

**IDENTIFYING THE RELEVANT, CLEAR AND EFFICIENT LIST  
OF DISCRETIONARY TRAVEL DECISION MAKING FACTORS  
AND EVALUATIVE COMPONENTS OF DESTINATION IMAGE**

**W Glen Croy**

*Working Paper 3/05  
February 2005*

**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT  
WORKING PAPER SERIES  
ISSN 1327-5216**



# IDENTIFYING THE RELEVANT, CLEAR AND EFFICIENT LIST OF DISCRETIONARY TRAVEL DECISION MAKING FACTORS AND EVALUATIVE COMPONENTS OF DESTINATION IMAGE


## INTRODUCTION

The measurement of image is a troublesome affair. This is also similar to the measurement on any concept or construct where it is only able to be measured through the reconstruction of its fragments or variables. What are the variables that make up the construct, how many of these variables need to be measured, what variables make up larger parts of the construct, what variables do not make up much of the construct, what variables have high importance in the construct, what variables have less importance? All these questions are important, though in many cases are assumed or not asked at all. To include variables that do not make up a construct obviously then means that the instrument is measuring something other than the construct of focus. To assume variables have equal roles in the holistic construct underplays the significant relationships and outcomes of differing variables in the make up of the construct. What is needed is a process to identify the variables of a construct, and as important to identify a relevant, clear and efficient list of these variables for the measurement process.

This paper will outline an elimination process. First the tourist decision making process will be briefly introduced in which to based the following discussion. Second, a presentation and review of previous list limiting studies will be presented, especially considering issues and concerns with these arbitrary processes. Third, the elimination process used in this research will be presented. Fourth, outcomes of this process will be provided, before identifying the most pertinent points in the paper summary.

The reason for the focus on decision making factors and destination image is in the premise of travel decision making. Decisions on discretionary destinations are argued to go through a common process (Woodside & Sherrell, 1977; van Raaij & Francken, 1984; Moutinho, 1987; Woodside & Lysonski, 1989; Um & Crompton, 1990; Goodall, 1991). Motivations identify a need for discretionary travel. From motivated person's memory or environment a set of aware destinations is identified. This set of destinations is then limited based on factors of availability. Availability factors are what are generally termed decision-making factors, such as cost, time, family, safety. The next step is limiting the available set based on the perception of the destinations to satisfy the initial and other emergent motivations. The perceptions or image of a place also present the expectations of what that destination will be able to provide. The limiting at this stage is dependent on the evaluative components of image of the respective destinations. From this the available destinations are sorted into three sets: the inept set; the inert set; and the evoked set. From the evoked set a destination is chosen for the discretionary travel experience (Figure 1).

**Figure 1: Destination Selection Model**



Thus the decision making factors define the availability of a destination, and the evaluative components of destination image allocates the destinations into the inept, inert, or evoked sets. Previous studies to identify these attributes are plentiful, though have nonetheless largely focused on descriptive attributes. They have additionally generally used structured attribute lists of about 20-50 attributes per study. As previously noted in 30 destination image studies reviewed there were approximately 600 attributes identified, as is indicated the studies were quite individualised; specifically there were not many common attributes. Most of the attributes were interestingly largely derived from the literature or researcher defined. This too was reflected in Pike's (2002) review of 143 destination image studies. In the 30 studies reviewed there was no mention of limiting lists or eliminating irrelevant, unclear and inefficient items. The phase one and two methods identified a list of 144 decision making factors and 254 destination image attributes.

The results from part one determined the factors and components to be used in the semantic differential scales. The list of 144 decision making factors and 254 evaluative components supplied through phase one were regarded as a complete description of the semantic space of destination image and were subsequently qualified and validated in phase two. Importance ratings, admittedly unrestricted, were also informed in phase two. It was these importance ratings, compared with the ordinal lists of phase one, which provided the need for an importance analysis to be included with the factor scales in part two. Using Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum's (1957) time guidance it would take approximately one hour to complete the survey. This is an increased issue in this research as the survey had to be completed again after watching a two hour feature film. In short, the list of terms of decision-making factors and evaluative components needed to be limited, though still sufficiently define the semantic space of destination image.

