Antecedents and consequences of experiential versus utilitarian consumption in the travel context

Wei Wei and Asli D.A. Tasci

Wei Wei and
Asli D.A. Tasci are based
at the Rosen College of
Hospitality Management,
University of Central
Florida, Orlando, Florida,
USA.

Abstract

Purpose – *Although experiential consumption has received some attention from tourism and hospitality researchers in the past decade, the profile of experiential consumers has not been discussed thus far. The purpose of this paper is thus twofold: to test the sociodemographic antecedents of experiential versus utilitarian consumption for profiling purposes and to examine the potential behavioral consequences of experiential versus utilitarian consumption tendencies.*

Design/methodology/approach – *On an online research platform, 413 respondents answered questions concerning logic-based/emotion-based decision-making traits, as well as sociodemographic characteristics and several travel behavior variables.*

Findings – *Data revealed that emotion-based decision makers are more likely to be females, who are more passionate about their travel needs than are logic-based decision makers. Results also revealed that the importance that emotion-based decision makers place on travel preferences, potential travel risks and travel information sources is higher than that of their logic-based counterparts.*

Research limitations/implications – *The current study used one personality trait, emotion-based decision-making, as a proxy for experiential consumption. There are other potentially explanatory traits that should be investigated in future studies.*

Practical implications – *Destination marketing organizations (DMOs) promoting destinations with historical and cultural attractions can capitalize on the finding that these attractions are highly demanded by both types of decision makers, whereas DMOs of man-made attraction destinations may need to find ways to embellish the significance of these attractions for both types of decision makers.*

Social implications – *Even though social risk was the lowest-rated item in general, both decision-making traits were highly correlated with social risk. The higher the tendency in the decision-making style, either logic-based or emotion-based, the more important how a trip would make them look within their social circle. Social risk concerns for both types of decision makers should be addressed in marketing messages.*

Originality/value – *The current study represents one of the earliest attempts to draw a picture of experiential consumers in comparison with utilitarian consumers in sociodemographic and behavioral characteristics.*

Keywords *Social media, Experiential consumption, Motivation, Travel needs, Travel risk, Utilitarian consumption*

Paper type *Research paper*

1. Introduction

A long stream of conceptual and empirical studies has attempted to reveal the reasons for and consequences of travelers' decisions, some of which are experiential or hedonist consumption factors. Tourism research has acknowledged the importance of studying experiential aspects of consumption, such as emotions and hedonics (Hosany and Gilbert, 2010; Nawijn *et al.*, 2013; Wu and Li, 2014). Little research to date, however, has simultaneously used both utilitarian and experiential perspectives when studying

www.manaraa.com

consumption experience in the tourism and hospitality setting. To gain some comparative insights into experiential consumption, as opposed to utilitarian consumption, the current study made one of the initial attempts to compare experiential and utilitarian consumers by answering two questions:

Q1. Are there any sociodemographic differences between experiential and utilitarian consumers?

Q2. Are there any differences between experiential and utilitarian consumers in relation to their travel-related behavior?

Thus, the objectives of this study are twofold: to test the sociodemographic antecedents of experiential versus utilitarian consumption tendencies for profiling purposes and to examine the potential travel-related behavioral consequences of experiential versus utilitarian consumption tendencies. To achieve these goals, a relevant personality trait, namely, logic-based decision-making trait versus emotion-based decision-making trait in general consumption context, was selected as a proxy for these consumption tendencies. Logic/emotion-based decision-making trait is originally conceptualized in the general life context and thus used in the current study to categorize consumers with experiential consumption versus utilitarian consumption tendencies in the consumption context. More specifically, the scale (International Personality Item Pool [IPIP], 2017) consists items such as "I believe important decisions should be based on logical reasoning" (logic-based decision-making trait or utilitarian consumption tendency) or "I plan my life based on how I feel" (emotion-based decision-making trait or experiential tendency). The assumption is that socio-demographic profiles can determine one's tendency to make decisions based on logic versus emotions and that this tendency will affect different behaviors in the general travel consumption context.

2. Literature review

2.1 Utilitarian vs experiential consumption in tourism and hospitality

A pioneering article by Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) initiated a crusade to move the marketing community into an era where consumer behavior is considered essentially experiential. In contrast to the traditional information processing view that focuses on one's rational evaluation of a product's functions, Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) advocated that consumption experience should also be understood from an experiential perspective. Based on the experiential perspective, the consequences of consumption can be manifested in the phenomenological aspect (e.g. the feeling that it evokes) and thus a more energetic investigation of multisensory psychological relationships in consumer behavior is encouraged (Lofman, 1991). In addition to recognizing the mounting significance of multisensory imagery, Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) discussed the hedonic consumption based on the most influential theories in social science, namely, Freud's psychoanalysis theory (Burger, 1993, pp. 56-58), by including the emotional arousal or feelings such as jealousy, joy, fear, rage and rapture in marketing research.

Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) further explained both the information processing view and the experiential view in relation to Freud's (1955) psychoanalysis theory with references to id, the ego, and the superego. Information processing view regards the consumer as a logical thinker and rational problem solver who arrives at carefully considered evaluations (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). Such mental activities reflect the "secondary process" thinking discussed by Freud (1955) because they represent the way one's mental processes function through socialization (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982) or guided by the superego. On the contrary, the experiential view considers the consumer as an emotional hedonist driven by a hedonic, pleasure principle (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). This view is in accord with the "primary process" thinking in Freudian theory, which emphasizes a hedonic response and is "'primary' in the sense that it hearkens back to the

way a baby pursues immediate pleasure or gratification" (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982, p. 135) or guided by it.

Following the lead set by Holbrook and Hirschman (1982), the past two decades have witnessed a growing focus on the intangible experiential qualities of consumption in general hospitality and tourism settings (Mcintosh and Siggs, 2005; Titz, 2008). Tourism experiences, such as experiences in rural tourism and convention tourism, are increasingly recognized to be centered on experiences, fulfillment and rejuvenation, rather than on things and places (King, 2002; Wei and Miao, in press).

Recognizing the significance of both logic and emotions, some researchers have advocated attention to both. Värlander (2007) indicated that consumption experience should be considered both as a rational decision-making process and a process involving feelings, fun and amusement. Batra and Ahtola (1991) noted that consumption activities usually take place for two reasons: utilitarian reasons and hedonic gratification. Lofman (1991) more explicitly pinpointed utilitarian consumption and hedonic/experiential consumption as two types of consumption: utilitarian consumption refers to a means toward an end, a state of readiness to engage in realistic, active, voluntary and relatively effortful decision-making, event planning and other goal-directed behaviors, whereas hedonic/ experiential consumption denotes an end in itself, a mind state of openness to undergo any experiential events (i.e. sensory or imaginal) that may occur. Lofman (1991) suggested that consumers can be both instrumentally and hedonically oriented, implying that experiential consumption may be classified as primarily hedonic, primarily instrumental or a mix of the two.

Tourists, in particular, have been found to seek both utilitarian and pleasurable consumption experiences and the latter are characterized by intrinsic satisfaction, perceived freedom and involvement (Yuksel, 2004). For instance, Ford and Heaton (2000) adopted the experiential philosophy and proposed "guestology" as a management approach, which stresses the quality of an entire guest experience. Gursoy et al. (2006) found that individuals attend festivals for both utilitarian and hedonic reasons, although the hedonic aspects of festivals are significantly more important to attendees. Wei et al. (2017) discovered the salience of both the instrumental and hedonic domains of attendees' experiences in a conference setting, supporting the call made by earlier studies for an experiential perspective on consumption experience (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982; Mcintosh and Siggs, 2005). There is therefore a need to investigate both consumption tendencies to define the points of digression in characteristics and behavior.

