotler & Keller, 2012, p. 130). The goal of positioning is to locate the brand in the consumer’s mind and maximize the potential benefit to the company. Positioning the brand well
explains the brand’s essence, identifies the goals it helps the consumer achieve, and showing how the brand is different from its competitors (Kotler & Keller, 2012). For example, the Marriott hotel group developed the ‘Courtyard’ brand to better serve their business customers. Marriott developed a new form of research and product development technique to achieve this goal. The development process underwent the following stages: selection of a product development team; environment and competitor analysis; customer analysis; idea generation; product refinement; product positioning; and monitoring of results (Moutinho, 2000). The gaps in the market were defined by the environment, and competitor analysis and the remaining stages were defined by consumer research; specifically related to preferred product attributes and benefits.

Seven groups of attributes were identified at the end of the brand development process: external factors; rooms; food-related services; lounge facilities; services; leisure facilities; and security which were used to develop individual product attributes (Moutinho, 2000).

Wong and Wu (2013) studied the attributes customers used to gauge their experience at major casinos in Macau and created a perceptual map of the market position of these major casinos based on the attributes. Casino players from six selected casinos in Macau was the sample for the study. A survey was distributed to the players and 274 participating in the study. Six categories of attributes were identified by the participants: employee service, value, hedonic and novelty appeal, brand, and perceived luck (Wong & Wu, 2013). Based on these attributes the casinos were placed on a perceptual map with service environment and employee service and value as the two dimensions on either axis. The casinos were divided into three tiers with one being the
best positioned casino (Wong & Wu, 2013). Identifying the role customer experience plays in creating the positioning for casinos is important and beneficial to managers because it provides a deeper understanding of the type of experience customers desire (Wong & Wu, 2013). It could be used as a tool to better position the casino to customers and determine which strategies (offering promotions, theme-park-like facility, and live shows) are the most profitable and meeting customer’s needs (Wong & Wu, 2013).

**Packaging and programming.** The hospitality and tourism industry uses a variety of market segmentation approaches to target their customers more professionally and understand their travelers better (Choi & Tsang, 2008). The various types of activities preferred by travelers can provide a broader view of the market. The application of ‘activity types’ can improve industry profitability by increasing the appeal to target markets and attracting new markets (Choi & Tsang, 2008). Offering ‘activity packages’ for travelers can ease the vacation planning process, accommodate for budgetary variances, and lead to an increased desire for partaking in specialized experiences and activities (Choi & Tsang, 2008). Understanding the meaning of activities and grouping them into packages can help managers better understand the types of opportunities visitors are seeking while traveling (Choi & Tsang, 2008).

In previous studies, authors have looked at sport tourism and how to capitalize on the sport’s subculture by packaging the sport with other tourism opportunities (Kim & Chalip, 2010). For example, Kim and Chalip (2010) studied nine elements to determine the intent of American tae kwon do practitioners to visit Korea. The nine elements included price, three park features, three typical tours, and two physical activities.
Overall 305 adult American tae kwon do practitioners were surveyed for the study at two separate championships events (Kim & Chalip, 2010). The study involved three stages: (1) participants were shown pictures and descriptions of eight tours/activities they could include in a trip to Korea, (2) participants ranked 16 holiday packages with various combinations of the eight possible Korean tours plus three levels of price, (3) participants were asked to complete a questionnaire. Half the participants were asked to fill the questionnaire first then complete the ranking and vice versa (Kim & Chalip, 2010).

Conjoint analysis was used to create the clusters of four identified segments: (1) culturally conscious competitors, (2) heritage seekers, (3) price sensitives, and (4) competitive tourists (Kim & Chalip, 2010). The study supported sport can be used to promote tourism in a destination and enhance a sport opportunity’s attractiveness to its target market. Also, it shows each segment is different and value specific experiences, providing tour operators and marketers with the information to market certain segments effectively (Kim & Chalip, 2010).

**Segmentation Bases**

Using segmentation bases allows a company to target the most appropriate segments for the potential market (Morritt, 2007). By selecting the optimal combination of segmentation bases, marketers can select the most attractive and desirable markets. There are a variety of stages hospitality companies use; single-stage, two-stage, or multistage segmentation depending on the number of bases being used (Morritt, 2007). The more the number of bases being used at once, the more specific the target market will be, compared to using fewer bases. Previous research focused on the following
segmentation bases: geographic (Kotler & Keller, 2012; Moscardo, Pearce, & Morrison, 2001; Obenour, Lengfelder, & Groves, 2005); demographic (Bruwer & Li, 2007; Chi, 2011; Kotler & Keller, 2012); behavioral (Kotler & Keller, 2012; Tanford & Baloglu, 2013); purpose of the trip (Morritt, 2007); product-related (Morritt, 2007); and channel of distribution (Morritt, 2007).

There are four ways to segment the market: undifferentiated, concentrated, differentiated, and customized (Moutinho, 2000). Undifferentiated marketing is where there is little or no diversity among the market segments as determined by marketers. Concentrated marketing targets one specific segment and marketers develop a marketing mix for that market and allocate all their resources to the one segment. If the target is too narrow or the wrong segment is selected it can produce a negative outcome (Moutinho, 2000). Differentiated marketing involves more than one market segment and marketers create marketing mixes for each one. Factors influencing the marketing mixes includes competitive conditions, corporate objectives, available resources and alternative marketing opportunities (Moutinho, 2000). Finally, customized marketing is where marketers attempt to satisfy multiple segments and their set of needs with various marketing mixes. Along with these four types of market segmentation, there are subdivisions to further define the market: geographic, demographic, psychographics, benefit segmentation, usage rate and price sensitivity are most commonly used in the tourism industry (Moutinho, 2000).

**Geographic Segmentation.** Geographic segmentation divides the market into specific units such as nations, states, regions, counties, cities or neighborhoods (Kotler &
Depending on the target market, a company may decide to operate in a few locations or all locations. Should the company select a few locations, it can enable them to tailor their marketing programs to meet the wants and needs of local consumers in neighborhoods and local stores (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Marketing by zip code has been used in regional marketing and some approaches have combined geographic and demographic information to obtain a more in-depth description of consumers (Kotler & Keller, 2012). A geoclustering approach called PRIZM (Potential Rating Index by Zip Markets) was developed by Nielsen Claritas and has been used to categorize over half a million U.S. residential neighborhoods into 14 distinct groups and 66 distinct lifestyle segments called PRIZM Clusters (Kotler & Keller, 2012). The clusters include people who live similar lives, drive similar cars and have similar jobs (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

This type of segmentation is popular and most commonly used among researchers because it is easier to do and much simpler to analyze the statistics (Moscardo, Pearce & Morrison, 2001). Also, geographic segmentation is ease to use when developing media promotional campaigns. Researchers have argued that conducting psychographic segmentation first would identify the major markets; using geographic segmentation after that would provide the location of the markets to help direct marketing strategies (Moscardo et al., 2001).

Tkaczynski (2013) studied the profile of visitors (tourist or resident) focusing on their residency and activity preferences of attendees of the annual Toowoomba Carnival of Flowers in Queensland, Australia. An on-site survey was administered to attendees and addressed 10 event and five tourism related activity preferences and measured
residency by the city or town they lived in (Tkaczynski, 2013). The responses were then divided into “tourist” and “resident” depending on the location of residency. Overall, 511 surveys were completed. It was found there was an equal amount of tourists and residents attending the festival making it important for marketers to target both groups equally instead of focusing on one (Tkaczynski, 2013). Using local promotions in media such as newspapers and radio would be ideal to market to both segments. In addition, regardless of residency, both segments enjoyed the two main events advertised reassuring marketers that both segments are receptive to this type of promotion and can be used in the future (Tkaczynski, 2013).

Obenour, Lengfelder, and Groves (2005) conducted a study analyzing the image of a newly developed nature-based tourist destination along Lake Erie in Ohio and examined the influence of distance on a destination’s image. The sampling for the study was dependent on the six dominant market areas (DMAs) that had the most past tourists visiting Ohio (Obenour et al., 2005). The six DMAs were Detroit, MI; Columbus, OH; Pittsburgh, PA; Cincinnati, OH; Chicago, IL; and Indianapolis, IN. Overall, 610 surveys were completed for a 45% response rate, with 28 image variables compared amongst all DMAs. It was found that a tourist’s distance from the destination is not the only variable to determine the length of stay at a destination (Obenour et al., 2005) potentially indicating that geographic segmentation may have to be used in conjunction with other types of segmentation. The study supports the idea of the destination image becoming a factor in the length of stay at the destination by the tourist. It also supports the differentiation of nearby markets to help marketers tailor their use of media and message
to those markets, making it more effective and increasing intent to visit (Obenour et al., 2005).

**Demographic Segmentation.** In demographic segmentation, the market is divided by a series of variables such as age, family size, family life cycle, gender, income, occupation, education, religion, race, generation, nationality and social class (Kotler & Keller, 2012). This is another popular measurement used by marketers because it is easy to use and helps marketers understand consumer’s wants and needs. Also, the demographic information can estimate the size of the market, judge the attractiveness, access a group of consumers, and the type of media used to reach this market (Bruwer & Li, 2007; Kotler & Keller, 2012). For example, race and ethnicity require multicultural marketing in order to address the different needs and wants associated with various ethnic and cultural segments (Kotler & Keller, 2012). A mass market approach would not be appropriate to use in such a diverse marketplace. Multicultural markets should be factored into the marketing strategy as it is being created, not added afterword (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Chi (2011) studied the differences in the loyalty formation process among different demographic groups. Eureka Springs in Arkansas was the site studied since it has been attracting visitors for over 100 years. The sample was selected during a two month period to complete an on-site survey distributed by staff members. A total of 345 questionnaires were returned totaling 90% of the targeted sample size (Chi, 2011). The following demographic variables: gender, age, education and income; were measured to discover the potential differences among tourist groups and see if they formed loyalty to a
destination differently. The study revealed there were no differences in age and income segments on their perceptions of destination image, levels of satisfaction or loyalty (Chi, 2011). Also, tourists in different gender and education segments had various levels of destination image but formed similar satisfaction levels and loyalty. In addition, the study proved the loyalty process remained the same amongst varying demographic segments (Chi, 2011).

