DECISION MAKING AND TRAVEL BEHAVIOR: A MIDWESTERN STUDY

Dissertation for the Degree of Ph. D. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY PAUL BARRY MYERS 1974



æ

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

Decision Making and Travel Behavior: A Midwestern Study

presented by

Paul Barry Myers

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Doctor of <u>Philosophy degree in Resource</u> Development

Lewis W Money Major professor

Date November 15, 1974

O-7639





.

WIR'S 71 JLP 2 6 1924 180 H-10-372-1 278 MAGIC 2 40 JAN 2 7 1999 042 MAN 8 23 3 2003 昭17 日本 107 A 153 HE

ABSTRACT

DECISION MAKING AND TRAVEL BEHAVIOR: A MIDWESTERN STUDY

By

Paul Barry Myers

Developing attractions to draw pleasure travelers is often seen as one way that localities, regions, and nations can supplement the economic benefits flowing into the area. Successful travel-based economic development involves effective promotion of the destination area and in this way the travel industry is similar to other industries dependent upon extensive marketing activities. It is fundamentally important, therefore, that promotional efforts created to attract visitors to an area be efficient and effective.

This research was an assessment of decision making patterns of travel consumers. Interest centered upon domestic automobile pleasure travelers in the Midwestern United States. The areas selected as locations of high potential for travel development were Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Ontario. The findings of the study should permit improvement in the efforts of the agencies responsible for promotion in these states and this province.

Conceptually, the research was based on the creation and tests of hypotheses drawn from previous studies of family decision making, spatial assessment and perception, social class, and family ideology. Optimal integration of conceptual and applied concerns was attempted.

A survey was executed in eight Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois counties in May and June, 1974, to gather the data for analysis. Total sample size was four hundred seventy-eight. The instrument was the structured personal interview questionnaire.

Major findings of the research include the patterns of decision making between spouses on the destination, route, and lodging choices before them. The destination and lodging decisions were found to most frequently be democratic while the route decisions most often are made by the male head of the household. The patterns of decision making between parents and children are shown to be largely a function of the age of the children.

Autonomy of decision making between age and class groups was examined, but the findings did not strongly support the hypotheses taken from the literature. Social class, visitation of relatives or non-relative centered destinations, and family ideology linkages were fruitfully discovered.

The psychological assessment of the form destination areas by respondents in the sampled state was measured with the semantic differential. Differences between persons who had visited the destination areas and other persons who had not been exposed directly to these states and this province are clear-cut. Previous visitors were more positive in their evaluations of the places.

A series of proposals developed after examination of the data are also included. These ideas fall into two groups. Future research is suggested that would be built upon this study and would further clarify the issues involved. The policy implications of the findings are presented in the hope that the principal agency clients will find the research useful in policy considerations.



DECISION MAKING AND TRAVEL BEHAVIOR: A MIDWESTERN STUDY

By

Paul Barry Myers

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Resource Development

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is first expressed to the members of my graduate committee: Professor Lewis Moncrief, who made the financial support for the study available, had sufficient confidence in my abilities to allow me to largely plan and execute the research, and actively chaired the committee; Professors Raleigh Barlowe, Robert McIntosh, and Denton Morrison, who served on the committee and lended their wise assistance to the planning of my program and development of this study. As a group and individually, these men worked with me and in my behalf during the period of my graduate training at Michigan State.

Several fellow students also participated in the project. Their contributions were put forth both formally and informally. Reckoning with their ideas was to my advantage. Included in this group of good friends and student colleagues are Charles Aldini, Robert Manning, David Mihalic, and Daniel Stynes. Their presence made my stay at Michigan State much more enjoyable and enlightening than it would have been in their absence.

The staff of the Recreation Research and Planning Unit, Jean Geis, Mary Casanova, Laura Welmers, Anne Mills, and Daniel Stynes, was relied upon heavily for several different types of assistance.

I am blessed with a family in which we comfort, cheer, and appreciate one another. My gratitude to the three feminine jewels of my personal Triple Crown, Nancy, Parke, and Heidy, cannot be adequately expressed. Through them, I am fulfilled.

ii

The Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission funded the study through Technical Assistance Project #10320168.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

																	Page
ACKNOW	LEDGME	NTS	•		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	ii
LIST O	F TABL	ES.	•	•••	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	vii
LIST O	F FIGU	RES	•	•••	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	ix
LIST O	F APPE	NDICES	S .	•••	•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	x
Chapte	r																
Ι.	INTRO	DUCTI	ΟΝ ΤΟ) THE	PRC	BLEM	I AND	OBJ	JECT	١V	ES	0F	THE	ST	UDY	•	1
	TRA I I	VEL-B/ mpacts mpacts mpacts	ASED s in s on s on	ECON the Soci the	OMI(Ecor al I Natu	C DEV nomy Insti Iral	'ELOP tuti Envi	MENT ons ronn	r nent	•	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	• • •	1 1 5 8
	THE	ROLE	OF I	BEHAV	IOR	NL RE	SEAR	CH I	IN T	RA	VEL	DE	VELO)P m i	ENT	•	11
	OBJ D D A T	ECTIVI ecisio ecisio ssessi ravel Deve	ES OI on Ma on Ma ment Dec lopma	F THE aking aking of P ision ent	RES Bet lace Mak	EARC tween tween and ting	H Spo Par I the and	ents Des Trav	; s an stir vel-	id iat Ba	Chi ion sed	ldr De Ec	en cis onor	ion nic	• • •	• • •	12 13 14 14
II.	REVIE	W OF '	THE I	RELEV	ANT	LITE	RATU	RE		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	17
	SOU	RCES (OF TI	RAVEL	. Mot	IVAT	ION	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	17
	DEC P P	ISION atter atter Chil	MAK ns o ns o dren	ING I f Dec f Dec	N TH isic isic	IE FA on Ma on Ma	MILY king king	Bet	twee twee	en en	Spo Par	use ent	s saı	nd	•	•	20 20 24
	F	amily	Ide	ology	and	i Rol	e De	fini	itic	on	•	•	•	•	•	•	25
	THE T T	ASSE he At he Im Senso Marko Geog he En	SSME titu ager ory l etin raphy viro	NT OF dinal y Per Psych g and y . nment	PL/ Pen rspection long Tra	ACE L rspec ctive gy ar avel Perce	ITER tive d Ps	ATUF ycho n Pe	RE	era	py		• • • • •	• • • •	• • •	•	26 27 28 28 30 31 32

Chapter

III.	CONCEPTS, THEIR MEASUREMENT AND HYPOTHESES	. 36
	CONCEPTS AND THEIR MEASUREMENT	. 36
	Decision Making Detween Spouses	
	Decision Making between Parents and Unitaren	. 3/
		. 3/
	Assessment of Place	. 37
	Exposure to the Region	. 38
	Travel for Pleasure	38
	Purpose of Plassure Trin	
		. 40
		. 40
	Background Factors	. 41
	HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED	. 41
	The Destination Decision	41
	The Poute and Lodging Decisions	12
	Family Idealogy and Autonomy	. 42
		. 43
• • •		45
11.	RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS	• 45
	DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT	. 45
	Pretest One	. 45
	Pretest Two	. 46
	SAMPLING	. 47
	Definition of the Area to be Sampled	
	Potucon County Compliand	. 4/
		. 40
	Within County Sampling	. 49
	Response to the Survey	. 50
	PERSONNEL AND THEIR TRAINING	. 53
	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE AND THE POPULATION	. 54
	Educational Achievements	54
		. 54 EA
		. 54
		. 56
	Sexual Composition	. 58
	Summary of the Check for Representativeness	. 60
	PROCEDURES OF ANALYSIS	. 60
۷.	FINDINGS: THE DESTINATION DECISION	. 62
		• •
	PATTERNS RETWEEN SPOUSES	62
		. 02
	DATTERNS DETLICEN DARENTS AND CUTLEREN	
	PATTERNS BETWEEN PARENTS AND CHILDREN	. 00
	VISITATION OF RELATIVES AS THE ATTRACTANT	. 69
	ASSESSMENT OF PLACE IN THE DESTINATION DECISION	. 72
	SOCIAL CLASS AND EXPOSURE	. 80

	- 90
SUMMARY OF THE DESTINATION DECISION FINDINGS	82
VI. FINDINGS: THE ROUTE AND LODGING DECISIONS	84
THE ROUTE DECISION	84 84 88
THE LODGING DECISION	91 91 94
VII. FINDINGS: FAMILY IDEOLOGY, AUTONOMY, AND TRAVEL BEHAVIOR	98
FAMILY IDEOLOGY AND TRAVEL	98
SOCIAL CLASS AND VISITATION OF RELATIVES	103
AUTONOMY IN TRAVEL DECISION MAKING	107 107 109
SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER	111
VIII. SUMMARY, POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS	113
SUMMARY	113
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS Recognition of Children as Travel Decision Makers Researching Assessment of Place As a Destination Promotion Tool Attracting the Traveler that Regularly Visits	116 116 117
Relatives	119
RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS	120
Decision Making Clarification of the Relationship Between Exposure	120
and Assessment	120
Inquiry on the Causal Relations Between Income and Visitation of Relatives	121
Analysis of the Social Class and Autonomy Relationship	122
LITERATURE CITED	124
APPENDICES	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	The County Within Each Stratum Selected for Study	49
2.	Response by County	51
3.	Comparison of the Median Years of Education Completed by Respondents and the Populations	55
4.	Comparison of Annual Household Income of Respondents and the Populations by County	57
5.	Comparison of the Racial Composition of the Sample and the Populations by County	59
6.	Comparison of the Sexual Composition of the Sample and the Populations by County	59
7.	Response to the Destination Question between Spouses by Sex	63
8.	Response to the Destination Question between Spouses by Educational Level	65
9.	Response to the Destination Question between Parents and Children	68
10.	The Age of Children Influence on the Destination Decision between Parents and Children	68
11.	Maternal and Paternal Patterns in Visitation of Relatives.	71
12.	The Polar Adjectives Used in Measuring the Assessment of Place Factor	73
13.	Intra-Regional Comparisons of Mean Scores on Each Scale .	74
14.	County Means of the Summated Attractiveness Score Toward Each Area	76
15.	Means of the Summated Attractiveness Score Toward Each Area by Exposure	78
16.	Exposure to the Region by Different Educational Groups - Michigan	82

Table

17.	Response to the Route Decision Question between Spouses by Sex	86
18.	Response to the Route Decision Question between Spouses by Educational Level	87
19.	Response to the Route Decision Question between Parents and Children	89
20.	The Age of Children Influence on the Route Decision between Parents and Children	89
21.	Response to the Lodging Decision Question Between Spouses by Sex	92
22.	Response to the Lodging Decision Question between Parents and Children	95
23.	The Age of Children Influence on the Lodging Decision between Parents and Children	95
24.	Response to the Family Ideology Scales by County	101
25.	Mean Scores on the Family Ideology Measure by Reason for Trips	102
26.	Differences in Educational Achievement by Reason for Trip .	1 05
27.	The Relationship Between Autonomy in the Destination, Route, and Lodging Decisions and Income Level	108
28.	The Relationship Between Autonomy in the Destination, Route, and Lodging Decisions and Age Level	110

Page

LIST OF FIGURES

	Figure								
	1.	The Sequence of Interest: Decision Making and Economic Development	•	16					
2	2.	Profile Presentation of Mean Scores on the Semantic Differential	•	75					

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

- A. Interview Schedules Pre-Test and Final
 - 1. Pre-Test Interview Schedule
 - 2. Final Interview Schedule
 - 3. Guide Map Given to Respondents
- B. Area of the Study and Selected Counties
- C. Letter Sent to Potential Respondents
- D. Matrices of Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between Semantic Differential Scales - Michigan, Minnesota, Ontario, Wisconsin
 - Correlation Matrix Between Semantic Differential Scales -Michigan
 - Correlation Matrix Between Semantic Differential Scales -Minnesota
 - 3. Correlation Matrix Between Semantic Differential Scales Ontario
 - Correlation Matrix Between Semantic Differential Scales -Wisconsin
- E. Exposure to the Region by Different Educational Groups -Minnesota, Ontario, Wisconsin
 - 1. Exposure to the Region by Different Educational Groups Ontario
 - Exposure to the Region by Different Educational Groups -Wisconsin
 - 3. Exposure to the Region by Different Educational Groups -Minnesota
- F. Number of Children and Patterns of Decision Making Between Parents and Children
 - 1. Number of Children by Response to the Route Decision between Parents and Children
 - 2. Number of Children by Response to the Lodging Decision between Parents and Children
- G. Family Ideology Measure Means and Correlation Matrix
 - 1. Mean Scores on Each Scale of the Family Ideology Measure
 - 2. Correlation Matrix between Family Ideology Scales

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The attraction of non-resident travelers to an area is widely recognized as one of the means that can be used toward achieving the goal of more complete economic development at local, state, regional, and national levels. Travelers, directly and indirectly, stimulate the economies of destination areas through their expenditures. As a consequence of their presence and spending, levels of employment, income, and transactions are increased.

Since changes in the economy lead to and reflect changes in the **natural environment and other social institutions of any society**, a **review of travelers**¹ affects on areas should include a discussion of **these two spheres as well as the economy**. The interdependence of **these three elements has long been known**, but frequently neglected by **reporters in each of the areas of inquiry**.

Travel-Based Economic Development

Impacts in the Economy

Travel-based development is most frequently justified on the **basis** that the residents of the destination locale will receive eco**nomic** benefits from the spending of travelers. It has been written **that** economic benefits are one of few positive consequences of an

area's reliance on serving as a destination for visitors. A brief comparison between the travel industry and its related enterprises and other possible growth sectors should serve as a source of clarification on the travel industry's potential for creating and sustaining economic development in an area.

First, the travel multiplier is generally low relative to other industries. Whether measured in terms of income generated or employment induced, the travel industry's multiplier, the rippling effect that spending has through economic systems, is not particularly high. This is due to high leakage in the industry. This means that much of the return on the exported product, travel and recreation, is lost through imports. A large proportion of the money coming into the area goes directly back out before circulating in the local economy. This leakage, however, varies under differing conditions. For example, locally owned establishments generate more local income and employment than do facilities of similar scale associated with regional or national franchise chains.

A second factor associated with travel development is its potential for stretching local tax bases without adequate return. Infrastructural costs required to service the travel industry are high and in some

¹Arthur D. Little, Inc., <u>Tourism and Recreation</u> (Washington, D.C.: ^ECONOmic Development Administration, United States Department of ^{COMM}merce, n.d.), p. 57.

Wendell Beardsley, "The Economic Impact of Recreation Development: A Synopsis", in <u>Recreation Symposium Proceedings</u> (Upper Darby, Pa.: Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, United States Forest Service, 1971), pp. 29-30.

areas the visitors, through sales taxes usually, do not cover the costs of providing the services and facilities that they necessitate. Examples of this are transportation facilities, public health measures, police and fire protection, and other services/facilities that may be necessary on a seasonal basis.³ It should be pointed out, however, that these costs are most often met through additional revenues generated by the travelers.

A third consideration in evaluating the potential of the travel industry to lift local, regional, or national economies is the type of labor required by firms in the industry. This varies considerably by type of firm, but in general, tourism is a low-skill, labor-intensive industry. This is not true for many firms in the industry and does not reflect the situation in other sectors that may be travel dependent. In addition, the fact that many travel-based firms do largely rely on lowskill or seasonal labor does not detract from their appeal in areas where unemployment is high, wages are low, the labor force is poorly trained, and there are few development alternatives.

Perhaps the most notable consequence of travel and recreation development is increasing values of land. Beardsley observes that increasing land values are distinctive economic changes caused by tourism developments. Beardsley, in fact, reports that Cape Cod remained economically unchanged except for the rise in land costs when the national seashore was created there by the Department of the Interior.⁴

⁽Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), pp. 247-248.

⁴Beardsley, "Economic Impact of Recreation", p. 31.

One of the areas upon which this study is focused, northern Michigan, is heavily dependent upon the travel and recreation industry. Since tourism has surpassed mining, agriculture, forestry, and other sectors and become "the leading industry of northern Michigan",⁵ it is appropriate to briefly discuss the impact of travel for pleasure on this particular area.

As early as 1964, it was estimated that \$118,400,000 was brought into and spent in Michigan's Upper Peninsula alone for tourism and recreational activities.⁶ If the northern part of the Lower Peninsula were included, if the substantial increases in levels of consumption were considered, and if the influence of inflation were taken into account, then this figure would doubtlessly be higher today.

Michigan ranks third in the nation in the number of second homes owned by its residents.⁷ A high proportion of these residences are located in northern Michigan on both peninsulas. In terms of per capita tourist spending, it was estimated in 1963 that northern Michigan received \$175 per resident in expenditures by visitors. The figure for the remainder of the state was estimated at only \$35 per year.⁸

⁷Conway Research, Inc., <u>The Site Selection Handbook-Guide to Land</u>, <u>Leisure and Travel Investment</u>, <u>1973</u> (Atlanta: Conway Research, Inc., 1973), p. 6.

⁸Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, <u>An Economic Survey of the Northern Lake States</u> <u>Region</u> (East Lansing: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, 1967), p. 87.

⁵W. Paul Strassman, <u>Economic Growth in Northern Michigan</u> (East Lansing: Institute for Community Development and Services, Michigan State University, n.d.), p. 5.

⁶Uel Blank and Clare Gunn, <u>Guidelines</u> for <u>Tourism-Recreation</u> in <u>Michigan's</u> <u>Upper</u> <u>Peninsula</u> (Upper Peninsula Committee on Area Progress, Tourism and Recreation Subcommittee, 1966), p. 15.

Another statistic that adds perspective to the assertion of tourism's leading economic role in northern Michigan is the estimate that 13 per cent of the total sales and services generated in the area was due to spending by visitors. The level for southern Michigan was estimated to be only 2 per cent.⁹ Data such as these, despite legitimate questions as to their absolute accuracy, permits the observer to fully appreciate the reliance of this particular area on the travel trade. Other areas, around the Great Lakes, in Florida, and the Rocky Mountain West, are similarly dependent on visitors' spending. On the whole, tourism can seldom carry the economic development burden alone. Few, if any, industries are capable of doing so.

In summary, however, it is clear that the attraction of non-residents can contribute to the economic well-being of the distination area. The travel industry does carry with it several unique characteristics, such as seasonality, high elasticity of demand, and so on, which reduce its attractiveness as a primary growth sector. Yet in many areas where travel for pleasure is the major industry there are few other apparent or feasible means of generating economic development.

Impacts on Social Institutions

It has been written that "institutions represent established arrangements in society and established ways of doing things. They involve the working rules of society".¹⁰ Perhaps reflecting the

¹⁰Raleigh Barlowe, <u>Land Resource Economics</u>, 2nd ed. (Englewood **Cliffs**, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 357.

⁹Ibid., p. 88.

priorities of economic growth, there has been little research devoted to assessing the institutional changes caused by or associated with reliance on travel as an economic base. Three reports, however, do merit attention. Each of the reports is primarily based upon observations of international travel for pleasure and none of them are solidly supported by empirical research. Using the broad concept of institutional factors to apply to informal as well as formal arrangements between people in a society, each of these three reports can be appropriately considered under the heading of institutional changes brought on by travel development.

The first report is directed toward the patterns of interpersonal relationships between host and visitor. Willis Sutton has attempted to illuminate the nature of the social bond that exists between the traveler and the residents of the distination area. He describes three unique "social qualities" of tourism. First, Sutton writes that both parties recognize the transitory and non-repetitive nature of their relationship. This mutual recognition of the temporary nature of the relationship can Promote tolerance and forebearance. It can, however, also lead to attempts by either or both parties to exploit the other without fear of having to interact with the other person over an extended period of time.¹¹

The second characteristic of the bond between host and visitor, as discussed by Sutton, is the orientation to immediate gratification. The host seeks to get a maximum return from the visitor while he can.

¹¹Willis Sutton, "Travel and Understanding: Notes on the Social Structure of Touring", <u>International</u> <u>Journal</u> <u>of</u> <u>Comparative</u> <u>Sociology</u> (1967): 221-222.

The visitor, too, tries to pack all he can into a few days time. Opportunities for a number of activities must be taken advantage of quickly or they are lost forever.¹²

The unbalanced level of knowledge of the two parties is the third distinctive characteristic of encounters between residents and visitors. The resident is usually familiar with local facilities and opportunities while the visitor may be quite ignorant of such matters. This assymetry in knowledge can produce suspicion, resentment, and exploitation. On the other hand, it can circumstantially lead to genuinely gracious assistance that is highly appreciated by the visitor.¹³

Taken as a group, Sutton's remarks reflect a certain ambivalence in the social consequences of travel upon an area. The interaction between residents and visitors can be mutually satisfying or intolerable. The exchanges that develop in such a setting and the ramifications of such exchanges on the institutional patterns of resident relationships in the destination area have not received thorough empirical treatment.

One rather casual attempt to generalize a sequence of the relationship between visitors and residents is presented in Lundberg. The unit of analysis here is not individuals but rather different groups of persons interacting over time. There is a continual turnover in persons meeting one another because of the transitory nature of the travel experience. The sequence begins with a period during which visitors are warmly received as benefactors by the residents. Later the residents realize that the travelers do not bring instant wealth to the host area and

¹²<u>Ibid</u>. ¹³<u>Ibid</u>.

resentment of visitors increases. Lackadaisical treatment of guests, labor inefficiencies, and other manifestations of such resentment become apparent.¹⁴

This description was applied to the hotel and tourism development efforts of several underdeveloped countries. It was not created to point out the problems of tourism development in nations such as the United States. It does serve as a reminder, however, that the interaction between residents and visitors can be quite strained.

The final report to be covered was prepared by John Forster. Forster also discusses the evolving changes in the attitudes of residents toward visitors but his paper is focused on the lifestyle impacts of tourism on residents. He charges that dependence on visitors' presence creates artificiality on the part of residents and changes culturallybased behavior into mere performance.¹⁵ At the same time, travel development does not necessarily serve as a source of cultural disintegration. Forster's remarks appear to be warranted for areas where travel reliance is excessive and where the cultural backgrounds of residents and visitors are widely disparate. These circumstances seldom exist in domestic destination areas.

Impacts on the Natural Environment

The connections between the productive process and various natural systems are well documented for many industries. Beyond research done

¹⁴Donald E. Lundberg, <u>The Tourist Business</u> (Boston: Cahners Books, **7972**), pp. 192-193.

¹⁵John Forster, "The Sociological Consequences of Tourism," <u>Inter-</u> **Inter- Inter- Inter-Int**

on different transport modes and on natural recreation areas, little analysis has been completed on the relationship between the productive units of the travel industry and the natural environment in which they are located. Much of the attention of observers has been focused on aesthetic issues associated with the travel industry.

One chapter of historian Daniel Boorstin's book, <u>The Image</u>: <u>A Guide</u> to <u>Pseudo-Events in America</u>, is devoted to what he calls the "lost art of travel". Boorstin wrote of fundamental changes in American society which were largely due to advances in communications technology. He argued that pseudo-events had in large part replaced the genuine observable reality of American life and places. Appearance, according to Boorstin, has displaced substance as the key to our evaluation of objects, persons, and places. Travel, he writes, is no exception. He writes of destinations which have evolved from an original attraction to mere artificial substitutes of that attraction.¹⁶ The tourist's expectations, created through exposure to various media, must be met or surpassed. Otherwise, he will be disappointed.¹⁷

As people are attracted to an area, firms to service them are also pulled to it. The result is that many areas, in the words of Clare Gunn,

¹⁶Daniel Boorstin, <u>The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America</u> (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), Chapter 3.

¹⁷The author is reminded of an incident that took place on a recent Visit to Everglades National Park in Florida. While walking along one of the elevated boardwalks out into the deep sawgrass, he overheard another Visitor tell his wife that "it looks like just another marsh to me." The COuple was disappointed because it was during the rainy season and the "gator hole" was empty of alligators. Their expectations were not fulfilled.

have become "chaotic, awkward, and ugly".¹⁸ Gunn's professional life has been spent in trying to help localities avoid such problems.

His point has been echoed by Lowenthal in his description of "visual schizophrenia" in American life.¹⁹ Overdevelopment and past construction of low quality and unsightly facilities now plagues many destination areas in the United States. These aesthetic concerns are shared by residents and visitors alike. The very qualities that appeal to both groups are ultimately destroyed by persons seeking to enjoy them.

Concern with enhancement of a physical environment often emerges, however, when residents realize the way non-residents may perceive their area. In this way, the travel industry has contributed to the maintenance of the attractive features of many communities and wider geographical areas. Several cities in the United States serve as prominent examples of these phenomena. These localities have sections, Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco, the San Antonio riverfront, and the French Quarter in New Orleans, which have been preserved or developed to attract visitors.

So again, it is clear that travel development can be attractive to areas in need of economic stimulation, cultural revitalization, and aesthetic guidance while at the same time potentially disruptive of these same elements of concern. This requires that great care be exercised in planning travel development projects of any type. The goal should be to minimize the negative and maximize the positive affects of

¹⁸Clare Gunn, <u>Vacationscape</u>: <u>Designing Tourist Regions</u> (Austin: Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas, 1972), pp. 6-7.