2.2 Antecedents of experiential versus utilitarian consumption: sociodemographic characteristics

Sociodemographic variables have been considered essential to prediction and correlation analyses for a comprehensive theory development, especially in explaining micro level behavior (Sheth, 1977). Sheth (1977) predicted that "demographics are here to stay with us for projection, identification and segmentation of the markets so long as the census data of the countries are limited to the socioeconomic-demographic profile of the citizens" (p. 136). Thus, sociodemographic profiling has been an essential part of segmenting and targeting in marketing research and practice, including that investigating tourism and hospitality products and services.

Even though past literature does not offer insights into the sociodemographic profiles of experiential or utilitarian consumers specifically, there are some indications from studies with related constructs. Some studies imply that age (Trinh et al., 2014), gender (Wilkins, 2011) and education (Swanson and Horridge, 2004) are associated with souvenir consumption and the symbolic meanings that souvenir products hold for their owners. Research concerning gender and emotions has expanded since the 1980s (Fischer, 2000), but the identified gender differences in emotions have varied vastly across settings. Some

researchers have developed theoretical frameworks for elucidating the gender-emotion link (Shields *et al.*, 2006); however, the explanatory power of sociodemographics on utilitarian/ experiential consumption has not been substantiated thus far. Taking the logic-based decision-making trait as a proxy of utilitarian consumption and the emotion-based decision-making trait as a proxy of experiential consumption in the general consumption context, the current study aimed to empirically test the significance of sociodemographic characteristics in explaining experiential versus utilitarian consumption tendencies. *H1* is as follows:

> *H1.* There is a relationship between sociodemographic characteristics (i.e. age, marital status, income, race, education) and logic/emotion-based decision-making trait.

2.3 Consequences of experiential versus utilitarian consumption: impact on travel needs, preferences, travel risk perception and information sources preference

The past few decades have witnessed a growing amount of research examining the consequences of experiential aspects of consumption. For instance, Cooper-Martin (1992) studied experiential products, which are chosen, acquired and consumed for sole experience and enjoyment. Cooper-Martin (1992) determined that consumer behavior could vary depending on the types of products (experiential products and non-experiential products). Overby and Lee's (2006) study considered both the utilitarian and experiential aspects of consumption experience by examining the impacts of utilitarian value versus hedonic value on consumers' preference for internet retailers and on their consumption intentions. Prayag *et al.* (2017) research concerning tourists travelling to Sardinia Italy revealed that tourists' emotional experiences act as antecedents of perceived overall image and satisfaction. Nevertheless, there remains a lack of attention to comparative consequences of utilitarian-oriented and experiential-oriented consumptions. To advance this line of investigation in the tourism context, the current study aimed to explore differences in the travel-related behavior of consumers predominantly driven by utilitarian benefits (with logic-based decision-making trait) in comparison with those predominantly oriented toward experiential enjoyment (with emotion-based decision-making trait).

2.3.1 Travel needs. Past literature is replete with studies identifying and assessing various travel needs and motivations in different contexts and for different groups of tourists (Crompton, 1979; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Krippendorf, 1987; Pearce and Lee, 2005). The current study focused on four of the most commonly studied needs in the context of tourism and hospitality consumption: *self-actualization*, the top need on the pyramid of human needs developed by Maslow (1943), which represents the extent to which one feels proud of him/herself, achieves his/her full potential and feels that he/she is a successful person; *social affiliation*, which focuses on social needs for improving one's relationships, becoming part of a group with similar others and enhancing one's social network; *arousal*, which concerns the seeking of excitement, surprise and emotional charge; and finally, *escape*, which indicates one's desire to escape from mundane everyday life and feel detached from routine tasks. Based on the earlier discussion of the experiential approach (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982), the need for arousal can be expected to be more important for experiential consumers, whereas a need with more utility, such as enhancing social network, can be expected to be more important for utilitarian consumers. This study therefore proposed a relationship between consumers' decision-making traits and their travel needs, whether positive or negative, as expressed below:

> *H2.* There is a relationship between logic/emotion-based decision-making trait and travel needs.

2.3.2 Travel preferences. Although there are many different tourism paradigms conceptualized within the domains of mass tourism and sustainable tourism, the most common travel preferences that define these paradigms are sea-sand-sun, history, nature, culture, man-made attractions such as theme parks and special events and activities, as

well as visiting friends and relatives (Morrison, 2013). These travel preferences were thus chosen in the present study to explore the potential differences in travel preferences of logic-based decision makers and emotion-based decision makers. Following the utilitarian approach described by Holbrook and Hirschman (1982), logic-based decision makers are logical, rational problem solvers, who may pay greater attention to salient, functional benefits while showing less passion for travel activities. By contrast, following the experiential approach, emotion-based decision makers are predominantly driven by emotions, feelings and hedonics and could be more impulsive (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). It is therefore reasonable to assume that emotion-based decision makers may show more passion and higher preference for travel activities, especially those that are more engaging, active and stimulating. In contrast, utilitarian consumers may place higher importance on travel attractions. Thus, similarly to travel needs, this study proposed a relationship between consumers' utilitarian/experiential consumption tendencies and their travel preferences. The following hypothesis was put forward accordingly:

H3. There is a relationship between logic/emotion-based decision-making trait and travel preferences.

2.3.3 Travel risks. The concept of risk is purported to include concepts of probability, mismatch, consequence, loss and uncertainty related to an outcome (Mitchell, 1998, 1999; Mitchell and Greatorex, 1993; Peter and Ryan, 1976; Yates and Stone, 1992). When there is perceived risk related to an outcome, there exists a potential mismatch between the expected outcome and the likely outcome, leading to uncertainty and potential loss of the expected outcome (Yates and Stone, 1992). With losses in different dimensions in mind, the assessment of risk in different areas results in a plethora of risks. Literature concerning travel risk reflects several different types of risks; however, researchers have categorized different risks into six types, which reflect potential losses of functional, financial, physical, psychological, social and temporal/time dimensions (Kaplan *et al.*, 1974; Mitchell and Greatorex, 1993; Stone and Gronhaug, 1993).

The tourism industry places great importance on reducing tourists' risk perceptions to attract tourists and increase sales (Dickson and Dolnicar, 2004); thus, investigating the issue of perceived travel risk has received attention in tourism literature (Reisinger and Mavondo, 2006; Tasci and Boylu, 2010). Travel choices are known to be entangled with diverse types of risks, as travelers rely mostly on information from sources other than self-experiences (Um and Crompton, 1992). In the travel context, functional risk relates to likelihood of a product or service not providing the expected utility, which can then result in financial and time risks, or in potential loss of invested money and time in the trip (Boksberger *et al.*, 2007). Physical and psychological risks connote more extreme cases, where there exists the potential for loss in relation to physical and psychological well-being, such as injury or mental trauma due to mishaps of different natures (Boksberger *et al.*, 2007). Social risk, conversely, relates to potential loss in image or reputation among social circles due to mismatch between expectations and outcome (Boksberger *et al.*, 2007). For example, a traveler who spends time and money for a vacation at a destination where the trip does not provide any of the expected attractions or activities will lose not only the utility, time and money spent, but may also run into a health issues, embarrassment or even feel that they have incurred damage to their image if they experience a physical assault during their trip.