The survey and interviews identified a large range of attributes and there was a curial need to limit the sizes of the lists so not to be overwhelmed by heterogeneity (Smith, 1995). The reduction of lists has also been a concern for those developing lists to assess feelings, beliefs and behaviours of groups (Osgood, Suci & Tannebaum 1957; Mueller, 1986; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). They also noted that a precise delimitation process was necessary for successful measurement of a concept. It must also be noted that there are concerns related to reducing lists (Schuman & Presser, 1996; Thorne, Kirkham & MacDonald-Emes, 1997; Sommer & Sommer, 2002; Jennings, 2001; de Vaus, 2002). This is especially as the elimination may result in the reduction of quality, detail and complexity of the holistic measurement of the concept and provide only "superficial understandings at the expense of deeper and more meaningful analytical interpretations" (Thorne, Kirkham & MacDonald-Emes, 1997: 174). These concerns can be minimised through the development of an effective procedure in place to precisely reduce lists or eliminate items for the measurement of a concept (Osgood, Suci & Tannebaum 1957; Mueller, 1986; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). In contrast however, generally the selection and elimination of items is by the researchers' "good judgement" (Osgood, Suci and Tannebaum 1957: 77). In short, the list of terms of decision-making factors and evaluative components need to be limited, though still sufficiently define and explain the semantic space.

Previous studies were identified that had limited a large collection of items to a manageable though sufficient collection for scale surveys. Ten studies were sourced, largely from psychology, though also included a marketing and health study. The studies were derived from outside of tourism as there was an lack of documentation of a similar process in the tourism literature. Though these studies had quite different foci to this research, the elimination of items for the efficient collection of information of all research drew commonality. Each of the studies used between 1 and 5 steps in their elimination processes (Table 1). The contemporary timeframe of the studies found also indicates that documenting a process of attribute elimination has only been in recent times identified as an important stage in list formation.

**Table 1: Item Elimination Processes**

Author	Year	Focus	Source of items	Initial items	Elimination Process					Final items
					Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	
Ohanian	1990	Celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness	Literature	182 items	Extreme items eliminated (43)	Words unfamiliar to 75% or more of the sample eliminated (n=38) (35)	Words with 75% or more agreement as 'belonging' to the concept kept (n=52) (32)			72 items
Mouton-Simien, McCain, and Kelley	1997	Toddler behaviour screening	Elicitation survey, and literature, and previous surveys	194 items	Evaluated for clarity, conciseness, and duplication by professionals (n=10) (101)	Items eliminated if not identified by more than 30% of the sample as prominent in the concept, and if more than 10% did not indicate the severity of the item (53)				40 items
Auty and Elliot	1998	Fashion involvement and the meaning of brands	Focus groups college students	32 items	Items eliminated that failed a comprehension test on group of children (3)	Pilot test on college students (2)				27 items
McMillan <i>et al.</i>	2002	Workaholism	Previous surveys	25 items, plus 18 items	Scale and related items eliminated on low correlation tests (6)					19 items, plus 18 items

Author	Year	Focus	Source of items	Initial items	Elimination Process					Final items
					Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	
Retzlaff <i>et al.</i>	2002	Aviation personality	Literature, currently used tests, other available tests, diagnostic manuals, and referral questions	18 scales, 24 items per scale	Pre-test no variance or poor item-total correlation (n=86) (10%, though replaced with 'new and better items')	Pilot testing items eliminated when fewer than 5% or more than 95% answered true (n=200) (?)	Items with negative, non-significant or low Item-total correlations, and items that correlated with other scales higher than their own were eliminated. Additionally, only items scales with internal consistencies above 0.70 were retained (4 scales, 8 items)			15 scales, 16 items per scale
Souto and Garcia	2002	Body image	Definition literature	81 items	Authors analysed items eliminating those with same or exact opposite meaning (38)	Seven judges evaluated items those with lower than 0.80 agreement were eliminated (4)	Reliability test re-test of items – good correlation Items removed based on respondent feedback (3)	Construct validity elimination of items whose exclusion would increase Cronbach's alpha co-efficient (10)	Re-test of construct validity (3)	23 items

