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TOURISTS’ BEHAVIOUR IN EXOTIC PLACES

A structural and categorical model for Portuguese tourists

Abstract

This paper addresses the decision-making processes observed in Portuguese tourists who have travelled to exotic places by developing a conceptual framework that focuses on information sources, motivations, perceptions, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. Determinants such as publicity and promotion are used to measure the role of information sources on activating motivations and on the learning process that leads to these perceptions. Such a decision process could be assessed in two phases: pre-purchase and post-purchase. The pre-purchase phase presupposes a set of motivations, which are combined according to the intrinsic needs of the individual, through the influence of the publicity and promotion. From the external and internal stimuli, the individual conceives their perceptions about the considered destinations, which leads to the choice of destination. Upon return, these perceptions and motivations are either confirmed or refuted. This construct, designated by satisfaction, will influence future purchase behaviour. This conceptual framework, defined around the main constructs that it is possible to measure, was used and tested by means of a survey carried out with Portuguese tourists on outward and inward flights to exotic places. All the relationships within these constructs were assessed by means of a structural model that attempted to explain why they choose as they do, how they behave, and what their future intentions are. Complementarily a categorical principal component analysis (CATPCA) was performed to evidence the
relationships between psychological and social motivations and satisfaction as well as the cause-effect relationships among each of the observed variables used to measure the latent constructs.

The results of the empirical study show that behavioural intentions are direct antecedents of emotional and cognitive satisfaction which, in turn, are explained by perceptions and motivations. It was concluded that exotic destinations are perceived as places of leisure although the facilities and core attractions are not quite as well documented in the traditional information sources. The managerial implications of this study are also discussed.
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Introduction

It is widely recognized that tourism is one of the major growth sectors all over the world, and particularly in Portugal. This capital importance on a global environment where tourists and tourism interplay increases the need to understand how and why tourists behave the way they do. The strategic management of tourist destinations must be conceived based on the development of a grounded theory of consumer behaviour, from which understanding and prediction of the tourist’s choice is the challenge for excellence.

Tourism demand is a topic which has merited the attention of a large number of scholars and is one of the first concerns of policy makers of such destinations. This topic, which first appears in the tourism literature in the fifties, depends fundamentally upon the variables that were used to fit the demand for tourism. Substantiated in econometric models, the first studies intended to predict the demand for tourism through a more macro-economic approach (Crouch, 1994). In the econometric or time-series fields, studies which forecast the demand for tourism fed by aggregated data are increasing (Witt, 1992).

The micro-economic principles, which find their basic constructs in Marshall’s (1920) and Lancaster’s (1966) theories of classical economics defend consumer heterogeneity and the need to find each individual’s curve of demand. This way of approaching and theorizing the demand for tourism acknowledges that man is a rational being who selects a behaviour of maximization of satisfaction, and it assumes that this being decides based on a perfect knowledge of all the possible alternatives. This form of understanding human behaviour encounters its main limitation in man’s incapacity to perceive and evaluate all the existing alternatives (Decrop, 1999; Mansfeld, 1992). This incapacity results firstly from the existence of an infinite number of possible combinations which provide the maximization of the consumer utility. If this is a fact in the case of a set of specific products, it gets worse with
regard to tourism, where the diversity of destinations, accommodation, recreation, means of transportation and motivation all compete for the assembly of different packages with the same level of use. Secondly, the human condition itself limits the capacity to apprehend. This definition of man’s decision-making process, despite its limitations, has been widely used in modelling demand. The models which are based on these principles have been extensively reviewed by Crouch (1994) and later by Lim (1997). The majority of these demand functions study the tourist’s behaviour using time-series, single-equation or simultaneous equation models, where the explained variables are lodging, number of guests, or arrivals, and the explicative variables are available income and cost factors at the destination, namely prices, exchange rates and travel expenses (Archer, 1976; Artus, 1972; Sheldon, 1990; Witt and Martin, 1987). These demand functions estimated from econometric models permit the estimation of the elasticity of price and income demands, which, disregarding consumer heterogeneity and its cognitive capacity, outline a destination implementation strategy based on prices and income.

The consumer, as a rational human being, presents a dynamic behaviour, with increasingly sophisticated needs, and more complex motivations (Correia, 2000). In the context of dynamics and of complex cognitive interactions, the tourist is understood to be a cognitive thinker who decides according to the destination’s attributes, to their intrinsic motivations, and to prior knowledge (Howard and Sheth, 1969). In this context of complexity and dynamic interdependence the consumer’s behavioural models assume a transversality, which allows them to analyze all the different processes that are formed before making the final decision.

This decision-making process, which finds its principles in economics, psychology and sociology, shows the importance of motivation and of the external stimulus in the definition of a preferential scale conducive to choice, as well as the importance of satisfaction in
predicting future behaviours. Although this dynamic system of decision-making was imported from other fields of study and adapted to explain tourism behaviour, its interrelationships are still an issue that deserves more research (Woodside, 2005).

This paper presents a conceptual tourism decision-making process framework, based on microeconomic theory, and supported by behavioural models, which allows for the examination of the variables which influence individual travel behaviour, and provides an empirical framework by which is possible to understand its interrelationships.

The proposed framework was tested on Portuguese tourists who have travelled to exotic places such as Brazil, Morocco, Egypt, the Dominican Republic and Sao Tome and Principe, by means of a structural equation model (SEM) (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1986) and also by means of a categorical principal component analysis (CATPCA). The SEM that appears in the work of Rosenberg (1956) and Fishbein (1967) assumes that choice is a function of the perceptions and attributes of the destination. Later Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) add the behavioural intention component to Fishbein’s original model as a function of expectations and social and individual factors.

However, the number of studies about holiday decision-making processes, and the choices of outbound Portuguese tourists, has not been assessed through this perspective. Additionally, the methodologies used to research this issue focus on exploratory statistics; SEM are scarce. Inspired by the model presented by Yoon and Uysal (2005), this model introduces new constructs - the role of information sources (brochures, promotion, news and movies) on the formation of motivations, perceptions, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. It is widely argued that people travel pushed by internal forces and pulled by external forces (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; Correia and Crouch, 2004; Kozak, 2001; Uysal and Hagan, 1993; Correia, Valle and Moço, 2005). However, the interplay of push and pull motivations has not been
considered with regard to satisfaction. Therefore, two additional constructs have been conceptualized; push satisfaction (emotional) and pull satisfaction (cognitive). Satisfaction is an issue that has deserved the attention of a number of researchers (Baker and Crompton, 2000; Moutinho, 1987; Ryan and Glendon, 1998). These authors refer to satisfaction as an emotional state of fulfilment after the experience. Knowing that the sense of fulfilment is not only due to the destination’s attributes, it makes sense that the traditional breakdown of motivations in push and pull motives can be used in the satisfaction assessment. In this paper, push and pull satisfaction appear as two individual factors that may contribute to the overall evaluation. Push satisfaction is understood as the individual’s internal state of well being with their holiday, considering their main push motivations. In other words, the tourist goes on holiday because he or she wants to achieve intellectual, physical and social rewards, and the concept of push satisfaction measures the level of internal achievement perceived by the tourist. Pull satisfaction refers to the confirmation of the tourist’s expectations regarding the destination’s attributes, which is the concept that traditionally is explored in tourism studies (Ryan and Glendon, 1998; Murphy, Pritchard and Smith, 2000; Bigné, Sánchez and Sánchez, 2001; Yoon and Uysal, 2005; Correia, Barros and Silvestre, 2006). The main objective of this paper is, therefore, to develop and empirically validate a SEM for measuring the decision-making process of Portuguese tourists who visit exotic places.

Our conceptual framework considers all the constructs of the holiday decision-making process found in the bibliography which were possible to measure and which interrelate with the other variables by means of a SEM.

In order to further explore the cause-effect relationships among each of the observed variables in the model, a CATPCA was performed. This statistical method represents a set of categorical variables on perceptual maps, and allows us to explore the simultaneous
connections among the observed variables used to measure the latent constructs in the structural model. This model, which permits the identification of the significant statistical variables that explain how and why tourists behave as they do in exotic places, has clear implications in the definition of marketing strategies, compatible with tourists’ choice determinants, which strongly contribute to the overall image of exotic places as tourist destinations.

This paper is organized as follows. In the second section, we present the contextual setting. In the third section, we present a literature review in which the seminal models of consumer behaviour theory, and the decision making process and its constructs are analyzed. In the fourth section, the conceptual model adopted, hypotheses and its constructs are presented, along with the methodology applied. In the fifth section, we present the empirical model. This section is organized into four sub-sections; the first discusses the formation of each construct by means of exploratory factor analysis (EFA), the second presents the measurement model, the third presents and tests the structural model, and the fourth explores the relationship of each set of variables that measured the latent constructs of the model. In the sixth section, the results are discussed and their managerial implications underlined. Finally, the seventh section presents the conclusions, limitations, and extensions of the research.

