

7146515 3 1999



This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

Cohort Analysis: An Application to Canadian Tourism

presented by

Lori Pennington-Gray

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Park, Recreation and

Tourism Resources

Joseph D. Dr. J. D. , SU D. Fridgen

Major professor

Date August 3, 1999

8/3/ 199

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

0-12771

LIBRARY Michigan State University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record. TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due. MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
MAY 2 6 2002 0 8 1 9 2002		
CT 2 4 2007 -		

1/98 c/CIRC/DateDue.p65-p.14

COHORT ANALYSIS: AN APPLICATION TO CANADIAN TOURISM

By

Lori Pennington-Gray

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources

ABSTRACT

COHORT ANALYSIS: AN APPLICATION TO CANADIAN TOURISM

By

Lori Pennington-Gray

The primary purpose of this study was the application of cohort analysis to travel philosophies, benefits sought and travel interests of Canadians. Five research questions guided the course of this study: (1) Is there a significant relationship between period and travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests of Canadians? (2) Is there a significant relationship between age and travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests of Canadians over time? (3) Is there a significant relationship between generation and travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests of Canadians? (4) Does generation, age or time explain the greatest variation in travel philosophies, benefits sought and travel interests within Canadians? (5) Which structural model best measures the effects of age, period and generation on three constructs: travel philosophy, benefits sought and travel interests?

Three-way analysis of variance was used to examine the effects of age, period and generation on the travel-related variables. This method was used because it revealed the most information and violated the fewest assumptions. The total variation explained and interaction effects were presented for each of twelve travel-related variables. The cohort analysis revealed that interaction effects among age, period and generation explained the most between-group variation for all of the twelve variables. Interaction effects were more significant than any of the main effects.

Several major discoveries arose from the study. They were: (1) age, period and generation explained very little of the total variation in the responses to the twelve travel-related variables, (2) the interaction of the three independent variables (age, period and generation) explained the greatest percentage of variation for all twelve variables, (3) the combination of the triad method and three-way analysis of variance was an effective and informative method of performing cohort analysis, and (4) future researchers need to consider (a) obtaining panel data which measures a number of cohorts over the life span, (b) keeping variables the same from one survey to the next, (c) including variables which might be more "generational" in nature, and (d) including variables which permit the assessment of period effects.

Copyright by Lori Pennington-Gray 1999 I dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Doug Gray, for all his support and encouragement along the way.

.

·

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to my Ph.D. advisor, Dr. Joseph D. Fridgen, for his support and advice. He was instrumental in the success of my Ph.D. program. His patience, thoughtfulness and intellectual stimulation are examples I will try to follow.

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Daniel J. Stynes, for his ongoing help in the completion of this manuscript. His command of statistics and research methods helped to strengthen this dissertation.

I am truly grateful to Dr. Richard Spreng (Department of Marketing and Logistics) and Dr. Bonnie Knutson (School of Hospitality Business), members of my Ph.D. committee, for their continued guidance in the shaping of this manuscript and their continued support of me personally.

Special thanks are extended to Deborah L. Kersetter (The Pennsylvania State University), my Master's thesis advisor and member of my dissertation committee, for her friendship and support. I know I couldn't have made it without her. She was always there when I needed it.

Sincere appreciation to my friend and mentor, Ronald McCarville (The University of Waterloo), for his encouragement from the very start. Without his suggestion to continue my education, I wouldn't be where I am today.

Many thanks are extended to Dr. Stephen Smith, Scott Meis and Gerald Ballie, members of the Canadian Tourism Commission. I am extremely grateful to them for access to the data from 1983 and 1995. Without access to the Canadian data, this study would not have been possible.

vi

Sta fini Dou supp

.

me t than I want to thank and acknowledge the National Tour Association and Michigan State University. The financial support provided by each helped me to stay on track and finish in three years. For this, both my husband and I are truly grateful.

With that, my deepest and warmest gratitude must be extended to my husband, Doug Gray. His support through this long process never waned. I am utterly grateful.

To my family, I extend my deepest gratitude for your understanding, patience and support throughout my graduate program. Special thanks to Kirsten and Steve for helping me through those hard times (comprehensive exams, interviews and the big book report), thank goodness you were around.

LIS

LIS AB

CH [N]

CH Re'

CH. Me

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLESx		
LIST OF FIGURES xiv		
ABBREVIATIONS	,	
CHAPTER 1		
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM		
Purpose of the Study)	
Research Questions)	
Delimitations	l	
Definitions11		
Organization of the Study13	\$	
CHAPTER II		
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	ł	
Cohort Studies in Research14	ł	
Cohort Studies in Marketing	,	
Cohort Studies in Travel Research)	
Demographics as a Component of Travel Research	6	
Life Cycle as a Variable in Travel Research	6	
Age as a Variable in Travel Research	\$	
Psychographics as a Component of Travel Research	5	
Benefits Sought as a Component of Travel Research45	j	
Change Over Time as a Component of Leisure Research	5	
Strauss and Howe's Theory Applied to the Canadian Population	!	
Cohort Analysis as a Method of Statistical Analysis	ŀ	
Triad Method65	j	
Regression Analysis with Dummy Variables	j	
Structural Equations Modeling	j	
Summary)	
CHAPTER III		
METHODOLODGY)	
Source of Data)	
Canadian Travel Attitude and Motivation Study		
Domestic Tourism Market Research Study)	
Conversion of the Data	j	
Treatment of the Data	j	

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	78
Sample Profile and Sample Bias	78
Age	80
Income	80
Marital Status	81
Education Level	81
Gender	82
Number of Income Earners	83
Accounting for Large Sample Sizes	84
Period and Travel-Related Variables	85
Age and Travel-Related Variables	88
Generation and Travel-Related Variables	91
Using Different Methods of Cohort Analysis	93
Multicollinearity as a Complexity of Cohort Analysis	95
Using Cohort Tables as a Method of Cohort Analysis	96
Results of the Analysis	97
Using Analysis of Variance as a Method of Cohort Analysis	122
Results of the Analysis	124
Using Structural Equations Modeling as a Method of Cohort Analysis	130
Study Limitations	133
CHAPTER V	
CONCLUSIONS DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDITIONS	135
Conclusions and Discussion	135
Recommendations for Future Research	
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Canadian Attitude and Motivation Study	151
Appendix B: Domestic Tourism Market Research Study	160
Appendix C: Three-way Analysis of Variance for travel philosophies,	
benefits sought and travel interest variables	166
BIBLIOGRAPHY	171

•

Table
Table
Tabie
Table
Table
Table
Table
Tabia
Tabl
Tat
];

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Strauss & Howe's Generations
Table 2.	Example of a Cohort Analysis Table16
Table 3.	Comparison of Three Theories of Generations21
Table 4.	Alternative Views of the Life Cycle Model
Table 5.	Example of Perreault, Darden and Darden's (1977) AIO Statements 37
Table 6.	1983's Study Number of Respondents by Province
Table 7.	1995's Study Number of Interviews by Province
Table 8.	Common Variables in Both Studies
Table 9.	Age of Each Generation at Each Period76
Table 10.	Sample Sizes of Each Generation at Each Period77
Table 11.	Demographic Characteristics of Respondents in Both Studies
Table 12.	Observed Differences on Standardized Scale related to Original Scale 85
Table 13.	Means of Travel Philosophies, Benefits Sought and Travel Interests for
	1983 Study, 1995 Study and Pooled Dataset
Table 14.	Standard Deviations of Travel Philosophies, Benefits Sought and Travel
	Interests for 1983 Study, 1995 Study and Pooled Dataset
Table 15.	Means for Significant Relationships between Generation and Travel
	Philosophies, Benefits Sought and Travel Interests
Table 16.	Means for Significant Relationships between Generation and Travel
	Philosophy, Benefit Sought and Travel Interest Statements
Table 17.	Multicollinearity of Age, Generation and Period96
Table 18a.	Age by Period for "Money Spent on Travel is Well Spent"

Ta	
Ta	
Tal	
Tat	
Tat	
Tab	
Tab	
Tab	
Тан	
Tabl	
Tu	
Tadie	
τ	
lable	
lable .	
Table 2	
Table 2:	
Table 23	

Table 18b.	Generation by Period for "Money Spent on travel is Well Spent"
Table 18c.	Age by Generation for "Money Spent on Travel is Well Spent"
Table 19a.	Age by Period for "Important that People Speak my Language"
Table 19b.	Generation by Period for "Important that People Speak my Language"101
Table 19c.	Age by Generation for "Important that People Speak my Language" 101
Table 20a.	Age by Period for Importance of "Having Fun and Being Entertained"102
Table 20b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "Having Fun and Being
	Entertained" 102
Table 20c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "Having Fun and Being
	Entertained" 103
Table 21a.	Age by Period for Importance of "National and Provincial Parks" 105
Table 21b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "National and Provincial
	Parks"
Table 21c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "National and Provincial
	Parks"
Table 22a.	Age by Period for Importance of "Beaches for Swimming and
	Sunning" 106
Table 22b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "Beaches for Swimming and
	Sunning" 107
Table 22c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "Beaches for Swimming and
	Sunning" 107
Table 23a.	Age by Period for Importance of "High Quality Restaurants" 109
Table 23b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "High Quality Restaurants" 109

Table 23c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "High Quality Restaurants" 110
Table 24a.	Age by Period for Importance of "Budget Accommodations"111
Table 24b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "Budget Accommodations"111
Table 24c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "Budget Accommodations" 111
Table 25a.	Age by Period for Importance of "First Class Accommodations" 113
Table 25b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "First Class
	Accommodations"
Table 25c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "First Class Accommodations".113
Table 26a.	Age by Period for Importance of "Shopping" 115
Table 26b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "Shopping" 115
Table 26c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "Shopping"115
Table 27a.	Age by Period for Importance of "Nightlife and Entertainment"117
Table 27b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "Nightlife and Entertainment"117
Table 27c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "Nightlife and Entertainment" 117
Table 28a.	Age by Period for Importance of "Museums and Art Galleries"119
Table 28b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "Museums and Art Galleries" 119
Table 28c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "Museums and Art Galleries" 120
Table 29a.	Age by Period for Importance of "Amusement and Theme Parks" 121
Table 29b.	Generation by Period for Importance of "Amusement and Theme
	Parks"
Table 29c.	Age by Generation for Importance of "Amusement and Theme
	Parks"

Ĩ
Ta
Ta
Tat

Tat

Table 30.	Three-Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction of Age, Generation and
	Period on the Importance of "Nightlife and Entertainment"
Table 31.	Three-Way Analysis of Variance Examining Total Interaction of Age,
	Generation and Period on the Importance of "Having Fun and Being
	Entertained"12
Table 32.	Three-Way Analysis of Variance Examining Total Interaction of Age,
	Generation and Period on the Importance of "Beaches for Swimming and
	Sunning" 12
Table 33.	F Values of Three-way ANOVA for all Variables
Table 34.	Percentage of Total Percent of Explained Variance

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Lifestyle Expectation Model2
Figure 2.	A Conceptualization of The Role & Relationship Of Respondents
	Motives
Figure 3.	Transformation from 5-Point Scale to 4-Point Scale74
Figure 4.	Transformation from a 4-Point Scale to a Standardized Scale75
Figure 5.	Mapping Comparisons on a Standardized Scale76
Figure 6.	Graphical Representation of No Interaction Effects between Generation
	and Period for "Money Spent on Travel is Well Spent"
Figure 7.	Graphical Representation of Interaction Effects of Generation and Period
	for "Having Fun and Being Entertained"103
Figure 8.	Graphical Representation of Interaction Effects of Age and Period for
	"Beaches for Swimming and Sunning"108
Figure 9.	Graphical Representation of Interaction Effects of Age and Period for
	"Nightlife and Entertainment"118
Figure 10.	The Model131

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
CTAMS	Canadian Travel Attitude and Motivation Study
DTS	Domestic Tourism Market Research Study
SEM	Structural Equations Modeling

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

While mass marketing is a necessary part of many marketing plans, such strategies are no longer as efficient or cost effective as they once were. The marketplace is continually changing. The marketplace has moved from a manufacturing driven to a consumer driven economy (Kotler, 1996). In 1956, Wendell Smith wrote in the Journal of Marketing of the need to target homogeneous components of a heterogeneous market rather than the market as a whole. He was the first to call this strategy "segmentation." In "The Third Wave," Alvin Toffler warned that the "mass market has split into evermultiplying, ever-changing sets of mini-markets that demand a continually expanding range of options..." (1980, p. 248). To remain competitive today, companies must be able to develop and refine their products and services to meet segments' needs and preferences.

Segmentation bases (or variables) include the characteristics of individuals, groups or organizations. All are used to divide the mass market into more homogeneous groups. These variables may include for example, age, sex, race, income, household size, education, personality traits, emotional needs, attitudes, interests and opinions, activities and organizational memberships. Authors have classified segmentation variables into four main areas: (1) demographics, (2) psychographics, (3) behavior and (4) lifestyle (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Lifestyle Expectation Model, Knutson, 1982

Segmentation has been applied to a wide range of situations in a variety of different settings. Early studies tended to focus on demographic segmentation techniques. This was especially true within the context of tourism. According to Gladwell (1990) "the most frequently collected data for identifying the characteristics of tourists are demographic data" (p.15). Anderson and Langmeyer, (1980) among others, believe that age has a significant interpretive power on travel behavior. According to Wells (1975), "demographic profiles, essential though they may be, have not been deemed sufficient" (p. 196). Thus, research has moved towards using life cycle characteristics to segment and profile travelers. Zuzanek and Smale (1992) stated that life cycle explains greater variance in consumer behavior than single item variables, such as age. This is because life cycle theory combines biological characteristic, psychological orientations and social roles.

Anderson and Langmeyer (1980) building off the lifecycle concept, found that family obligations such as time and finances were less of a constraint for older travelers than younger travelers and that incomes appeared to be somewhat comparable between the two segments. In addition, they found that younger travelers tended to be more active while on vacation than older travelers.

Zimmerman (1982) documented that patterns of daily trip frequency varied over the life cycle and that households were more mobile at some stages than others. He found that families with children tended to increase their frequency of travel as the children aged. Lawson (1991) studying patterns of expenditures and types of vacations over the life cycle, found that individuals with small children tended to travel less often and spend less money than individuals with older children or no children at all.

An additional approach to life cycle segmentation is the use of psychographic profiles to provide an understanding of tourists. One of the first studies to use Attitude, Interest, and Opinion Scales or psychographics in recreation and tourism was conducted by Perreault, Darden and Darden (1977). Their study served as the foundation for many future studies which used AIO scales to study travelers (c.f., Gladwell, 1990; Mayo, 1975; Schewe & Calantone, 1978). For example, Gladwell (1990) used psychographics to examine state park travelers and found that three identifiable groups of travelers varied in relation to their vacation behavior. She found that budget conscious travelers took fewer vacations and shorter trips than two other groups. Mayo (1975) looked at auto vacationers to national parks. His study, which used 85 psychographic statements to profile users, documented that the tourist who is attracted to national parks enjoys adventure, does not plan in detail, is impulsive, likes the outdoors, likes to escape crowds and has power over other individuals.

Many researchers have moved beyond psychographics to the use of "benefits sought" to address differences between various segments of a market. Such benefits as

escape from reality (Bello & Etzel, 1985; Wahlers & Etzel, 1985), status and prestige (McIntosh & Goeldner, 1986), social interaction (Pearce & Caltabiano, 1983), novelty (Snepenger, 1987), relaxation (Crompton, 1979; Woodside & Jacobs, 1985), and climate (Loker & Perdue, 1992) for example, appear to be important "benefits" of traveling. Hence, these benefits and others have been used to segment travelers into distinct groups. Many researchers also have focused on the relationship between sociodemographic variables and the types of benefits sought through travel.

Gitelson and Kerstetter (1990) highlighted benefits sought through travel in relation to such variables as age, family income, education and gender. Hawes (1988) originally found that age was an important predictor of benefits sought by travel. Contrary to what previous literature had suggested, however, he found that as individuals age, they are less likely to seek rest and relaxation while on vacation. Woodside and Jacobs (1985) discovered that national origin impacts the types of benefits sought when travelling to Hawaii. They suggested that Canadian visitors, American visitors and Japanese visitors to Hawaii differ widely in the types of benefits sought when vacationing.

Given the challenges with traditional demographic segmentation and the incompatible results of psychographic segmentation, several researchers have suggested that a combination of psychographics and demographics is the best way to delineate segments (Abbey, 1979; Perreault, Darden and Darden, 1977; Shewe and Calantone, 1978). Cohort segmentation is one way to combine these variables (Bonnici, 1992).

the syi the tir: ana pro cor spe wh Ho spe sou ben unfo Thes "inte "intr anoth when consi accou

A cohort is defined as individuals within a delineated population who experienced the same significant life event within a given period of time. Birth cohort is used synonymously with generation. Cohort analysis typically refers to any study in which there are measures of some characteristic of one or more cohorts at two or more points in time. The majority of studies have examined consumption patterns by use of cohort analysis. Coffee purchases, cola purchases, and automobiles are just a few of the products which have been addressed using cohort analysis to examine changing consumption patterns. Rarer is the examination of interests or philosophies held by specific generations. According to several authors, a generation has a distinct personality which binds them together (Foot & Stoffman, 1996; Smith & Clurman, 1997; Strauss & Howe, 1991). It is this personality which is said to affect attitudes and interests toward specific experiences and products. To date, cohort research has not focused on benefits sought. Considering studies have found that there is a strong relationship between benefits sought and other sociodemographic variables, this dearth of research is unfortunate.

Typically, a cohort analysis involves simultaneous evaluation of three variables. These variables include time period, age and generation. The process involves "intercohort trends" which examines the change in different cohorts as they age and "intracohort trends" which examines the change in the cohort from one point in time to another. For example, an intracohort trend would follow travelers born in 1943-1964 when they were 36 years old and again when they were 50 years old. Three effects are considered: age effects, period effects and cohort effects. Age effects are those effects accounted for by biological, psychological and social aging. Period effects are those

effects accounted for by environmental changes such as marketing or changes in measurement and cohort effects are those differences in socialization or cohort composition.

To date, cohort studies have rarely been applied to the area of travel and tourism. Warnick (1993) conducted one of the few studies that has used cohort analysis. He examined the US domestic travel market. His study suggested that the Baby Boomer generation's participation rate in domestic travel has declined at the same or a lower rate than the overall population change. In addition, domestic travel is experiencing growth due, in part, to the youngest generation (13th Generation). He suggested that understanding generational personalities would be helpful in future travel trend prediction.

Opperman (1995) used a systematic examination of past behavior to explore cohort effects on the travel patterns of German residents. He used a "self-report" methodology to analyze lifelong travel patterns of the respondents. His results suggested that destination region preferences were dependent on cohort membership. To truly understand these results, however, Opperman suggested that more longitudinal studies are needed.

According to Strauss and Howe, a generation is shaped by its "age location," or by participation in epochal events that occur during their course of life (e.g., Depression, World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the Energy Crisis). During each stage of the life cycle, a set of collective behavioral traits and attitudes is produced. They call this a "peer personality." This peer personality, in turn, gives history a dynamic quality. Attitudes of one generation affect how their children are brought up and later

how those children raise their offspring. As a generation ages, its inner beliefs retain a certain consistency over its life cycle, like that of an aging individual. Although the beliefs and behavior of a generation rarely are uniform across all members, those who differ from the peer norm usually are aware of their lack of conformation. A variety of data such as work habits, ambition, and even attitudes towards travel can offer evidence about peer personalities.

Strauss and Howe defined a generation as "a cohort-group whose length approximates the span of a phase of life and whose boundaries are fixed by peer personalities" (p. 60). This definition includes two elements that are of importance: the length of a generational cohort and its peer personality. Unlike other social philosophers, they based the length of a generational cohort on the length of a phase of life. Accordingly, they determined that each cohort-group is up to 22 years long and possesses a special unified personality that will later distinguish it from other age-brackets.

Strauss and Howe (1991) concluded that there are seven generations currently living in the United States. Two of the generations are in the 90+ age group. The remaining five generations fall between one year and eighty-nine years of age (Table 1). These generations are identified by the year that they were born and by their personalities. First, there is the "GI Generation" born between 1901 and 1924. The next generation is the "Silent Generation," followed by the "Baby Boomers." After the Boomers, comes the "Thirteenth Generation" or "Generation X." The last, or youngest generation, is the "Millennial Generation."

Year Born	
1901-1924	
1925-1943	
1944-1964	
1965-1981	
1982-present	

Table 1. Strauss & Howe's Generations

Members of the GI Generation have been characterized as America's confident and rational problem-solvers. Members of the earlier years of the GI generation, which produced Walt Disney, Arthur Godfrey, and Ronald Reagan, are characterized by "their jaunty optimism," whereas the last half of the generation (e.g., Lee Iacocca, George Bush) is characterized by "a more clean-cut rationalism." World War I had a significant impact on the personalities of this generation and created a generation of enormous economic and political power. Its personality carries a strong government flavor and is willing to put trust in government and authority. As well, the GI Generation came of age preferring clearly defined sex-roles and is considered a generation that is "heavily malefixated" (p. 264).

The next generation is the Silent Generation born between 1925 and 1943. This generation has been described as the "transitional" generation or "middle" generation. The Silent Generation is one of caution, indifference, lack of adventure and imagination, and basically just "silent." The first half of the generation is one born during the depression and, as a result, gives freely to charity, have a tender social conscience and believe in a fair process more than final results. The last half of the generation can remember World War II from their childhood, and many joined the Peace Corps to show their generational bond.

The next generation is the well-recognized Baby Boom Generation. Although most demographers defined the Boomers as being born between 1943 and 1960, Strauss and Howe describe this generation as being born between 1944 and 1964. This generation was born to an era of optimism and growth. The Boomers are characterized by a "quest for self" attitude. This fixation on self resulted in a strong individual conscience rather than duty to community. With this generation, "made-in-the-USA" became passe and consumer loyalty weakened; however, the Boomers continued to desire the best in products and services. In all areas of life, the Baby Boomers have exhibited an attitude of self-absorption, perfectionism and high self-esteem.

After the Baby Boomers comes a generation that has been recognized by many labels: the 13th Generation, the Baby Busters, and Generation X. This generation was born between 1965 and 1981. The 13th Generation, or Generation X, is a generation characterized by divorce, poverty, latchkey syndrome and non-traditional families. This generation is skeptical about its economic future and realizes its members will have to work harder to achieve the same standard of living as their parents. Forced to grow up fast, Generation X exhibits a matter of fact approach to sexuality. In addition, this generation lacks faith in government and believes its members are responsible for their own future.

While a theoretical foundation has been laid out by Strauss and Howe (1991), this study will provide the first look at generations in travel and tourism context. It was also the first study to assess travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests held by Canadians using a cohort analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to assess the effects of a person's generation on specific travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests held by Canadians using a cohort analysis. The study used several approaches to assess the effects of age, period and generation on travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests held by Canadians, including analysis of variance, regression analysis and structural equations modeling. The strengths and limitations were discussed for each.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

- (a) Is there a significant relationship between time period and travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests of Canadians?
- (b) Is there a significant relationship between age and travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests of Canadians?
- (c) Is there a significant relationship between generation and travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests of Canadians?
- (d) Which effect (generation, age or period) explains the greatest variation in travel philosophies, benefits sought and travel interests within Canadians?
- (e) Is there a structural model which best measures the effects of age, period and generation on three constructs: travel philosophy, benefits sought and travel interests?

Delimitations

The study was delimited to the sample of Canadians who participated in either the Canadian Tourism Attitude Motivation Study (1983) or the Domestic Tourism Market Research Study (1995). It was further delimited to residents over the age of 15 residing in Canada who had traveled in the past 12 months. Only the areas of travel philosophies, benefits sought, interests and demographics were addressed.

Definitions

The following terms are defined for the purpose of this study. For many of the terms, a more detailed operational explanation is included in Chapter III.

Generational cohort: individuals grouped together in 22+ year configurations (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Baby Boom Generation: individuals born between 1944 & 1964 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Benefits Sought: reasons for participation; benefits a person seeks from a product or service.

Cohort: people within a geographically or otherwise delineated population who experienced the same significant life event within a given period of time (Glenn, 1977).

Cohort Analysis: typically refers to any study in which there are measures of some characteristic of one or more cohorts at two or more points in time. The term does not apply to cohorts compared at one point in time, in a cross sectional fashion (Glenn, 1977).

Generation: a "special cohort group whose length approximately matches that of a basic phase of life or about 22 years over the last three centuries" (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 34).

Generational profile: "A peer personality is a generational persona recognized and determined by (1) common age location; (2) common beliefs and behavior; and (3) perceived membership in a common generation" (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 64).

G.I. Generation: individuals born between 1904 & 1924 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Life Cycle: The family life cycle (FLC), is the typical process of life through a series of stages, usually within a familial context (Stampfl, 1978).

Pleasure travel: travel for the purpose of pleasure or amusement, not business.

Silent Generation: individuals born between 1925 & 1943 (Strauss & Howe,

1991).

Sociodemographic variables: variables used to describe the population, including: age, income, education, gender and occupation.

Structural Equations Modeling: the method of looking at causal relationships between variables and testing for significance.

Thirteenth Generation: individuals born between 1965 & 1981 (Strauss & Howe, 1991).

Triad Method: emphasizes three levels of analysis in order to compute observable differences infers which effects produced the differences, and imputes causes (Glenn, 1977).
Organization of the Study

The document is organized into five chapters. Following this introductory chapter is a review of the relevant literature. Relative to the research questions, the following topics are discussed: cohort studies in marketing and travel research; demographics as a component of travel research; psychographics and life style as a component of travel research; benefits sought as a component of travel research; change over time as a component of leisure research; Strauss and Howe's theory applied to the Canadian population; and cohort analysis as a method of statistical analysis. The third chapter presents the sources of data, how the data were transformed for this study and the treatment or methods used for the cohort analysis. Chapter IV provides profiles of the study population compared to the Canadian population and possible biases that may exist, the results of three bivariate analyses, the two-way interaction results, the three-way interaction results, the structural equation model results and limitations of the study. Finally, Chapter V contains the conclusions and discussion, and recommendations for further research.

25 W was con rese con pep (G) geo life . 1 ψp 2/1 nat eve "ĝi hou ear

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature on the theory of generations as well as attitudes and motivations of pleasure travel. The survey of related literature was divided into six major areas: 1) cohort studies in research; 2) demographics as a component of travel research; 3) psychographics and life style as a component of travel research; 4) benefits sought as a component of travel research; 5) change over time as a component of leisure research; 6) Strauss and Howe's theory applied to the Canadian population; and 7) cohort analysis as a method of statistical analysis.

Cohort Studies in Research

The term cohort originally referred to a Roman group of warriors or soldiers (Glenn, 1978). Today, however, a cohort is typically defined as "those people within a geographically or otherwise delineated population who experienced the same significant life event within a given period of time" (Glenn, p. 8). Cohort analysis deals with any type of cohort: birth, age, marriage, education, etc. The term generation is used synonymously with birth cohort. According to Glenn (1978), a birth cohort may have natural or arbitrary boundaries. In the former, boundaries are set by specific years and events in time which affect a group of individuals, thereby creating a cohort or "generation." A cohort with arbitrary boundaries consists of individuals "internally homogenous in some important respect and distinctively different from persons born earlier or later" (p. 9).

Cohort analysis typically refers to any study in which there is a measure of some characteristic of one or more cohorts at two or more points in time. The term does not apply to cohorts compared at one point in time, in a cross sectional fashion. However, most cohort studies involve simultaneous cross sectional and period comparisons. This study will apply cohort analysis which "measures some characteristics of one or more cohorts at two or more points in time" (p. 9). For example, travelers born in 1943-1964 will be studied when they were 36 years old and again when they were 50 years old. The study includes "intracohort trends" which examines the change in the cohort from one point in time to another.

Cohort Studies in Marketing

One of the first cohort studies in marketing was performed by Reynolds and Rentz (1981). In the article, "Cohort Analysis: An Aid to Strategic Planning" (1981), Reynolds and Rentz used cohort analysis to aid in strategic planning. The analysis was used for the purpose of understanding certain environmental trends and aiding in forecasting. The article presented the procedure using a nationwide survey conducted in 1969, 1975 and 1979. The researchers suggested that consumption data is often viewed using cross sectional data and that more than one interpretation becomes possible by using a "process viewpoint." Their basic form of a cohort analysis is represented in Table

2.

~1	-	1010			10.00	1000	
Age Class	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	
10-19	10	10	10	10	10	10	
20-29	15	15	15	15	15	15	C12
30-39	20	$\overline{20}$	20	20	20	20	C11
40-49	25	25	25	25	25	25	C10
50-59	30	30	30	30	30	30	C9
60-69	35	35	35	35	35	35	C8
70-79	40	40	40	40	40	40	C7
		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
*	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	

 Table 2. Example of a Cohort Analysis Table

"C" -represents ten-year cohorts measured at ten-year intervals. Cohort C7 is underlined to follow movement through time.

Table 2 is an example of a cohort table. The table is a visual representation of changes over time, within cohorts and among age groups. Variations can be interpreted as either age effects (biological, psychological, and social aging), period effects (environmental changes such as marketing or changes in measurement) or cohort effects (historical differences in socialization, genetic change and cohort composition).

Reynolds and Rentz (1981) suggested an alternative model to the cohort table. They suggested that a constrained regression model is more conceptually appealing. Computing observable differences expands the analysis to include statistical differences. Three possible types of observable differences exist (1) longitudinal differences (age + period effects); (2) cross sectional differences (age + cohort effects) and (3) time lag differences (period - cohort). Reynolds and Rentz (1981) looked at women's agreement with the statement "a woman's place is in the home." Their study computed observable differences using t-tests and found that a combination of period and cohort effects were responsible for differences to responses to this question over a 10-year period.