Author	Year	Focus	Source of items	Initial items	Elimination Process					Final items
					Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	
Goldbeck, <i>et al.</i>	2003	Life satisfaction with cystic fibrosis	Interviews, literature, and members of a multi-professional team working with patients	16 items, paired importance satisfaction	Items with the most common variance with the generic concept were eliminated (4)	If a more than one item loaded more than 0.50 in a factor analysis, the lesser item was eliminated (3)				9 items
Kilpatrick, Bartholomew, and Riemer	2003	Goal orientation in exercise	Previous survey	13 items	Review by authors of wording and generation of additional terms (+8)	Implemented and assessed for internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha and item-total correlation more than 0.60 (n=75) (11)	Confirmatory factor analysis – all items accepted			10 items
Lehman, <i>et al.</i>	2003	Outcomes of schizophrenia care and assessment	From two previous surveys, and drew upon other surveys	Not stated	Item-to-scale correlation, test re-test stability (n=121?), and sensitivity to group differences and or change over time	Reviewed by authors	Pilot test to primarily assess feasibility and acceptability (n=?)			100 items
Vileikyte, <i>et al.</i>	2003	Quality of life with neuropathy and foot ulcer	Focus group in-depth interviews (n=62) analysed by four reviewers	49 items, plus paired item for each to assess importance or bother	Items with low test re-test correlation were eliminated (6, word changes to other items) (n=153)					43 items plus pair, plus an overall item

Most of the studies implemented a multi step process of elimination generally based on three considerations. First, the relevance, relationship or correlation of the items identified to the concepts being studied. Second, the clarity of the items identified for respondents to understand and implement. Finally, the efficiency of the items identified to measure the concepts being studied. These are also points identified by Osgood, Suci and Tannebaum (1957) for consideration. Relevance and singularity are the same consideration of the item being a measure of the concept. Clarity and familiarity of items are again the same consideration that respondents can understand the items. Finally, the efficiency of the items is related to representativeness of the items in explaining the concept. These three considerations should limit the large list of items to a list that is manageable, though still provides a sufficient explanation of the semantic space of destination image.

The previous studies had implemented a range of measures for these three factors. First, to assess relevance previous methods asked respondents if the items belonged to the concept (Ohanian, 1990), and by testing item-concept correlation (McMillan, *et al.*, 2002; Retzlaff, *et al.*, 2002; Souto & Garcia, 2002; Goldbeck, *et al.*, 2003; Kilpatrick, Bartholomew & Riemer, 2003; Lehman, *et al.*, 2003). Second, the clarity of the items in their meaning was assessed so that instruments do not confuse and thus deter responses or respondents. This was a limitation identified of SDS in assessing the ability of respondents to make a meaningful response (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957; Snider & Osgood, 1969; Ohanian, 1990). This consideration had previously been assessed by professionals (Mouton-Simien, McCain & Kelley, 1997), by asking respondents their familiarity with the items (Ohanian, 1990), by assessing children's comprehension of the items (Auty & Elliot, 1998), and by author review (Kilpatrick, Bartholomew, & Riemer, 2003; Lehman, *et al.*, 2003). Third, the efficiency of the items to identify and measure the concept must be assessed. As related to respondent fatigue a shorter list is better, though it still needs to identify and measure destination image. Therefore the items that do not add to the explanation of the concept need to be identified, as they are inefficient. Previous methods to assess the efficiency of the items were by identifying levels of respondent agreement and selecting the items with the highest levels of agreement (Ohanian, 1990; Mouton-Simien, McCain & Kelley, 1997; Retzlaff, *et al.*, 2002), by expert agreement (Souto & Garcia, 2002), by author review (Kilpatrick, Bartholomew & Riemer, 2003; Lehman, *et al.*, 2003), by undertaking factor analysis (Goldbeck, *et al.*, 2003; Kilpatrick, Bartholomew & Riemer, 2003), and by testing Cronbach's Alpha (Souto & Garcia, 2002; Kilpatrick, Bartholomew & Riemer, 2003). This research needed to consider these three issues for elimination and the methods used.

The identified list of decision-making factors and evaluative components was too large and would lead to respondent fatigue and acquiescence. From the lists, items needed to be eliminated based on the three factors of relevance, clarity, and efficiency of the items identified to measure the concepts being studied. An additional consideration was the phase three and four was to provide responses from collating individual responses. It must be noted that this was a process of elimination of irrelevant, unclear and inefficient items, rather than selecting relevant, clear or efficient items. An elimination process was developed derived from previous studies.

Based on these three issues a reliable process was required to eliminate irrelevant, unclear, and inefficient items. Based on the studies reviewed above and the processes they implemented, an arbitrary process was developed to eliminate items from the lists of decision making factors and destination image attributes. This was a four step process to identify relevant, clear and efficient list of attributes to measure change in decision making factors and evaluative destination image components. Though this would not indicate importance, it would indicate relevance of the terms to the concept of decision-making factors and evaluative components of destination image. Additionally, if items were identified by a number of people it would indicate that the terms were clear.