Previous studies have made an effort to understand how travel risk perception may differ in relation to cultural differences (Reisinger and Mavondo, 2006; Tasci and Boylu, 2010), demographic characteristics (Simpson and Siguaw, 2008) and prior experience (George, 2003). Past literature has found that some consumers tend to favor travel activities that involve higher risks, following a "no risk, no fun" philosophy (Dickson and Dolnicar, 2004, p. 1). Research concerning traffic accidents suggests that people who are "sensation seekers" (akin to emotion-based decision makers in the context of this study) hold a higher

target risk level (Dickson and Dolnicar, 2004, p. 7) because they are willing to seek out varied, novel, thrilling and intense experiences at the expense of physical, social and financial risks (Zuckerman, 1994, cited in Hansen and Breivik, 2001). The current study aimed to test the explanatory power of logic-based decision-making trait versus emotion-based decision-making trait on the importance of potential travel risks, to the extent that logic-based decision makers and emotion-based decision makers place different emphasis on the utilitarian outcomes and experiential elements of travel. For example, experiential consumers can be expected to be more concerned about psychological and social image, whereas utilitarian consumers can be expected to focus more attention on the physical, financial and time risks associated with travel in general. Thus, *H4* was formulated as follows:

> *H4.* There is a relationship between logic/emotion-based decision-making trait and the importance of potential travel risks.

2.3.4 Travel information sources. Consumers' preference for varied information sources has been a widely-studied topic in past literature from diverse fields, such as education (Stephens-Martinez *et al.*, 2014), health care (Tsai *et al.*, 2013), politics (Yoo and Shin, 2016), hospitality (Murphy *et al.*, 2016) and tourism (Tang and Jang, 2014). The tourism literature contains ample studies of tourism information sources used before, during and after a trip, including personal sources (friends, family, travel agents, tour operators), traditional sources (newspapers, travel magazines, TV travel programs, travel guidebooks, tourism office brochures) and internet sources (travel agent websites, e-newsletters; Chen and Gursoy, 2000; Fodness and Murray, 1997; Gursoy and Chen, 2000; Um and Crompton, 1992). For example, Um and Crompton (1992) studied people's preferences for information sources and found that tourists rely mainly on information gained from external sources other than their self-experiences. There is a lack of attention to travel information sources of utilitarian and experiential consumers in the literature, however.

As the experiential perspective has begun to call for greater attention to emotional and hedonic consumption, some researchers have found that consumers prefer experiential information sources when choosing experiential products (Cooper-Martin, 1992). Cooper-Martin (1992) studied consumers' perceptions of experiential information sources (i.e. conveying a sense of the subjective experiences) versus non-experiential information sources (i.e. not discussing consumption experience), using movies as an example. They provided empirical support that in the context of choosing movies, consumers prefer to use experiential information sources, such as previews, friends' comments and television advertisements, which they perceived to be more helpful and credible by providing a sense of the multi-sensational experience (e.g. sight, smell, hearing, taste, touch). In contrast, non-experiential information sources, such as print advertisements, are less useful as they fail to illustrate or mimic the consumption experience. It is worth pointing out that, although the study by Cooper-Martin (1992) provided valuable insights into consumers' preferences for experiential information sources, the identified preference was contextualized within experiential consumption and thus could be constrained by a lack of discussion concerning logic-based decision makers, who focus on problem solving and utilitarian outcomes of a potential travel decision, rather than the experiential aspects.

In the travel context, some studies provide implications for experiential consumers' information sources. For example, Hosany and Gilbert (2010) developed a scale for tourists' emotional experiences toward holiday destinations and found significant relationships between the dimensions of tourists' emotional experiences and their intentions to share information about the destination. Lo *et al.* (2011) provided empirical evidence that nearly half of pleasure travelers posted travel pictures on social networking sites. Hence, we can assume that experiential consumers focus more on the subjective experience itself, on how a trip may make them feel and on the emotions,

hedonics and other sensations the trip might evoke (Holbrook and Hirschman, 1982). Thus, we can assume such consumers to be more likely to use other people's stories, experiences and pictures shared on social media sites and through marketing channels, given that they are frequently posted to arouse readers' excitement, passion and other positive emotions that will likely lead to a purchase behavior. Experiential consumers may also be more likely to share information about a destination with others via diverse social media platforms. In contrast, utilitarian consumers may be more likely to trust their own first-hand experiences and objective information sources and less likely to use social media platforms (e.g. Facebook, Pinterest, Twitter) or various marketing channels [e.g. Destination Marketing Organizations (DMOs), Convention & Visitors Bureaus (CVBs), travel media), where the disclosed travel information may be perceived as a commercial strategy to entice readers to exhibit impulsive buying behavior. The current study proposed a relationship between utilitarian/experiential consumption tendencies and travel information sources, as expressed below:

> *H5.* There is a relationship between logic/emotion-based decision-making trait and the importance of travel information sources.

3. Methods

A concise survey was developed incorporating the key concepts that were identified as the most relevant for the purposes of the study. First, Barchard's nine-item emotion-based decision-making trait scale was adapted with seven-point accuracy anchors (1 = very inaccurate, 7 = very accurate), to categorize consumers with experiential consumption versus utilitarian consumption tendencies. This nine-item scale was validated with two factors, emotion-based decision-making ("I plan my life based on how I feel") and logic-based decision-making (e.g. "I believe important decisions should be based on logical reasoning") (0.73, 0.67; International Personality Item Pool [IPIP], 2017). Second, typical sociodemographic questions were included to draw a picture of experiential consumers in relation to age, gender, education level, marital status, income and ethnicity/race. Third, a 13-item travel needs scale with a seven-point agreement anchors (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) was developed. These items were selected from the literature and purified through a scale development process to reveal four major travel needs: self-actualization, social affiliation, arousal and escape. Next, a seven-item scale of travel preferences, in terms of sea-sand-sun, heritage, culture, visits to friends and relatives (VFR), nature, man-made attractions and events, was developed with 7-point importance anchors (1 = very unimportant, 7 = very important). In addition, an eight-item travel risk scale was developed in line with potential losses in utility (two items), money, time, physical, psychological, social well-being, as well as overall safety and security. In this scale, seven-point anchors of importance (1 = very unimportant, 7 = very important) were used to allow respondents to rate the importance of neutral statements reflecting the desired outcomes without the implication of loss. This was preferred to avoid biased responses to negatively valenced statements. Furthermore, a 14-item travel information sources scale was developed to assess the importance of different information platforms, also using seven-point anchors of importance (1 = very important, 7 = very unimportant).

A random sample was acquired from Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), an internet marketplace consisting of thousands of voluntary participants with diverse sociodemographic backgrounds. MTurk was chosen in this study because of its large participant pool. The demographics of MTurk workers are more diverse than standard internet samples and it was recognized to obtain high-quality data efficiently in social sciences (Buhrmester *et al.*, 2011). A total of 413 completed surveys were included in data analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to check the frequencies and central tendencies of the variables. Principal component analysis was then used to analyze the validated component structure of the logic/emotion-based decision-making. Grand means of the logic-based decision-making and emotion-based decision-making were

used in further analyses. Similarly, confirmatory factor analysis was used to confirm the structure of the travel needs. As the purpose of the current study was not scale development, only a summary of the tests is provided in this study. The grand means of the self-actualization, social affiliation, arousal and escape factors were used in further analyses. To identify the sociodemographic antecedents and behavioral consequences of logic- or emotion-based decision-making, a Pearson correlation test, *t*-test and one-way ANOVA with post-hoc Scheffe test were used.