1. Contextual Settings: Portuguese Tourists in Exotic Places

Portugal is one of the most important tourist destinations in Europe, although only in recent times have Portuguese citizens begun to enjoy holidays outside their own locality, and even more recently, abroad.

In the context of a relative retraction of the tourism market, Asia and the Pacific have begun to awaken as tourism markets on a world-wide scale, concentrating 19.98% of international
arrivals, which translates into a 27.9% increase compared to 2003 (WTO, 2005). Faster and more economically accessible air transportation, as well as a significant decrease in flight durations explain the expansion of routes and the increasing affirmation of the most exotic destinations in world tourism. This is a tendency that Portuguese tourists have been aware of despite the lack of a strong tradition of foreign holidays.

Between 2000 and 2004, a reduction from 71.0% to 53.2% was verified in Portuguese people over the age of 15 who went on holiday, with a significant increase to 56.0% in 2005. The number of Portuguese tourists travelling abroad showed a small increase, from 19.2% in 2004 to 21.4% in 2005, although these numbers only represent one fifth of the population who usually go on holiday. In 2005, Europe continued to lead this trend with about 50.0% of tourists travelling abroad, followed by South America (18.1%), Asia (2.5%), and Africa (1.2%). In accordance with the increase in the Asian market, we highlight the fact that Portuguese tourists’ preferences regarding these destinations also increased in 2005, making this a new holiday destination. The preference for the sun/sea product was demonstrated by more than 65.0% of tourists, while the countryside was preferred by 20.0% (DGT, 2006).

Restricted by the school holiday system and by job contracts, the Portuguese go on holiday between the months of August and September (81.1%). Even though 16.0% of tourists resort to travel agencies, the majority organize the trip by themselves (42.2%) or via the internet (8.3%), the preference for the latter having doubled since 2004. The majority of Portuguese people who go on holiday are under the age of 44 (63.6%) and regarding socio-economical status, as would be expected, the majority of holidaymakers are distributed among the higher social classes.

Regarding Portuguese tourists’ average daily expenses while on holiday abroad, significant increases were registered from 2004 to 2005. These increases were noticed in the average
daily expenditure abroad, which in 2004 was 60.50 Euros and increased to 76.12 Euros per person, per day, in 2005. When travelling abroad, Portuguese tourists travel on chartered flights to exotic places such as Brazil, Mexico, Tunisia, Morocco, Sao Tome and Principe and Egypt. Air Luxor, SA is a privately owned Portuguese airline, which is among the top three national tourist operators. Air Luxor charter flights go from Portugal to South American tourist resorts, namely Brazil and Mexico, and to African tourist markets, namely Morocco, Tunisia, and Egypt; to the tropical island of Sal in Cape Verde, and to the islands of Sao Tome and Principe. It also offers scheduled flights inside Europe to the tropical island of Sao Tome and to Guinea-Bissau in Africa.

This paper intends to analyze the influence of various sources of information on the decision motivations, perceptions regarding the destination, the level of satisfaction upon returning home, and future behavioural intentions and assumes the existence of two moments of questioning; departure and arrival. As such, the gathering of data took place aboard Air Luxor planes, which, apart from being one of the main national operators, also showed total receptivity to the research project.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Seminal Models of Consumer Behaviour

Consumer behaviour is a dynamic and complex process. When applied to tourism, this process is rendered even more complex by the intangibility of the product and by the discontinuity and accumulation of purchasing power (Correia, 2002). The interdisciplinary nature of the subject under study has given rise to three distinct groups of models: microeconomic models; structural models, and processional models. Microeconomic models assume that the tourist intends to maximize his/her utility based on a set of attributes and three
The structural models examine the relationship between an input (stimulus) and an output (response), while the processional models examine individuals’ decisions, concentrating on the cognitive processes (transformation process between the input and the output) that are generated prior to the final decision being taken (Abelson and Levi, 1985).

The microeconomic model of consumer behaviour is based on classic economic theory (Marshal, 1920). This theory is more appropriate to examining the demand for simple products, and as such, presents some limitations in terms of tourism analysis, since this is a product composed of a group of elements which characterize it. However, the concept of individual maximization towards product tradeoffs, inherent in the classic economic theory, is sufficient for the analysis of composed products, such as tourism, according to Samuelson (1981). Agreeing that tourist destinations appear, not as an object of direct use, but as products whose characteristics permit us to endow them with utility (Lancaster, 1966), it is possible to maximize their utility, subject to a certain number of restrictions. Applications of the microeconomic theory to tourism are presented by Morley (1992), Paraskevopoulos (1977), O’Hagan and Harrison (1984), Witt and Martin (1987), Lim (1997), McFadden (1981) and Song and Witt (2000).

Processional models examine the complete decision process of an individual, concentrating on the cognitive processes which are generated prior to making the final decision. In other words, these models provide information on the consumer’s behaviour during the decision process, which is superior to that provided by the individual in their report on their own behaviour, after the final decision has been made. The variable in processional models is the decision process itself, in addition to the factors that influence this process. Any tourism product boasts a multiplicity of attributes that define this product and distinguish it from the
competing alternatives. The majority of consumers are unable to process a large number of variables simultaneously, and hence apply few criteria upon arriving at their final decision. There are three outstanding models which underpin all of the studies in the field of consumer-behaviour analysis from a processional perspective.

The Nicosia model (1966) focuses on the communication which takes place between the consumer and the company, and the latter’s predisposition to persuade the consumer to buy the product. The work carried out by Engel, Kollat and Blackwell (1978) produced one of the most extensive revisions of the literature on consumer behaviour. Howard and Sheth’s model (1969), also employing the input concept in consumer behaviour models, suggested forms of sequencing these inputs in the decision-making process. This model continues to be one of the most important studies on consumer behaviour theorization.

Academic studies on tourist consumer behaviour from the perspective of the decision process only began to appear from 1970 onwards. Most of the models explain the tourist’s decision process in terms of a sequence of interrelated phases, varying between three and five. From the pre-purchase to the post-purchase phase, these models try to assess different constructs of decision-making and its interplay (Crompton, 1979; Moutinho, 1982, 1987; Woodside and Lysonski, 1989; Woodside and King, 2001; Middleton, 1994; Ryan, 1994; Nicolau and Más, 2005; Um and Crompton, 1990). Regardless of the number of phases, the models vary essentially in terms of the focus which they place on the shaping of perceptions and on the evaluation of the post-purchase process. The models presented are deductive and are based on observations and, similar to other behavioural models, they only permit inferences to be made on cognitive aspects. Foxall and Goldsmith (1994) suggest that these models might not signify very much, other than to aid the understanding of the consumer’s actions. According to these authors, the consumer’s decision is made after a sequence of phases; the decision is
not linear, and the models should clarify which variables are preponderant in the consumer’s decision. In fact, by accepting different choice-formalization frameworks, the cognitive elements will have different weights in the formalization of the choice and, necessarily, will influence the attitude in different ways. These presuppositions substantiate the bases of the research into structural models, which also support the model proposed in this paper.

The first structural models appeared in the works of Rosenberg (1956) and Fishbein (1967), who based them on the principle that the decision is a function of the perceptions of the objective and of the destination’s attributes. Numerous researchers concluded that the cognitive elements might differ in qualitative terms and, thus, that they should be organized into different frameworks and categories, have assessed this type of relationship. Some researchers working in the area of attitudes suggest that consumers need to compare purchasing attitudes or intentions within different conceptual frameworks of their behaviour. Prior to finalizing their choice, the individual will define cognitive, affective, and connotative elements in relation to each of the options. The final choice will emerge after having compared all the various options. The seminal works in this field are the models of Rosenberg (1956), Fishbein (1967), Cohen, Fishbein and Ahtola (1972), and Fishbein and Ajzen (1980).

The model proposed by Fishbein and Ajzen (1980), labelled the behavioural intention model, constitutes an extension of Fishbein’s original model (1967). While maintaining behavioural theory as a basis for the development of the model, it defines the behavioural intention as a function of the expectations, and of social and individual factors (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1980). This model permits the following presuppositions: an object with multiple attributes is evaluated as a set of attributes which generate costs and benefits at different levels; the attitude index does not increase indefinitely with the acquisition of new expectations, because the attitude is determined by a limited number of visible attributes.
The models studied, which are commonly referred to in the specialist literature as multi-
attribute, since they consider that a product possesses several self-compensating attributes
(compensatory), find their basis in value-expectancy theory (Edwards, 1954). This theory
defines expectation as the probability that a certain attitude will lead to positive or negative
benefits, thus allowing the isolation of determining factors of behaviour and, furthermore,
specifying how expectation and value can be combined in order to make choices. Value-
expectancy theory is a way of measuring the subjective utility, and is based on Edwards’
(1954) behavioural decision theory. This theory deals with expectation as to the consequences
of adopting a certain form of behaviour. It measures this view of expectation from the stance
that the individual chooses in accordance with his or her own expectations and values.
Generally, the main advantages of the value-expectancy theory are the following: it enables
the use of some of the concepts present in the same model; it allows the integration of the
emotional component in tourist motivation; it can incorporate any of the reasons for travelling
put forward in the studies about motivation; it enables the resolution of the problem of the
push and pull factors, as well as the evaluation of personality, and finally, the theory allows a
more realistic and sophisticated view of tourist motivation.