Rentz, Reynolds and Stout (1983) looked at changing consumption patterns with cohort analysis. They looked at soft drink consumption in the U.S. and found that when the data was examined using an aging interpretation, total soft drink consumption would increase, however, a cohort interpretation would produce opposite results. Data was taken from surveys of the U.S. population conducted in 1950, 1960, 1969 and 1979. Responses were weighted to adjust for differences in demographic distributions between samples and population. Data were examined using a constrained multiple regression model. Cohorts, ages and periods were coded as dummy variables. The model with the best fit (the highest R^2) was the cohort model (although the values were small for all three models). The net impact of age, period and cohort effects shows an upward trend in cola consumption, for each aging cohort due to the positive age effects. There were large differences in cohort effects, which indicated that each succeeding cohort consumed more soft drinks than the previous cohort. Rentz et al. suggested that soft drink consumption is influenced more strongly by consumer's cohort membership than by their age and that only by considering both age and cohort effects in succession can marketers make precise forecasts of product consumption.

Rentz and Reynolds (1991) forecasted the effects of an aging population on coffee consumption. Three measures of consumption were analyzed: (1) total coffee penetration (percentage of the population who consumed any coffee the day before being surveyed); (2) average cups consumed per drinker (among drinkers, average cups consumed the day before being surveyed) and (3) cups consumed per person (total cups divided by total population). Data for the study were taken from surveys of the U.S. population in 1950, 1960, 1970 and 1980. In each survey a stratified random probability design was used with

quotas for age and sex. Virtually identical consumption questions were asked on all surveys. Three of the four surveys were personal interviews, while one was a telephone survey. They found that the model that combined age, period and cohort effects fit the data the best. The regression model was then used to predict coffee consumption. They found that forecasts based on cross sectional patterns of age produced results not only different, but opposite to cohort analysis. The authors suggested that dummy variable regression is an appropriate method for forecasting behaviors, attitudes and opinions.

Perhaps the most comprehensive book to date on the direct application of cohort anlaysis is Smith and Clurman's (1997) "Rocking the Ages, The Yankelovich Report of Generational Marketing." Smith and Clurman (1997) suggested that a generational cohort defines who a person is, what s/he believes, and what s/he buys. The Yankelovich report used 30 years of comprehensive data about consumers- their interests, habits and lifestyles- to outline differences between the generations' values and motivations. The authors suggested that "each generation is driven by unique ideas about the lifestyle to which it aspires" (1997, preface XIV).

Smith and Clurman (1997) grouped people into three generational cohorts-Matures (born 1909-1945), Boomers (born 1946-1964) and Xers (born 1965-present). These categories contrast with Strauss and Howe's (1991) classification system in that they are broader and encompass more than one cohort group in both the Mature and Xer generation. Based on Strauss and Howe's theory of generational cycles, it would appear that the combination of two or more cohort groups could alter "generational personality" which is based on "shared life experiences in their formative years." Much of the information on values and motivations could possibly be broken out into more

comprehensive age groups in order to provide more precise target marketing. However, the Monitor represents the first publication devoted to documenting comprehensive differences in interests, attitudes and values that affect purchasing behavior.

Smith and Clurman indicated that Matures are more adventuresome than previous fifty-plus generations. Boomers like experimentation and Xers like risk. However, they suggest that marketers need to consider physical and psychological safety for Matures, predictability for Boomers and a safety net for Xers (they like the risk but they don't want the fall to "kill" them). Research indicates that Boomers want to expand their cultural experiences and "nostalgia travel is a big market" they think fondly of memories of their youth. In contrast, Xers "make up another part of the growth market in mini-vacations," because they can't afford to take a weeklong or two-week vacation. The authors suggested that there is a greater quest for balance between work and leisure and that "work will undergo the biggest metamorphosis" (p. 234). They suggested that just as work shaped leisure in the eighties, leisure will shape work in the future.

The only Canadian study to date which looked at generations is called, "Boom, Bust & Echo" (Foot & Stoffman, 1996). The authors looked at Canadian demographics and indicated how Canada's demographics are unique. Foot and Stoffman (1996) suggested that different behaviors among unique demographic groups are useful information for forecasting. One major difference between Foot and Stoffman's theory and Strauss and Howe's (1991) theory is that they believe changes in social and economic behavior result from the aging process and fluctuations in birth rate as opposed to changes in attitudes and behaviors which are homogeneous in each generation. They

suggested that the size of the generation drives consumption and that participation rates are stable over time rather than dynamic.

According to Foot and Stoffman, there are eight cohorts that exist presently in Canada. These generations fall between one and 100+ years in age. They are identified by the year they were born and epochal events during their formative years. The first one is called "Pre-World War I," born in 1914 and earlier. The next generation is the "World War I" generation, followed by "The Roaring Twenties," "The Depression Babies," "World War II," and the infamous "Baby Boom" generation. After the Baby Boom comes GenX, followed by "The Baby Bust," "The Baby-Boom Echo" and the "Future Generation." The generations outlined by Foot and Stoffman are shorter in year span than those outlined by Strauss and Howe (Table 3). Also, Foot and Stoffman, indicated that in Canada, GenXers are those born between 1960-1966. This is different from Strauss and Howe's definition which suggests that Generation Xers or the 13th Generation (as they call it) are those born between 1961 and 1981.

Cohort Studies in Travel Research

The theory proposed by Strauss and Howe has been researched in relation to the impacts of an aging population on domestic travel patterns. Warnick (1993) analyzed whether generational characteristics and personalities impact U.S. domestic travel. He used a database available through the Simmons Market Research Bureau to obtain a national stratified random probability sample for each year from 1979 through 1991. Warnick found that the Baby Boom Generation's participation rate in domestic travel declined at the same or a lower rate than the overall population change.

Smith & Clurman	Foot & Stoffman
Matures	Pre-World War I
1909-1945	1914 and earlier
	World War I
	1915-1919
	The Roaring Twenties
	1922-1929
	The Depression Babies
	1930-1939
	World War II
	1940-1946
Boomer	The Baby Boom
1946-1964	1947-1966
Trailing Boomer	GenX
1960-1964	1960-1966
Xer	The Baby Bust
1965-present	1967-1979
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The Baby Boom Echo
	1980-1994
	Millenium Kids
	1995-2010
	Smith & Clurman Matures 1909-1945 Boomer 1946-1964 Trailing Boomer 1960-1964 Xer 1965-present

Table 3. Comparison of Three Theories on Generations

The Silent Generation (those 35 to 44 in 1979 and then age 45 to 54 in 1989) experienced a rise in participation rates in domestic travel. The rise in domestic travel makes them a prime market for domestic travel. Each of the other generational segments showed greater decline rates than the overall population. Warnick divided travelers into light, moderate and heavy or frequent travelers. Results indicated that the U.S. domestic travel market is experiencing growing participation rates among heavy travelers over the age of 35. Also, in all market volume segments for those age 65 and older there has been a decline in participation among travelers. Overall, domestic travel is experiencing a generational decline for Baby Boomers and a portion of the Silent Generation, but a generational growth for the 13th Generation. He suggested that understanding generational personalities will be helpful in future travel trend prediction.

Opperman (1995) looked at travel patterns of German residents. He used longitudinal systematics to examine cohort effects. This type of research was used to research lifelong travel patterns of respondents. Questionnaires were sent to a convenience sample of 1,000 households in Germany. Respondents were asked to name, for each year in their life, the purpose, length and travel party size for all trips which lasted for more than three nights. Respondents could use diaries, travel logs or photo albums for reference. A total of 1,975 trips were used for the analysis. Due to the small sample size, only three cohort groups could be defined for analysis. These grouping were based on age cohorts, the age groups were 18-33 years, 34-48 years and anyone over 49 years. Opperman found that trips to Central Europe were decreasing from older to younger generations and that destination region preferences were dependent on cohort membership. Moreover, it was found that transportation usage differed by cohort groups. Cohorts aged 34-48 and over 49 years appeared to have an increasing amount of air travel compared to the youngest cohort group. Opperman did explain differences in transportation by increasing discretionary income and the introduction of mass air transportation. The overall concept of "period effects" was omitted from his analysis. These effects help to explain variations in travel behavior in addition to age and cohort effects. Opperman's results indicated that greater use of cohort analysis is needed to examine changes in travel behavior. Longitudinal studies are needed to examine differences in travel behavior and complement data gained from cross sectional inquires.

In the "Pop Culture" literature (literature published to attract a general audience), a variety of theories of generations are presented. Interestingly, consistency among the theories is not strong. The only consensus appears to be that monitoring generational

affects is a good tool for predicting the future. Lacking from the literature is an analysis of the changing interests, philosophies and benefits sought of cohort groups in the area of travel and tourism. Strauss and Howe (1991) suggested that generational profiles affect philosophies and interests, thus it is the researchers contention that an individual's generation should have an affect on philosophies, benefits sought and interests for pleasure travel.

Demographics as a Component of Travel Research

The following section of the literature, guided by the lifestyle model propopsed by Knutson (1982); (see Figure 1, Ch.1), highlights demographics as a predictor of travel behavior. In fact, such explanatory variables as age, income, ethnicity and family life cycle have been suggested as good predictors of travel behavior. Several studies have investigated various age groups and their travel patterns (c.f., Anderson & Langmeyer, 1982; Blazey, 1987; Tongren, 1980; Rosenfeld, 1986; Vincent & de los Santos, 1990). The demographic areas that are most pivotal to the concept of generations, however, are lifecycle and age. Therefore, age and life cycle are the only areas that will be covered in the literature review.

Life Cycle as a Variable in Travel Research

The literature has suggested that life cycle is a good segmentation technique for travel (Cosenaz & Davis, 1981; Lawson, 1991). However, the examination of travel behavior with respect to life cycle has not been extensively explored. All the research studying the relationship between Family Life Cycle (FLC) and tourism is based on previous models developed by researchers of FLC and consumer behavior.

Stage	Lansing and Morgan (1955)	Wells and Gubar (1966)	Staples and Murphy (1979)	Lawson (1991)
1	Bachelor- young, single not at home	Bachelor- young, single not living at home	Young Single- young, single	Not classifiable
2	Newly Married- no children	Newly Married Couples- no children	Young, Married Without Children- no children	Young singles under 25
3	Full Nest I- youngest child under 6	Full Nest I- youngest child under 6	Other Young- young divorced with(out) children, young married with children	Full Nest I- preschool children
4	Full Nest II- youngest child 6 and over	Full Nest II- youngest child 6 and over	Middle Aged- married with(out) children divorced with(out) children married with (out) dependent	Full Nest II- school aged children
5	Full Nest III- older couple with dependent children	Full Nest III- older couples with dependent children	Older- married unmarried (divorced or widow)	Full Nest III- older children, possible non dependent
6	Empty Nest- no children living at home	Empty Nest I- no children living at home, head in labor force	All Other	Empty Nest I- still working, no children
7	Solitary Survivor- only one spouse living	Empty Nest II- head retired		Empty Nest II- retired
8	-	Solitary Survivor- in labor force		Solitary Survivor- retired
9		Solitary Survivor- retired		

.

I ADIC 7. MICH MALIVE VIEWS OF THE LITE CYCLE MICHC	Table 4.	Alternative	Views	of the	Life	Cycle	Mode
--	----------	-------------	-------	--------	------	-------	------

The more frequently cited research efforts (Table 4) are those of Lansing and Morgan (1955), Wells and Gubar (1966), Staples and Murphy (1979) and Lawson (1991).

Cosensaz and Davis (1981) examined the influence of life cycle on vacation decision-making. A random sample of 252 families in the Dayton area was drawn to examine the decision making process over the life cycle. The study based on length of marriage, average age of head of the house, and composition of the family. The study focused on a new methodology for measuring dyadic dominance in the purchase decision.

The authors found that in stage one of the life cycle (characterized by married less than 14 years, average age about 34 years, children under 14 years), the decision-making was syncratic (both partners made decisions together). In stage two (characterized by married more than 14 years but less than 20 years, with children under 18 years and the average age less than 44 years) the husband was the dominant decision-maker. Stage three, (characterized by marriage for 20 to 30 years, children beginning to leave home, average age approximately 54 years) was the stage where vacation purchases are at a peak. This stage is predominantly wife-dominant. Stage four (characterized by marriage more than 30 years, children have left home, and retirement) is largely wife dominant, but moving back toward syncratic decision-making. Stage five shifts back to generally syncratic, but is close to husband-dominant. This stage is characterized by couples married more than 30 years with children still present and the dyad's age being less than retirement (65 years of age). The last stage, the sixth stage is characterized by couples married more than 40 years and retired without children at home. This stage is relatively

wife-dominant. The results signify the importance of recognizing the impact life stage has on decision-making behavior.

Lawson (1991) studied patterns of tourist expenditures and types of vacation across the family life cycle. His study addressed three separate areas: distribution of tourists according to life cycle stage; expenditure on different elements of the vacation; and differences across the life cycle in the type of holiday, activities pursued, amount of travelling done, type of accommodation used and length of stay. The life cycle model used was based largely on Wells and Gubar's (1966) model. There were three alterations to the model: (1) the break between Full Nest I and Full Nest II was at age five for the youngest child (2) possible non-dependent children were included in the Full Nest III stage and (3) no allowance was made for solitary survivors still within the labor force (see Table 4). The study classified expenditure data in nine different categories: accommodations, meals, travel, arranged tours, entertainment, miscellaneous items, total expenditures on vacation, total spent in destination, and other costs before arrival. The average holiday expenditures were the greatest in the fifth life cycle stage (Full Nest III, older children, possibly independent) for all categories except entertainment, where the third life cycle stage (Full Nest I, preschool children) spent the most money. Also, total expenditures was greatest for the Full Nest III life cycle stage, with the seventh stage significantly behind. Life cycle theory (Wagner & Hanna, 1983) suggests discretionary expenditures are high in stages one and two and fall at stage three before rising again in stages five and six and then falling again. Theoretically, stages seven and eight would see a decline in spending due to the financial constraints of retirement. Lawson's (1991) results supported this theory.

Lawson (1991) presented a synopsis of the characteristics of each stage of the life cycle. First, he found that young singles are highly active, but like to travel cheaply. Visiting friends and relatives, being restricted to domestic travel, rafting, jet boating, entertainment, and sporting events characterize their trips. Second, young couples reflect the honeymoon market. Their trips are highly pre-arranged, tour-oriented; include visit national parks; boating, sports, spas, and rafting. Third, the Full Nest I Stage is characterized by visiting friends and relatives. Travel is limited due to the presence of small children. Fourth, the Full Nest II Stage is mostly involved in visiting friends and relatives and spas and sports. Fifth, the Full Nest III Stage is characterized by travel through tour operators, use of rental cars and activities such as jet boating. Sixth, the Empty Nest I is distinguished by travel through tour operators, use of rental cars, taxis, and exploration of museums, demonstrating optimal purchasing power. Seventh, the Empty Nest II Stage is identified by individuals who visit national parks, museums, prefer traditional foods and enjoy cultural concerts. Eighth, Solitary Survivors' trips are characterized by travelling to see friends and relatives, fishing and enjoyment of cultural concerts. Lawson (1991) concluded that life cycle is an effective segmentation tool for marketers.

According to Zuzanek and Smale (1992), life cycle theory is suited to the study of behavioral differences of specified population groups because of its functional approach. They stated that life cycle, used as an independent variable, explains greater variance in consumer behavior and leisure behavior than single item variables. This is because life cycle theory combines biological characteristics with social role (marital status, income level, social class, presence of children) and psychological orientation.

Age as a Variable in Travel Research

The travel literature has suggested that age is a good segmentation technique (Anderson & Langmeyer, 1982; Tongren, 1980). Several studies have examined younger travelers versus older travelers (Blazey, 1987; Shoemaker, 1990). As well, many travelrelated studies have looked at the theory of aging and its relationship to patterns of behavior (Atchley, 1993; Javalgi, Thomas & Rao; 1992). This section examines age as a variable for segmentation in the travel literature.

First, in 1980 Tongren studied the travel plans of the over 65 market pre- and post- retirement. He found that (a) 52% of the respondents were planning to take 3-4 trips per year when they reached retirement, (b) the older group engaged in a distinct preretirement planning phase and a detailed post retirement search and implementation and (c) over 50% of those over 65 still take a minimum of one to two trips per year.

Anderson and Langmeyer (1982) profiled travelers over and under the age of 50. They sampled 826 households in the Dayton Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. The sample was stratified to represent populations proportionately according to their demographic profiles in four counties. A response rate of 40% for the over-50 travelers and 60% for younger travelers was achieved. The study examined family status, income, education, occupation and health. Results indicated that the over-50 group preferred simpler, pre-planned pleasure trips for the purpose of rest and relaxation or visiting friends and relatives and were relatively inexpensive. While those under-50 traveled for rest and relaxation, but were more likely to participate in outdoor recreation or visit amusement facilities. Anderson and Langmeyer suggested that family obligations (time and financial) of the older segment are fewer yet their income appears to be somewhat comparable to younger travelers.

The study also suggested that younger travelers tended to be more active while on vacation and use vacation to escape from everyday routine. The authors suggested marketers should pay more attention to the over 50 market because they are a lucrative market.

Blazey (1987) examined the differences between participants and nonparticipants in a senior travel program. He examined travel interests, constraints and demographic characteristics of those over 55 years of age. The study population included a random sample of 680 individuals who subscribed to a local newspaper that targeted seniors. A mail-in questionnaire was sent out and 321 usable surveys were returned, yielding a 47.2% response rate. A screening question separated participants from nonparticipants and a separate set of questions were asked of each group. Blazey suggested that participants in a senior travel program are over-represented by females. Further, he found that males to be significantly more constrained by: lack of time, interruption of routine, and other responsibilities, than females. Females were more likely to indicate they were constrained by lack of a travel companion and safety. Interestingly, the nonparticipant group reported higher incomes, was more likely to be pre-retirement age, and reported poorer health conditions as a constraint to travel. Blazey suggested that health considerations should be included in further research on constraints to travel.

Shoemaker (1989) studied members of the senior travel market and found that the senior market could be segmented into several submarkets based on their reasons (motivations) for pleasure travel. The study population consisted of residents' age 55 and older from the state of Pennsylvania. The sampling frame consisted of 5,000 randomly selected residents. However, six counties in Pennsylvania were eliminated. The response

rate was 33%, yielding 407 usable questionnaires. Shoemaker used cluster analysis to place respondents into groups. This procedure led Shoemaker to conclude that there were three clusters: Family Travelers, Active Resters, and Older Set. These clusters were distinctly different from each other on four variables: "to spend time with family," "to seek intellectual enrichment," "to seek spiritual enrichment," and "to meet people and socialize." Shoemaker concluded that the senior market can be segmented into smaller homogeneous groups based on their motivations for travel.

Vincent and de los Santos (1990) focused on the senior winter traveler to Texas. They examined winter Texans staying in mobile homes. A total of 1,757 questionnaires were administered 70% of which were usable. The authors found that 70% of all winter travelers to Texas staying longer than one month seek many incidental activities, plan their travel and are from the midwestern states. The results also indicated that climate and friendliness of the people were the two most important attractions when choosing a winter vacation place.

Javalgi, Thomas and Rao (1992) studied senior and nonsenior groups in the U.S. pleasure travel marketplace. They presented demographic information on both markets and determined which types of pleasure trips they took and the differences in travel related characteristics (mode of transportation, type of accommodations, etc.) The study used data collected in a research project sponsored by Tourism Canada in 1985. The results indicated that nonseniors are currently a better-educated group and more likely to engaged in detailed information search process before making a purchase decision. Seniors, on the otherhand, were more likely to buy trip packages and travel by bus or airplane and use travel agents for making travel arrangements. The most common type of

trip for both groups was one taken for the purpose of visiting friends and relatives. Nonseniors tend to take a close to home pleasure trip, a city trip, an outdoor vacation, a resort vacation and a trip to a theme park or special event; whereas, seniors were more likely to take a cruise or touring vacation. It is important for marketers to understand these differences and aim effective marketing programs at both segments.

Zimmer, Brayley and Searle (1995) examined the differences between older adults who travel and those who do not travel and the differences in their destination choices. The data for the study were collected as part of the Canadian Aging Research Network and the sample included 1,406 adults, 65 years of age and older, living in Manitoba, Canada. No residents of long-term care institutions were included in the study. Nontravelers were identified as those who had not taken a trip for the purpose of pleasure within the last two years. A discriminant function analysis was performed to determine how well a series of predictor variables were able to classify senior into those who were travelers and those who were not travelers. The predictor which bestdistinguished travelers from nontravelers was age (r = -.68). That is, as age increased the tendency to travel decreased. The two other best predictors were education and number of mobility problems. Years of education was the best distinguishing factor (r=0.48). Factors such as income, education, rural residency, willingness to spend money on recreation, and health status influenced the choice of destination. One interesting finding was that place of residence, be it rural or urban, does not influence the choice of travel. However, it does influence the chosen destination. This study showed that patterns of leisure decision making tend to be consistent over the life span.

In Goeldner's "1996 Travel Outlook" (1996), Peter Mason of Better Homes and Gardens discussed the family leisure travel outlook. His report detailed family vacation travel patterns prepared for Better Homes and Gardens by the U.S. Travel Data Center. Generation X travelers (18 to 30 years) were found to spend the least on their family vacation (\$949), while Mature travelers (50 to 64 years) spent the most (\$1,148). Baby Boomers (31 to 49 year olds) averaged \$1074 on their trips and the oldest age group, "Older Matures" spent an average of \$1038.

This section of the literature review has focused on literature relating to two main demographics: life cycle and age and their relationship to travel behavior. The theory of life cycle and aging are particularly interesting for understanding how behaviors change as a result of movement through the aging process and different stages in life. However, the literature suggests several constraints might occur through using only demographics as an explanation for travel behavior. For example, changing lifestyles have affected the life cycle and no longer do people progress through the stages in a consecutive or progressive method. In addition, people do not behave the way traditional aging theories suggest. For example, leisure/travel behavior does not necessarily decrease with age. Thus, it is important to look at other ways of predicting travel behavior, specifically, analyzing the relationship between a person's generation and travel behavior. This approach may provide more insight into travel behavior than simply studying demographics.

Psychographics and Life Style as a Component of Travel

Much of the life style and psychographic theory is based on the premise that personality characteristics remain stable over time which leads to general patterns of consistent behavior (Epstein & Teraspulsky, 1986; Swenson, 1990). For example, one of the foundations for Plog's allocentric/psychocentric model (one of the classifications of travelers by personality types) is that although individuals change over time, their personalities are enduring (Griffith & Albanese, 1996). Much of the literature which examines psychographics and life style suggests that "although travel destination choices will vary over time, the general types of destination decisions will remain relatively stable" (Griffith & Albanese, 1996, p. 3). The following section of the literature review, guided by the lifestyle model (Figure 1. Ch. 1) examines psychographics and lifestyle in the travel literature.

Stanley Plog (1972) designed one of the most frequently cited models of traveler profiles. He used behavioral characteristics to group people into "types" of travelers. He found that the U.S. population fell along a continuum which he divided into five segments: allocentric, near-allocentric, mid-centric, near psychocentric and psychocentric. Psychocentrics are defined as those who tend to visit well developed tourist locations and prefer to travel with tour groups, while allocentrics are those who prefer independent vacation experiences at destinations that have not yet developed a mass tourism market. Further, he developed a predictive model using regression statistics to determine which behaviors can be determined by each psychographic personality characteristic and to what degree they are predictable. The estimates suggested that 4% of the population are allocentric and 21% are psychocentric (Plog, 1985).

Cohen (1972) was one of the first to identify tourists on a continuum based on attitudes and interests towards the destination. Cohen's tourist role typology was based on the degree to which tourists seek novelty or familiarity in their travel. Four proposed tourist roles were defined as follows: the organized mass tourist, the individual mass tourist, the explorer, and the drifter.

Mayo (1975) studied vacationers to National Parks and segmented them based on their psychographic profiles. He sampled auto-vacationers at 24 sites across the U.S.. The sample population consisted of 670 auto-vacationers. Respondents were asked to react to 85 psychographic statements that dealt with a variety of issues in their life and vacation. Mayo used multiple regression to determine differences in the way individuals rated the attractiveness of National Parks. Parks as a vacation destination were rated more important among better-educated, higher income tourists. The tourist's attitudes, interests and opinions were correlated with the attractiveness ratings of the National Parks. Eighteen of eighty-five were statistically significant. Seven life-style traits were the most significantly correlated with the attractiveness ratings. These traits were: "The Adventurer," "The Planner," "The Impulsive Decision-Maker," "The Action-Oriented Person," "The Outdoorsman," "The Escapist," and "The Self-Designated Opinion Leader." More specifically, the results showed that the tourist who is attracted to National Parks enjoys adventure and the unknown, does not plan the vacation in detail, is an impulsive decision maker, action oriented, outdoors-like, likes to escape crowds and people and feels he/she has persuasive power over other individuals.

Hawes (1977) stated that "Psychographics are meaningful... not merely interesting" (p.1). To validate this statement, he used 10 travel related activity, interest

and opir -demog market s attractiv educatio when it take a s vacatio categor of corre compos explain family friends Travel female be use (cluster Variabl produc pre-tes Lakes

and opinion (AIOs) statements as a measure of psychographics. His thought was that "demographics alone do not, in many cases, provide adequate discrimination between market segments" (p. 3). Using data obtained from Market Facts, Inc., he found that (a) attractiveness of a cabin on a quiet lake as a place to summer travel declined with age. education and income. (b) females of higher education tended to be more spontaneous when it came to vacation activities and (c) cities were considered an unattractive place to take a summer vacation. A surprisingly large percentage of the population felt that vacations should be planned for children. This was consistent across all life stage categories. Hawes also looked at how well the 10 AIO statements interrelated. The use of correlation analysis was employed to test the interrelatedness, followed by principal components factor analysis. Four factors emerged with eigenvalues over 1.0 and explaining 52% of the variance. The data showed that benefits such as strengthening family ties, recuperation from work, culturally enriching experiences, and strengthening friendships were the most important variables associated with pleasure travel. Also, the "travel now and play later" attitude was not thought of strongly by either males or females, but particularly not by married, females aged 35-44 years.

Perreault, Darden and Darden (1977) suggested that psychographic scales could be used to examine vacation life styles. Their study used AIO statements that were clustered to show that vacation life styles differ according to sociologically relevant variables. The purpose of the paper was to report " a psychographic study designed to produce a realistic portrait of vacation types" (p. 208). The data were collected with a pre-tested mail questionnaire sent to 2,000 households in the Southeastern and Great Lakes regions of the United States. The response rate was 33%, which provided 670 usable surveys. Measures of activities, interests and opinions provided the basis for the study. Twenty-eight vacation-specific variables were used (Table 5). Households with similar AIOs were grouped together.

Cluster analysis procedures produced five distinct groups of types of vacationers. The groups were named: "The Budget Traveler," "The Adventurer," "The Homebodies," "The Vacationers," "The Moderates." The largest cluster, the "Budget Traveler," represented 28% of the total sample. Socioeconomic variables indicated that "Homebodies" on average were the oldest; "Adventurers" had the greatest years of formal education; "Vacationers" had the lowest paying jobs; and "Moderates" had average scores across all the socioeconomic variables. The authors concluded that socioeconomic characteristics and general behavioral characteristics were consistent with the groups' specific attitudes and interest in vacation activities.

Schewe and Calantone (1978) profiled tourists to Massachusetts using psychographic segmentation. In conjunction with the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and Development, auto travelers were randomly sampled during the 1974-1975 year. Individuals driving cars with non-Massachusetts license plates were approached on the turnpike and given postage paid envelopes containing questionnaires. A cash incentive was used to increase the response rate. A total of 1,498 useable surveys were sent back. The questionnaire included 101 lifestyle statements, which were measured on a six point likert type scale. The study indicated that the typical tourist was family and socially oriented, satisfied and optimistic. Profiles were consistent over seasons and over the year.

Scale Name	Sample Statement
Vacation Travel Interest	I enjoy looking at vacation or travel magazines
Generalized Self Confidence	I like to be considered a leader
Opinion Leadership	My friends often ask my advise about vacation travel
Plan Ahead Travel	I would never leave on a vacation without
	reservations at my destination
Undecided Vacationer	I often have difficulty in deciding where to visit on a
	vacation
Information Seeker	I often ask the advise of my friends regarding
	vacation spots to visit
Impersonal Information Seeker	I often contact a travel agency for information about
I im The Mantenance	
Leisure l'ime venturesome	I enjoy vacation travel to new places
Money Oriented Vacationer	Given a windfall of money, I prefer to spend it on
Due diamonition to Transl	vacation travel than something else.
Composition to Travel	My formily onious comming
Camping Impost	Compine sites are beginning to overerouved some of
Camping impact	the nonular vacation areas
Palaying Traveler	If L can't completely relay. I don't feel that I've had a
Relaxing Haveler	receiption
Weekend Traveler	Vacation. I prefer to take several short vacations rather than a
	few longer ones
Cosmonolitan Traveler	I would not vacation in an area where first class
	accommodations were not available.
First Class Traveler	I spare no expense in making vacation travel
	arrangements
One Up-Manship Traveler	Having my friends over to see my vacation slides is
	the best part of my vacation.
Educational Traveler	Educational vacations are the most fun and the most
	rewarding
Sports Participation	My vacation is normally planned so that I can
	participate in my favorite sport
Jet Setter or Vagabond Traveler	On vacation, I would not hesitate to hop on a plane
	and travel to a more fun location
Economic Traveler	On vacation, I often eat in more economical
	restaurants
Historical Vacation	Visiting historical locations is an important
	consideration in planning my vacation
Town Vacationer	The atmosphere of guided tours is too stifling
Sportsman-Spectator	I normally plan my vacation around watching my
	favorite sporting event
Functional Gregariousness	The most important part of any vacation is meeting
	new people
Familial Traveler	Families that vacation together are happier
Vacation Gregariousness	When I have a choice, I would rather travel to a new
	place and meet new people

Table 5. Perreault, Darden and Darden (1977) AIO Statements

P way tour Calanton recomme 4 this by e identific Commu statemen consiste demogr were air demogr asked to demogr tour tra designe profiles more co 20). A shouid

market

Psychographics were used to provide a way of viewing the tourist and reveal the way tourists felt about a variety of subjects. Similar to Hawes (1977), Schewe and Calantone suggested that "psychographics cannot do the job alone" (p. 20). They recommended the use of demographics to profile groups.