Independent tests were used for each variable, as the purpose of this study was to identify the differences in sociodemographic characteristics for different decision-making traits (the logic-based decision-making trait as opposed to the emotion-based decision-making trait), as well as to investigate relationships among different travel behaviors and logic-based and emotion-based decision-making trait. Once individual differences and relationships are identified, future studies can apply different models to predict the membership of different groups with logic/emotion-based decision-making trait based on sociodemographic and travel behavior attributes.

4. Results

4.1 Sample characteristics

The sociodemographic characteristics of respondents are displayed in Table I. The average age of the entire sample was 31.61 years, with a slight female dominance (53.5 per cent). The majority of respondents were college or university graduates (53.7 per cent) and

Table I	Socio-demographic characteristics of the sample
Variables	*(N = 413)*
Age (Years, X̄)	31.61
Gender (%)	
Male	46.5
Female	53.5
Level of education (%)	
High school	24.5
Vocational school/associate	10.8
College/university	53.7
Master's or PhD	10.0
Other	1.0
Marital status (%)	
Single	48.3
Married	32.1
Divorced	5.6
Separated	1.0
Living with a partner	11.0
Other	2.0
Family's annual income (%)	
Under 15,000	26.4
15,000-24,999	14.7
25,000-34,999	13.0
35,000-49,999	15.4
50,000-74,999	14.7
75,000 or above	15.8
Race/ethnicity (%)	
White/Caucasian	77.6
African American	4.6
Hispanic	6.1
Asian	7.8
Others	3.8

nearly half of the respondents were single (48.3 per cent). A quarter of respondents had an annual income of less than US$25K and approximately half made less than US$35K per year. Three-quarters of respondents were Caucasian, which is normal for online recruited samples.

4.2 Factor analysis of logic/emotion-based decision-making traits and travel needs

Logic/emotion-based decision-making characteristic scale items were subjected to principal component analysis, which revealed two solid factors with high internal consistency: emotion-based decision-making and logic-based decision-making. As can be seen in Table II, the internal reliability of the emotion-based decision-making and logic-based decision-making factors (0.87 and 0.91, respectively) were higher than those originally reported in Barchard's study (0.73 and 0.67; IPIP, 2017).

Confirmatory factor analysis of the needs scale revealed a four-factor travel needs structure (χ^2 = 127.434, df = 53, $p < 0.001$, CFI = 0.962, RMSEA = 0.061). The composite reliability (CR) of the factors revealed acceptable reliability of factors: 0.78 for self-actualization, 0.86 for social affiliation, 0.71 for arousal and 0.66 for escape, all of which are greater than the cut-off point (0.6). Examination of factor loadings showed a high level of contribution of all items in explaining the four-factor travel needs model. Table III includes a list of items and statistics for travel needs.

4.3 Analysis of descriptive statistics of scale variables

A close inspection of the mean ratings in Table III revealed that the sample had a higher tendency for logic-based decision-making, with an average mean rating of 4.96, compared to that of emotion-based decision-making (4.33). The most important travel need was escape, with the highest factor grand mean of 5.60, followed by arousal (5.12), self-actualization (4.09) and social affiliation (3.54). For travel preferences, the highest-rated items were cultural attractions (5.59), natural attractions (5.38) and historical attractions (5.31). The lowest-rated preferences were man-made attractions (3.86), VFR (3.97) and special events and activities (4.51). In terms of travel risk factors, financial cost or financial risk, was the highest rated item (5.98), followed by psychological (5.61), overall safety and security at the destination (5.45) and functional risks (5.33 for utility in variety of attractions and 5.32 for utility in variety of activities). The lowest-rated items were social risk (3.06) and time risk (4.49). For the travel information sources, internet search engines such as Google were the top-rated items (5.64), followed by friends and relatives (5.27) and online rating sites such as TripAdvisor (5.04). The lowest-rated items were Twitter (2.32), Pinterest (2.49) and travel agents and photo sharing platforms, such as Flicker (both 3.17, on average).

4.4 Relationship between sociodemographics and logic/emotion-based decision-making trait

To determine whether any of the sociodemographic characteristics explained logic- versus emotion-based decision-making, different tests were used to investigate the relationships between each characteristic and each decision-making trait. As can be seen in Table IV, the Pearson correlation test revealed that age explained logic-based decision-making, but not emotion-based decision-making. The older the respondent, the more likely it was that they were a logic-based decision maker, whereas an emotion-based decision maker could belong to any age group. Gender, in contrast, showed an explanatory power for both emotion-based and logic-based decision-making. T-test results showed that, with higher average factor grand means, males were more likely to be logic-based decision makers than were females, whereas females were more likely to be emotion-based decision makers than were males. One other influential characteristic was the level of education. One-way ANOVA with Scheffe test revealed that respondents from higher income brackets (US$50K and up) were more likely to be

Table II Results of principal component analysis on emotion/logic-based decision-making (N = 413)

Items and factors (1 = Very Inaccurate, 7 = Very Accurate)	Factor loadings F I	F II	% of variance explained	Cumulative % of variance explained	Factor mean	Cronbach's alpha
Factor I: logic-based decision-making			56.849	56.849	4.96	0.91
I believe important decisions should be based on logical reasoning	0.859	−0.177				
I plan my life logically	0.854	−0.146				
I listen to my brain rather than my heart	0.846	−0.267				
I make decisions based on facts, not feelings	0.842	−0.270				
Factor II: emotion-based decision-making			15.868	72.717	4.33	0.87
I believe emotions give direction to life	−0.233	0.848				
I listen to my feelings when making important decisions	−0.028	0.829				
I plan my life based on how I feel	−0.308	0.801				
I listen to my heart rather than my brain	−0.531	0.649				
I base my goals in life on inspiration, rather than logic	−0.509	0.542				

Notes: Survey question: Please state how accurately the following statements describe you. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself NOW, NOT as you wish to be; Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy = 0.893; Bartlett's test of sphericity = 0.000; Extraction method: principal component analysis; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization

Table III Descriptive statistics on scale items and factors analyzed in the study