¹⁹David Lowenthal, "America as Scenery", <u>Geographical Review</u> 56 (1966): 115-118.

travel on the economy, the social institutions, and the natural environment of the destination area.

The Role of Behavioral Research in Travel Development

If travel development is accepted as a development goal in an area, what potential roles could be played by social scientists, particularly behavioral scientists, in the successful implementation of plans and reaching of goals? Behavioral scientists can fulfill two important functions in efforts of this type. They are the data-collection and the consumer study functions.

The systematic collection of reliable information on the volume, characteristics, and patterns of visitors, facilities, and interaction between visitors and facilities/services has unfortunately been widely neglected in the United States during the past. Such data, if it is of sufficient quality and can be readily retrieved, is of great value to agencies and firms involved in the planning process. One observer of travel in the Upper Midwest has made several recommendations to the public sector regarding travel development. His first, and most heavily emphasized, suggestion involved building systematic data-gathering and research programs that would be coordinated with one another.²⁰ Behavioral scientists can be useful in creating and maintaining such information systems.

The second prominent role that can be played by applied behavioral scientists involves study of travel consumers, their tastes, and their

²⁰Donald E. Lodge, <u>The Development of Outdoor Recreation in the</u> <u>Upper Midwest</u> (Minneapolis: North Star Research and Development Institute, 1964), p. 123.

behavior. Qualitative and quantitative improvement of marketing and promotion activities are mentioned by Gray as one of two basic ways that areas can increase their share of the travel export market.²¹ The crucial role of promotion in travel development cannot be denied. Consumer, or visitor, research can be both conceptually and practically strong as it is done by the behavioral scientist.

This study falls in the latter category of behavioral research as it relates to travel and recreation development and planning. It is a study of potential visitors to the Upper Great Lakes region in the United States and Canada. A genuine effort has been made in the development of this proposal to integrate conceptual concerns with the information needs of the sponsoring agency and other clients outside the academic community. This is consistent with the approach called for by Hendee. This sociologist has ably presented arguments for the inclusion of both theoretical and applied questions in the planning of research on leisure behavior.²²

Objectives of the Research

This section is devoted to a brief discussion of the goals of the study. The points of attention are the decision making process between spouses in the family, the decision making processes between parents and children in the family, and travel opportunity perception by the individual. These comments will be followed by a short section which relates

²¹H. Peter Gray, <u>International Travel-International Trade</u> (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1970), p. 126.

²²John C. Hendee, "Sociology and Applied Leisure Research," <u>Pacific</u> <u>Sociological Review</u> 4 (1971): 360-368.

the goals of the study to the broader goals of travel-based economic development.

Decision Making Between Spouses

Potential travelers face numerous choices in the planning and execution of travel for pleasure. The first of the major objectives, both conceptual and applied, of this study is to assess and analyze the patterns of travel decision making that exist between husband and wife. The decisions of interest are the selection of a destination, choice of a route, and selection of lodging facilities.

Conceptually, patterns of decision making and sources of influence on the decision are of interest to observers of the nuclear family. The roles played by husband and wife in reaching a settlement on any type of issue before the couple reflect a good deal on the internal mechanics of their relationship. Travel for pleasure judgements, like selections of housing, employment, child-rearing procedures, and a myriad of consumer choices, involve mutual recognition of expertise or lack of expertise, trust, and role-playing between the spouses.

In an applied sense, the determination of patterns of decision making is useful in preparing a product for the market and in developing awareness knowledge of its existence or utility. This is a fundamental concern to persons involved in the marketing aspect of private enterprise and, in a broader sense, the provision of services or facilities by the public sector as well. Knowledge of who makes the choice facilitates the efficient communication of information to the appropriate person. Decision Making Between Parents and Children

If attention is directed only toward the spouses of the family, study of the patterns of decision making is incomplete. Children are also involved in such processes and cannot be neglected by the careful researcher. For this reason, travel decisions reached between parents and their child or children are included as an area of inquiry in this study.

As before, the decisions selected for analysis are the destination, route, and lodging choices. The remarks made on the conceptual and applied uses of research done on decision making and spouses apply equally well in this case. The roles occupied by parents and children in travel decisions are of interest to persons involved in both conceptual knowledge generation and practical knowledge use.

Assessment of Place and the Destination Decision

The third point of attention in this study deals specifically with the destination decision. Perception of alternative destinations influences the destination ultimately chosen by the potential visitors or the member(s) of the group selecting the destination. As with the other main objectives of this study, assessment of place as a research concern has both scholarly and practical uses.

The body of scientific literature dealing with man's perception of the various environments in which he finds himself is growing rapidly. Natural and artificial places have been analyzed in the way occupants perceive them. Micro and macro environments have also been studied from the viewpoint of the human perceiver. Analysis of this assessment data permits researchers to continue to generalize on the relationship between man and his reaction to the settings in which he is located.

The applied uses of such information are apparent. Potential and past alterations of the environment, regardless of scale, can be subjected to research with people evaluating such changes. Planning can be done with this consideration optimized within the constraints of the project. In travel development particularly, data on assessment of place permits greater efficiency in promotion and allows planners to base their judgements on a greater amount of information.

Travel research, and leisure research in general, has been primarily oriented toward the third of Clawson and Knetsch's five phases of the recreation experience.²³ This is the on-site experiences and activities phase of the total experience. Less attention has been paid to the first two phases: anticipation and travel to the site. Included in the anticipation phase is trip planning. Selection of a destination is integral in trip planning. This is the influence that assessment of place has on the destination decision. Other factors being equal, persons are more likely to journey to areas that they perceive as capable of fulfilling their preferences than to alternative areas of less attractiveness.

Travel Decision Making and Travel-Based Economic Development

The relationship between the attraction of visitors and economic development has been documented. Likewise, the role of decision making in travel has been tied to the attraction of visitors. The ultimate impacts of these decisions lie clearly in the realm of travel-based economic development. The possible contributions of behavioral research

²³Clawson and Knetsch, <u>Economics of Outdoor Recreation</u>, pp. 33-36.

are not far removed from economic development efforts if these efforts are holistic and systematic.

FIGURE 1.--The Sequence of Interest: Decision Making and Economic Development DECISION MAKING TRAVEL DEVELOPMENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Figure 1 presents the model guiding this study. An attempt has been made to describe the sequence of concern, from decision making to travel to economic development, in such a way as to facilitate understanding of the apparent leap from inter-and intra-personal choice patterns to economic change. The exercise of individual and group tastes is the basis of economic systems. The manifestations of these tastes are behavioral acts. Understanding of economic development requires knowledge of such behavior as well as economic models.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

Sources of Travel Motivation

A useful approach for classifying the reasons people take trips for pleasure is the distinction between "push" and "pull". Discussions of travel motivation tend to be oriented in one or the other of these two directions. These reports share themes that are found in many analyses of human migration. "Push and pull" factors influence the permanent migrant as well as the traveler. Wolpert's paper on the concepts of stress and strain and their role in a migrant's response to environmental pressures reflects this conceptualization.²⁴ From this perspective, travel for pleasure may be seen as a temporary form of migration and the "push-pull" idea is helpful in categorizing literature on travel motivation.

Several publications have been released which include material on the psychological sources of travel for pleasure. These are treated here as "push" factors. Grinstein, a psycho-therapist, has written a paper on this topic from a psychoanalytical viewpoint and stated that:

vacations may effect a change in the situation so that either the demands of the external world are temporarily reduced or the situation is so altered that the possibilities of dealing actively with some segment of reality are increased.

²⁴ Julian Wolpert, "Migration as an Adjustment to Environmental Stress," Journal of Social Issues 22 (1966): 92-102.

This serves to enhance the feeling of mastery over reality, either directly or symbolically.²⁵

This report concluded with Grinstein's observation that vacation travel is merely one way in which persons may "extend their ego boundaries."²⁶

This is similar to a more general set of reasons covered by Lundberg. This travel specialist has presented a series of "push" factors. Included are: the need for change, search for the exotic, learning, to experience power, beauty, and wonder, ego enhancement and sensual indulgence, rest, relaxation and/or excitement, and others.²⁷ His terminology is somewhat vague and overly generalized, but the point is well made that persons travel for a great variety of conscious and expressable reasons. Kaplan takes a similar approach in distinguishing between the form and content of the travel experience. Form refers to attitudes, expectations, and planning. Content refers to contacts with different people, places, and objects.²⁸ The form and content idea is a convenient bridge to "pull" factors as content may be thought of as "push" and form as "pull" in this present treatment.

Others have approached the travel motivation issue from the viewpoint of the destination of the traveler, rather than the traveler himself. These discussions are here labeled "pull" ideas. Gray uses the terms <u>wanderlust</u> and <u>sunlust</u> in describing the two basic appeals that destinations may satisfy. Wanderlust is defined as:

²⁵Alexander Grinstein, M.D., "Vacations: A Psycho-Analytic Study," <u>International Journal of Psycho-Analysis</u> 36 (1955): 178.

²⁶<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 184.

 $^{^{27}}Lundberg,$ Tourist Business, Chapter entitled, "Why Tourists Travel".

²⁸Max Kaplan, Leisure in America: <u>A Social Inquiry</u> (New York: Wiley, 1960), p. 212.

that basic trait in human nature that causes some individuals to want to leave things with which they are familiar and to go and see at first hand different existing cultures and places, or the relics of past cultures in places famous for their historical associations, ruins and monuments.²⁹

<u>Sunlust</u> is described as "a special type of travel which depends upon the existence elsewhere of different or better amenities for a specific purpose than are available locally."³⁰ Using this dichotomy, destinations may be categorized as either satisfying sunlust, wanderlust, or a combination of the two drives. Gray's reduction of the multiple sources of travel for pleasure behavior into two basic forms is quite useful in considering the appeal of commercial destinations. It has no utility in accounting for visits to non-commercial locations. A prominent example is the function that vacations can have in what Dumazedier loosely calls "tightening family ties."³¹

A final approach that has been used in attempting to explain the pull of commercial destinations is Plog's allocentric-psychocentric dimensioning. Plog believes that both travelers and locations can be categorized using these concepts. Psychocentricity is used to describe a person who is self inhibited, nervous, and non-adventuresome. Allocentric persons are characterized by "adventuresomeness, self confidence, a lack of generalized anxieties common among psychocentrics and a willingness to reach out and experiment with life."³² It then follows,

²⁹Gray, <u>International Travel</u>, p. 13.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Joffre Dumazedier, <u>Toward a Society of Leisure</u> (New York: Free Press, 1967), p. 134.

³²Stanley Plog, "Why Destinations Rise and Fall in Popularity," a paper presented before Southern California Chapter, The Travel Research Association, October 10, 1972, pp. 2-30.

according to Plog, that these "personalities" are drawn to destinations with similar "personalities". Plog's research has apparently shown that the distribution of these characteristics in the American population approaches normality. Psychocentricity and allocentricity represent the ideal types, or extremes, of the distribution. This approach is along the same lines as other studies which describe product-consumer matchups and is the final discussion of travel motivation to be covered. This review can be summarized with the generalization that travel for pleasure is a result of simultaneous pressures on the individual. He is pushed out of one area and drawn to another for a number of reasons, several of which have been discussed.

Decision Making in the Family

Patterns of Decision Making Between Spouses

Murdock writes that a nuclear family "consists typically of a married man and woman with their offspring, although in individual cases one or more additional persons may reside with them."³³ He reviewed a massive volume of ethnological reports and concluded that an intra-family division of labor between the sexes is found in every known human society. This included both conjugal and consanguinial family structures. The reasons for the apparent inevitability of such a division of labor lie in the biological makeup of the sexes and all cultures have reinforced these differences with a great variety of norms, values, and beliefs.

Approaching the conjugal, or nuclear, family from a functionalist viewpoint, Zelditch set down the basic dimension of expressive and

³³George Murdock, <u>Social</u> <u>Structure</u> (New York: Macmillan, 1960), P. 1.
instrumental functions in the family.³⁴ These concepts have been widely applied both in family studies and research on other samll groups and institutions. Expressive-instrumental functions were reviewed by Parsons and Bales. They wrote that:

the instrumental-expressive distinction we interpret as essentially the differentiation of functions, and hence of relative influence, in terms of 'external' vs 'internal' functions of the system. The area of instrumental function concerns relations of the system to its situation outside the system, to meeting the adaptive conditions of its maintenance of equilibrium, and 'instrumentally' establishing the desired relations to external goal-objects. The expressive area concerns the 'internal' affairs of the system, the maintenance of integrative relations between the members, and regulation of the patterns and tension levels of its component units.³⁵

Typically, the male performs instrumental roles and the female accounts for the expressive roles. The influence of each, however, is relative and not absolute. This has been verified in a large number of studies.³⁶

The relationship between the traditional roles of husband and wife in the family and patterns of decision making between them should be apparent from the discussion above. Husbands generally make decisions in the instrumental sphere and wives generally make decisions in the expressive sphere. This broad generalization, however, hides a number of conditional and variable influences.

³⁴Morris Zelditch, "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: A Comparative Study," in Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales, <u>Family</u>, <u>Socialization</u>, and <u>Interaction Process</u> (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955), Chapter 6.

³⁵Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales, <u>Family</u>, <u>Socialization</u>, <u>and</u> <u>Interaction</u> <u>Process</u> (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955), pp. 46-47.

³⁶Murdock, <u>Social Structure</u>, pp. 7-8; Wilson, <u>Sociology</u>: <u>Rules</u>, <u>Roles</u>, and <u>Relationships</u> (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1971), p. 300; Goode, <u>The Family</u> (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 69-72.

One treatment of the household decision making process as it relates to spending patterns, in particular, was written by Kenkel. Kenkel relates purchasing of goods and services to Zelditch's concepts of expressive and instrumental functions and follows with a discussion of the substantial variation produced in these patterns by such factors as social class, ethnicity, age of the couple, presence of children, presence of wife in the external labor force, and others. For example, Kenkel discusses the greater rigidity of the sexual division of labor in lower status households and the impact of such definitions of proper **responsibilities** on spending decisions.³⁷ In doing so. Kenkel took the concepts of instrumental and expressive functions out of their original context. Parsons, Bales, and one of their contributors, Zelditch, rather strictly used these terms to describe extra-familial and intrafamilial functions. Apparently, they are flexible enough to be crossbred with other dimensions of family life. This study will follow Kenkel's lead and utilize the particular concepts somewhat more broadly than their developers did.

Komarovsky wrote of similar variations in expenditure patterns and focused on social class differences. Her interest was in autonomy of spending decisions and she created a master hypothesis that is stated as: "there is greater autonomy with regard to expenditures at the bottom and at the top of the socioeconomic hierarchy than among the

³⁷William F. Kenkel, "Family Interaction in Decision-Making on Spending," in Nelson Foote, ed., <u>Household Decision-Making</u> (New York: N.Y.U. Press, 1961), pp. 140-164.

middle classes."³⁸ This curvilinear pattern, cutting across status lines, is matched by a point made by Kenkel on the influence of age on expenditures. He reported young and elderly couples are more specialized in decision-making than couples in the middle age range.³⁹

Several propositions set forth or discussed by Kenkel, Komarovsky, and Wilkening⁴⁰ have been developed into testable hypotheses in the context of travel for pleasure for this study. Some research has already shown that around seventy per cent of couples jointly select a vacation destination.⁴¹ The questions here, however, go well beyond this basic consideration and include a greater variety of decisions that are made prior to or during travel for pleasure. Choices of routes and lodging, as well as destinations, are each activities that involve decision making processes. Variations in these patterns by social class and other factors also deserve examination. The basic questions revolve around the maintenance or suspension of roles more firmly established while the couple is going about its usual routine in its permanent residence. For example, does the wife who has homemaking responsibilities at home also select the lodging on a trip? Or, are such responsibilities clouded and shared? Since travel involves "coping with strange environments", a traditionally masculine or instrumental function,

³⁸Mirra Komarovsky, "Class Differences in Family Decision Making On Expenditures," in Nelson Foote, ed., <u>Household Decision-Making</u> (New York: N.Y.U. Press, 1961), p. 260.

³⁹Kenkel, "Family Interaction," p. 154.

⁴⁰Eugene A. Wilkening, "Joint Decision-Making in Farm Families as a Function of Status and Role," <u>American Sociological Review</u> 23 (1958): 187-192.

⁴¹Harry Sharp and Paul Mott, "Consumer Decisions in the Metropolitan Family," <u>Journal of Marketing</u> 21 (1956): 152.

perhaps the husband's role is expanded to include more expressionistic functions during travel.

These questions are of both conceptual and applied importance. Conceptually, they involve specific responsibilities in the nuclear family. In an applied sense, as Kenkel points out, effective promotion should be directed to the person making the decision or exerting the strongest influence on the final decision made.⁴² The integration of applied and conceptual concerns is apparent.

Patterns of Decision Making Between Parents and Children

There has been relatively little research conducted on the roles children play in family decision making. Engel, Kollat, and Blackwell have observed that "most studies have not attempted to measure the influence of children in purchasing decisions" in their review of family influences on consumer behavior.⁴³ This appears to be the case in the sociological literature as well. The role of children in travel decision making is, however, part of this study.

Kenkel has pointed out that the life cycle variable is a key factor in decision making patterns. Included in the consideration of 44 this influence is the age of the children, particularly the oldest child. As children increase in age, it is more likely that they will be included in the process. It is for this reason that information on the

⁴²Kenkel, "Family Interaction," p. 162.

⁴³James Engel, David Kollat, and Roger Blackwell, <u>Consumer Behavior</u> (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968), p. 336.

⁴⁴Kenkel, "Family Interaction," pp. 151-152.

impact of children on travel decisions and the variation of their impacts between age levels was collected for this study. The number of children in the household is also influential, but this factor is correlated with the age of the oldest child.

Family Ideology and Role Definition

Ideological orientations of members of family groups are related to the expressive-instrumental dimension of functional responsibilities. Persons who believe in the traditional sexual division of labor tend to behave in much the same way. The study of family ideology can be directly traced to <u>The Authoritarian Personality</u>, a classic of modern social **psychology**. Levinson and Huffman were interested in how people believe families should function and how families should be structured. Included are relations between man and wife, male and female, and parents and children. They used a democratic-autocratic continuum in approaching the problem and summarized the two extremes by writing that:

the autocratic extreme is represented by various forms of 'traditional family ideology' -- viewpoints which involve an hierarchical conception of familial relationships, emphasis on discipline in child-rearing, sharp dichotomization of sex roles, and the like. The democratic orientations tend to decentralize authority within the family, to seek greater equality in husband-wife and parent-child relationships, and to maximize individual self-determination. The terms 'democratic' and 'autocratic' refer not to a simple dichotomy but to antipodes of a broad and internally complex continuum.⁴⁵

These authors developed a scale, the Traditional Family Ideology Scale, for assessing an individual's position on the democraticautocratic continuum. Factors covered in the scale include

⁴⁵Daniel J. Levinson and Phyllis Huffman, "Traditional Family Ideology and Its Relation to Personality," <u>Journal of Personality</u> 23 (1955): 251.

Conventionalism, Authoritarian Submission, Extreme Emphasis on Discipline, Moralistic Rejection of Impulse Life, and Exaggerated Masculinity and Femininity. In their pilot studies, as might be expected, this scale correlated highly with the more widely used Ethnocentrism, Fascism, and Religious Conformity scales.⁴⁶

One attempt to use this scale in the study of decision making roles within the family was on the whole unsuccessful.⁴⁷ Regardless, the concept does offer attractive potential for expanded examination for scholarly purposes of the relationships discussed in the section on the sexual division of labor and other concerns of this study. For example, are persons who are more autocratic in their family orientation also more prone to use their opportunities for travel to visit their relatives? There is some evidence which suggests that the more traditional, but also less affluent, members of lower strata do use their travel experiences to visit their kinfolk more often than persons higher in the stratification system. Are these differences between strata due to a variable familial orientation or to the usual lower costs of such visits to relatives?

The Assessment of Place Literature

In both scholarly and non-scholarly settings, assessment of place is a rapidly developing area of inquiry. For this reason the field is being subjected to a wide variety of types of research. Rapid development also, unfortunately, brings with it considerable confusion in

⁴⁷William F. Kenkel, "Traditional Family Ideology and Spousal Roles in Decision Making," <u>Marriage and Family Living</u> 21 (1959): 334-339.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 264-265.

terminology and methods. This section is an attempt to sort out and systematically discuss the various viewpoints from which research in environmental assessment is being conducted.

The focus will be on the assessment of what Beck has called ego space. In contrast to objective space, the space of physics and mathematics, and immanent space, the internalized space of fantasy, dreams, and the unconscious, ego space is "the individual's adaptation of observed to objective space." This adaptation produces "a coherent and logically consistent view of sizes, shapes, and distances."⁴⁸ Ego space is influenced by both objective and immanent space and a conscious subjective perception of the physical environment is the consequence of this interaction.

The Attitudinal Perspective

Attitude is a generic term used by social scientists to describe a number of psychological phenomena.⁴⁹ The classical definition of these phenomena is by Allport. He wrote that:

an attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related. 50

⁴⁹J.B. Cooper and J.L. McGaugh, "Attitudes and Related Concepts," in Marie Jahonda and Neil Warren, eds., <u>Attitudes</u>: <u>Selected Readings</u> (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966), pp. 26-31.

⁵⁰Gorden W. Allport, "Attitudes," in Martin Fishbein, ed., <u>Readings</u> in <u>Attitude Theory</u> and <u>Measurement</u> (New York: Wiley, 1967), p. 8.

⁴⁸Robert Beck, "Spatial Meaning and the Properties of the Environment," in Harold Proshansky, William Ittelson, and Leanne Rivlin, eds., <u>Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical Setting</u> (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970), p. 137.

For some reason, perhaps the term's "precondition to behavior" generality, persons involved in research on environmental assessment appear to deliberately avoid using the concept of attitude. This is true despite the widespread use of attitude measures such as Osgood's semantic differential.⁵¹ Regardless, the term is seldom found in the literature on this subject.

The Imagery Perspective

In contrast, "images" and "imagery", as concepts, are haphazardly scattered across the landscape of the literature on environmental assessment. There are several indistinctly bordered disciplinary uses of these terms. A brief sorting procedure would appear to be of value at this point.

Sensory Psychology and Psychotherapy

Bugelski has written that "today we are taking images very seriously...but we still do not know what we are talking about."⁵² Bugelski has reacted to the casual use of the term and taken a rather conservative stance on what is and is not an image. He says images are "involuntary occurances, subject to no one's personal control."⁵³ Furthermore, according to Bugelski, they are not projected into the external world.⁵⁴ He emphatically states that "reports of images are not images" and

⁵¹C. E. Osgood, G. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbaum, <u>The</u> <u>Measurement</u> <u>of Meaning</u> (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

⁵²B. R. Bugelski, "The Definition of an Image," in Sydney Segal, ed., <u>Imagery</u>: <u>Current Cognitive Approaches</u> (New York: Academic Press, 1971), p. 51.

⁵³<u>Ibid</u>., p. 56. ⁵⁴Ibid., p. 53.

concludes his essay by writing that:

I have tried to emphasize that imagery is an active process and not a thing in the sense of a object. If we think in terms of a verb instead of a noun, we will have made some progress. Perhaps we could reduce the frequency of usage of such terms as 'image' and 'imagery' while we raise the frequency of 'imaging'.⁵⁵

To be more direct, the following viewpoints are presented on what constitutes an "image". Harrison and Sarre write that "an image is an individual's mental representation of the parts of external reality known to him via any kind of experience."⁵⁶ Others have placed images somewhere between hallucinations and perceptions on a scale of "correspondence to reality or perceived external reality". Both Short and Segal distinguish between percepts and images quite clearly but are less precise in discussing the differences between images, hallucinations, dreams, and illusions.⁵⁷

To this author, the use of the concept by Horowitz, a psychoanalyst, is the most attractive one found. This may be because of its breadth. Horowitz writes that images are "not mere imitations, but memory fragments, reconstructions, reinterpretations, and symbols that stand for objects, feelings, or ideas."⁵⁸ He explains the development of images by saying that:

⁵⁶John Harrison and Philip Sarre, "Personal Construct Theory in the Measurement of Environmental Images," <u>Environment and Behavior</u> 3 (1971): 353.

⁵⁷Segal, "Processing of the Stimulus in Imagery and Perception," in <u>Imagery: Current Cognitive Approaches</u>, ed. Sidney Segal, p. 97; Short, "The Objective Study of Mental Imagery," <u>British Journal of</u> <u>Psychology</u> 44 (1953): 38.

⁵⁸Mardi Horowitz, M.D., <u>Image Formation and Cognition</u> (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), p. 4.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 67.

perceptions are retained for a short time, in the form of images, which allows continued emotional response and conceptual appraisal. In time, retained images undergo two kinds of transformation: reduction of sensory vividness and translation of the images into other forms of representation (such as words). Ordinarily, the transformation of images is automatic.