Abbey (1979) asked the question "Does life-style profiling work?" He answered this by examining 12 vacation life-style dimensions and 8 demographic variables. The identification of the life-style dimensions was based on Bauer's Transactional Communication Theory. Respondents indicated on a seven point scale which of the statements they strongly agreed with or strongly disagreed with. The final questionnaire consisted of two parts: 48 statements which measured the life-style dimensions and 8 demographic questions. A total of 800 tour travelers were surveyed in Las Vegas. Half were air travelers and half were motorcoach travelers. Eight profiles were drawn using a demographic and life-style dimensions. Based on the profiles, two tour operators were asked to design four tour packages; two budget and two first class. Tour 1 was based on demographic data and Tour 2 was based on life-style data. The results suggested that tour travelers prefer tours designed with vacation life-style information rather than designed with demographic data. The preferences were maintained across all eight profiles. Abbey suggested that "life-style allows the designer to create a package that is more compatible with the motivations, attitudes, and opinions of the tour travelers" (p. 20). Again, similar to the studies introduced earlier, results indicated that life-style data should not replace demographic data but rather work in conjunction with it.

Bryant and Morrison (1980) studied visitors to Michigan by segmenting the target market group in Michigan by vacation activity preferences using activity and recreational

interest s their den actions a effective S socioder vacation limited r predict t Kingdor were use past 12 r The state 1978). eigenval perform characte specific found to explain 1 ł Park inn variety c interest scales. They developed six vacation activity preference types and determined their demographic profiles using cross tabulations. The results indicated that marketing actions and promotional activities could be focused at each of the groups to increase effectiveness of the promotion and management priorities.

Schul and Crompton (1983) used travel specific psychographic and sociodemographic variables to predict and explain search behavior of international vacationers. The objectives of their study were to determine the relative ability of a limited number of travel psychographics statements and sociodemographic variables to predict travel search behavior. The data were obtained from 560 residents of the United Kingdom who completed questionnaires concerning travel. Of the returned surveys, 544 were useable. Qualified respondents were over 25 years and had traveled by air in the past 12 months. Sixteen psychographic statements were included in the questionnaire. The statements were derived from a previous study done in the UK (Hay Associates, 1978). Factor analysis was performed on the 16 statements, resulting in 6 factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Then a two step multiple regression analysis was performed to predict search behavior using the psychographics and sociodemographic characteristics. The results suggested that search behavior is better explained by travel specific psychographics than by demographics. Travel specific psychographics were found to correlate with length of time of the search. However, psychographics did not explain the tendency to use multiple sources prior to the trip.

Adding to the literature on psychographics, Gladwell (1990) studied Indiana State Park inn users and found identifiable groups of users with significant differences on a variety of characteristics. She surveyed 1,200 users of Indiana State Park Inns in 1983.

No fol
-Know
cluster
vacatio
and sh
on the
differe
allocer
"Activ
wester
partici
(1987)
relatin
energy
Alloce
was m
includ
the use
interna
measu
test the
suppor

No follow-up mailings took place. Three groups of users were identified:

"Knowledgeable Travelers," "Budget Conscious Travelers, " and 'Travel Planners" using cluster analysis on 26 AIO variables. The three groups had differences in relation to vacation travel behavior measures. "Budget Conscious Travelers" took fewer vacations and shorter trips than the other two groups and "Travel Planners" tended to travel further on their vacation than the others. This study indicated that lifestyle measures could differentiate travelers into types of travelers.

Nickerson and Ellis (1991) examined the extent to which Plog's model of allocentrism/psychocentrism and energy traveler types could be explained by the "Activation Theory." LISREL was used to analyze 171 randomly selected alumni of a western state university. All subjects were selected by telephone in order to solicit participation in the mail in questionnaire. The study examined the two theories. Plog's (1987) theory on psychocentrism and allocentrism and Fiske and Maddi's (1961) theory relating energy and allocentrism/psychocentrism. In activation theory, activation or energy is assumed to be correlated with variety, internality, and passivity.

Allocentrism/psychocentrism were measured using Plog's five-item scale (1972). Energy was measured using Thayer's (1967) activation-deactivation checklist. Activation theory included three other variables which were measured as follows: (1) variety- measured by the use of the arousal seeking tendency scale (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974); (2) internality- measured using Eysenck's Personality Inventory (1968); and (3) passivity-measured through Lumpkin's brief locus of control scale (1985). LISREL was used to test the fit of the data to the model. All path coefficients were significant. Thus, results supported the use of the activation theory for explaining Plog's model. The model also

angges
orihog
locus (
extrav
preferi
lookin
and de
mainta
was ba
consu
behavi
attribu
profile
charac
(age) t
indicat
signifi
attribu
and co-
iouriste
as "the

suggested that Plog's model of allocentrism/pychocentrism and energy are not orthogonal. The study concluded that four travel personalities exist: introvert-external locus of control, extravert-external locus of control, introvert-internal locus of control and extravert-internal locus of control. Each personality type varied in terms of destination preferences, travel companions, interaction with local cultures, and degree of activity.

Weaver, McCleary, Lepisto and Damonte (1994) expanded the literature by looking at the relationship of destination selection attributes to psychological, behavioral and demographic variables. A survey conducted for the Adult Longitudinal Panel (ALP), maintained by the center for Adult Longitudinal Studies at Central Michigan University was based on a life span model and involved data on psychology, demographics and consumer behavior. The purpose was to examine whether psychographic, consumer behavior and demographics can successfully predict groups of individuals clustered by attributes sought. Weaver et al. found four cluster solutions that represented different profiles in terms of destination attributes sought. The study revealed two behavioral characteristics ("seek the new" and "fashion conscious") and one demographic variable (age) that explained statistically significant differences among groups. The study indicated that no psychological variables or psychographic characteristics showed significant differences among the groups. This study added to the literature by examining attributes sought in a destination and their relationship to demographic, psychographic and consumer behavior variables.

Waryszak and Kim (1994) utilized psychographic segmentation of Korean tourists visiting Australia to predict their travel behavior. They defined psychographics as "the study of personality, life styles and attitudes of individuals and groups, especially

in quant characté (p.66). & Bern of 84 K determi "Opinic "Know higher j Leader organiz Leader desirab food in dimens than ot Plog's trave] Rokea termin measu measu
in quantitative terms, based on the belief that such readily measurable, descriptive characteristics serve as better predictors of behavior than demographic characteristics" (p.66). They used previous works by Johnston et al. (1986). Van Minder (1987). Evans & Berman (1988), and Michman (1991) to shape their definition. The sample consisted of 84 Koreans who had just returned from their vacation to Australia. A factor analysis determined the underlying motivations of Korean tourists. Five factors were identified: "Opinion Leaders," "Pleasure Seekers," "Experience Chasers," "Adventurers," and "Knowledge Seekers." Cross tabulations on demographics for each group indicated a higher percentage of males in "Experience Chasers," "Pleasure Seekers" and "Opinion Leaders." Older males with slightly higher average incomes, many of whom traveled in organized groups dominated the "Experience Chasers" group; whereas, "Opinion Leaders" were dominated by younger, less affulent males. The only differences among desirable attributes were among "Opinion Leaders" and "Adventurers" with regards to food in Australia. The article indicates that "demographic data is still a more reliable dimension in measurement when a comparative demographic profile can be compiled than other approaches" (p.8).

Madrigal (1995) examined the relationship between List of Values (LOV) and Plog's traveler personality type scale. His study addressed the ability of each to predict travel style. A convenience sample of 514 visitors to Arizona were asked to respond to Rokeach's Value Survey (1973), which consisted of 18 instrumental values and 18 terminal values. The LOV scale used in the study consisted of nine personal values measured on a five-point scale. Plog's allocentric/psychocentric model was used to measure personality type. Discriminant anlaysis was used to determine whether the nine personal values could differentiate group travelers from independent travelers. Of the nine values in the LOV scale, four values differentiated between the groups: being well respected, warm relationships with others, self-fulfillment and accomplishment. A significant predictor of group travelers was being well respected, whereas excitement and self-respect were predictors of independent travelers. The study indicated that personal values were a better predictor of independent vs. group travel than Plog's allocentrism/psychocentrism scale. Values of self fulfillment and accomplishment were significantly related to allocentrism, whereas, security was significantly related to psychocentrism. The results also suggested that Plog's personality types can be conceptualized more broadly into locus of control and that internal and external motivators are consistent with Plog's description of allocentrics and psychocentrics.

Griffith and Albanese (1996) examined the correlation between Plog's instrument, underlying theoretical constructs and actual travel behavior. A sample of 145 undergraduates at a large midwestern university was given a questionnaire that examined Plog's 28 personality characteristics as well as a modified Nickerson scale. Nickerson's scale used two single-items to measure allocentrism and psychocentrism. Two types of vacations were described: one which used adjectives such as novel, different, nontouristy and the other which used adjectives such as national hotel chain, tourist shops and group tour. The dependent variable in this study was travel behavior. The respondents were asked to explain their travel behavior on their last trip. Correlations between travel behavior and responses to Plog's instrument were executed. Significant correlations between Nickerson's scale, Plog's 28 personality characteristics and actual travel behavior appeared, suggesting that there is support for Plog's model of travel behavior.

Thus, Plog's segmentation Silve the southeast to determine characteristic commerciall states. A mo response rat socioeconor Dunlap and measure of horizon, inf analysis on education h informatior sought. Fo activity of and whose analysis wa emerged. T was perfor characteris Thus, Plog's theoretical model is said to "provide a firm foundation for psychographic segmentation in the field of travel research" (p. 8).

Silverberg, Backman and Backman (1996) investigated nature-based travelers to the southeastern United States using psychographic segmentation. Their study attempted to determine if different segments in terms of environmental attitudes, demographic characteristics and travel behavior. A sample was randomly selected from a commercially purchased mailing list. A total of 1,200 individuals were contacted in three states. A modified Dillman total design method was used to collect the data and yielded a response rate of 36%. The questionnaire had five sections: trip purpose, trip behaviors, socioeconomic and demographic information, environmental attitudes, and AIOs. Dunlap and Van Liere's (1978) NEP (new environmental paradigm) was used as a measure of environmental attitude. Then, travelers behavior was assessed via planning horizon, information source, accommodations and travel party type variables. Factor analysis on the 46 AIO statements was performed. Six dimensions were identified: education/history, camping/tenting, socializing, relaxation, viewing nature and information. Then, cluster analysis was performed according to the nature-based benefits sought. Four clusters emerged. The only significant difference existed in the primary activity of viewing nature between individual's whose purpose of trip was nature-based and whose purpose was education. No other significant differences were found. Factor analysis was performed on the dimensions of environmental attitudes. Two factors emerged. The factors were labeled conservationists and consumptives. Cluster analysis was performed on the factors to profile the groups by demographic and travel behavior characteristics. Two groups clustered, they were named campers and noncampers. The

results suggested t

socializing appear

appeared that nati

one benefit.

Haley (19

consumers may s

researchers have

benefits sought.

Crompto

identified nine m

conceptual fram

psychological a

relaxation, prest

The last two mo

socio-psycholog

cultural motives

results suggested there are differences among nature-based tourists. For example, socializing appeared to be more important to one group than another. In addition, it appeared that nature-based travelers are looking for a package of benefits rather than only one benefit.

Benefits Sought as a Component of Travel Research

Haley (1968) was one of the first researchers to suggest that different segments of consumers may seek unique benefits from using a product. Since his initial effort, many researchers have attempted to discover motivations for travel and what might impact benefits sought.

Crompton (1979), for example, looked at the pleasure vacation travel market and identified nine motives for travel. These motives for travel were developed into a conceptual framework (see Figure 2). Eight were classified as sociological or psychological and included: escape from normal life, exploration, evaluation of self, relaxation, prestige, regression, enhancement of family relations, and social interaction. The last two motives were more cultural: novelty and education. Crompton found that socio-psychological motives were not related to the destination attributes; whereas cultural motives and novelty were at least partially related to the destination traits.



Figure 2. A Conceptualization of the Role and Relationship of Respondent's Motives (Crompton, 1979, p. 414)

Young, Ott and Feign (1978), using a national probability sample, divided the U.S. travel market into six segments using benefits as a variable. The sample was collected by the Canadian government. Of the six segments identified, some included visit friends and family, doing nothing, visiting a place that they have never been before.

Woodside, Moore and Etzel (1980) studied the vacation travel behavior and perceived benefits of South Carlonia's residents. A questionnaire on travel and tourism behavior was mailed to 834 members of the University of South Carolina's consumer panel. Factor analysis was performed on 50 psychographic statements. Eleven factors emerged: educational, affection, recommended place, physical activities, refreshing, unique experience, rewarding, family togetherness, self-confidence, unplanned, and unwinding. Woodside et al. (1980) found that an important element in promoting products is stressing the educational benefits and unique experiences, and that residents were more interested in personal benefits than out of state travelers.

Crask (1981) explored vacation attribute statements and uncovered five vacationer groups. The five groups were found to differ on most demographic variables. Cluster one was a group that likes to travel for rest and relaxation or to get away from it all and was characterized by middle age, middle income and the presence of school-aged children. Cluster two depicted individuals who indicate that sightseeing was the most important reason for travelling. High education and high income characterized this cluster. Cluster three was cost conscious and included attraction-oriented vacationers. This group was interested in shopping, amusement parks, and the cost of their trips and was mostly young adults, middle to low income, and at least some post-secondary education. Cluster four was characterized as sports enthusiasts and was looking for sporting facilities when travelling. The group was characterized by low income and was found to be either very young or over the age of retirement. Members of the fifth group were looking for camping experiences and opportunities to sightsee; they were mostly middle age, with young children and were in the lower income brackets. Crask found that members of each group were looking for different experiences when they vacationed and that the demographic profiles differed by group.

Etzel and Woodside (1982) offered an approach to studying near-home vacationers and distant travelers. A questionnaire addressing what people seek on vacation was sent out to 900 Dayton area households. Fifty psychographic statements taken from the literature, relating to the benefits perceived by the respondents, were included in the questionnaire. The researchers found that distant travelers have vacation

experiences and expectations quite different from those of near-home travelers. They found that the longer the trip was, the more it was viewed as an adventure, exciting, a change of pace and a once in a lifetime experience. Near-home travelers placed more importance on relaxation and slower paced experiences than did distant travelers. Etzel and Woodside (1982) suggested that when benefit-oriented items are "combined with the degree of satisfaction, the tourism manager is provided with a useful picture of the consumer's desires" (p. 13).

Pearce and Caltabiano (1983) examined travel motivations by having respondents describe positive and negative experiences from their last pleasure trip. Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs was used as a descriptive tool to code the responses. They found that positive experiences were associated with fulfillment of love, physiological needs and self-actualization. Negative experiences were associated with lack of physiological and safety needs. Pearce and Caltabiano suggested that promoting how attributes address particular needs is more effective than merely promoting the attributes themselves.

Adding to the literature on benefits sought, Mazanec (1984) surveyed 250 Austrian citizens who indicated that they would take a pleasure vacation. Three segments were identified. Segment I (45% of travelers) demonstrated interest in almost any benefit offered and appeared to be versatile and extravagant. Segment II (27% of travelers) showed a higher interest in swimming and evening entertainment. Segment III (28% of travelers) revealed an interest in nature travel, not comfort of accommodations. Mazanec also broke each segment down by age and found that Segment I was predominantly middle aged, Segment II was mostly young, and Segment III fell in the 50 and older category. This study also indicated that some benefits might be incompatible, depending on the segmer interest in sig oriented and l Wood they sought th departure in a nationalities. and past expe nationality. E Canada, the I sought by the most importa included sorr benefit of be togetherness strategies for Pitts travelleisure and needs in individuals v values. Data of the Unive ^{Scale}" (Roke on the segment. Segment II members were highly motivated by swimming and had a low interest in sightseeing or climbing or walking; whereas Segment III was highly natureoriented and less concerned with entertainment and shopping.

Woodside and Jacobs (1985) looked at different national samples and the benefits they sought through travel. Sixty travel groups were approached while waiting for departure in airport waiting areas. A questionnaire was developed for each of three nationalities. The questionnaire consisted of 26 likert type questions on benefits realized and past experiences. Woodside and Jacobs reported three different segments based on nationality. Benefits sought through travel were examined for three countries, including Canada, the United States, and Japan. They found significant differences in the benefits sought by the different nationalities. Canadian visitors reported rest and relaxation as the most important benefit of travelling to Hawaii. Americans sought similar benefits, but included some unique features. Mainland Americans were more likely to identify the benefit of being safe whereas, Japanese visitors were more likely to seek family togetherness. The authors recognized that marketers might need to create separate strategies for Canadians, Americans, and Japanese visitors.

Pitts and Woodside (1986) developed benefit segments using cluster analyis of travel/leisure criteria. The study examined values as a means of understanding motives and needs in making leisure and travel decisions. The purpose of the study was to group individuals with similar recreation choice criteria on the basis of common personal values. Data for the study was obtained from a mail survey administered to 250 students of the University of South Carolina. Values were measured using the "Rokeach Values Scale" (Rokeach, 1973). The scale consisted of 18 items or values, which were to be

ranked in order of importance. Such attributes as cost, accessibility, excitement, activities for group, good food, relaxation, physical exercise, educational benefits, comfortable accommodations and good for the whole family were included in the study. The study used a two step analysis: cluster analysis of the benefit statements, and then discriminant analysis to create benefit segments. Four segments emerged from the cluster analysis. The clusters were then analyzed in relation to actual travel behaviors.

Gitelson and Kerstetter (1990) reported an empirical test of the relationship between sociodemographic variables, benefits sought and subsequent vacation behavior. In a questionnaire sent out to 2,700 individuals in North Carolina, they found that a relationship existed between sociodemographic variables and benefits sought by vacationers. Their study supported Hawes' (1988) finding that as individuals age they do not seek rest and relaxation as much as those under the age of 30 years. In addition, women tended to value the social dimensions more and rate the relaxation dimension as being more important than men. Hawes study also suggested that individuals in the middle income bracket felt that the explorer dimension was more important than other income brackets.

Loker and Perdue (1992) examined the feasibility of segmenting the tourist market on the basis of benefit segmentation. The North Carolina Office of Park and Tourism Research conducted a year-long survey of non-resident travelers to North Carolina. A survey questionnaire was sent out to 6,418 and resulted in a response rate of 56%. The factor-cluster model was used to distinguish six benefit-based segments that were then compared on the basis of five dependent variables. Selection of target markets was based on profitability, reachability, and accessibility. The study found that there were

six markets: naturalists, nondifferentiators, family and friends-oriented,

excitement/escape, escapists, and pure excitement seekers. It was determined that the naturalists were highly educated males aged 30 to 59 years who reported middle incomes, and vacationed in lodges or cottages. The nondifferentiators were professional males living with middle to upper incomes who usually had children, stayed in hotels and visited museums when on vacation, and enjoyed amusement parks and fishing. The family-oriented segment traveled for the purpose of interaction with family or friends. This segment was represented by lower to middle income families. This group enjoyed visiting beaches and historical sites. The next segment was the pure excitement seekers; individuals who were self-employed or retired earned a middle to upper income, generally traveled in small groups and enjoyed going to the beach area and/or sporting events. Single or married individuals without children, who used travel brochures frequently, and visited museums and beaches when on vacation, primarily characterized the segment excitement/escape. The last segment was the escapists who were aged 30 to 49 years, earned a middle to upper income, planned trips one to three months in advance, lodged in hotels and motels, and enjoyed visiting historical sites or scenic areas. The study suggested that benefits segmentation is a practical and useful method of segmenting the vacation market.

Shoemaker (1994) segmented the U.S. travel market according to benefits realized. The segmentation study was based on the benefits derived from travel that was not destination specific. Major market segments were identified through the study of past travel experience. Shoemaker used a telephone to survey qualified, random U.S. households in six separate specific geographic regions. Qualified respondents were

actively involved in the decision-making process and had taken at least one overnight trip in the past 12 months. The study found that there were four market segments, but only three were considered an accurate size for analysis. These three markets were: "Get Away/Family Travelers." "Adventurous/Educational Travelers" and "Gamblers/Fun Oriented Travelers." It was determined that members of the "Get Away/Family Travelers" were more likely to travel to a place where friends or relatives live, to visit destinations with scenery, visit places which provide rest and relaxation, have the ability to drive to the destination. In contrast, "Adventurous/Educational Travelers" visited a place that had cultural activities, went to a place they had never been before, someone else they knew had been there, offers a number of activities, has fine dining/elegant restaurants and offers hotel or accommodations in all price ranges. This group is less concerned with a vacation destination that is one of rest and relaxation. Last, the "Gamblers/Fun Oriented" market places high importance on activities associated with gambling and fun. They look for opportunities for recreation or sport, a popular destination, good night life and entertainment, good value for money and fine dining/elegant restaurants. This study suggested that benefit segmentation is a viable way to segment the market and that past trip experience explains benefits realized which in turn provide more meaningful benefits segments.

Wight (1996) examined ecotourists in terms of benefits sought. More specifically, activities, preferences and motivations were examined. This study found that travelers in ecotourism seek a wide variety of activities that are passive and active, general and specialized, and land or water oriented. The essence of the article is that traveler preferences are dynamic. Certain activities increase or decrease depending on the

experience of the ecotourist. Travelers in all markets are looking for products that respect the environment. In addition, motivations and benefits sought vary by destination and are also dynamic. Both ecotourists who are interested in the outdoors and consumers interested in cultural experiences rank natural settings as the most important feature. Benefits with high discriminating power for ecotourists and traditional travelers tended to be on the primitive nature-end of the continuum.

This section of the literature review has focused on literature relating to benefits sought through pleasure travel. The literature suggests that there are several benefits sought when travelling for pleasure. Such benefits might range from seeking rest and relaxation to looking for various forms of entertainment. As well, the literature has focused on the characteristics of the members of each benefit segment. Unfortunately, generational cohorts have not received any attention in the literature and little is known about the types of benefits each generation seeks and what impacts the types of benefits sought might have on the volume and type of pleasure travel in Canada.

Change Over Time as a Component of Leisure Research

To date there have been only a few national studies with large representative samples of older adults across two or three generations. Rather, most studies of tourism and leisure over time have been small local or regional studies of the leisure needs, activities, preferences and patterns of older adults (McPherson 1983). In addition, almost all of the research has been cross sectional in nature and compared different age groups on their frequency of leisure participation. These studies typically relate types and rates of participation across different segments of society where age is just one criterion used

to classify people. According to Mannell and Kleiber (1997) age group differences make it tempting to assume that getting older leads to differences or changes in behavior. However, simple examinations of linear progression do not provide enough information to drawn conclusions about intergenerational differences.

The central concepts of behavioral change are stability and intraindividual variability. There are four concepts of stability that have been covered in the literature; structural invariance, normative stability, level stability, and ipsative stability. Structural invariance refers to consistency in the multivariate patterning of relationships between latent variables and the manifest variables that are used to represent those indicators in empirical research (Glenn, 1977). Invariance of factor loadings is the best known and most systematically studied methodological approach. Normative stability refers to the extent to which individuals or other entities retain their relative ranks or statuses on attributes of interest across times of measurement. Level stability refers essentially to the extent to which scores remain invariant across times of measurement and ipsative stability refers to the extent to which the organization of multiple attributes within the individual remains invariant across times of measurement. Personality research illustrates the context for this kind of stability. Stability is a class of concepts which has contributed to the understanding of a variety of phenomena.

Intraindividual variability also encompasses a broad set of concepts: (1) within person change that may or may not be reversible and that may or may not be synchronous across individuals (i.e., learning); (2) within person changes that are more or less reversible and that may or may not be synchronous over individuals (i.e., states, moods, emotions); (3) patterns of organizations of intraindividual variability within the

individu
of an in
variabil
There a
cohort
variab
Ahola
recen
cohor
leisu
1996
stabi
pref
near
inte
peo
dev
col
em
dif
CO

individual; (4) patterns of intraindividual variation reflecting the profile or organization of an individual's attributes (hierarchy of attributes). Stability and intraindividual variability summarize time (period) or age-related changes in attitude and behavior. There appears to be a lack of literature which examines this variability or stability as a cohort difference.

From the life course perspective, stability is uncommon. One explanation is that variability aids in the adaptive capacity, especially in the transition to adulthood (Iso-Ahola, 1980). The concept of stability dominated earlier research; however, more recently researchers have focused on variability across the life course. Finally, in the cohort literature, the concept of stability of preferences is lacking in the tourism and leisure literature although it is quite common in the popular press (c.f., Foot & Stoffman, 1996; Smith & Clurman, 1997). The following section will examine the concept of stability and variability of the tourism and leisure markets. Literature related to change in preferences and attitudes will also be examined in the field of tourism and leisure.

Development is a process that occurs over the entire life span and applies to nearly all areas of human behavior. Development is not simply the accumulation of interests, abilities and experiences; it is systematic and predictable change by which people become qualitatively different in some way from what they were before. The developmental perspective is facilitated by two models, the life span model and life course model. Life span models are generally "psychological" in nature and tend to emphasize those biological and psychological issues or challenges faced by individuals at different stages of life (Erickson, 1963; Havighust, 1972). Life course models, in contrast, are "sociological" in scope and examine how individuals behave in light of age-

related expe examine ho during their trajectories school con experience sports and sedentary D influence (Baltes, (species s changes develop events. secular divorce life circ Well be have su and cha related expectations and norms (Neugarten, 1977). Life course models also tend to examine how individuals act as a result of life events or unique turning points that occur during their lives (Brim, 1980). Life course theory focuses on the interweave of life cycle trajectories (i.e., family and work careers) and short-term transitions such as marriage or school completion. Life course is structurally and experientially tied to family experiences and work experiences. For example, young people tend to participate more in sports and activities that require physical prowess; while older people participate in more sedentary leisure activities (Lock, 1993; McPherson & Kozlik, 1987).

Development involves three types of influences, (1) normative age graded influences; (2) normative history graded influences; and (3) non-normative life events (Baltes, Cornelius, & Nesselroade, 1980). Normative age influences are changes that are species specific and biological in origin, for example, the graying of hair with age. Such changes are found across all cultures and historical periods. Normative history graded development involves a form of evolutionary change associated with significant historical events. For example, the depression in the 1920s, the Vietnam War in the 1960s and secular trends. Finally, development is influenced by non-normative life events, such as divorce where the changes experienced by people are precipitated more by unexpected life circumstances than by local, social or large-scale cultural changes.

The notion of change often seems to be associated with growth, development and well being. Several authors (Iso-Ahola, 1980a; Jackson & Dunn, 1994; Kleiber, 1985) have suggested that a person's development relies heavily on experiencing both stability and change in one's life; these states are in balance and work to stimulate each other. Too

much c
develop
behavi
predict
Ericks
span n
change
are "so
The m
buildi
that fo
peopl
an op
Sugge
1997
durin
activ
Chri
leisu
activ
tani.
-401/

much change may be unsettling, whereas too much stability may not lead to successful development. Novelty and change are important for growth and development.

Erickson's model (1963) provides a useful perspective for thinking about leisure behavior and its role in development over the life course. Erickson argued that predictable changes do not end with the transition from adolescence to adulthood. Erickson's model has been thought of as too general a model; however, Leveinson's life span model is more specific and detailed. This model was first applied to thinking about changes in leisure behavior by Iso-Ahola (1980a). Levinson's model suggested that there are "seasons" of life during which certain developmental issues are predictably faced. The model suggests that the seasons are involved in alternating periods of structure building and structure changing throughout the adult life course. This research suggested that for many, midlife brings an unwillingness to keep up appearances and associate with people out of obligation, thus resulting in freedom for experimentation. Leisure provides an opportunity for this experimentation.

Although there are a variety of what seems like competing theories, research suggests that there is some continuity in leisure behavior over time (Mannell & Kleiber, 1997). What is less well known is the extent to which leisure behaviors people learn during youth persist into adulthood. Several studies have concluded that youthful activities are reflected in adult leisure choices (Burch, 1969; Buse & Enoch, 1977; Christenson & Yoesting, 1973). Most of these studies have dealt with only a few types of leisure activities and have used adults' recall to determine the nature of their childhood activities. It is estimated that 40 to 80 percent of adult leisure activities have a close equivalent in childhood activities. These figures suggest that new patterns of

participation are indeed established throughout adulthood; however they tend to be similar to activities pursued in early adulthood, rather than radically different activities.

One of the most widely cited studies of variations in leisure activity across the life span was done with a survey in the 1970s, of 1,441 people between the ages of 20 and 94 (Gordon, Gaitz & Scott, 1976). This study showed that overall leisure activity level decreased with age and that this pattern was consistent across a variety of activities (e.g., cooking and solitary activities). In other words, older adults placed less importance on for example, skiing than did younger adults. Activities done outside the home, requiring physical exertion and high involvement indicated the strongest negative correlation with age. The negative correlation between activity and age has also been found in studies conducted by Kelly (1987a) and Unkel (1981). The limitation of this study was that it was cross sectional in nature and as a result, cohort and period effects were not able to be isolated as indicators of change.

Iso-Ahola (1980a) suggested a curvilinear relationship, with the variety of leisure activities reaching its peak in middle adulthood and declining towards old age. His study suggested that for most of people's adult lives there is a decline in the number of personal leisure resources available corresponding to the apparent decline in number of leisure activities engaged in and the intensity of involvement.