Hwang, Hyun and Park (2013) investigated different types of occupational stress that exist in the hotel industry. The authors focused on whether or not they can be grouped into sub-segments based on their stress and sought to determine any statistical differences between the sub-segments based on demographics. Eleven, five-star hotels agreed to have their employees surveyed for the study with a total of 288 surveys completed. Demographic information was requested from participants and 23 items related to occupational stress was used (Hwang et al., 2013). Six occupational stress factors were extracted and used in a cluster analysis to determine four clusters followed by determining the differences in demographics among the four clusters (Hwang et al., 2013). The four groups had statistically significant differences based on age, gender, marital status, years of employment, and department of employment. Hwang et al. (2013) suggest if hotel managers created stress management training programs based on this study, it can effectively target the specific type(s) of stress employees are experiencing making it beneficial for both the employees and the employer.

**Behavioral Segmentation.** Another method of segmenting the market is based on consumer behavior. Buyers are divided into groups based on their knowledge,
attitude, use of, or response to a product (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Different variables such as needs or benefits, decision roles, or user and usage-related attributed are included. Combining behavioral variables can lead to a more cohesive view of the market and the segments within it (Kotler & Keller, 2012). The needs and benefits approach helps identify more distinct segments and provide a clearer understanding of which marketing tactics to use (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Decision roles focuses on the roles consumers take when making a decision to purchase a product. The five roles that consumers take include: initiator, influencer, decider, buyer, and user (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Finally, user and usage involves a series of variables including occasions, user status, usage rate, buyer-readiness stage, loyalty status, and attitude which help create market segments (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

Two of the attributes studied in behavioral segmentation is attitude and loyalty. Tanford and Baloglu (2013) used the loyalty matrix to segment customers into four quadrants based on their frequency of purchase and attitude toward a hospitality business, in this case casinos. During a one month period, guests who visited a Las Vegas hotel were surveyed for the study with 261 surveys completed. Survey questions included a series of loyalty constructs (commitment, trust, etc.); reward program value; behavioral indicators (visitation frequency); and gaming preferences (Tanford & Baloglu, 2013). Customers were classified into the four quadrants: true, latent, spurious and low loyalty creating the different types of customers in casino loyalty programs. The differences in loyalty members is important for casino managers because it can help them improve their programs and satisfy the needs and wants of the customers (Tanford & Baloglu, 2013).
Purpose of Trip Segmentation. One of the most traditionally used segmentation technique is “purpose of trip” to segment consumers into business travelers and leisure travelers (Morritt, 2007). Consumers are divided into one of these broad segments because their needs, preferences, and price sensitivity are very different (Morritt, 2007). For example, business travelers are typically less price sensitive (especially if they are traveling on an expense account), are more time constrained, and require business facilities and supplies such as conference rooms and high speed internet (Morritt, 2007). Leisure travelers on the other hand are more price sensitive, usually make trade-offs to stay within budget, and have more time to relax (Morritt, 2007).

Cai, Lehto, and O’Leary (2001) studied the profiles of Chinese travelers visiting the United States in terms of their demographics, lead time of pre-trip preparation, package usage, participation rates of activities, length of stay, expenditure patterns, and where they received their information. Three groups were compared to identify similarities and/or differences among the groups: business only, business and leisure, and leisure only travelers. A sample of 1,001 respondents was drawn from the “In-Flight Survey of International Air Travelers” with those identifying themselves as Chinese citizens selected for the analysis. The majority of respondents were visiting the United States for leisure (41.3%), more than a third for business (37%), and the remaining for business and leisure (21.4%) (Cai et al., 2001). Differences among the groups included a lengthier stay and longer preparation time for leisure travelers and more tours to countryside by leisure travelers compared to business travelers. All groups used a travel agency to obtain information (Cai et al., 2001). Knowing the differences among the
groups and their purpose of the trip is important for marketers because it can help with
tour design and advertising strategies (Cai et al., 2001).

**Product-Related Segmentation.** Another traditional segmentation technique
used by marketers is product-related segmentation normally used initially to divide the
market (Morritt, 2007). Usually this type of segmentation is used without the assistance
of market research and follows common practices used by others in the industry. For
example, hotels provide a variety of product lines to accommodate all types of consumers
(Morritt, 2007). Most hotel companies offer budget, economy, all suite, mid-scale, and
upper-scale properties along with other segments unique to the company. Airlines,
gambling casinos, and restaurants offer similar product lines ranging from budget to up-
scale products (Morritt, 2007).

Diaz and Koutra (2013) segmented hotel chains into luxury, midscale, and
economy to evaluate the persuasiveness of their websites. To determine website
persuasiveness six items were considered: informativeness, usability, credibility,
inspiration, involvement and reciprocity (Diaz & Koutra, 2013). A sample of 229 hotel
chain websites were used for analysis and significant differences among the websites
were found. For example, usability varied among each hotel category with economy and
midscale hotels websites having perceived easier navigation than luxury hotel websites
(Diaz & Koutra, 2013). The credibility variable showed differences in hotel history with
luxury hotels providing more information than the other two hotel types. Overall, luxury
hotels had higher persuasiveness than economy and midscale in all six categories except
usability. This information could be useful for marketers creating and/or updating hotel
websites to meet consumer’s needs because each product attracts a specific segment (Diaz & Koutra, 2013).

**Channel of Distribution Segmentation.** Hospitality companies market directly to consumers, but they also need to market intermediaries and other channels of distribution (Morritt, 2007). Segmenting various channels requires segmentation by function and common characteristics shared by functional groups (Morritt, 2007). Types of distribution channels include travel agents, tour wholesalers/operators, the internet and social media. It is important for hospitality companies to determine which intermediaries are appropriate for their target market(s) and fulfill their needs. For example, more people are making travel arrangements online making all aspects of the hospitality industry create websites to attract their target market(s) and increase sales (Morritt, 2007).

**Definition, Benefits, and Shortcomings of Lifestyle Segmentation**

Unlike geographic and demographic segmentation, psychographics relate to data concerning lifestyles of consumers and their activities, interests, and opinions (AIOs) to help marketers understand the way of life of consumers (Moutinho, 2000). In addition to AIOs, basic characteristics such as stage in life cycle, income and education can be added to the consumer profile to make it more detailed and useful to marketers (Schewe & Calantone, 1978). Psychographic data can also predict consumption and/or buying behaviors of consumers making it easier for marketers to direct their promotions to a specific market (Bruwer & Li, 2007; Moutinho, 2000). The more a company knows about their consumers, the more effectively they can communicate and market to them.
(Schewe & Calantone, 1978). Psychographic segmentation can also lead to more effective positioning of the company and places importance on how consumers spend their time, their interests, and attitudes towards various types of products (Moutinho, 2000). Another measurement of psychographics is the VALS system, with the main dimensions of consumer motivation and consumer resources used as the framework for measurement (Kotler & Keller, 2012). The three motivations for the VALS system include ideals, achievement, and self-expression; the motivation of consumers is dictated by the various levels of resources which can increase or decrease their motivation (Kotler & Keller, 2012).

According to Bruwer and Li (2007), studying lifestyle patterns provides a deeper, broader view of consumers which helps marketers think about them in a more sophisticated way and beyond a two dimensional view. Using the lifestyle construct in segmentation also represents the way consumers wish to live based on the activities they have chosen to participate in as well as provide insight on their personalities (Bruwer & Li, 2007). Lifestyle segmentation has been used successfully to predict and profile consumer segments in a variety of products and services (Bruwer & Li, 2007). According to Thyne, Davies, and Nash (2005), lifestyle segmentation is more beneficial than segmentation based on demographics because it lets marketers understand the motivations that drive their choices and goals they have set for themselves.

Studying the lifestyles of specific consumers especially in the hospitality industry can be more complicated than other products and services advertised. Usually consumers have different wants and needs while on vacation than in their everyday life; therefore,
developing specific lifestyle measurements such as vacation lifestyle variables can identify travel behaviors (Chen, Huang, & Cheng, 2009). Using the lifestyle variables for segmenting the market can provide insights for marketers as to how leisure time is spent and what type of vacationers exist. It can also classify the differences in tourist consumption behaviors for each segment because it shows the personality traits of the consumers through their lifestyle choices (Chen et al., 2009). As a result, lifestyle information can be used as a predictor of travel behavior which otherwise would not have been found through demographic information. Also, studying lifestyles can help predict behaviors of leisure travelers, concentrate on the most profitable groups, target new market segments, and even determine hotel choices made by consumers (Gonzalez & Bello, 2002; Ignatov & Smith, 2006; Millar & Mayer, 2012; Tkaczynski & Rundle-Thiele, 2013; Zins, 1998).

Lifestyle segmentation is useful for communication purposes in marketing, but it can also be seen as too general to predict specific behavioral differences (Moutinho, 2000). Another issue with lifestyle segmentation is the trade-off between the general application of the results and the need for a more specific analysis (Scott & Parfitt, 2004). Segmentation developed through groupings or cluster analysis are not usually generalizable beyond the original data. Instead of using a system for marketing in general, lifestyle segmentation provides insight to problems that are highly situation specific. Sometimes researchers can develop a framework from the groupings or clusters for a classification that relates to a wider theory (Scott & Parfitt, 2004).