The third issue is that of efficiency of the items to identify and measure the concept of destination image. A large list would indicate that there are inefficient items in the list, especially as indicated by previous destination image studies that used less than 50 items. Therefore, the items that do

not add to the explanation of the concept need to be identified and eliminated. The inefficient items would be indicated by not being noted as relevant or clear, and inherently these items would not efficiently add to the explanation of the concept.

## THE ELIMINATION PROCESS

Considering these three issues and the studies reviewed, a four step process was designed. This process would provide the transition between Part One and Part Two of this research, moving from a breadth of discretionary travel decision making factors and evaluative components of destination image to a list of relevant, clear and efficient attributes (Figure 2). Step one and two were an elimination process based on the phase one and two results. Step three was another elimination process using a different method based again on the phase one and two results. Finally in step four the retained attributes from step two and three would be compared. The common attributes would then be included in the measurement of change in destination image method.

**Figure 2: Transition between Part One and Part Two**



Step one involved identifying items that may not be relevant, clear or efficient from the phase one and two results, and step two validating these selections by validating the two methods used in Part One. Phase one was expected to identified a broad range of salient items. Though this would not indicate importance, it would indicate relevance of the terms to the concept of decision-making factors and evaluative components of destination image. Additionally, if items were identified by a number of people it would indicate that the terms were clear. The third issue is that of efficiency of the items to identify and measure the concept of destination image. Inefficient items would be

indicated by not being noted as relevant or clear to a number of the sample, and inherently these items would not add to the explanation of the concept.

In comparison to the other studies, Retzlaff's *et al.* (2002) eliminated items with more than 95 percent agreement or less than five percent agreement. This follows from Mueller (1986) in identifying if facts are well established then these would not make good measures. Nonetheless, Retzlaff *et al.*, (2002) utilised a different method to identify items with a consequent different focus, so that they did identify well-established facts. In a similarly related elimination process, though identifying agreement rather than 'facts', Mouton-Simien, McCain and Kelley (1997) eliminated items identified by less than 30 percent of the sample. This was also similar to Ohanian (1990) and Souto and Garcia (2002), where items required certain levels of agreement from the sample to be retained (though these were at high levels of 75 and 80 percent agreement respectively). Nonetheless, items would be included in the phase three and four instrument if identified by at least 25 percent of the sample. The other items retained would have to match with items identified in the step three list.

The irrelevant, unclear and inefficient items would be identified as those stated by less than five percent of respondents. This is an arbitrary measure though derived from the above noted processes of eliminating items (Ohanian, 1990; Mouton-Simien, McCain & Kelley, 1997; Retzlaff *et al.*, 2002; Souto & Garcia, 2002). The different measure was implemented as different item elicitation techniques were used in this research, the value of the cut off was more liberal. Thus this elimination value will still eliminate irrelevant, unclear and inefficient items, though retains a range of values to compare to the step three results.

First, as the results would be need to be applicable to any destination, thus items were eliminated that were specific to places, spaces or people, and therefore irrelevant to others. In this process three decision-making factors were omitted as they related to a specific place or people, such as Maori, leaving 141 factors. Additionally, sixteen destination image components were also eliminated as they related to specific geographic areas such as Pacific Islands and Europe, countries, such as USA or Fiji, or icons such as Uluru, retaining 238 components.

In the first part step one, the irrelevant, unclear and inefficient items were identified as those stated by less than five percent of respondents. From the phase one results eliminating these items reduces the decision-making factors from 141 to 26 items. Though this provides a list still that explains 75 percent of the phase one responses. As phase one implemented a free elicitation method designed to obtain a breadth of responses it is inappropriate to selecting items only identified by 30 percent of the sample (as per Mouton-Simien, McCain & Kelley, 1997). This would have resulted in only two items being retained: cost and time. For the evaluative factors, eliminating items identified less than five percent reduces the list from 238 to 33, whilst still explaining 68 percent of responses.

Additionally, items would be included in the phase three and four instrument if identified by at least 25 percent of the sample. This included four decision-making factors of activities (things to do and see), cost, time, and season. Also retained for the phase three list were the six evaluative components affordable, beach, friendly, relaxation, sun, and warm (not too hot). For other items to be identified as relevant, clear and efficient they would have to match with items from the step three list.