Crawford, Godbey and Crouter (1986) investigated the stability of leisure preferences across a two-year time span. Leisure preference data were collected from 126 married couples shortly after their marriage and then two years later. They used rank order stability (assessed by correlational methods), and mean stability (assessed by a ttest) to assess the stability of preferences over time. The study focused on single item

measures rather than latent variables (assessed by factor stability). They found that individual's preferences for specific leisure activities are significantly and positively correlated across a two-year period. Results indicated gender differences in stability coefficients, the average number of preference declines over time, and that husbands and wives show no pattern of increased leisure preferences over the first two years. Crawford et al. concluded that psychological and environmental influences co-predict the stability of leisure preferences.

McGuire, Dottavio and O'Leary (1987) used the 1982-1983 Nationwide Recreation Survey (NRS) to determine whether late life differences in outdoor leisure activity participation could be explained by early life participation. The study involved 6,000 individuals 12 years of age and older. They found that those age 65 and over could be categorized as "expanders" or "contractors" based on their patterns of leisure involvement. Expanders altered their leisure patterns by the addition of new activities throughout the life course, whereas contractors showed evidence of continuity and maintained the same pattern of leisure involvement over the life course.

McGuire and Dottavio (1987) looked at the data from the NRS to examine why people in different ages quit, replaced, added or continued leisure activities. This study examined three constructs of abandonment, continuity and liberation in outdoor recreation participation among different age groups over the life course. The investigators found that each of the three patterns existed at each life course stage. Thus, abandonment, continuity and liberation all occurred at all different stages of the life course.

Stability of leisure participation and motivational factors among 139 community residents were assessed by Lounsbury and Hoopes in 1988. Their study used a list of 113 leisure activities based on the Leisure Activities Blank and five participation factors to assess stability over a five-year period. Unlike, Crawford et al. (1986), these researchers examined the internal consistency of latent variables of participation and motivation and assessed the reliabilities so that estimates of "true stability" could be generated. They used a MANOVA to examine change over the five-year period. The results indicated a high level of stability over a five-year period for leisure activity participation as well as leisure motivation. In addition, results revealed large proportions of variability attributed to between subject differences and subject by time interactions. They suggested that such stability may be attributable to a person's lifestyle or the constancy of environmental opportunities.

Searle, McTavish and Brayley (1993) supported these patterns in a study of 1,209 Canadians in Manitoba. The sample ranged from 16 to 65 years of age. They found that about 20% of the sample were classified as replacers, 25% were quitters, 16% were adders, and 40% were continuers. They also found that the number of people who were continuers increased with the age of the cohort group. The researchers suggested that perhaps other factors besides age need to be examined to help explain patterns of participation.

Iso-Ahola, Jackson and Dunn (1994) conducted a study of 3,927 households in Alberta, Canada and found that the number of people indicating they started new activities within the last year decreased steadily over three phases of adulthood until retirement. The number of replacing activities, activities dropped or replaced by another,

also declined over the life course. This study found that over the four stages of adulthood studied, those who chose to continue with the same activities increased in number while those who started new activities decreased. The authors concluded that the "tendency to seek novelty through new leisure activities declines with advancing life stages, whereas the tendency to maintain stability through old and familiar activities increases with life stages" (p. 243). The study does not support the theory that older adults disengage from life and become inactive, but rather they become more selective and discriminating.

In 1989, Scott and Willits published a more comprehensive and long-range report of the linkages between various adolescent recreational activities and corresponding adult leisure choices using data from a long-term panel study of rural Pennsylvania residents. In that analysis, panel members involvement in five types of leisure activities in 1947 when they were in high school was positively related to the frequency of participation in these same activities 37 years later (in 1984) when the subjects were in their fifties. The strength of these relationships varied somewhat by specific type of activity. The strengths of the relationships for sports and creative/artistic activities were significantly greater for women then men. Not only were there positive correlation between adolescent and adult leisure patterns, but adolescent participation was more predictive of midlife involvement in socializing, formal organizational participation, and for women in creative/artistic activities and sports than respondents, gender, health rating, education or income.

In 1993, these same panel members were re-surveyed, and data on the frequencies of their participation in these same five types of leisure activities were assessed again. In 1992, the subjects were in their early sixties- a period of life during which adults in American society are likely to be experiencing various life changes. Although there is

- clear genk imp inc ar ŵ Ī I

clearly diversity among adults in their early sixties, occupational achievements have generally peaked and retirement looms on the horizon or may already have occurred. The impending or actual loss of long-standing occupational identities and generally reduced incomes can threaten customary lifestyles, while at the same time provide freedom from earlier responsibilities.

One of the problems with studying leisure patterns and preferences over the life course is the confounding problem of age and historical events (period effects). It is important to be critical when studying findings from cross sectional studies because it may be difficult to isolate age effects from cohort effects. Therefore, the use of longitudinal data on the same persons across time avoids the possibility of age effect bias (LaPage & Reiyan, 1974; Smale & Dupuis, 1995; Freysinger & Ray, 1994; Schmitz-Scherzer & Thomas, 1983; Crawford, Godbey & Crouter, 1986).

Strauss and Howe's Theory Applied to the Canadian Population

According to Foot and Stoffman (1996), much of the thinking related to attitudinal and social changes in America can be applied to Canada because they have followed a similar pattern. Canada's population pyramid contains a massive bulge, representing the huge generation of the Baby Boomers born in a 20-year period from 1946 to 1966. By comparison, the GI Generation and the Silent Generation that preceded the Baby Boomer Generation and Generation X are small. The most recent generation, the Millennial Generation, (children of the Baby Boomers) is also a comparatively large generation. This pattern is the same as that of the United States, although the precise dates may vary by a year or two.



According to Foot and Stoffman (1996), Canada's baby boom was the loudest in the industrialized world. In fact, only three other Western countries – the United States, Australia and New Zealand had baby booms. Part of the reason was that these four countries were immigrant receivers, and immigrants tend to be in their 20s, the prime childbearing years. Foot and Stoffman (1996) have suggested that the generational profiles includes "those born elsewhere during those same years but now living in Canada" (p. 13).

The U.S. boom started earlier, in 1946, and it also ended earlier, in 1964. At its peak in 1957, the U.S. boom hit 3.7 children per family, nearly half a baby fewer than Canadian women were producing at the peak of the Canadian boom. The Americans started their boom earlier because more of their war effort was in the Pacific. The U.S. troops were brought home in 1945 and kids started appearing in 1946. Canadian troops came home later, so Canadian births did not leap upwards until 1947. One third of Canadians today are boomers and for that reason, according to Foot and Stoffman, they are a slightly more important factor in Canadian life than American boomers are in American life.

Additional support for the application of the profiles by Strauss and Howe to the Canadian population comes from Matthew Elmslie (1998). From 1997 to 1999, he has been active in developing support for the application of Strauss and Howe's theory to the Canadian population. He has suggested that the "Canadian saeculum matches the American saeculum exactly all the way down the line" (source: <u>www.fourthturning.com</u>). He has also assumed that all of British North America (what is now known as Canada) operates on a single saeculum and not a bunch of differing local ones. His argument is

that "due to the overwhelming nature of modern American media, the two countries cycles were pretty much in sync" (source: www.fourthturning.com). Matthew Elmslie has gone through history and found support for the phases that are outlined in Strauss and Howe's theory. He has suggested there are five phases: (1) Pre-European, (2) Pre-French, (3) French; (4) British and (5) Canada. He suggested there is no essential difference between a British possession in North America (Canada) and a non-British possession in North America (United States). Based on the research of these three Canadian authors, the application of Strauss and Howe's generational theory to the Canadian population was deemed reasonable.

Cohort Analysis as a Method of Statistical Analysis

There are a number of ways to study change in individuals over time. They range from cross sectional to longitudinal in nature. However, the best way to study change over time is by use of the cohort sequential research design. This allows the researcher to control for year of birth (which tells period effects) and age (life stage and age). Repeated measures on multiple cohorts allow the researcher to partial out the sources of group differences and changes associated with aging. This method of longitudinal research gives the most complete picture of the all three effects over time. There are three statistical ways to implement a cohort sequential research design. They include, the triad method, regression analysis with dummy variables and structural equations modeling. Discussions on each of the three statistical techniques follow.

Īr

- M
- af

- •

Triad Method

The least rigorous technique to analyze change over time is called the Triad Method. This method uses t-tests or ANOVAs to examine differences in cohort's attitudes or preferences over time. Palmore's (1978) triad method "peels off" the data into three layers or levels and makes sense out of them in a dependent fashion. The first layer consists of measuring (1) longitudinal differences (difference between two measurements of the same cohort over time); (2) cross sectional (difference between younger and older cohorts at a specific time; (3) time lag (difference between two cohorts measured at two different points in time such that their age is equal at the respective times of measurement). Palmore suggests that period effects may be caused by changing physical environments, group composition, measurement techniques, etc. and cohort effects may be caused by historical differences in social or physical environments during critical earlier years.

Regression Analysis with Dummy Variables

An additional method for examining differences over time, which takes into account all three effects, is regression analysis with dummy variables. The first researchers to use this technique were Rentz and Reynolds (1991), who examined differences in coffee consumption over time. Rentz and Reynolds noted that many of the previous techniques used to perform cohort analysis were not adequate in separating the effects of age, cohort membership and period. They noted that multiple cross sections can be used but, in their original form, are linearly dependent. Therefore, they suggested the following model:

$$Y_{ij} = \mu + \beta_i + \gamma_j + \delta_k + \epsilon_{ij}$$

Where the effect of the i_{th} age group is given by β_{t} , the effect of the jth period by γ_{j} and the effect of the k_{th} cohort by δ_{k} where μ is the grand mean of the dependent variable and ϵ is the random error. The i age groups are coded into i-1 dummy variables, the j periods into j-1 dummy variables, and the k cohorts into k-1 dummy variables. Because of the linear dependency, the linear effects of age, period and cohort are confounded but the nonlinear effects are not. Therefore, in data that are linear this method should not be used. Because the model is underidentified, one of the parameters must be constrained in order to estimate the other parameters. Typically, two or more age, period or cohort effects are constrained to be equal. Because there are three variables, three combinations of constraints exist. In order to test the relative importance of the three dimensions, all three combinations are performed and one model is then chosen as the appropriate model to interpret. Tests of significance are used to test the fit of the models and determine which is the most appropriate.

Structural Equations Modeling

Another technique used with longitudinal data to measure cohort effects is structural equations modeling. The most powerful statistical analysis of cohorts involves structural equations modeling. According to Bollen (1989), longitudinal data often require complex multivariate statistical models and techniques for their analyses. Structural equations modeling involves observed variables, which are regarded as indicators of latent variables (Bollen, 1989). Each indicator has a relationship with the latent variable but one indicator alone may be a poor measure of the latent variable. By using several indicators of a latent variable we get a better measurement of it. Using latent variables incorporates the concept of measurement error (observational error) in the observed variables. Measurement errors occur because of imperfection in the various measurement instruments (tests, questionnaires, scales, etc.) used to measure such concepts. Even if one could construct a valid measurement of these concepts it would still be impossible to obtain perfectly reliable measurements. One assumption is that the measurement model is assumed to be invariant over time as well as over cohorts. This assumption enables us to use the same scale in examining changes in the latent variable over time and differences in the latent variable between cohorts. To explain the values of the latent variable we build a structural model that contains a mean structure and a covariance structure. The mean structure is an autoregressive model, which explains the latent variable at time t by the value of the latent variable at time t-1 and by other observed explanatory variables (Bollen, 1989).

According to Glenn (1977), the general model is one that has observations on a number of individuals over t periods of time from each of G cohorts. At each occasion we have measurements on the same p variables. The observed score of an individual from a cohort on variables i at time period t, where the sample size is adequate. Initially, we examine one cohort. We assume that the p variables are fallible measures of a single latent variable. The measurement model specifies how the p response variables are used to measure the latent variable at occasion t. The measurement model can be used to study measurement properties such as validity and reliability of the responses variables and how these vary over time and over cohorts. It is assumed that the error terms are

uncorrelated with the observed variables for every cohort. Furthermore, it is assumed that error terms are uncorrelated with each other. Both origin and the unit of measurement are arbitrary and, therefore, to define a scale which is common to all occasions, we fix the origin of one lambda to one for one cohort or set the variance to one for all cohorts. The covariance matrix and mean vector will be different for different cohorts. This may in principle hold for the phi (relationship between latent constructs), but it may be of interest to see to what extent phi is invariant over cohorts. The structural model is used to describe how the latent variable depends on other variables whose effects are to be estimated and studied. Explanatory variables are included in the structural model. These explanatory measures include sex, education, experience and income. The changes in coefficient alpha represent effects of cohort and time each confounded by age. The coefficient alphas reflect changes in level (means) over time. The Beta coefficient is usually called a stability coefficient, because it reflects the extent to which the later latent variable can be predicted from the earlier latent variable. High values of beta are associated with high stability. The error term in the equation is a random disturbance term representing the combined effects of all variables influencing the latent term and not included in the indicator variable (Bollen, 1989; Glenn, 1977).

To test the measurement model, the phi matrix is free to vary, one of the lambda's is set to one, and the first element of k is set to zero. The test of the measurement model is essentially the test of the hypothesis that v and lambda are invariant across time. Note also that the hypothesis states that there is a correlation of error terms across time, such that they are correlated with the same variable over time but not with other variables. The test of the measurement model is then measured using the chi-square statistic to evaluate
how well the data fit the model. To test the structural model, the lambda's and v's must be constrained to be equal across time. In this analysis, all the means of the latent variables in all cohorts can be estimated except for a single additive constant.

To test the structural model, one assumes that the measurement model holds and is invariant over occasions and cohorts and imposes additional structures on the mean vector k and covariance matrix or phi. If the vector is unconstrained and free to vary over cohorts the structure on the means does not impose any restrictions. When the time periods are greater than three, the hypothesis of first order autoregression imposes restrictions on the phi covariance matrix. When the lambdas are constrained to be equal over time, the means are then estimable and significant differences in the size of the means can be measured. We are then able to determine the differences in attitudes or behaviors of the different cohorts over time.

Summary

The beginning of this literature review proposed a theoretical foundation for the study of cohorts or generations. The review then focused on research relating to attitudes, motivations and benefits sought through travel. Until recently, the idea of segmenting the market based on generations was unheard of. However, researchers have begun to recognize the importance of cohorts. Though, there has been a lack of empirical evidence regarding the relationship between a person's generation and the impact on attitudes and motivations towards travel. The purpose of this study was to see if there was empirical evidence to support generational theory in a tourism context.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Cohort analysis was used to investigate the impact of generational variables on twelve travel-related variables. The preparation of the data for the cohort analysis will be addressed in the following sections: (a) source of data; (b) conversion of the data; and (c) treatment of the data.

Source of Data

The data used in this study was secondary in nature. Cohort analysis requires data from two or more periods in time, usually which cover a period of 10-15 years or more. The availability of data from more than two time periods which measure the same variables on the same population using the same method is limited. Similar to the approach referred to in the Yankelovich report, this study used two time periods as the bases for cohort analysis. Studies providing good travel data were obtained through the Canadian Tourism Commission. Specifically, the survey data were obtained through two national surveys funded by Tourism Canada (later called the Canadian Tourism Commission). Permission was obtained from the Canadian Tourism Commission to use both the data sets. These studies were the "Canadian Travel and Tourism Motivation Study" (CTAMS) and the "Domestic Tourism Market Research Study" (DTS).

The selection of the subjects in both surveys included Canadians, aged 15 and older. The data was obtained through a combination of both telephone surveys and personal interviews. The selection of respondents for CTAMS was obtained through a telephone survey using a random digit dial sampling technique. The selection of

respondents for the DTS used two different data collection methods. A telephone survey was conducted nation-wide on a random basis, while the remaining respondents were selected in shopping malls in large cities to meet regional quotas. Then, a more in-depth survey consisting of in-person interviews with 1,457 randomly selected Canadians was conducted. This survey was conducted in 48 urban centers with a population over 30,000.

Canadian Tourism Attitude and Motivation Study

The Canadian Tourism Attitude and Motivation Study was conducted by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion in the autumn of 1983. The objective of the study was to "develop an understanding of the Canadian travel market through the definition and analysis of population sub-groups based on: vacation needs; attitudes to vacations, interests with respect to vacations and their actual behavior" (p.1). The sample size was 11,500 and equally distributed throughout the 10 provinces. The 1983 sample was 11,500 and distributed fairly equally among the 10 Provinces in Canada (Table 6).

Province	Number of Interviews
Newfoundland	1500
Prince Edward Island	948
Nova Scotia	1346
New Brunswick	1430
Quebec	1437
Ontario	1808
Manitoba	1602
Saskatchewan	1896
Alberta	1158
British Columbia	1055
Total	11,500

Table 6. Number of Respondents by Province in 1983 CTAMS Study

Domestic Tourism Market Research Study

The Domestic Tourism Market Research Study was conducted by Coopers & Lybrand Consulting in September and October of 1995. The objective of the study was to examine in detail the motivations, attitudes and perceptions of Canadians about tourism, travel opportunities and destinations. The overall purpose of the research was "to determine how best to market Canadian destinations and products to Canadians and examine possibilities for import substitution" (p.i). The results were based on a combination of telephone and in-person interviews with over 3,356 Canadians in all regions of the country. The Domestic Tourism Travel's survey sample size was 1,899 telephone surveys and 1,457 in-person surveys. The sample size varied in the 10 Provinces and was weighted accordingly (Table 7). The data had a weight variable so that age, gender and province were representative of the entire population.

Province	Number of Interviews
Newfoundland	119
Prince Edward Island	27
Nova Scotia	185
New Brunswick	154
Quebec	429
Ontario	438
Manitoba	235
Saskatchewan	210
Alberta	440
British Columbia	447
Total	3356

 Table 7. Number of Interviews by Province in 1995 DTS Study

Conversion of the Data

Due to the nature of the study, it was necessary to have scalar equivalence among the variables. Thus, all variables needed to be identical in both measurement, meaning and wording. A total of 12 variables across both studies were worded exactly the same. These variables were categorized as three main constructs (by Tourism Canada): (1) Travel Philosophies; (2) Benefits Sought and (3) Travel Interests. Under the "Travel Philosophy" section, there were two variables which had scalar equivalence; under the "Benefits Sought" section there was one variable that had scalar equivalence and under the "Travel Interest" section there were nine variables that had scalar equivalence. Therefore, there are a total of 12 variables that were used to examine the effects of age, generation and period on travel-related variables (Table 8).

	CTAMS- 1983	Domestic Travel- 1995
Travel Philosophy		
V 1	Money spent on travel is well	Money spent on travel is well
V2	Important people speak my language	Important people speak my language
Benefits Sought		
V3	Having fun, being entertained	Having fun, being entertained
Travel Interests		
V4	National/provincial parks	National/provincial parks
V5	Beaches for swimming and sunning	Beaches for sunning and swimming
V6	High quality restaurants	High quality restaurants
V7	First class hotels	First class hotels and resorts
V8	Budget accommodations	Budget accommodations
V9	Nightlife and entertainment	Nightlife and entertainment
V10	Museums, art galleries	Museums and art galleries
V11	Amusement/Theme parks	Theme parks and amusement parks
V12	Shopping	Shopping

Table 8. Common Variables in Both Studies

The travel philosophy variables at period one (CTAMS) were measured on a 5point likert scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The travel philosophy variables at period two (DTS) were measured on a 4-point scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Therefore, the variables were standardized on a 0-1 scale, where 0 was "strongly agree" and 1 was "strongly disagree." Z-scores were not used. Not using Z-scores prevented the standard deviation from being normalized on a 0 to 1 scale. It was felt that maintaining the original range of responses provided more information which in turn helped in analyzing patterns. Figure 3 maps the conversion from the five and four point scales to the standardized scale.



Figure 3. Transformation from 5-Point Scale to 4-Point Scale

The scale was interpreted as follows: 0 = "strongly agree,".25 = "somewhat agree,".50 = "neutral,".75 = "somewhat disagree" and 1 = "strongly disagree."

The benefits sought variable was measured in both time periods on a 4-point scale, which ranged from "very important" to "not at all important." However, in time period one (CTAMS) a score of one was "very important" and in time period two a score of one was "not at all important;" therefore, time two was reverse coded so the scales were the same.

The final set of variables, the travel interest variables, were also measured on a 4point likert type scale from "very important" to "not at all important." The same variables were measured on identical scales. Similar to the benefit sought variable, however, the scores needed to be reverse coded for one period into to make them comparable.

For the purpose of comparison, all variables were standardized. Therefore, the benefits sought and travel interest scales were standardized on a zero to one scale. Figure 4 maps the transformation from the four-point scale to the standardized scale.



Figure 4. Transformation from 4-Point Scale to Standardized Scale

The way the scales were interpreted were that a score of 0 represented "important," a score of .33 on the standardized scale represented "somewhat important," a score of .66 represented "not very important" and a score of 1 represented "not at all important." Figure 5 indicates how the two scales could be used to map comparisons among the 12 variables on a standardized scale.



Figure 5. Mapping Comparisons on a Standardized Scale

Treatment of the Data

The data were analyzed using the statistical package, SPSS (1995). Initially, the FREQUENCIES procedure was applied to obtain a "picture" of the data in the form of raw frequencies and percent of occurrence for the sample.

The "age" variable in each dataset was recoded to represent the generations outlined by Strauss and Howe (1991). When coding the generation variable it was necessary to leave out specific age categories so that they would not overlap. This allowed each age category to represent only one generation.

Table 9. Age of Each	Generation a	at Time	of Two	Studies
----------------------	--------------	---------	--------	---------

Generation	Year Born	Age in 1983	Age in 1995
GI Generation	1901-1924	82-59	94-71
Silent Generation	1925-1943	58-40	70-52
Baby Boomer	1944-1964	39-19	51-31
Generation X	1965-1981	18-2	30-14

Generation	Year Born	Sample Size in 1983	Sample Size in 1995
GI Generation	1901-1924	1953	419
Silent Generation	1925-1943	1394	590
Baby Boomer	1944-1964	4133	1485
Generation X	1965-1981	360	862
Total		7840	3356

 Table 10. Sample Sizes of Each Generation in Two Studies

Data were initially analyzed using t-tests and analysis of variance. T-tests were preformed to measure bivariate relationships and ANOVAs were used to measure multivariate relationships.

The cohort analysis was performed by means of a three-way analysis of variance. The analysis of variance results were reported in a narrative form and in a table showing the main effects and interaction effects, the R^2 for each model was also reported. The ANOVA procedure tested for significance at the .05 level.

The final procedure was to analyze the data by means of structural equations modeling using the EQS program (Bentler, 1985). This method permits the analyst to specify the measurement of latent variables and to hypothesize the relations that occur among those latent variables. The adequacy of the measurement model and the tenability of the hypothesized causal relations among the latent variables can be tested simultaneously. A poor fit of the measurement model or causal model indicates that the hypothesized relations are inconsistent with the data. A good fit supports the legitimacy of the model but does not rule out plausible alternatives that were never tested.

Chapter IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The purpose of this study was to assess specific travel philosophies, benefits sought and preferences held by Canadians using a cohort analysis. This chapter has been divided into the following sections: (a) sample profile and biases; (b) accounting for large sample sizes (c) period and travel-related variables; (d) age and travel related variables; (e) generation and travel-related variables; (f) using different methods of cohort analysis; (g) using structural equations modeling as a method of cohort analysis.

Sample Profile and Biases

Both the Canadian Tourism Attitude and Motivation Study (CTAMS) and the Domestic Tourism Market Research Study (DTMRS) provided demographic variables that helped to profile the samples. The following demographic variables were included in both studies: age, income, marital status, education, gender, and number of income earners in household. The purpose of profiling the respondents was to address the representativeness of the sample to the Canadian population. Population statistics were obtained from the 1984 and 1996 Census collected by Statistics Canada. Biases were addressed in the narrative. The results are presented in Table 11.

Demographic	1983	1983	1995	1995
Characteristic	CTAMS	CTAMS	DTS	DTS
	Sample	Population*	Sample	Population ⁺
	%	- %	%	- %
Age				
15-19	3.3	9.6	8.4	8.4
20-24	11.3	11.3	8.6	8.7
25-34	28.2	22.7	23.1	20.8
35-44	20.0	18.3	22.9	20.8
45-54	11.8	12.8	16.2	15.6
55-64	11.9	11.7	11.5	10.7
65+	13.5	13.6	9.4	15.1
Income				
Under median	44.1	42.8	50.0	40.9
Median	11.7	6.4	6.5	6.5
Over Median	44.3	50.8	43.4	52.6
Marital Status				
Married	68.0	42.7	59.8	42.9
Single	21.0	49.6	27.2	47.8
Other	11.0	7.7	12.9	9.3
Education Level				
University/College	32.0	31.5	48.6	39.7
High School	48.0	20.3	48.7	23.1
Grade School	20.0	47.8	2.6	36.8
Gender				
Male	49.0	49.3	38.2	49.6
Female	51.0	50.7	61.8	50.4
Number of income				
earners				
1	38.0	31.8	40.0	29.7
2	36.0	41.9	52.3	43.4
3 or more	25.0	26.3	7.7	26.9

Table 11. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents in Both Periods

• Percentages may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

• (*) Source: Statistics Canada 1986 Census

• (*) Source: Statistics Canada 1994 Census

The age groups were not coded the same in both studies. Therefore, the categories in the DTS were recoded to match the age categories in the CTAMS study. The DTS was recoded to match CTAMS because the groupings were more evenly distributed in the CTAMS than the groupings in the DTS study. Most categories in the 1983 study were in 10 year increments, while age categories in the DTS varied considerably.

Approximately, 28% of the CTAMS study were 25 to 34 years, while slightly less (23.1%) were the same age in the 1995 study. The youngest and the oldest categories had the least representation in both studies. In the CTAMS study, the youngest category (15-19) represented 3.3% of the entire sample, while the same category in the DTS represented 8.4%. Similarly, in the CTAMS study, the oldest group (65+) represented 13.5% while in 1995 this category represented 9.4% of the sample.

Examining the Canadian population parameters revealed that the youngest category in the 1983 study and the oldest category in the 1995 study were under represented. The 25-34 year old category and the 35-44 year old category in both the 1983 and 1995 study over represented the numbers of Canadians in that category. However, the proportions in each age group were relatively the same as the proportions in the population. Thus, based on age categories, the samples appeared to be fairly representative of the Canadian population.

Income

The median income category in the 1983 study was \$20,000 to \$24,999 per annum. In 1995, the median income category was \$40,001 to \$45,000. This was fairly representative of the Canadian population, where the median income in 1983 was

Age

\$20,332 and the median income in 1995 was \$47,124. The 1995 study was slightly biased in its estimate of the number of Canadians who fell below the median. However, this bias does not appear to be that large. In the 1983 study, 44.1% of the sample reported an income under the median, while in 1995, 50% of the sample indicated an annual income under the median. Whereas, in 1983, 44.3% reported having incomes over the median and in 1995, 43.4% reported having incomes above the median. The relative proportions of those over and under the median were consistent with the population in both periods.

Marital Status

The largest segment of both samples were those who were married. In the 1983 study, 68% reported being married, while in 1995, slightly less (59.8%) reported being married. A slightly larger group reported being single in 1995 (27.2%) compared to 21.0% in 1983. Approximately 13% and 11% fell into the "other" category in 1995 and 1983 respectively. The "other" category was made up of divorcees and widows. Comparison of sample estimates to population parameters revealed that in both studies the number of single Canadians were under represented. The result of this bias may be that the importance of certain travel-related variables may be affected.

Education Level

The levels of education of the two samples were very different. Education statistics from Statistics Canada were reported for those over the age of 21, this

represented only those who have had an 'opportunity' to obtain an education. Therefore, the sample data only looked at the results of those over the age of 21.

In 1983, a much larger proportion of the sample reported that their highest level of education was grade school. In 1995, only 2.6% of the sample reported having only a grade school education. The number of respondents who had a university or college education in 1983 was less than in 1995; 32% reported being university or college educated in 1983 while 48% reported being university or college educated in 1983. The percentage of respondents who reported having a high school degree was essentially the same for both samples (48%).

Examining the population parameters suggested that the 1983 sample over represented Canadian's whose highest level of education was high school and under represented Canadian's whose highest level of education was grade school. In 1995, a severe bias was imposed by under representing the number of people with grade school education. This may result in biases associated with the importance of travel-related variables which are educational in nature, such as the importance of art galleries and museums.

Gender

The percentage of males to females was relatively proportionate in the 1983 study (49.0% males and 51.0% females). However, in the 1995 study, females were over represented. They represented almost 62% of the total sample whereas men only represented 38% of the sample. Examining the population parameters suggest that this represents an over sampling of approximately 15%. This bias could affect scores on

certain types of travel-related variables. For example, shopping is traditionally viewed as a more "female" activity and therefore responses on this variable may be biased due to an over representation of females in the 1995 sample.

Number of Income Earners

The number of dual income earning families went up from 1983 to 1995. In 1983 only 36% reported having two people working whereas in 1995, slightly over half reported having two people working in the home. The number of homes who reported having more than three people in the home working was greater (15%) in 1983 than in 1995 (7.7%). However, this number was underrepresented in the sample. The number of households in the population in 1995 with 3 or more income earners was approximately 27%. The sample did not capture enough of this group and therefore, there could be sample biases. These biases should be taken into account when analyzing the results.

Overall, the sample estimates are fairly representative of the population, except on a few variables. The age variable under represented the youngest category in 1983 and the oldest category in 1995 and the two middle-aged categories (age 25-34) were over represented. Gender, marital status, and education are the three variables which have the strongest biases associated with them. The number of women sampled in 1995 was over represented considerably and should be kept under consideration when evaluating the results. Likewise, the percentage of married people in the sample was over represented and the number of single people was under represented. This also needs to be taken into consideration when evaluating the results. Finally, the number of individuals in the sample whose highest level of education was "grade school" were under represented in

both studies. These variables may present problems when analyzing and interpreting the relationships among age, generation and period on the travel-related variables. In variables where there are anticipated relationships between these demographic variables and the importance of the travel-related variable, period effects have a greater effect. The problem associated with these biases is that the researcher is unable to isolate the effects of these biases and the other independent variables, making the analyses even more complicated.