Horowitz has also phenomenologically typologized images, in whatever form they take, according to their vividness, context, interaction with perceptions, and content.⁶⁰ Underwood has related images in the visual sense to his broader concerns of memory attributes by observing that the visual attribute of a memory consists of images.⁶¹ This is consistent with the approach of Horowitz. It should be pointed out, however, that each of the discussions mentioned above tie images and imagery directly and closely to sensory mechanisms, usually visual. This is not particularly so for publications in other fields.

Marketing and Travel

A major concern of persons involved in marketing and promotion is brand, product, and company images. The use of the term in this field, however, is attitudinal, not sensory, in nature. Nelson used several fundamentals derived from sociological and psychological research on attitudes and called them "the Seven Principles in Image Formation".⁶²

⁶¹Benton Underwood, "Attributes of Memory," <u>Psychological Review</u> 76 (1969): 559-573.

⁶²Bardin Nelson, "Seven Principles of Image Formation," <u>Journal of</u> <u>Marketing</u> 26 (1962): pp. 67-71.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 78.

⁶⁰<u>Ibid</u>., p. 71.

Others have used the semantic differential, an attitudinal measure, to study brand images. 63

In the travel sphere, the semantic differential was used by Hunt to study the images of several Rocky Mountain states among residents of other parts of the country.⁶⁴ A consultant group, working for the Texas Tourist Development Agency, conducted a similar study for that state.⁶⁵ In both cases, the "product" was a spatial entity, just as the subject of this study is a geographical area.

Geography

Persons in geography have been active in the study of environmental assessments. Few, however, have used the term "image" in describing their conceptual concerns. Lowenthal and the previously mentioned Harrison and Sarre paper both have frequent references to this term. Harrison and Sarre's use of image has already been given and Lowenthal's is apparently based on a discussion in a book by Kenneth Boulding to be covered below.⁶⁶

A brief review of the concept of image is needed at this point. What is meant by "image"? Is it a useful concept in the present research? First, it is now clear that "image" like "attitude", is a

⁶³William Mindak, "Fitting the Semantic Differential to the Marketing Problem," <u>Journal of Marketing</u> 25 (1961): 28-33.

⁶⁴John D. Hunt, "Image--A Factor in Tourism" (Ph.D. diss., Colorado State University, 1971).

⁶⁵Belden Associate, <u>Attitudes on Texas Among American Tourists</u> (Dallas: Belden Associates, 1964).

⁶⁶Harrison and Sarre, "Environmental Images," p. 353; Lowenthal, "Geography, Experience, and Imagination: Towards a Geographical Epistemology," <u>Annals of the Association of American Geographers</u> 51 (1961): 241-260.

broad, generic term. The publication in 1956 of Boulding's <u>The Image</u>, in which the author used the term in an attitudinal sense,⁶⁷ and its concommitant use by people in the media in contemporary American life have contributed to a broader use of "image". Outside of the sensory psychology field, its use is oriented toward attitudes and opinions held by observers, but with the retention of sensory qualities. Second, because of its shifting uses, it will not be conceptually used in this study. The lack of precision in its use substantially decreases its utility in this kind of research effort.

The Environmental Perception Perspective

An emerging field at the interface of psychology and geography is environmental perception. Orientations toward environments at both extremes of the micro-macro continuum are being studied productively. The measures employed in these studies are frequently attitudinal, but unlike image studies, the environment to be evaluated is most often directly perceivable by the respondent.

Canter investigated the judgements of persons toward living quarters. Subjects were shown pictures of an interior and exterior and asked to react to them through polar adjective descriptions. This is the semantic differential. The question pursued by Canter involved the clustering of the responses. Osgood's dimensions of evaluation, potency, and activity were not manifested. Instead, Canter found, using factor analysis, that character, friendliness, and coherence were

⁶⁷Kenneth Boulding, <u>The Image</u> (Ann Arbor: University of Mighigan Press, 1956).

the dominant factors in judgements of these micro-level scenes.⁶⁸

At an intermediate level, several studies have been reported on environmental perception. Lowenthal and Riel also used the semantic differential in comparative study. They compared responses to actual urban environmental settings and purely semantic relationships without environmental references. They found clusters on the following dimensions: beauty, ordered, fresh, smooth, rich, vivid, pleasant, clean, likeable, and light. These were differences between the "perceived" and the "imagined" studies, however, and the authors concluded that "the way we think we see the world is in many respects not the way we actually do see it."⁶⁹

Calvin, Dearinger, and Curtin also examined, via the semantic differential, perceptions of locations intermediate in scale. They gave pictures of scenic areas to subjects and asked them to rate each area using twenty polar adjectives. Eight-five percent of the variation among scenes was accounted by two factors that emerged through factor analysis. These two factors were interpreted as <u>natural scenic beauty</u> and <u>natural force</u>. The authors pointed out the similarity between these two terms and the Osgoodian concepts of <u>evaluation</u> and potency.⁷⁰

⁶⁸David Canter, "An Intergroup Comparison of Connotative Dimensions in Architecture," <u>Environment and Behavior</u> 4 (1972): 37-48.

⁶⁹David Lowenthal and Marquita Riel, "The Nature of Perceived and Imagined Environments," <u>Environment and Behavior</u> 4 (1972): 206.

⁷⁰James S. Calvin, John Dearinger, and Mary Ellen Curtin, "An Attempt at Assessing Preferences for Natural Landscape," <u>Environment and</u> <u>Behavior</u> 4 (1972): 467.

The final group of studies involve grander spatial entities entire nations. Both Robinson and Hefner and Wish have examined, perceived or imagined similarities between nations around the world. Robinson and Hefner used a non-metric multidimensional analysis technique and showed definite clustering in two dimensions, level of economic development and democratic-communist.⁷¹ Wish's results were similar.⁷² The subjects were not stimulated by pictures of the objects in either case.

One final task in this section remains. Four other reports should be covered before going to the next section. In the first one, by Golant and Burton, the semantic differential was applied in a study of the interpretation of various environmental hazards. Factor analysis displayed the emergence of four factors, stability, controllability, magnitude, and expectancy.⁷³ Mercer and Lowenthal both review the uses and abuses of studies in environmental perception. Mercer's article is oriented toward the role of perception in leisure behavior.⁷⁴ Lowenthal's is an overview of some of the emerging empirical problems and problems in methods that should be given greater attention in

⁷¹John P. Robinson and Robert Hefner, "Perceptual Maps of the World," <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u> 32 (1968): 273-280.

⁷²Myron Wish, "Individual Differences in Perceptions and Preferences Among Nations," in Charles W. King and Douglas Tigert, eds., <u>Attitude</u> <u>Research Reaches New Heights</u> (American Marketing Association, n.d.).

⁷³Stephen Golant and Ian Burton, "A Semantic Differential Experiment in the Interpretation and Grouping of Environmental Hazards," <u>Geographical Analysis 2 (1970): 129.</u>

⁷⁴David Mercer, "The Role of Perception in the Recreation Experience: A Review and Discussion," <u>Journal of Leisure Research</u> 3 (1971): 26 1-276.

research.⁷⁵

In light of the material covered in this section, the concept chosen for use in this study is assessment of place. Image and imagery were rejected because of the multiple uses of these terms. Environmental perception was not acceptable because the spatial areas to be judged are not immediately perceivable. As will be shown in the section on measurement, attitude toward environments would be appropriate except that it is believed that the chosen concept should carry with it distinctly areal connotations. Craik uses the concept of assessment of place and despite its generality, it is a useful approach. Craik's process model for the assessment of places includes the elements of judges, presentation of displays, nature and format of judgements, and validational criteria.⁷⁶ Assessment of place, or environmental assessment, is explicitly recognized as a broad, ambiguous term. The alternatives, though, are equally broad and perhaps more ambiguous.

⁷⁵David Lowenthal, "Research in Environmental Perception and Behavior," <u>Environment and Behavior</u> 4 (1972): 333-342.

⁷⁶Kenneth Craik, "The Assessment of Places," in Paul McReynolds, ed., <u>Advances in Psychological Assessment</u>, <u>Volume Two</u> (Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1971), p. 48.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTS, THEIR MEASUREMENT AND HYPOTHESES

Concepts and Their Measurement

Discussed below are the major concepts of this study. Measurement procedures are included. These concepts, and the measures chosen to represent them, form the bases for the conceptual and research hypotheses that were tested.

Decision Making Between Spouses

This idea refers to habitual patterns of decision making, individually or jointly made, between the head and spouse of the head of the household. For the purposes here, information was sought on the person or persons experientially or hypothetically making decisions on trip destinations, routes, and lodging facilities.

This data was coded in two ways. First, the respondents were asked to indicate where, on a husband always - husband usually - joint wife usually - wife always continuum, their spouses and themselves would be located regarding the destination, route, and lodging decisions. Second, their responses were placed into an "autonomous" versus "joint" categorization. Husband always - husband usually and wife always - wife usually were considered as autonomous decisions. Joint decisions carried this label intact. Each of the three decisions of interest was treated in this way as well as in the first manner.

Decision Making Between Parents and Children

Patterns of decision making between parents and children was approached in a way similar to decision making between spouses. The concept refers to the roles that parents and children play in the decision making process and who makes the decision. Again, information was sought on the person or persons making decisions on trip destinations, routes and lodging facilities. The respondents were asked where, on a parents always - parents usually - joint - children usually children always continuum, their family would be located regarding the decisions.

Family Ideology

Family ideology has already been reviewed as a concept. It refers to a person's ideals regarding relationships between the sexes, man and wife, and parents and children. Levinson and Huffman's Traditional Family Ideology (TFI) scale, short form, was used to assess the autocratic-democratic dimension of the respondents' family orientation. The TFI scale, short form, is composed of twelve Likert-type sub-scales. Numbers from one to seven were attached to the response categories which are strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, neutral, slightly disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The sum of the twelve responses was used as the indicator of family ideology.⁷⁷

Assessment of Place

Assessment of place involves a person's subjective evaluation of the characteristics, both physical and non-physical, of a particular

⁷⁷Levinson and Huffman, "Traditional Family Ideology." p. 268.

spatial entity. The semantic differential, a technique designed to measure the meaning attached to an object, area, person, or issue, was used to ascertain the positiveness-negativeness of the respondents' perception of potential destination areas. The semantic differential is made up of a series of polar adjectives. The adjectives that were chosen for this study are primarily reflective of perceived opportunities for pleasure travel in non-urbanized areas.

Several attributes of the semantic differential make it an attractive procedure for studies of this type. It has been productively used in several of the other studies of environmental perception and assessment that have been reviewed. Mean scores on any of the dimensions employed can be presented in profile form. Comparisons are thus facilitated and easily understood. The individual scales can also be summed to represent the gross attractiveness level that the respondent possesses toward the place or object in guestion.

Exposure to the Region

Extent of direct, physical exposure to the region in question may be an influential factor in assessment. Therefore, information was sought regarding the respondent's presence, at one time or another for any reason, within the area. An estimate of the number of nights, if any, spent in the area was also sought.

Travel for Pleasure

The concern of this study is intra-regional pleasure travel. Pleasure travel is travel undertaken under no formal obligation. Travel experiences of an intra-regional type are almost always accomplished in wheeled vehicles. Blank and Gunn's study of tourist development reported that ninety-eight percent of visitors to Michigan's Upper Peninsula traveled by car.⁷⁸ A Wisconsin study showed that eightysix percent of that state's residents used cars to reach their vacation destination.⁷⁹ And Sebastian deGrazia flatly stated that "the fact remains that four out of five Americans do not go on vacation where the family car won't take them."⁸⁰ Given the areal boundaries of this study and the well-established dependence on private transportation by Americans, only pleasure travel by car was considered in this study.

One study conducted in the Midwest showed that "about three in eight midwestern families took no 1968 vacation involving overnight stays away from home."⁸¹ This means that if data was sought on the respondents' travel for pleasure during the year previous to the study, almost one-half of them could not report. For this reason, questions were asked about the respondent's <u>last trip</u> by car for purposes of pleasure, as well as the <u>longest trip during the last year</u> and <u>the</u> <u>longest trip during the last five years</u>. Longest here refers to distance. Trip is defined as a journey during which the respondent was at least once more than one-hundred miles in straight line distance

⁷⁸Blank and Gunn, <u>Guidelines</u> for Tourism-Recreation, p. 15.

⁷⁹Nava Enosh, Rollin Cooper, Sydney Staniforth, and Rudolf Christianson, <u>The Travel Behavior of the Wisconsin Vacationer</u> (Madison: University of Wisconsin-Extension, 1973), p. 14.

⁸⁰Sebastian deGrazia, <u>Of Time</u>, <u>Work</u>, <u>and Leisure</u> (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1964), p. 106.

⁸¹William Rudelius, Allan Pennington, and Ivan Ross, "Analyzing State Tourism: A Case Study of the Midwest," <u>Journal of Leisure</u> <u>Research</u> 3 (1971): 254.

from his permanent residence.

Business travel was not a subject in this study. Travelers moving about for purposes of business are an important source of revenue for several segments of the travel industry. However, they are not greatly influenced by promotional efforts and their travel tends to be routinized to some extent.⁸² It is for these reasons that business travel was not included.

Purpose of Pleasure Trip

"The single most important reason given for taking the trip" is the definition of this concept. Examples include visiting friends or relatives, sightseeing, outdoor recreation, and similar motivations.⁸³ If visitation of relatives was indicated as the purpose of the trip under consideration, note was taken as to whether it involved the wife's, husband's, or both sides of the family.

Social Class

Social class refers to a system of ranking, based on such factors as educational achievement, wealth, and family prestige, of persons in the social hierarchy. The income of the household in the year previous to the study and the educational achievements of the respondent were used as indicators of this concept. These variables were used both absolutely and categorically by levels of income and education.

⁸²Western Council for Travel Research, Committee on Research Methods, <u>Standards for Traveler Studies</u> (Salt Lake City: Western Council for Travel Research, 1963), p. 7.

⁸³Michigan Department of State Highways, <u>The Tourist in Mid-</u> <u>Michigan</u> (Lansing: Management Services Division, Michigan Department of State Highways, n.d.), pp. 43-45.

Background Factors

The sex, age, and race of the respondent were also used in the analysis of the information gathered. These were collected to serve as bias checks and as influential factors on the levels of the other measures. The age of the oldest child and the number of children in the household were selected as variables with which to examine decision patterns between parents and children. Often they are taken as indicants of family life cycle or similar factors.

Hypotheses to be Tested

The hypotheses of this study have been developed from the literature reviewed and involve the concepts just discussed. They are presented below in the order of the analysis sections. Both the conceptual and operational or research forms are included.

The Destination Decision

- <u>Conceptual</u>: The selection of a pleasure travel destination is most often a joint decision.
 <u>Research</u>: More than fifty percent of the respondents will indicate that the destination decision is jointly made.
- <u>Conceptual</u>: As children increase in age, their role in the destination decision is greater.

<u>Research</u>: The average age of the oldest child will be higher for the <u>joint-children</u> <u>usually</u> - <u>children</u> <u>always</u> respondents to the destination question than the <u>parents</u> <u>always</u> or <u>parents</u> <u>usually</u> respondents.

- 3. <u>Conceptual</u>: Visitation to relatives more often involves visitation to the wife's relatives than to the husband's relatives. <u>Research</u>: A higher proportion of respondents will give "visiting wife's relatives" as the most important reason for taking their last trip than "visiting husband's relatives."
- 4. <u>Conceptual</u>: There is a positive relationship between the amount of exposure to a region and the favorableness of its assessment. <u>Research</u>: Persons who have not visited an area have lower attractiveness scores in the semantic differential than persons who have visited an area.
- <u>Conceptual</u>: There is a positive relationship between social class and exposure to a destination area.

<u>Research</u>: Higher proportions of persons in the upper educational levels will have visited the destination areas than persons in the lower levels.

The Route and Lodging Decisions

- 6. <u>Conceptual</u>: Males are more likely to select the route to be taken, an instrumental function, than are females. <u>Research</u>: More respondents will indicate that <u>husband always</u> or <u>husband usually</u> reflects their experience with the route decision than joint - wife usually - wife always.
- 7. <u>Conceptual</u>: As children increase in age, their role in the route decision is greater.

<u>Research</u>: The average age of the oldest child will be higher for the <u>joint</u> - <u>children</u> <u>usually</u> - <u>children</u> <u>always</u> respondents to the route question than the <u>parents</u> <u>always</u> or <u>parents</u> <u>usually</u> respondents.

- 8. <u>Conceptual</u>: Females are more likely to select commercial lodging facilities, an expressive function, than are males. <u>Research</u>: More respondents will indicate that <u>wife always</u> or <u>wife usually</u> reflects their experience with the lodging decision than joint - husband usually - husband always.
- <u>Conceptual</u>: As children increase in age, their role in the lodging decision is greater.

<u>Research</u>: The average age of the oldest child will be higher for the <u>joint</u> - <u>children</u> <u>usually</u> - <u>children</u> <u>always</u> respondents to the lodging question than the <u>parents</u> <u>always</u> or <u>parents</u> <u>usually</u> respondents.

Family Ideology and Autonomy

10. <u>Conceptual</u>: Persons displaying a high traditional family ideology orientation are more likely to say that visitation of relatives was the most important reason for taking their last trip than are persons low in this orientation.

<u>Research</u>: Persons who say visitation of relatives was the most important reason for taking their last trip will have lower scores on the Family Ideology questions than persons who traveled to non-family destinations.

11. <u>Conceptual</u>: Persons in lower class level families are more likely to say that visitation of relatives was the most important reason for taking their last trip than are persons from upper class level families.

<u>Research</u>: Respondents with lower education will say that visitation of relatives was the more important reason for taking their last trip than respondents with higher education.

- 12. <u>Conceptual</u>: There is greater autonomy in decision-making regarding the destination, route, and lodging at both extremes of the class factor than there is in the middle levels. <u>Research</u>: Higher proportions of the destination, route, and lodg-ing responses will be <u>autonomous</u> in the extremes of the income level grouping, while the middle levels have higher proportions of joint responses.
- 13. <u>Conceptual</u>: There is greater autonomy in decision-making regarding the destination, route, and lodging at both extremes of the age variable than there is in the middle levels.

<u>Research</u>: Higher proportions of the destination, route, and lodging responses will be <u>autonomous</u> in the extremes of the age level grouping, while the middle levels have higher proportions of <u>joint</u> responses.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Development of the Instrument

The data collection procedure for this study was the personal interview. The merits of this approach relative to other procedures are well-documented.⁸³ The primary consideration which led to the selection of this method was the length of the instrument. It was believed that the desired instrument was of such length, in terms of number of questions, that a mailed questionnaire was not feasible. The personal interview was chosen because it allows for greater complexity, variety, and length of time in questioning the respondent.

Pretest One

One part of what was to become the interview schedule was pretested with student subjects in two locations. Lower level undergraduates in parks and recreation courses at Clemson University in South Carolina and Michigan State University participated in the refinement of the semantic differential measure of assessment of place. Thirty-seven Michigan State and forty-four Clemson students were given four lists of thirty polar adjectives. Their responses were used in selecting the the ten most discriminating scales for the final interview schedule.

⁸³Delbert Miller, <u>Handbook of Research Design</u> and <u>Social Measure</u>-<u>ment</u>, 2nd ed., (New York: McKay, 1970), Part II.

The four areas assessed were the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan and the province of Ontario. These places are serving as the potential travel development areas in this study. The three American states are included because their northern sections are in need of economic rejuvenation and appear to possess the necessary resources upon which greater travel development can be based. Ontario was also studied in terms of assessment. Its travel industry is highly developed, its government spends much money to promote it as a destination, and it is a principal competitor of the three American states for the attraction of Midwestern travelers.

The students' responses were examined in two ways for each of the four assessed areas. Pearson correlation coefficients and differences in means were used to choose the ten scales that were most discriminating within and between the scales on the four areas. The resulting tenscale measure is the destination attractiveness or assessment of place variable used in the final survey.

Pretest Two

The other sections of the interview schedule were pre-tested in the East Lansing, Michigan, area. Chunk sampling was employed in the interviewing of twenty-one adult subjects. This procedure permitted the editing and refinement of the entire schedule except the assessment of place section. Appendix A1 contains the pre-test form of the questionnaire. Simple frequency counts, chi square, and Pearson correlation coefficients were used to look at the measures involved and the relationships between measures. The final schedule used may be found in Appendix A2. A map showing a ring with a radius of 100 miles around the principal city of the respondent's home county was attached.

It was designed to help the respondent determine if the trip being considered qualified as a "trip" using the definitions of this research. An example of this map is found in Appendix A3.

Sampling

Definition of the Area to be Sampled

A combination of judgement based on traveler origin studies and a review of one of the region's travel promotion agency's expenditure patterns was used in designating the area in which to conduct this study.⁸⁴ A map showing the counties in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio that were included is in Appendix B. A total of one hundred fortysix counties in northeastern Illinois, northern Indiana, and northwestern and central Ohio represented the survey area.

The 1970 census showed that the population of this area was 18,844,111 persons. This was roughly 60% of Ohio's total population, roughly 75% of Illinois' total population, and roughly 80% of Indiana's total population.⁸⁵ This belt of population south of Lake Michigan, south of the state of Michigan, and south of Lake Erie is the origin of most of the non-resident visitors to Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ontario. It is for this reason that this particular population area was chosen as the location of the study. Its residents are

⁸⁴ Campbell-Ewald Public Relations, "Proposal of Public Relations Services for Michigan Tourist Council," July 25, 1972; Ross Roy Incorporated, "1973-74 Michigan Tourist Council Winter Advertising Proposal," September 6, 1973.

 $^{^{85}}$ U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC (1) - C15 Illinois, C16 Indiana, C37 Ohio, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

potential pleasure travelers in the four destination areas being considered and travel development would largely depend on attracting them. Between County Sampling

Using the 1970 census reports, all of the counties in the area of the study were arranged in order, from the county with the largest number of residents to the county with the fewest inhabitants. Without altering this sequence, ten strata with approximately the same number of inhabitants were created. One county, or primary sampling unit, was randomly selected from each stratum of the ten strata.

It should be pointed out that the use of this plan would ideally involve stratum counts of approximately 1,880,000 persons each. This is 18,844,000 (total population) divided by ten (strata). Obviously, approximations to this figure within each stratum were required. Cook County, Illinois, with a population of 5,492,000, alone constituted three strata and Cuyahoga County, Ohio, with a population of 1,721,000, alone constituted a stratum. Four strata were thus automatically nonrandomly composed of these two counties. Beyond this point, random selection was possible. Stratum five was composed of two counties, stratum six of four counties, stratum seven of seven counties, stratum eight of twelve counties, stratum nine of twenty counties, and stratum ten of the remaining one-hundred and nine counties. The distribution of population is widely imbalanced in the study area and the number of counties within each stratum reflects this fact.

Str	atum	<u>County</u>	Principal City
I	Co	ook. Illinois	Chicago
ĪI	Co	ook. Illinois	Chicago
ĪĪ	I Co	ook. Illinois	Chicago
ĪV	Ci	uvahoga. Ohio	Cleveland
v	Ma	arion. Indiana	Indianapolis
Ϋ́Ι	Li	ucas, Ohio	Toledo
VĪ	I Lo	orain. Ohio	Lorain-Elvria
VI	II Sa	angamon, Illinois	Springfield
IX	Wa	avne. Indiana	Richmond
X	Fi	ulton, Ohio	Wauseon

TABLE 1.--The County Within Each Stratum Selected for Study

Coincidentally, the selection of Ohio and Illinois counties in four strata each, and Indiana counties in two strata closely reflects each state's proportion in the area's total population. A map showing the locations of each of these counties is found in Appendix B.

Within County Sampling

Households were randomly selected from the most recent telephone directories of each of the chosen counties. After the names were drawn from the respective directories, a list containing names, addresses, and phone numbers was created for each interviewer. The interviewers were instructed to try and arrange interviews with a set number of respondents while going through their lists in order. This was an attempt to avoid a sampling bias in the direction of the more affluent or accessible households.

The hazards of sampling through telephone directories are well known. Transients, many students, the very poor, and the very wealthy or prominent members of a community frequently do not have telephone service or have unlisted numbers. In the states where the survey was done, about 93% of the households do have telephone service. There are ninety-four main residence phones per one-hundred households in Illinois, ninety-three per one-hundred households in Ohio, and ninety per onehundred in Indiana.⁸⁶ These are state-wide percentages.

In addition to the households lost through non-service, another 6.8% of the households in the country have either unlisted or unpublished numbers.⁸⁷ These figures are reported in order to give recognition to the possible biases involved in the use of this sampling procedure. Generally, the lowest and highest households in the stratification system are excluded. This means that statistical inferences, strictly speaking, are limited to the households in the actual sampling frame. In this study, these matters are not of major operational consequence.

Response to the Survey

The original plan involved randomly selecting eighty-four households per stratum. This meant that the response rate would be set at about 60%, since fifty interviews per stratum were desired. Each county except Cook County would contribute fifty observations and the total size of the sample would be five hundred. Cook County constituted three strata and its share of the total was one hundred-fifty.

The original plan, however, required alteration. Interviewers had considerable difficulty in almost every county in obtaining their quota of interviews. For this reason, additional households were randomly selected in seven counties. This second drawing was

⁸⁶American Telephone and Telegraph Company, Corporate Planning Organization, "Telephone Development by States," New York: 1973.