The literature assesses tourism behaviour from an exploratory analysis of motivations,
expectations, perceptions, and satisfaction. The application to tourism of statistical
multivariate techniques that rely on principal component analysis, correlation tests, cluster
analysis, multiple discriminant analysis, and homogeneity analysis, was stressed by Gallarza,
Saura and Garcia (2002). Tourism behaviour was assessed by discrete-choice models, in
particular qualitative choice models. Qualitative choice models rely on binomial (Fleischer
and Pizam, 2002; Stynes and Peterson, 1984; Kockelman and Krishnamurthy, 2004; Perales,
2002; Barros and Proença, 2005) or multinomial logit (Kockelman and Krishnamurthy, 2004;
Morley, 1994; Nicolau and Más, 2005; Taplin and Qiu, 1997; Hong, Kim, Jang and Lee,
2006; McFadden, 1981; Seddighi and Theocharous, 2002; Luce, 1959). More recently, tourist consumer behaviour has been assessed by the structural equation model. There are a number of examples of structural models in tourism research. Baker and Crompton (1998) tested the effect of perceived quality performance on behavioural intentions; Yoon and Uysal (2005) tested causal relationships among push and pull motivations, satisfaction and destination loyalty; Vogt and Andereck (2003) tried to assess how emotion and cognition can influence perceptions; Silvestre and Correia (2005), from a second-order factor analysis, explain the image of the Algarve as a tourist destination; Correia, Valle and Moço (2005) assess motivations and perceptions about exotic destinations, and Kim and Yoon (2003) present the formation of perceptions from a conceptual point of view.

2.2 Decision Making Process

The tourist decision process assumes three essential stages, namely, pre-decision, decision and post-purchase evaluation (Crompton and Ankomah, 1993; Um and Crompton, 1990; Crompton, 1992; Ryan, 1994; Middleton, 1994; Moutinho, 1982; Bentler and Speckart, 1979; Correia, 2002).

The pre-decision phase tends to occur quite some time prior to the purchase itself, seeing as it frequently involves decision making from a great distance and between highly symbolic and unattainable alternatives. The choice of destination and the combination of activities which are necessary to go ahead with the holiday involve a group of complex decisions that consume a large amount of time in order to choose the desired product before departure. Nevertheless, many tourists derive the majority of their holiday pleasure from these activities which lead to the actual trip (Crouch and Jordan, 2004). This pre-decision phase develops around the construction of motivations, which are diffused by the various existing sources of
information, which also allow the tourist to learn about the destination and to construct his or her own perceptions about it.

The decision phase includes the evaluation of the perceptions through which consumers make their decisions, based on time and income restrictions, which condition the choice of options. In view of the displacement verified between purchase and use, purchase, as a decision phase, becomes a transitory activity.

Post-purchase evaluation results from other stimuli which influence the choice process, and presupposes the satisfaction evaluation taken from the “consumption” of a certain destination. This phase is also important in evaluating the probability of repeating the purchase of a specific destination and/or the intention to recommend it.

The theoretical underpinning of this decision making process is discussed in the following sub-section, in which a brief theoretical overview of the main constructs is presented.

2.3 Theoretical Constructs

Motivational Constructs

From a general point of view, motivation refers to a need which leads an individual to adopt a certain behaviour which satisfies that need. Fodness (1994) argues that motivation theories describe a dynamic process of internal psychological factors (needs, desires and goals) which generate an uncomfortable level of tension in the individual’s body and mind, and which induce the purchase.

Gartner (1993), Dann (1996) and Baloglu (1997) suggest that motivations have a direct influence on the affective component of the image. The affective image refers to the feelings
that a certain place generates, and individuals with different motives may evaluate a tourist destination in similar ways if they believe that the destination offers them their desired benefits.

Some studies identified key motivational elements; the need to get away (for example from daily routine or work) and the desire to search, for example for pleasant experiences (McCabe, 2000). However, Crompton (1979) is the researcher who generates the most consensus with his push-pull model. The idea behind the model is the division of the tourist destination into two forces. The first is designated as push, pushing the tourist out of the home, in order to try to generalize the desire to go and to be somewhere else, without specifying where. In this field, the push motives underlined in the literature rely on personal achievement, satisfaction, rest and relaxation, adventure, knowledge, getting away, and others connected to social relations such as the desire for recognition, prestige, and to develop new friendships. The second force is designated in the literature as pull, directing the individual to a certain destination, due to its attributes (Uysal, Mclellan and Syrakaya, 1996). Pull motives are those which affect the choice of place, directly or indirectly related to the destination’s attributes, and more concretely, to the tourism infrastructure. The destination’s tangible characteristics or attributes allow the tourist to create expectations regarding the probability of that destination satisfying his or her needs/motivations. The identification of different motivations has been accepted and tested by several authors, for different tourist contexts, and for different segments (Iso-Ahola and Mannel, 1987; Correia and Crouch, 2004; Correia, Valle and Moço, 2005; Dann, 1981; Pearce, 1982; Uysal and Hagan, 1993; Yoon and Uysal, 2005; Gnoth, 1997; Crompton, 1979; Beerli and Martin, 2004; Uysal, Mclellan and Syrakaya, 1996; Lundberg, 1990; Fodness, 1994; Mohsin and Ryan, 2003; Shoemaker, 1989).
Once the need has been perceived, the tourist needs to determine the destination that will satisfy it, and he or she then enters the learning phase.

**Learning Process**

Learning is the process whereby the consumer acquires knowledge about the product and the experience that will be applied in future behaviours. The learning process was studied by Bettman and Park (1980), who developed an information-processing model in which the consumer is portrayed as a being with limited memory, who decides according to simplistic processes. Miller (1956) notes that the consumer is only capable of retaining a maximum of seven destinations, and a minimum of two.

During the learning process, the consumer goes through the simplification phase, in other words, the consumer encounters a large number of brands or destinations, but has difficulty remembering them all, therefore a limited number is chosen for evaluation. In the literature this is referred to as the “evoked set”, which consists of the construction of a small subgroup of destinations that the consumer is capable of processing and remembering (Moutinho, 1987; Woodside and Lysonski, 1989; Um and Crompton, 1990).

Howard and Sheth (1969) discuss the diverse levels of activation of the destinations in the consumer’s memory. These are termed “evoked set” destinations, of which the consumer is conscious, is able to evaluate, and manifests some desire to visit; “inert set” destinations, about which the consumer is indecisive as to whether to visit or not, and “inept set” destinations - all those destinations that the consumer shows no interest in visiting, even though he or she is aware of their existence. After the information from the different levels - “evoked set”, “inert set” and “inept set” - is stored away, the consumer moves on to the learning phase.
The way in which the consumer learns can be analyzed from a behavioural or cognitive perspective. The behavioural perspective allows the learning to occur in three parts: information gathering, choice, and experience. The benefits obtained result in a repetition of behaviour. The cognitive perspective assumes that learning results from the existence of an unresolved problem.

The information which is processed and stored about a destination can be differentiated into several categories: the cognitive component (evaluation of the product’s attributes), and the affective component (normally the motives which determine what is desired to be understood about the destination under consideration). The learning process and the image formation refer to the behavioural variations that occur due to the influence of internal and external stimuli. These are the result of previous experience, the recommendations of friends and family, publicity and promotion, word of mouth and so on. These stimuli, which in the beginning, activate the individual’s needs and motivations, later, in the learning process, influence the decision and help the tourist to form his or her image of each of the alternative destinations, strongly influenced by personality and psycho-sociological characteristics.

Studies about tourists’ learning processes and the influence of the information sources in the formation of the destination’s image refer to some of the stimuli which contribute the most to the cognitive process. In this line of investigation, the study undertaken by Beesley (2005) proposes a model that relates communication, individual cognition, social contingencies, affection, and values to an understanding of the dynamic process of learning. Fisher (2004) argues that the learning process can identify four types of tourist behaviour: exact imitation, deliberately inexact imitation, accidental inexact imitation, and social learning. Walmsley and Jenkins (1992) present a methodology for understanding the learning process based on cognitive mapping. It was demonstrated that tourists develop cognitive images of resort areas
quickly and that cognitive maps are influenced by experience, both in the immediate sense of the length of time spent in the area and in the more general sense of the lifestyle to which the tourist is accustomed. Guy, Curtis and Crotts (1990) point out that previous experience and the tourist’s direct and indirect sources of information are determinants for the first time tourist learning about destinations. Money and Crotts (2003) show that consumers from national cultures characterized by higher levels of uncertainty avoidance use information sources that are related to the channel (e.g., travel agencies), instead of personal, destination marketing-related, or mass media sources. Fodness and Murray (1997) demonstrate that the information search is the result of a number of situational, tourist, and marketplace contingencies. Jamrozy, Backman and Backman (1996) prove that highly involved travellers tend to be more receptive to information concerning the travel product or destination and spread that information willingly.