The second step was a process of assessing the validity of the phase one lists. As the phase one and two methods were shown as valid, the irrelevant, unclear and inefficient items from phase one were eliminated. The outcome of part one provides an indicative list of relevant, clear and efficient items, though a list still much longer than recommended.

The third step in the process involved the implementation of a relevance and clarity survey on the whole list of items identified in phase one and two (141 decision making factors and 238 evaluative components). Relevance and clarity were assigned again the arbitrary limit of 75 percent

agreement, as used by Ohanian (1990). Others had also implemented cut off limits in their elimination process, again using an agreement level of between 70 percent and 80 percent to identify an efficient list (Mouton-Simien, McCain & Kelley, 1997; Retzlaff, *et al.*, 2002; Souto & Garcia, 2002). Items identified as familiar by 95 percent of the sample would automatically be included for the phase three and four instrument. The other items retained would have to match with items from the step two list. The outcome of this step would be a list of relevant, clear items, and efficient items.

A study with similar objectives to above was that of Ohanian's (1990) elimination process. In that study she used two consecutive stages first to assess clarity (n=38), and second relevance (n=52). Nonetheless, no reasons were apparent why they could not be completed concurrently.

The survey was developed in three sections. The first listed the decision-making factors, in alphabetical order. This was done so not draw attention to the previously most salient factors. Each factor had a box beside it, in which the respondent was directed to identify if the factor was familiar or not. Familiarity was further clarified as if the term was familiar or unfamiliar in relation to deciding on holiday destinations. In clarifying familiarity in this way, both unclear items, and irrelevant items were identified as unfamiliar. If the term was familiar they were asked to write a capital *F* in the box next to the term, if it was unfamiliar they wrote a capital *U*. It was also noted in the instructions that some of the items may have appeared similar to each other, though a response to each factor was required.

Similarly, the second section presented the destination image evaluative components in an identical way. Again respondents were asked to identify the clarity and relevance of each of the components to destination image. In clarifying familiarity for this section it was stated that respondents should focus on 'is this a term used to describe a holiday destination?' The third section asked demographic questions of the respondents' age and gender.

The survey was needed to be pilot tested, especially to eliminate or modify extreme, imbalanced, exclusive and ambiguous items. This is a consideration that extreme words and words denoting temporary states are not suitable for impression-formation tasks (Mueller, 1986; Ohanian, 1990). Also identified was that the use of extreme terms forces respondents into selecting neutral responses (Ursic & Helgeson, 1989). The pilot test also sought to eliminate imbalanced, exclusive and ambiguous wording of questions (Mueller, 1986; de Vaus, 2002).

The survey was pilot tested on four students and a lecturer. Respondents to the pilot test noted that some extreme, imbalanced, exclusive and ambiguous items. From the decision making factors 'Doesn't mind speaking English even when not usual language' was changed to 'Able to use English as a second language', 'hot guys' changed to 'guys', and 'no whinging', 'spectacular scenery'<sup>1</sup> and 'where police aren't as corrupt as the thieves' were deleted. This retained a total of 138 decision-making factors for assessment. Similarly, for the evaluative components of destination image 'lightly clad babes' was changed to 'babes', 'Local public transportation' changed to 'public transportation', 'Relatively isolated' was changed to 'isolated', 'Relativity unregulated' changed to 'unregulated', 'Sexy men' changed to 'men', 'Super photography' changed to 'photography', and 'Blissfully peaceful'<sup>2</sup> was deleted. This reduced the list of evaluative components to 237 items.

The respondents to the pilot survey were then questioned regarding the changes and their response to the changed items collected. Thirty additional people were then asked to complete the survey, and 29 usable completed surveys were collected and added to the initial 5 of the pilot test, an overall response rate of 97 percent. The responses were coded, entered and analysed in Microsoft Excel. Table 2 presents the demographic profile of the respondents.