^{87&}lt;u>Ibid</u>.

9000 adu ted Sta Eli ita inti vari view lett abid T nunt Vie

<u>بالم</u>

4

•

4

K

h

accompanied by a personal letter to the respondent requesting that an adult member of the household participate in the survey. This facilitated collecting the data since the stationery used was from Michigan State University. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix C. Elimination of respondent suspicions that the survey involved solicitation was useful in increasing the total samplw size. Yet it also introduced a potential source of bias in the assessment of place variable on Michigan. An attempt had been made, through the interviewers, to not identify the university sponsoring the research. The letter seeking cooperation meant that it was not possible to strictly abide by this rule.

Table 2 shows the total number of names, addresses, and phone numbers drawn for each county. It also indicates the number of interviews completed and the response rate for each county.

<u>Stratum</u>	County	<u>Total Drawn</u>	Interviews <u>Completed</u>	<u>Response</u> <u>Rate</u>
I, II, III	Cook, Illinois	409	150	36.7%
IV	Cuyahoga, Ohio	108	39	36.1%
٧	Marion, Indiana	119	43	36.1%
VI	Lucas, Ohio	99	45	45.5%
VII	Lorain, Ohio	94	50	53.2%
VIII	Sangamon, Illinois	107	50	46.7%
IX	Wayne, Indiana	98	51	52.0%
x	Fulton, Ohio	84	50	59.5%
	Total	1118	478	42.8%

TABLE 2.--Response by County

There are several basic reasons why the response rates are not equal to the planned levels. First, the method involved the interviewer's calling the household and seeking to arrange an interview appointment. Residents of the counties with higher population levels, where the response rates are lowest, were hesitant to allow strangers into their homes. The interviewers were instructed to try and overcome this mistrust by fully explaining the reasons for the study and topics included in the survey. Nevertheless, they were simply voices over the phone and urbanites remained fearful of possible criminal intent or mistrustful of possible solicitation attempts.

Secondly, the interviewers were bothered by inability to contact many households. In Cook County, for example, only one hundred-three persons actually refused to participate while one hundred fifty-six households were never reached. These persons had moved, gone on vacation, had died, or their name, telephone number, or address in the directory was erroneous. The within county sampling procedure did not adequately take into account the volume of such non-contacts.

A third source of non-response was limitations placed on the interviewers. They were instructed to interview an equal number of adult men and women. It is generally more difficult to arrange a session with men than women. The respondent also had to be living in a household in which the head was twenty-five years old or older. In addition, the respondent had to have been married during his or her lifetime. This qualification was included because the decision making responses depend on the respondent having interacted with a spouse or children. Together, these requirements further eroded the response rate in all of the involved counties.

Personnel and Their Training

Minor problems with personnel could be listed as the fourth reason for the lowered response rate. The project necessitated the hiring of over forty women as interviewers. With a group of this size, breakdowns are to be expected. Illness, illness in the family, and the simple quitting of a couple of interviewers led to the gathering of 478 observations rather than 500. The deficits, though not of major scale, are most prominent in the four most heavily populated counties except Cook County. In Chicago, a supervisor was hired to select interviewers and to see that the Cook County segment was completed.

In the other counties the interviewers were employed in three ways. A reference from a survey researcher in Illinois led to the hiring of the interviewers in Sangamon County. Interviewers in Wayne County, Indiana, Fulton County, Ohio, and Lucas County, Ohio, responded to a classified newspaper advertisement. The interviewers in the other counties were from a temporary personnel agency. The interviewers' experience ranged from working on dozens of surveys to none at all.

Regardless of experience, all interviewers were required to attend a training session held in each of the counties. This session usually lasted about four hours. Principles and guidelines discussed in the Survey Research Center's <u>Interviewer Manual</u> was used in the training of interviewers.⁸⁸ These training sessions, and a subsequent interviewer evaluation done a week after the interviewers had been trained and given their respondent lists, were finished in late May, 1974. The data collection phase of the research ended in early July,

⁸⁸Survey Research Center, <u>Interviewer Manual</u> (Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969).

1974.

Overall, the performance of the interviewers was satisfactory. Interviewers from the personnel agency did not do as well as the interviewers chosen in other ways. Interviewers in the larger cities had more difficulty in obtaining respondents than interviewers in the less heavily populated counties. Yet the severely disruptive problems that could be a part of a study of this scale, supervision level, and dispersed pattern of sampling did not emerge.

Characteristics of the Sample and the Population

This section is devoted to an examination of the representativeness of the respondents relative to all the residents in the counties from which they were chosen. Four basic characteristics are used to compare the sample with the population. These are educational achievement, income level, racial composition, and breakdowns by sex.

Educational Achievements

Comparisons between the male and female respondents and the residents of the counties in terms of education are in Table 3. It appears that a reasonably representative group was interviewed. In one or two counties the respondents' level of last year of school completed was considerably higher than the population's, but overall, the medians are close to one another. The disparity that exists is likely due to the sampling procedure and probably some interviewer bias.

Income

The second factor used to judge the representativeness of the sample is annual household income. Table 4 contains three figures on annual income for each county. The first series is the mean annual

fears of Education	and the Population
of the Median \	y Respondents a
3Comparison c	Completed by
TABLE	

County	Cook	Cuyahoga	Marion	Lucas	Lorain	Sangamon	Wayne	Fulton
<u>Males</u> :								
Samp le	12.4	12.4	12.8	12.3	12.0	11.9	12.1	11.7
Population ^a	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.0	12.0	12.2	12.0	12.1
Females:								
Sample	12.3	12.3	12.7	12.0	12.3	12.0	12.2	12.1
Population ^b	12.0	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2	12.0	12.2
a, b ₁₁ c Burneau	of the C	ancus Soria	and Fron	omic Char	arteristic	c Tahle 120		

J. 5| 3 • 2 D
income level of the counties in 1970.⁸⁹ The second series was created by multiplying the 1970 figure by 1.21. This is the ratio of average weekly earnings in the private sector in 1974 to average weekly earnings in 1970 for the nation as a whole.⁹⁰ It is assumed that county changes in income paralleled the national increases during this period of high wage and price inflation. The third figure is the mean level reported by the respondents in each county. Since a number of respondents refused to give income information for the year prior to the survey to the interviewers, the number reporting in each county is also included.

The table shows a dominant pattern of the sample's income level being higher than the 1970 figures, but lower than the level projected. Thus, it is not possible to easily determine how representative the sample is. County by county statistics are not available on rapidly shifting income patterns except through the census. The elapsed time between censuses makes them less useful for studying income every year past their publication. In general, the study does not appear to be greatly out of line with the underlying county, or regional levels.

Racial Composition

The racial makeup of the sample is a significant factor in assessing representativeness. Systematic exclusion of Negroes and other racial or ethnic groups would mean that inferences could not properly

 $^{^{89}\}text{U.S.}$ Bureau of the Census, Social and Economic Characteristics, Table 124.

⁹⁰Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, <u>Employment</u> <u>and Earnings</u> 17 (October, 1970): 17 and <u>Employment</u> <u>and</u> <u>Earnings</u> 20 (April, 1974): 105.

TABLE 4.--Comparison of Annual Household Income of Respondents and Population by County*

	Cook	<u>Cuy ahoga</u>	Marion	Lucas	Lorain	Sangamon	Wayne	Ful ton
<u>Mean</u> , <u>1970</u>	13.1	12.9	12.2	12.2	11.9	11.6	11.1	10.8
Projected, 1974 (1970 X 1.21)	15.8	15.6	14.8	14.8	14.4	14.0	13.4	13.1
<u>Mean</u> , <u>Sample</u>	12.8	13.3	14.2	11.3	15.8	13.3	13.0	12.3
Number Reporting	125	8	35	45	47	8	49	49
Total Reporting	428							

*in thousands of dollars

be made from the sample to the sample frame. These groups, despite their generally lower income levels, are presently becoming an important segment in travel marketing as well. Formal and informal barriers that once made travel for pleasure by Negroes difficult have been largely removed. Thus, in terms of both checking the sample and analyzing travel behavior, the racial composition should not be ignored.

Table 4 presents the percentages of persons in the county populations classified as being Negro or as being part of other ethnic groups in the 1970 census. The sample percentages are included as a source of comparison.

Again it appears that overall the sample's proportion of minorities, 9.6 percent, is representative, but in particular counties Negroes and persons in other groups were over- or under-sampled. The within county differences between actual composition and respondent composition can be attributed to the sampling procedure, interviewer bias, and simply the small number of households sampled within each county.

Sexual Composition

Interviewers were instructed to obtain an equal number of male and female respondents. The greater difficulty of interviewing males is well-known and a sample can become "too feminine" if such controls are not exercised. The percentages of the within county respondents who are males is presented in Table 6. It shows that somewhat less than one half, 46.4 percent overall, of the respondents were men. It also shows the percentages of the eighteen years or older population that was male in 1970. The lower age limit for this study was the qualification that the head of the household must have been at

	Cook	Cuyahoga	Marion	Lucas	Lorain	Sangamon	Wayne	Fulton
% Negro and other								
1970 Census ^a	22.8	19.6	17.3	11.7	6.8	5.1	5.1	0.5
Sample	16.7	12.8	18.6	6.7	0.0	0.0	3.9	6.0
^a U.S. Bureau o Final <u>Report PC</u> (1) Printing Office, 19:	f the Censu - B 15 Ill /1), Table	ls, Census of inois, <u>B 16</u> 16.	· Populatio <u>Indiana</u> , <u>B</u>	n: 1970, 37 <u>Ohio</u>	. <u>General P</u> (Washingto	opulation <u>Ch</u> n, D.C.: U.	aracteris S. Govern	tics, ment
	TABLE	6Comparis Sample a	on of the nd the Pop	Sexual Co ulations	mposition by County	of the		
	Cook	Cuyahoga	Marion	Lucas	Lorain	Sangamon	Wayne	Fulton
% male, 18 and over, 1970a	46.7	46.3	46.4	46.7	48.0	44.5	46.4	47.7
% mæle, sample	48.0	43.6	34.9	46.7	42.0	50.0	49.0	52.0

least twenty-five. The groups, however, should be similar and they appear to be in line with one another.

Summary of the Check for Representativeness

If taken collectively, the four tables indicate that the sample was fairly representative. Within particular counties on selected factors there was some disparity between the two groups. This is to be expected given the relatively small within county sample sizes. The sample appears to be slightly higher in educational achievement and income than the base populations. It contains somewhat fewer minority respondents than it might. Yet these factors were influenced by the sampling procedure and the use of several inexperienced interviewers. Overall, it is suggested the sample is reasonably representative of the population in the sampling frame.

Procedures of Analysis

The analysis of the information derived from the survey began in June, 1974, at Michigan State University. The interviewers and supervisors returned the completed interview schedules and the responses were coded on the same forms. These forms were then used for key punching and verification. Data on the computer cards was transferred to magnetic tape after key punching was completed.

Computer programs to calculate the statistics were contained in the <u>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</u> series used by the Computer Laboratory at Michigan State in August and September, 1974.⁹¹

⁹¹Norman Nie, Dale Bent, and Hadlai Hull, <u>Statistical</u> <u>Package</u> for <u>the Social Sciences</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970).

Detailed discussions of the statistical procedures used in the analysis of the data can be found in Blalock and elsewhere. 92

,

⁹²Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., <u>Social Statistics</u>, 2nd ed., (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972).

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS: THE DESTINATION DECISION

Patterns Between Spouses

Choice of a destination is a decision usually made prior to departure. The interest here is in whom, husband or wife, most often makes this decision. The Sharp and Mott study reported that **a**bout 70% of the destination choices were made jointly between man and wife.⁹³ For this reason, it was hypothesized that "the selection of a pleasure travel destination is most often a joint decision."

The results regarding this issue are in Table 7. They are here being used simultaneously for two purposes. Before a judgement can be made on the hypothesis, a check for possible bias by the sex of the respondent must be done. The chi square statistic is used to evaluate the similarity-disparity dimension of responses by sex of the respondent.

Table 7 reveals no evidence that there are significant differences in the way that men and women responded. The chi square statistic is low. The results cannot be attributed to systematic respondent bias.

The table also shows that roughly 71 percent of the respondents reported that the destination decision was jointly made in their experience. This proportion supports the hypothesis being tested and

⁹³Sharp and Mott, "Consumer Decisions", p. 162.

TABLE 7.--Response to the Destination Question Between Spouses by Sex

	Wife				:	
èx:	AIWAYS	Usually	Joint	<u>Us ua Li y</u>		Always
Male	2.3 ^a	6.5	72.2	13.0		6.0
Female	4.3	4.5	69.6	6.9		6.7
Total	3.4	8.1	70.8	11.3		6.4
l = 469 ^b						
hi square	= 3.89	4 DF	Si	gnificance = .	42	O
- 6				•		

^aIn percentaged form, to nearest third decimal.

^bTotal is short of 478 due to non-response to one or more of the questions involved. This is characteristic of other tables that follow, but it is not noted.

almost exactly duplicates the level reported by the other study.

Hypothesis 1. <u>Conceptual</u>: The selection of a pleasure travel destination is most often a joint decision. <u>Research</u>: More than 50 percent of the respondents will indicate that the destination decision is jointly made.

Supported

The next question of interest in the patterns of destination decision making between spouses involves possible differences between social classes. Table 8 shows the breakdowns using level of education as the control factor. A strong tendency for the college-educated to be more democratic on the destination decision is evident. Kendall's tau, a non-parametric measure of the strength of the relationship between two variables, for another measure of social class, income level, and the destination decision between spouses is -.0339. This nonpositive figure confirms that there is a tendency for the decisions of the lower status respondents to be more husband-based than the higher status respondents.

The implications of this series of findings are clear-cut. Promotion of destinations for pleasure travelers should be directed to both spouses equally, as both appear to most often participate in the selection of a destination. Promotional messages would most efficiently be channeled through media with audiences dominated by neither sex. This varies by the social class level of the household and is particularly true in higher class levels.

Conceptually, the distination decision appears to be one that has both instrumental and expressive elements involved. The high

		spouses by Eauc	ational Level			
	Wife Always	Wife Usually	Joint	Husband <u>Usually</u>	Husband Always	Total
Year of School Completed:						
0-11	5.1 ^a	8.2	65.3	14.3	7.1	100.0
12	2.1	6.9	67.5	12.0	8.4	100.0
<u>13-15</u>	4.8	5.8	75.0	9.6	4.8	100.0
<u>16+</u>	2.7	6.7	80.0	8.0	2.7	100.0
Total	3.4	8.1	70.7	11.3	6.4	
N = 468						
chi square =	11.190	12 DF	Signif	icance = .513		
^a In percent	aged form, to	nearest third de	cimal			

TABLE 8.--Response to the Destination Question Between

proportion of joint responses indicates the decision is most often democratically reached. The choice of a destination involves cost estimates, distance and time considerations, and knowledge of transportation requirements. These are instrumental considerations. The choice also may depend on such factors as interests of family members, linkages with kinfolk, and the variety of family activities sought. These are expressive considerations. It is clear that the destination decision is predominately democratic. The nature of the choice is too complex to be controlled by a single spouse in most families.

In terms of equalitarianism between the sexes, Table 8 shows that women possess greater decision making influence in upper level households than in lower level households. It is likely that women in such settings exert their influence more strongly and find greater receptiveness by their husbands when they do so. These findings are consistent with many reports in the scholarly and popular literature which have pointed out the decline in authoritarianism between the sexes as wealth and education increase.

Patterns Between Parents and Children

Because the destination decision is most often democratically reached between spouses, it does not necessarily follow that children also participate in the process. Table 9 shows the frequency of responses to each of the alternatives given the respondent for this question.

It is evident from Table 9 that close to one-half of the respondent's families did allow children a full voice in reaching the decision, but only 6% allowed children to dominate the decision. For more than one-half of the respondents, the decision is apparently controlled largely by the parents. The questions that emerge now revolve

around the characteristics of the different response groups and how they might differ.

The age of the children, particularly the oldest child, would seem to be an important factor in this situation. It was hypothesized, following Kenkel, that "as children increase in age, their role in the destination decision is greater." If this is true, then persons responding"parents always" or "parents usually" should have somewhat younger children than persons responding in other ways. The next table, Table 9, supports this statement. The mean ages of the oldest child steadily increase as the responses reflect greater contributions of the children in the process.

Hypothesis 2. <u>Conceptual</u>: As children increase in age, their role in the destination decision is greater. <u>Research</u>: The average age of the oldest child will be higher for the joint-children usually-children always respondents to the destination question than the <u>parents always</u> or <u>parents usually</u> respondents.

Supported

Although the age of the children clearly influences their participation in the destination selection, the number of children involved does not appear to differ between the response groups. The persons responding <u>parents always</u> had only slightly fewer children per household than persons whose responses attributed greater influence to children. This is evidence that the age of the children has greater influence on the patterns of decision making than the number of children. This statement deserves attention. If the same pattern holds for the route

	Parents Always	Parents Usually	Joint	Child/Children Usually	Child/Children Always
N	80	57	106	3	3
<u>Per Cent</u>	30.9	22.0	40.9	5.0	1.2
Total N =	259				

TABLE 9.--Response to the Destination Question Between Parents and Children

TABLE 10.--The Age of Children Influence on the Destination Decision Between Parents and Children

	Parents Always	Parents Usually	Joint-Children Usually- Children Always
<u>N</u>	75	55	119
<u>Mean Age in Years</u> of the Oldest Child	11.92	12.89	15.75
Total N = 253			
Analysis of Variance	F Rat	tio = 7.37	F Probability = $.001$

and lodging decisions, the generalization will be advanced that in travel decisions the intrafamilial decision pattern is strongly influenced by the age of the children, but only slightly affected by the number of children.

A final note on this topic involves the relationship between social class and family decision making. Differences between groups would indicate that another key dimension beyond age of the children shapes the patterns. The Kendalls tau, .0583, for the family destination decision in relation to income level is quite low, however. Social class has little impact, evidently, on the patterns of decision making. The key factor is the age of the children. Other factors being considered appear to exert little influence.

Visitation of Relatives as the Attractant

The destination decision often results in the family members choosing to visit their relatives. This can be accomplished either as part of a trip to other locations or as the single reason for taking the trip. Conceptually, such a trip can be seen as having expressive functions in the nuclear and extended families. It is one way of satisfying the affective needs of family members to interact with one another on occasion.

The question created out of the hypothesis being examined here pertains to tendencies to visit paternal relatives more or less often than maternal relatives. It was hypothesized that "visitation to relatives more often involves visitation to the wife's relatives than to the husband's relatives." Given the affective, or expressive, functions usually held by wives in our society, it would seem likely that they would exert the influence they have toward the visitation of

their relatives more often than the husband's relatives.

Table 11 shows the responses to questions regarding the single most important reason for taking the last trip, the longest trip of the last year, and the longest trip taken during the last five years. Some responses are duplicated from one trip to another as many persons' last trip was also the longest of the last year and so on.

The table indicates a statistically insignificant tendency for persons to visit the maternal relatives more often than paternal relatives, given that the primary reason for the trip was visitation of relatives. Apparently the expressive functions of such visits are near equally served between the husband's and wife's kinfolk. It is also evident that a large proportion of such trips are made to visit both husband's and wife's relatives as well as the children. This pattern differs little between the last trip, the longest trip of the last year, and the longest trip of the last five years.

Hypothesis 3. <u>Conceptual</u>: Visitation to relatives more often involves visitation to the wife's relatives than to the husband's relatives.

> <u>Research</u>: A higher proportion of respondents will give "visiting wife's relatives" as the most important reason for taking their last trip than "visiting husband's relatives."

Not Supported

The most important reason given for taking	Visiting Husband's <u>Relatives</u>	Visiting Wife's <u>Relatives</u>	Visiting Husband's and Wife's <u>Relatives</u>	Visiting Children
the last trip	(60) 31.4 ^a	(66) 34.5	(45) 23.6	(20) 10.5
longest trip of last year	(27) 25.2	(32) 29.9	(26) 24.3	(22) 20.6
longest trip of last five years	(23) 27.4	(26) 31.0	(17) 20.2	(18) 21. 4
N = 382 Chi Square = 8.56	6 DF	Significance = .	19	

TABLE 11.--Maternal and Paternal Patterns in Visitation of Relatives

^aIn percentaged form, across columns.

Assessment of Place in the Destination Decision

The role of a decision maker's assessment of different locations in the selection of a travel destination has been described. This matter is of both conceptual and operational importance. Conceptually, it is desirable to determine factors that relate to the perception of places that persons possess. Operationally, messages carrying promotional items would most effectively either build on the positive ideas that the desired visitors have about the area or attempt to alter their less positive ideas.

The instrument chosen to measure the sample's assessments of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Ontario was the semantic differential. The scales of the semantic differential are based upon polar adjectives. The series of scales used in this study are found in Table 12. The same scales were applied toward each state/province of interest. The actual sheets given the respondents are displayed in Appendix A2, with the rest of the questionnaire form.

The results can be examined in several different ways. State/ province comparisons can be made on each individual scale, as they are in Table 13. Figure 2 presents these comparisons in graphic form. This table and the accompanying graph indicate little intra-regional differentiation of assessment using these scales. Every one of the means lies on the positive side of neutral, which would be 4.00. The differences are slight, but Ontario was assessed as the most intrinsically attractive location. Using these adjectives that would appear to be particularly relevant to the choice of a non-urban destination, Michigan appears to be the least attractive. This assumes that each scale is weighted equally. Some factors are almost certainly weighted more heavily than others in the selection of a destination by potential travelers. Nor does this assessment include such factors as distance, cost, or other concerns that must interact with assessments in the choice of a destination. Thus, the scale-by-scale comparisons are subject to possible over-interpretation if other considerations are ignored. The utility of such information is in showing relative differences in assessment with other factors hypothetically held constant.

-								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Man-made								Natural
Noisy								Quiet
Unpleasant								Pleasant
Common								Unique
Tense								Relaxed
Dirty								Clean
Unfriendly								Friendly
Drab								Colorful
Unimpressive								Impressive
Boring								Interesting

TABLE 12.--The Polar Adjectives Used in Measuring the Assessment of Place Factor

	Minnesota	Wisconsin	Michigan	<u>Ontario</u>
Man-made-Natural	5.29	5.39	5.20	5.64
Noisy-Quiet	5.17	5.26	4.98	5.44
U npleasant- Pleasant	5.44	5.56	5.44	5.70
Common-Unique	4.61	4.80	4.65	5.44
Tense-Relaxed	5.34	5.41	5.16	5.54
Dirty-Clean	5.39	5.41	5.03	5.54
Unfriendly-Friendly	5.27	5.48	5.33	5.45
Drab-Colorful	5.42	5.55	5.49	5.75
Unimpressive-Impressive	5.23	5.31	5.25	5.65
Boring-Interesting	5.31	5.48	5.50	5.76
N	458	461	463	4 59

TABLE 13.--Intra-regional Comparisons of Mean Scores on Each Scale

A second manner of analyzing the semantic differential involves examining the relationships between scales. Matrices of Pearson correlation coefficients for all scales applied to each state/province are found in Appendix D. Each of these coefficients are positive. They vary greatly in level, however. If they are extremely high, this would indicate the scales are essentially measuring the same dimension of assessment. Very few of these coefficients are above .70, which means they are generally related to one another but appear to be tapping different aspects of assessment.

The third technique involving these scales in the summation of the

	4.0	5.0	6.0	
Man-made		:[!	/	Natural
Noisy	Mich.		Ont.	Quiet
Unpleasant				Pleasant
Common	Minn. 🛶		, Wisc.	Unique
Tense			•	Relaxed
Dirty				Clean
Unfriendly			· ·	Friendly
Drab				Colorful
Unimpressive				Impressive
Boring		\` <i>`</i>		Interesting

FIGURE 2.--Profile Presentation of Mean Scores on the Semantic Differential^a

^aNote should be made that this figure has limits of 4.0 and 6.0 while the scales ranged from 1.0 to 7.0. The figure displays relative, rather than absolute, differences in assessment and should be interpreted with this in mind.

	Minnesota	Wisconsin	Michigan	<u>Ontario</u>
ILLINOIS:				
Cook Sangamo	54.89 on 53.00	56.32 51.22	54.10 50.86	55.94 54.35
INDIANA:				
Marion Wayne	52.80 51.56	52.97 53.28	46.50 51.74	53.05 52.22
OHIO:				
Cuyahog Lucas Lorain Fulton	ja 57.47 47.77 51.44 52.14	50.94 50.25 53.48 54.44	43.05 52.86 51.82 58.57	63.08 56.11 57.40 55.95
mean overall	 52 54			
	52.54	23.03	52.08	55.89

TABLE 14.--County Means of the Summated Attractiveness Score Toward Each Area

ten within state/province scores into a single grand score for each state or province. Examination of overall differences between various groups is now feasible. Table 14 displays the mean total scores for the destination areas by each county in the survey. Substantial variation in the scores exists between counties toward a particular area and between areas for each county.