The formation of perceptions about destinations results from the learning process.

**Perception Construct**

Previous researchers have defined perceptions as the perceived value of the product (Sheth, Newman and Gross, 1991; Holbrook, 1996; Oh, 2000; Zeithaml, 1988; Correia and Crouch, 2004; Correia, Valle and Moço, 2005). These concepts are developed from a cognitive or behavioural perspective. Therefore, perception should be used as a holistic concept that results from the learning process, combined with the tourist’s own motivations.

Past research about tourist motivation showed that affective factors play a critical role in tourists’ selection and evaluation of leisure travel products (Fodness, 1994).
The tourist has his or her own internal and external motivations to travel, which lead to different perceptions about the destinations. This assumption was based on Baloglu and McCleary (1999), Gartner (1993), Dann (1996), Baloglu (1997), Correia, Valle and Moço (2005), who demonstrate that perceptions about the destination are a function of internal motivations (push motives) and external motivations (pull motives). This happens because the perception is the process by which consumers select, organise, and interpret stimuli into a meaningful and coherent sense. Therefore consumer perception can vary from the true attributes of a product through the way the consumer is able to capture and process information. That is, consumer perception depends upon the way in which the characteristics of a product are perceived individually by the tourist, and not necessarily on their true attributes (Dann, 1981; Pearce, 1982). The idea of selective perception includes selective exposure, selective attention, perceptual defence, and perceptual blockage. Consumers understand the things they need and desire, and block out unnecessary, unfavourable or painful stimuli.

From the process of learning, two concepts of perception emerge: the cognitive and emotional perspectives (Gnoth, 1997). According to this author, cognitive perception is a result of the evaluation of the destination’s attributes, while emotional perception depends on how the individual actually perceives the destination.

In this paper, we suggest that the resulting perceptions are not only based on cognitive evaluation, but also on emotional evaluation (Otto, 1997; Otto and Ritchie, 1995). Both cognitive and emotional measures are necessary for a thorough modelling of perceptions of leisure travel products. Throughout our study, perceptions are defined as the overall perception of a consumer about the product that he or she has consumed, which involves both
perspectives. In other words, perceptions are the preference rate that leads the tourist to purchase a particular destination.

Perception formation, from a conceptual point of view, is presented by Kim and Yoon (2003) and Vogt and Andereck (2003). These authors propose structural models (SEM) which seek to analyse how emotions and cognitions can influence perceptions of tourist destinations. Seddighi and Theocharous (2002) use a conditional logit model to measure the perceptions/feelings about the characteristics of tourist destinations. From this methodology, the authors can predict the probability of revisiting a travel destination. Murphy, Pritchard and Smith (2000) define a structural model that relates the tourist’s intention to return (as a proxy of satisfaction/quality) to his or her perceptions of the travel experience. Driscoll, Lawson and Niven (1994) test the consistency of two semantic differential scales used to measure perceptions, concluding that the resulting perceptions could be different depending on the data collection format adopted.

**Satisfaction Construct**

Due to the satisfaction concept being interpreted differently by each individual, the definitions are varied, which means that the majority of academic definitions involve the comparison between expectations and experience (Woodside, Frey and Daly, 1989).

One of the most widely cited definitions in satisfaction research is that of Bultena and Klessig (1969, p. 349). The authors state that a satisfactory experience “is a function of the degree of congruency between aspirations and the perceived reality of experiences”. From a purely cognitive point of view, Hunt (1977, p. 459) states that “satisfaction is not the pleasurableness of the experience, it is the evaluation rendered that the experience was at least as good as it was supposed to be.”
Others, such as LaTour and Peat (1979), argue that satisfaction is nothing more than the brand’s attitude.

Recent studies have examined the influence of affective reactions to consumption experiences on post-purchase satisfaction judgements (Barsky, 1992; Madrigal, 1995; Oliver, 1993; Spreng, MacKenzie and Olshavsky, 1996). The assumption is that the tourist’s satisfaction is a function of the product’s performance, perceptions, and motivations. Satisfaction increases as the performance/perception ratio increases (Moutinho, 1982) and depends on the quality of the experiences found in relation to those anticipated and desired. Dissatisfaction can be measured in terms of the degree of disparity between the expectations and the product’s performance. This conceptualization of satisfaction based on expectations has been widely criticised. Arnould and Price (1993) suggest that satisfaction often appears to be associated with surprise, while Miller (1977) proposes that satisfaction can take on different forms; desirable, ideal, or tolerable. Research about the tourist’s perceptions and motivations shows that the level of satisfaction with holidays is also correlated with motivation. Truong (2005) state that the attractiveness of a destination is also associated with its capacity to satisfy tourists’ needs and motivations. The destination’s image consists of a group of factors and tangible attractions that the individual understands to be capable of satisfying his or her explicit and implicit desires. It is therefore natural that the evaluation of the post-purchase behaviour is not only related to the evaluation of the tangible attributes, but is also connected to the evaluation of the tourist destination’s capacity to satisfy the individual’s intrinsic motivations. From this presupposition emerges the concept of push and pull satisfaction which, once adapted to the definition of push and pull motivations, allows us to measure the tangible and intangible components of post-purchase purchase. In order to operationalize this evaluation, two questionnaires were developed. The first was constructed to identify the sources of information that were used prior to contact with the destination, perceptions of that
destination, and to identify the intrinsic (push) and extrinsic (pull) motivations. The second questionnaire set out to measure the disparity between the tourist’s motivations and satisfaction after the holiday period, as well as future behavioural intentions.

The concept of satisfaction has traditionally been measured by product logic rather than by consumer logic. Therefore, measuring instruments which permit the measurement of displacement between the anticipated product and that actually experienced, at the level of the various services which constitute the tourist destination, assisted in this part of the investigation. The work of Parasuman, Zethaml and Berry (1985), Moutinho (1987), Kozak and Rimmigton (2000), are examples of this.

According to Barsky and Labagh (1992), the analysis of consumer satisfaction was one of the most important challenges in the 90s. If managers are able to identify how the components of a product or service affect consumer satisfaction, they will be able to alter the consumer’s experience in order to maximize satisfaction (Petrick, Backman and Bixler, 1999). While there are no guarantees that a satisfied consumer will repeat his or her visit, an unsatisfied consumer will generally not return (Dube, Renaghan and Miller, 1994). The assumption that can be made from these studies is that if an experience has a positive affect on an individual, then he or she is more likely to repeat the activity. This means that satisfaction influences and determines behavioural intentions (Opperman, 2000).

**Behavioural Intentions Construct**

The intention to purchase is a function of the attitude towards behavioural and social norms. The attitude is composed of ascertained expectations regarding the possibility of adopting a certain behaviour and the evaluation of how the consumer feels about it (Fisbein and Ajzen, 1980).
In this context, we highlight the studies of Lam and Hsu (2006), who, based on the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1980), show that attitude, perceived behaviour and past behaviour are related to the behavioural intention of choosing a destination. Along the same lines, and based on a structural model, Bigné, Sánchez and Sánchez (2001) treat the tourist’s intention to return as a proxy of satisfaction/quality with the tourist’s perceptions and image of the tourist destination. The results of this study show that a touristic image is a direct antecedent of perceived quality, satisfaction, intention to return and willingness to recommend the destination. With reference to the other relationships, the fact that quality has a positive influence on satisfaction and intention to return, and that satisfaction determines the willingness to recommend the destination is also confirmed. Kozak (2001) shows that overall satisfaction and the number of previous visits considerably influences the intention to return, especially in mature destinations. Baker and Crompton (2000) tested a structural model to show that perceived performance quality has a stronger total effect on behavioural intentions than does satisfaction. Mazursky (1989) asserted that the variables that explain the construction of future behavioural intentions are norms and measures from past experience. Correia, Barros and Silvestre (2006) tested a random parameter logit model to analyze which characteristics (e.g. individual characteristics, motivations, tripographic variables and the most quoted attributes of golf destinations) are associated with the probability of golf tourists playing in Algarve returning to this Portuguese tourist region.