---

<sup>1</sup> Scenery was an already existing factor

<sup>2</sup> Peaceful was an already existing factor

**Table 2: Demographic Profile of Respondents**

Demographics	Responses	Percentage
Gender		
Female	18	52.9
Male	16	47.1
	34	100.0
Age		
Under 18	0	0.0
18-24	8	23.5
25- 34	10	29.4
35-44	5	14.7
45-54	9	26.5
55-64	2	5.9
65+	0	0.0
	34	100.0

Respondents on average identified 61 of the possible 138 decision making items as unfamiliar, specifically items that were unclear or irrelevant, though this ranged from 14 to 130, with a median of 55. On average number of unfamiliar responses to a decision making item was 14.5, with a range from 0 to 32, and a median of 14. In total there were 39 decision-making factors identified by 75 percent or more of the respondents. Items identified as familiar by 95 percent of the sample would automatically be included for the phase three and four instrument. These included three identified as familiar to all respondents. These items were accommodation, activities (things to do and see), and cost. Additionally, these retained three factors only identified by one respondent as unfamiliar, these were accessibility, fits my interests, and length of stay. The other items retained would have to match with items from the step two list.

Respondents, on average, also identified 72 of the 237 evaluative component items as unfamiliar. Again there was a large range from 2 to 224, and with a median of 61. On average 10 unfamiliar responses were attributed to each of the evaluative components, with a range from 0 to 33, and a median of 9. As reflected in this lower average and median, there was a much larger list of retained evaluative component items as compared to the decision-making factors. Overall, there were 111 evaluative components identified by 75 percent or more of the sample. Twenty-two items were retained for the phase three and four instrument as they were familiar to 95 percent of the sample. These included five items identified as familiar to all respondents. These consensus items were available, fun, pleasurable, scenic, and sun. Additionally retained were 17 items only indicated as unfamiliar to one respondent. These items were affordable, beautiful, clean, enjoyable, family, friendly, helpful, interesting, nature, peaceful, quality, reasonably priced, reliable, safe, sightseeing, tropical, and unique.

Step four, then involves the comparison of the resulting step three list with that obtained from the step two elimination to identify any irregularities between the two retention lists. The matched items between the two lists would be retained for the phase three and four image measurement process. This would then provide a list of relevant, clear and efficient items. Additionally, though limiting the lists of decision-making factors and evaluative components, the lists would maintain a diversity to sufficiently define the semantic space of destination image. The final list of factors and components would be of such a size that it would also be efficient to implement.

The output lists were similar in size for the decision-making factors. Step two retained 26 decision-making factors, as compared to the retention of 39 factors in step three. The initial contrast between the lists was the number of items in the evaluative components. The step-two elimination

process retained 33 components, compared to step three, which retained 111 components. First a comparison of the content of the two lists will be made.

Table 3 compares the items retained in the two decision-making factor elimination processes. There were 18 comparable items from the two elimination processes. The consensus indicates that these items should definitely be included in the phase three and four instrument.

**Table 3: Step Two and Step Three Decision Making Retentions**

<b>Step Two</b>	<b>Step Three</b>
<b>Matched items</b>	
Accessibility	Accessibility <sup>1</sup>
Accommodation	Accommodation <sup>1</sup>
Activities - things to do and see <sup>a</sup>	Activities - things to do and see <sup>1</sup>
Can meet family and friends	Can meet family and friends
Climate	Climate
Cost <sup>a</sup>	Cost <sup>1</sup>
Distance to travel	Distance to travel
Family	Family
Good facilities	Good facilities
Haven't been before	Haven't been before
Location	Location
Relaxing	Relaxing
Safety	Safety
Scenery	Scenery
Season <sup>a</sup>	Season
Time <sup>a</sup>	Time
Transport	Transport
Uncrowded	Uncrowded
<b>Unmatched items</b>	
Comfort	Able to cater for ourselves sometimes
Culture	Adventure
Entertainment	Atmosphere
Exchange rate	Beach
Good food choices	Casual
Historical	Fits my interests <sup>1</sup>
Political stability	Friendly
Shopping	Fun
	How will I get there
	Interesting
	Length of stay <sup>1</sup>
	New experiences
	Peaceful
	Privacy
	Recommendations from friends
	Reputation
	Satisfy needs/motivations
	Side trips available
	Swimming pool
	Uniqueness
	What will I take - what activities do I do

<sup>a</sup> = items from phase one that obtained 25 percent agreement

<sup>1</sup> = items from step three that obtained 95 percent agreement

Additionally, as noted above, results from the step two would be included if identified by at least 25 percent of the sample, and items from step three if identified by 95 percent of the sample. This required no additions from the step two list, and meant the addition of 'fits my interests' and 'length of stay' from the step three list. Thus the list of decision-making factors for use in the phase three and four instrument was made up of 20 factors.