For example, the mean scores on Michigan assessments range from a high of 58.57 in Fulton County, Ohio, to a low of 43.05 in Cuyahoga County, which is also in Ohio. This fifteen-point spread represents a substantial difference averaging 1.50 on each of the ten individual scales. From this table alone, the observer can say little in the way of accounting for the origins of the differences that exist, however.

One tendency that does deserve mention is the apparent positive association between proximity and favorableness of assessment. Generally, respondents in the various counties assessed those areas lying a greater distance away from their residence less favorably than nearer areas. This reflects the situation between the American states accurately, but Ontario seems to rise above this consideration. Its levels are relatively high regardless of county.

The likely source of Ontario's favored position is its status as a foreign country. It appears to be seen as unique relative to the American states even though objective assessment of its natural qualities would probably show few differences. Knowledge of cultural disparities may influence perception of natural environments as well as artificial developments such as cities.

The linkage between favorableness of assessment and proximity may be the likelihood of the respondent's exposure to the destination area. It was hypothesized that "there is a positive relationship between exposure to the region and the favorableness of its assessment." Table 15 offers support for this statement. The ten scales were summed and means derived for persons who had visited the state or province and for persons who had not been in each one.

It is clear in each case that persons who had visited the area tended to evaluate it more positively than persons who had not visited the state or province. Previous visitors brought the mean levels up while persons who had not been actually exposed to the areas brought them down.

	Michigan		
	N	X	<u>SD</u>
Have visited	385	53.14	12.15
H ave not visit ed	78	46.60	10.98
t=4.77	P=.001 ^a		
	Wisconsin		
	N	X	<u>SD</u>
Have visited	278	56.02	9.80
H ave not vi sited	182	50.10	9.68
t=6.35	P=.001		
	Ontario		
	<u>N</u>	X	<u>SD</u>
Have visited	233	57.80	9.40
Have not visited	226	53.92	10.97
t=4.07	P=.001		
	Minnesota		
	<u>N</u>	X	<u>SD</u>
Have visited	141	57.62	9.06
Have not visited	318	50.29	9.58
t=7.81	P=.001		

TABLE 15.--Means of the Summated Attractiveness Score Toward Each Area by Exposure

Two matters of curiosity are introduced through examination of this table or series of tables. First, the relatively high attractiveness of the areas to persons who had visited them could be taken to mean that exposure had altered their assessment of the area. Visiting a particular place may necessitate a person's adjustment of previous perceptions. In these cases the ideas are systematically more positive, though this could not be inevitable. This would likely be a function of the person's experiences in the area.

A second interpretation of the information in Table 15 reverses the cause and effect sequence from the one offered above. It is probable that persons with positive assessments are more likely to visit an area than persons with less positive perceptions. This would seem to be fundamental. So the sequence between the two elements, assessment and visitation, is subject to different interpretations regarding causation. The data upon which this study is based does not permit approaching this issue with the goal of clarifying the sequence. There is little doubt, however, that the two are strongly related to each other.

Hypothesis 4. <u>Conceptual</u>: There is a positive relationship between the amount of exposure to the region and favorableness of its assessment.

<u>Research</u>: Persons who have not visited an area have lower attractiveness scores on the semantic differential than persons who have visited an area.

Supported

The second matter introduced through Table 15 involves the distribution of the scores. The standard deviations were included in the

table for this reason. The point that should be made is that the Michigan scores tend to be more variable than the scores for the other areas. This is particularly so for persons who have visited the state. The source of this item of curiosity must lie in the sharp contrast between northern and southern Michigan in terms of industrialization, urbanization, environmental aesthetics, and so on.

Like visitors to other Upper Great Lakes states and province, visitors could be exposed to only one or the other of the two extremes in environments. This would depend on duration and length of travel patterns within the area. Yet it is more likely that this would occur in Michigan. This is true because the developed southern part of the state must be passed through by most non-residents to reach the northern part of the state. Major transport routes allow easier access for persons in the area where this study was done to reach northern Michigan through southern Michigan than by other routes. It appears, if the standard deviation is a guide, that exposure to Michigan is limited to the southern part of the state. This is not as likely for residents of the sampled area in their visitation of Minnesota, Wisconsin, or Ontario.

Social Class and Exposure

Exposure to an area and favorableness of its assessment are clearly related. Another factor that deserves attention in relationship to exposure is social class. Social class should represent an earlier stage in the conceptualized sequence than either of the other two elements. It was hypothesized in this regard that "there is a positive relationship between social class and exposure to the region" since

higher class groups tend to travel more widely than lower class groups.

Table 16 presents the relationship between the educational level of the respondent and his exposure or lack of exposure to one of the destination areas being considered, Michigan. Similar tables for exposure to Ontario, Wisconsin, and Minnesota are found in Appendices E1, E2, and E3 respectively. Each of these tables displays the relationship between educational achievement and exposure as clearly as Table 16.

The table shows an unmistakable tendency for the proportion of persons having more formal education to increase in relation to having visited Michigan at one time or another. The contrast between the nonhigh school graduates and the rest of the sample is particularly evident. Table 16 and the information in it lend support to the hypothesis being tested. More systematic support is found in Appendix E. Persons from higher class levels are more likely to have visited each of the destination areas than persons from lower levels.

Hypothesis 5. <u>Conceptual</u>: There is a positive relationship between social class and exposure to the region. <u>Research</u>: Higher proportions of persons in the upper educational levels will have visited the destination areas than persons in the lower levels.

Supported

	Michigan	
	Have <u>Visited</u>	Have Not <u>Visited</u>
Educational level:		
0-11	(68) 68.7	(31) 31.3
12	(166) 86.9	(25) 13.1
13-15	(94) 87.0	(14) 13.0
16+	(66) 84.6	(12) 15.4
Chi Square = 17.63	3 DF Sig	mificance = .0005

TABLE 16.--Exposure to the Region by Different Educational Groups - Michigan

<u>Summary of the Destination Decision</u> <u>Findings</u>

The diversity of findings presented in this chapter makes a summary worthwhile. The destination choice has been examined from several angles. It was shown that the majority of decisions reached between spouses were democratically reached. This varied by social class level. When children are included in the process, they often participate in the selection of a destination. Their participation, however, appears to largely be a function of their ages. Respondents with younger children attributed less decision making power to them than respondents with older children. If the destination chosen is occupied by relatives of the family, there appears to be near equal likelihood that paternal, maternal or both sets of kinfolk are involved. Assessment of place was presented as a key factor in the choice of a trip, particularly if visitation of relatives is not the most important reason for taking it. Patterns of assessment tended to be highly related to whether or not the respondent had visited the area being evaluated. Persons who had visited the state or province involved scored them more positively than persons who had not been there. Visitation in the past was related to the social class level of the respondent, but this varied somewhat by distance of the county of residence to the destination area.

Five hypotheses were tested in this section and four of them were supported by the data. The questions approached were fundamental and did not involve elaborate statistical scrutiny. Yet both conceptually and operationally they were relevant to this undertaking and merited attention.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS: THE ROUTE AND LODGING DECISIONS

Examination of route and lodging decision patterns can proceed in a more straightforward manner than the review of the destination decision. The hypotheses to be tested are similar in form for both concerns and the statistical procedures used to test the hypotheses are well defined. Unlike the destination decision topic, which included assessment of place and other matters, route and lodging decision patterns are discussed as entities in themselves.

The Route Decision

Patterns Between Spouses

The destination decision has both expressive and instrumental elements. The route decision is more clearly instrumental. Males are generally responsible for the provision of transportation. These responsibilities include maintenance, repair, and the actual driving of the vehicle if it is privately owned. It would seem that the execution of these tasks would carry over into the realm of route selection as well. For this reason, it was hypothesized that "males are more likely to select the route to be taken, an instrumental function, than are females."

This issue is of greater conceptual interest than operational. Access to the tools used in reaching the decision is not sex-linked. Use of maps, discussions with previous travelers, and experience are subject to little manipulation by policy-makers. Interest in the

route by the decision maker and/or lack of interest on the part of the other spouse would lead to the use of such procedures.

Table 17 displays the responses to the route selection question by the sex of the respondent. The use of the chi square statistic as a bias check reveals a slight tendency for males and females to differ in their response patterns. The differences are of very minor scale, however, and the chi square figure is well below the significance levels usually associated with it. The response pattern cannot be attributed to a bias by the sex of the respondent.

The table also shows that over two-thirds of the respondents indicated that the husband usually or always makes the route decision in their household. The percentages by sex for these responses taken together are 71.5 percent for men and 63.9 percent for women. In either case, the husband's role in the route decision is greater than the wife's. This appears to be the situation in well over one-half of the households. Hypothesis 6. Conceptual: Males are more likely to select the route

> to be taken, an instrumental function, than are females. <u>Research</u>: More respondents will indicate that <u>husband</u> <u>always</u> or <u>husband</u> <u>usually</u> reflects their experience with the route decision than joint-wife usually-wife always.

Supported

It was shown in the last chapter that the destination decision patterns differed between class levels. Social class is a factor of considerable conceptual interest since many social behaviors are tied to it. Table 18 contains the response pattern to the route decision between s pouses as it is related to the educational level of the

to the Route Decision	Between Spouses by Sex
TABLE 17Response	Question

	Wife Always	Wife Usually	Joint	Husband Usually	Husband Always
Sex of respondent:					
Male	1.4 ^a	2.8	24.3	37.4	34.1
Female	2.4	4.0	29.8	36.1	27.8
Total N	466				
Chi Square = 3.86	4DF	Significance = .4249	6		

^apercentaged across columns, to third decimal

	Wife Always	Wife Usually	Joint	Husband Usually	Husband Always
Educational level of the respondent:					
11-0	4.1 ^a	2.0	32.7	32.7	28.6
<u>12</u>	1.1	3.7	25.3	36.8	33.2
13-15	1.0	3.9	23.3	34.0	37.9
<u>16</u> +	2.7	4.1	31.1	44.6	17.6
Total N	465				
Chi Square = 15.14	12 DF	Sign	uificance = .233		

TABLE 18.--Response to the Route Decision Question Between Spouses by Educational Level

^apercentaged across columns, to third decimal

respondent. Again, there is a definite tendency for the lowest educational group to differ from the higher groups. Yet in this situation the husband appears to have less decision making influence than in the other levels. Beyond this, the pattern found in the lowest level is duplicated in the highest level. Thus, the husband's role is usually expanded in the middle levels while the extremes indicate a more democratic pattern. This u-shaped pattern is not statistically significant, but is apparent in this data.

Perhaps greater abilities among females in the highest level and lesser abilities among males in the lowest levels contribute to these differences. Kendall's tau, .0456, for another measure of social class, income level, and the route decision between spouses is not high. But it would not be expected to be high if the apparent curvilinear pattern was in evidence. Regardless of class level, however, the husband usually or always makes this decision in most households. This is the most pertinent point to be made regarding the route decision between spouses.

Patterns Between Parents and Children

Children played a major role in the choice of a destination in almost one-half of the respondents' households. This varied quite dramatically between age groupings of the oldest child. The choice in this instance is of a route, however, and it is not known if children are as influential in this sphere as they are in the broader destination sphere. Table 19 shows the response pattern to the route decision between parents and children.

It is very evident that in most households the children have little decision making influence. Over 80 percent of the responses are parents

		Between	Parents and Ch	nildren	
	Parents Always	Parents Usually	Joint	Child/Children Usually	Child/Children Always
Z	158	51	45	£	2
Per Cent	60.8	19.6	17.7	1.2	æ.
Z	260				
Mean age of the		Parents Always	Parents Usually	Joint	-Child/Children Usually- /Children Always
oldest cnila: N		12.94 254	13.40		17.10
Analysis of Vari	iance	F Rat	io = 6.26	F Probability =	.002

TABLE 19.--Response to the Route Decision Question Between Parents and Children

<u>usually</u> or <u>parents always</u>. Together with the data found in previous tables, this information reflects a husband dominated decision as being the most typical behavior. The tau between education level and this response is only -.0292 and between income level and this response is .O 371. Both relationships are weak. This is evidence that a parent's, particularly husband/father, controlled decision is typical regardless of class level. The remaining factors of interest are the age of the children and number of children in relation to the patterns.

It was hypothesized that "as children increase in age, their role in the route decision is greater." This was supported when it involved the destination decision and Table 20 demonstrates a similar Pattern in the route decision between parents and children.

Hypothesis 7. <u>Conceptual</u>: As children increase in age, their role in the route decision is greater.

<u>Research</u>: The average age of the oldest child will be higher for the <u>joint-children</u> <u>usually-children</u> <u>always</u> respondents to the route question than the <u>parents</u> always or parents usually respondents.

Supported

This systematic increase in mean ages of children was not matched by changes in the numbers of children per response group in the destination decision. This factor examined for the route decision between Parents and children is of interest. Breaking down the response groups in the same order as before, the mean number of children goes from 2.87 to 2.68 to 1.98.⁹⁴ This pattern is the reverse of what might be

 94 Appendix F 1 contains the full table.

expected. Households in which the route decision is dominated by parents have more children than households which allow children to participate. Again the influence of the children's age is apparent while the number of children factor appears to have only a slight impact on the decision pattern.

The Lodging Decision

Patterns Between Spouses

The lodging decision is being presented as an expressive function. It has elements of both expressive and instrumental functions, however. It involves coping with both extra-familial and intra-familial environments or settings. Its interpretation as an instrumental function rests upon the facts that it is a form of providing shelter and that it takes place away from the permanent residence. Its interpretation as an expressive function is based on residential maintenance and cleaning responsibilities typically fulfilled by the wife. Because it involves such a micro-environment in which the family resides temporarily, it is here considered as an expressive function. The hypothesis developed around this decision was that "females are more likely to select commercial lodging facilities, an expressive function, than are males."

In terms of bias by sex of respondent, Table 21 offers almost no evidence of bias. The chi square level is quite low. This can be eliminated as a concern. The table also shows, however, that almost 70 Percent of the decisions are typically reached democratically or jointly. The majority of the other responses fall into the <u>husband</u> usually or <u>husband always</u> categories. This is contrary to the hypothesized pattern. It appears that the decision was mislabeled as an expressive function exclusively. Its nature is of greater complexity,
Question	
Decision	
Lodging	by Sex
e to the	Spouses
21Response	Between
TABLE 2	

	Wife Always	Wife Usuall <u>y</u>	Joint	Husband Usually	Husband Always
Sex of respondent:					
Male	3.2 ^a	6.5	68.5	1.71	4.6
Female	3.6	8.7	68.7	13.5	5.6
Total N	468				
Chi Square = 2.01	4	. DF	Significance	e = .7338	

^apercentaged across columns, to third decimal

involving both spouse's participation. Indeed, the figures in Table 21 make it appear to be more instrumental than expressive in a large number of households.

These findings are operationally significant as well as being conceptually illuminating. Effective marketing of commercial lodging facilities would not be oriented to the wife alone. Both spouses are usually involved. Rational, as opposed to affective, considerations most likely structure this decision between spouses while they are traveling. Location, costs, and facilitation might tend to be weighted more heavily than aesthetics, for example.

Hypothesis 8. <u>Conceptual</u>: Females are more likely to select commercial lodging facilities, an expressive function, than are males.

<u>Research</u>: More respondents will indicate that <u>wife</u> <u>always</u> or <u>wife</u> <u>usually</u> reflects their experience with the <u>lodging</u> decision than <u>joint-husband</u> <u>usually-husband</u> <u>always</u>.

Not Supported

Analysis of the social class variables, educational achievement and income levels, in relation to the lodging decision between spouses did not produce differences between the groups. Both chi square and tau procedures were used in this way, but neither statistic showed relationships of significance or near significance for either of the social class factors. Given the wide range in costs and quality of commercial lodging facilities it might be expected that different income groups, for example, would display different patterns in the division of labor in this matter. This does not appear to be supported, however.

Patterns Between Parents and Children

The role of children in the destination decision is significant in many families. Their role in the route decision is most usually less prominent, but this pattern varies by the age of the children. The lodging decision is the focus of interest here for both conceptual and operational reasons. Conceptually, the influence of the age of the children and number of children on decision patterns has been shown to be variable by age of children, but relatively slight by number of children. Examination of the lodging decision should further clarify issues associated with these factors in relation to decision making.

Operationally, the need to know the decision makers in households has been stressed previously. Marketing practices are based on such factors. The information in Table 23, which displays the responses to the lodging decision between parents and children, is the type of information needed in such efforts. This table presents a pattern of decision making for lodging that lies between the extremes, in terms of children's influence, of the destination or route decisions. Approximately 70 percent of the respondents indicated the parents always or usually make this decision. Less than 30 percent of the responses indicated that children played an equal or greater role than the parents. Ninety-six percent of this group characterized the decision as a jointly-made one.

Thus, children in most households appear to most frequently influence the destination decision, less often the lodging decision, and even less frequently affect the route decision. This sequence of children's

		סבראבבוו	rarenus anu un		
	Parents Always	Parents Usually	Joint	Child/Children Usually	Child/Children Always
z	121	64	73	2	-
Per Cent	46.4	24.5	28.0	8.	4.
z	261				
	TABL	.E 23The Age o Decision Parents Alwave	of Children Infl Between Parents Paren	uence on the Lodging and Children Lodging Ls Ls	nt-Children Usually-
Mean age of oldest chil	the d:	11.71	13.	96	17.29
z		255			
Analysis of	Variance	F Ra	itio = 14.249	F Probabili	ty = .000

TABLE 22.--Response to the Lodging Decision Question Between Parents and Children

influence seems to be based on the distinction between the prior to and during periods of decision making. The indications are that children often participate in the planning of a trip but less often in the execution of the trip. Parents may believe that children are unable to understand the details of making a trip, but are capable of understanding the reasons for a trip. These beliefs may have been supported by experience.

Of interest now are variations in these patterns in relation to other factors. Social class may influence the pattern. Lower level households tend to be somewhat more authoritarian than higher level households. Kendall's tau between this decision and income level is a low .0654. The impact of social class appears to be negligible.

Age of the children has consistently been related to the decision patterns. Again it was hypothesized that "as children increase in age, their role in the destination decision is greater." Table 23 presents evidence that this hypothesis is correct. The age of the oldest child steadily increases as the children's influence increases to joint status.

Hypothesis 9.--<u>Conceptual</u>: As children increase in age, their role in the lodging decision is greater. <u>Research</u>: The average age of the oldest child will be higher for the joint-children usually-children always respondents to the lodging decision question than the <u>parents always</u> or <u>parents usually</u> respondents.

Supported

The number of children, however, increases slightly as the responses go from <u>parents always</u> across to <u>joint</u>. The difference between the means involved has a range of .53 years and the differences are far from being statistically significant. Yet this finding clouds the associate issue of the impact of the number of children on travel decision making between parents and children. There were differences by age composition for all three of the decisions examined. There were no differences by the number of children involved for the other two decisions.

In general, it appears that the age of the children has greater influence than the number of children on travel decision patterns. No hypotheses were tested that revolved around the number of children factor. It was considered after examination of the data revealed the curious tendencies reported. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between age of the oldest child and the number of children is .1050. This is significant at the .05 level. The two factors are positively related but not strongly. This is consistent with the responses to the decision questions in relation to them. Their impact or lack of impact on decision patterns is evidently independent of the influence of one another.

CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS: FAMILY IDEOLOGY, AUTONOMY, AND TRAVEL BEHAVIOR

The findings presented in this final chapter devoted to the analysis of the data collected are related to decision making patterns, but their relevance is less focused or direct than past findings reported. The hypotheses tested concern such factors as family ideology, visitation of relatives as a destination attractant, social class, and autonomy of decision making. The issues associated with the findings are primarily conceptual, rather than operational, in nature. Little attention will be given to the marketing or planning implications of the results.

Family Ideology and Travel

The ideas underlying the concept of family ideology have been presented. Beliefs centering upon relations between the sexes, man and wife, and parents and children are the points of attention. The respondents' belief patterns were measured on the democratic-autocratic continuum with the Traditional Family Ideology scale, short form, developed by Levinson and Huffman.

The respondents were asked to indicate their response to a series of twelve statements on a seven-point <u>strongly agree</u> to <u>strongly disagree</u> scale. These statements, as they were presented to the respondent, are located in Appendix A2, with the remainder of the interview schedule. Numbers from one to seven were attached to the responses and statistical

analysis based upon these numbers were feasible at the interval level of measurement. They are conventionally used in this way.

The mean score for each of the twelve items is found in Appendix G1. The means range from 2.76 to 5.15 and the standard deviations range from 1.65 to 1.98. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used to examine the internal relationships between the twelve items. The correlation matrix is located in Appendix G2. It shows that all items are positively related to one another, as would be expected. The coefficients range from .4740 to .1563. Most of them lie in the .20-.40 range. This is taken to mean that the items are tapping slightly different dimensions of the respondent's family orientation. If they were exceedingly high, this would be an indication that the scales were duplicating one another. If they were very low or negative, this would be a sign that an item, or items, was not measuring family ideology as it was conceived.

The twelve scores were summated into a single autocratic-democratic measure of family ideological orientation. The mean score for the entire sample is 50.32, with a standard deviation of 14.04. Lower scores represent the autocratic end of the spectrum and higher scores represent a democratic orientation. The Pearson correlation coefficients between such factors as age, income, and education and the ideology measure can be useful in examining the apparent validity of the measure. Age is used negatively related to measures built upon the concepts of authoritarianism. Older persons tend to be more conservative. Income and particularly education are most often positively related to such measures. Persons in higher status levels tend to be more equalitarian than persons in the lower levels. The coefficient between this measure and the age of the respondent is -.4118, between this measure and educational

achievement is .4052, and between this measure and income is .2961. These strong relationships lend support to the acceptance of the validity of the measure.

Another factor of interest in relationship to family ideology is the rural-urban residence of the respondent. Persons in rural areas generally are more traditional than the residents of large cities.⁹⁵ Table 24 displays the means and standard deviations for each county's residents participating in the survey on the ideology measure. The counties are ordered on the basis of their population from the fewest residents, Fulton County, Ohio, to the most residents, Cook County, Illinois. It would be expected that the respondents living in counties with fewer residents, rural and semi-rural areas, have lower scores than persons from heavily and densely populated counties.

The table shows a broken tendency for the scores to increase as the number of residents increases. Yet the scores do not continuously increase from county to county as might be expected. If the counties were grouped, for example, into three categories with the two least populated counties, the next four counties, and the two most populated counties constituting each level, this pattern would emerge quite clearly.

The hypothesis to be tested that relates to family ideology is that "persons displaying a high traditional family ideology orientation are more likely to say that visitation of relatives was the most importand reason for taking their last pleasure trip than are persons low in

⁹⁵Robert Redfield, "The Folk Society," <u>American Journal of</u> Sociology 52 (1947): 293-308.

<u>County of Residence</u> : ^a	Mean Score, Summated Family Ideology Scale	Standard 25 Deviation
Fulton County, Ohio	44.06	13.2
Wayne County, Indiana	48.45	12.7
Sangamon County, Illinois	49. 86	10.8
Lorain County, Ohio	50.77	12.3
Lucas County, Ohio	44.95	14.1
Marion County, Indiana	57.78	11.6
Cuyahoga County, Ohio	53.07	13.5
Cook County, Illinois	52.02	15.4
Analysis of Variance	F Ratio = 4.725 F Probabi	lity = .000

TABLE 24.--Response to the Family Ideology Scales by County

^aranked from fewest residents to most residents

	Visita As Mos Reason	tion of Re t Importar Given for	latives it · the Trip	Non-fa Given the T	amily R for Ta rip	easons king	Analysis of Variance <u>F Ratio F</u> P	robability
TFI score for:	Z		<u>S.D.</u>	z		S.D.		
Last Irip	192	49.35	13.7	226	51.31	13.8	2.098	.148
<u>Longest Trip of Last</u> <u>Year</u>	133	51.21	12.8	190	51.55	14.4	.050	.824
Longest Trip of Last Five Years	125	50.01	14.7	244	51.58	13.3	1.058	.304

TABLE 2**3.--**Mean Scores on the Family Ideology Measure by Reason for Trips

this orientation." Conceptually, the nature of the democratic-autocratic continuum suggests that more traditional persons would be more likely to use travel opportunities for maintaining linkages with kinfolk than persons placing less emphasis on sustaining family ties.

Table 25 presents evidence, however, that does not support this line of thinking. Persons who used their last trip for visiting relatives do not significantly differ in family orientation from persons who used their trip for sightseeing, outdoor recreation, and other activities. The hypothesis is not supported. The table also contains the mean ideological scores, using the same criterion for dividing the respondents into two groups, for persons describing their longest trip of the last year and the last five years. Again the differences are on the family measure so slight that they are not significant.

Hypothesis 10. <u>Conceptual</u>: Persons displaying a high traditional family ideology orientation are more likely to say that visitation of relatives was the most important reason for taking their last pleasure trip than are persons low in this orientation.

> <u>Research</u>: Persons who say visitation of relatives was the most important reason for taking their last trip will have lower scores on the family ideology questions than persons who traveled to non-family destinations.