According to the literature, the variables that influence future behaviour are motivations, information sources, perceptions, and satisfaction.
3. Theoretical Model and Hypotheses

Figure 1 depicts the hypothetical causal model. Each component of the model was chosen based on the review of the literature, with the purpose of defining, in the closest possible way, the reality of consumer behaviour – a sequential process, dynamic and organized, where diverse factors compete for analyse consumer decision process. Previous studies show that behavioural intentions are the result of the post-purchase evaluation process (Dick and Basu, 1994; Oliver, 1999; Yoon and Uysal, 2005). Other authors show that the post-purchase evaluation depends on the tourist’s motivation (Mannell and Iso-Ahola, 1987; Ross and Iso-Ahola, 1991; Yoon and Uysal, 2005; Silvestre and Correia, 2005; Correia, Valle and Moço, 2005; Correia, Barros and Silvestre, 2006). Woodside and Lysonki (1989) show that personal and documental information tends to activate the consumer’s need and, therefore, serve as a motivational element. These sources are also used by the consumer in the construction of perceptions phase (in which the consumer needs to learn about the destination). This model breaks down motivations into two constructs: push (internal forces) and pull motives (external forces), as tested by Yoon and Uysal (2005), Correia, Valle and Moço (2005), Correia and Crouch (2004), McCabe (2000), Goosens (2000), Dann (1977), Driscoll, Lawson and Niven (1994), Baloglu and McCleary (1999). Beginning from the conceptual framework that allows us to categorize motives into pull and push, and presuming that each motivation is expected to be accomplished, at the end of the trip, tourists are able to evaluate each motive as a component of their overall satisfaction. Therefore, this model also breaks down satisfaction into two constructs: push satisfaction and pull satisfaction. Subsequently, the model examines the structural causal relationships among the information sources, push and pull motivation, perceptions, push and pull satisfaction, and behavioural intentions. This model contribution relies on the identification of relationships between the above-mentioned constructs, and the new concept of satisfaction.
Let us suppose that the tourist has already decided to go on holiday abroad, as well as how long they intend to stay and how much they intend to spend. In this framework, there is no choice, so the tourist’s consumption behaviour can be analyzed by focusing on the phases of pre-decision and post-purchase. These two phases are crucial in explaining the tourist’s consumption behaviour, as it is during these phases where the most relevant constructs in the purchase process are constructed: sources of information, motivations, perceptions, satisfaction, and behavioural intentions.

**Figure 1 here**

Hypothetically, it was ascertained that:

**H1: The information is explained by a set of sources used by the tourist**

Baloglu and McCleary (1999) established that tourists use various sources of information to become acquainted with the destination. Um and Crompton (1990), Fakeye and Crompton (1991) and Gunn (1972) identified the importance of information sources (such as promotional media, friends and relatives and word of mouth) in the decision making process. Bargeman and Poel (2006), Crotts (1999) and Moutinho (1982) state that the search for information makes use of four basic types of source: neutral sources (tourism offices); commercial (travel agents); social (friends and relatives, family); and promotional (newspapers, magazines, radio, television, internet).

**H2: These information sources are used to activate push motivations in the tourist’s mind**

Um and Crompton (1990) prove that information sources are used to form either a cognitive image or an affective image. Tourism may be considered a product, which requires an elevated involvement in the decision process, and it is therefore expected that the individual will resort to various sources of information in order to decide. The effect of the different
sources of information on the need arousal was highlighted by Woodside and Lyosnski (1989).

Money and Crotts (2003) show that consumers from national cultures characterized by higher levels of uncertainty avoidance use information sources that are related to the channel (e.g., travel agent), instead of personal, destination marketing-related, or mass media sources.

Crompton (1979) and Kotler, Haider and Rein (1993) suggest that motivation is a result of the need for social acceptance and of publicity and promotion. Publicity and promotion are one of the most important sources for tourists.

**H3: Information sources are used to activate pull motivations on the tourist’s mind**

Woodside and Lyosnski (1989), Holbrook (1978) and Gartner (1993) state that information sources are used as forces to influence pull motivations.

**H4: Push motivations are determined by a set of internal motives**

Dann (1977) classifies push motivations which influence the trip as internal factors: loneliness, getting away from it all, and social recognition. On the other hand, Crompton (1990) refers to motives that lead to the desire to travel: an escape from the daily routine, relaxation, prestige, regression, and social interaction.

**H5: Pull motivations are determined by a set of external motives**

Uysal and Hagan (1993) state that pull factors are mainly related to the attributes of the tourist destination. On the other hand, Crompton (1990) states that pull motives are those which influence the choice of the location. Factors such as landscape, hospitality, lodging, price, heritage interests, gastronomy, sports, nightlife, shopping, and accessibility are examples of pull motivations.
**H6: Push motives were expected to positively influence pull motives**

Correia, Valle and Moço (2005) prove that when the tourist has internal motivations (push) they are more likely to perceive pull motivations. Although most authors accept that the cognitive and affective image are related (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Yoon and Uysal, 2005; Um and Crompton, 1990; Gunn, 1972), there is no more empirical evidence of this relationship. Crompton (1979) argues that in practice, all human behaviours are motivated, however, the choices made in order to satisfy these motives may depend on other psychological variables. When individuals decide to travel for recreation, they do so for several motives and reasons; all of which are interdependent.

**H7: Perceptions of the destination are influenced by push motives**

Perceptions are a cognitive and behavioural measure of the value of the tourism destination (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Morrison, 1989), since they are formed in a consciously unconscious manner. Perceptions as a behavioural cognitive measure are expected to be formed based on the emotional state of the tourists (motivations) (Murphy, Pritchard and Smith, 2000; Woodside and Lyonski, 1989; Crompton, 1979; Correia, Valle and Moço, 2005; Dann, 1996; Gartner, 1993). Beerli and Martin (2004) added the concept of affective perception of the destination, which is influenced by emotional state.

**H8: Perceptions of the destination are influenced by pull motives**

According to Gnoth (1997) perceptions can be measured as a cognitive component, which means that the tourist evaluates and perceives the destination’s attributes. On the other hand, perceptions can be measured by a personal component, which means that the destination is perceived as the tourist intends it to be. In fact, perceptions can be different from the true attributes of the product depending on how the individual receives and processes information,
and this is explained by tourist motivations about the destination’s attributes (Dann, 1981; Pearce, 1982).

**H9: Information sources were used to form their perceptions**

According to Mazursky (1989) the construction of perceptions derives from the information obtained beforehand, which helps the consumer clarify and evaluate the alternatives regarding the choice of destination (Um and Crompton, 1990).

Um and Crompton (1990) also argue that beliefs and expectations about the attributes of a destination are constructed by individuals according to the information received. Burgess (1978) states that information sources influence the image of the destination. Baloglu and MacCleary (1999), Gunn (1972) and Gartner (1993) also stress the importance of information sources on the formation of perceptions.

**H10 and H11: Different perceptions lead to different levels of push (H10) and pull (H11) satisfaction**

From the motivation theory mentioned above it could be argued that the tourist on holiday looks for rewards: psychological rewards (relaxation, rest, and refreshment), social rewards (recognition, prestige) (Gnoth, 1997); and economic rewards (measured by the perceived value of the destination). Petrick (2002), Gnoth (1997), Baloglu and McCleary (1999) and Gartner (1993), among others, have stated that the tourist has an affective and cognitive image of the destination, so it could be expected that perceptions influence push and pull satisfaction.
H12: Push satisfaction is determined by a set of internal rewards

Push satisfaction happens when the tourist has a feeling of psychological and social fulfilment.

H13: Pull satisfaction is determined by the perceived value of the destination

Perceived value has been defined as the global evaluation of the use of a product or service based on the perceptions of what you get versus what you give (Zeithaml, 1988). It has also been suggested that higher levels of perceived value result in purchase and in higher levels of consumer satisfaction (Bojanic, 1996).

H14: Pull satisfaction was expected to influence push satisfaction


H15 and H16: The level of push (H15) and pull (H16) satisfaction obtained determines future behavioural intentions

Levitt (1981), Whipple and Thatch (1988) and LaTour and Peat (1979) state that the evaluation of the product’s attributes could be crucial to determine behavioural intentions. While there is no guarantee that a satisfied consumer will repeat his or her visit, an unsatisfied consumer will not generally return (Dube, Renaghan and Miller, 1994; Barsky, 1992). Madrigal (1995) and Oliver (1993) argue that if an experience has a positive effect on the tourist, he or she is more likely to return. For the authors, it is a fact that if a tourist is not satisfied, then he or she will certainly not return. Festinger (1954) argues that satisfaction with the destination influences future choices. Beerli and Martín (2004) prove that sun and beach destinations with a good image have a high level of repeat visitors.
**H17: Behavioural intentions are explained by two factors**

Behavioural intentions that represent the willingness to return and the intention to recommend are the two likely outcomes of future behaviour (Yoon and Uysal, 2005).