Scale items and factors	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Logic/emotion-based decision-making factors (1 = Very Inaccurate, 7 = Very Accurate)					
Logic-based decision-making (factor grand mean)	413	1	7	4.96	1.252
Emotion-based decision-making (factor grand mean)	413	1	7	4.33	1.163
Travel need factors (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7 = Strongly Agree)					
Self-actualization (factor grand mean)	413	1	7	4.09	1.499
Social affiliation (factor grand mean)	413	1	7	3.54	1.460
Arousal (factor grand mean)	413	1	7	5.12	1.236
Escape (factor grand mean)	413	1	7	5.60	1.161
Travel preferences (1 = Very Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)					
Sea-sand-sun attractions (e.g. beaches, sea-side resorts)	412	1	7	4.72	2.012
Visiting and seeing friends and relatives (VFR)	412	1	7	3.97	2.063
Natural attractions (e.g., parks, wilderness, wetlands)	412	1	7	5.38	1.595
Historical attractions (e.g., heritage sites, archeological sites, museums, monuments)	412	1	7	5.31	1.591
Cultural attractions (e.g., unique local culture, cuisine, arts and crafts, religion)	412	1	7	5.59	1.436
Man-made attractions (e.g., theme parks, amusement parks, casinos)	412	1	7	3.86	2.008
Special events and activities (e.g., festivals, conventions, sporting events, concerts)	412	1	7	4.51	1.822
Travel risk factors (1 = Very Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)					
Functional-variety of attractions at the destination	410	1	7	5.33	1.441
Functional-variety of activities at the destination	410	1	7	5.32	1.400
Psychological-trip's effect on my psychological well-being	410	1	7	5.61	1.391
Physical-trip's effect on my physical well-being	410	1	7	5.23	1.485
Financial-financial costs of the trip to the destination	410	1	7	5.98	1.222
Time-time spent for planning and the trip itself	410	1	7	4.49	1.693
Social-trip's effect on my image among family and friends	410	1	7	3.06	1.931
Overall safety and security at the destination	410	1	7	5.45	1.535
Travel information sources (1 = Very Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)					
Friends and relatives	410	1	7	5.27	1.481
Photo-sharing platforms (e.g., Flicker, Instagram)	410	1	7	3.17	1.917
Destination marketing organizations (e.g., Conventions and Visitors Bureaus, travel information offices)	410	1	7	3.81	1.806
Internet search engines (e.g., Google, Bing)	410	1	7	5.64	1.374
Online rating sites (e.g., TripAdvisor)	410	1	7	5.04	1.698
Personal consumer blogs	410	1	7	3.98	1.800
Travel media (e.g., magazines, brochures, guides, newsletters)	410	1	7	3.78	1.791
Travel agents and tour operators	410	1	7	3.17	1.822
News media (TV, newspapers, magazines)	410	1	7	3.63	1.664
Company websites (e.g., hotels, resorts, attractions)	410	1	7	4.86	1.644
Facebook	410	1	7	3.57	1.968
Pinterest	410	1	7	2.49	1.768
Twitter	410	1	7	2.32	1.686

Notes: Survey question for travel needs: Please state your agreement level with the following statements regarding your travel preferences; Survey question for travel preferences: Please state the importance of the following reasons for your vacation decisions; Survey question for travel risk: Please state the importance of the following factors when you consider a destination for your vacation; Survey question for travel information: Please state the importance of the following information sources for you to receive or share travel related information; *Self-actualization (CR = 0.780)* (feel proud of myself; achieve my full potential; feel that I am a successful person); *Social affiliation (CR = 0.857)* (improve my relationships; be around others similar to me; become part of a group; improve my social network); *Arousal (CR = 0.706)* (feel excitement; feel emotionally charged; have surprise element in my life); *Escape (CR = 0.659)* (be away from my everyday life; feel detached from mundane tasks; get out of routine); *Model fit:* Chi-square (χ^2) = 127.434, df = 53, χ^2/df = 2.404, $p < 0.001$; goodness of fit index (GFI) = 0.951, adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) = 0.917, normal fit index (NFI) = 0.938, Tucker – Lewis coefficient (TLI) = 0.944, comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.962; root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.061, close fit (PCLOSE) = 0.083

logic-based decision makers than were those in the US$15K-25K income bracket. Education level, marital status and race did not show any explanatory power for either decision-making characteristic. Thus, *H1*, that there are relationships between different sociodemographic characteristics and logic- or emotion-based decision-making, was supported, although only for three of the selected sociodemographic variables.

www.manaraa.com

Table IV Socio-demographic correlates of emotion-based and logic-based decision-making characteristics ($n = 413$)

Sociodemographic characteristics	Logic-based decision-making (correlation or mean)	Emotion-based decision-making (correlation or mean)
Age ($n = 409$)	0.149	−0.041
Pearson correlation significance	0.003	0.407
Gender		
Male ($n = 190$)	5.27	4.09
Female ($n = 219$)	4.68	4.55
t-test significance	$p = 0.000$	$p = 0.000$
Level of education		
High school ($n = 100$)	4.95	4.42
Vocational school/associate ($n = 44$)	4.63	4.50
College/university ($n = 219$)	4.95	4.32
Master's or PhD ($n = 41$)	5.44	4.01
Other ($n = 4$)	4.38	4.70
One-way ANOVA test significance	$p = 0.042$*	$p = 0.283$
Marital status (%)		
Single ($n = 197$)	4.98	4.31
Married ($n = 131$)	4.91	4.35
Divorced ($n = 23$)	5.07	4.52
Separated ($n = 4$)	4.13	5.15
Living with a partner ($n = 45$)	5.09	4.16
Other ($n = 8$)	5.19	0.4.30
One-way ANOVA test significance	$p = 0.701$	$p = 0.605$
Family's annual income (%)		
Under 15,000 ($n = 108$)	4.89	4.27
15,000-24,999 ($n = 60$)	4.41	4,74
25,000-34,999 ($n = 53$)	5.03	4.35
35,000-49,999 ($n = 63$)	4.96	4.32
50,000-74,999 ($n = 60$)	5.30	4.17
75,000-or above ($n = 69$)	5.23	4.23
One-way ANOVA test significance	0.001**	0.093
Race/ethnicity (%)		
White/Caucasian ($n = 318$)	4.92	4.32
African American ($n = 19$)	5.32	4.67
Hispanic ($n = 25$)	5.03	4.03
Asian ($n = 32$)	5.08	4.28
Others ($n = 19$)	4.99	4.73
One-way ANOVA test significance	0.708	0.230

Notes: *Scheffe test revealed no difference between groups; **Scheffe test revealed 15,000-24,999 different from two groups: 50,000-74,999 and 75,000 or above

4.5 Relationship between logic/emotion-based decision-making trait and travel needs and preferences

Table V shows Pearson correlation tests for the relationship between different decision-making traits and travel needs and preferences. As can be seen from the table, emotion-based decision-making trait showed significant correlations with all travel needs (*H2*) and most travel preferences (*H3*), whereas logic-based decision-making trait was not correlated with any. Emotion-based decision makers showed more passion for all travel needs and had higher preferences for sea-sand-sun, VFR, natural attractions and special events and activities for their vacations. Neither of the decision-making traits explained preference for historical, cultural or man-made attractions. *H2* and *H3* were therefore supported.

Table V	Correlations between logic/emotion-based decision-making and travel needs and travel preferences (*n* = 412-413)		
Travel needs and preferences	*Logic-based decision-making Correlation*		*Emotion-based decision-making Correlation*
Travel needs (1 = Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree)			
Self-actualization (factor grand mean)	0.086		0.130**
Social affiliation (factor grand mean)	−0.034		0.208**
Arousal (factor grand mean)	−0.037		0.250**
Escape (factor grand mean)	0.042		0.109*
Travel preferences (1 = Very Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)			
Sea-sand-sun attractions	−0.085		0.186**
Visiting and seeing friends and relatives (VFR)	0.015		0.150**
Natural attractions	−0.051		0.173**
Historical attractions	0.034		0.064
Cultural attractions	0.065		0.046
Man-made attractions	0.050		0.061
Special events and activities	0.059		0.158**
Notes: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)			

4.6 Relationship between logic/emotion-based decision-making trait and travel risks

Pearson correlation test results also showed the explanatory power of emotion-based decision-making trait on potential travel risks (Table VI). Only one travel risk (social risk) was correlated with logic-based decision-making; the more logic-based decision maker a person is, the more important is the effect of a trip on the social risk or on one's image among family and friends. The same was also true for emotion-based decision-making. Moreover, the more emotion-based decision maker a person is, the more important is the functional, psychological, physical and time risks of a trip, as well as the overall safety and security of the trip destination. The functional risk in utility of activities was correlated with emotion-based decision-making, but utility of attractions was not correlated with either decision-making trait. Similar to functional risk in utility of attractions, financial risk was also not explained by either decision-making trait. Thus, *H4* was supported.