Activities, Interests and Opinions (AIO) Segmentation
Wells and Tigert (1971) were the first to use Activities, Interests, and Opinions (AIO) rating statements to better understand the lifestyles of consumers in specific markets (Plummer, 1974). These statements help researchers and marketers understand how to communicate effectively with their audience as well as focus on the consumer rather than the product (Plummer, 1974). The AIO model can help create new products and explain why certain products are successful or unsuccessful (Plummer, 1974). Using this model can help marketers understand a target market that is unfamiliar or new and understand what their wants, needs and lifestyles are in order to create successful products. Since the staycation market is relatively new and unfamiliar, the AIO model can identify the lifestyle of this specific target market.

Konu (2010) studied the lifestyles of Finnish tourists in order to determine the potential of creating a wellbeing tourist segment, as well as find any statistically significant differences between the segments. The AIO model was used to classify tourists into potential segments based on 24 lifestyle questions. The questionnaire was distributed online through four discussion forums and available for three weeks after two travel fairs occurred during 2007-2008. Once the data were collected the following six segments were identified: sport and nature people interested in technology, home appreciating travelers, family and health oriented sport and nature people, culture appreciative self-developers, material wellbeing appreciatives; and people indifferent about traveling and social issues (Konu, 2010). There were statistically significant differences between the segments regarding gender, age, annual household gross income, and residential area. There were not statistically significant differences concerning how
many long trips (over three days) are taken during a year, travelling companion, preferred
duration of wellbeing holiday, and their willingness to pay for a wellbeing holiday that
lasts three days (Ko
nu, 2010). Overall, understanding the various differences and
similarities of the segments is beneficial because managers can see the potential for new
customers. Being open to new ideas can lead to a profitable market segment for the
company and help them grow their customer base. Using AIO can help managers and
marketers discover these potential customers and be successful.

A benefit to using the AIO model is that it is applicable to a variety of different
products (Berkman & Gilson, 1974). It can be applied to products for strictly men or
women or both. For example, a study was done on beer drinkers conducted by Plummer
(1966) using the AIO model and it was found heavy beer drinkers are more hedonistic
and pleasure seekers than non-beer drinkers (Berkman & Gilson, 1974). The heavy beer
drinkers thought beer was a man’s drink and preferred male-oriented activities.
Understanding these lifestyle variables helped the Schlitz beer company create a
campaign that involved men doing male-type activities and showing they were enjoying
themselves while drinking the beer (Berkman & Gilson, 1974). Another study was done
on women’s makeup and the differences between heavy makeup users and light makeup
users. Some of the differences observed were that heavy makeup users tended to buy
more cosmetic products and were heavy smokers; and being attractive to others was
important to their self-image; whereas full-time housewives used less makeup and had
more traditional views (Berkman & Gilson, 1974). Finally, a study was done on
lifestyles of bank credit card users and both males and females were studied separately.
It was found that both male and female heavy users of credit cards had a contemporary approach to life rather than a traditional one and was more focused on material and self-image aspects of life (Berkman & Gilson, 1974). Each of these three studies were conducted on a variety of products and target markets but was able to reveal lifestyle characteristics which are beneficial to managers and marketers alike.

Using AIO can increase creativity in marketing, better position a product, and select the most appropriate media channels to target consumers (Berkman & Gilson, 1974). Another benefit to using AIO is it helps marketers weigh the pros and cons of targeting a new market segment. The analysis could reveal that a particular market segment is unlikely to use the product or service which would save time and money for marketers. For example, Todd and Lawson (2001) did a study on consumers in New Zealand visiting art galleries and museums using AIO to learn more about the visitor and non-visitor segments as well as determine how these visits fit into each segment’s lifestyle. The researchers sent out questionnaires to a random sample and identified seven segments; active ‘family values’ people, conservative quiet lifers, educated liberals, accepting mid-lifers, success-driven extroverts, pragmatic strugglers, and social strivers (Todd & Lawson, 2001). Next, the segments were analyzed by their visiting behavior; never, yearly, monthly and weekly. Understanding how often the different segments visit the art galleries and museums could greatly influence the marketing strategies used to target them (Todd & Lawson, 2001). For example, some segments, such as conservative quiet lifers, may not visit museums or art galleries because it is not conducive to their lifestyle. They prefer to stay at home and not look for entertainment
outside their home or enjoy social events (Todd & Lawson, 2001). Knowing the lifestyle of this particular segment makes it very clear it would not be a profitable market to target and that efforts should be put somewhere else. Analyzing the other six markets will provide insight as to which markets to focus on especially when the market is unfamiliar.

Moscardo (2004) also studied a newer segment involving the lifestyles of 1,258 park visitors to the Wet Tropics World Heritage Area in the northeastern part of Australia and compared their service quality ratings and overall satisfaction. Surveys were distributed in departure lounges in the Cairns Airport and only visitors were asked to participate in the study. The survey comprised of five sections related to regional travel behaviors, rainforest site visitation, rainforest travel features, satisfaction and socio-demographics (Moscardo, 2004). Activity, interest, and opinion statements were used to determine rainforest travel features and create segments. Four groups were identified and compared resulting in differences between the groups on the variables studied. For example, “Wilderness Adventurers” preferred physical activities and escaping from other people whereas “Just Passing Through” preferred to socialize with friends and family and had a lower appreciation for nature (Moscardo, 2004). Most visitors had a high satisfaction with their rainforest experience and perceived quality.

Lee and Sparks (2007) studied the differences in lifestyles and travel behaviors between two groups of Koreans: those living in Australia and those living in Korea. A survey was distributed in public places to collect responses from these two groups and 554 usable surveys were analyzed. The survey included 33 travel-specific lifestyle items selected from AIO statements used in previous literature (Lee & Sparks, 2007). The
items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale measuring the amount of agreement/disagreement with the statements. The data revealed seven factors that were divided into four segments: culturally safe travelers, non-sports activity seeking travelers, independent active travelers and group travelers (Lee & Sparks, 2007). It was found there were significant differences between the two groups of travelers. For instance, Koreans in Australia took more frequent and longer holidays, and preferred independent travel whereas Koreans prefer to travel in groups and take holidays for less than a week (Lee & Sparks, 2007). Gathering this information on the two groups could help marketers extend their markets to multicultural countries by understanding the needs and wants of neighboring countries (Lee & Sparks, 2007).

Chen, Huang, and Cheng (2009) focused their study on Taiwanese travelers and understanding their vacation lifestyle. Surveys were distributed to those tourists visiting the Ken-Ting National Park in Taiwan and 420 usable samples were collected. The survey included 37 AIO statements regarding vacation characteristics that were measured on a 6-point Likert scale (Chen et al., 2009). The responses produced five factors which in turn created three clusters: family oriented travelers, stylish travelers, and social oriented travelers. The three groups had statistically significant differences in the following vacation characteristics: frequencies of international travel, the average expenditure of accommodations per night and hotel preference (Chen et al., 2009). The authors suggested tourism marketers use this information to better market Taiwanese tourists and focus on the important variables that the tourist segments desire (Chen et al., 2009).
Matzler, Hattenberger, Pechlaner, and Abfalter (2004) studied the influence of lifestyle on guest satisfaction among skiing tourists, more specifically in Austria and Italy. The sample was randomly selected from German speaking skiing tourists in 10 different resorts in Tyrol, Austria and South Tyrol, Italy. The survey was self-administered and produced a sample size of 1,042 tourists (Matzler et al., 2004). The survey included socio-demographic information as well as 24 AIO lifestyle statements. The analysis revealed seven distinct groups of skiing tourists according to their lifestyles: pleasure seeker, work-oriented, couch potato, family oriented, committed helper, the average, and culture interested (Matzler et al., 2004). It was found satisfaction among tourists was correlated to the overall satisfaction with the destination. In addition, it is not enough for marketers to only measure customer satisfaction, but also understand their lifestyles in order to identify the most attractive market segments and increase customer satisfaction (Matzler et al., 2004).

**Lifestyle Segmentation Research in Hospitality and Tourism**

Gonzalez & Bello (2002) completed a study using lifestyle segmentation to predict the behaviors of leisure travelers in Spain. Using general lifestyle variables to segment the market and predict their behaviors provides a better measurement of lifestyles rather than using variables that measure the style of tourism adopted by the traveler (Gonzalez & Bello, 2002). After using cluster analysis, five clusters emerged: home-loving, idealistic, independent, hedonistic and conservative. The labels attempted to provide a general idea of the lifestyle of each segment (Gonzalez & Bello, 2002). For instance, the conservative lifestyle characteristics included: working in order to earn a
living, turning to family and friends when a problem arises; and preferring longer
vacations (one to two weeks) usually at seaside destinations (Gonzalez & Bello, 2002).
For this segment, marketers were advised to offer inexpensive accommodations, and
promote the sea and sun and value for their money (Gonzalez & Bello, 2002).

Lifestyle segmentation is beneficial for marketers because it can help them
concentrate on the most profitable groups. Tkaczynski and Rundle-Thiele (2013)
conducted a study on religious music festivals, specifically Christian, to identify the
segments that were attending these festivals and what their motivations were for
attending. Four segments were identified after data from questionnaires and interviews
were analyzed: working family visitors, local young students, working active campers,
and youth group campers (Tkaczynski & Rundle-Thiele, 2013). The criteria for creating
these segments were based on 12 profiling variables some of which included: age, group
size, income, where they live, motivations, accommodation, and festival pass purchase
behavior. Identifying these segments based on the profiling variables confirmed that
there are multiple segments within music festivals and should be targeted differently
(Tkaczynski & Rundle-Thiele, 2013). Understanding the motivations and profile of the
segments means advertising and promotions can be more focused and capture the
attention of the target markets drawn to Christian music festivals. It is especially helpful
for marketers because they can efficiently allocate their resources and not waste extra
time and money.