4. Methodology

4.1 Survey

The questionnaires employed both open and closed questions in order to evaluate the sources of information, motivations, perceptions, the level of post-purchase satisfaction and future behavioural intentions using a seven point Likert scale, as suggested by Maio and Olson (1994). Respondents were invited to participate in the survey and were asked to fill out the questionnaires during the flight, and just before arriving at the airport. Data collection took place between July and September 2004, as this is the period during which the majority of Portuguese people go on holiday. The questionnaires were subjected to a pre-test which was carried out on a sample of 150 passengers upon departure and on arrival. This pre-test enhanced the validity and reliability of the questionnaires. After this pre-test, minor ammends were made in order to avoid eventual logic and/or question perception errors.

The first questionnaire begins with the tourist’s personal characteristics (age, sex, marital status, profession, education and nationality). The logistics and travel experience section is intended to determine the budget for the trip, the frequency of travel, time restrictions, average length of stay, number of people travelling together, the type of lodging, how the trip was booked, and previous experience. This is followed by an analysis of the learning process, motivations and perceptions. It was only possible to measure the level of importance of each of the alternative sources of information in the purchase decision. Seven sources of
information were used: travel agencies, brochures and guidebooks, friends and family, advertising, books and films, articles and news reports, and direct mail. The information sources considered in this study result from a literature review in which each is discussed. Rojek (1990) discusses the role of advertising and television in explaining consumer behaviour. Schofield (1996) argues that the consumer actually buys signals and images rather than products, as a result of the marketing stimulus. Goosens (2000) defines involvement as the state that defines the interests and motivations of the consumer about the product, and explains the way in which they look for more information in order to learn about the product. According to this author, the tourist perceives the value of a destination according to the marketing stimuli that are found in magazines, brochures and publicity, among others. His model tries to explain how tourists perceive visual and external information. Woodside and Dubelaar (2002) define the theory of tourism consumption systems as the inter-relationship between different sets of variables in which the role of web advertising, information guides, marketing and advertisements play a central role to explain the decision of the consumer. Their model highlights the role of information sources in explaining motivations, perceptions and the post-purchase evaluation. Fodness and Murray (1999) conclude that tourists use different sources of information to plan their vacations. The main information sources used by tourists were brochures, guidebooks, friends and relatives, magazines, newspapers, personal experience, travel agents; sources that were also used in our study, as well as the internet and direct mail.

The second question was structured around 21 statements which reflect the main motivational factors identified in the literature (Uysal, Mclellan and Syarakaya, 1996; Iso-Ahola and Mannel, 1987; Lundberg, 1990; Fodness, 1994; Mohsin and Ryan, 2003; Shoemaker, 1989; Correia, Valle and Moço, 2005; Silvestre and Correia, 2005; Correia, Barros and Silvestre, 2006). The motivations considered appear in table 1.
Still in this phase, we intended to determine the perceptions regarding the destination, shown in table 1. This construct follows the lines presented in the paper by Correia, Valle and Moço (2005), who, based on the work of Baloglu and McCleary (1999), assume that perceptions are a function of external and internal motivations.

The second questionnaire was administered after the holiday experience, on the return flight. This consisted of a first group of questions about travel data, which allowed us to connect the two questionnaires, a second group about behavioural intentions and a third about satisfaction.

The behavioural intention is established by the tourists level of satisfaction and is evaluated in terms of the probability of returning and recommending the destination to friends and family (Moutinho, 1987; Baker and Crompton, 1998). With this group of questions we intended to check the probability of returning and recommending. The behavioural intentions concept arises in the literature with the theory of reasoned action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1980), which assumes that intentions can explain the consumer’s behaviour. This concept was only adopted and tested in the tourism context - as far as we know - by Cronin, Joseph and Taylor (1992) and Baker and Crompton (1998). Backman and Crompton (1991) argue that loyalty is not only defined by behavioural intentions, but also by attitude, so it is necessary to understand the tourist’s attitude towards the destination in order to determine his or her loyalty. Following this idea, our study is only intended to explain the behavioural intentions.

The third group measures satisfaction with the 21 attributes found to be important in the decision process. The authors define this as pull satisfaction.

According to Spreng, Mackenzie and Olshavsky (1996), satisfaction is an emotional state directed towards a product or service. With this definition the authors intend to go beyond the traditional concept of confirmation/disconfirmation, widely defined as quality or performance of a product (Parasuman, 2000; Oliver, 1980). This definition is in accordance with
psychological theories (Oliver, 1980), which argue that overall satisfaction is also a sociopsychological state of being that leads the consumer to evaluate the product differently, according to his or her emotional state. Our model departs from this point of view to depict and analyze two different levels of satisfaction: emotional satisfaction is measured here by the level of achievement of internal motives, and is defined as pull satisfaction, while cognitive satisfaction is measured by the perceived quality of the destination’s attributes. Therefore, still in this group, the level of satisfaction is evaluated, internally, with the confirmation/disconfirmation concept, also using a 7 point scale. This evaluation takes into account the 16 motives that push the tourist towards the destination, referred to as push satisfaction. In terms of quality performance, the above 21 attributes of the destination are evaluated using the same seven point Likert scale (table 1). This dimension of evaluating satisfaction is labelled pull satisfaction.

The questionnaires were individually checked and numbered. The statistics were elaborated with the help of the SPSS 14.0 program (SPSS Inc., 2005) and analysis of moment structures (AMOS 6), which not only permit the verification of each question individually, but also facilitate a descriptive and multivariable statistical analysis, and consequently, the validation of the variables’ importance when explaining the behaviour of the tourist as a consumer, as well as outlining and testing structural models that corroborate the cause-effect relationships in the decision process and exploring those relationships based on perceptual maps.

Table 1 here

4.2 Data

Two questionnaires were developed in order to test the proposed hypotheses. The questionnaires, which were presented to a stratified, random sample of Air Luxor passengers, were completed on incoming and outgoing flights. The first questionnaire was developed in
order to determine the information sources used to learn about the destination, the motives that led to the choice of that destination, and the perceptions that they had of it.

The second questionnaire was completed on the return flights in order to determine the level of satisfaction with the experience, and behavioural intentions. The sample was stratified by destination, using the airline database. Because of budgetary restrictions and the limited time available, we decided to collect data from 1,097 questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed during the flight to destinations such as Brazil, Morocco, Egypt, the Dominican Republic, and Sao Tome and Principe, presupposing two questioning times. 1,097 questionnaires about perceptions and motivations were distributed on departure, and 1,091 tourists classified the quality and satisfaction regarding their destination upon their return. Of the 1,091 questionnaires completed, 453 were answered by the same tourists in both situations, departure and return. A response rate of 41.5%, is justified by the specificity of the analysis presented, and because the questionnaires were not always handed out to people on the same planes or going to the same places both on departure and arrival. Hence, we can be certain that the 453 tourists who completed the questionnaires were representative of Air Luxor passengers, and therefore of Portuguese tourists in exotic destinations, since such people mostly travel on Air Luxor charter flights.

First, a univariate descriptive analysis of the questions was undertaken by calculating summary measures (measures of central tendency, dispersion and absolute and relative frequencies). The main goal of this preliminary analysis was to characterize the people who were questioned, both from a sociodemographic point of view, and regarding the sources of information that conditioned their choice of the exotic destination. The social classes were defined according to Dubois (1993); high class: corporate executives, liberal professions, high-salaried professionals; high-medium: Lower-paid professionals; medium-lower: blue-
collar workers and manual labourers. The characterization of the sample is presented in table 2, shown below.

**Table 2 here**

The sample under study is represented by 48.6% men and 51.4% women, and the relative balance between the genders shows the predominance of family holidays. The average age of the tourists was 35.6, however the mode (the value which appears most often) is 27 years of age. With a below average purchasing power, the majority of the individuals questioned presented a higher level of education, were married, without young children.

The travel experience and its logistics are shown in table 3.

**Table 3 here**

The majority of the individuals questioned travelled once a year, and with a budget of under 1,500 Euros (73.1%), they try to combine time off work with existing holiday special offers. Without prior travel experience (83.7%), but hoping to find low prices at travel agencies (95.1%), many booked less than one month beforehand (75.7%). On average, the number of family members who travel together was 1.8, with an average length of stay of 9.1 days in exotic places such as Brazil (25.4%), Egypt (25.4%), and the Dominican Republic (40.6%).

The majority of people who answered the questionnaires stayed at beach hotels (51.4%) or at resorts (31.1%) where everything was included (53.12%).