4.7 Relationship between logic/emotion-based decision-making trait and travel information sources

Pearson correlation test results showed the explanatory power of emotion-based decision-making on preference for different travel information sources (Table VII). Of the 13 sources of information investigated, three were negatively correlated with logic-based decision-making trait; the more logic-based decision maker a person is, the less important are news media, Facebook, and Pinterest for their trip-related information needs. In

Table VI	Correlations between logic/emotion-based decision-making and travel risks (*n* = 410)		
Travel risks (1 = Very Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)	*Logic-based decision-making Correlation*		*Emotion-based decision-making Correlation*
Variety of attractions at the destination (functional)	0.064		0.082
Variety of activities at the destination (functional)	0.086		0.113*
Trip's effect on my psychological well-being (psychological)	−0.027		0.250**
Trip's effect on my physical well-being (physical)	0.024		0.237**
Financial costs of the trip to the destination (financial)	0.025		0.065
Time spent for planning and the trip itself (time)	0.021		0.141**
Trip's effect on my image among family and friends (social)	0.119*		0.102*
Overall safety and security at the destination	0.005		0.207**
Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)			

Travel information sources (1 = Very Unimportant, 7 = Very Important)	Logic-based decision-making Correlation	Emotion-based decision-making Correlation
Friends and relatives	−0.057	0.239**
Photo-sharing platforms (e.g., Flicker, Instagram)	−0.048	0.125*
Destination marketing organizations (e.g., Conventions and Visitors Bureaus, travel information offices)	−0.035	0.201**
Internet search engines (e.g., Google, Bing)	0.084	−0.020
Online rating sites (e.g., TripAdvisor)	0.097	0.001
Personal consumer blogs	0.046	0.023
Travel media (e.g., magazines, brochures, guides, newsletters)	0.007	0.146**
Travel agents and tour operators	−0.091	0.191**
News media (TV, newspapers, magazines)	−0.097*	0.220**
Company websites (e.g., hotels, resorts, attractions)	0.028	0.067
Facebook	−0.149**	0.207**
Pinterest	−0.124*	0.168**
Twitter	−0.072	0.136**

Table VII Correlations between logic/emotion-based decision-making and travel information sources ($n = 410$)

Notes: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

contrast, nine information sources were positively correlated with emotion-based decision-making trait. Four sources that were not correlated with either emotion-based or logic-based decision-making trait were internet search engines, online rating sites, personal consumer blogs and company websites. Thus, *H5* was supported.

5. Discussion and implications

This study examined the relationships between decision-making trait and sociodemographic and travel behavior characteristics to profile consumers with utilitarian and experiential consumption tendencies. Specifically, the study aimed to draw a picture of a rational consumer, or logic-based decision maker and an experiential consumer, or emotion-based decision maker, in relation to sociodemographic characteristics and some resultant travel needs, preferences, perceptions and behaviors due to their logic-based or emotion-based decision-making traits. The internal reliability values of the emotion-based decision-making and logic-based decision-making factors (0.87 and 0.91, respectively) being higher than those originally reported in Barchard's study (0.73 and 0.67; IPIP, 2017) provide positive support for this construct within the trait theory.

In addition, those individuals sampled for the study had a higher tendency to be logic-based decision makers. Results also showed that emotion-based decision makers are more likely to be females, regardless of age category, whereas logic-based decision makers are more likely to be males, to be older in age and to belong to higher income categories. These results offered empirical support for the gender-emotion link suggested by researchers (Shields *et al.*, 2006). In addition, results implied that stabilization with age and greater income induces more logic-based decision-making, providing insight into the profile of logic-based decision-making consumers which has not received empirical attention. Practically, the results of this study suggest that DMOs targeting males and higher age and income groups may need to strategize by addressing logic and rationality in choosing their products and services. Conversely, other organizations targeting females of any age may need to highlight how their products and services induce certain emotions and hedonics.

The findings of this study related to travel needs revealed that the most important needs in general are escape and arousal, which implies higher demand for travel products offering escape and arousal for travelers in general. The high stress work environment, especially

in cultures such as that of the USA where these data were collected, may put these needs at high importance. This study further advanced prior theories explaining travel needs and motivations. In a chronological order, Cohen's (1972) motivational tourist typology, Dann's (1977, 1981) push – pull theory, Iso-Ahola's (1982) theory of seeking/escaping and Pearce and Lee's (2005) theory of travel career pattern are all widely accepted theories that shed light on needs and motivation in travel and leisure contexts. While these theories have provided a thorough understanding of different types of travel needs, the present study expanded this understanding by examining how the importance of different needs may vary for consumers depending on their decision-making traits. Specifically, in comparison to logic-based decision makers who are perceived as rational problem solvers, however, emotion-based decision makers who are guided by their feelings rather than their brain have shown more passion for all four travel needs; indeed, the higher the tendency to make decisions based on emotions, the higher the significance of all travel needs. One plausible explanation could be that travel in general is experiential, hence the related needs are, as well. Perhaps, therefore, all needs were significantly more important for experiential consumers. Even though social affiliation was expected to be more utilitarian, logic-based decision makers did not rate higher on it. This may also be because the more logic-based consumers are less likely to allow their ratings to approach extreme ends, regardless of their passion. From a managerial perspective, these results imply that DMOs need to highlight escape and arousal for travelers in general, while integrating experiential consumption dimensions into their marketing messages to attract emotion-based decision makers.

Prior literature has indicated that destinations are more likely to be successful if they recognize the experiential qualities of their products and services and that research into the emotional content of a destination experience remains scarce (Hosany and Gilbert, 2010). The current study has advanced this line of thought by suggesting that whether and how to stage and promote the experiential qualities of a destination's offerings should be evaluated based on the specific target market. The results of this study revealed that the highest-rated travel preference items are cultural attractions, natural attractions and historical attractions. Natural attractions have more importance for emotion-based decision makers than for their counterparts. In contrast, the lowest-rated preferences are man-made attractions, VFR and special events and activities. Both groups are similar in their high importance placed on historical and cultural attractions and the low importance placed on man-made attractions; however, emotion-based decision makers place significantly higher importance on other travel preferences, namely, sea-sand-sun, VFR, natural attractions and special events. On the contrary, no relationship was found between logic-based decision-making and any of the included travel preferences. These results indicate that travel types involving sea-sand-sun, VFR, natural attractions and special events may be more likely to provide the diverse emotions that emotion-based decision makers seek in their travel experiences.

As destination promoters around the world are under growing pressure to recognize and to understand the crucial components of a meaningful tourist experience (Gretzel et al., 2006), this study provided specific strategic insights for DMOs. Those DMOs promoting destinations with historical and cultural attractions can capitalize on the finding that these attractions are highly demanded by both types of decision makers, whereas DMOs of man-made attraction destinations may need to find ways to embellish the significance of these attractions for both types of decision makers. Perhaps they need to highlight how these man-made attractions reflect the historical and cultural profile of places, depending on the times of their development. In addition, keeping in mind that emotion-based decision makers seek travel types with higher chances of inducing feelings, such as special events, VFR and sea-sand-sun, DMOs may need to identify ways to highlight such emotional properties of other types of travel preferences, to increase the appeal of other types of attractions for emotion-based decision makers. Perhaps the excitement in historical and

cultural attractions need to be highlighted in images and messages for marketing communications.