Not Supported

Social Class and Visitation of Relatives

The relationships between the social class measures and family ideology measure were strong, as was expected. The relationship between

family ideology and visitation of relatives was hypothesized to be clearcut but was not. It seems appropriate to complete the review of this series of possible relationships by inspecting the influence of social class factors on patterns of visits to relatives or non-family destinations. It was hypothesized that "persons in lower class level families are more likely to say that visitation of relatives was the most important reason for taking their last pleasure trip than are persons from upper class level families."

The next table, Table 27, shows the mean level of education, one of the social class indicators, for persons who said the most important reason for taking their last trip, the longest trip of the last year, and the longest trip of the last five years was visiting relatives. They are compared to respondents who said non-family reasons lay behind their taking the respective trips.

Persons who used their travel opportunities to meet with their relatives as a group have completed fewer years of formal education than persons taking trips for other reasons. This is true for each of the three categorizations by trip taken. The hypothesis is supported that persons from lower status levels are more likely to use their travel to visit relatives.

Hypothesis 11.Conceptual:Persons in lower class level families are
more likely to say that visitation of relatives was the
most important reason for taking their last pleasure
trip than are persons from upper class level families.

Research: Respondents with lower education will say that
visitation of relatives was the more important reason for
taking their last trip than respondents with higher
education.Supported

TABLE	26Differences	in	Educational	Achievement
	by Reason fc	r J	rip	

	Visita As Mos <u>Reason</u>	tion of Re t Importar Given for	elatives it * the Trip	Non-f Given the T	amily R for Ta rip	easons king	Analysis o Variance <u>F Ratio</u> <u>F</u>	F Probability
Years of Education Completed:	zl	×	S.D.	z	×	S.D.		
Last Trip	197	12.25	2.9	232	13.02	2.5	8.416	.004
Longest Trip of Last Year	137	12.57	2.4	196	13.10	2.6	3.452	.064
Longest Trip of Last Five Years	132	12.15	2.9	249	13.27	2.4	15.282	000.

•

The question remaining is whether or not these differences are due to the costs of travel or choice, regardless of costs. It should be somewhat less expensive to visit relatives than to take trips not in-volving relatives. The distances required to make such non-family oriented trips tend to be longer than family trips. In straight-line distance from the principal city of the home county of the respondent to the destination, the mean one-way distance of the trips to kinfolk was 422 miles. The mean distance for other trips was 437 miles. These averages are for the last trip taken by the two response groups, but similar differences were found for the longest trip of the last year and the longest trip of the last five years.

Thus, the relationship between reasons for travel and social class remains unclear. The evidence from the family ideology analysis suggests that no differences exist between the two groups on this dimension. Yet social class differences are apparent on the prevailing tendencies between groups to visit kinfolk or other destination attractants. The key to this entire cluster of concerns is the relationship between family ideology and visitation of relatives. If family ideology scores had been found to differ between persons making relatives-centered trips and others making non-relatives-centered trips, then the overall situation would have been more clear. As it is, income or, more generally, social class, appears to largely determine the relatives/nonrelatives pattern. The cost differential may indeed be the source of the destination differences between low and high income groups.

Autonomy in Travel Decision Making

Social Class and Autonomy

Autonomy in decision making refers to the degree of specialization between husband and wife. Autonomous decisions are usually made by one spouse or the other, rather than together. Komarovsky advanced the idea that specialization is highest in the lowest and highest social classes because expertise or lack of expertise is most evident to each spouse in these households.⁹⁶ Persons in middle status groups tend to share the decision making more because the spouses' perceptions of their partner's knowledge base is less focused than in the extremes.

The hypothesis tested follows Komarovsky. It suggests that "there is greater autonomy in decision making regarding the destination, route, and lodging at both extremes of the class variable than there is in the middle level." Table 28 shows the patterns that emerge when <u>husband</u> <u>usually-husband always</u> and <u>wife usually-wife always</u> responses are taken as one <u>autonomous</u> group opposed to joint responses.

In each case the two extreme categories at each end of the income distribution have higher levels of autonomy than the middle three categories. The dip in the percentage categorized as autonomous in the middle income groups is evident but not statistically significant. Thus, technically the hypothesis is not supported. Recoding the seven income groups into the three groups mentioned above and recalculating chi square did not result in the emergence of statistically significant differences either.

⁹⁶ Kamarovsky, "Class Differences in Decision-Making," p. 260.

	Destination	Route	Lodaina
Household income during the past year:	Joint Autonomous	Joint Autonomous	Joint Autonomous
\$ 0- 4,999	64.7 ^a 35.3	29.4 70.6	67.6 32.4
5,000- 9,999	64.8 35.2	29.3 70.7	62.6 37.4
10,000-14,999	68.6 31.4	22.7 77.3	63.6 36.4
15,000-19,999	77.0 23.0	30.2 69.8	75.9 24.1
20,000-24,999	79.5 20.5	35.9 64.1	79.5 20.5
25,000-29,999	72.2 27.8	5.6 94.4	66.7 33.3
30,000+	65.0 35.0	30.0 70.0	60.0 40.0
Z	407	408	407
Chi Square	5.717	7.747	7.683
DF	9	9	9
Significance	.4556	.2572	.2623

TABLE 27.--The Relationship Between Autonomy in the Destination, Route, and Lodging Decisions and Income Level

^apercentaged across columns, to third decimal

Hypothesis 12. <u>Conceptual</u>: There is greater autonomy in decision making regarding the destination, route, and lodging at both extremes of the class variable than there is in the middle levels.

> <u>Research</u>: Higher proportions of the destination, route, and lodging responses will be <u>autonomous</u> in the extremes of the income level grouping, while the middle levels have higher proportions of joint responses.

Not Supported

Age and Autonomy

Just as it was suggested that autonomy is greater in extreme status settings, a companion idea was presented that suggested a similar curvilinear existed by age as well. It was hypothesized that "there is greater autonomy in decision making regarding the destination, route, and lodging at both extremes of the age variable than there is in the middle levels." The thinking behind this suggestion was similar to that which lay behind the previous one regarding social class. Spouses at an early age are unsure of their partners' abilities, then they later demonstrate greater sharing of decision making. Still later in their marriage they tend to specialize more as habitual tendencies become set.⁹⁷

The table showing the response patterns to the three decision areas categorized by age groupings is Table 29. It shows no systematic differences in level of autonomy for the destination and lodging decisions by age level. The route decision, however, does consistently

⁹⁷Kenkel, "Family Interaction," pp. 151-152.

the Destination,	Level
TABLE 28The Relationship Between Autonomy in	Route, and Lodging Decisions and Age

	Joint	ination Autonomous	Joint R	oute Autonomous	Joint Lo	idging Autonomous
Age of the Respondent:						
29 or below	72.1 ^a	27.9	17.6	82.4	64.7	35.3
30 - 39	67.0	33.0	20.5	79.5	65.2	34.8
40 - 49	70.4	29.6	24.7	75.3	1.07	29.9
50 - 59	69.2	30.8	30.4	69.6	7.17	28.3
60 - 69	77.8	22.2	37.0	63.0	68.8	31.3
70+	68.4	31.6	42.1	57.9	73.7	26.3
:						
Z	464		464		464	
Chi Square	2.782		14.001		1.944	
DF	5		5		5	
Significance	.7334		.0156		.8567	

^apercentaged across columns, to third decimal

become less autonomous through each of the six age groups. In this case, the relationship is clearly linear rather than curvilinear as suggested. The relationship between this decision and age is a strong one. This suggests that specialization steadily declines with age. For the route decision, this would generally mean that the husbands permit the wives to more frequently share in the route decision the older they are or the longer they have been married. Overall, however, the hypothesized patterns did not emerge.

Hypothesis 13. <u>Conceptual</u>: There is greater autonomy in decision making regarding the destination, route, and lodging at both extremes of the age variable than there is in the middle levels.

> <u>Research</u>: Higher proportions of the destination, route, and lodging responses will be <u>autonomous</u> in the extremes of the age level grouping, while the middle levels have higher proportions of the joint responses.

Not Supported

Summary of the Chapter

The concepts and hypotheses built with these concepts that appeared in this chapter were oriented toward the workings of the nuclear family as these behaviors are related to pleasure travel. Family ideology was examined in relation to social class and visitation of relatives as a travel destination. The simple causal sequence from social class to family ideology to visitation of relatives was defective as a model. The hypothesized bond between family ideology and relatives-centered travel was absent statistically. Yet the qualitative dimension of travel was touched upon. It is well known that higher income and educational groups tend to travel more and further for pleasure. They also tend to spend more for travel.⁹⁸ The significance of the examination of the "reason for trip" factor was that it was done in relation to the usual quantitative factors as well as the less apparent, and qualitative, affective factor of family ideology.

The findings in the section on decision making autonomy only suggested that a u-shaped pattern exists from one extreme of the income hierarchy to the other. Neither of the two hypotheses regarding autonomy were supported. Social class differences in proportional autonomy in the suggested pattern were evident, but not statistically significant. No evidence supported the same ideas with age the causal variable in relation to patterns of autonomy.

⁹⁸ Clawson and Knetsch, <u>Economics of Outdoor Recreation</u>, pp. 102-110.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Travel-based development was presented as one means of reaching broader goals of economic development. The impacts of travel development on social institutions and the natural environment were also discussed. In general it appears that the attraction of visitors is not an ideal industry upon which to build economic development efforts. Yet the feasible alternatives are few in number in many areas of an economically depressed or semi-depressed character.

Behavioral research was put forth as one potentially contributing factor to travel development efforts sponsored by public and private organizations. The efficiency and effectiveness of development strategies is facilitated with increasing knowledge of the persons upon whom the success of development plans ultimately rests. This research focused upon decision making patterns. Information of the type gathered should be of value to workers involved in travel development.

Conceptually, the research was designed to assess processes in the muclear family and acts of individual persons in the family, in matters relating to pleasure travel. Hypotheses were deductively created out of ideas presented in the literature on the family, assessment of place, and travel behavior. Travel is particularly interesting conceptually if it is examined from an expressive-instrumental perspective. Expressively, pleasure travel serves to bring the family

together and strengthen the linkages that exist between members of the family. Instrumentally, travel involves encountering non-routinized environments and handling details necessary to complete the journey. Questions involving the temporary suspension during travel of traditional or habitual sex roles in the family were central issues in the research. Integration of these conceptual conerns with the aforementioned applied interests was a basic objective in planning the study.

Literature on travel motivation, decision making in the family, assessment of place, and related pieces were reviewed. Following this section, the concepts, their measures, and the hypotheses of the study were presented. Thirteen such hypotheses, in conceptual and research form, were developed. Analysis of the data indicated support for eight of these positively stated hypotheses and non-support for five of them. This ratio of support to non-support findings is taken as a reflection of the lack of systematic information available on the concerns of this study. Clarification of these issues here should permit later researchers to point toward selected issues and perhaps avoid others.

The research design was the next topic covered. The pretests of the questionnaire and measures, sampling within and between counties, personnel, and other specific procedures followed were included. A comparison of the sample interviewed and the populations of the selected counties completed this topic's coverage. Respondents and residents were paralleled as to their income, educational achievements, racial composition, and sexual composition. Overall, the sample was well matched to the persons in the sampling frame, but within particular counties there was some disparity on several variables.

Findings on the destination decision showed that the decision showed that the decision pattern is relatively democratic between spouses and between parents and children. When the trip taken by the respondent was to visit relatives, the wife's relatives were visited no more often than the husband's relatives. The assessment of place component of the destination varied by county of the respondent and by exposure to the judged area. The relationship between exposure and assessment was positive, as was the linkage between social class and exposure.

The route and lodging decisions were analyzed in the same ways as the destination decision. The route decision was predominately the husband's responsibility, as was predicted. The lodging decision was shown to be democratic in most households and this was contrary to the hypothesis that women most often made this decision. Children appear to have little influence on the route decision in most families, but more often do participate in the lodging decision. The role of the children in each of the three decisions of interest was largely a function of their age. As children increase in age, the significance of their input in the process increases. This positive relationship did not hold when the number of children in the household was examined in relation to travel decision making between parents and children.

Family ideology scores were strongly correlated with the respondent's education, age, and household income. Income and education were positively related to the democratic ideology while age was negatively related to this orientation. These family orientation scores, however, were not variable by the respondents' visitation to relatives or non-relative attractions. Social class did influence the pattern of visitation of relatives. Persons visiting relatives had

lower educational achievement than persons visiting other destinations on the last rrip, the longest trip of the last year, and the longest trip of the last five years.

There was evidence, statistically not significant, that spouses in the lowest and highest income groups were more autonomous in travel decision making than persons in the middle income groups. This was the hypothesized pattern. These tendencies were not existent when the age of the respondent was examined in relation to autonomy and jointness of decision making. Additional research should clarify and solidify the findings given on these conceptual concerns.

Policy Recommendations

The policy implications of this study lie largely in the sphere of travel promotion. Effective promotion is a basic concern of persons and groups working in travel development. Use of information such as was presented in this report can be valuable, but must be tempered to some extent by understanding the frequent disparity between verbal responses and actual behavior. The scale of this problem is likely greater in the decision making area than in the assessment of place area. Decision making responses are dependent upon both behavior in the interview environment and behavior in the family environment. Assessment of place responses are free of concrete experiential references beyond those contained in the measure itself.

Recognition of Children as Travel Decision Makers

The role of children in travel decision making, particularly in the choice of a destination, is substantial in many households. The recognition of this fact and consideration of it in the implementation of promotional activities would likely make for greater effectiveness of such efforts. This recommendation applies to destinations other than large amusement parks and similar facilities that already realize the impact of children's expressions of desires on the final decision reached.

Destination areas and facilities and commercial lodging operations appear to promote themselves mainly, if not exclusively, in media with an adult-dominated audience. Producers of other consumer goods used by children have been less hesitant to market directly toward children. The assumption that parents always make the destination or lodging decisions alone simply does not hold. This situation varies by the age of the children, but the recognition of the children's role in decision making has not been adequately taken into account by travel promoters in the destination and lodging areas.

Messages oriented toward older children is one method in the promotional sphere that would be useful in attracting children's attention toward the destination. Emphasis on activities heavily participated in by children, rather than exclusively adults, is one obvious way that messages could be geared toward children. Examples include downhill skiing, cross-country skiing, visitation of historic places, going to amusement parks, and so on.

Researching Assessment of Place As a Destination Promotion Tool

The agencies and firms in the Upper Great Lakes area involved in destination promotion should consider the findings of this study and future studies in developing their messages to the public. The assessment of place findings should be particularly useful in this regard. The focus should be to strengthen the most positive perceptions held by the public and to radically alter in the positive direction the less positive perceptions.

Two sets of findings are pertinent here. Exposure was shown to be highly associated with positiveness of perception. Messages that build on this might be effective. For example, the encouragement of non-residents to "ask someone who's been there" would likely result, if the suggestion were received and acted upon, in the person's having a friend's or acquaintance's laudatory recollections of one of his previous visits to the area. The indirect use of informal information channels such as this by persons in the creation of formal messages could be increased.

The second series of findings that can be used by persons in travel development are the simple means and standard deviations of the individual scale scores. For example, Michigan's attributes were more variably assessed than the other states or province. The respondents' perception of Michigan is thus less clear-cut than their perceptions of the other areas. It was suggested that the north-south differences in the state may be the source of this ambiguity. Future research should be planned which attempts to confirm or disconfirm such suggestions, should attempt to monitor the impacts of promotion efforts, and such research should be regularly and systematically completed. Research of this type would contribute to more efficient use of promotional resources held by government agencies and private firms to a lesser extent.

For example, the question has come up among members of the research team as to how Michigan's travel promotion agency can best handle the apparently wide-spread stereotyping of the state in terms of its most populous and prominent city, Detroit. It has been suggested by several persons that the racial conflicts, crime, and heavy industrybased economy of Detroit have contributed to a distorted idea surrounding the state as a whole in the minds of the American public. Should Detroit's stereotype be confronted or avoided in promotional efforts? Future research using different messages could measure the impact of each type of message on the public's assessment of the state as a travel destination. The confrontation or avoidance issue could be resolved empirically. This would make for greater efficiencies in promotion of the state.

Attracting the Traveler that Regularly Visits Relatives

Many families use their travel opportunities to visit their relatives. For some persons this is the only apparent reason that they travel. Recognition of these facts and subsequent efforts to attract a segment of the market that has been largely unswayed by destination promotions could be worthwhile.

Much of this endeavor should be directed at facilitation of the travel experience for persons unfamiliar with required behavior. Many persons in American society have never registered at a motel or attempted to plan a pleasure trip regarding potential destinations to visit or route to be taken. Assistance in helping them overcome any hesitance that they might have would be valuable to them. This is directed toward persons most often in lower income groups and the aged.

It should be recognized, however, that attraction of this substantial group of potential travelers may not result in benefits to the area or facility greater than the costs of altering this group's wellestablished habits of travel. Given their income level, it is likely that they would spend less money on their trips than persons who already are frequent travelers. Furthermore, it is unknown whether this block of potential visitors can be convinced to visit destinations other than their relatives.

Research Recommendations

Further Study of the Role of Children in Travel Decision Making

One significant finding of this research was that children's ages, not their number, affected their role in the decision making process. Future research could further clarify these patterns if additional factors were included in the analysis. Sex of the children, ages of each of the children, their participation in other family decisions, and similar variables would be useful in gaining a more complete understanding of the entire process as children relate to it.

Clarification of the Relationship Between Exposure and Assessment

The data gathered for this study did not permit causal sequences of exposure to place and assessment of that place to be determined even inferentially. Additional research involving longitudinal analysis, examination of promotional impacts on assessment and travel behavior, and control of such variables as reasons for past visitation to the area would be both conceptually and operationally useful. Positiveness of assessment and the respondents' exposure to the region were shown to be associated. Studies of greater sophistication would permit the empirical testing of more discriminating suggestions.

Examination of Latent Influences on Perception of Natural Areas

This study's findings indicated that Ontario was generally assessed more positively than the three American states being considered, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. It was suggested that knowledge of cultural differences may intrude into perception of natural settings. Thus, the knowledge that Ontario is part of a different country than Wisconsin, Michigan and Minnesota may lead to the person's evaluating it differently without having been to either area or while knowing that environmentally the areas are similar.

This idea of uniqueness is used effectively by travel promotion agencies in Ontario in their communications efforts to the American public. Operationally, it would be useful to further examine the origins of such exaggerated percepts. Effective counter-messages might then be devised to eliminate the differences between Ontario's and the American states' quality of assessment in the minds of potential visitors.

Conceptually, the idea that identical pictures might be shown to persons and be judged differently if the persons were told that the pictures were taken in different countries is a matter of curiosity. This avenue of research is virtually open-ended as factors like the many different countries with different cultural bases, the variety of natural landscapes and cityscapes, and the great variety of testing situations available are considered. This appears to be a fruitful avenue of future research.

Inquiry on the Causal Relations Between Income and Visitation of Relatives

Persons in lower income groups are more likely to use pleasure travel opportunities to visit their relatives. The evidence suggests that these patterns are a function of cost differentials between such trips and visits to scenic, recreational, and culturally significant areas. Family ideology differences between persons visiting relatives and non-relative-centered destinations did not appear. Further study should seek to examine the influence of additional factors of an affective nature. Differences in attitudes toward the use of leisure time, possibly inflated estimates of the costs of non-relative oriented pleasure travel, and similar factors should also be considered in research on this topic.

Analysis of the Social Class and Autonomy Relationship A definite pattern existed in the relationship between autonomy of decision making and social class. This supported Komarovsky's hypothesis that autonomy is highest in the highest and lowest class levels. Further research, applied to a greater variety of decisions, should solidify these findings. Other factors might also be used in the analysis of these patterns. In-depth questioning on past as well as present decision making, sources of expertise of the decision maker, and interaction between spouses regarding this knowledge of the elements of the decision would contribute more evidence toward understanding the variable patterns. Distinguishing Between Decision Making and Influence The focus of this study was travel decision making. It is evident that subtle influences from a number of sources which are part of the process studied were not researched. Only the final act of a sequence of acts was approached empirically. Future studies might be conducted which account for the preliminary behavior patterns that shape the nature of the travel decision and perhaps determine which person, or persons, makes the final choice.

The goal of this study was to describe the basic patterns coming out of the decision process as a whole. Behavioral research can contribute to improvements in the execution of travel development plans. Such refinements in the travel development orbit should facilitate economic development of many areas, both domestic and international. LITERATURE CITED

LITERATURE CITED

Books

- Allport, Gordon. "Attitudes." In <u>Readings in Attitude Theory and</u> Measurement, edited by Martin Fishbein. New York: Wiley, 1967.
- Barlowe, Raleigh. Land <u>Resource</u> <u>Economics</u>. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Beardsley, Wendell. "The Economic Impact of Recreation Development: A Synopsis." In <u>Recreation Symposium Proceedings</u>. Upper Darby, Penn.: Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, United States Forest Service, 1971.
- Beck, Robert. "Spatial Meaning and the Properties of the Environment." In <u>Environmental Psychology: Man and His Physical Setting</u>, edited by Harold Proshansky, William Ittelson, and Leanne Rivlin. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr. <u>Social Statistics</u>. 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Blank, Uel, and Gunn, Clare. <u>Guidelines</u> for <u>Tourism-Recreation</u> in <u>Michigan's Upper</u> <u>Peninsula</u>. Upper Peninsula Committee on Area Progress, 1966.
- Boorstin, Daniel. <u>The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America</u>. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Boulding, Kenneth. <u>The Image</u>. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956.
- Bugelski, B. R. "The Definition of the Image." In <u>Imagery</u>: <u>Current</u> <u>Cognitive Approaches</u>, edited by Sydney Segal. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Clawson, Marion, and Knetsch, Jack. <u>Economics of Outdoor Recreation</u>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1966.
- Conway Research, Inc. <u>The Site Selection Handbook</u>: <u>Guide to Land</u>, <u>Leisure</u>, <u>and Travel Investment</u>. Atlanta: Conway Research, 1973.
- Cooper, J.B., and McGaugh, J.L. "Attitudes and Related Concepts." In <u>Attitudes</u>: <u>Selected Readings</u>, edited by Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1966.

- Craik, Kenneth. "The Assessment of Places." In <u>Advances in Psycholog-</u> <u>ical Assessment, Volume Two</u>, edited by Paul McReynolds. Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1971.
- deGrazia, Sebastian. <u>Of Time</u>, <u>Work</u>, <u>and Leisure</u>. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964.
- Dumazedier, Joffre. Towards a Society of Leisure. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Engel, James; Kollat, David; and Blackwell, Roger. <u>Consumer Behavior</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- Goode, William. <u>The Family</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Gray, H. Peter. <u>International Travel-International Trade</u>. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1970.
- Gunn, Clare. <u>Vacationscape</u>: <u>Designing Tourist Regions</u>. Austin: Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas, 1972.
- Horowitz, Mardi, M.D. <u>Image Formation and Cognition</u>. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Kaplan, Max. Leisure in America: <u>A Social Inquiry</u>. New York: Wiley, 1960.
- Kenkel, William F. "Family Interaction in Decision-Making." In <u>Household Decision-Making</u>, edited by Nelson Foote. New York: N.Y.U. Press, 1961.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. Class Differences in Family Decision-Making on Expenditures." In <u>Household Decision-Making</u>, edited by Nelson Foote. New York: N.Y.U. Press, 1961.
- Arthur D. Little, Inc. <u>Tourism</u> and <u>Recreation</u>. Washington: Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, no date.
- Lodge, Donald E. <u>The Development of Outdoor Recreation in the Upper</u> <u>Midwest</u>. Minneapolis: North Star Research and Development Institute, 1964.
- Lundberg, Donald. The Tourist Business. Boston: Cahners Books, 1972.
- Miller, Delbert. <u>Handbook of Research Design</u> and <u>Social</u> <u>Measurement</u>. 2d ed. New York: David McKay, 1970.
- Murdock, George Peter. Social Structure. New York: Macmillan, 1960.
- Nie, Norman; Bent, Dale; and Hull, Hadlai. <u>Statistical Package for the</u> <u>Social Sciences</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

- Osgood, C.E.; Suci, G.J.; and Tannenbaum, P.H. <u>The Measurement of</u> Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Bales, Robert F. <u>Family</u>, <u>Socialization</u>, <u>and</u> <u>Interaction Process</u>. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.
- Segal, Sydney. "Processing of the Stimulus in Imagery and Perception." In <u>Imagery</u>: <u>Current Cognitive Approaches</u>, edited by Sydney Segal. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Survey Research Center, <u>Interviewer's Manual</u>. Ann Arbor: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.
- Wilson, Everett K. <u>Sociology</u>: <u>Rules</u>, <u>Roles</u>, <u>and</u> <u>Relationships</u>. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1971.
- Wish, Myron. "Individual Differences in Perceptions and Preferences Among Nations." In <u>Attitude Research Reaches New Heights</u>, edited by Charles W. King and Douglas Tigert. American Marketing Association, no date.
- Zelditch, Morris. "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: A Comparative Study." In <u>Family</u>, <u>Socialization</u>, <u>and Interaction</u> <u>Process</u>, by Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955.