Accounting for Large Sample Sizes

The data in this study contained 14,000 cases. Based on the size of the sample, it is appropriate to conclude that the population estimates are the actual population parameters. However, one of the problems associated with such large datasets is the ability to easily reject the null hypothesis or show statistical differences with relatively small differences. In large datasets minor differences are statistically significant. Therefore, it was appropriate to set a standard or "benchmark" to evaluate how big a difference is a meaningful difference. Translation of the differences back to the scales, allows us to determine what may be a meaningful difference. For example, a .05 difference in means represents a difference of .20 on the original 5-point scale. That translates into a move of 20% from a score of "strongly agree" to "agree." A difference of .10 translates into a difference of .4 on the original five-point scale. That is less than half a scale value and therefore probably not meaningful. Table 12 identifies how differences translate into the four and five-point scale. It was determined that less than a

.05 difference is probably not meaningful and therefore absolute differences of greater than .05 will be considered "meaningful" differences.

Table 12. Observed Differences on the Standardized and Original Scales							
Difference on 0-1 Scale	Difference on the	Difference on the					
	4 point scale	5 point scale					
.05	.15	.20					
.10	.30	.40					
.15	.45	.60					

Each of the single variables (age, generation and period) were analyzed both for statistical differences and meaningful differences. Meaningful differences were computed by subtracting the highest value from the lowest value. It is recognized that this is a fairly liberal method of determining differences and that more conservative methods could have been used. However, it was felt that this liberal method was appropriate for the purpose of assessing where meaningful differences might be evident.

Period and Travel-Related Variables

The t-test procedure was preformed to test for statistical differences in means across the two periods. Nine out of twelve were significantly different at the 99% confidence interval (Table 13).

The three travel-related variables that were not statistically different between the two periods were: "beaches for swimming and sunning," "budget accommodations" and "amusement and theme parks." In all three cases, the ranking in both periods were identical. "Beaches for swimming and sunning" was rated as "somewhat important."

Both "budget accommodations" and "amusement and theme parks" ranked between

"somewhat important" and "not very important."

Philosophy, Benefits and Interest	Mean	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Diff.
• •	1983	1995	Pooled		high-
	. <u>.</u>		Data		low
*Money spent on travel is well spent	.44	.37	.42	.00	.07
*Important people speak my language	.50	.53	.51	.00	.03
Having fun, being entertained	.24	.17	.22	.00	.07
National/provincial parks	.30	.31	.30	.02	.01
Beaches for swimming and sunning	.31	.31	.31	.32	.00
High quality restaurants	.41	.46	.43	.00	.05
Budget accommodations	.48	.48	.48	.71	.00
First class accommodations	.34	.30	.33	.00	.04
Shopping	.36	.31	.35	.00	.05
Nightlife and entertainment	.43	.42	.43	.02	.01
Museums and art galleries	.42	.45	.42	.00	.03
Amusement and theme parks	.43	.43	.43	.20	.00
Overall Mean	.39	.38	.39	.00	.01

Table 13. Means of Travel Philosophy, Benefits Sought and Travel Interests for 1983 Study, 1995 Study and Pooled Data

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 = "somewhat important," .66 = "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

* Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neither agree nor disagree,"
.75 = "disagree," and 1= "strongly disagree."

As previously mentioned it is important to examine the differences between mean scores on a practical level as well as a statistical level. Because the number of cases in the dataset exceeded 14,000, evaluation of differences was based on "meaningful differences" of greater than .05. Only four of the twelve travel-related variables showed a meaningful difference between time periods. These variables included, "money spent on travel is well spent," "having fun and being entertained," " high quality restaurants," and "shopping." The remaining variables revealed a practical difference of less than .05 and were therefore deemed not significantly different. "Having fun and being entertained" was the most important travel-related variable. The mean score on this variable was .22 which represented a score of better than "somewhat important" but less than "important" on the standardized scale. Canadians were more likely to find this important in 1995 than in 1983 (.17 and .24 respectively). There was a difference of .07. This suggests that Canadians moved from feeling that having fun and being entertained was "somewhat important" closer to "important."

The least important travel-related variable was "people I encounter speak my same language." The overall mean was .51. Respondents did not feel strongly one way or the other toward people speaking the same language. Canadians in 1995 ranked this statistically lower in importance than in 1983.

Agreement with the statement "money spent on travel is well spent" indicated a meaningful difference of .07 between the two time periods. Canadians tended to rate this as more important in 1995 than they did in 1983.

"High quality restaurants" became less important over time. The importance of high quality restaurants declined by .05 from 1983 to 1995. Canadians tended to rate this less important in 1995 than they did in 1983. This difference translates into a difference of less than half of the scale value between strongly agrees to agree.

Finally, "shopping" became more important over time. The difference between 1983 and 1995 was a difference of .05 again which represented a difference of .15 on the original scale. This suggests that Canadians are moving closer to "important" from "somewhat important."

(Tab
is w
they
"bez
imn
шр
Ta
Tr Ph
*\
*] Ha
Na
Bo
nı Bi
Fi
Sł
N
M
A: O
$\frac{0}{5c}$
im
*
.75
bet
ev-
• 10

The standard deviations for all twelve variables ranked between .19 and .27

(Table 14). The variable with the smallest standard deviation was "money spent on travel is well spent." This suggests that there was less variability in the responses to how much they agreed with this statement. The variable with the largest standard deviation was "beaches for swimming and sunning" indicating a greater range in responses to the importance of this variable in pleasure travel.

Philosophy, Benefits and Interest	Std.	Std.	Std. Dev
	Dev.	Dev.	Pooled
	1983	1 995	Data
*Money spent on travel is well spent	.19	.16	.19
*Important people speak my language	.23	.27	.24
Having fun, being entertained	.22	.21	.22
National/provincial parks	.25	.24	.25
Beaches for swimming and sunning	.27	.25	.27
High quality restaurants	.25	.26	.26
Budget accommodations	.24	.25	.24
First class accommodations	.24	.25	.25
Shopping	.25	.25	.25
Nightlife and entertainment	.26'	.25	.25
Museums and art galleries	.26	.23	.25
Amusement and theme parks	.25	.24	.24
Overall standard deviation	.24	.24	.24

Table 14. Standard Deviations of Travel Philosophy, Benefits Sought and Travel Interests for 1983 Study, 1995 Study and Pooled Data

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 = "somewhat important," .66 = "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

* Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neither agree nor disagree," .75 = "disagree," and 1= "strongly disagree."

Age and Travel-Related Variables

The analysis of variance procedure was used to test for statistical differences

between means of the responses to the travel-related variables across subgroups. The

examination of age and the 12 travel-related variables was performed on the pooled data.

Post hoc tests were not performed because due to the large sample size small differences resulted in significant differences among groups (e.g., difference of .02). Therefore, instead of post hoc tests practical differences were used to reveal differences. A practical difference of .05 was deemed a meaningful difference. All twelve means were significantly different, meaning that there was a statistical difference between at least one variable and the overall mean. On some of the variables, there was a negative linear relationship. The importance of the travel interests, "national and provincial parks," "first class accommodations," "nightlife and entertainment" and "amusement and theme parks," for example, was *less* important with age. One of the variables had a positive linear relationship. The importance of "museums and art galleries" was *more* important with age. Table 15 shows the mean scores based on age, the significance level of the ANOVA and the practical difference between the highest mean score and the lowest mean score for each age category.

Again, because statistical differences are sensitive to sample size, analysis of meaningful differences was important. Analysis using differences between the highest mean score and the lowest mean score in each age category illustrated a more meaningful difference in scores. Seven of the twelve travel-related variables indicated differences greater than .05. These differences were meaningful for the following variables, "important that people speak my language," "having fun and being entertained," "national and provincial parks," "beaches for swimming and sunning," "first class accommodations," "nightlife and entertainment" and "amusement and theme parks." On six of the seven variables, the largest differences were seen between the oldest age group (65+) and either the youngest group (15-19) or the second youngest group (20-24).

Philosophy,	Age	Age	Age	Age	Age	Age	Age	All	Sig.	Diff.
Benefits and	15-	20-	25-	35-	45-	55-	65+			high-
Interest	19	24	34	44	54	64				low
Statements										
*Money spent on	.42	.42	.41 *	.42	.42	.42	.43 ^a	.42	.010	.02
travel is well										
spent										
*Important	.52	.53	.53	.54 ^a	.51	.48	.45 ª	.51	.000	.09
people speak my										
language										
Having fun,	.15ª	.15	.21	.23	.25	.21	.26 ^a	.22	.000	.11
being entertained										
National/provinc	.27ª	.27	.30	.31	.31	.31	.33ª	.30	.000	.06
ial parks							_			
Beaches for	.26	.24 *	.25	.29	.33	.29	.45ª	.31	.000	.21
swimming and										
sunning							0			
High quality	.45 *	.42	.41 *	.41 *	.42	.44	.45 ª	.43	.001	.04
restaurants										
Budget	.50 *	.49	.49	.48	.46 *	.48	.48	.48	.000	.04
accommodations							- - 9			
First class	.29ª	.31	.32	.33	.33	.35	.37*	.33	.000	.08
accommodations					• • •					
Shopping	.34 *	.34 *	.35	.36	.34 *	.35	.37 *	.35	.008	.03
Nightlife and	.31	.30 *	.38	.43	.47	.50	.55°	.43	.000	.25
entertainment	9	9	9							
Museums and art	.44 *	.44 *	.44 *	.42	.42	.40 *	.41	.42	.000	.04
galleries		•••								
Amusement and	.37"	.39	.41	.43	.45	.48	.50"	.43	.000	.13
theme parks	0.4	0.6.8	•••	•••	• •	• •	40.8	• •	000	6 -
Overall Mean	.36*	.36*	.38	.39	.39	.39	.42 *	.39	.000	.06

 Table 15. Means for Significant Relationships between Age and Travel

 Philosophy, Benefits Sought and Interest Statements

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 = "somewhat important," .66 = "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

* Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neither agree nor disagree," .75 = "disagree," and 1= "strongly disagree."

(a) indicates where largest differences between age groups exist

.

The two variables which indicated the greatest difference in scores between the oldest age group and the youngest age group were "beaches for swimming and sunning" and "nightlife and entertainment" (difference of .21 and .25 respectively).

Generation and Travel-Related Variables

The analysis of variance procedure was used to test for differences between means of the responses to the travel-related variables across generational subgroups. The examination of generation and the 12 travel-related variables was performed on the pooled data. Post hoc tests were not performed because due to the large sample size small differences resulted in significant differences among groups (e.g., difference of .02). Therefore, instead of post hoc tests, practical differences were used to reveal differences. A practical difference of .05 was deemed a meaningful difference. Analysis of variance revealed that the subgroup means differed from each other and from the grand mean.

For the travel-related variables "money spent on travel is well spent," "having fun, being entertained," "national and provincial parks," "beaches for swimming and sunning," "first class accommodations," "shopping," "nightlife and entertainment," and "amusement and theme parks," younger generations rated these interests more important than older generations. The importance of budget accommodations in pleasure travel was more important to older generations than younger generations. All other variables had no pattern relative to generation. Table 16 displays the mean scores based on generation, the significance level of the ANOVA and the practical difference between the highest mean score and the lowest mean score.

As with the previous two analyses, examination of meaningful differences was an important step to analyzing the true differences based on generation. Nine of the twelve

travel-related variables indicated differences greater than .05. These differences were meaningful for the following variables, "money spent on travel is well spent," "important that people speak my language," "having fun and being entertained," "beaches for swimming and sunning," "high quality restaurants," "first class accommodations," "shopping," "nightlife and entertainment," and "amusement and theme parks."

- Intosophy, Denemos Bou							
Philosophy, Benefits	Gen X	Baby	Silent	GI	All	Sig.	Diff.
and Interest Statements		Boomer					high-
							low
*Money spent on travel	.39 ^a	.42	.43	.44 ^a	.42	.000	.05
is well spent							
*Important people speak	.52	.53 ª	.52	.46 ^a	.51	.000	.07
my language							
Having fun, being	.14 ^a	.19	.25	.27 ª	.22	.000	.13
entertained							
National/provincial parks	.29 ª	.29	.31	.32 ª	.30	.000	.03
Beaches for swimming	.28	.25 ^a	.30	.43 ^a	.31	.000	.18
and sunning							
High quality restaurants	.46 ^a	.42	.41 ^a	.44	.42	.000	.05
Budget accommodations	.49	.49 ^a	.47 ^a	.48	.48	.002	.02
First class	.27 ª	.32	.34	.36 ^a	.33	.000	.09
accommodations							
Shopping	.32 ^a	.35	.36	.37 ^a	.35	.000	.05
Nightlife and	.36 ª	.36	.45	.54 ª	.43	.000	.18
entertainment							
Museums and art	.44 ^a	.44	.42	.40 ^a	.42	.000	.04
galleries							
Amusement and theme	.39 ª	.41	.44	.49 ^a	.43	.000	.10
parks							
Overall Mean	.36 ^a	.37	.39	.42 ^a	.39	.000	.06
0 1 0 1 1 0 4		22 22 66	1		1 1 22 6	6 46 1	··· ·· ·· ·· ··

 Table 16. Means for Significant Relationships between Generation and Travel

 Philosophy, Benefits Sought and Interest Statements

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 = "somewhat important," .66 = "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

* Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neither agree nor disagree," .75 = "disagree," and 1= "strongly disagree."

(a) indicates where largest differences between age groups exist

On six of the nine variables, the largest differences were seen between the GI generation and Generation X. In all cases, the GI generation ranked the following variables as less important than Generation X, "money spent on travel is well spent," "having fun and being entertained," "first class accommodations," "shopping," "nightlife and entertainment" and "amusement and theme parks." For "it is important that people speak my language" and "beaches for swimming and sunning," the greatest difference was between Baby Boomers and the GI Generation. In both cases, the GI generation felt these activities were less important than the Baby Boomer generation. The difference between the Silent Generation and the GI Generation was greatest for the importance of "high quality restaurants." The Silent Generation ranked "high quality restaurants" more important than the GI Generation.

Using Different Methods of Cohort Analysis

Cohort analysis is used in this study to determine the amount of variance explained by the variables age, period and generation. There are several methods to determine the amount of explained variation. Methods, which are generally accepted, can be both statistical and non-statistical in nature. The two most common methods include the triad method using cohort tables or dummy variable regression. The triad method for cohort analysis is generally accepted as a non-statistical method, this method "eyeballs" the data to detect patterns. This study used a variation of the triad method in order to get a "picture" of the data.

The second method that is widely accepted is regression. This technique is in the form of dummy variable regression and provides estimates of the effects on a dependent

variable. To perform this analysis, the effects of either two age levels, two generations or two periods are assumed to be equal. The assumption that the effects are equal is not a problem; however, the technique assumes that age, generation and period are not additive (do not interact). That means that age effects are the same for all generation and periods; that generation effects are the same for all ages and periods and that period effects are the same for all ages and generations. This assumption is not realistic; nor after using analysis of variance was it found to be true.

In addition, the majority of research which uses dummy variable regression in cohort analysis has used subgroup means to perform the regression analysis. One of the problems with this is that subgroup means do not reveal how much variation there is *within* subgroups. It is important to note that failure to report within group variation can be misleading. In fact, individual variation, on average, accounts for 95% of the variation in scores. Therefore, subgroup means isolate the five percent variation between groups and fits the regression line through the group means. Even though there are problems with this technique it appears to be the most common method used in marketing research. The cohort studies that are most widely accepted (Rentz & Reynolds, 1981, 1991; Rentz, Reynolds, & Stout, 1983) have all used subgroup means. It is important to note, however, that the R²s reported in these articles are much higher than one would expect if individual scores were used. Thus, caution should be taken when this method is used to forecasting future behavior. Considerable errors could be made if future efforts were made based on between group variations of only five percent.

Therefore, in order to reveal the within group variation and account for the relationship among the three independent variables, a three-way analysis of variance

procedure was used in this study. This method is accepted in the literature; however rarely used (Glenn, 1977). This method was used as opposed to dummy variable regression because it violated fewer assumptions and revealed more information. Typically, analysis of variance is used in experimental design; however, in cohort analysis the examination of effects is post hoc or after the fact.

Multicollinearity as a Complexity of Cohort Analysis

Many authors have suggested that "the influences of cohort membership, age and period is appealing however, operationally complex" (Rentz & Reynolds, 1991, p.18). The effects of generation, age and period are confounded in traditional research. Longitudinal designs using repeated measurements or independent samples of the same generations, confound the effects of age and the effects of period. Mason et al. (1973) presented a lucid discussion of the implications of confounding. They showed that the confounding makes the parameter estimation in most statistical models impracticable. Multicollinearity exists when there is a high correlation between independent variables. The R² is not affected by multicollinearity; however, parameter estimates are attenuated (under estimated). The major problem with multicollinearity is that the effects of age, period and generation can not be separated and therefore problems are caused when interpreting the amount of variance explained by each of the effects. According to Kennedy (1998), there are two options for researchers faced with multicollinearity: (1) do nothing or (2) incorporate additional information. The second option includes any of the following alternatives: obtaining more data, formalizing relationships among regressors (independent variables), specifying a relationship among some parameters, dropping a

variable, incorporating estimates from other studies, forming a principal component, and shrinking the OLS estimates.

As with all cohort studies, multicollinearity is a rather central problem. One statistic that demonstrates the extent of multicollinearity is a correlation table. The correlations between the three independent variables (age, generation and period) in this study revealed a very high correlation between age and generation (r=.91). The correlation between age and period was negative and not as strong; however, due to sample size, it was still statistically significant (r= -.50). The final correlation between generation and period was slightly less than age and period; however still significantly different (r=.32).

 Table 17. Multicollinearity of Age, Generation and Period

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Age	Period	Generation
Age	1.00		
Period	50**	1.00	
Generation	.91**	.32**	1.00
**	011 1 0		

****** significant at .01 level of significance

Using Cohort Tables as a Method of Cohort Analysis

Cohort analysis using cohort tables should be "viewed as a method of research, not a statistical technique" (Rentz & Reynolds, 1981, p. 63). A cohort table involves simultaneous process and cross-sectional comparisons. The ability to examine developmental (age) and cohort differences simultaneously is regarded as a unique property of cohort tables (Riley et al., 1972). In this study, however, all three effects are presented together. The main reason is because the categories of age groups (seven categories in increments of 10) are not clearly representative of the generations defined by Strauss and Howe. Because the original surveys had age categorized as a nominal variable, separation into the exact dates outlined by Strauss and Howe was not possible. Therefore, overlapping age categories were dropped and those that clearly fell into the four generations outlined by Strauss and Howe were kept. The best way to communicate the results in a cohort table was by examining the bivariate relationships separately.

The tables are constructed so that subgroup means are reported for each of the age, period and generations on each of the travel-related variables (Tables 18-29). SPSS for Windows was used to generate the subgroup means. The interpretation of the tables is not straightforward. The analysis is performed by looking for patterns in the data. If the patterns in both time periods are the same the variables can be treated independently and explained independently; however, if the patterns are not the same, the independent variables must be treated as an interaction effect.

Results of Analysis Using Cohort Tables

Money Spent on Travel is Well Spent

There was no particular pattern based on age or generation. In fact, upon examination of all three tables, it would appear that period effects play the largest role in agreement with the statement "money spent on travel is well spent." "Money spent on travel is well spent" had an overall mean of .44 in 1983 and a mean of .37 in 1995. This represented an absolute difference of .06. Using the "standard" set forth in the previous section this appears to be a meaningful difference. Canadians in 1995 were more likely to "agree" with the statement.

Canadians between 25 and 34 were the most likely to agree with the statement "money spent on travel is well spent" in 1983 (Table 18a). In 1995, Canadians between 35 and 44 were the most likely to agree that "money spent on travel is well spent." In 1983, the Baby Boomer and Silent Generations agreed most with the statement that "money spent on travel is well spent." In 1995, the Baby Boomer Generation was most likely to agree with the statement. Examination of Table 18c revealed that as each generation aged, they were more likely to agree that "money spent on travel is well spent."

Money spent on Traver is wen Spent			
1983	1995	Pooled Data	
0.44	0.39	0.42	
0.44	0.37	0.42	
0.43	0.36	0.41	
0.43	0.35	0.42	
0.44	0.38	0.42	
0.44	0.36	0.42	
0.45	0.37	0.43	
0.44	0.37	0.42	
	1983 0.44 0.43 0.43 0.44 0.43 0.44 0.43 0.44	198319950.440.390.440.370.430.360.430.350.440.380.440.360.450.370.440.37	

Table 18a. Age by Period on "Money spent on Travel is Well Spent"

Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neutral,"

.75 = "disagree" and 1= "strongly disagree."

Table 18b.	Generations	by Period o	on "Money	Spent on	Travel is	Well
Spent"			-	-		

Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.44	0.37	0.39
Baby Boomer	0.43	0.36	0.41
Silent Generation	0.43	0.37	0.43
GI Generation	0.44	0.37	0.44
Total	0.44	0.37	0.40

Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neutral,"

.75 = "disagree" and 1= "strongly disagree."

Age Class	Generation	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.42				0.42
20-24	0.37	0.42			0.42
25-34	0.36	0.42			0.41
35-44		0.38	0.43		0.42
45-54		0.37	0.41		0.42
55-64			0.36	0.44	0.42
65+				0.43	0.43
Total	0.39	0.42	0.43	0.44	0.42

 Table 18c. Age by Generation on "Money Spent on Travel is Well Spent"

Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neutral," .75 = "disagree" and 1= "strongly disagree."

A graph illustrating the effects between generation and period illustrates "no interaction" between these two variables (Figure 6). A chart of all three variables would be three-dimensional and none of the lines would intersect.



Figure 6. Graphical Representation of Interaction Effects between Generation and Period for "Money Spent on Travel is Well Spent."

Important that People Speak my Language

Overall, agreement with the statement " it is important that people speak my language" was greater in 1983 than in 1995 (Table 19a). It appeared that in the 1983 data Canadians were more likely to agree with the statement that "it is important that people I encounter speak my same language" the older they got. The statement that it is important that people speak my language was more agreed upon by the two oldest age groups in 1983 than other age groups. Whereas, in 1995, the opposite appeared to be true, that younger Canadians agreed more with the same statement. Examination of the patterns across both time periods for the seven age groups does not reveal a consistent pattern. This may suggest there are interaction effects present.

In 1983, the GI Generation was the most likely to agree with the importance of encountering people their same language, whereas, in 1995, the GI Generation was most likely to agree that it is important that people speak my same language (Table 19b). Examination of a cross section of age and generation revealed that there were no consistent patterns within generations or age groups (Table 19c).

0.0			
Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.52	0.52	0.52
20-24	0.53	0.53	0.53
25-34	0.53	0.52	0.53
35-44	0.53	0.55	0.54
45-54	0.51	0.53	0.51
55-64	0.47	0.53	0.48
65+	0.43	0.55	0.45
Total	0.50	0.54	0.51

 Table 19a. Age by Period for "Important That People Speak my Language"

Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neutral,"

.75 = "disagree" and 1= "strongly disagree."

Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.52	0.52	0.52
Baby Boomer	0.53	0.54	0.53
Silent Generation	0.52	0.53	0.52
GI Generation	0.45	0.55	0.46
Total	0.50	0.54	0.51

Table 19b. Generation by Period for "Important People Speak my Language"

Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neutral,"

.75 = "disagree" and 1= "strongly disagree."

Age Class	Gen X	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
-		Boomer			
15-19	0.52				0.52
20-24	0.53	0.53			0.53
25-34	0.51	0.53			0.53
35-44		0.55	0.53		0.54
45-54		0.53	0.51		0.51
55-64			0.53	0.47	0.48
65+				0.45	0.45
Total	0.52	0.53	0.52	0.46	0.51

Table 19c. Age by Generation for "People Speak my Same Language"

Scale 0-1 where 0= "strongly agree," .25 = "agree," .50 = "neutral," .75 = "disagree" and 1= "strongly disagree."

Having Fun and Being Entertained

The importance of "having fun and being entertained" appeared to have two effects, an age effect as well as a period effect. In the pooled data, "having fun and being entertained" was overall more important for younger Canadians than it was for older Canadians (Table 20a). Examination of the data for the two years revealed that similar patterns failed to exist. Again this lack of consistency in patterns suggests an interaction between the two variables may exist.

Examination of generations over time indicated there was no consistent pattern in responses to "having fun and being entertained" (Table 20b). In 1983, each consecutive

generation rated "having fun and being entertained" as less important, however, in 1995,

this pattern was not as consistent.

Examination of the age and generation table revealed each generation was lower

than the next on most of the scores (Table 20c). No real pattern existed for each

generation as it aged.

A slight pattern in responses over time and as one ages may suggest a

generational effect. The combination of changes in the environment (time period) as one

ages might be interpreted as generational effects.

Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data	
15-19	0.13	0.17	0.15	
20-24	0.15	0.14	0.15	
25-34	0.22	0.17	0.21	
35-44	0.25	0.16	0.23	
45-54	0.27	0.19	0.25	
55-64	0.29	0.18	0.21	
65+	0.28	0.18	0.26	
Total	0.24	0.17	0.22	

Table 20a. Age by Period for "Having Fun, Being Entertained"

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 20b. Generation by Period for "Having Fun, B	eing Entertained"
--	-------------------

	•		
Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.13	0.15	0.14
Baby Boomer	0.20	0.18	0.19
Silent Generation	0.26	0.19	0.25
GI Generation	0.28	0.18	0.27
Total	0.24	0.17	0.22

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
-	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.15				0.15
20-24	0.14	0.16			0.15
25-34	0.15	0.21			0.21
35-44		0.16	0.25		0.23
45-54		0.18	0.26		0.25
55-64			0.18	0.29	0.27
65+				0.26	0.26
Total	0.15	0.19	0.25	0.27	0.22

 Table 20c. Age by Generation for "Having Fun, Being Entertained"

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

The graphical representation of the relationship between generation and period for the variable "having fun and being entertained" illustrates the large interaction effects (Figure 7). The graph indicates a strong negative linear relationship between generation and importance of "having fun and being entertained" in 1983 and a slightly weaker negative linear relationship in 1995. This suggests that older generations are less likely to agree that "having fun and being entertained" is an important part of pleasure travel.



Figure 7. Graphical Representation of Interaction Effects of Generation and Period for "Having Fun and Being Entertained."
National and Provincial Parks

Over time, the importance of "national and provincial parks" has declined from 1983 to 1995. The absolute change from 1983 to 1995 was a decline of .04 (overall mean₁₉₉₅ – mean₁₉₈₃). Examination of the pooled data indicated that as Canadians age they are less likely to agree that "national and provincial parks" are important to their pleasure travel. This pattern is not consistent at either time period but when the data are pooled reveals more of a linear pattern.

"National and provincial parks" were more important for Generation Xers and Baby Boomers than for any other generation (Table 21b). In the 1983 data, Generation X was more likely to agree that "national and provincial parks" are important whereas, in 1995, Baby Boomers and the Silent Generation were more likely to agree "national and provincial parks" are important to pleasure travel.

Examination of Table 21c revealed that for three of the four generations (Generation X, Baby Boomers, and GI Generation) that "national and provincial parks" became less important as they aged, whereas, for the Silent Generation, "national and provincial parks" became slightly more important. However, using the standard of an absolute difference of .05 to measure meaningful differences would suggest that this is probably not a meaningful difference.

Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.24	0.32	0.27
20-24	0.26	0.32	0.27
25-34	0.30	0.31	0.30
35-44	0.26	0.32	0.31
45-54	0.28	0.32	0.31
55-64	0.32	0.30	0.31
65+	0.33	0.33	0.33
Total	0.28	0.32	0.30

 Table 21a. Age by Period for National and Provincial Parks

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 21b. G	Generation	bv	Period	for	National	l and	Provi	incial Parks
--------------	------------	----	--------	-----	----------	-------	-------	--------------

	v		
Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.24	0.32	0.29
Baby Boomer	0.26	0.31	0.29
Silent Generation	0.31	0.31	0.31
GI Generation	0.32	0.33	0.32
Total	0.28	0.32	0.30

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Age Class	Gen	Gen Baby Silent GI			
-	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.27	····			0.27
20-24	0.32	0.26			0.27
25-34	0.31	0.30			0.30
35-44		0.32	0.31		0.31
45-54		0.31	0.31		0.31
55-64			0.30	0.32	0.31
65+				0.33	0.33
Total	0.29	0.29	0.31	0.32	0.30

Table 21c. Age by Generation for National and Provincial Parks

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Beaches for Swimming and Sunning

The largest effect on the importance of "beaches for swimming and sunning" in pleasure travel appeared to be age effects (Table 22a). In 1983, younger Canadians were more likely to rank "beaches for swimming and sunning" as important (Table 22a). In 1995, the pattern was not as clear. Those between 20-25 and 35-44 years of age ranked "beaches for swimming and sunning" more important than any other age group.

The overall importance of "beaches for swimming and sunning" to Canadians remained fairly consistent over the 12 year period; however closer examination revealed that in 1983 Canadians responses ranged from close to very important to much less than somewhat important; whereas in 1995, the scores all hovered around "somewhat important."

Table 22c indicates that as each generation ages, they are less likely to find "beaches for swimming and sunning" as important to their pleasure travel. Table 22c revealed a fairly consistent pattern in age effects for each generation. In addition, older generations rated "beaches for swimming and sunning" slightly less important than the younger generations.