This study has also contributed to the literature concerning travel risk perceptions. Prior studies have examined how travel risk perception could vary depending on demographic characteristics (Simpson and Siguaw, 2008), prior experience (George, 2003) and cultural differences (Reisinger and Mavondo, 2006; Tasci and Boylu, 2010). Cohen's (1972) theory of motivational tourist typology and Plog's (1973) theory of psychocentric/allocentric tourist typology are more related to the personality construct, which explained how travelers with different personality traits (introverted/extraverted, risk avoider/risk taker, novelty seeker/familiarity seeker, etc.) may prefer different types of destinations. In recognition of the increasing attention paid to experiential consumption, the present study added an important personality trait to the extant literature on travel risk, namely, logic-based/emotion-based decision-making trait.

With the exception of the financial cost and the variety of activities, emotion-based decision makers place more importance on all risk factors. The more emotion-based decision maker a person is, the more important are the functional, psychological, physical and time risks of a trip, as well as the overall safety and security of the trip destination. Conversely, logic-based decision-making was surprisingly correlated with only social risk. One explanation for this may be that logic-based decision makers rationally evaluate the outcomes of a trip based more on its functionality and efficiency, keeping in mind the effort required of them; the more effort required, the more confidence gained and the less important are the salient risks, except for the possibility of making a mistake and looking bad among friends and family. On the contrary, emotion-based decision makers may be more influenced by the emotions, hedonics, pleasure, enjoyment and aesthetics associated with a decision to be made, which may raise their concern about the potential travel risks that they may have overlooked when making a decision.

Financial risk, the highest-rated factor and functional risk in a variety of attractions are not correlated with either decision-making trait. This may be because some types of attractions are uniformly expected at any travel destination and financial costs are also uniformly expected with trips, regardless of decision-making traits. The utility of a trip in terms of the variety of activities available at a destination, however, is important for emotion-based decision makers. This may be because activities induce certain emotions, such as excitement, thrill, surprise, joy and fear. Conversely, even though social risk was the lowest-rated item in general, both decision-making traits were highly correlated with social risk. The higher the tendency in the decision-making style, either logic-based or emotion-based, the more important how a trip would make them look within their social circle. Practically, these results imply that DMOs should pay attention to travel risk factors in general, especially for emotion-based decision makers who display a higher likelihood of concern for these factors. Marketing messages need to ensure travelers that their needs for safety and security will be met, not only in general but also in specific dimensions. Social risk concerns for both types of decision makers should be addressed in marketing messages.

Finally, while consumers' preference for varied information sources has been widely explored in past literature from diverse fields (Murphy *et al.*, 2016; Tang and Jang, 2014; Yoo and Shin, 2016), especially in the tourism literature (Chen and Gursoy, 2000; Fodness and Murray, 1997; Gursoy and Chen, 2000; Um and Crompton, 1992), preferences of utilitarian versus experiential consumers lacks theoretical understanding. The findings of the present study have added to previous literature concerning information sources by suggesting that while travel products and services are considered experiential in nature (Yuksel, 2004), tourists' preferences for different information sources could still differ in relation to each individual's decision-making, whether based on logic or emotions. Different from Um and Crompton (1992) who found that tourists rely mainly on information gained

from external sources other than their personal experiences, this study provided empirical support for Cooper-Martin (1992) that consumers may prefer experiential information sources when choosing experiential products.

It is interesting that in the travel context, which is experiential in nature, logic-based decision-making is either not correlated or negatively correlated with information sources. The more logic-based decision maker a person is, the less likely it is that they will rely on information they receive from news media or from social media channels such as Facebook or Pinterest. On the contrary, emotion-based decision-making trait is positively correlated with all information platforms except for internet search engines, online rating sites and personal consumer blogs. The more emotion-based decision maker a person is, the more likely it is that they will rely on social media sites, word-of-mouth, news media, travel agents and DMOs. Google, word-of-mouth and TripAdvisor are the most important sources, whereas short messages and photo sharing platforms are not as popular in general. Practically, this finding reveals important insights for DMOs to consider when choosing their integrated marketing communication tools. When targeting logic-based decision makers, DMOs are better off to stay away from social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter. One finding in favor of DMOs while attracting logic-based decision makers is that this type of traveler will not be affected by negative news about a destination that appears through media, which happens occasionally because of natural or human-caused disasters. Conversely, when attracting emotion-based decision makers, DMOs should use a variety of sources, including their own channels in the form of websites with embedded social media channels.

6. Limitations and directions for future research

Although the current study revealed important insights for DMOs in relation to targeting travelers with different decision-making traits, there is a need for more focus on clarifying the profiles of experiential and utilitarian consumers. The current study used one personality trait, emotion-based decision-making, as a proxy for experiential consumption. There are other potentially explanatory traits that should be investigated in future studies. For example, emotionality and rationality (International Personality Item Pool [IPIP], 2017) are other relevant personality traits that can be investigated for a more comprehensive psychographic description of different decision-making styles. Furthermore, other travel behavior characteristics, such as types of activities engaged in during trips, satisfaction and loyalty tendencies of different decision-making styles can be compared by using on site or exit studies with actual visitors at a destination. Even with these limitations, the current study provides much insight into the characteristics and behaviors of experiential consumers in comparison with utilitarian consumers.

References

Batra, R. and Ahtola, O.T. (1991), "Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian sources of consumer attitudes", *Marketing Letters*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 159-170.

Boksberger, P.E., Bieger, T. and Laesser, C. (2007), "Multidimensional analysis of perceived risk in commercial air travel", *Journal of Air Transport Management*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 90-96.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T. and Gosling, S.D. (2011), "Amazon's Mechanical Turk: a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data?", *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, Vol. 6, pp. 3-5.

Burger, J.M. (1993), *Personality*, 3rd ed., Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Grove.

Chen, J.S. and Gursoy, D. (2000), "Cross-cultural comparison of the information sources used by first-time and repeat travelers and its marketing implications", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 191-203.

Cohen, E. (1972), "Toward a sociology of international tourism", *Social Research*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 164-182.

Cooper-Martin, E. (1992), "Consumers and movies: information sources for experiential products", *Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 19, pp. 756-761.

Crompton, J.L. (1979), "Motivations for pleasure vacation", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 408-424.

Dann, G.M.S. (1977), "Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 4, pp. 184-194.

Dann, G.M.S. (1981), "Tourist motivation: an appraisal", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 187-219.

Dickson, T. and Dolnicar, S. (2004), "No risk, no fun the role of perceived risk in adventure tourism", CAUTHE 2004: Creating Tourism Knowledge, Ipswich, p. 184.

Fischer, A. (2000), *Gender and Emotion: Social Psychological Perspectives*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fodness, D. and Murray, B. (1997), "Tourist information search", *Annals of tourism research*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 503-523.

Ford, R.C. and Heaton, C.P. (2000), *Managing the Guest Experience in Hospitality*, Delmar Publisher, Iowa.

Freud, S. (1955), "Beyond the pleasure principle", in Strackey, J. and Zilboorg, G. (Eds), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. 18, Hogarth Press, London.

George, R. (2003), "Tourist's perceptions of safety and security while visiting Cape Town", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 575-585.

Gretzel, U., Fesenmaier, D.R., Formica, S. and O'Leary, J.T. (2006), "Searching for the future: Challenges faced by destination marketing organizations", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 116-126.

Gursoy, D. and Chen, J.S. (2000), "Competitive analysis of cross cultural information search behavior", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 21 No. 6, pp. 583-590.

Gursoy, D., Spangenberg, E.R. and Rutherford, D.G. (2006), "The hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attendees' attitudes toward festivals", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 279-294.