Zins (1998) conducted a study using psychographic concepts to determine a
consumer’s hotel choice when vacationing. The psychographic constructs included travel
behaviors such as lifestyle and vacation style. A questionnaire was developed and distributed to hotel guests in middle and upper class hotels in Austria pertaining to five specific theme or special interest hotels (Zins, 1998). The questions included statements based on a list of values (LOV) items as well as statements pertaining to lifestyle, vacation style, personal values and benefits. After gathering the information, the researcher was able to use the data to explain the relationship of the four psychographic constructs. More importantly, Zins (1998) was able to classify the consumers based on their lifestyle, vacation style, benefits and personal values to determine how their hotel choice was made. Understanding the lifestyle of the consumer such as having a leisure style, and understanding the vacation style such as comfort/relaxation revealed a hotel with a golf theme fit this consumer profile. Besides using demographic information, lifestyle and vacation style added another level of segmentation. Marketers can use this information to benefit their strategies and ensure they are using their money and time effectively (Zins, 1998).

Millar and Mayer (2012) studied the profiles of travelers who were willing to stay in an environmentally friendly (green) hotel to better understand this specific market segment. Hoteliers know very little about this segment making it difficult to create successful marketing advertisements to target them (Millar & Mayer, 2012). The sample consisted of travelers who stayed one night in a hotel in the past 12 months who were willing to stay in an environmentally friendly hotel. The online survey was sent to participants who already agreed to be contacted to participate in the survey resulting in 571 responses. The study showed the more consumers participated in green activities at
home (recycling, using energy efficient appliances) the more willing they are to stay in a
green hotel (Millar & Mayer, 2012). Using other characteristics besides socio-
demographics give managers the opportunity to identify other attributes these consumers
possess. Identifying these attributes can help managers and marketers create
advertisements relevant, effective, and targeting the correct segment. In addition,
building a green hotel differentiates the product creating competition while attracting new
tavelers making it beneficial to the hotel (Millar & Mayer, 2012). Marketers can use the
advantage of targeting a new market first by thoroughly researching the market to make it
worth the time and money.

Restaurants also benefit from lifestyle segmentation. Ignatov and Smith (2006)
studied culinary tourists in Canada focusing on the differences in demographics,
psychographics, trip characteristics, and media habits between ‘wine tourists’, ‘food
tourists’ and ‘food and wine tourists’. These segments were defined from the Travel
Activities and Motivations Study (TAMS) conducted in Canada and the U.S. using
telephone and mail surveys with 18,385 completing the telephone survey and 5,740
completed mail surveys (Ignatov & Smith, 2006). From the surveys, it was evident that
each segment is unique in terms of the variables studied which affects the marketing
strategies used to target them. For example, food tourists are likely to be female, and
have a lower education/income than those identified as food and wine tourists.
Therefore, marketers should focus their strategies on designing products and
advertisements by focusing on value and the social benefits experienced by sharing food-
related experiences with friends and family (Ignatov & Smith, 2006).
Specific to staycation travelers, lifestyle segmentation can benefit marketers and hotel managers because they will be able to understand the type of lifestyle staycation travelers have and determine what would be the best products to market to them. According to existing literature, most staycation travelers are on a budget, looking for convenience and for a chance to make memories with those around them (Sharma, 2009; Kay & Yawei, 2010). Conducting AIO segmentation is beneficial for new markets such as this, because it provides a more in-depth look at the consumer profile and identifies the strategies that can be used to target them effectively. Understanding these characteristics can help lodging providers create packages to offer staycation travelers when they are deciding which accommodation to stay in for their trip. It can provide a competitive advantage to those lodging establishments that are offering packages aimed at staycation travelers. Both the travelers and lodging providers could benefit from the packages created from AIO segmentation.

**Theoretical Underpinnings**

A variety of theories became prevalent in past literature related to this study on staycations and segmentation of consumers. Theories relevant to this study discussed here include: Theory of Reasoned Action (Buttle & Bok, 1996; Han & Kim, 2010; Ryu & Han, 2010); Theory of Planned Behavior (Han, Hsu & Sheu, 2010; Han & Kim, 2010); and the Gravity Theory (Calantone, Benedetto, & Bojanic, 1987; Crampon, 1966; Nyaupane & Graefe, 2008; Uysal & Crompton, 1985). These theories are relevant to this study because it provides the foundation of why people make their decisions such as staying in a specific hotel or other lodging establishment again rather than a competitor’s
(Buttle & Bok, 1996). It also explains why people behave the way they do due to their lifestyle, like staying in a green hotel because the traveler believes in participating in eco-friendly behaviors (Han, Hsu & Sheu, 2010). The gravity theory specifically assists in understanding the relationship between distance and a destination to help marketers advertise a destination accordingly to its travelers. For instance, for those traveling to national parks, the distance they traveled could influence the type of advertisements used to target long and short-distance travelers (Nyaupane & Graefe, 2008).

**Theory of Reasoned Action**

The Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA) was first studied by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and their intention was to explain how TRA predicts human behaviors under their own influence and control (Han & Kim, 2010). The theory assumes most individual’s decisions/behaviors come from their volitional efforts for the specific decisions/behaviors (Han & Kim, 2010). The TRA explains individuals are rational and motivation-based when making decisions and make a reasonable choice compared to other alternatives. It involves a series of intentions including behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, attitude and subjective norm (Buttle & Bok, 1996). The theory can accurately predict individuals’ decisions and behaviors when applied to any activity or situation (Han & Kim, 2010). The TRA is commonly used among researchers because of its accuracy in predicting consumer behavior and effectively explaining the decision making process. This theory is applicable for this study because it can aide in better understanding the reason behind why staycation travelers make their decisions they do when traveling. It provides a
deeper look into the lifestyle this segment possesses and in turn helping marketers better target these travelers by fulfilling their needs and desires.

The theory has been used in numerous studies to understand the lifestyles of travelers and segment them according to their needs and desires. For example, Buttle and Bok (1996) used the TRA to survey international business travelers staying in a top hotel in the world and determine whether or not it could help direct marketing strategies. The research showed that the type of marketing strategy used was dependent on whether the business traveler’s attitude towards staying at the hotel again or the subjective norm was the main influence on behavioral intentions (Buttle & Bok, 1996). If the main intention is the attitude, the marketing strategy should show the positive consequences of the behavior such as outcomes that are beneficial, enjoyable and highly valued by the consumer. If the main intention is based on the subjective norm, marketers should target the influencers of the consumer to promote a positive word of mouth (Buttle & Bok, 1996). Understanding these intentions of the consumer will benefit the hotel by choosing the correct marketing strategy to target consumers. Another study by Ryu and Han (2010) studied consumers’ intention to try the local cuisine in New Orleans, Louisiana. The study supported the belief that TRA can predict consumer behaviors as well as explain the intentions of trying new foods. Experiencing new foods was highly dependent on attitudinal factors of consumers instead of social norms (Ryu & Han, 2010). Past experiences with food were also a significant factor in the intention of trying the new cuisine. The study suggests marketing efforts should be focused on the positive outcomes of trying the local cuisine. Showing pictures of various dishes, promoting
adventurous food, and showing the interior and exterior of the restaurant could make the consumer feel more comfortable and have a positive attitude towards trying new foods (Ryu & Han, 2010).

Theory of Planned Behavior

An extension of the Theory of Reasoned Action is the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). This theory considers both the voluntary choices of the individual as well as the involuntary choices (Han & Kim, 2010). Individual intention is the most important factor to these two theories and explains an individual’s readiness/willingness to participate in a specific behavior (Han & Kim, 2010). Three main intentions comprise the TPB model: attitude toward the behavior, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control (Han & Kim, 2010). The attitude intention is based on main behavioral beliefs of the individual with behavioral beliefs referring to the perceived probability of an expected outcome’s occurrence by participating in a specific behavior. The outcome evaluations are based on the possible consequences of a certain behavior (Han & Kim, 2010). The second intention, subjective norm, relates to the social pressure exerted to participate in a specific behavior. The subjective norm includes normative belief (perceived behavioral expectations of important people to an individual) and motivation to comply (individual’s desire to accommodate opinions of those important people in relation to the behavior) (Han & Kim, 2010). Finally, the third intention, perceived behavioral control, refers to the control beliefs (perceived present or absent resources and opportunities that encourage or inhibit the performance of a behavior) and perceived power (perceived importance of the resources and opportunities in reaching behavioral
results) (Han & Kim, 2010). Again, this study is related to TRA meaning it would be helpful in understanding the lifestyle of staycation travelers. Each segment exemplifies habits and behaviors which distinguishes them from others and using this theory can bring those characteristics into focus because it aides in understanding the attitudes, social influences, available resources and importance of achieving desired behavioral results of staycation travelers (Han & Kim, 2010). Marketers advertising to staycation travelers could have a more successful outcome by understanding their intentions before they implement their marketing strategies (Han, Hsu, & Sheu, 2010). Since this market has not been empirically studied, it is crucial to understand all aspects of the market before creating travel packages and using various types of media to gain their attention.