Lance Laa. Age by I	c by I critica for Deaches for Swimming and		Journma
Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.19	0.35	0.26
20-24	0.22	0.30	0.24
25-34	0.24	0.31	0.25
35-44	0.28	0.30	0.29
45-54-	0.33	0.33	0.33
55-64	0.40	0.34	0.29
65+	0.48	0.33	0.45
Total	0.31	0.32	0.31

Table 22a. Age by Period for Beaches for Swimming and Sunning

Scale O-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

	•		-
Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.19	0.31	0.28
Baby Boomer	0.23	0.31	0.25
Silent Generation	0.30	0.33	0.30
GI Generation	0.44	0.33	0.43
Total	0.31	0.32	0.31

Table 22b. Generation by Period for Beaches for Swimming and Sunning

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 22c. Age by G	eneration for	IUI IUI DEACHES IUI SWIMMING AND SUM		nning	
Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
-	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.26				0.26
20-24	0.29	0.22			0.24
25-34	0.29	0.25			0.27
35-44		0.30	0.28		0.29
45-54		0.32	0.33		0.33
55-64			0.33	0.40	0.39
65+				0.45	0.45
Total	0.28	0.25	0.30	0.43	0.43
0 1 0 1 1 0 //	•	11 00 1 11			

Table 22c. Age by Generation for Beaches for Swimming and Sunning

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

When examining a graph of the relationship between age and period for the variable "beaches for swimming and sunning," it was apparent that large interaction effects were present. The graph indicated a strong linear relationship between age and importance of "beaches for swimming and sunning" in 1983 and a less distinct relationship in 1995 (Figure 8).



Figure 8. Graphical Representation of Interaction Effects of Age and Period for "Beaches for Swimming and Sunning"

High Quality Restaurants

The importance of "high quality restaurants" was more important in 1983 than in 1995. An overall change in score from .41 to a score of .46 suggests that Canadians found "high quality restaurants" more important in 1983. The scores suggest that Canadians rate "high quality restaurants" somewhat important to their pleasure travel. The absolute difference between 1983 and 1995 was .03. Based on the previous standard, this does not indicate a meaningful difference. Canadians between 45-54 in 1983 and 35-44 year old Canadians in 1995 (Table 23a) rated "high quality restaurants" more important. Members of these age categories were also members of the Silent Generation. The Silent Generation tended to rate "high quality restaurants" more important than any other generation, although as they age it becomes less important to them (Table 23b and 23c). There was no consistent pattern in responses from one generation to the next over time, however one consistent pattern was that as each generation aged, it rated "high quality restaurants" less important (Table 23c).

Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.43	0.49	0.45
20-24	0.41	0.47	0.42
25-34	0.40	0.46	0.42
35-44	0.40	0.45	0.41
45-54	0.39	0.47	0.41
55-64	0.43	0.46	0.44
65+	0.45	0.46	0.45
Total	0.41	0.46	0.42

 Table 23a. Age by Period for High Quality Restaurants

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Ocheration in thigh At	amy nestaur	
1983	1995	Pooled Data
0.43	0.43	0.46
0.40	0.46	0.42
0.40	0.44	0.41
0.44	0.46	0.44
0.41	0.46	0.42
	1983 0.43 0.40 0.40 0.44 0.41	1983 1995 0.43 0.43 0.40 0.46 0.44 0.46 0.41 0.46

Table 23b. Age by Generation for High Quality Restaurants

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
•	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.45				0.45
20-24	0.47	0.41			0.42
25-34	0.47	0.41			0.41
35-44		0.45	0.40		0.41
45-54		0.48	0.40		0.42
55-64			0.46	0.43	0.44
65+				0.45	0.45
Total	0.46	0.42	0.41	0.44	0.42

 Table 23c. Age by Generation for High Quality Restaurants

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Budget Accommodations

The importance of "budget accommodations" in pleasure travel was relatively consistent over time. In fact, examination of the overall mean scores in each time period revealed no difference in the rating of the importance of "budget accommodations" (Table 24a).

Scrutiny of the responses to the importance of "budget accommodations" by each age group in the two time periods revealed no consistent patterns. All responses tended to hover around a neutral response; however, responses varied by age category (Table 24a).

"Budget accommodations" were most important to the Silent Generation in 1983 and both the Silent Generation and the GI Generation in 1995 (Table 24b). No clear pattern existed when the combination of age and generation were examined (Table 24c). This suggests a possible interaction.

Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.50	0.50	0.50
20-24	0.49	0.48	0.49
25-34	0.49	0.50	0.49
35-44	0.47	0.49	0.48
45-54	0.46	0.46	0.46
55-64	0.48	0.47	0.48
65+	0.49	0.47	0.48
Total	0.48	0.48	0.48

Table 24a. Age by Period for Budget Accommodations

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 24b. Generation by Period for Budget Ac

Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.50	0.49	0.49
Baby Boomer	0.49	0.48	0.49
Silent Generation	0.47	0.47	0.47
GI Generation	0.48	0.47	0.48
Total	0.48	0.48	0.48

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table	24c.	Age by	Generation	for Budget	Accommodations
-------	------	--------	------------	------------	----------------

Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
-	Х	Boomer			
15-19	0.50				0.50
20-24	0.48	0.49			0.49
25-34	0.49	0.49			0.49
35-44		0.47	0.48		0.48
45-54		0.47	0.46		0.46
55-64			0.47	0.48	0.48
65+				0.48	0.48
Total	0.49	0.48	0.47	0.48	0.48

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

First Class Accommodations

The importance of "first class accommodations" in pleasure travel gained importance over time (Table 25a). Overall, Canadians rated "first class accommodations" more important in 1995 than they did in 1983 (Table 25a). In fact, scores on this variable indicate that "first class accommodations" are fairly important to pleasure travel (mean₁₉₉₅=.29).

When examining the change in importance within the generations over time, it is interesting to note that Generation X had the most drastic change in their rating of the importance of "first class accommodations." In fact, the percentage change got smaller for each older generation. This suggests a period effect that is affecting younger Canadians at a greater rate than older Canadians (Table 25b).

Table 25c indicates that "first class accommodations" is more important for Generation X in their middle years of the generation and for the remaining three generations "first class accommodations" becomes less important as they age. Examination of the total scores for each generation reveals that each consecutive generation rates "first class accommodations" less important than the previous generation and that this also becomes less important as one ages (Table 25c).

Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.31	0.26	0.29
20-24	0.32	0.23	0.31
25-34	0.33	0.27	0.32
35-44	0.34	0.31	0.33
45-54	0.34	0.31	0.33
55-64	0.35	0.33	0.35
65+	0.37	0.35	0.37
Total	0.34	0.29	0.33

 Table 25a. Age by Period for First Class Accommodations

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 = "somewhat important,"

.66 = "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 25b. Generation	by Period for First Cla	ss Accommodations
-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------

Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.31	0.25	0.27
Baby Boomer	0.33	0.30	0.32
Silent Generation	0.34	0.33	0.34
GI Generation	0.36	0.35	0.36
Total	0.34	0.29	0.33

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
0	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.29				0.29
20-24	0.24	0.32			0.31
25-34	0.25	0.33			0.32
35-44		0.31	0.34		0.33
45-54		0.30	0.34		0.33
55-64			0.33	0.35	0.35
65+				0.37	0.37
Total	0.27	0.32	0.34	0.36	0.33

Table 25c. Age by Generation for First Class Accommodations

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Shopping

Overall, "shopping" gained in importance from 1983 to 1995. In 1983, Canadians rated "shopping" as a component of pleasure travel as a little less than "somewhat important." In 1995, Canadians rated "shopping" as slightly better than "somewhat important." The importance of "shopping" to Canadians increased from 1983 to 1995. An absolute difference in mean scores from 1983 to 1995 suggests this difference is a meaningful difference (greater than .05).

Examination of Table 26a revealed that neither time period showed consistent patterns across age groups. In 1983, the youngest age group (15-19) indicated "shopping" was the most important. In 1995, the age groups from 35-65+ indicated that "shopping" was more important than the younger age groups.

Table 26b indicates that in 1983, Generation X rated shopping most important and in 1995 all generations rated shopping about the same level of importance. The pooled data revealed a increase in importance from the youngest generation to the oldest generation; however, closer examination indicates that each period is distinctly different from the other.

Table 26c suggests that for the three youngest generations (Generation X, Baby Boomers and Silent) as they aged, they rated shopping more important. For the oldest generation, the GI Generation, shopping became slightly less important with age.

Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.32	0.36	0.34
20-24	0.34	0.30	0.34
25-34	0.36	0.32	0.35
35-44	0.37	0.31	0.36
45-54	0.35	0.31	0.34
55-64	0.36	0.31	0.35
65+	0.39	0.31	0.37
Total	0.36	0.31	0.35

Table 26a. Age by Period for Shopping

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 26b. Generation by Period for Shopping

	-		
Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.32	0.32	0.32
Baby Boomer	0.36	0.31	0.35
Silent Generation	0.36	0.31	0.36
GI Generation	0.37	0.31	0.37
Total	0.36	0.31	0.35

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

FF						
Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall	
	X	Boomer				
15-19	0.34				0.34	
20-24	0.30	0.34			0.34	
25-34	0.30	0.36			0.35	
35-44		0.31	0.37		0.36	
45-54		0.31	0.35		0.34	
55-64			0.31	0.36	0.35	
65+				0.37	0.37	
Total	0.32	0.35	0.36	0.37	0.35	

Table 26c. Age by Generation for Shopping

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Nightlife and Entertainment

Overall, "nightlife and entertainment" in pleasure travel was slightly more important in 1995 than it was in 1983 (Table 27a). "Nightlife and entertainment" had an overall mean of .43 in 1983 and a mean of .42 in 1995. The absolute difference of .01 suggests that this difference is probably not a meaningful difference. Canadians rated "nightlife and entertainment" as a fairly neutral component to their pleasure travel.

Upon examination of all three tables, it would appear that age effects play the largest role in the importance of "nightlife and entertainment." In 1983, there is a clearly negative linear relationship between age and importance of "nightlife and entertainment." Thus, as one ages, "nightlife and entertainment" becomes less important. In 1995, the relationship is not as clear. Canadians who are between the ages of 20-24 and 55-64 rated "nightlife and entertainment" most important. The pooled data would suggest a negative linear relationship between age and importance of "nightlife and entertainment."

Examination of Table 27b indicates a relationship between generation and importance of "nightlife and entertainment." This relationship is more clear and greater in 1983 than in 1995. In 1995, the ratings are more clustered around the mean and less variable. Thus, the differences in the two periods would suggest the presence of an interaction effect between generation and period.

Investigation of the age by generation table (Table 27c) illustrated that for each generation, "nightlife and entertainment" becomes less important as they age. This is consistent within each generation and within time periods.

Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.23	0.42	0.31
20-24	0.27	0.40	0.30
25-34	0.37	0.42	0.38
35-44	0.44	0.41	0.43
45-54	0.48	0.44	0.47
55-64	0.53	0.40	0.50
65+	0.58	0.42	0.55
Total	0.43	0.42	0.43

Table 27a. Age by Period for Nightlife and Entertainment

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 27b. Generation by Period for Nightlife and Ent	Entertainment	nt
---	---------------	----

Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
Generation X	0.23	0.41	0.36
Baby Boomer	0.35	0.42	0.36
Silent Generation	0.45	0.41	0.45
GI Generation	0.56	0.42	0.54
Total	0.43	0.42	0.43

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
- ,	Χ	Boomer			
15-19	0.31				0.31
20-24	0.40	0.27			0.30
25-34	0.41	0.38			0.38
35-44		0.41			0.43
45-54		0.44	0.44		0.47
55-64			0.48	0.52	0.50
65+				0.55	0.55
Total	0.36	0.36	0.45	0.54	0.43

 Table 27c. Age by Generation for Nightlife and Entertainment

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

,

A graph of the relationship between age and period for the variable "nightlife and entertainment" illustrates the large interaction effects (Figure 9). The interaction effects are represented by the intersection of the lines. The graph indicated a strong linear relationship between age and importance of "nightlife and entertainment" in 1983 and a less distinct relationship in 1995.



Figure 9. Graphical Representation of Interaction Effects of Age and Period for "Nightlife and Entertainment."

Museums and Art Galleries

The largest effect for the change in the importance of "museums and art galleries" appears to be change in period (Table 28a). The mean score in 1983 was .40 while the mean score in 1995 was .45. This represents an absolute change of .05, a meaningful difference. "Museums and art galleries" were rated as more important in 1983 than in 1995.

Table 28a revealed the oldest two age groups rated "museums and art galleries" as most important (.33 and .39 respectively) in 1983. In 1995, those between the ages of 34-

44 rated "museums and art galleries" as most important. No clear linear relationship is apparent in either of the time periods. However, the pooled data suggests that "museums" and art galleries" are more important to older Canadians than to younger Canadians

Examination of Table 28b indicates minimal changes in responses across the generations and across time. The GI Generation had the greatest change between 1983 and 1995 in their rating of the importance of "museums and art galleries." Baby Boomers were the most likely to rate "museums and art galleries" consistently over time. "Museums and art galleries" became less important to all generations other than the Baby Boomers as they aged (Table 28c).

Table 200, 1160 by I cliba for Mascalls and 111 Gancies					
Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data		
15-19	0.43	0.47	0.44		
20-24	0.44	0.45	0.44		
25-34	0.44	0.47	0.44		
35-44	0.41	0.43	0.42		
45-54	0.33	0.45	0.42		
55-64	0.39	0.44	0.40		
65+	0.40	0.45	0.41		
Total	0.40	0.45	0.42		

Table 28a Age by Period for Museums and Art Calleries

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," 66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 280. Generation by Period for Museums and Art Galleries					
Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data		
Generation X	0.43	0.47	0.44		
Baby Boomer	0.43	0.44	0.44		
Silent Generation	0.41	0.45	0.42		
GI Generation	0.39	0.45	0.40		
Total	0.40	0.45	0.42		

Fable 28b. Generation b	v Period for	Museums and Art	Galleries
--------------------------------	--------------	-----------------	-----------

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
U	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.44				0.44
20-24	0.45	0.44			0.44
25-34	0.49	0.44			0.44
35-44		0.43	0.42		0.42
45-54		0.43	0.41		0.41
55-64			0.44	0.39	0.40
65+				0.41	0.41
Total	0.46	0.44	0.42	0.40	0.42

Table 28c. Age by Generation for Museums and Art Galleries

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Amusement and Theme Parks

Overall, the period appeared to have little effect on the importance of "amusement and theme parks" in pleasure travel (Table 29a). The means scores in both 1983 and 1995 were relatively close at .42 in 1983 and .43 in 1995.

Age appeared to have the greatest effect on the importance of "amusement and theme parks" (Table 29a). Overall, younger Canadians rated "amusement and theme parks" more important than older Canadians. In 1983, a clear pattern existed in the responses to the importance of "amusement and theme parks." Older Canadians rated "amusement and theme parks" less important than younger Canadians. In 1995, this pattern was not as clear. Those between the ages of 20-24 rated "amusement and theme parks" as most important. The variation in scores in 1995 was much less than the variation in scores in 1983. The scores in 1995 were all fairly neutral compared to 1983 where they ranged from somewhat important to closer to not very important.

The generation table (Table 29b) indicated that overall older generations rated "amusement and theme parks" as less important. However, this pattern was not as consistent in both time periods. In 1983, the pattern was fairly clear. Generation X rated amusement and theme parks as most important. In 1995, the range of scores was much less and a linear pattern did not exist. This may indicate an interaction between the two variables.

Examination of the age by generation table illustrated that as each generation aged, they were less likely to rate "amusement and theme parks" as important (Table 29c). Each consecutive generation tended to rate "amusement and theme parks" less important than the next and as each generation aged they were less likely than the next to find "amusement and theme parks" important to their pleasure travel.

I able 29a. Age by	Period for Amuseme	nt and 1 neme P	arks
Age Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data
15-19	0.32	0.44	0.37
20-24	0.39	0.39	0.39
25-34	0.40	0.43	0.41
35-44	0.42	0.43	0.43
45-54	0.45	0.44	0.45
55-64	0.49	0.44	0.48
65+	0.51	0.44	0.50
Total	0.42	0.43	0.43

1 701

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Table 290. Generation D	y Feriou for An	iusement and 1	neme farks
Generation Class	1983	1995	Pooled Data

Table 20h Conception by Davied for Amusement and Theme Davis

Generation Class	1903	1775	I UVICU Data
Generation X	0.32	0.42	0.39
Baby Boomer	0.39	0.43	0.41
Silent Generation	0.45	0.43	0.44
GI Generation	0.50	0.44	0.49
Total	0.42	0.43	0.43

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important,"

.66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Age Class	Gen	Baby	Silent	GI	Overall
	X	Boomer			
15-19	0.37	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			0.37
20-24	0.39	0.39			0.39
25-34	0.43	0.41			0.41
35-44		0.43	0.43		0.43
45-54		0.44	0.46		0.45
55-64			0.44	0.49	0.48
65+				0.50	0.50
Total	0.39	0.41	0.44	0.49	0.43

Table 29c. Age by Generation for Amusement and Theme Parks

Scale 0-1 where 0= "very important," .33 is "somewhat important," .66 is "not very important," and 1= "not at all important."

Analysis of Variance as a Method of Cohort Analysis

Analysis of variance as a cohort method is an appropriate method because it reveals the main effects of the three variables (age, period and generation), the two-way interactions (age-period, age-generation, and period-generation) and the three-way interactions (age-period-generation). The R^2 indicated how much variation in the responses is accounted for by the interaction of the three variables.

Analysis of variance is a technique which partitions the total sum of squares into two components, the variation between the subgroups (variation in sample means) and the variation within each subgroup divided by generation, period and age (variation among the treatment group means). The total deviation of a score from the grand mean is represented by $(X_{ij} - X_g)$. The between group variation due to an effect of the independent variable is represented by $(X_a - X_g)$, this is the difference of the subgroup mean from the grand mean. The measure of within group or error variation (sum of square of error) is calculated by x_{ij} - x_a and represents the variation of scores within the group from the group mean. If the independent variable has no effect, then the variation among the treatment group means will be due only to sampling error. The F statistic is computed as a ratio of group variation to the between group variation. When the mean squares between groups is the same as the mean square of errors, the F ratio is about 1.00.

One assumption of analysis of variance is that the F statistic will follow the F distribution. If this assumption is violated, the accuracy of the approximations will be affected. The analysis of variance test also depends on the assumption that the variances of the different populations are equal. However, experience has shown that F-tests are robust and not adversely affected by deviations from normality in the distribution (Blalock, 1972).

Examination of the correlations between the independent variables previously revealed an extremely high correlation between age and generation. In a cohort analysis with a greater number of periods this correlation would be reduced; however, because this study only had two years, the correlation was higher than normal. In spite of this correlation, it was felt that the analysis of variance would provide support for the relationship between the three independent variables and demonstrate the percentage of variation accounted for by the combination of variables (age, generation and period).

The main effects, two-way interaction and the three-way interaction among age, period and generation for each of the travel-related variables were presented. When the significance of an interaction between variables is greater than the main effects, it suggests there is multicollinearity or that change in one variable is dependent on change in another variable. When two or more explanatory variables are related, it is not possible to disentangle their separate effects on the dependent variable. In past cohort analysis

these effects are treated as minimal or ignored. In this study, it was felt that it was important to address the amount of interaction among age, period and generation.

Results of the Three-Way Analysis of Variance

The results of the three-way analysis of variance for three variables ("nightlife and entertainment," "having fun and being entertained" and "beaches for swimming and sunning") are presented below (Table 30-32). The percentage variance explained (\mathbb{R}^2) was reported as part of the output from the three-way analysis of variance procedure in the Statistical Package for the Social Science 8.0 (SPSS). Three variables were chosen to report because they had the largest \mathbb{R}^2 (variance explained by the combination of age, period and generation). The results for the remaining variables are available in Appendix C.

The greatest amount of variation in "nightlife and entertainment" was explained by the interaction of age, period and generation (Table 30). A total of 11% of the variation was accounted for by the interaction of the three independent variables, age, period and generation. This was the largest amount of variation explained across all the 12 variables. The interaction among age, period and generation was highly significant and represented 95% of the total percentage variance explained (see Table 34). In addition, the interaction between period and generation was statistically significant. Large interaction effects indicate that it is not possible to partial out the main effects of age, period or generation. However, as with past cohort studies, holding the interaction effects constant will allow the strength of the main effects to be addressed.

In the variable, "nightlife and entertainment," the main effects of age were fairly large (α =.000). Thus, one could argue that of the three independent variables (age, period and generation) age effects had the largest effects on nightlife and entertainment. Examination of the mean scores from Table 27a show that nightlife and entertainment in pleasure travel was more important for younger Canadians than it was for older Canadians (note: lower scores indicate greater importance). The results support what was illustrated in the "eyeballing" method. With the "eyeballing" method, age effects appeared to be the strongest effects.

Further investigation of the analysis of variance indicated that the error (within group variation) was larger than the sum of squares for the main effects or the interaction effects. This suggested that there was more *within* group variation than *between* group variation. This finding was consistent among all 12 travel related variables. Therefore, the amount of variation between individuals was much greater than the amount of variation within groups of Canadians.

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squ	are F	Sig.
Age	3.40	6	0.57	9.65	.000
Period	0.09	1	0.09	1.51	.219
Generation	0.17	2	0.08	1.43	.240
Age * Period	0.16	2	0.08	1.34	.253
Age * Generation	0.17	1	0.17	2.84	.092
Period * Generation	0.25	1	0.25	4.23	.040
Age * Period * Generation	89.36	17	5.26	89.43	.000
Error	699.96	11909	0.06		

Table 30. Three way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction of Age, Generation and Period on the Importance of "Nightlife and Entertainment" in Pleasure Travel

 R^2 = .113 (Adjusted R^2 = .112)

For the travel-related variable "having fun and being entertained," the greatest amount of variation was again explained by the interaction of age, period and generation (Table 31). A total of 5% of the variation in the response to the importance of "having fun and being entertained," was accounted for by age, period and generation. The interaction between age, period and generation was highly significant. None of the twoway interactions were statistically significant. Although the main effects of age and generation were statistically significant, due to large interaction effects it was not possible to partial out the main effects. Therefore, drawing conclusions about any of the main effects is impossible. However in order to better understand which of the main effects may have the greatest effect on the importance of "having fun and being entertained," the interaction effects were held constant.

Examination of the mean scores indicate that "having fun and being entertained" was more important for younger generations of Canadians than it was for older generations of Canadians and that it was gaining importance over time (note: lower scores indicate greater importance). The largest main effect on "having fun and being entertained" was generation (F value = 4.12, α =.02). The findings from the analysis of variance are consistent with the "eyeballing" technique. In the "eyeballing" technique it was apparent through examination of age and generation that each generation ranked "having fun and being entertained" more important than the last and that over time this was also becoming more important.

Similar to "nightlife and entertainment," the error (within group variation) was larger than the sum of squares for the main effects or the interaction effects. This

suggested that there was more within group variation than between group (generation)

variation.

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	.758	6	.126	2.77	.011
Period	.166	1	.166	3.65	.056
Generation	.376	3	.188	4.12	.016
Age * Period	.019	3	.009	.211	.810
Age * Generation	.005	1	.005	.103	.748
Period * Generation	.041	1	.041	.888	.346
Age * Period * Generation	28.34	17	1.67	36.57	.000
Error	542.64	11905	.045		

Table 31. Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction of Age, Generation and Period on the Importance of "Having Fun and Being Entertained" in Pleasure Travel

 R^2 = .050 (Adjusted R^2 = .048)

Finally, just like with the other two variables, the greatest amount of variation in "beaches for swimming and sunning" was explained by the interaction of age, period and generation (Table 32). A total of 8.6% of the total variation was accounted for by the combination of age, period and generation. Again, it is not possible to partial out the main effects. However, for the purpose of isolating the largest main effect, the interaction effects were held constant and the F scores for the main effects were examined. In this case, the largest main effect was age. Examination of the mean scores indicated that "beaches for swimming and sunning" were more important for younger generations of Canadians than for older generations of Canadians (note: lower scores indicate greater importance). This is the same conclusion that was come to with the "eyeballing" technique.

Similar to "nightlife and entertainment" and "having fun and being entertained," the error (within group variation) was larger than the sum of squares for the main effects or the interaction effects, suggesting that there was more within group variation than between group variation. Thus, the amount of variation among individuals was much greater than the amount of variation among different groups (generations) of Canadians.

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Age	4.45	6	.742	11.24	.000	
Period	.000	1	.000	.000	.986	
Generation	.109	3	.054	.826	.438	
Age * Period	.155	3	.078	1.18	.308	
Age * Generation	.001	1	.012	.019	.893	
Period * Generation	.005	1	.005	.084	.772	
Age * Period * Generation	73.68	17	4.33	65.61	.000	
Error	786.27	11902	.067			

Table 32. Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction of Age, Generation and Period on the Importance of "Beaches for Swimming and Sunning" in Pleasure Travel

 R^2 = .086 (Adjusted R^2 = .084)

Table 33 summarizes the F values for the main effects and the interaction among age, period and generation for each of the travel-related variables. For all the variables, there was a significant interaction of age, period and generation. This result indicates that the relationship among the three variables explains the most variation. To reiterate, when two or more explanatory variables are related, it is not possible to disentangle their separate effects on the dependent variable. In fact, the combination of age, generation and period is so great that it accounts for between 74% and 96% of the total percentage of explained variance (Table 34).

	Main Effect	Main Effect Beriod	Main Effect	Interaction	R ² / Adj R ²
Money well spent	<u> </u>	0 52***		16.96***	021/020
Noney wen spent	0.05	9.52 17.40***	2.00	10.70	.0217.020
Speak same language	4.51	17.40	3.00	19.77	.025/.024
Having fun, being	2.77	3.65	4.12	36.57	.050/.048
entertained					
National/provincial	0.48	5.17	0.50	4.48	.006/.005
parks					
Beaches for swim &	11 24***	000	0.83	65 61***	086/ 084
	11.21	.000	0.05	05.01	.000/.001
	0.96	5 20*	0.17	7 40***	010/000
High quality	0.80	5.38	0.17	1.42	.010/.009
restaurants					
First class	1.18	0.62	1.12	1.80	.003/.001
accommodations					
Budget	0.88	1.36	1.69	9.03***	.013/.011
accommodations					
Shopping	2 25**	1 50**	0.24	6.00***	010/008
	2.55	4.37	0.24	0.90	.010/.008
Nightlife and	9.65	6.84	1.43	89.44	.113/.112
entertainment					
Museums, art	0.85	6.88***	2.03	5.93	.008/.007
galleries					
Amusement theme	2.16	0 70	0.18	20.82***	029/ 027
narke	2.1.0	0.70		20.02	
Pars					

Table 33. F Values from Three-Way ANOVA for All Travel Variables

* significant at $\alpha = .05$

****** significant at α = .01

*** significant at α = .001

There were two variables where the F value for a main effect was greater than the F value for the interaction effects. For these two variables, period explained the most variation. The two variables were "museums and art galleries" and "national and provincial parks." According to Blalock (1972), "if the interaction effect is relatively large, this simple distinction between main and interaction effects will be difficult to translate into substantive or theoretical terms" (p. 346). He also suggests that when the main effect is significant but the interaction effect is large (F value is close to the main effect) it does not make theoretical sense to obscure real differences by talking about the

average effects of age, period or generation. Therefore, although the main effects for national and provincial parks and museums and art galleries were larger than the interaction effects, the large size of the interaction effects rules out any meaningful interpretation of period effects alone.

Travel-Related Variable	Main Effect	Main Effect	Main Effect Main Effect	
	Age	Period	Generation	A*G*P
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Money well spent	2	3	0	95
Speak same language	6	4	3	83
Having fun, being entertained	3	1	1	95
National/provincial parks	3	6	1	8 6
Beaches for swim & sun	6	0	0	94
High quality restaurants	4	4	0	92
First class accommodations	17	1	5	74
Budget accommodations	3	1	2	92
Shopping	10	3	0	84
Nightlife and entertainment	5	0	0	95
Museums, art galleries	4	6	3	85
Amusement, theme parks	4	0	0	96

Table 34. Percentage of Main Effects and Interaction Effects for Total Percent of Explained Variance (%)

*May not total to 100% because 2-way interaction percentages not presented

Using Structural Equations Modeling as a Method of Cohort Analysis

The structural equation modeling technique was used to examine whether there was a structural model that existed which measured the relationship between age, period and generation on three travel-related constructs. The EQS program by Bentler (1985) was used to perform the cohort analysis with structural equations modeling. The initial step was to see if the 12 variables represented the three constructs outlined by the Canadian Tourism Commission (Figure 10). As mentioned in the methods section of this manuscript, the two variables "money spent on travel is well spent" and "it is important that people speak my language" represented the "travel philosophy" construct. The "benefit-sought" construct was a single item indicator represented by "having fun and being entertained." The "travel interest" construct was hypothesized as a reflective variable made up of "national and provincial parks," "beaches for swimming and sunning," "high quality restaurants," "budget accommodations," "first class accommodations," "shopping," "nightlife and entertainment," "art galleries and museums" and "amusement and theme parks."



Figure 10. The Model

Confirmatory factor analysis was performed using the statistical software package EQS. In order for the constructs to be "confirmed" three tests needed to indicate a good fit. The tests used were the CFI, RMR and the GFI. The results indicated that the "travel philosophy" construct was a poor construct. The goodness of fit scores were too poor to conclude that these two indicators were measuring the same thing. Therefore, they needed to be measured separately and called two separate items. The "benefits sought" construct was a single item indicator and therefore was not tested. The "travel interest" construct initially had nine indicators; however, after evaluating the LMTest (indicated

cross loadings of indicators on other constructs and large errors) and the t value (which indicated the significance of each indicator), the final construct had four indicators. These four indicators were "shopping," "beaches for swimming and sunning," "nightlife and entertainment" and "national and provincial parks."

The next step was to measure the relationships among the three exogenous variables (independent variables) and the three constructs. This is where the initial problems occurred. The model was hypothesized to measure each of the effects on each of the constructs and determine which of the effects was the strongest. This is the same as the regression procedure however, SEM allows an overall "goodness of fit" which measures all variables at once.

Results revealed that the full model did not fit the data. The goodness of fit measures were so weak that even manipulating the parameters as indicated by the LM Test did not yield a good fit. Several problems may have been underlying the lack of fit. Some of these may include problems due to multicollinearity and problems due to unstable constructs. Due to the multicollinearity of the three exogenous variables, a clear model was impossible to derive. Even when age, period and generation were allowed to correlate, the relationship between the exogenous variables and the endogenous variables was not direct. A consistent finding with each of the constructs was that each exogenous variable wanted to correlate indirectly with the construct through the individual indicator. This suggested that the constructs were perhaps not as reliable as the CFA suggested.