The step two and three retained evaluative components provided a list of matched items Table 4. There were 30 matched items from the two retention lists. Again this indicates that these items would definitely be included in the phase three and four instrument.

**Table 4: Step Two and Step Three Evaluative Component Retentions**

Step Two	Step Three
<b>Matched items</b>	
Accessible	Accessible
Adventurous	Adventurous
Affordable <sup>a</sup>	Affordable <sup>1</sup>
Beach <sup>a</sup>	Beach
Beautiful	Beautiful <sup>1</sup>
Broad range of options	Broad range of options
Cheap	Cheap
Clean	Clean <sup>1</sup>
Comfortable	Comfortable
Cultural	Cultural
Entertaining	Entertaining
Exciting	Exciting
Exotic	Exotic
Friendly <sup>a</sup>	Friendly <sup>1</sup>
Fun	Fun <sup>1</sup>
Good accommodation	Good accommodation
Good weather	Good weather
Historic	Historic
Hot	Hot
Interesting	Interesting <sup>1</sup>
Nature	Nature <sup>1</sup>
Peaceful	Peaceful <sup>1</sup>
Relaxation <sup>a</sup>	Relaxation
Safe	Safe <sup>1</sup>
Scenic	Scenic <sup>1</sup>
Shopping	Shopping
Sun <sup>a</sup>	Sun <sup>1</sup>
Tropical	Tropical <sup>1</sup>
Uncrowded	Uncrowded
Warm - Not Too Hot <sup>a</sup>	Warm - not too hot

<sup>a</sup> = items from phase one that obtained 25 percent agreement

<sup>1</sup> = items from step three that obtained 95 percent agreement

Nonetheless, there was a large list of unmatched items, 3 from step two and 73 from step three. Again, as noted above, results from the step two were included if identified by at least 25 percent of the sample, and items from step three if identified by 95 percent of the sample. This again required no additions from the step two list. Though it did mean the inclusion of an additional ten items from the step three list. These items were 'available', 'enjoyable', 'family', 'helpful', 'pleasurable', 'quality', 'reasonably priced', 'reliable', 'sightseeing', and 'unique'. In total, the list of


evaluative components of destination image for the phase three and four instrument included 40 items.

The outcome of this elimination process has identified a list of relevant, clear and efficient items for the phase three and four image measurement process. Though limiting the lists of decision-making factors and evaluative components, the list maintained a diversity to sufficiently define the semantic space of destination image. The final list of 20 decision-making factors and 40 evaluative components were of such a size that it would also be efficient to implement, particularly when compared to the initial list of 144 factors and 254 components. Using Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum's (1957) time guidance the 60 items would take approximately nine minutes to complete. Additionally, comparing these to the phase one results indicates that the final list explains 73 percent of the original decision making factors and 69 percent of the evaluative components of destination image.

Thus, the destination selection model is completed with relevant, clear and efficient discretionary travel decision making factors and evaluative components of destination image included, Figure 3. After the motivation to travel all destinations aware of are assessed based on their availability as determined by the decision making factors. If assessed negatively the destinations would be disregarded. If positively assessed the destinations would then be assessed again based on their ability to satisfy the motivations to travel. If negatively assessed, again the destinations would be disregarded. Though if positively assessed the now small number of potential destinations would be allocated to the evoked set, from which the final destination would be selected.

It must also be noted again that the importance of each of the identified attributes may change with different motivations and with different people. This was additionally noted in the process of completing the phase two interviews, where it was also identified that the importance of attributes changed as the destination selection process was being implemented. Therefore it is also very important that the measurement instrument for phase three and four have an importance measure for each decision making factor and evaluative component.

**Figure 3: Destination Selection (relevant, clear and efficient discretionary travel decision making factors and evaluative components of destination image)**



The foundation for Part Two is now complete. The next part is to identify the effect of a specific event on destination image, and most importantly the discretionary travel decision making factors and evaluative components that make up a holistic destination image. The role of the media, and especially the fictional media, has been increasingly noted in the process of creating or forming destination image. The media termed as organic agents of destination image formation. Nonetheless, in the context of actual destination image the components that contribution most to the holistic image are dependent on what the perceiver identifies as important. These components have been identified above, and would be common to all destinations in the available set for a specific type of holiday. Nonetheless, there will be components that will be common to most destinations, though their importance in the forming of the holistic image will vary between perceivers. The results identified above will provide the basis for the development of an instrument to identify and measure destination image. Additionally the instrument will measure change in image due to a specific event.