The TPB has been used to explain consumers’ intentions in the hotel industry (Han, Hsu & Sheu, 2010). Hotel consumers were studied to determine their intentions to visit a green hotel. The study showed that the intention to stay at a green hotel was greatly influenced by how an individual’s referents viewed the performance of eco-friendly behavior (Han et al., 2010). The attitude toward a behavior had a greater influence on visit intention than subjective norm and also partially mediated the effect of the subjective norm on visit intention (Han et al., 2010). Finally, the research showed the links between predictor variables and visiting intention to green hotels can differ with daily environmentally friendly behaviors. Understanding these outcomes can help marketers find ways to increase environmental concerns that can build up a favorable attitude towards long-term green behavior by consumers (Han et al., 2010). By focusing on increasing consumers’ positive attitude towards green hotels, marketers can make
them more aware of being environmentally friendly while traveling and showing this through different media channels. In addition, marketers should educate consumers on why it is beneficial to select a green hotel, and the eco-friendly practices they use (Han et al., 2010).

**Gravity Model**

The “gravitation model” used by Crampon (1966) is based on the concept that a measurable relationship exists between the number of visitors arriving at a given destination from specific markets and a series of independent variables. The two most important variables are the size of the population of the market area and the distance between the destination and that market. This is because the basic assumption of this model is the number of trips taken by a population from a beginning location to a specific destination is a function of both the total population and the distance (Uysal & Crompton, 1985). The name of the model refers to Newton’s law of gravitation: “two bodies attract each other in proportion to the product of their masses and inversely by the square of their distance apart” (Uysal & Crompton, 1985, p. 10). Gravity models are similar to regression models but instead focus on the effects of distance or time it takes to travel as a restriction which affects travel (Uysal & Crompton, 1985). It can also examine the effects of cost and other variables related to tourism demand (Calantone, Benedetto, & Bojanic, 1987). This theory is relevant to this study because it explains the relationship between the number of travelers and distance to their destination. If a destination has a low number of visitors, the gravity theory can be used to determine where the tourists are coming from and if marketers are targeting the correct market segments (Crampon, 1966;
Uysal & Crompton, 1985). It could also be useful in studying new and developing market segments, such as staycation travelers in this study, by determining exactly where the tourists are coming from and their distance of travel (Uysal & Crompton, 1985).

Nyaupane and Graefe (2008) studied the demographic and behavioral characteristics of nature-based visitors based on distance traveled. The researchers used the gravity model to explain that the number of trips is inversely related to distance to the destination and how it affects travel behavior. Data were collected from 642 visitors at Gifford Pinchot National Forest, USA (Nyaupane & Graefe, 2008). Survey questions included providing a zip code to measure the distance from the origin to the destination for each respondent along with demographic information, frequency of visits, and activity participation questions. The respondents were segmented into four categories based on the distance traveled: less than 50 miles, 50-99.99 miles, 100-599.99 miles and more than 600 miles (Nyaupane & Graefe, 2008). Demographic differences between groups based on distance traveled were found. Those traveling longer distances were often 41-60 years old and travelers over 40 tended to be repeat visitors (Nyaupane & Graefe, 2008). Also, those who traveled shorter distances (less than 50 miles) were more likely to be repeat visitors which supports the gravity model that the closer one lives to the park the more frequently they visit the park. This information is helpful for marketers because it determines which marketing strategies to use for potential visitors coming to the park based on their travel time (Nyaupane & Graefe, 2008). Even though closer visitors frequent the park more than long-distance visitors, they often spend less money per day and participate in fewer activities per day. Understanding the different impacts of each
visitor and how far they have traveled will influence segmentation of travels and the specific type of activity and park promotion used to target travelers (Nyaupane & Graefe, 2008).

**Rationale for Study**

After reviewing the literature on staycations, it is evident very little research has been conducted on the lifestyles of staycation travelers (Alexander, Lee & Kim, 2011; Bracco, 2013; Cole, 2008; Fox, 2009; Kay & Yawei, 2010; Kruse, 2009; Martin, 2012; Sharma, 2009; TripAdvisor, 2013; Tuttle, 2012; Vacations are on the rise, 2011; Vackova, 2009; Wixon, 2009; Yesawich, 2010). Staycations became popular after the recession hit the American economy in 2008 and travelers began making some changes in travel behaviors and are still doing so today (Fox, 2009; Pant, 2014; Sharma, 2009; TripAdvisor, 2013). According to TripAdvisor (2013) American travelers are making sacrifices to save money for travel and are taking more short frequent vacations to discover their own country. In doing so, Americans have been taking trips closer to their hometown and even in their own home towns as an alternative and more budget-friendly option for vacation (Pant, 2014). Even as the economy rebounds, statistics show many travelers are still considering taking a staycation (Martin, 2012). This shows that staycations will not be a trend but become more of a lifestyle for Americans creating a need to study staycation traveler’s lifestyle in order to properly segment and market them.

Conducting this study on understanding the lifestyle of staycation travelers would address gaps in existing literature. To date, there are no empirical studies on the activities, interests and opinions of staycation travelers, leaving hospitality and tourism
professionals and researchers unfamiliar with this market segment. According to Pant (2014) staycations are very popular still among travelers because it is inexpensive and does not involve heavy planning like a traditional vacation. Due to its popularity, it is evident more information is needed on this market segment which would help marketers and industry professionals serve these travelers better in the future.

One of the most common methods for studying lifestyles of market segments is the Activities, Interests, and Opinions (AIO) model which is used to identify the characteristics of specific markets and focuses on the consumer rather than the product (Plummer, 1974). Since the staycation market is new and unfamiliar, using the AIO model will provide insights into the wants, needs, and lifestyle characteristics of staycation travelers in order to properly segment the market and create travel packages for lodging providers to offer (Plummer, 1974). Lodging providers could benefit from offering packages to staycation travelers because it generates revenue for the local economy and forms partnerships between local businesses (Bracco, 2013; Bronner & Hoog, 2012).

The goal of this study is to understand lifestyle patterns of staycation travelers in order to be able to segment the market and create customized packages for each segment. The specific research objectives are as follows:

1. To understand the lifestyles of staycation travelers using the Activities, Interests, and Opinions (AIO) model
2. To segment and profile staycation travelers; and
3. To create staycation packages for each of the identified segments
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Previous studies (Bruwer & Li, 2007; Chen, Huang, & Cheng, 2009; Gonzalez & Bello, 2002; Ignatov & Smith, 2006; Millar & Mayer, 2012; Tkaczynski & Rundle-Thiele, 2013; Zins, 1998) have focused on lifestyles of different segments in the hospitality and tourism industry. To date, no empirical studies have focused on staycation travelers and their lifestyles, and more specifically, on creating packages for lodging providers to market to this segment. This information would be useful for managers and marketers in lodging operations because it would target a profitable market (Sharma, 2009; TripAdvisor, 2013).

This chapter describes the use of human subjects in this research and outlines the following subsections explaining the data collection procedure: sample selection, instrument design, data collection, and data analysis techniques.

Human Subject Review

The researcher involved in this study has completed human subjects training. The Kent State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed the proposed methodology and data collection materials and assessed the risks and benefits to the participants in the research (Appendix A). A cover letter explaining the reason for the study was distributed to all participants.

Sample Selection
To gather data on staycation travelers and understand their lifestyle, a survey was distributed in-person to a convenience sample of college students at a Midwestern university.

According to Yesawich (2010), staycation travelers took at least one overnight leisure trip/vacation within a 50-mile radius of their home. Staycations are popular among adults who are single or married and may or may not have children (Yesawich, 2010). More travelers are cutting their travel spending down and taking more shorter frequent trips rather than one long one (Trip Advisor, 2013). Finally, another main characteristic mentioned about this tourist segment is their need to stay on a budget and make sacrifices on alternative products and activities to save for traveling (Trip Advisor, 2013). According to Yesawich (2010), 37% of staycations were taken by the Millennial generation (18-30) followed by 31% taken by Generation X (31-44). The younger generation combined traveling locally on a budget by visiting museums, attending local festivals and concerts, camping in their backyard, watching local sports games, and volunteering.

College students are budget conscious, travel shorter distances for trips more frequently, and may be single or married with or without children (Best Universities.com, 2011; Yesawich, 2011). Given these traits, college students would be an appropriate sample for this study. This segment could provide more insight to their staycation lifestyles.

**Instrument Design**
The survey instrument was designed using previous studies (Berkman & Gilson, 1974; Chen, Huang, & Cheng, 2009; Konu, 2010; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Matzler, Hattenberger, Pechlaner, & Abfalter, 2004; Moscardo, 2004; Todd & Lawson, 2001) utilizing the Activities, Interests, and Opinions (AIO) model as a guide. In addition to the AIO statements, demographic information was also collected in previous studies to further define the travelers and segment them appropriately (Berkman & Gilson, 1974; Chen et al., 2009; Konu, 2010; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Matzler et al., 2004; Moscardo, 2004; Todd & Lawson, 2001). The AIO statements for this study were selected based on relevancy to the study and modified to fit the needs of the current study. Responses to the AIO statements were completed using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”.

In order to create the AIO statements for the survey, two focus groups were conducted to identify the top lifestyle dimensions for staycation travelers (Matzler et al., 2004; Vyncke, 2002). The focus groups consisted of students from a Midwestern university with junior, senior, or graduate standing from a variety of majors. Each group member was given a handout with a table listing the activities, interests, and opinions variables and sub-variables as stated by Plummer (1974) (Appendix B). Both of the groups were briefed on the research objectives and the variables and sub-variables of the AIO model. The group members were also briefed on the definition of a staycation and the reasoning for the study. Group members were asked to name one item under each category directly related to staycation travelers (Lin, 2003). Each focus group had between 6-12 participants (Guest, Bunce & Johnson, 2005; Morse, 1994). The first
group unanimously decided on the main activity being “entertainment” and interests being “food.” There was some debate on the opinions dimension but the group came to the conclusion of “culture” because they felt people wanted to immerse themselves into their surroundings while traveling. The second focus group agreed with the first group identifying “entertainment” as the main activity and “food” as the main interest. The second group identified “themselves” as an opinion because when taking a staycation, travelers would focus on what their wants and needs are. Overall, the results showed the main activity was “entertainment”, interest was “food” and opinions were “culture” and “themselves”.