Hansen, E.B. and Breivik, G. (2001), "Sensation seeking as a predictor of positive and negative risk behavior among adolescents", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 627-640.

Hirschman, E.C. and Holbrook, M.B. (1982), "Hedonic consumption: emerging concepts, methods and propositions", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 92-101.

Holbrook, M.B. and Hirschman, E.C. (1982), "The experiential aspects of consumption: consumer fantasies, feelings and fun", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 132-140.

Hosany, S. and Gilbert, D. (2010), "Measuring tourists' emotional experiences toward hedonic holiday destinations", *Journal of travel research*, Vol. 49 No. 4, pp. 513-526.

International Personality Item Pool [IPIP] (2017), "Alphabetical index of 274 labels for 463 IPIP scales", available at: http://ipip.ori.org/newIndexofScaleLabels.htm

Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1982), "Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: a rejoinder", *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 256-262.

Kaplan, L.B., Szybillo, G.J. and Jacoby, J. (1974), "Components of perceived risk in product purchase: a cross-validation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 59 No. 3, pp. 287-291.

King, J. (2002), "Destination marketing organizations connecting the experience rather than promoting the place", *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 105-108.

Krippendorf, J. (1987), *The Holiday Makers: Understanding the Impact of Leisure and Travel*, Heinemann Professional, Oxford.

Lo, I.S., McKercher, B., Lo, A., Cheung, C. and Law, R. (2011), "Tourism and online photography", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 725-731.

Lofman, B. (1991), "Elements of experiential consumption: an exploratory study", *NA-Advances in Consumer Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 729-735.

Maslow, A.H. (1943), "A theory of human motivation", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 370-396.

Mcintosh, A.J. and Siggs, A. (2005), "An exploration of the experiential nature of boutique accommodation", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 74-81.

Mitchell, V.W. (1998), "Defining and measuring perceived risk", *Academy of Marketing Conference*, *Academy of Marketing Association, Sheffield*.

Mitchell, V.W. (1999), "Consumer perceived risk: conceptualisations and models", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 33 Nos 1/2, pp. 163-195.

Mitchell, V.W. and Greatorex, M. (1993), "Risk perception and reduction in the purchase of consumer services", *Service Industries Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 179-200.

Morrison, A.M. (2013), *Marketing and Managing Tourism Destinations*, Routledge, Abingdon.

Murphy, H.C., Chen, M.M. and Cossutta, M. (2016), "An investigation of multiple devices and information sources used in the hotel booking process", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 52, pp. 44-51.

Nawijn, J., Mitas, O., Lin, Y. and Kerstetter, D. (2013), "How do we feel on vacation? A closer look at how emotions change over the course of a trip", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 265-274.

Overby, J.W. and Lee, E.J. (2006), "The effects of utilitarian and hedonic online shopping value on consumer preference and intentions", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 59 No. 10, pp. 1160-1166.

Pearce, P.L. and Lee, U.I. (2005), "Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 226-237.

Peter, J.P. and Ryan, M. (1976), "An investigation of perceived risk at the brand level", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. 5 No. 13, pp. 184-188.

Plog, S.C. (1973), "Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity", *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 14, pp. 13-16.

Prayag, G., Hosany, S., Muskat, B. and Del Chiappa, G. (2017), "Understanding the relationships between tourists' emotional experiences, perceived overall image, satisfaction and intention to recommend", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 56 No. 1, pp. 41-54.

Reisinger, Y. and Mavondo, F. (2006), "Cultural differences in travel risk perception", *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 13-31.

Sheth, J.N. (1977), "Demographics in consumer behavior", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 129-138.

Shields, S.A., Garner, D.N., Di Leone, B. and Hadley, A.M. (2006), "Gender and emotion", *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, Springer, New York, NY, pp. 63-83.

Simpson, P.M. and Siguaw, J.A. (2008), "Perceived travel risks: the traveller perspective and manageability", *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 315-327.

Stephens-Martinez, K., Hearst, M.A. and Fox, A. (2014), "Monitoring moocs: which information sources do instructors value?", *Proceedings of The First ACM conference on Learning@ Scale Conference*, *ACM*, pp. 79-88.

Stone, R.N. and Gronhaug, K. (1993), "Perceived risk: further considerations for the marketing discipline", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 27, pp. 39-50.

Swanson, K.K. and Horridge, P.E. (2004), "A structural model for souvenir consumption, travel activities and tourist demographics", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 372-380.

Tang, L. and Jang, S. (2014), "Information value and destination image: investigating the moderating role of processing fluency", *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, Vol. 23 No. 7, pp. 790-814.

Tasci, A.D. and Boylu, Y. (2010), "Cultural comparison of tourists' safety perception in relation to trip satisfaction", *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol. 12 No. 2, pp. 179-192.

Titz, K. (2008), "Experiential consumption: affect-emotions-hedonism", *Handbook of Hospitality Marketing Management*, Routledge, London, pp. 324-352.

Trinh, T.T., Ryan, C. and Cave, J. (2014), "Souvenir sellers and perceptions of authenticity – the retailers of Hôi An, Vietnam", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 275-283.

Tsai, M.C., Chou, Y.Y., Lin, S.J. and Lin, S.H. (2013), "Factors associated with adolescents' perspectives on health needs and preference for health information sources in Taiwan", *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, Vol. 98 No. 1, pp. 9-15.

Um, S. and Crompton, J.L. (1992), "The roles of perceived inhibitors and facilitators in pleasure travel destination decisions", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 18-24.

Värlander, S. (2007), "Online information quality in experiential consumption: an exploratory study", *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 14 No. 5, pp. 328-338.

Wei, W. and Miao, L. (in press), "Memorable experiences in customer-customer interactions (CCIs) at conferences", *Event Management*, Vol. 21, p. 6.

Wei, W., Lu, Y., Miao, L., Cai, L. and Wang, C. (2017), "Customer-customer interactions (CCIs) at conferences: an identity approach", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 59 No. 1, pp. 154-170.

Wilkins, H. (2011), "Souvenirs: what and why we buy", *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 239-247.

Wu, H.C. and Li, T. (2014), "A study of experiential quality, perceived value, heritage image, experiential satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists", *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, doi: 10.1177/1096348014525638.

Yates, J.F. and Stone, E.R. (1992), "The risk construct", in Yates, J.F. (Ed.), *Risk Taking Behavior*, Wiley, Chichester, pp. 1-25.

Yoo, W. and Shin, D.H. (2016), "Examining predictors of online news use: perceived bias in traditional media and preference for partisan news", *Info*, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 59-72.

Yuksel, A. (2004), "Shopping experience evaluation: a case of domestic and international visitors", *Tourism Management*, Vol. 25 No. 6, pp. 751-759.

About the authors

Wei Wei is an Assistant Professor of tourism and hospitality consumer behaviors and experiences in the Department of Hospitality Services in the Rosen College of Hospitality Management at the University of Central Florida. Her research interests include consumer behavior, psychology and experience with a focus on consumer-to-consumer interactions, consumer engagement behavior and technological experiences in cross-cultural tourism and hospitality settings.

Asli D.A. Tasci is an Associate Professor of tourism and hospitality marketing in the Department of Tourism, Events & Attractions in the Rosen College of Hospitality Management at the University of Central Florida. Her research interests include tourism and hospitality marketing, particularly consumer behavior. She completed a number of studies measuring destination image and branding with a cross-cultural perspective. Asli D.A. Tasci is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: adatasci@yahoo.com