**4.3 Statistical Data Analysis**

The main objective of this study is to test a structural model that permits the representation of the whole process of the tourist’s decision making. SEM allows us to evaluate how well a
conceptual model that contains observed and latent variables explains and fits the data (Yoon and Uysal, 2005). This technique also allows us to measure causal relationships among latent constructs, estimating the amount of unexplained variance (Yoon and Uysal, 2005). Our conceptual model shows a set of relationships among latent and observed variables, based on previous empirical and theoretical studies. Therefore, the statistical approach adopted in this paper is based on SEM. This analysis was performed in two stages. The first was an EFA used as a preliminary technique to find the underlying dimensions or constructs in the data. This procedure available on SPSS 14.0 is used to reduce data and identify the latent constructs that explain most of the variance of the observed variables. The extraction method applied was maximum-likelihood, an interactive algorithm that produces parameter estimates based on an observed correlation matrix. The correlations are weighted using the inverse of the uniqueness of the variables. The method of factor rotation used was varimax, an orthogonal rotation method which minimizes the number of observed variables with high loadings on each latent construct, which makes the interpretation of the factors easier. A latent root criterion of 1.0 was used for factor inclusion; to extract factors the cut-off of 0.5 was used as the criterion to include items in the factors. A subsequent confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to evaluate the resulting scales. This analysis specifies the relationships of the observed variables to the latent constructs, and it is believed that all the constructs can be inter-correlated freely. The reliability of the obtained factors was measured by Alpha Cronbach’s coefficient (Cronbach, 1951), while the goodness of fit for each construct was analyzed independently. If the scales are validated, we can proceed to the estimation of the structural model.

Having identified the factors that contribute the most to the formation of each construct, a SEM was estimated in order to assess the underlined research hypotheses. The factors obtained by means of EFA were used as indicators of the latent constructs: information
sources, push and pull motives, push and pull satisfaction, and behavioural intentions. The model was estimated with the AMOS 6 software (Arbuckle and Wothke, 1999) and the asymptotically distribution free estimation method was applied. The model fit was evaluated by following the approach suggested by Hair, Anderson, Tatham and Black (1998), which first requires the assessment of the overall model fit, and then the measurement and structural models individually (Correia, Valle and Moço, 2005).

The types of overall model fit measures usually used are absolute, incremental and parsimoniously fit measures. Absolute fit measures are used to evaluate how the theoretical model fits the sample data. The incremental fit measures compare a target model with a more restricted model, while the parsimonious fit measures diagnose the degree to which the model fit was improved by an excess of coefficients.

To represent the absolute fit measures, we used the chi-square goodness-of-fit test, although it is very sensitive at sample size. Therefore, the goodness-of-fit index (GFI) (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1986), the root mean square residual (RMSR) and the root mean square residual of approximation (RMSEA) (Steiger, 1990) were used to evaluate the proposed model’s overall absolute fit. The incremental fit measures used to evaluate the proposed model’s fit were: the adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) (Joreskog and Sorbom, 1986), the normed fit index (NFI) (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980), the Tucker and Lewis index (TLI) (Tucker and Lewis, 1973), the incremental fit index (IFI) (Bollen, 1988), the relative fit index (RFI) (Bollen, 1986) and the comparative fit index (CFI) (Bentler, 1990). In general the measurement model could be accepted if the indexes were closer to 1 (perfect fit), as values closer to 0 indicate no fit. In the particular case of RMSR and RMSEA, smaller values are better (0 indicates a perfect fit).
When evaluating the measurement model, each latent variable was assessed separately by examining the standardized loading, the construct reliability, and the variance extracted. When analyzing the structural model fit, parameter estimates were examined in relation to their sign and statistical significance. Standardized estimates are useful in comparing the parameters’ effect throughout the model, since they remove scaling information. All the proposed hypotheses were tested by observing the statistical significance of the corresponding paths in the structural model.

This methodology ends with the representation of the relationship between information sources, push factors, pull factors, perceptions, push and pull satisfaction and behavioural intention, on perceptual maps. Perceptual maps are performed with a CATPCA. This analysis necessitated the recoding of the main components - information sources, motivations, satisfaction, and behavioural intentions - in order to convert them into categorical variables. This method allows us to simultaneously correlate a group of categorical variables and present the results geometrically in a bidimensional space, called a perceptual map, in which the visualization of the connections made among the categories allows for an easier interpretation of the results. On the map, the categories represented by points when relatively close and with similar distributions show the association among the variables. On the other hand, categorical variables with very different distributions suggest a non-correlation among variables. In this study, the perceptual maps show the connections among the information sources used, motivational factors, elements of satisfaction and behavioural intentions. This explanatory analysis allows us therefore to understand how the different factors associate themselves in order to explain the tourist’s behaviour when making a choice.

These maps complete the analysis provided by the SEM since they allow a detailed evaluation of the relations among each construct, this analysis was carried out with SPSS, 14.
We now proceed with the analysis of the results.

5. RESULTS

5.1 The Constructs of the Model

The latent constructs of the model were analyzed by means of an EFA. The results of the EFA determined significantly correlated factors, including four information sources, three push motivations, three pull motivations, three pull satisfactions, three push satisfactions, and two behavioural intentions. These factors are relevant because they have significant loadings. In the following subsections, the latent constructs of the model are presented, as well as the indicators of each latent variable. The results of the EFA are presented separately for each construct in the following sub-sections.

Information Sources

The information sources classified by the tourists with the Likert scale were submitted to an EFA. The EFA allowed us to extract one factor that represents 53.415% of the total variation (table 4). The variables mail, travel agencies, and family and friends were removed since the EFA fitted well without them. Therefore, the obtained factor, labelled information sources, has high loadings in the following observed variables: movies, news, promotion, brochures.

Table 4 here

Table 4 also shows the relative importance of each attribute (average) as an information source, on a Likert scale from 1 (not importance), to 7 (extremely important). The results obtained are in accordance with Fodness and Murray (1999) and Woodside and Dubelaar
(2002), who assume that brochures are one of the main sources of information in which the tourist finds most of the information they need, followed by newspapers. Movies and promotion, understood to be complementary sources, activate the tourist’s motivations and fuel the learning process about the destination. Travel agencies and family and friends were expected to appear as privileged information sources, however, this was not actually the case. The lack of any tradition among Portuguese people of travelling abroad on holiday explains why they do not consider the recommendations of family and friends. Only 16.3% of the sample had previous experience of travelling abroad on holiday. It is curious that travel agents were not seen as important sources, as 95.1% of tourists included in the sample made their reservations through a travel agency (table 3).

**Motivation**

In order to ascertain the push motivations, we submitted 16 original variables to an EFA, which resulted in three motivational factors that explain 60.489% of the total variables, as shown in table 5, after varimax rotation.

The characteristics of a destination are also preponderate in the choice phase. Therefore, the level of importance of 21 factors as decisive elements in the decision process were evaluated. These factors, which appear in literature as pull motives, were submitted to an EFA analysis from which three factors arose that explain 52.983% of the total variance.

Considering the meaning of the motives with higher loadings, the push factors were labelled knowledge motivation, social motivation and recreational motivation. The pull factors were labelled facilities, core attractions and landscape.

**Table 5 here**
The first push factor, motivation knowledge, is especially related to the need to do and learn new things as well as exploring different cultures and places, and includes increasing knowledge, amusement, getting to know different cultures and lifestyles, intellectual growth, and visiting new places. The second push factor, social motivation, put forward the need to visit places that friends had not been to, telling friends about the trip, and developing close friendships. These factors are related to social rewards, also discussed by Gnoth (1997). The push factor recreational motivation mainly includes motives related to personal well-being, such as stress relief, escape from routine and physical relaxation, presented as physical rewards. These results are in accordance with previous studies, in particular Gnoth (1997), who discusses three different push motives: self-actualization, sense of self-esteem and social status.

The first pull motive, referred to as facilities, is related to weather, accessibility, gastronomy, security, relaxing atmosphere and social environment. The second, core attractions, is related to shopping facilities, nightlife, and sports, while landscape motivations includes natural environment and landscape.

The mean scores obtained and presented in the penultimate column of the table show that the main leading push motivations that lead tourists to visit exotic places, concerning knowledge motivations, are related to amusement, getting to know new places and cultures, and doing different things. Regarding social motivations, tourists value the development of friendships and talking about the holidays with friends. The leading recreational motivations are related to stress relief and escape from routine. In what concerns the pull motivations, it is obvious that the social component contributes less to the choice of destination, highlighting only the social atmosphere variable. The natural environment and touristic facilities determine the formation of the destination’s image, since they were classified as being very important by the majority
of the Portuguese tourists, at the maximum value of the scale. These include attributes such as landscape and nature, security, weather and facilities, indicative of the fact that the natural resources of a destination constitute competitive components.

**Satisfaction**

Satisfaction is defined as a state of well-being resulting from the feeling that holidays compensate the intrinsic motivations and predispose the evaluation of the services used during the trip. To demonstrate the fact that satisfaction is emotional and cognitive, the 16 factors that were used to measure the push motivations, and the 21 factors identified as pull motivations were replicated. These factors were submitted to two EFA analyses, with a maximum likelihood estimation. The first was concerned with an evaluation of the push satisfaction, (on a scale of 1- worse than expected; to 7- surpassed my expectations) and resulted in three emotional satisfaction factors that explained 72.233% of the total variance, as shown in table 6, after varimax rotation. The second concerned the 21 attributes of the destination considered in the pull motivations evaluation. In terms of pull satisfaction, as can be observed in table 6, three factors were extracted that explained 49.169% of the total variance.