**Data Collection**

To collect data from university students with different majors across campus, various student groups on campus containing junior, senior, and graduate students were contacted to explain the purpose of the study. Only these students were contacted because the researcher felt they would have more access to the resources needed to take a staycation compared to underclassmen. Their permission to distribute the surveys during the last 10 minutes of the meeting was sought. Distributing the surveys in the classroom where the meetings were held produced a potentially larger sample size and higher response rate (Reisinger & Mavondo, 2004) (Appendix C). A total of 397 surveys were distributed with 390 surveys returned for a 98 percent response rate. Of the 390 surveys, only 297 were deemed usable for the study due to incomplete responses or respondents not meeting the requirement of being a junior, senior, or graduate student.

**Data Analysis Techniques**
Once the surveys were completed, data was tallied and organized for analysis using two steps: factor analysis and cluster analysis. Factor analysis identified the underlying dimensions in the data by condensing the specified variables. Next, the data from the factor analysis was used in a cluster analysis to compare the groupings of the data. Matzler et al. (2004) recommended using hierarchical and nonhierarchical methods to identify clusters. The hierarchical method determined the number of clusters, and the nonhierarchical method improved the relationship between the points in the clusters (Matzler et al., 2004). This study used both methods to cluster the groups and later create travel packages for lodging providers to market.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study was designed to use the Activities, Interests, and Opinions (AIO) model to gain a better understanding of staycation travelers, segment and profile staycation travelers, and to create staycation travel packages for each of the identified segments. This study contributes to the currently non-existent empirical literature related to staycation and specifically, leads to a better understanding of lifestyles of staycation travelers.

Demographic Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics

Information about demographic characteristics of respondents is available in Table 1. Of the 300 respondents 89% ($n = 267$) were between the ages 18-24 and more than half the sample was female ($n = 206$). The majority of the sample, 92.7% ($n = 278$) responded as “single” for marital status and for “Family Life Cycle” the majority of the sample, 80.7% ($n = 242$) responded “young single” with the next largest group being “young couple (no children)” at 14.3% ($n = 43$) of the sample. The majority of the respondents were juniors (42%; $n = 126$) and seniors (37%; $n = 110$).
Table 1

*Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (n = 300)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Partnership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life Cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Single</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Couple (no children)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with pre-school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family with school-age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About a two-thirds of the respondents (65%; n = 195) had taken a staycation within the past year (see Table 2). The average trip length was about 2.6 days, average distance traveled was about 48 miles, and the average budget was about $240 (see Table 3). Respondents were asked to identify which source(s) were mostly referenced for vacation information. The total frequencies for all the items will be more than the sample
size due to respondents selecting more than one answer. As seen in Table 4, the most frequently referenced sources were the internet \((n = 198)\) and friends and/or relatives \((n = 187)\). Finally, frequencies of responses related to sources of money for the staycation, accommodations, and eating habits while taking a staycation are available in Table 5.

Table 2

*Staycation Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you taken a staycation within the past year?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics for Staycations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staycation Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you have taken a staycation before, what was the duration of the trip? (in days)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How far did you travel to your destination for your staycation? (in miles)</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>47.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much money do you budget for a staycation? (in dollars)</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>240.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Vacation Information Sources*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and/or relatives</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents either agreed or strongly agreed (79.4%; \( n = 238 \)) to using their own money for a staycation. They were less likely to use their parent’s money as 54.3% (\( n = 163 \)) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. Respondents either agreed or strongly agreed (50.7%; \( n = 152 \)) to staying with family members but were more likely to stay with friends for a staycation as 70.3% (\( n = 211 \)) agreed or strongly agreed to this question. The majority of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed (46%; \( n = 138 \)) to staying at a campground for a staycation. They were more likely to stay in a hotel as 61.6% (\( n = 185 \)) either agreed or strongly agreed to this item. Finally, respondents either agreed or strongly agreed (63%; \( n = 189 \)) to eating at fast food restaurants while on a staycation but were more likely to eat at casual dining restaurants as 85% (\( n = 255 \)) agreed or strongly agreed to this question.

Table 5

Staycation Money, Accommodation, and Food Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use my parent’s money to go on a staycation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use my own money to go on a staycation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stay with family members while taking a staycation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stay with friends while taking a staycation.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to a campground for a staycation.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stay in a hotel while taking a staycation.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to fast food restaurants while taking a staycation.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I eat at casual dining restaurants while taking a staycation.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Underlying Dimensions of Lifestyle of Staycation Travelers**

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy was done to confirm the adequateness for factor analysis (Lee & Sparks, 2007). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure for the data was 0.760 (see Table 6) which exceeds the recommended value of 0.6 to complete a successful factor analysis (Lee & Sparks, 2007). Bartlett’s Test of
Sphericity reached a statistical significance of \( p = 0.000 \) supporting the factorability of the rotated component matrix as well as producing a Chi-square of 3973.597 and \( \text{df} = 861 \) (Table 6).

Table 6

**Sampling Adequacy and Sphericity**

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | 0.760 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | Approx Chi-Square | 3973.597 |
| Df | 861 |
| Sig. | .000 |

The 42 items for the activities, interests, and opinions statements regarding staycation travelers were used in a factor analysis using principal component analysis with varimax rotation to reduce the variables to a smaller number of underlying factors. To help eliminate those items that did not fit, only items with a 0.4 loading or higher were kept for evaluation (Lee & Sparks, 2007). A total of 13 factors were identified for analysis. These factors were tested for reliability using Cronbach’s alpha. Only the first six factors as described in Table 7 had a Cronbach alpha score of above 0.5 and hence, the last seven factors were disregarded from further analysis. The six factors were named as follows: (1) *culture enthusiasts*, (2) *adventurous eaters*, (3) *socialites and party goers*, (4) *health conscious individuals*, (5) *television and movie buffs who rely on family and friends*, and (6) *performing arts and museum seekers*. 
Table 7

**Factors Underlying Lifestyle (AIO) of Staycation Travelers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor name</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Variance (%)</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Culture Enthusiasts</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.155</td>
<td>14.655</td>
<td>0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersing myself in the culture while on vacation is important to me.</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the local people and customs is important to me.</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to visit new places and learn about different cultures.</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is not important to me while traveling on vacation.</td>
<td>-0.673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong hold on cultural values.</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often research the culture of a destination before I travel there for vacation.</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Adventurous Eaters</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.349</td>
<td>7.974</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to try foods from foreign countries.</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am an adventurous eater.</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am interested in trying new foods.</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a picky eater.</td>
<td>-0.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to visit more local restaurants.</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Socialites and Party Goers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.523</td>
<td>6.006</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to bars and night clubs are one of my favorite forms of entertainment.</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping is very entertaining to me.</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of my favorite forms of entertainment is to go out with friends.</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often go to concerts or music festivals.</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Health Conscious Individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.303</td>
<td>5.483</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My eating habits are healthy.</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a healthy person.</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5: Television/Movie Buffs Who Rely on Family and Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>4.499</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My favorite entertainment is to watch</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
movies. Watching television is my favorite entertainment. I eat to enjoy myself. I fall upon my family and friends for help.

Factor 6: Performing Arts and Museum Seekers
I often see performances at the theater. I enjoy visiting museums and/or exhibits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.690</th>
<th>4.025</th>
<th>0.588</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lifestyle Clusters of Staycation Travelers**

To segment the various lifestyles of staycation travelers, two types of cluster analyses were used; hierarchical and nonhierarchical. The factor scores from the factor analysis were used as the input for the cluster analysis. The hierarchical method was used first to identify the appropriate number of clusters by using Ward’s method (Lee & Sparks, 2007). The first large increase in the data appears between stages 293 and 294 and because of this, four clusters were selected to group the data together. Next, the nonhierarchical approach was conducted to strengthen the cluster method by using the hierarchical results to generate the seed points of the clusters. Each of the six factors were assigned a seed point for each of the four clusters, demonstrating the differences among them. Once the final cluster centers were calculated, the clusters were named based on the characteristics each one possessed. To determine the characteristics to report for each cluster, the highest and lowest mean scores were identified for each factor and were only reported for those clusters containing those points (see Table 8). What follows is a description of individuals who represented each of the four clusters.
### Table 8

*Lifestyle Cluster Mean Scores for Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
<th>Cluster 4</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>(<em>p</em> &lt; .000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture Enthusiasts</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-1.371</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>62.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventurous Eaters</td>
<td>-1.273</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>62.449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialites and Party Goers</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>-0.396</td>
<td>12.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Conscious Individuals</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>8.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television/Movie Buffs Who Rely on Family and Friends</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>-0.586</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>-0.754</td>
<td>64.091</td>
<td>(<em>p</em> &lt; .000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts and Museum Seekers</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>-0.202</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>17.427</td>
<td>(<em>p</em> &lt; .000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cluster 1: Socialites**

This cluster contained 56 respondents which accounted for 18.86% of the sample. This cluster scored the highest for the *socialites and party goers* factor (0.484) which includes respondents who liked going to bars and night clubs, shopping, going out with friends and seeing concerts or going to music festivals during their staycation. This cluster scored the second highest for the *television/movie buffs who rely on family and friends* factor (0.330) which includes respondents who like to watch movies and television for entertainment.