## REFERENCES

- Auty, S., and Elliot, R. (1998) Fashion Involvement, Self-monitoring and the Meaning of Brands. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*. 7(2): 109-115.
- de Vaus, D. A. (2002) *Analyzing Social Science Data*. London: Sage.
- Goldbeck, L., Schmitz, T. G., Henrich, G., and Herschbach, P. (2003) Questions on Life Satisfaction for Adolescents and Adults with Cystic Fibrosis: Development of a Disease-specific Questionnaire. *Chest*. 123(1): 42-48.
- Goodall, B. (1991) Understanding Holiday Choice. *Progress in Tourism Hospitality Research*. 3 (1): 58-77
- Jennings, G. (2001) *Tourism Research*. Australia: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Kilpatrick, M., Bartholomew, J., and Riemer, H. (2003) The Measurement of Goal Orientations in Exercise. *Journal of Sport Behavior*. 26(2): 121-136.
- Lehman, A. F., Fischer, E. P., Postrado, L., Delahanty, J., Johnstone, B. M., Russo, P. A., and Crown, W. H. (2003) The Schizophrenia Care and Assessment Program Health Questionnaire (SCAP-HQ): An Instrument to Assess Outcomes of Schizophrenia Care. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*. 29(2): 247-256.
- McMillan, L. H. W., Brady, E. C., O'Discoll, M. P., and Marsh, N. V. (2002) A Multifaceted Validation Study of Spence and Robbins' (1992) Workaholism Battery. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 75(Sep): 357-368.
- Moutinho, L. (1987) Consumer Behaviour in Tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*. 21 (10):3-44.
- Mouton-Simien, P., McCain, A. P., and Kelley, M. L. (1997) The Development of the Toddler Behavior Screening Inventory. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 25(1): 59-64.
- Mueller, D. J. (1986) *Measuring Social Attitudes: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nunnally, J. C., and Bernstein, I. H. (1994) *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ohanian, R. (1990) Construction and Validation of a Scale to Measure Celebrity. *Journal of Advertising*. 19(3): 39-52.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., and Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957) *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana, University of Illinois Press.
- Pike, S. (2002) Destination Image Analysis: A Review of 142 Papers from 1973 to 2000. *Tourism Management*. 23(5): 541-549.
- Retzlaff, P. D., King R. E., Marsh, R. W., Callister, J. D., and Orme, D. R. (2002) The Armstrong Laboratory Aviation Personality Survey: Development, Norming, and Validation. *Military Medicine*. 167(12): 1026-1032.
- Schuman, H., and Presser, S. (1996) *Questions and Answers in Attitude Surveys: Experiments on Question form, Wording, and Context*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Smith, S. L. J. (1995) *Tourism Analysis: A Handbook*. 2nd Edition. Harlow, Longman.
- Sommer, B., and Sommer, R. (2002) *A Practical Guide to Behavioral Research: Tools and Techniques*. Fifth Edition. New York, Oxford University Press.
- Souto, C. M. R. M., and Garcia, T. R. (2002) Construction and Validation of a Body Image Rating Scale: A Preliminary Study. *International Journal of Nursing Terminologies and Classifications*. 13(4): 117-126.
- Thorne, S., Kirkham, S. R., and MacDonald-Emes, J. (1997). Interpretive Description: A Non-categorical Qualitative Alternative for Developing Nursing Knowledge. *Research in Nursing and Health*. 2: 169-177.
- Um, S., and Crompton, J. L. (1990) Attitude Determinants in Tourism Destination Choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 17 (3). 432-48.
- van Raaij, W. F., and Francken, D. A. (1984) Vacation Decisions, Activities and Satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*. 11:101-112.

- Vileikyte, L. Peyrot, M., Bundy, C., Rubin, R. R., Leventhal, H., Mora, P., Shaw, J. E., Baker, P., and Boulton, A. J. M. (2003) The Development and Validation of a Neuropathy- and Foot Ulcer-specific Quality of Life Instrument. *Diabetes Care*. 26(9): 2549-2555.
- Woodside, A. G. and Sherrell, D. (1977) Traveler Evoked, Inept, and Inert Sets of Vacation Destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*. 16 (1): 14-18.
- Woodside, A. G., and Lysonski, S. (1989) A General Model of Traveler Destination Choice. *Journal of Travel Research*. 27 (4): 8-14.