Articles

- Calvin, James S.; Dearinger, John; and Curtin, Mary Ellen. "An Attempt at Assessing Preferences for Natural Landscapes." <u>Environment</u> and Behavior 4: 447-470.
- Canter, David. "An Intergroup Comparison of Connotative Dimensions in Architecture." Environment and Behavior 1: 37-48.
- Forster, John. "The Sociological Consequences of Tourism." <u>Internation-al Journal of Comparative Sociology</u> 5: 217-227.
- Golant, Stephen, and Burton, Ian. "A Semantic Differential Experiment in the Interpretation and Grouping of Environmental Hazards." <u>Geographical Analysis</u> 2: 120-134.
- Grinstein, Alexander, M.D. "Vacations: A Psycho-Analytic Study." International Journal of Psycho-Analysis 36: 177-186.
- Harrison, John, and Sarre, Philip. "Personal Construct Theory in the Measurement of Environmental Images." <u>Environment and Behavior</u> 3: 351-374.
- Hendee, John C. "Sociology and Applied Leisure Research." <u>Pacific</u> Sociological Review 4: 360-368.
- Kenkel, William F. "Traditional Family Ideology and Sponsal Roles in Decision Making." <u>Marriage and Family Living</u> 21: 334-339.
- Levinson, Daniel, and Huffman, Phyllis. "Traditional Family Ideology and Its Relation to Personality." Journal of Personality 23: 251-273.
- Lowenthal, David. "America as Scenery." <u>Geographical Review</u> 56: 115-118.

_____. "Geography, Experience, and Imagination: Towards a Geographical Epistemology." <u>Annals of the Association of American</u> Geographers 51: 241-260.

_____. "Research in Environmental Perception and Behavior." <u>Environment and Behavior</u> 4: 333-342.

_____, and Riel, Marquita. "The Nature of Perceived and Imagined Environments." Environment and Behavior 4: 189-206.

- Mercer, David. "The Role of Perception in the Recreation Experience: A Review and Discussion." Journal of Leisure Research 3: 261-276.
- Mindak, William. "Fitting the Semantic Differential to the Marketing Problem." Journal of Marketing 25: 28-33.
- Nelson, Bardin. "Seven Principles of Image Formation." <u>Journal of</u> Marketing 26: 67-71.
- Redfield, Robert. "The Folk Society." <u>American Journal of Sociology</u> 52: 293-308.
- Robinson, John P., and Hefner, Robert. "Perceptual Maps of the World." Public Opinion Quarterly 32: 273-280.
- Rudelius, William; Pennington, Allen; and Ross, Ivan. "Analyzing State Tourism: A Case Study of the Midwest." <u>Journal of Leisure</u> <u>Research</u> 3: 250-260.
- Sharp, Harry, and Mott, Paul. "Consumer Decisions in the Metropolitan Family." Journal of Marketing 21: 149-156.
- Short, P.L. "The Objective Study of Mental Imagery. <u>British Journal</u> of <u>Psychology</u> 44: 38-51.
- Sutton, Willis. "Travel and Understanding: Notes on the Social Structure of Touring." <u>International Journal of Comparative</u> <u>Sociology</u> 8: 218-223.
- Underwood, Benton. "Attributes of Memory." <u>Psychological Review</u> 76: 559-573.

- Wilkening, Eugene. "Joint Decision-Making in Farm Families as a Function of Status and Role." <u>American Sociological Review</u> 23: 187-192.
- Wolpert, Julian. "Migration as an Adjustment to Environmental Stress." Journal of Social Issues 22: 92-102.

Unpublished Material

- American Telephone and Telegraph Company: Corporate Planning Organization. "Telephone Development by States." New York: 1973.
- Belden Associates. <u>Attitudes on Texas Among American Tourists</u>. Dallas: 1964.
- Campbell-Ewald Public Relations. "Proposal of Public Relations Services for Michigan Tourist Council." July 25, 1972.
- Hunt, John D. "Image A Factor in Tourism." Ph.D. dissertation, Colorado State University, 1971.
- Plog, Stanley. "Why Destination Areas Rise and Fall in Popularity." A paper presented to the Southern California chapter, The Travel Research Association, October 10, 1972.
- Ross Roy, Incorporated. "1973-74 Michigan Tourist Council Winter Advertising Proposal." Detroit: September 6, 1973.

Public and Quasi-Public Agency Reports

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. <u>Employment and</u> Earnings 17. October, 1970.

. Employment and

Earnings 20. April, 1974.

- Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. An Economic Survey of the Northern Lake States Region. East Lansing: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, 1967.
- Enosh, Nava; Cooper, Rollin; Staniforth, Sydney; and Christianson, Rudolph. <u>The Travel Behavior of the Wisconsin Vacationer</u>. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Extension, 1973.
- Michigan Department of State Highways. <u>The Tourist in Mid-Michigan</u>. Lansing: Management Services Division, Department of State Highways.
- Strassman, W. Paul. <u>Economic Growth in Northern Michigan</u>. East Lansing: Institute for Community Development and Services, Michigan State University.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970. <u>General Population Characteristics</u>, <u>Final Report PC(1)</u> <u>B15 Illinois</u>, <u>B16</u> <u>Indiana</u>, <u>B37 Ohio</u>. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Pppulation: 1970. <u>General Social</u> and <u>Economic Characteristics, Final Report PC(1)</u> - <u>C15 Illinois</u>, <u>C16 Indiana</u>, <u>C37 Ohio</u>. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Western Council for Travel Research, Committee on Research Methods. <u>Standards for Traveler Studies</u>. Salt Lake City: 1963. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULES -

PRE-TEST AND FINAL

APPENDIX A1

PRE-TEST INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TOURISM STUDY PRE-TEST INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

ENTERVIEW NUMBER Introduction: Try to put the respondent at ease. Assure him/her that his cooperation is appreciated and that his/her candor is necessary if the results are to be meaningful. 1 2 3 "Just relax".

Present the order of the interview:

COUNTY NUMBER

INTERVIEWER NUMBER

- 1. Travel experiences.
- 2. Travel ideas and attitudes in relation to family attitudes.

them to you in order to show you where we're going.

"These are the areas we will be covering during the next few minutes. The interview is broken into six areas and I'll read

- 3. Sources of information (newspaper, TV, magazines).
- 4. Impressions of Great Lakes Region.
- 5. Influence of gas shortages on trip planning.
- 6. Personal background information.

 $\sim 10^{-10}$ cm s $^{-10}$ cm $^{-10}$ cm $^{-10}$ • . .

 $\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \left$: • . · · · . `

(a) A set of the set of the

· · ·

			The Rem for see on. You it	first area we need to cover is your travel experiences. ember, before we get started, that vacations are taken a number of different reasons to visit relatives, to new places, to get away from it all, to camp out and so This means that we cannot strictly define vacations. do. If you think of a trip as travel for pleasure, then is.
			So,	first question.
7			7.	Have you ever taken a pleasure trip by car or bus that involved traveling over 100 miles total?
				Yes if no, go to 22 2. No
8			8.	If yes Thinking back, can you remember the last trip by car that you took that was over 100 miles long?
				1. Yes if no, go to 14
				2. No
STATE				If yes
9 REGION	10		9.	Where did you go on that trip or, more specifically, where were you when you were furthese from your present home on that trip? (Get particular location and state)
11 DIGMANY				(Distance)
DISTAN	ιK.			
12	13	14	15	
			10.	How many nights were you gone on that trip? If you can't remember exactly, estimate the number of nights.
16	17			
			11.	What was the single most important reason for taking it?
18	19			<pre>(If response is visitation of relatives find out which side or both) 1. Rel - H 2. Rel - W 3. Rel - B</pre>

.

· · · · · · · · interview = the state of the state of

•

stylet the second se

ر بر المحمد ا محمد المحمد ال محمد المحمد ا

.

12. Now, you were gone about _____ nights on that trip. Can you remember where you spent those nights? By this I mean with friends, relatives, motel, hotel, campgrounds, ... wherever.

TYPE	# 01	7 NIGHTS		Type of accomodation Number of nights in each
			20-	22
20	21	22	23-	25
23	24	25	26-	28
26	27	28	29-	31
29	30	31	32-	37
32	33	34	00	
35	36	37		(Try to account for each night)
38	39		13.	Can you remember the month and year in which the trip was taken?
				Number of months passed since trip was taken: (Exclusing the month of the trip and the present month included) Now, let's look at some other trips by car that you've take
40	41		14.	How many auto pleasure trips of over 100 miles do you think you took during the last year?
42	43		15.	Where did you go on the largest one during the last year? (specifically)
				(Distance)
44	45	40 47	16.	What was the single most important reason for taking it?
48	49			
50			17.	Now to go back a little further, would you say that you've taken at least one trip of 100 miles every year during the last five years?
				1. Yes 2. No
51	52		18.	Where did you go on the longest automobile trip you've taken during the last five years?
53	54	55 56		(specifically) Distance

. . . .

t is the second seco

 $\sigma \to 1^{-1}$, $\sigma \to 1^{-1}$

· · · ·

Example 2 (a) and a set of the set of the

57	58			19.	What was the single most important reason for taking it?
				20.	We've been talking about the longest trip in the last five years what about the <u>most memorable trip</u> ? This could be in the United States or outside it. Could you tell no where you went on the trip that you best remember as being pleasant?
59	60	61	-		Distance (U. S. only)
62	63	64	65	-	
				21.	Why did you take that trip?
66	67				
63				22.	Now I'm going to ack you to describe yourself in several ways regarding how you travel. First, <u>how often</u> do you take trips of over 100 miles. Compared to your friends, relatives, co-workers, and so on do you travel.
					<pre>1. Very often 2. Often 3. Occasionally 4. Seldom 5. Never</pre>
- 69				23.	Now, describe <u>hew far</u> you typically would go on such trips. Again, use relatives, friends, neighbors, as comparisons
					Do you usually take trips that are:
					1. Very close by (no 100 mile limit 2. Within a short distance here) 3. Modium distance + 4. Long distance
70				24.	Now, describe yourself or your family in terms of <u>planning</u> trip. Do you plan out the trip (where to go, where to stay what to do,)
					<pre>1. Not c' all 2. A little 3. Quite a bit 4. Carefully 5. Very carefully</pre>
71	72			25.	If you had questions on where to go or how to get there or where to stay on a trip, where would you go for informatio

Page 4

				Now, let if you h	's look a ave been	at four part to any of t	icular plac these areas	es. We and for	how long.	
			26.	First, h	ave you e	ever been in	n the Canadi	an prov	ince of Ontar	1c?
/3				1. Yes 2. No			if no, go	to 28		
74	75	76	27.	Can you in Ontar	estimate io?	the total n	number of ni	.ghts you	u have spent	
77	78	 79	28.	Have you	ever bee	en to Minnes	sota?			
CARD #				1. Yes 2. No			if no, go	to 30		
	80									
1-6 Sar	me as 1									
	7									
8	9	10	29.	Can you in Minne	estimate sota?	the total r	number of ni	ghts you	u have spent	
-			30.	Ever bee	n in Wisc	consin?				
				1. Yes 2. No			if no, go	o to 32		
			31.	For how	many tota	al nights wo	ould you gue			
12	13	14	32.	Have you	ever bee	en in Michig	gan?			
-	15			1. Yes 2. No			if no, go	o to		
16	17	18	33.	And how in Michi	many tota gan?	al nights wo 	ould you gue	ess you	have spent	
				Okay, no certain response and try	w we are decisions on past to recall	going to di s on a trip. experience. L.	iscuss how y . You will . Think bac	your fam have to ck on yo	nily makes base your our trip(s)	
	19		34.	First, t 1. Yes 2. No	hough, do	o you have d	children in	the hou	sehold now?	

22

23

24

25

26

27

35. How many?

Okay, that makes a difference because first I want you to imagine taking a trip without the children--just you and your wife/husband. (If no children or no children on last trip, explain that they can do this without imagining.)

(hand card 1 to respondent)

36. You and your husband/wife are on a long trip involving several nights away from home. Who would have chosen the the destination of the trip?

Wife	Wife	Joint	Husband	Husband
Always	Usually		U sually	Always

37. Who would have chosen the route to take?

Wife	Wife	Joint	Hus' .nd	Husband
Always	Usuall y		Usually	Always

38. Who would typically decide where to eat?

Wife	Wife	Joint	Husbans	Husband
Always	Usually		Usually	Always

39. Who would typically decide when to take a rest stop? (not gasoline stop)

Wife	Wife	Joint	Husband	Husband
Always	Usually		Usually	Always

40. Who would typically decide where to take a rest stop? (not gasoline stop)

	wile	wile	JOINL	nusband	nusband
Always Usually Usually Always	Always	Usually		Usually	Always

41. Who would typically decide where (accommodations) to spend the night?

Wife	Wife	Joint	Husband	Husband
Always	Usually		Usual ly	Always

.*

.

•

 $(\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}) = \mathbf{t}_{1} + \mathbf{t}_{2} + \mathbf{t}_{3}$

na Alta - Anta Anta - Anta - Anta Manazza - Manazza - Anta - Anta - Anta

...

		if no childre	n in household	l-go to #4	49	
		Now, let's in are on a trip children (chi	clude the chil . You are dri ld) are (is) w	ldren in t lving to t vith you.	these quest the destina	ions. You tion. The
		(hand respond	ent care 2)			
4	42.	Who would hav	e chosen the d	lestinati	on?	
31		One or both Parents Always	One or both Parents Usually	joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
	43.	Who would hav	e chosen the 1	route to	be taken?	
52		One or both Parents Always	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
33	44.	Who would typ (not gasoline	<pre>ically decide stop)</pre>	when to	 take a rest	stop?
		One or both Parents Always	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
				·····		
34	45.	Who would typ (not gasoline	ically decide Stop)	where to	take <mark>a res</mark>	t stop?
		One or both Parents Always	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
4	6.	Who would typ	ically decide	where to	eat?	
		One or both Parents Always	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
	_					
36	7.	Who would typ	ically decide	where to	spend the	n ig ht?
<u>37 38 39</u>		One or both Parents Always	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always

You

The

Okay, these next few questions may seem a bit strange, but they are here for a good purpose.

(hand respondent Sheet 1)

All you have to do is mark the space which you think is appropriate. There are seven spaces--they range from strong agreement with the statement to strong disagreement. Just read the statement and mark the space that fits your ideas on the statement. (Make sure they understand.) (Mark down their response number after they have finished.)

40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51.	48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59.	 (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) 	
50. 51.	 58. 59.	(11) (12)	

Okey, now let's turn to your habits of watching TV, reading the newspaper and so on.

First, let's cover television...

60. Is there a television in the household?

1. Yes 2. No

if no, see if they watch
TV somewhere else-if still
no, go to #71

55 56

57

52

54

58 . 53

61. Can you estimate how much television you watch on a typical day? (put in minutes per day)_____

(hand respondent card 3)

You can see we have put the different type shows into categories. Can you tell me how much you watch each type of show?

	1		2 3		4	
	Never	Sor	me Regu la	rly Very	Regular	:ly
				if uns	ure, giv	ve examples
62.	Western	s		Gunsmo	ke	

63. Spy/Detectives _____ Cannon, Kojak, Columbo

	64.	News/Public Affairs	Cronkite, 60 Minutes
61	65.	Situation Comedies	All in the Family, Mary Tyler Moore, Lucille Ball
62	66.	Variety	Carol Burnett, Bob Hope Specials
63	67.	Sports	Football, Baseball, Wide World of Sports
64	68.	Soaps	Edge of Night, As the World Turns
65	69.	Womens/Games	Dinah's Place
05		Okay, now radio	
66 67			
68	70.	Is there a radio in the ho	ouse o r in your car?
		1. Yes 2. No	If no, go to #74
<u>69</u> 70 71	-		
	71.	How much do you listen to per day)	the radio? (put in minutes
	72.	When do you usually listen	n to the radio?
72		Morning	
73		Afternoon	
-74		Evening	
		Throughout the day	
		Okay, now newspapers	
76	73.	Does your family take a ne	ewspaper?
		1. Yes 2. No	
77 78 79	-		
80		(Card)	

		(1-6 same as #1)
7	4.	Do you read a newspaper(s) regularly?
/		1. Yes 2. No if no, go to #77
8 9 10 7	5.	How much time do you spend daily with the newspaper or newspapers? (put in minutes per day)
_	<u>-</u>	Okay, now magazines
7	7.	Do you subscribe to or regularly buy a magazine?
		 Yes No if no, go to #80
7	'8.	I'll read off different types of magazines and you tell me if you take or read one or more regularly. (Ask them to name them as you proceed.)
13		News (Time, Newsweek)
14		Sports (Sports Illustrated)
15		Hobby (Photography, Cars)
15		Travel (AAA)
17		Decorating (Better Homes & Gardens)
17		Opinion (Harpers, Saturday Review)
10		TV Guide
		Reader's Digest
-20		Men's (Playboy, Esquire, True
		Ladies (McCall;s, Redbook)
22		Total read
23 24 7	9.	Now, to switch back to travel, have you ever written Michigan for travel information?
		1. Yes 2. No
8	80.	Have you ever written Ontario for travel information?
20		1. Yes 2. No

-

-

-

.

Page 10

	Page 11
81.	Have you ever written Wisconsin for travel information?
	1. Yes 2. No
82.	Have you ever written Minnesota for travel information?
	1. Yes 2. No
	That's all we need to know about your reading, viewing, and listening habits.
	There has been a lot of talk lately on the TV and Radio that the United States does not have enough fuel to meet the needs of everyone. Some people have said fuel prices will be going up and that fuel may even be rationed. Others say that a fuel shortage does not even exist.
	These next few questions are here to find out what you think about this possible fuel shortage and to see if your recrea- tional trips have changed as a result of any increased prices or shortage of gasoline.
83. (1)	Do you thjnk there has been a fuel shortage of any kind in the last 6 months?
	Yes go to 2 No go to 3
84.	How severe did you consider this shortage?
(-/	Insignificant 1 to 9 Extremely severe
85. (3)	In the last 6 months were you ever concerned that you might not be able to get enough gasoline?
	Yes go to 4 No go to 5
86. (4)	How much did this concern influence your decision to take pleasure trips?
	Very little a little quite a bit very much
87. (5)	Do you think there is a fuel shortage of any kind at the present time?
	Yes go to 6 No go to 7

88. How severe do you consider this present shortage? (6) 1 ----- 9

34

27

28

29

30

31

32

n de la construcción de la constru Nota

	89. (7)	Do you think there will be a fuel shortage of any kind 6 months from now?
35		Yes go to 8 No go to 9
	90.	How severe do you think this shortage might be?
- 26	(9)	1 10
(91. (10)	How much do you think this shortage will affect your pleas- ure trip(s) in the future?
37		Very little a little quite a bit very much
57		In these next few questions you will need to see a difference between gasoline availability and gasoline prices. For pur- poses of this study gasoline availability has to do with whether you can get as much gas as you need when you want it. and gasoline price is the amount you have to pay per gallch of gas.
(92. (15)	Have you ever cancelled or drastically changed a pleasure trip as a result of gasoline prices or gasoline availability?
38		Yes go to 16 No go to 17
39	93. (16)	Explain: When, why.
40	94. (17)	On any of your previous trips were you ever hampered (slowed down) because of gasoline shortages or high gasoline prices?
41		Yes go to 18 No go to 19
42	95. (18)	Explain: When, why.
43		
(96. (19)	Have you ever chosen to use some form of transportation other than an automobile because of gasoline shortages or high gasoline prices?
44		Yes go to 20 No go to 21
	97.	When, what mode

	98. (21)	Is there any particular destination which you have previously visited but now consider it too costly because of high gaso- line prices, or too far because of slower speed limits, co- unreachable because of gasoline shortages?
46		Yes go to 22 No go to 23
	99. (22)	Explain: When, where, why.
47		
	100. (23)	Are you planning a recreational trip of 100 miles or more in the next six months?
		Yes go to 24 No go to 35
	101. (24)	Where do you plan to go on the longest trip planned if more than one trip is planned?
49		No decision Decision
50 51 5	53	
	102. (25)	Did fuel availability influence your decision of where to compare the second se
54		Yes go to 26 No go to 27
	103.	How much would you say availability influenced your doctor
55	(26)	Very little a little quite a bit a lot
	104. (27)	Did fuel prices influence your decision?
56		Yes go to 28 No go to 29
	105. (28)	How much would you say prices influenced your decision?
57		Very little a little quite a bit a lot
	106. (29)	Did the slower speed limits that many states have enacted influence your decision?
58		Yes go to 30 No
	107. (30)	How much would you say slower speed limits influenced your decision?
59		Very little quite a bit a lot

60			108.	As a result of gasoline availability, cost, and any other recent change such as lower speed limits and banning Sunday gasoline sales, which of these six travel patterns will you most likely do:
61			109.	Think back to how you would have rated Michigan as a travel destination one year ago. When you take into consideration any possible fuel conditions how would you rate Michigan now in comparison to your rating last year?
				Less desirable about the same more desirable
				We're almost finished with this questionnaire. In order to compare different groups, I need to get some background in-formation on you and your family.
			110.	Sex of respondent
62				1. Male 2. Female
63			111.	Race of respondent
				 White Black Other (Indian, Chicano, etc.)
			112.	How many years of education did you complete?
64	65			
			113.	What is the occupation of the head of this household?
66	67			
			114.	Can you tell me how much pre-tax income this household had last year?
68	69	70		(Use list in 1,000's)-coded
	72		115.	How old are you?

APPENDIX A2

FINAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

UPPER GREAT LAKES TOURISM STUDY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction: Try to put the respondent at ease. Assure INTERVIEW NUMBER him/her that his cooperation is appreciated and that his/her candor is necessary if the results are to be meaningful. "Just relax" is the theme. 3 2 1 Present the order of the interview: COUNTY NUMBER "These are the areas we will be covering during the next few minutes. The interview is broken into six areas and I'll read * them to you in order to show you where we'll be going. INTERVIEWER NUMBER 1. Travel experiences. Travel ideas and attitudes in relation to 2. family attitudes.

- 3. Sources of information (newspaper, TV, magazines).
- 4. Impressions of Great Lakes Region.
- 5. Influence of gas shortages on trip planning.
- 6. Personal background information.

5 6

			The <u>Rem</u> for see on. You 1t	e first area we need to cover is your travel experiences. member, before we get started, that vacations are taken a number of different reasons to visit relatives, to a new places, to get away from it all, to camp out and so This means that we cannot strictly define vacations. do. If you think of a trip as travel for pleasure, then is.
			So,	first question.
7			7.	Have you ever taken a pleasure trip by car or bus that involved traveling over 100 miles from your home?
				1. Yes if no, go to 21 2. No
			•	If yes
8			8.	Thinking back, can you remember the last trip by car that you took that was over 100 miles long? (<u>Hand respondent U.S. Map.</u>)
				1. Yesif no, go to 152. No
				If yes
9	10	(State)	9.	Where did you go on that trip or, more specifically, where were you when you were furthest from your present home on that trip? (Get particular location and state.)
	(Regi	on)		
12	13	14 15		(Distance)
16	17		10.	How many people were traveling on this trip together?
18	-19		11.	What was the single most important reason for taking it? (Be specific) (If response is visitation of relatives find out which side or both)
				1. Rel - H 2. Rel - M 3. Rel - B
20			12.	How many nights were you gone on that trip? If you can't remember exactly, estimate the number of nights.

				13.	Now, you were gone about nights on that trip. Can you remember where you spent those nights? By this I mean with friends, relatives, motel, hotel, campgrounds wherever.
TYPE	#	OF	NIGHTS		Type of accommodation Number of nights in each
				22-	24
22		23	24		
				25-	27
25		26	27		
				28-	30
28		29	30		
					(Try to account for each night)
31		32	_	14.	Can you remember the month and year in which the trip was taken?
					Number of months passed since trip was taken: (Excluding the month of the trip and the present month included.)
					Now, let's look at some other trips by car that you've taken.
33	•	34	-	15.	How many auto pleasure trips of over 100 miles do you think you took during the last year?
35		36	_ (State)	16.	Where did you go on the longest one during the last year? (Specifically)
					(Distance)
37		38	39	⁴⁰ 17.	What was the single most important reason for taking it? (be specific)
41		42	-		
43	-			18.	Now to go back a little further, would you say that you've taken at least one trip of 100 miles every year during the last five years?
					1. Yes 2. No
44		45	_ (State)	19.	Where did you go on the longest automobile trip you've taken during the last five years? (Specifically)
		47		49	(Distance)

1 1	a statistic Parent in the second	1 - 10 - 11 1 - 10 - 11				
44) (i				÷		
			11. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.			
					Ъ.	