**Cluster 2: Healthy Individuals**

This cluster had 48 respondents which made up 16.16% of the sample. This cluster scored the highest in the *health conscious individuals* factor (0.210). These respondents consider themselves to be healthy people and their eating habits to be healthy.
too. This cluster scored the second highest for the *adventurous eaters* factor (0.265) which included trying foods from foreign countries, trying new foods, and visiting more local restaurants.

**Cluster 3: Adventurous Eaters and Television/Movie Buffs**

The third cluster included the most number of respondents (*n* = 110) which accounted for 37.03% of the sample. This cluster scored the highest in the *adventurous eaters* factor (0.422) and the *television/movie buffs who rely on family and friends* factor (0.657). Therefore, members in this cluster like to try new foods and foods from foreign countries, and would like to visit more local restaurants. Watching television and movies are some of their favorite forms of entertainment and they like to eat to enjoy themselves.

**Cluster 4: Culture Enthusiasts**

The final cluster contained 83 respondents or 27.95% of the sample. This cluster scored the highest for the *culture enthusiasts* factor (0.438) and *performing arts and museum seekers* factor (0.536). Members of this cluster have strong cultural values, research the culture of the destination before traveling there, like immersing themselves in the culture while on a staycation, and like to learn about the local people and customs. Going to see performances at the theater and visiting museums and/or exhibits are activities they really enjoy.

Once the clusters were identified, ANOVA was used to find any statistically significant differences among the clusters in regards to the staycation characteristics. No statistically significant differences were found among the clusters based on the various staycation (see Table 9).
Table 9

ANOVA for Staycation Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Trip</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Traveled</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>47.956</td>
<td>50.277</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Spent</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>238.731</td>
<td>255.280</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s Money</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>1.390</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Money</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4.128</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays with Family</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.229</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stays with Friends</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.721</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>0.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.525</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eats at Fast Food</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.572</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eats at Casual Dining</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The main objectives of this study was to segment and profile staycation travelers using Activities, Interests, and Opinions (AIO) lifestyle segmentation and create travel packages for lodging providers to market. The lifestyles of staycation travelers have not been previously studied which could leave industry professionals and researchers unfamiliar with this segment. Various definitions of a staycation are available in the literature (Fox, 2009; Sharma, 2009; Yesawich, 2010). This study used the definition provided by Yesawich (2010) because it included distance traveled and duration of the trip. Providing these guidelines made it easier for respondents to identify whether or not they have taken a staycation before. Findings of this study revealed that the average distance of travel was 48 miles and duration was about 2.6 days. This distance is supported by the literature, and the duration adds to the definition of a staycation since it was unclear (Yesawich, 2010). In addition, 65% of respondents took a staycation within the past year which is also supported by the literature. It shows people are still choosing to take a staycation even when the economy is slowly going back up (Pant, 2014; TripAdvisor, 2013). Finally, the literature does not clearly define a budget or amount travelers usually spend on a staycation. To fill this gap in the literature, this study found the average budget for a 2.6 day staycation was $240.52. The study also determined the source of money for a staycation for the sample of college students; i.e., Millennial generation, was their own money as opposed to that of their parents.
With respect to staycations specifically, the literature does not clearly state where travelers are getting their vacation information from but identifies the internet being a source of information (Bracco, 2013; Lacho & Kiefer, 2008). This finding was supported by the study as respondents reported frequently referring to the internet ($n = 198$) as well as family and/or relatives ($n = 187$) to obtain staycation information. This information could be important for lodging managers and marketers because it would help them use the most effective media channels to market to this segment. Also, the literature suggests people are staying in a hotel for a staycation due to hotels promoting them, but it is not clearly stated (Bracco, 2013; Sharma, 2009). The study found that staycation travelers were most likely to stay with friends (70.3%; $n = 211$) followed by staying in a hotel (61.6%; $n = 185$). These respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed (46%; $n = 138$) to staying at a campground for a staycation. This information would be important for lodging marketers and managers because it shows where these staycation travelers are more likely to stay, ensuring more effective marketing by specific lodging establishments. By understanding where they are staying, lodging establishments can assess the attractions around them that would best suit the needs of staycation travelers. It would also help them assess whether or not staycation travelers would be a suitable segment for them to market to.

In addition to lodging, the literature suggests travelers eat out in casual dining restaurants while on a staycation (Kruse, 2009; Fox, 2009). The study confirmed travelers were more likely to eat in casual dining restaurants, as 85% ($n = 255$) of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed to this question. To add to the literature, it
was found 63% \((n = 189)\) of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed to eating at fast food restaurants when taking a staycation. Again, this information would be important for lodging managers because potential partnerships between casual and fast food restaurants would be beneficial for both businesses. Examples of successful partnerships between lodging and foodservice establishments are available in past literature (Bracco, 2013).

The study also revealed that using AIO lifestyle statements was successful in segmenting staycation travelers. The 42 items were used in a factor analysis to discover the strongest underlying factors. Six factors were identified and named respectively: (1) *culture enthusiasts*, (2) *adventurous eaters*, (3) *socialites and party goers*, (4) *health conscious individuals*, (5) *television/movie buffs who rely on family and friends*, and (6) *performing arts and museum seekers*. The six factors were used in a cluster analysis to find out how the factors clustered together. Four clusters were identified: (1) *socialites*, (2) *healthy individuals*, (3) *adventurous eaters and television/movie buffs*, and (4) *culture enthusiasts*; each cluster showed unique traits in various lifestyles. The clusters, however, did not show any unique traits based on staycation characteristics. Perhaps differences did not appear due to constraints such as school obligations and limited income that college students typically experience. Involving other generations could have created more differences in staycation habits among the clusters. After reviewing the clusters, sample travel packages were created to assist lodging operators, hotels specifically, market to staycation travelers. The following section explains the packages in great detail as well as suggestions for marketers and lodging managers.
Managerial Implications

Cluster analysis revealed four distinct clusters that profiled the staycation travelers in this study. This is the first attempt being made in the industry to segment this market. The four clusters include: (1) socialites, (2) healthy individuals, (3) adventurous eaters and television/movie buffs, and (4) culture enthusiasts. Each cluster exemplified various characteristics to provide insight on their lifestyles while taking a staycation. The final objective of this study was to create travel packages to assist lodging providers in meeting the needs of staycation travelers more effectively. Travel packages addressing the unique needs of individuals who make up each of the four clusters is described below.

The first cluster, socialites, are interested in activities that involve their friends, music, and night clubs and bars. These people also enjoy watching movies and/or television. To accommodate their interests, the following sample travel package is suggested (see Table 10). Offering items such as tickets for a concert, shuttle service to and from specific bars/night clubs, and free movie showing at the lodging establishment would all be of interest to members in this cluster. Lodging establishments should be mindful of this cluster’s members traveling in larger groups and have the ability to offer appropriate activities for larger groups to enjoy. To add more value to the package, lodging providers could include transportation to all the above stated activities to make it easier for the groups to travel together. If travelers are experiencing the night-life one night, instead of a shuttle, the hotel could partner with a limo service to increase the value and make the travelers feel special. Also, lodging providers could partner with a concert venue or music festival event to offer discount tickets for the concert and discount on
their stay at the lodging establishment. A few alternate suggestions include: partnering with a night club and offering VIP service for the group, or providing a group discount on movie theater tickets.

The second cluster is titled *healthy individuals* and includes those who consider themselves very healthy and have healthy eating habits. Members of this cluster also like to try new foods, foods from foreign countries, and visit local restaurants. The following travel package is suggested to meet this cluster’s needs (see Table 10). Including items such as fitness classes, spa treatments, and tips for healthy eating at ethnic restaurants while on a staycation can entice travelers in this cluster. Creating opportunities to be healthy and trying new foods is crucial for lodging establishments to remember when targeting this segment. Lodging operators could add more value to the package by partnering with a local fitness center to provide more options for fitness and wellness classes at a discounted rate. Other practices to attract this cluster could include offering a walking tour in a local, state or national park, clinics on nutrition, and touring local restaurants in the area and sampling new foods. A tour to the local farmer’s market to sample healthy, homegrown foods would be another option for lodging providers to offer as part of a package.

The third cluster is titled *adventurous eaters and television/movie buffs*. The travelers in this cluster are not very interested in doing a lot of physical activities and prefer to relax and watch television and/or movies. Because of this, the following travel package is suggested for these travelers (see Table 10). Offering movie theater tickets and discounts on food would meet the needs of these travelers. Partnering with local
ethnic restaurants in the area would be beneficial for lodging operators because featuring more than one restaurant could add more value to the package and would help the restaurants market themselves to these travelers. Since these travelers are more local they may be more likely to return giving business to both businesses. Also, lodging operators could partner with the local movie theater to offer “dinner and a movie” by providing dinner at their establishment and providing the movie theater tickets. Lodging establishments could offer other items such as providing a complimentary appetizer/dessert when ordering room service while at the lodging restaurant, or a shuttle/bus tour sampling various ethnic restaurants in the area.