One suggestion that has arisen to deal with this problem is the creation of "formative" constructs (c.f., Bollen & Lennox, 1991; Cohen, Cohen, Teresi, Marchi & Velex, 1990; MacCallum & Browne, 1993). These constructs are measured "without

error." The idea is that the construct is "formed" by the indicators. In this study it was not appropriate to do this because to form the construct "travel philosophy" by the two indicators "money is well spent" and "important that people speak my language" would be illogical. In fact, it is counter intuitive. The construct travel philosophy is NOT simply the addition of those two indicators, in fact it has several other indicators which have not been accounted for. Therefore, this solution is an inappropriate resolution to the problem.

An additional solution to the problem is to perform "group" analyses. These groups would be similar to dummy variables and a model would be run for each dummy variable. However, this is merely a variation of dummy variable regression and one of the assumptions of dummy variable regression is that the three effects do not interact. This assumption is not appropriate given the results of the three-way ANOVA and therefore the decision NOT to use dummy variable regression was made. Likewise, with structural equations, this method would not capture the interaction among all three variables. Therefore, it was concluded that structural equation modeling was not an effective way to measure cohort analysis in this case.

Study Limitations

Before advancing to the conclusions of this study, there are several limitations that should be acknowledged. It is important to address these limitations to fully understand the conclusions and recommendations that have come about as a result of this study.

First, the study only included two time periods. Although cohort analysis only needs a minimum of two time periods, three or more periods result in more robust

datasets. One of the problems that arose because having only two time periods was that it was difficult to conclude a linear relationship over time. Having only two points does not indicate a linear trend one way or the other. Additional research efforts need to keep this in mind when performing cohort analysis.

An additional problem that arises by not having enough time periods is that we can not follow a generation over its life span. In this data, Generation X was never measured at a later life stage and the GI generation was never measured in their youth. Thus, it becomes more difficult to partial out the age effect from the generational effects because older aged Canadians were also older generations of Canadians. Future studies need to address this when performing a cohort analysis.

Second, another limitation of the study was that the age variable in the original studies was measured at the ordinal level. Therefore, pre-existing categories made it difficult to recategorize age into Strauss and Howe's generations. When recoding the data into generation, one age category was dropped because it contained two generations. If age was measured at the interval level, the categorizing both the age and generation variables for this study would have been more precise. This should be kept in mind for future research.

Finally, because these studies were not designed to perform a cohort analysis there were limited numbers of variables that had scalar equivalence. Both datasets were very large and had over 100 variables each; however, only 12 were worded identically and measured the same construct (term used loosely after SEM results). More variables that were measured in the same manner would have perhaps resulted in a better structural equation model.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions and Discussion

Considerable research has relied on cohort analysis as a means to predict future consumption behaviors. This study sought to extend this type of research by focusing solely on travel-related philosophies, benefits and interests.

The study set out to assess which effect (age, period and generation) explained the most variation in travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests of Canadians who travel. Specifically, generational effects on travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests were of importance. However, no conclusive findings relating a person's generation and travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests were made. Essentially, attributing any changes in travel philosophies, benefits sought or travel interests to generation effects was less than conclusive.

Several methods were used to examine the effects of generation on travel philosophies, benefits sought, and interests. The use of these different methods helped to reinforce the difficulty of isolating generational effects on the 12 travel-related variables. Using these different methodologies yielded several important. These discoveries are discussed below.

One of the most important discoveries that this study revealed was that the combined effects of age, period and generation do not account for much variation in individual responses to travel philosophies, benefits sought and travel interests. The amount of variation explained by the combination of age, period and generation ranged from less than 1% to a high of 11.3%. Therefore, generation accounts for even less

variation in responses than the combination of the three independent variables. These findings suggest that people 's response to travel changes over time.

What does this mean for tourism marketers? Overall because generation does not account for much variation in response to travel-related variables other variables must be considered if a researcher is going to assess the role that generation plays in a person's travel philosophies, interests and benefits sought. Marketers should not completely dismiss the idea of generational marketing. However, what needs to be done is consider generational variables in conjunction with other demographic and psychographic variables.

Previous literature has suggested that sociodemographic variables such as family life cycle, income, geographic location, and education can influence the benefits sought, philosophies and interests of travelers (c.f., Anderson & Langemeyer, 1982; Fodness, 1992; Shoemaker, 1994; Zimmer, Brayley & Searle, 1995). McPherson (1991) suggests that "aging and leisure behavior are influenced by a number of sociodemographic factors that must be included in studies addressing the question of leisure" (p. 425). He proposed these factors could include such things as "gender, race, ethnic membership, education, lifelong and present income and assets, marital status (past and present), and type and place of residence (rural vs. urban, north vs. south, east vs. midwest vs. west, etc.)"(p. 425).

One variable that should be included in future cohort studies is family life cycle. Fodness (1992) found that as family structure changes (i.e., the family moves through the life cycle) predictable changes occur in terms of family decision-making and interests. His study found that in families with children the wife predominantly made the decision

of what to do on vacation. He also found that "roles are likely to change over time, both in general and within the specific stages of the family life cycle (p. 12). In addition, Lawson (1991) in his study of tourist expenditure and types of vacations across the family life cycle found that those in the "full nest group" tended to stay with friends and relatives more frequently than members of other life cycle stages. He suggested that constraints imposed by small children were easy to discern in their lack of activities. Several authors have suggested that family structure changes over time and changes in travel patterns represent "unique parameters for each generation." Therefore, it is recommended that the family life cycle variable be included in future cohort studies.

Related to family life cycle, income might be an additional variable that might help to explain the amount of variation in responses. One theory of income, dating back to the 1950s, introduces considerations based on family life cycle position. The hypothesis recognizes predictable life cycle patterns in earnings, asset accumulation and consumption (Blomqvist, 1981; Mincer, 1974). Poterba (1989) found that randomly chosen individuals had less than 50% chance of being in the same income quintile in 1971 and 1978, indicating that the annual income distribution is unstable over time. Searle, Mctavish, and Brayley (1993) suggest tourism spending is affected by income. These authors suggest that a small change of income at the bottom end of the scale bring a large proportionate change in tourist spending. Therefore, monitoring changes in household income over time might help to explain changes in responses to the importance of specific travel-related variables.

An additional variable that needs to be considered is gender. Women have been found to be more interested in educational experiences and have rated the social

dimension higher than males. Although there is some support for the theory that women's interests and preferences for travel have changed over time (Hawes, 1988; Kinnaird & Hall, 1994; Pennington & Kerstetter, 1997; Samuel, 1999) there is little to no research that has examined changes in interests or preferences for travel among cohorts over time. However, it would make sense that different generations of women would respond differently to specific preferences for travel given that younger generations have considerably more freedom than older generations had in their formative years.

Finally, research should consider a person's ethnicity as a factor in explaining variation in responses to travel philosophies and interests over time. Several studies have documented observable differences in travel behavior, especially for outdoor activities among ethnic or racial subgroups in the US population. Ethnicity theory maintains that "lower levels of participation in outdoor recreation by minorities are primarily explained by distinct subcultural values about leisure" (Bowker & Leeworthy, 1998, p. 64). Some theorists (Drucker, 1997; Metz, 1999) believe that the influence of technology and the media has lead to more assimilated cultures and less ethnic diversity. This has been called "cultural pluralism." Proponents of this theory argue that the world is becoming more similar and true than changes over time based on ethnicity may be reduced. The opposing theory is called a cultural mosaic (Villanueva, 1996). This theory argues that individuals will continue to maintain their cultural identity regardless of influences such as media and globalization. Larmer's (1999) article in Newsweek suggests that in America, "a country that constantly redefines itself, the rise of Latinos also raises questions about race, identity and culture- and whether the United States will ever truly be one nation" (p. 49) or one culture. These conflicting views; however, need to be considered in cohort

studies. How does a changing population (i.e., more ethnically diverse or more homogenous) influence generational profiles? Future research needs to be consider these issues and examine changes in interests and preferences for travel over time in relation to a person's ethnicity.

These are just some of the variables which might have an influence on changing philosophies and interests for travel over time. It is necessary for future researchers to be aware that all of these factors, "alone or in combination, can influence past, present or future leisure values, preferences and opportunities" (McPherson, 1991, p. 425). Thus, a combination of sociodemographic variables might provide a better picture of what variables effect changes in travel philosophies, benefits sought and interests. One recommendation is to examine a person's generation in relation to other demographic variables in terms of its predictive power. For example, the previously discussed variables in addition to other variables could be included in a regression procedure which measures the strength of each variable alone and in combination in determining future travel philosophies, benefits sought or travel interests.

The next significant discovery that came out of this study was the extent of the interaction of age, period and generation in explaining differences in travel philosophies, benefits sought, and travel interests. In fact, the percentage accounted for by the combination of age, period and generation ranged from 74% to 96% of the total percent variance explained. This is a substantive finding. Most other cohort studies fail to report the extent of this interaction. The presence of such a large interaction makes it impossible to partial out the main effects of age, period or generation. Therefore, conclusions can not
be drawn for any one main effect. This is an important methodological issue for researchers.

Previous studies have acknowledged the problem of multicollinearity or interaction effects; however, many of the techniques ignore the relationship between the three variables and proceed to make conclusions anyway. In this particular study, collinearity was more of a problem because there were only two time periods with a range of only 12 years. Therefore, age and generation were more closely aligned. In previous cohort studies, the number of time periods has been greater and therefore, age and generation have not shown as strong a correlation. However, all cohort studies should address the issue of collinearity, particularly those which have limited time periods over a limited time frame. It is important for readers to understand that fewer time periods will result in higher correlations among the independent variables, which in turn will result in greater interactions.

In marketing, Rentz & Reynolds (1981) addressed the issue of "confounding." They suggested the three independent variables are inherently correlated as a result of the formal linear dependency between the operations. However, the authors downplay the confouding and argue that "cohort analysis can provide tentative evidence of the probable influence of age, period and cohort membership (p. 65). No where in the article is the correlation or percentage variance explained presented.

In their next article, Rentz and Reynolds (1983) again mentioned the linear dependency but proceeded to use a constrained dummy variable regression model to estimate cohort effects. They suggested that the "constrained multiple regression model is the most appealing conceptually and statistically" (p. 14). However, again this article

fails to present the relationship between the confounding variables, or the R² indicating the amount of variance explained by the combination of the three variables. Upon completion of the present study, the researcher feels that ignoring the interaction and the amount of variation explained by the independent variables can lead to false conclusions. In both Rentz and Reynolds studies the findings were used to forecast future behavior. This author would argue that forecasting future behavior based on 5% of the explained variation is problematic.

In addition, the presence of such large interaction effects has significant marketing implications. First, due to the presence of interaction effects, it is difficult to partial out how much change in travel philosophies, benefits sought or interests is a result of a person's generation. Therefore, marketers should be cautioned about developing marketing plans which strictly focus on a person's generation. The relationship between a person's age, generation and time period need to be considered simultaneously. It is not enough to focus on a person's generation in isolation. The idea of generations is important and should not be downplayed. However, measuring specific characteristics or preferences of generations is more difficult than the literature suggests. Marketers should be aware that segmenting based on age is probably just as effective as generational marketing. In fact, knowing how different ages behave and what is happening at that time period may be more beneficial than spending lots of money trying to profile different generation's preferences and interests.

In addition, tourism marketers should be cautious of trendy literature that suggests generational marketing is path to success. One book that gained considerable attention in late 1990s is "Rocking the Ages: The Yankelovich Monitor on Generational Marketing"

(1997). The main focus of the book was to provide support for generational marketing. The Yankelovich Monitor used longitudinal data to examine changes in attitudes and consumption of three different generations over time. The authors illustrated changes in attitudes and behavior both cross-sectionally and over time. At first glance it would appear that there are several differences among generations which provide a strong basis for generational marketing. However, one of the main problems is the authors' failure to address or even measure the interaction among age, period and generation. Smith and Clurman are not alone in their procedures, in fact, they do what most cohort analysis dothey ignore the interaction of the three effects and focus strictly on the main effects (in this case generation). Unfortunately, ignoring the confounding effects of age, period and generation may lead to false conclusions. Therefore, without taking the generation's age and the time period into account, the changes in attitude and consumption are not as meaningful. In addition, Smith and Clurman fail to recognize the amount of within generation variation. They assume that all members of a particular generation will respond the same way. Smith and Clurman use years of data to support the theory that different generations will respond in different ways to different products. However, it is important for marketers to recognize that much of the complexities of cohort analysis are not addressed in their book. Although the book is based on surveys of the general population, many of the limitations of their particular data have also not been presented or addressed in their book. Therefore, tourism marketers should be cautious of adopting strategies suggested in the popular literature without being fully informed of methods of data collection and the statistics used for interpretation.

A third conclusion that has come out of this study is that the use of analysis of variance is an effective and appropriate method to explain the effects of age, period and generation. The two methods of cohort analysis which are most common are the triad method and dummy variable regression. Although, both methods are useful in understanding the complexity of the cohort analysis; they are do not provide information about the interaction among the three independent variables and the interaction's effect on the dependent variable. In addition, dummy variable regression typically uses subgroup means rather than individual scores. This can be misleading in that, generally group differences account for less than 5% of the overall differences.

Various other models have been proposed which attempt to unravel the effects of age, period and generation; however, all of these methods are all based on assumptions. For example, Baltes and Reinert's (1969) bifactorial model assumes that period effects are zero. Because most cohort analysis involves change over a ten-year period, this assumption would seem difficult to support. In addition, Schaie and Strother (1968a) assume that period effects are positive; however, it was demonstrated in this study that period effects could be negative rather than positive. Therefore, it is sometimes a great leap in the social sciences to assume that all period effects are positive. This document has demonstrated that fatal flaws can be made if the researcher makes the wrong assumptions.

One of the only models which avoids the statistical problems of confounding variables is the triad method. Bonnici et al. (1992) suggested this method is "logically appealing, simple and offers a methodologically adequate tool for the marketing

practitioner" (p. 3). Therefore, it is argued that this method should be used initially in all cohort analyses.

The present study has demonstrated how the use of three-way analysis of variance can be used in conjunction with the triad method. The use of the three-way analysis of variance enabled complex patterns and relationships to be identified. The statistical procedure enabled the researcher to illustrate empirically what was happening in the data.

Results of the analysis of variance revealed that when large interaction effects are present, isolating the main effect of generation would be inappropriate. Hypothetically, if only generational effects were present, the three-way analysis of variance would indicate significant main effects for generation and no significant effects for age, period and any of the interactions. Therefore, using the three-way analysis of variance illustrates the main effects and the interaction effects. This provides enough information for the researcher to be able to draw conclusions about the relationships between age, period, generation and behavior. Therefore, future cohort analysts should consider using the combination of three-way analysis of variance and cohort tables.

An additional discovery that came out of the present study was that a structural equation modeling is a difficult procedure to use to address generational effects. Although structural equations are an appropriate method to measure the overall "fit" of a model, several factors cause problems which affect the overall fit of the model. The main problem with structural equations is that there is too much individual variation in responses and as a result the constructs were not stable over time. In addition, assessing the three effects (age, period and generation) simultaneously is not possible given the large numbers of categorical independent variables. A method available in structural

equations modeling which could be used is "group" analysis. However, it was determined that "group" analysis is essentially the same as dummy variable regression. As with dummy variable regression the groups' analysis would make several assumptions that may not be valid. Thus, it was felt that the use of structural equations did not provide an effective means of cohort analysis in this study.

Finally, cohort analysis is much more complex than what researchers might think. It is not simply assessing how a generation's preference or behavior for a product or service changes over two or more times. It includes pulling apart the intertwined variables of age, period and generation, determining how much interaction exists between the variables, finding measures at multiple points in time and finding a statistical technique which best illustrates what is going on over time. This complexity effects the practical nature of generational segmentation. Thorough examination of the segmentation literature supports this complexity. Segmentation is caught between two extreme worlds, one which argues we can segment an entire hemisphere into "nine nations" (Kahle, 1986) and another which argues that each individual is it's own market and that we can market to a segment of one (Zieger, 1999). The "nine nations" argument proposes nine regions in North America which can be uses as a basis for market segmentation under the assumption that values and cultural influences on consumption differ across geographical regions. The "individual market" argument suggests that each individual is it's own market and that we need to understand the individual to maintain and increase our business. Undoubtedly, these two theories come at understanding markets from opposite perspectives. Generational marketing as a whole is more similar to the "nine nations"

argument (geographical regions); however, the findings in this study have provided more endorsement for the "individual market" argument.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study has demonstrated that there are several issues that future researchers need to keep in mind if they are going to perform an effective cohort analysis. First, although several cohort methodologists (c.f., Achlety, 1989; Glenn, 1977; McPherson, 1990) have supported the use of repeated cross-sectional design, there are several limitations with this method. One of the main limitations of this method is finding variables that are "scalar" equivalent. Typically, researchers design surveys in isolation from previous studies. Thus, it is rare that variables are worded the same over time. If marketers are to learn more about generations, researchers should attempt to keep the wording of variables consistent among studies. A strong recommendation for the Canadian Tourism Commission, Travel Industry Association of America, state travel offices and other large tourism research organizations is to develop a set of "core" questions which would not change over time. It would be valuable for the leaders in public sector tourism to commission partners, who collect national or state-level tourism, to include this small set of "core" questions on all surveys over a set number of years. This would allow for more effective longitudinal studies and the examination of cohorts over time.

In addition to the limited variables with scalar equivalence, repeated cross-section designs play into individual variations. As demonstrated in this study, analysis of variance isolates individual variations in relation to group variations. The use of repeated

cross section designs only inflate the amount of individual variation in responses. This leads into the next recommendation.

It is recommended that tourism researchers strive to collect longitudinal panel data. A representative national panel surveyed every 10 years for at least 50 years would enable researchers to more readily determine which of the three effects (age, period and generation) explains the most variation in travel philosophies and interests. Typically a cohort study looks at changes in attitudes or behavior in 5-10 year increments over a 20-30 year period. According to LaPage (1994), "sometimes it is desirable to periodically recontact the sample of respondents" (p. 482). He argues "panels are superior for providing in-depth answers to questions of why market shifts and trends are taking place" (p. 482). In addition to providing in-depth answers, a longitudinal panel design enables tracking of changes in attitudes and preferences of multiple cohorts over time. Following several cohorts over their life span might help the researcher to isolate the effects of age, period and generation. True differences in cohorts are better revealed when the researcher can examine differences in several cohorts at different times in their life. For example, measuring consumption and preference patterns for the GI Generation at a several different ages, then for the Silent Generation at the same ages and finally for the Baby Boomers might revealed more meaningful differences.

Panels are an extremely powerful means for understanding social change, for assessing the impact of unforeseen events and for short-term forecasting. In fact, Lapage (1994) argues that "the magnitude of change in people's leisure-behavior patterns, and their receptivity to new leisure opportunities, appear to be far greater than would be true for household purchases" (p. 486) and therefore, panel research is a distinctly appropriate

method of travel and tourism research. Future cohort analysts are urged to consider both collecting and obtaining panel data to assess generational effects on different aspects of travel and tourism.

An additional recommendation is that researchers who wish to examine cohort effects should design and use variables that are more "generational" in nature. Researchers need to think creatively about questions that may appeal to one generation over another. Strauss and Howe (1991) profile generations based on birth year and a set of epochal events which define the generation. Consideration should be given to the events and the possible "nostalgia" that may surround it. For example, if the Silent Generation is touted as "frugal" and the Baby Boomers as "excessive" then inclusion of variables which measure these attitudes might be included in future travel studies. Future researchers should attempt to design specific measures that a specific generation may relate to. Profiling a generation based on these variables may provide a clearer idea of the effects of a person's generation on specific philosophies or preferences.

Fourth, researchers who perform longitudinal studies should consider including variables which may indicate environmental changes. This is perhaps the most difficult variable to measure when examining changes over time. In order to truly account for period effects, surveys need to include measures which focus on environmental changes, such variables might include changes in the use of technology in tourism or changes in marketing. Because it is important to measure this change over time, it is necessary that the variables be measured in each time period and in the same manner. Additional measures may be added to future studies; however, continuing to ask the same questions using the same environmental variables in subsequent surveys is essential.

Fifth, perhaps cohort analysis travel and tourism needs to consider "travel" epochal events rather than world epochal events to define the generations. What might be interesting is defining specific generations based on epochal "travel" events, such as the rise in airline travel or growth in "cybertravel." Defining a generation based on an event in travel that may have shaped their travel philosophies or interests might reveal greater differences between the generations. Future cohort analysis should consider developing profiles of different generations which are based on some of the larger travel events. These generations may be named "the airline generation," "the automobile generation," or "the computer assisted travel generation." It is argued that generations would differ based on differential exposure to different types of travel.

In all, the results of this study have led to a more comprehensive understanding of cohort analysis as it relates to the travel philosophies, benefits sought and travel interests of Canadians. The study has been especially useful in isolating several issues that require attention when conducting a cohort analysis. APPENDICES



P

CANADIAN TOURISM ATTITUDE AND MOTIVATION STUDY

RESEARCH REPORT SEGMENTATION ANALYSIS

TOURISM CANADA

Published under the authority of the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion

August 1986

Resea This and Cana CTA cond Exp The dat tha Ca ana att va be

Research Background

This report presents the results of a segmentation analysis of the vacation and pleasure travel market in Canada based on data provided by the Canadian Tourism Attitude and Motivation Survey (CTAMS). The CTAMS data base is the result of a national survey of Canadians conducted in the fall of 1983 by the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion (Tourism) through the Labour Force Survey.

The purpose of this analysis is to develop a framework for the CTAMS data base that provides an understanding of the Canadian travel market and that can be used as input to marketing development decisions in the Canadian tourism industry. The framework is based on the definition and analysis of population sub-groups which are derived from Canadian's attitudes with respect to taking vacations, planning and arranging for vacations, their vacation needs and interests, and their actual vacation behaviours. The framework will provide insight to the Canadian vacation travel market in terms of:

- What various segments or groups of the Canadian population want in a vacation
- o What products or environments are necessary to deliver these wants
- How to Canadian travellers perceive the alternate vacation destinations available to them based on the destinations they have chosen to meet the attributes desired by them
- Whether there is a potential to alter the perceptions of various vacation products/environments available in Canada in order to influence the choice of vacation destinations by more Canadians.

The analysis was done by Burak Jacobson Research Partners Inc. on behalf of the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion (Tourism).

Research Objectives

The specific objectives of this analysis are:

- To identify the factors which influence the travel decisions of Canadians
- 2. To develop an information base on current attitudes and motivations to leisure travel among Canadians
- 3. To identify market groups, including any special markets, that offer potential for increased travel within Canada by Canadians
- 4. To develop priorities for market development based on any market groups for which the potential for increased travel in Canada can be identified
- 5. To identify elements of the Canadian tourist product that could attract more Canadian visitors if expanded, improved or better promoted
- 6. To provide a basis for positioning Canada and the provinces as travel destinations relative to foreign destinations and, where feasible, to do the same for major sub-provincial regions as well

In addition, tabulations were run across the derived groups to test the following specific hypotheses:

- a) The groups derived in this analysis do not differ on the basis of their place of residence:
 - o By region or province
 - o By urban versus rural locations
 - o By metro versus non-metro locations
- b) The groups derived do not differ in terms of the:
 - o Characteristics of trips actually taken and recorded in the

CTAMS questionnaire including destinations

o The duration of trips taken e.g., short trips (1 to 3 nights)

long trips (4 or more nights)

- c) The groups derived do not differ on the basis of the demographic characteristics of respondents belonging to each group.
- d) The groups derived do not differ in terms of their frequency of travel and the proportion of travellers versus non-travellers.

The Data Base

The CTAMS data base is the result of a national survey of Canadians conducted by DRIE (Tourism) in the fall of 1983 and consists of 11,500 completed interviews.

The CTAMS data base covers five categories of travel information about Canadians. Three categories comprise attitudinal information:

- 1. Attitudes concerning vacations in general, and the planning and arrangements involved
- 2. Benefits important in choosing a vacation
- 3. Activities and Interests desired in a vacation

Two categories provide behavioral information:

- 1. Actual travel behaviour data
- 2. Description of a specific vacation or pleasure trip taken in the previous 12 months, in terms of the benefits sought and the activities and interests important in attracting them to that choice

The research vehicle used to collect the CTAMS data was the Statistics Canada Labour Force Survey. This survey consists of six "rotation" groups each consisting of a national sample of just over nine thousand respondents so that the total sample approaches 60,000 person. Each rotation group remains in the sample for six months and the groups are staggered over the period.

The CTAMS survey method was to give a supplementary questionnaire to selected respondents in the Labour Force survey.

For the CTAMS research one rotation group provided the sample for Ontario, Quebec, Alberta, and British Columbia. Two rotations groups were needed to obtain a sufficient sample for Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba; three groups for Newfoundland; and four rotations for Prince Edward Island sample. The territories were not included.

The Sample

The sample was designed with a disproportionate distribution across the provinces so that the results would have similar reliability for each province. The distribution of attempted interviews was as follows:

Newfoundland	1,500 interviews
Prince Edward Island	948
Nova Scotia	1,346
New Brunswick	1,430
Quebec	1,437
Ontario	1,808
Manitoba	1,602
Saskatchewan	1,896
Alberta	1,158
British Columbia	1,055

Just over 80% of respondents completed the questionnaire for a total of

11,500 interviews.





Introduction: Study Background and Objectives

The Domestic Tourism Market Research study is the first major initiative since the 1980s to examine in detail the motivations, attitudes, and perceptions of Canadians about tourism, travel opportunities and destinations. The overall purpose of the study is to determine how best to market Canadian destinations and products to Canadians and examine possibilities for import substitution.

This study is particularly timely, given the new federal support for domestic tourism marketing with the recent creation of the Canadian Tourism Commission (CTC). A good understanding of the marketplace is obviously necessary to provide a sound basis for future market planning and marketing efforts by the CTC and industry alike.

In addition, import substitution is a growing issue as a result of the rapid rise of Canada's international travel account deficit over the last decade. Curbing the flow of Canadians who vacation outside the country and convincing them to travel domestically is clearly one way to reduce this deficit. According to Statistics Canada, there was a 60% increase in the number of overnight trips made by Canadians outside Canada between 1984 and 1993. In contrast, overnight domestic travel rose by only 26% in the same time period. This suggests that the industry should look seriously at ways in which to market its products and attractions to outbound travellers who may be amenable to travelling within Canada instead.

The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

- To determine the incidence, market size and characteristics of Canadians who take overnight pleasure trips to intra-provincial destinations, inter-provincial destinations, the U.S., and other countries.
- To assess Canadian's awareness of and attitudes toward Canada overall, major regions in Canada and the U.S. as pleasure travel destinations.
- To determine the impressions of product offerings associated with different trip types in Canada and the U.S.
- To evaluate the pleasure destination decision-making process of Canadians.
- To determine the perceived advantages and barriers to pleasure travel in Canada and the U.S.
- To segment the Canadian overnight pleasure travel market in terms of travel motivations and travel philosophy

Methodology

Two different data collection methodologies were used in this study:

- A telephone survey of 1,899 Canadians, aged 15 or older, was undertaken in September, 1995. About 91% of these interviews (1.725) were conducted on a random basis, while the remaining respondents were selected to meet regional quotas.
- A more in-depth survey consisting of in-person interviews with 1,457
 Canadians was conducted in October 1995.

Combined the two surveys yielded interviews with 3,356 Canadians including 2,694 travellers and 662 non-travellers. The results for the 2,694 travellers are accurate 19 times out of 20 to within plus or minus 1.9%. Some questions were asked only in the in-person survey (n=1,233); for these questions, the margin of error rises to about 2.8%.

For the purpose of this study, a pleasure trip was defined to be any trip of at least one night away from home, taken entirely or in part for vacation, recreation or holiday purposes, including out-of-town visits to family or friends or trips to a cottage.

Organization of the report

The remainder of this report is organized as follows:

- Chapter 2 presents an overview of the domestic travel market including market size, incidence rates, trip characteristics, trip decision-making, travel motivations and attitudes and future travel intentions.
- Chapter 3 focuses on the issue of brand loyalty and looks at the potential for import substitution in the domestic market
- Chapter 4 focuses on destination marketing and looks at the destination preferences of Canadian travelers, as well as their perceptions of Canada and the U.S.
- Chapter 5 summarizes the philosophy and motivational segments of the domestic market and explores specific opportunities for import substitution among these segments
- Chapter 6 concludes the report

Other products resulting from this study include two special reports, one on off and shoulder season marketing and the other on regional marketing opportunities. A set of computer volumes containing the detailed survey data are also available. These show the results of all questions in the questionnaire broken down by major categories.