	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -			
. 		• . • • •		
			• •	

ner en la seguie de la companya de l La companya de la comp

andara di secondo di se Secondo di se Secondo di se

المعامل الذي العام (1997). (1994) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997)

teri da programa da composición de la c En la composición de la En la composición de la

C. C. M. C. Statistical Astronomy and the second s Second sec

en M^{an} (1997) - 1994 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 1992 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -

(a) A set of the se

and the second secon

50 51	20. What was the single most important reason for taking it?(specifically)
52	21. Now I'm going to ask you to describe yourself in several general ways regarding how you travel. First, <u>how often</u> do you take trips of over 100 miles. Compared to your friends, relatives, co-workers, and so ondo you travel
	 Very often Often Occasionally Seldom Never
53	22. Now, describe <u>how far</u> you typically would go on such trips. Again, use relatives, friends, neighbors, as comparisons.
	 Very close by (no 100 mile limit Within a short distance here) Medium distance Long distance Very long distance
54	23. Now, describe yourself or your family in terms of planning a trip. Do you plan out the trip (where to go, where to stay, what to do,)
	 Not at all A little Quite a bit Carefully Very carefully
55 56	24. If you had questions on where to go, how to get there or where to stay on a trip, where would you go for information?
	Now, let's look at four particular places. We need to know if you have been to any of these areas and for how long.
	25. First, have you ever been in the Canadian province of Ontario?
57	1. Yes 2. No
	of a sector the test number of states you have apart

58 59 60

26. Can you estimate the total number of nights you have spent in Ontario?

	27.	Have you ever been to Minnesota?
61		1. Yes 2. No
<u> 62 63 64</u>	28.	Can you estimate the total number of nights you have spent in Minnesota?
	29.	Ever been in Wisconsin?
65		1. Yes 2. No
	30.	For how many total nights would you guess?
66 67 68	31.	Have you ever been in dichigan?
69		1. Yes 2. No
70 71 72	32.	And how many total nights would you guess you have spent in Michigan?
		Okay, now we are going to discuss how your family makes certain decisions on a trip. You will have to base your response on past experience. Think back on your trip(s) and try to recall.
73	33.	Before we do this, though, do you have children in the house- hold now?
		1. Yes 2. No
	34.	How many?
14 15	35.	What is the age of your oldest child here at home now?
76 77		Okay, that makes a difference because first I want you to imagine taking a trip without the childrenjust you and
78 79 80 (Card #)		your wife/husband. (If no children or no children on last trip, explain that they can do this without imagining.)
1-6 same as #1		(hand card 1 to respondent)
$\frac{1}{7} \frac{1}{14}$	36.	You and your husband/wife are on a long trip involving several nights away from home. Who would have chosen the destination of the trip. (where to go)
		Wife Wife Joint Husband Husband Always Usually Usually Always

ана стана стан •••

	37.	Who would	have chosen	the route to	take?	
8 15		Wife Always	Wife Usually	Joint	Husband Usually	Husband Always
9 16	38.	Who would Wife Always	typically de Wife Usually	 ecide where t Joint	o eat? Husband Always	Husband Usually
10 17	39.	Who would Wife Always	typically de Wife Usually	ecide <u>where</u> t Joint	 to take a res Husband Always	t stop? Husband Usually
11 18	40.	Who would spend the Wife Always	typically de night? Wife Usually	ecide where (Joint	(accommodatio Husband Usually	Husband Always
<u>12</u> <u>13</u> <u>19</u> Sum 7-11 Sum 14-18		if no chi Now, let' are on a children (hand res	ldren in hous s include the trip. You as (child) are pondent card	sehold-go to children in re driving to (is) with you 2)	#46 these quest the destina 1.	ions. You tion. The
20 27	41.	Who would One or bo Parents Always	have chosen th One or I Parents Usually	the destinat	tion? Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
21 28	42.	Who would One or bo Parents Always	have chosen th One or I Parents Usually	the route to	be taken? Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always

1	4.1		
$x = -\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \right)$. • . • P		

	1			
				, i
14.19 A. 14	ter alter a			
1 191 1 - 11				

Area and a second s

 $\psi_{1}(t)$ is the second seco

•

and a start of the start of t

en De Avenue de Carta de La completador de

 $(1-2\alpha_1)^{-1} = (1-\alpha_2)^{-1} = (1-\alpha_1)^{-1} = (1-\alpha_2)^{-1} = (1-$

1997 - Alexandre State (1997) - Alexandre Alexandre (1997) - Alexandre (1997) - Alexandre (1997) - Alexandre (1

f :	· 」 「 · · · 」		÷	the second second
	$(1, \dots, 1) \in \{1, 2, 2\}$			in the test

na se anna an taoinn Mart gu an taoinn an t

Name (qPa) A (1) definition of the second second
22	29	4:	3. V (ho would ty not gasolin	ypically decide ne stop)	e where to	o take a re	st stop?
			O P A	ne or both arents lways	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
23	30	. 4/	. W	ho would ty	pically decide	whe re t o	eat?	
			O P A	ne or both arents lways	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
		45	• W	ho would ty	pically decide	where to	spend the	night?
24	31		Or Pa A	ne or both arents lways	One or both Parents Usually	Joint	Child/ Children Usually	Child/ Children Always
25	26	32						
			Ok th (h is fr di th un	ay, these r ey are here and respond l you have appropriat om strong a sagreement. at fits you derst and.)	next few questi e for a good pu lent Sheet 1) to do is mark te. There are agreement with Just read the ur ideas on the	the space seven spa the statement statement	which you cesthey ment to st ant and mar at. (Make	strange, but think range rong k the space sure they
33			46	. (1)				
34			47	2. (2)				
35			48	3. (3)				
36			49	. (4)	New Johnson of Low Holes			
37			50	. (5)				
38			51	. (6)				

Page 7

n được (1) than the state of t 1....

.

Electronic de la seconda d

111 $\mathbf{Y}_{i} = \mathbf{Y}_{i} = \mathbf{Y}_{i}$

194 - t .

••.

 $f(x) = \left\{ \left\{ f(x) \in \{1, \dots, n\} : x \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\} : x \in \{1, \dots, n\} \right\}$

n de Marine de la companya Marine de la companya and the second . e . •

395 Sectors 10 Alternative Construction Statements and the statement of the sector Here and the

li i construction de la construction an an ann an tharaichte an start an an 1960. An tharaige an tharaichte an tharaichte an 1996 an tharai Meril - Child - States and the $\mathcal{W}^{(n)}$, the second sec A set of the second sec and a second a particular a secondaria de la compactaria. Españo de trabajo de compactaria Constant and a second

	. (17
	. ,
·· ;	а а ^{, с}
(2)	
(e.)	ł

 $(\tilde{\phi})$

		52. (7)	
		53. (8)	
41		54. (9)	
42		55. (10)	
43		56. (11)	
44		57. (12)	
45 46		Okay, now let's turn to yo the newspaper and so on.	ur habits of watching TV, reading
		First, let's cover televis	ion
	58.	Is there a television in t	he household:
47		1. Yes 2. No	if no, see if they watch TV somewhere elseif still no, go to #60
48 49 50	59.	Can you estimate how much day? (put in a specific e	television you watch on a typical stimate of minutes per day)
51	60.	Is there a radio in the ho 1. Yes 2. No	use or in your car? if no, go to #63
52 53 54	61.	How much do you listen to estimate of minutes per da	the radio? (put in specific y)
N	62.	When do you usually listen	to the radio?
- EF		Throughout the day	_
		Morning	
00		Afternoon	
57		Evening	

.

.•

•

$$(1, \dots, p)$$

and the first second second second

• Without States and the second s

and a start of the st Start of the start of

.

		Okay, now newspapers
	6	Does your family take a newspaper?
59		1. Yes 2. No
	64	. Do you read a newspaper(s) regularly?
60		 Yes No if no, go to #66
61	<u>62</u> <u>63</u> 65	. How much time do you spend daily with the newspaper or news- papers? (put in specific minutes per day)
		Okay, now magazines
	60	. Do you subscribe to or regularly buy a magazine?
04		 Yes No if no, go to #68
	6	. I'll read off different types of magazines and you tell me if you read one or more regularly. (Ask them to name them as you proceed.)
		News (Time, Newsweek)
65		
66		Sports (Sports Illustrated)
		Hobby (Photography, Cars)
0/		 Travol (AAA)
68		
69		Decorating (Better Homes & Gardens)
70		Opinion (Harpers, Saturday Review)
		TV Guide
71		Beederle Dieset
72		Reader's Digest

Page 10

73		Men's (Playboy, Esquire, True)
74		Ladies (McCall's, Redbook)
75		Farm
76 77		Total read
78	68.	Now, to switch back to travel, have you ever written Michigan for travel information?
		1. Yes 2. No
	69.	Have you ever written Ontario for travel information?
80		1. Yes 2. No
(Card #2) 1-6 same as #1		
7	70.	Have you ever written Wisconsin for travel information?
		1. Yes 2. No
	71.	Have you ever written Minnesota, for travel, information? 1. Yes 2. No
		That's all we need to know about your reading, viewing, and listening habits.
		Now let's turn to see how you feel about these states and the Canadian province that I've just mentioned.
		Hand respondent Sheets 3-6 and pen or pencil.
		Would you please go over these quickly and mark one of the spaces between each set of opposites. A "1" or a "7" means "extremely" or "very" whatever. Between these extremes are "2" through "6"they mean "slightly" or "somewhat" except for "4" which is a neutral space reserved in case you don't have a definite opinion about the state or province using these words.

	Minnesota	Wisconsin	Michigan	<u>Ontario</u>
9.	<u></u>	21	33	45
10.		22.	34	46
11.	<u></u>	23	35.	47
12.		24	36	48.
13.		25	37	49
14.		26	38.	50.
15.		27	39.	51.
16.		28	40	52.
17.		29.	41.	53.
18.		30.	42.	54.

57 58 59

There has been a lot of talk lately on the TV and radio that the United States does not have enough fuel to meet the needs of everyone. Some poeple have seid fuel prices will be going up and that fuel may even be rationed. Others say that a fuel shortage does not even exist.

44

55

56

43

These next few questions are here to find out if your recreational trips have changed as a result of any increased price in gasoline or any decreased availability of gasoline. For purposes of this study gasoline availability has to do with whether you can get as much gas as you need when you want it and gasoline price is the amount you have to pay per gallon of gas.

(Hand Card 3 to respondent)

31 32

- 72. Using this scale from one to five can you tell me how much the present availability and price of gasoline is affecting your travel at present?
 - 1. not at all _____
 - very little _____
 - 3. a little _____
 - 4. quite a bit _____
 - 5. a lot

61	73.	How much would you say gasoline availability and price affected your travel six (6) months ago?
		1. Not at all
		2. very little
		3. a little
		4. quite a bit
		5. a lot
62	74.	How much do you feel gasoline availability and price will affect your travel six (6) months from now?
		l. not at all
		2. very little
		3. a little
		4. quite a bit
		5. a lot
63	75.	In the last 12 months have you cancelled plans or drastically changed a pleasure trip as a result of gasoline prices or gasoline availability?
		yes
		no go to 77.
	76.	What destination(distance)
64 65		When
66 67 68	69	For what reason
70 71		
72	77.	In the last 12 months have you chosen to use some form of transportation other than an automobile on a pleasure trip because of gasoline shortages or high gasoline prices?
		yes
73		no go to 79.

.

Page 13

74	75	78.	What destination	_ (distance)
			When	
76 80	77 78 79 - Card #	. 1	For what reason	
. 7		5 1	Mode of travel	
. /	o			
9	10	79.	Is there any particular destination which you ha iously visited but now consider it too costly be high gasoline prices, or too far because of slow limits, or unreachable because of gasoline short	ve prev- cause of er speed ages?
11	_		yes	
			no go to 81.	
		80.	destination	
12	13		what reason	
14	_	81.	Are you planning a recreational trip of 100 mile in the next six months?	s or more
			yes	
15			no go to 84.	
		82.	How many trips are you currently planning?	
16	_	83.	Where do you plan to go on the longest trip plan than one trip is planned?	n ed i f more
			no decision	
17	18		destination	
	_	84.	Have you decided not to take a trip this year?	
19			yes	
			no go to 86	
		85.	Can you tell me why?	
20				

86. How much would you say gasoline availability influenced your decision on where to go or where not to go?

not at all				
very little				
a little				
quite a bit				
a lot				

87. How much would say gasoline prices influenced your decision on where to go or where not to go?

very little
a little
quite a bit
a lot

- 88. Compared to past years, would you say that your recreation trips this year will be?
 - a) fewer in number () more () or about the same ()
 b) longer in time () shorter () or about the same ()
 -)
 - c) shorter in distance () longer () or about the same (
 d) more costly () less costly () or about the same ()

 - e) more thoroughly planned () less thoroughly () or about the same ()
- 89. Think back to how you would have rated Michigan as a travel distination one year ago. When you take into consideration any possible fuel conditions how would you rate Michigan now in comparison to your rating last year?

less desirable	
more desirable	
about the same	

90. How would you rate Wisconsin now in comparison to last year?

less desirable _____ more desirable _____ about the same

30

31

91. How would you rate Minnesota in comparison to last year?

less desirable	
more desirable	
about the same	

92. How would you rate Ontario in comparison to last year?

less desirable	
more desirable	
about the same	

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

29

			We're almost finished with this questionnaire. In order to compare different groups, I need to get some background information on you and your family.
32	-	93.	Sex of respondent
52			1. Male
			2. Female
33	-	94.	Race of respondent
•••			1. White
			2. Black
			3. Other (Indian, Chicano, etc.)
34	35	95.	How many years of education did you complete?
		06	What is the accumption of the head of this household?
36	37	20.	
		97.	Can you tell me how much net pre-tax income this household
38	39 40		earned last year?
		98.	How old are you?
41	42		
80	-		
••			

(Card #)

Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Neutral	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. If chi experi	ldren are menting w	told much a fith it.	bout sex, t	hey are like	ly to go too	far in
Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Neutral	Slightly Disagree	D isagree	Strongly Disagree
3. Women unders	who want tand what	to remove the	e word obey be a wife.	from the max		e don't
Strongly Agree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Neutral	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. The mo ing am Strongly Agree	st import bition. Agree	ant qualitie Slightly Agree	es of a real Neutral	Slightly Disagree	ermination an Disagree	d driv- Strongly Disagree
4. The mo ing am Strongly Agree 5. A chil will 1	st import bition. Agree d should ose respe	ant qualitie Slightly Agree never be all ct for them.	Neutral	man are det Slightly Disagree 	Disagree parents, or	d driv- Strongly Disagree
4. The mo ing am Strongly Agree 5. A chil will 1 Strongly Agree	st import bition. Agree d should ose respe Agree	ant qualitie Slightly Agree never be all ct for them. Slightly Agree	Neutral	man are det Slightly Disagree k back to hi Slightly Disagree	ermination an Disagree s parents, or Disagree	d driv- Strongly Disagree else he Strongly Disagree
4. The mo ing am Strongly Agree 5. A chil will 1 Strongly Agree	st import bition. Agree d should ose respe Agree	ant qualitie Slightly Agree never be all ct for them. Slightly Agree	es of a real Neutral 	man are det Slightly Disagree k back to hi Slightly Disagree	ermination an Disagree parents, or Disagree	d driv- Strongly Disagred else he Strongly Disagred
4. The mo ing am Strongly Agree 5. A chil will 1 Strongly Agree 6. A man sexual	st import bition. Agree d should ose respe Agree should no relation	ant qualitie Slightly Agree never be all ct for them. Slightly Agree t be expected s before the	s of a real Neutral 	man are det Slightly Disagree k back to hi Slightly Disagree espect for a ed.	ermination an Disagree parents, or Disagree woman if the	d driv- Strongly Disagred else he Strongly Disagred wy have

SHEET 1

7. It is somehow unnatural to place women in positions of authority over men. Strongly Slightly Neutral Slightly Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Agree Disagree Disagree 8. The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained. Strongly Agree Slightly Neutral Slightly Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Disagree 9. A woman whose children are at all messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother. Strongly Slightly Neutral Slightly Disagree Strongly Agree Disagree Disagree Agree Agree 10. If a child is unusual in any way, his parents should get him to be more like other children. Strongly Slightly Neutral Slightly Agree Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Disagree 11. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents. Strongly Agree Slightly Neutral Slightly Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Disagree 12. The facts on crime and sexual immorality show that we will have to crack down harder on young people if we are going to save our moral standards. Strongly Agree Slightly Neutral Slightly Disagree Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Disagree

SHEET 2

1966)

				a la sur a la
	1.47			
	×.			
	· ·····	-		
	1			
				19.24
100 . 10				
				there is a family
1.1	1			
Sec. Warding	the start of the			
				and story surface
and the address				
				1
No. 22				

Sheet 4

Wisconsin

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Man-made								Natural
Noisy								Quiet
Unpleasant								Pleasant
Common								Unique
Tense								Relaxed
Dirty.								Clean
Unfriendly								Friendly
Drab								Colorful
Unimpressive								Impressive
Boring								Interestin

APPENDIX A3

GUIDE MAP GIVEN TO RESPONDENTS



-

z. z .

APPENDIX B

•

AREA OF THE STUDY

AND SELECTED COUNTIES

LLINOIS





15-3

DIANA



Jounties, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, and Selected Places





04:0

ò

ō

Central cities of SMSA's with fewer than 50,000 inhabita

Places of 25 100 to 50,000 -mabiants outside SMSA s

Standard Metropolitan

-

APPENDIX C

LETTER SENT TO POTENTIAL

RESPONDENTS

DEPARTMENT OF PARK AND RECREATION RESOURCES NATURAL RESOURCES BUILDING EAST LANSING + MICHIGAN + 48824

June 10, 1974

Mr. Frank Belacek 3429 West 60th Place Chicago, Illinois 60629

Dear Mr. Belacek:

As part of its continuing effort to maintain economic prosperity in this country, the United States Congress created The Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission. The Commission's responsibilities include the attraction of desirable industries to the northern sections of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan. It also sponsors research and we are now conducting a study for the Commission in selected Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois counties. Cook County is one of these counties.

Your household has been selected as one of the Cook County interview points. The interview takes about 30-45 minutes to complete and is focused on travel for pleasure. We have found that almost everyone interviewed has enjoyed the session since the topic is interesting and no sensitive information is sought.

We are writing you to ask for your cooperation on this project. An interviewer will call your household in the next few days and seek to arrange a meeting with you at your home at your convenience. We believe that this is preferable to simply knocking on your door without notifying you.

We need your help. Your assistance is very much appreciated. If you have questions about the study or your role in it, feel free to call us collect at 517-353-0646 and we will answer your questions.

Sincerely,

PB Myes

Paul B. Myers, Project Coordinator

1 FM moril

Lewis F. Moncrief, Project Director

MATRICES OF PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES-MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, ONTARIO, WISCONSIN

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

SCALES - MICHIGAN

			2	m	ব	ای	9	7	ωI	<u>o</u> .
-	Man-made-Natural									
2.	Noisy-Quiet	.699								
с	Unpleasant-Pleasant	.647	.720							
4.	Common-Unique	.526	.610	.564						
5.	Tense-Relaxed	.588	.778	.727	.631					
.9	Dirty-Clean	.545	.721	.730	.544	.727				
7.	Unfriendly-Friendly	.477	.590	.701	.511	.684	.698			
8.	Drab-Colorful	.536	.644	.758	.559	.653	.725	.682		
.	Unimpressive-Impressive	.498	.525	.638	.575	.595	.620	.647	.739	
0.	Boring-Interesting	.465	.494	.646	.522	.587	.574	.654	.735	.806

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

SCALES - MINNESOTA

			2	က	4	ى	او	7	ωI	6
-	Man-made-Natural									
2.	Noisy-Quiet	.645								
т.	Unpleasant-Pleasant	.564	.560							
4.	Common-Unique	.323	.350	.295						
5.	Tense-Relaxed	.612	.659	.656	.386					
6.	Dirty-Clean	.549	.608	.653	.349	.727				
7.	Unfriend]y-Friend]y	.468	.458	.661	.329	.560	.590			
8.	Drab-Colorful	.544	.471	.676	. 389	.653	.651	.622		
9.	Unimpressive-Impressive	.532	.418	.650	.488	.545	.567	.632	.737	
10.	Boring-Interesting	.450	.387	.654	.382	.548	.564	.648	.700	.760

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

SCALES - ONTARIO

										A rest of the second
		⊷	5	<u>m</u>	4	<u> </u> 2	<u>و</u>	7	ωI	6
-	Man-made-Natural									
2.	Noisy-Quiet	.642								
т	Unpleasant-Pleasant	.595	.653							
4.	Common-Unique	.500	.455	.559						
5.	Tense-Relaxed	.575	.674	.703	.575					
6.	Dirty-Clean	.533	.651	.630	.542	.707				
7.	Unfriendly-Friendly	.438	.473	.621	.461	.597	.622			
Э	Drab-Colorful	.533	.550	.708	.542	.605	.685	.592		
9.	Unimpressive-Impressive	.576	.519	.729	.607	.632	.637	.623	.803	
10.	Boring-Interesting	.580	.533	.728	.582	.626	.625	.636	.775	.848

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

SCALES - WISCONSIN

			5	m	4	ای	60	7	ωI	6	
1.	Man-made-Natural										
2.	Noisy-Quiet	.620									
э.	Unpleasant-Pleasant	.547	.653								
4.	Common-Unique	.359	.390	.395							
5.	Tense-Relaxed	.563	.613	.735	.476						
6.	Dirty-Clean	.540	.601	.722	.423	.672					
7.	Unfriendly-Friendly	.461	.484	.706	.426	.677	.664				
8.	Drab-Colorful	.518	.562	.702	.456	.630	.692	.684			
9.	Unimpressive-Impressive	.466	.454	.596	.578	.615	.602	.662	.679		
10.	Boring-Interesting	.438	.452	.646	.498	.614	.620	.642	.697	.759	

EXPOSURE TO THE REGION BY DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL GROUPS -MINNESOTA, ONTARIO, WISCONSIN

EXPOSURE TO THE REGION BY DIFFERENT

EDUCATIONAL GROUPS - ONTARIO

	ONTARIO	
Educational level:	Have <u>Visited</u>	Have not <u>Visited</u>
0-11	27 27.0%	73 73.0%
12	107 56.0%	84 44.0%
13-15	57 52.8%	51 47.2%
16+	48 61.5%	30 38.5%
Chi Square = 28.41	3 DF	Significance = .000

EXPOSURE TO THE REGION BY DIFFERENT

EDUCATIONAL GROUPS - WISCONSIN

	WISCONSIN	
Educational level:	Have <u>Visited</u>	Have not <u>Visited</u>
0-11	39 39.0%	61 61.0%
12	106 55.5%	85 44.5%
13-15	77 71.3%	31 28.7%
16+	64 83.1%	13 16.9%
Chi Square = 42.90	3 DF	Significance = .000

EXPOSURE TO THE REGION BY DIFFERENT

EDUCATIONAL GROUPS - MINNESOTA

	MINNESOTA	
	Have <u>Visited</u>	Have not <u>Visited</u>
Educational level:		
0-11	24 24.0%	76 76.0%
12	51 26.7%	140 73.3%
13-15	39 36.1%	69 63.9%
16+	32 41.0%	46 59.0%
Chi Square = 8.953	3 DF	Significance = .0299

APPENDIX F

NUMBER OF CHILDREN AND PATTERNS OF DECISION MAKING BETWEEN PARENTS AND CHILDREN
APPENDIX F1

NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY

RESPONSE TO THE ROUTE

DECISION BETWEEN PARENTS

AND CHILDREN

	Parents <u>Always</u>	Parents Usually	Joint-Child/Children Usually- <u>Child/Children Always</u>
N	158	51	51
Mean number of children in household:	2.87	2.68	1.98
Analysis of Variance	F Ra	tio = .722	F Probability = .487

APPENDIX F2

NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY RESPONSE

TO THE LODGING DECISION BETWEEN

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

	Parents <u>Always</u>	Parents Usually	Joint-Child/Children Usually- Child/Children Always
N	121	64	76
Mean number of children in household	2.47	2.59	3.00
Analysis of Variance	F Rati	o = .305	F Probability = .737

APPENDIX G

FAMILY IDEOLOGY MEASURE - MEANS AND CORRELATION MATRIX

APPENDIX G1

MEAN SCORES ON EACH SCALE

OF THE FAMILY IDEOLOGY MEASURE

	X	<u>SD</u>
1. ^a	3.65	1.80
2.	4.88	1.77
3.	4.23	1.86
4.	4.34	1.98
5.	3.97	1.86
6.	4.97	1.76
7.	4.49	1.82
8.	2.76	1.69
9.	4.63	1.91
10.	5.15	1.65
11.	3.76	1.92
12.	3.80	1.95

^aStatements are located in Appendix A2 with the remainder of the interview schedule.

APPENDIX G2

CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN FAMILY IDEOLOGY SCALES

	1	2	r	4	5	9	7	80	6	10	11
1.											
2.	.207										
ъ.	.354	. 394									
4.	.231	.332	.337								
5.	.183	.365	.392	.365							
6.	.156	. 394	.283	.339	.306						
7.	. 336	.356	.414	.330	.353	.325					
æ.	.206	.225	.313	.230	.332	.239	.329				
9.	. 164	.356	.341	.380	.408	.404	.371	.215			
10.	.162	.306	.353	. 396	.376	.317	.342	.239	.446		
11.	.200	.347	.380	.450	.474	.293	.399	.389	.444	.467	
12.	.219	.324	.299	.339	.463	.286	.328	.349	.382	.440	.473