The final cluster includes culture enthusiasts who enjoy immersing themselves in cultural activities while on a staycation, seeing theater performances, and visiting museums. Therefore, the following sample travel package is suggested for this cluster of travelers (see Table 10). Offering tickets to the local museum, a theater performance, or a tour of the cultural attractions in the area would interest these travelers during their staycation. To add more value to the package, cultural performances during holidays at the theater could be offered to really immerse the travelers into the culture. For example, the Italian culture celebrates Saint Anthony’s Feast every year at the end of August and one of the largest Saint Anthony’s Feast occurs in Boston, MA where people come to celebrate the holiday with parades, live entertainment, and religious services held daily (Saint Anthony’s Feast, 2014). The streets are beautifully decorated and lined with 100 pushcarts full of authentic Italian food (Saint Anthony’s Feast, 2014). A partnership could be formed between the museum(s) and the lodging establishment to offer a
personal guide for the travelers to get a more tailored experience. Lodging providers could also offer items such as a backstage tour of a local performance theater and meet and greet with the cast members, or discounts on stays during cultural holidays.

Table 10

*Sample Travel Packages for Staycation Travelers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Sample Travel Package</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) socialites                               | • Shopping and night-life guide with coupons and map of the area  
• Tickets for a concert or local bar with live music  
• Shuttle service provided to and from specific bars/night clubs  
• Free movie showing at lodging establishment |
| (2) healthy individuals                      | • Voucher for free fitness class (either on-site or in the area depending on lodging location)  
• Provide a discount for a spa treatment (either on-site or in the area depending on lodging location)  
• Healthy eating guide for ethnic restaurants in the area and provide a voucher or discount for one or more of those restaurants |
| (3) adventurous eaters and television/movie buffs | • Tickets to the movies or one free on-demand movie  
• Provide a guide of ethnic restaurants in the area and provide a voucher or discount for one of those restaurants  
• Offer a dinner-movie night package at the lodging establishment |
| (4) culture enthusiasts                       | • Offer discounted/complementary tickets to a local museum  
• Offer discounted/complementary tickets to a local performing arts show at the theater  
• Offer a shuttle/bus tour of the local |
Despite contributing to the scant staycation literature, this study is not without limitations. One of the biggest limitations of this study is it is not representative of the total population of staycation travelers. Data was only collected from the Millennial generation. Although they form the highest percentage of staycation travelers, Generation X (31 – 44 years of age) members also take staycations in high numbers but were not sampled in this study. Results of this study cannot be generalized to all Millennials and is only applicable to students in the sampled Midwestern University.

Another limitation is that the study only used one definition of staycation to ensure distance and time could be easily measured and understood by the respondents. The study only focused on overnight leisure trips/vacations taken within a 50-mile radius of one’s home and not the staycations people have taken in their actual home without traveling outside of it. Many of the AIO statements needed to be eliminated after the exploratory factor analysis resulting in a smaller list of AIO statements. This is a typical limitation with exploratory factor analysis (Vyncke, 2002).

Future Research

In future research, the sample could reflect other staycation travel segments such as families or couples with children and Generation X members. A comparison study could be done with more parameters included in the staycation definition and with a more diverse sample. Geographic differences in respondents may also result in different
clusters. Also, future researchers could interview staycation travelers and present these travel package ideas to them, and identify if it is meeting the needs of these travelers. It could potentially make the travel packages stronger by gaining feedback from the segment being marketed. Future researchers could also survey college students 5 years after graduation to determine if the clusters were similar and if there are differences in staycation characteristics due to less constraints on time, money, and school obligations.
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Focus Group Handout

AIO Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbies</td>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Social issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club membership</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>Products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Achievements</td>
<td>Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wells & Tigert (1971) were the first to use Activities, Interests and Opinions (AIO) rating statements to better understand the lifestyles of consumers in specific markets (Plummer, 1974). These statements help researchers and marketers understand how to communicate effectively with their audience as well as focus on the consumer rather than the product (Plummer, 1974). The AIO model can help create new products and explain why certain products are successful or unsuccessful (Plummer, 1974). Using this model can help marketers understand a target market that is unfamiliar or new and understand what their wants, needs and lifestyles are in order to create successful products. Since the staycation market is relatively new and unfamiliar, the AIO model can identify the lifestyle of this specific target market.

The purpose of this study is to understand the lifestyle of staycation travelers. The definition of a staycation is “a vacation that is spent at one’s home enjoying that entire home and [all] one’s home environs have to offer” (Fox, 2009). Instead of traveling to another state or overseas, these travelers are choosing to take a vacation in their actual home, or traveling within 50 miles of their home. These travelers are on a budget and carefully save their money for travel and even cut back on spending in other areas to save. Both singles and families take staycations but their lifestyles have not been recently studied.

The purpose of the focus group is to identify one item in each category that best describes staycation travelers (Lin, 2003). The group must collectively agree on the item selected which will later be used to develop the survey targeted at this segment.
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SURVEY
Dear Respondent,

My name is Alexandra James and I am currently a master’s student at Kent State University. As part of my master’s thesis, I am conducting research on staycation travelers. The aim of this study is to understand the lifestyles of staycation travelers and create travel packages for lodging providers to market to this segment.

A “staycation” is defined as at least one overnight leisure trip/vacation within a 50 mile radius of the person’s home (Yesawich, 2010).

I would be extremely grateful if you could fill out the attached questionnaire. You must be at least 18 years old or over to participate. Your participation is voluntarily and I assure the anonymity and confidentiality of your responses. I will solely use all information for my thesis and your answers will only be reviewed by me. Your individual answers will not be shared with anyone. You would have to spend no more than 12 to 15 minutes of your time for this. You will not be revealing your personal identity by filling this questionnaire, as there are no questions pertaining to your name or contact information.

This project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have specific questions about the rules and regulations please contact the Division of Research and Sponsored Programs at 330-672-2704.

Thank you very much for your support and completion of the survey. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Alexandra James
Graduate Student
Kent State University
440-376-0194
ajames14@kent.edu

Swathi Ravichandran
Associate Professor
Kent State University
330-672-7314
sravicha@kent.edu
Using Lifestyle Segmentation to Develop Lodging Packages for Staycation Travelers: An Exploratory Study with College Students

Survey

1. Age
   - 18-24
   - 25-34
   - 35-44
   - 45-54
   - 55-64
   - 65-74
   - 75+

2. Sex
   - Male
   - Female

3. Marital status
   - Single
   - Married
   - Domestic partnership
   - Separated
   - Divorced
   - Other

4. Family life cycle
   - Young single
   - Young couple (no children)
   - Family with pre-school children
   - Family with school age children
   - Other

5. Year in school
   - Freshman
   - Sophomore
   - Junior
   - Senior
   - Graduate student
   - Other

6. Staycation
   6.1 Have you taken a “staycation” within the past year? A “staycation” is defined as at least one overnight leisure trip/vacation within a 50 mile radius of the person’s home (Yesawich, 2010). (Please ask for clarification if needed)
   - Yes
   - No

   6.2 If you have taken a staycation before, what was the duration of the trip?
   __________________________ day
6.3 How far did you travel to your destination for your staycation?

____________ miles (Maximum 50 miles)

6.4 About how much money do you budget for a staycation? ____________
dollars

7. Which source do you mostly get your vacation information from? Select all that apply.

☐ Newspaper/ ☐ Television ☐ Internet ☐ Friends and/or ☐ Other
Magazine program relatives ________________________

8. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement for the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. 8</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.8 I eat at casual dining* restaurants while taking a staycation. 

*A casual dining restaurant is a restaurant that serves moderately-priced food in a casual atmosphere. Except for buffet-style restaurants, casual dining restaurants typically provide table service (The Free Dictionary.com, 2014).

### PLEASE CONTINUE TO THE NEXT PAGE

The following statements pertain to activities that staycation travelers may participate in. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement using the scale for the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>My favorite entertainment is to watch movies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td>I often go to concerts or music festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3</td>
<td>I enjoy visiting museums and/or exhibits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4</td>
<td>I often see performances at the theater.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5</td>
<td>I enjoy going out to eat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6</td>
<td>Going to bars and night clubs are one of my favorite forms of entertainment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7</td>
<td>Traveling with family entertains me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statements below pertain to interests staycation travelers may have. Please indicate level of agreement or disagreement using the scale for the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 I am interested in trying new foods.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 I usually purchase organic foods.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 I am more interested in chain restaurants rather than local restaurants.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4 I would like to visit more local restaurants.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5 I am an adventurous eater.</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.6</td>
<td>I like to try foods from foreign countries.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.7</td>
<td>I like to get the most value for my money when purchasing food.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.8</td>
<td>I eat to enjoy myself.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.9</td>
<td>My eating habits are healthy.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.10</td>
<td>I am a picky eater.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.11</td>
<td>Vegetarian or vegan options are necessary for me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.12</td>
<td>I like to eat on the go.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following statements below pertain to the opinions staycation travelers may have. Please indicate level of agreement or disagreement using the scale for the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>Immersing myself in the culture while on vacation is important to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>Learning about the local people and customs is important to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>I feel comfortable with people who speak the same language.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4</td>
<td>My dietary habits are typically ethnic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.5</td>
<td>I have a strong hold on cultural values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.6</td>
<td>I am apprehensive of adapting to other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.7</td>
<td>I like to visit new places and learn about different cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.8</td>
<td>Culture is not important to me while traveling on vacation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.9</td>
<td>I often research the culture of the destination before I travel there for vacation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.10</td>
<td>I prefer vacations that help me relax.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.11</td>
<td>I prefer to travel alone rather than in a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.12</td>
<td>I consider myself more open-minded than most people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.13</td>
<td>I am a healthy person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.14</td>
<td>I like to plan a lot of activities to do while on vacation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.15</td>
<td>I tend to do more things that are familiar to me when traveling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.16</td>
<td>I am cautious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.17</td>
<td>I fall upon my family &amp; friends for help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.18</td>
<td>I am an adventurous person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.19</td>
<td>I am a complex individual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.20</td>
<td>I am a planner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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