APPENDIX C

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TRAVEL PHILOSOPHY, BENEFIT SOUGHT AND TRAVEL INTEREST VARIABLES

THREE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR REMAINING TRAVEL PHILOSOPHY, BENEFIT SOUGHT AND TRAVEL INTEREST VARIABLES

Independent Variables	Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
and Interaction	Squares		_		
Age	.177	6	.003	.849	.532
Period •	.330	1	.330	9.519	.002
Generation	.007	3	.002	.064	.979
Age * Period	.008	3	.003	.076	.973
Age * Generation	.008	1	.008	.234	.629
Period * Generation	.009	1	.009	.266	.606
Age * Period * Generation	10.59	18	.589	16.956	.000
Error	486.118	14006	.003		

Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction Of Age, Generation And Period On Money Spent On Travel Is Well Spent

 R^2 = .021 (Adjusted R^2 = .020)

Three-Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction Of Age, Generation And Period On People I Meet Speak Same Language

			0 0		
Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	1.47	6	.250	4.509	.000
Period	.963	1	.963	17.400	.000
Generation	.608	3	.203	3.664	.012
Age * Period	.676	3	.225	4.074	.007
Age * Generation	.005	1	.005	.943	.331
Period * Generation	.186	1	.186	3.360	.067
Age * Period * Generation	19.56	18	1.09	19.77	.000
Error	774.119	13990			
R^2 = .025 (Adjusted R ² = .024)					

Independent Variables	Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
and Interaction	Squares				
Age	.180	6	.030	.483	.821
Period	.321	1	.321	5.167	.023
Generation	.062	3	.031	.499	.607
Age * Period	.066	3	.033	.536	.585
Age * Generation	.001	1	.015	.025	.876
Period * Generation	.005	1	.053	.086	.769
Age * Period * Generation	4.73	17	.278	4.48	.000
Error	737.38	11884	.062		

Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction Of Age, Generation And Period On Importance Of National And Provincial Parks

 R^2 = .006 (Adjusted R^2 = .005)

Three Way	y ANOVA	Examining	Total Interaction	Of Age,	Generation.	And
	Period O	n Importanc	e Of High Oualit	v Restau	rants	

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	.337	6	.056	.866	.519
Period	.350	1	.350	5.39	.020*
Generation	.021	3	.011	.166	.847
Age * Period	.016	3	.008	.122	.885
Age * Generation	.017	1	.017	.267	.605
Period * Generation	.015	1	.015	.234	.629
Age * Period * Generation	8.19	17	.482	7.42	.000
Error	772.07	11890	.065		

 R^2 = .010 (Adjusted R^2 = .009)

Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction Of Age, Generation An	d
Period On Importance Of First Class Accommodations	

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	.408	6	.067	1.18	.313
Period	.035	1	.035	.616	.433
Generation	.129	3	.064	1.12	.327
Age * Period	.026	3	.013	.229	.795
Age * Generation	.019	1	.019	.342	.559
Period * Generation	.008	1	.008	.140	.708
Age * Period * Generation	1.76	17	.103	1.80	.023
Error	683.38	11890	.058		

 R^2 = .003 (Adjusted R^2 = .001)

Independent Variables	Sum of	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
and Interaction	Squares				
Age	.317	6	.053	.876	.511
Period	.082	1	.082	1.36	.244
Generation	.204	3	.102	1.69	.184
Age * Period	.097	3	.049	. 8 07	.446
Age * Generation	.076	1	.076	1.26	.261
Period * Generation	.062	1	.062	1.04	.309
Age * Period * Generation	9.25	17	.544	9.03	.000
Error	715.81	11884	.060		

Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction Of Age, Generation And Period On Importance Of Budget Accommodations

 R^2 = .013(Adjusted R² = .011)

Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction Of Age, Generation And
Period On Importance Of Shopping

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	.900	6	.150	2.35	.029
Period	.293	1	.293	4.59	.032
Generation	.031	3	.015	.240	.786
Age * Period	.093	3	.047	.733	.481
Age * Generation	.045	1	.045	.701	.402
Period * Generation	.017	1	.017	.271	.603
Age * Period * Generation	7.48	17	.440	6.90	.000
Error	759.94	11911	.064		

 R^2 = .010 (Adjusted R² = .008)

Three Way ANOVA Exa	amining Total Interaction	o Of Age,	Generation	And
Period On Im	portance Of Museums An	nd Art Ga	alleries	

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	.321	6	.053	.847	.533
Period	.435	1	.435	6.88	.009
Generation	.257	3	.128	2.03	.131
Age * Period	.062	3	.031	.490	.613
Age * Generation	.032	1	.032	.507	.476
Period * Generation	.032	1	.032	.505	.477
Age * Period * Generation	6.37	17	.375	5.93	.000
Error	752.92	11911	.063		

 R^2 = .008 (Adjusted R^2 = .007)

Independent Variables and Interaction	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Age	.765	6	.128	2.16	.043
Period	.041	1	.041	.697	.404
Generation	.021	3	.010	.177	.838
Age * Period	.004	3	.002	.036	.965
Age * Generation	.006	1	.006	.104	.747
Period * Generation	.020	1	.002	.343	.558
Age * Period * Generation	20.88	17	1.23	20.82	.000
Error	702.16	11902	.059		
R^2 = .029 (Adjusted R^2 = .027)					

Three Way ANOVA Examining Total Interaction Of Age, Generation And Period On Importance Of Amusement And Theme Parks

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

- Anderson, B. B. & L. Langmeyer (1984). The Under 50 and Over 50 Travelers: A Profile of Similarities and Differences. Journal of Travel Research, 20 (1), 20-24.
- Atchley, R. C. (1988). Social Forces and Aging (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Atchley, R. C. (1989). A Continuity Theory of Normal Aging. <u>The Gerontologist</u>, 29, 183-190.
- Baltes, P. B.; Cornelius, S.W. & J. R. Nesselroade (1980). Cohort Effects in Developmental Psychology. In J. R. Nesselroade and P.B. Baltes (Eds.) <u>Longitudinal Research in the Study of Behavior and Development</u> (pp. 61-87). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Baltes, P. B. (1968). Longitudinal and Cross-Sectional Sequences in the Study of Age and Generation Effects. <u>Human Development</u>, 11, 145-171.
- Baltes, P. B. & G. Reinert (1969). Cohort Effects in Cognitive Development of Children as Revealed by Cross-sectional Sequences. <u>Developmental Psychology</u>, 3 (1), 169-177.
- Bello, D. C. & M. J. Etzel (1985). The Role of Novelty in the Pleasure Vacation. <u>Annals</u> of Tourism Research, 6, 408-24.
- Bentler, P. M. (1985). <u>Theory and Implementation of EQS: A Structural Equations</u> <u>Program</u>. Los Angeles: BMDP Statistical Software.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. (1966). The Identification Problem and Theory Building: The Case of Status Inconsistency. <u>American Sociology Review</u>, 25 (2), 52-61.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. (1972). Social Statistics (2nd Ed.) New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Blazey, M. A. (1987). The Differences Between Participants and Nonparticipants In A Senior Travel Program. Journal of Travel Research, 25 (4), 7-12.
- Blomqvist, N. S. (1981). A Comparison of Distributions of Annual and Lifetime Income: Sweden around 1979. <u>Review of Income and Wealth</u>, 27 (1), 243-264.
- Bowker, J. M. & V. R. Leeworthy (1998). Accounting for Ethnicity in Recreation Demand: A Flexible Count Data Approach. Journal of Leisure Research, 30 (1), 64-78.
- Bollen, K. A. & R. Lennox (1991). Conventional Wisdom on Measurement: A Structural Equation Perspective. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 110, 305-314.

- Bollen, K. A. (1989). <u>Structural Equations with Latent Variables</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Bonnici, J. L. (1992). Cohort Analysis: Analyzing Data on Product Use. Journal of Applied Business Research, 8 (4), 1-6.
- Brim, O. G., Jr. (1980). Types of Life Events. Journal of Social Issues, 36, 148-157.
- Bryant, B. & A. Morrison (1980). Travel Market Segmentation and the Implementation of Market Strategies. Journal of Travel Research, 18 (3), 2-8.
- Burch, W. R., Jr. (1969). The Social Circles of Leisure: Competing Explanations. Journal of Leisure Research, 1 (2), 121-147.
- Buse, R. C. & N. Enosh (1977). Youth Experience: Effect on Participation in Recreational Activities. Land Economics, 53, 468-486.
- Calantone, R. J. & J. S. Johar (1984). Seasonal Segmentation of the Tourism Market Using Benefit Segmentation Framework. <u>Journal of Travel Research</u>, 23 (2), 14-24.
- Caltabiano, M. J. (1995). Main and Stress-Moderating Health Benefits of Leisure. Loisir et Societe/ Society and Leisure, 18, 33-52.
- Christensen, J. E. & D. R. Yoesting (1973). Social and Attitudinal Variants In High and Low Use of Outdoor Recreational Facilities. <u>Journal of Leisure Research</u>, 5 (1), 6-15.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Toward a Sociology of International Tourism. <u>Social Research</u>. 39, 164-82.
- Cohen, P.; Cohen, J.; Teresi, J.; Marchi, M, & C. N. Velez (1990). Problems in the Measurement of Latent Variables in Structural Equations Causal Models. <u>Applied</u> <u>Psychological Measurement</u>, 14, 183-196.
- Coopers and Lybrand Consulting (1996). Domestic Tourism Market Research Study: Final Report. Report for Canadian Tourism Commission.
- Cosenza, R. M. & D. L. Davis (1981). Family Vacation Decision Making over the Family Life Cycle: A Decision and Influence Structure Analysis. <u>Journal of Travel</u> <u>Research</u>, 20 (3), 17-23.
- Crask, M. R. (1981). Segmenting the Vacation Market: Identifying the Vacation Preferences, Demographics, And Magazine Readership of Each Group. Journal of <u>Travel Research</u>, 20 (3), 29-34.
- Crawford, D. W.; Godbey, G. & A. C. Crouter (1986). The Stability of Leisure Preferences. Journal of Leisure Research, 18 (1), 96-115.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for Pleasure Vacation. <u>Annals of Tourism Research</u>, 6 (4), 408-424.
- Cutler, R. C. (1993). Older Women's Leisure Activity and Quality of Life. In J. R. Kelly (Eds.), <u>Activity and Aging: Staying Involved in Later Life</u> (pp. 86-98). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dunlap, R. E. & K. D. Van Liere (1978). The New Environmental Paradigm. Journal of Environmental Education, 9 (4), 10-19.
- Elmslie, M. (1997). Beyond America: Canada. [Online] Available at www.fourthturning.com/cgi.local/netform/beyondamerica/a.cgi/3---3, April, 1, 1999.
- Epstein, S. & L. Teraspulsky (1986). Perception of Cross Situational Consistency. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50 (6), 1152-1163.
- Erickson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and Society. New York: Norton.
- Etzel, M. J. & R.G. Wahlers (1985). The Use of Requested Promotional Material by Pleasure Travelers. Journal of Travel Research, 23 (4), 2-7.
- Etzel, M. J. & A. G. Woodside (1982). Segmenting Vacation Markets: The Case of the Distant and Near Home Travelers. Journal of Travel Research, 22 (1), 10-14.
- Evans, J. R. & B. Berman (1988). Marketing. N.Y.: McMillan.
- Fiske, D. W. & S. R. Maddi (1961). <u>Functions of Varied Experience</u>. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Fodness, D. (1992). The Impact of Family Life Cycle on the Vacation Decision Making Process. Journal of Travel Research, 31 (2), 8-14.
- Foot, D. K. & D. Stoffman (1996). <u>Boom, Bust and Echo: How to Profit from the</u> <u>Coming Demographic Shift</u>. Toronto, Canada: Macfarlane Walter & Ross.
- Freysinger, V. J. & R. O. Ray (1994). The Activity Involvement of Women and Men in Young and Middle Adulthood: A Panel Study. <u>Leisure Sciences</u>, 16, 193-217.
- Gitelson, R. J. & D. L. Kerstetter (1990). The Relationship between Sociodemographic Variables, Benefits Sought and Subsequent Vacation Behavior: A Case Study. Journal of Travel Research, 26:24-29.

- Gladwell, N. J. (1990). A Psychographic and Sociodemographic Analysis of State Park Inn Users. Journal of Travel Research, 28 (4), 15-21.
- Glenn, N. D. (1977). <u>Cohort Analysis. Series: Quantitative Applications in the Social</u> <u>Sciences</u>, Sage University Paper: Newbury Park.
- Gordon, C.; Gaitz, C. M. & J. Scott (1976). Leisure and Lives: Personal Expressively Across the Life Span. In R. Binstock and E. Shanas (Eds). <u>Handbook of Aging</u> and the Social Sciences (pp. 310-341). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.
- Griffith, D. A. & P. J. Albanese (1996). An Examination Of Plog's Pyschographic Travel Model Within A Student Population. <u>Journal of Travel Research</u>, 34 (4), 47-52.
- Haley, R. (1968). Benefit Segmentation: A Decision Oriented Research Tool. Journal of Marketing, 23 (6), 30-35.
- Havighurst, R. J. (1972). <u>Development Tasks and Education</u>. New York: Longman, Green.
- Havighurst, R. J. (1973). Social Roles, Work, Leisure and Education. In C. Eisdorfer & M. P. Lawton (Eds). <u>The Psychology of Adult Development and Aging</u>. Washington, DC: APA Press.
- Hawes, D. K. (1977). Psychographics are Meaningful... Not Merely Interesting. Journal of Travel Research, 15 (1), 1-7.
- Hirschman, E. C. (1984). Leisure Motives and Sex Roles. Journal of Leisure Research, 16, 209-223.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1980). Toward A Dialectic Social Psychology of Leisure and Recreation. In S. E. Iso-Ahola (Ed.), <u>Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure</u> <u>and Recreation</u> (pp. 19-37). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E.; Jackson, E. & E. Dunn (1994). Starting, Ceasing and Replacing Leisure Activities over the Lifespan. Journal of Leisure Research, 26(3), 227-235.
- Jackson, E. L., & E. Dunn (1991). Is Constrained Leisure An Internally Homogeneous Concept? Leisure Sciences, 13, 161-84.
- Javalgi, R. G.; E. G. Thomas, & S. R. Rao (1992). Consumer Behavior in the US Pleasure Travel Marketplace: An Analysis of Senior and Nonsenior Travelers. Journal of Travel Research, 31 (2), 14-20.
- Johnson, E. M.; Scheuing, E. E. & K. A. Gaida (1986). <u>Service Buyer Behavior</u>. <u>Profitable Service Marketing</u>. Homewool: Dow Jones-Irwin.

- Joreskog, K. G. & D. Sorbom (1988). <u>LISREL VI: Analysis of Linear Structural</u> <u>Relationships by Maximum Likelihood and Least Squares Method</u>. Mooresville, IN: Scientific Software, Inc.
- Kahle, L. R. (1986). The Nine Nations of North America and the Value Basis of Geographic Segmentation. Journal of Marketing. 50 (2), 37-48.
- Kelly, J. R. (1974). Socialization toward Leisure: A Developmental Approach. Journal of Leisure Research, 6 (2), 181-193.
- Kelly, J. R. (1977). Leisure Socialization: Replication and Extension. Journal of Leisure Research, 9 (2), 121-132.
- Kelly, J. R. (1987). Freedom to be: A New Sociology of Leisure. New York: Macmillan.
- Kinnaird, V. & D. Hall (1994). <u>Tourism: A Gender Analysis</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Kleiber, D. A. (1985). Motivational Reorientation in Adulthood and the Resource of Leisure. In D. Kleiber & M. Maehr (Eds.), <u>Motivation and Adulthood</u>. (pp. 125-150). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Kotler, P. (1967). <u>Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, and Control</u>. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- LaPage, W. F. (1994). Using Panels for Travel and Tourism Research. In Ritchie, J.R, & C. R. Goeldner (2nd Eds). <u>Travel, Tourism and Hospitality Research: A Handbook</u> for Managers and Researchers (pp. 481-491). Toronto, ON: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- LaPage, W. F. & D. P. Ragain (1974). Family Camping Trends: An Eight-Year Panel Study. Journal of Leisure Research, 6 (2), 101-112.
- Larmer, B. (1999). Latino America. Newsweek, 134 (2), 48-51.
- Lawson, R. (1991) Patterns of Tourist Expenditure and Types of Vacation across the Family Life Cycle. Journal of Travel Research, 29 (4), 12-19.
- Loker, L. E. & R. R. Perdue (1992). A Benefit-Based Segmentation of a Non-Resident Summer Travel Market. Journal of Travel Research, 29 (1), 12-18.
- Lounsbury, J. W. & L. L. Hoopes (1988). Five-Year Stability of Leisure Activity and Motivation Factors. Journal of Leisure Research, 20 (1), 31-45.
- MacCallum, R.C. & M. W. Browne (1993). The Use of Causal Indicators in Covariance Structure Models: Some Practical Issues. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 114, 533-541.

- MacIntosh, R. W.; Goeldner, C. R. & J. R. B. Ritchie (1995). <u>Tourism, Principles</u>, <u>Practices and Philosophies</u>. (Ed. 7). New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Madrigal, R. & L. R. Kahle (1994). Predicting Vacation Activity Preferences on the Basis of Value-System Segmentation. Journal of Travel Research, 32 (3), 22-29.
- Mannell, R. C. & D. A. Kleiber (1997). <u>A Social Psychology of Leisure</u>. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Mason, P. (1996). The Family Leisure Travel Outlook. In C. R. Goeldner (Ed.) <u>1996</u> <u>Travel Outlook.</u>
- Mayo, E. F. (1975). Tourism and the National Parks: A Psychographic and Attitudinal Study. Journal of Leisure Research, 14 (1), 14-18.
- Mazanec, J. A. (1984). How to Detect Travel Market Segments: A Clustering Approach. Journal of Travel Research, 23 (1), 17-21.
- McGuire, F.; O'Leary, J.; Yeh, C-K. & F. Dottavio (1989). Integrating Ceasing Participation with other Aspects of Leisure Behavior: A Replication and Extension. Journal of Leisure Research, 21 (4), 316-326.
- McPherson, B. D. (1983). Aging as a Social Process. Toronto, ON: Butterworth.
- McPherson, B. D. (1991). Aging and Leisure Benefits: A Life Cycle Perspective. In Driver, B.L., Brown, P. J. & G.L. Peterson (Eds.). <u>Benefits of Leisure</u> (pp. 423-429). State College, PA: Venture Publishing Inc.
- McQuire, R.; Dottavio, F. D. & J. O'Leary (1987). The Relationship of Early Life Experiences to Later Life Leisure Involvement. <u>Leisure Sciences</u>, 9 (2), 251-257.
- Mehrabian, A. & J. A. Russell (1973). A Measure of Arousal Seeking Tendency. Environmental Behavior, 5, 315-333.
- Metz, J. B. (1999). In the Pluralism of Religious and Cultural Worlds. <u>Cross Currents</u>, 49 (2), 227-236.
- Michman, R. D. (1991). Lifestyle Market Segmentation. N.Y.: Praeger Publishers.
- Mieczkowski, Z. (1990). World Trends in Tourism and Recreation. N.Y.: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Miller, S. J. (1965). The Social Dilemma of the Aging Leisure Participant. In A. M. Rose and W. Peterson (Eds.) <u>Older People and Their Social Worlds.</u> (pp. 77-92). Philadelphia, PA: F. A. Davis Company.

- Mincer, J. (1974). <u>Schooling, Experience and Earnings</u>. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Murphy, P. E. & W. A. Staples (1979). A Modernized Family Life Cycle. Journal of Consumer Research, 6 (1), 12-22.
- Naisbitt, J. (1984). Megatrends. New York: Warner.
- Neugarten, B. L. (1977). Personality and aging. In J. Birren & K W. Schaie (Ed.) <u>Handbook of the Psychology of Aging</u> (pp. 626-649). New York: Van Nostrant Reinhold.
- Neugarten, B. L.; Moore, J. W. & J. C. Lowe (1968). Age Norms, Age Constraints and Adult Socialization. In B. L. Neugarten (Ed.) <u>Middle Age and Aging</u> (pp. 22-28). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Nickerson, N. P. & G. D. Ellis (1991). Traveler Types and Activation Theory: A Comparison of Two Models. Journal of Travel Research. 29 (3), 26-32.
- Opperman, M. (1995). Family Life Cycle and Cohort Effects: A Study of Travel Patterns of German Residents. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 4 (1), 23-45.
- Palmore, E. (1978). When Can Age, Period and Cohort be Separated? <u>Social Forces</u>, 57 (1), 282-295.
- Pearce, P. L & M. L. Caltabiano (1983). Inferring Travel Motivations from Traveler's Experiences. Journal of Travel Research, 22 (1), 16-20.
- Pennington, L. & D. L. Kerstetter (1994). An Exploratory Study of the Benefits Sought by College-Educated Women Traveling for Pleasure: Is there a Generational Effect? <u>Abstracts 1994 Leisure Research Symposium</u>. National Recreation and Park Association. San Antonio, TX.
- Perreault, W. D.; D. K. Darden & W. R. Darden (1977). A Psychographic Classification of Vacation Life-styles. Journal of Leisure Research, 9 (1), 208-23.
- Peters, T. (1988). <u>Thriving on Chaos, Handbook for a Management Revolution</u>. New York: Knopf.
- Pitts, R. E. & A. G. Woodside (1986). Personal Values and Travel Decisions. Journal of <u>Travel Research</u>, 25 (1), 20-25.
- Plog, S. (1972). Developing the Family Travel Market. In <u>the Values of Travel Research:</u> <u>Planning, Techniques and Applications</u>. Travel Research Association Third Annual Conference Proceedings, (pp. 209-221), Quebec, August, 13-16.

- Plog, S. (1974). Why Destination Areas Rise and Fall in Popularity. <u>The Cornell Hotel</u> and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 14 (1), 55-58.
- Poterba, J. M. (1989). Lifetime Incidence and the Distributional Burden of Excise Taxes. <u>American Economic Review</u>, 79 (2), 325-330.
- Rentz, J. O. & F. D. Reynolds (1991). Forecasting the Effects of an Aging Population on Product Consumption: An Age-Period-Cohort Framework. <u>Journal of Marketing</u> <u>Research</u>, 28 (3), 355-360.
- Rentz, J. O.; F. D. Reynolds & R. G. Stout (1983). Analyzing Changing Consumption Patterns with Cohort Analysis. Journal of Marketing Research, 20 (1). 12-20.
- Rentz, J.O. (1980). <u>The Impact of Aging, Period and Cohort Membership on</u> <u>Consumption of a Product Class</u>, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Georgia.
- Reynolds, F. D. & J. O. Rentz (1981). Cohort Analysis: An Aid to Strategic Planning. Journal of Marketing, 45 (2), 62-70.
- Robinson, J. & G. Godbey (1996). The Great American Slowdown. <u>American</u> <u>Demographics</u>, 18 (6), 42-48.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press.
- Rosenfeld, J. P. (1986). Demographics on Vacation. <u>American Demographics</u>, 8 (1), 38-43.
- Rosma G. & M. Blenman (1989). Vacation Patterns of the Elderly German. Annals of <u>Tourism Research</u>. 16 (2), 178-88.
- Samuel, N. (1999). <u>Women, Leisure and the Family in Contemporary Society: A</u> <u>Multinational Perspective</u> (Ed.) UK: CAB International.
- Schewe, C. D. & R. Calantone (1978). Psychographic Segmentation of Tourists. Journal of Travel Research, 16 (1), 14-20.
- Schmitz-Scherzer, R., & H. Thomae (1983). Constancy and Change of behavior in Old Age: Findings from the Bonn Longitudinal Study of Aging. In W. K. Schaie (Ed.) <u>Longitudinal Studies Of Adult Psychological Development</u> (pp. 191-221). New York: Guilford Press.
- Scott, D, & E. K. Willits (1989). Adolescent and adult leisure patterns: A 37-Year Follow-Up Study. Leisure Sciences, 11, 323-335.

- Scott, D, & E. K. Willits (1998). Adolescent and Adult Leisure Patterns: A Reassessment. Journal of Leisure Research, 30 (3), 319-330.
- Searle, M. S.; Mactavish, J. B. & R. E. Brayley (1993). Integrating, Ceasing Participation with other Aspects of Leisure Behavior: A Replication and Extension. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Leisure Research</u>, 26 (3), 227-237.
- Shaie, K. W. & C. R. Strother (1968). A Cross-Sectional Study of Age Changes in Cognitive Behavior. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 75 (12), 671-680.
- Shih, D. (1986). VALS as a tool of Tourism Market Research: The Pennsylvania Experience. Journal of Travel Research, 23 (1), 2-11.
- Shoemaker, S. (1989). Segmentation of the Senior Pleasure Travel Market. Journal of <u>Travel Research</u>, 29 (2), 8-12.
- Shoemaker, S. (1994). Segmenting the US Travel Market According To Benefits Realized. Journal of Travel Research, 32 (3), 8-19.
- Shuh, P. & J. Crompton (1983). Search Behavior of International Vacationers: Travel Specific Lifestyle and Sociodemographic Variables. <u>Journal of Travel Research</u>, 22 (2), 25-31.
- Silverberg, K; S. Backman & K. Backman (1996). A Preliminary Investigation into the Psychographics of Nature-Based Travelers to the Southeastern United States. Journal of Travel Research, 35 (2), 19-28.
- Smale, B. J. A. & S. L. Dupuis (1995). <u>A Longitudinal Analysis of the Relationship</u> <u>Between Leisure Participation and Psychological Well-Being Across the</u> <u>Lifespan</u>. Paper presented 1995 National Recreation and Parks Association.
- Smith, J. W. & A. Clurman (1997). <u>Rocking the Ages: The Yankelovich Report on</u> <u>Generational Marketing</u>. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Smith, W. (1957). Product Differentiation and Market Segmentation of Alternative Marketing Strategies. Journal of Marketing, 1 (1), 4.
- Snepenger, D. J. (1987). Segmenting the Vacation Market by Novelty Seeking Role. Journal of Travel Research, 25 (2), 8-12.
- Sofranko, A. J. & M. F. Nolan (1972). Early Life Experiences and Adult Sports Participation. Journal of Leisure Research, 4 (1), 6-18.

- Statistics Canada. (1988). <u>Postcensal Annual Estimates of Population By Marital Status</u>, <u>Age, Sex And Components Of Growth By Canada Provinces And Territories</u>, <u>June 1, 1988</u>.
- Statistics Canada. (1996). <u>Postcensal Annual Estimates of Population by Marital Status</u>, <u>Age, Sex and Components of Growth by Canada Provinces and Territories</u>, June <u>1, 1996</u>.
- Strauss, W. & N. Howe (1991). The Cycle of Generations. <u>American Demographics</u>, 13(4), 24-33, 53.
- Strauss, W. & N. Howe (1991). <u>Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to</u> 2069. Quill: New York, New York.
- Swenson, C. A. (1990). <u>Selling to a Segmented Market: The Lifestyle Approach</u>. New York: Quorum Books.
- Thayer, R. E. (1967). Measurement of Activation through Self-Report. Psychological <u>Reports</u>, 7, 86-94.
- Toffler, A. (1980). The Third Wave. New York: William Morrow.
- Tongren, H. N. (1980). Travel Plans of the Over 65 Market Pre and Post Retirement. Journal of Travel Research, 19 (1), 7-11.
- Tourism Canada (1986). <u>Market Research and the Canadian Tourism Attitude and</u> <u>Motivation Study: Research Report Segmentation Analysis</u>. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Unkel, M. (1981). Physical Recreation Participation of Females and Males During The Adult Life Cycle. <u>Leisure Sciences</u>, 4, 1-27.
- Van Minden, T. T. R. (1987). Dictionary of Marketing Research. Aron: The Bath Press.
- Villanueva, C. (1996). A Mosaic Future. Futures, 28 (6-7), 692-695.
- Vincint, V. C. and G. de los Santos (1990). Winter Texans: Two Segments of the Senior Travel Market. Journal of Travel Research, 29 (1), 9-12.
- Warnick, R. (1993). <u>Back to the Future: U.S. Domestic Travel and Generational Trends</u>, <u>1979 to 1991.</u> Paper presented at the Resort and Commercial Recreation Association, Mohonk Mountain House, New Paltz, New York.
- Warnick, R. (1993). U.S. Domestic Travel: Back to the Future. The Impacts of an Aging U.S. Population on Domestic Travel Trends. <u>The Annual Review of Travel</u>, (pp. 75-89). New York: American Express Travel Related Services, Inc.

- Waryszak, R. Z. & H. Kim (1994). Psychographic Segmentation of Tourists as a Predictor of their Travel Behavior: An Exploratory Study of Korean Tourists to Australia. Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing, 2 (4), 5-19.
- Weaver, P. A.; McCleary, K. W.; Lepisto, L. & L. T. Damonte (1994). The Relationship of Destination Selection Attributes to Psychological, Behavioral and Demographic Variables. <u>The Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing</u>, 2 (2), 93-109.

.

- Wells, W. D. (1975). Psychographics: A Critical Review. Journal of Marketing Research, 12 (5), 196-213.
- Wells, W. D., & G. Gubar (1966). Life Cycle Concept in Marketing Research. Journal of Marketing Research, 3 (10), 355-63.
- Wight, P. A. (1996). North American Ecotourists: Market Profile and Trip Characteristics. Journal of Travel Research, 34 (1), 2-10.
- Woodside A.G.; Moore, E. M. & M. J. Etzel (1980). Vacation Travel Behavior and Perceived Benefits of Home State Residents. <u>Journal of Travel Research</u>, 18 (4), 28-35.
- Woodside, A. G. & R. E. Pitts (1976). Effects Of Consumer Life Styles, Demographics and Travel Activities on Foreign and Domestic Travel Behavior. <u>Journal of Travel</u> <u>Research</u>, 14 (1), 13-15.
- Woodside, A. G. & L. W. Jacobs (1985). Step Two in Benefit Segmentation: Learning the Benefits Realized by Major Travel Markets. <u>Journal of Travel Research</u>, 24 (1), 7-13.
- Yoesting, D. R. & D. L. Burkhead (1973). Significance of Childhood Recreation Experience on Adult Leisure Behavior: An Exploratory Analysis. Journal of Leisure Research, 5, 25-36.
- Young, S.; Ott, L. & B. Feigin (1978). Some Practical Considerations in Market Segmentation. Journal of Marketing Research, 15 (3), 405-410.
- Zeiger, A. (1999). Customization Nation. Incentive, 173 (5), 35-50.
- Zimmer, Z.; Brayley, R. E. & M. S. Searle (1995). Whether to Go and Where to Go: Identification of Important Issues, Journal of Travel Research, 33 (3), 3-11.
- Zimmerman, C. (1982). The Life Cycle Concept as a Tool for Travel Research. <u>Transportation</u>, 11, 51-69.

Zuzanek, J. & B. J. A. Smale (1992). Life-Cycle Variations in Across-the-Week Allocation of Time to Selected Daily Activities. <u>Loisir et Societe/ Society and</u> <u>Leisure</u>, 15, 559-586.