**Table 6 here**

The first push satisfaction factor, recreational satisfaction, mainly concerns the evaluation of emotional states related to personal well-being, such as stress relief, escape from routine, physical relaxation, and getting away from crowds. The second factor, knowledge satisfaction, is especially related to the sense that during the trip they can do and learn new things as well as exploring different cultures and places, which includes increasing knowledge, getting to know different cultures and lifestyles, visiting new places and
interesting people, as well as going to places where their friends have not been. The third push satisfaction factor, adventure satisfaction, put forward the sense that they have done different things, have experienced challenging emotions, and have had an adventure.

Pull satisfaction is related to the cognitive evaluation of the quality level of the services tourists have experienced during the trip. The first pull satisfaction factor, labelled facilities brings together the tourist’s level of satisfaction with the social environment, hospitality, relaxing atmosphere, information, gastronomy, and exoticness. The second, labelled core attractions, is related to cultural attractions, shopping facilities, nightlife, sports, and transport. Sun and sand satisfaction combine weather with landscape and beach.

The mean scores obtained and presented in the penultimate column of the table show that the most positive aspects of exotic places are weather, beaches, landscape, and hospitality. These destinations are also considered to be places where it is possible to escape from routine, do completely different things, meet interesting people, as well as having the satisfaction of visiting new places and learning about new cultures.

**Behavioural Intentions**

Behavioural intentions are measured by means of an EFA that combines two factors, the intention to return to the destination and the willingness to recommend that place to friends and relatives (Opperman, 2000). From this analysis there was a resulting factor, labelled behavioural intentions, which explains 79.254% of the total variance (table 7).

**Table 7 here**

Considering a Likert scale of seven points, the behavioural intentions are very positive, although tourists are more likely to revisit than to recommend. This conclusion is related to
the standard deviation that is higher for willingness to recommend than for probability of returning.

5.2 The Measurement Model

The CFA of the measurement model specifies the relationships of each observed variable with the latent construct. Assuming that all the constructs are freely inter-correlated, this analysis is performed on each construct separately before testing the measurement and structural model. This prior analysis allows us to understand which constructs and observed variables must be re-specified to improve the structural model.

The hypothetical model is a structural equation system with observable variables and latent constructs. Then, by imposing the constraints on the loadings as they emerged from the EFA, a CFA was used to assess and validate the measurement model, with all the constructs allowed to be freely inter-correlated. This model fits the data well, the regression coefficients and the covariance factor are all significant at the 1% and 5% level. Coefficient alphas for the latent variables are shown in table 8. All the factors show good reliability, because all the values are greater than 0.70.

Table 8 here

The measurement model demonstrates an adequate reliability and good fit indices, therefore it is possible to estimate the structural model.
5.3 The Structural Model

The complete model was estimated by the asymptotically distribution-free method using the AMOS 6 software. This method was selected because the database was not distributed normally. The standardized coefficients estimated are reported in figure 2. All the coefficients are significant at 1% significance level, only the path between pull motivations *path* and perceptions are not significant. As the chi-square is an adjustment measure, which is strongly influenced by sample size, other adjustment measures were used to evaluate the model. The selected overall fit indices are reported in table 9. The chi-square statistic indicates that the model fits the data well (\( \chi^2 = 139.339 \), \( df = 125 \), \( p = 0.180 > 0.05 \)). The other goodness of fit measures also indicate a good overall model fit (GFI=0.991 exceeds the level of 0.9; the RMSR=0.016 and RMSEA =0.021 are closer to zero, as desired). The other indicators closer to 1 indicate a good incremental and parsimonious fit.

*Figure 2 here*

*Table 9 here*

The empirical model fits the data well and allowed us to prove all the hypotheses, with the exception of H6, H8 and H9.

It was expected that the tourist used different sources of information to become acquainted with the destination (H1). According to the results, news reports and movies positively influence the latent variable information sources, as well as promotion and brochures; however, these present lower standardized coefficients, respectively 0.666 and 0.436. This suggests that brochures and promotion are not as important to the tourist as are news reports and movies.
Information sources may positively influence the formation of push motivations (H2) and this is what happens; the standardized coefficient estimated is 0.153. Contrary to what might be expected, the information sources negatively influence the pull motivations (H3), with a standardized coefficient of -0.201. This result shows that the information sources appear more as a source of selling dreams rather than an information source about the attributes and facilities of the destination.

According to Dann (1977) and Crompton (1990) the motives that lead the tourist to travel are social, rest and knowledge. As proved by Correia, Valle and Moço (2005), the internal motivations that positively influence the desire to travel (H4) are knowledge, recreation, and social motives.

According to Uysal and Hagan (1993) and Crompton (1990), the pull motives are related to the attributes of the destination and its attractions. Our empirical model allows us to identify three pull motives (facilities, core attractions and landscape), all of which positively influence the latent variable pull motive (H5).

Pull motives are not affected by push motives (H6), so hypothesis is rejected. It is also proved that perceptions of the destination are influenced by push motives (H7), as was demonstrated by a standardized coefficient of 0.125 and a t-value of 2.851. The perceptions of the tourists are not influenced by the pull motives, as well as by information sources, so hypotheses H8 and H9 are rejected. Emotional satisfaction (push) was found to be negatively influenced by the perceptions (H10), with a standardized coefficient of -0.348. Satisfaction with the destination’s attributes is influenced by the perceptions (H11) as was demonstrated by a standardized coefficient of 0.281. Emotional satisfaction (H12) is a result of knowledge, recreational and adventure; satisfaction factors that present positive standardized coefficients, respectively 0.428, 0.593 and 0.382. The destination is perceived in terms of the sun and sand
component, core attractions, and facilities (H13). These factors present positive standardized coefficients, respectively 0.415, 0.367 and 0.519.

Pull satisfaction positively influences push satisfaction (H14), with standardized coefficients of 0.402, this result suggests that the way in which tourists perceive cognitive satisfaction influence their emotional satisfaction.

The push (H15) and pull (H16) satisfaction positively explained the behavioural intentions, with standardized coefficients of 0.489 and 0.316, statistical significance at the 1% level.

Behavioural intentions are explained by the intention to recommend and the probability of return (H17), and these factors present positive standardized coefficients, statistically significant at the 1% level, respectively 0.659 and 0.811.

### 5.4 Categorical Principal Component Analysis

In order to explore the relationships between each factor in the constructs of the model in depth (information sources, push motives, pull motives, push satisfaction, pull satisfaction and behavioural intentions) a CATPCA was performed on the categorized factors. From the structural model, a significant influence of information sources on the formation of push and pull motivations was demonstrated.

In figure 3 we can see that all those who found sources of information to be very important were those who showed greater intrinsic motivations about the trip. The lines going in the opposite direction, associated with the push motivations and sources of information, show that the tourist conducted an indiscriminate search for information.

**Figure 3 here**
The indiscriminate research about the destination relates only to push motivations. Even though the tourist uses other information sources fairly randomly to learn about the destination’s core attractions, brochures provide the majority of the information. This conclusion is a result of the proximity of the orange and white blue lines, presented in figure 4.

**Figure 4 here**

Figure 4 shows that the individuals who find the sources of information to be more important are also those who show more highly developed perceptions about the destination.

The perceptual map represented in figure 5 allows us to come to two conclusions. The more highly motivated the tourist is, the more well developed are his or her perceptions. On the other hand, as the cream and purple lines are close, we can state that perceptions about the destination are a result of social motivations.

**Figure 5 here**

The perceptual map which relates perceptions to push satisfaction (figure 6) shows that more highly developed perceptions are connected to greater levels of emotional satisfaction. This connection is more obvious with recreational satisfaction, as can be seen by the proximity of the blue line to the purple line.

**Figure 6 here**

The perceptual map which relates perceptions with pull satisfaction (figure 7) confirm that more highly developed perceptions are connected to greater levels of cognitive satisfaction. This connection is more obvious with sun and sand satisfaction, the attribute that they perceive better.
The perceptual map which relates push and pull satisfactions (figure 8) shows that intellectual reward (knowledge) is connected to the satisfaction of core attractions. On the other hand, satisfaction with recreation is connected to satisfaction with facilities. Satisfaction with sun and sand are separate from the others.

The perceptual map which relates push satisfaction to behavioural intentions (figure 9) shows that tourists recommend exotic destinations and intend to return because of satisfaction with recreation. This result suggests that this kind of destination is very good for rest and relaxation, even if you want to engage in sports or experience the nightlife, as was the case.

Regarding satisfaction with the attributes of the destination, facilities is the main factor that determines positive behavioural intentions, and this means that this kind of destination is good enough in terms of tourism resources, even if tourists are not aware of them through the information sources available (figure 10).

6. Discussion and Managerial Implications

This study has sought to develop a conceptual model of tourist decision making, and provides tenable evidence of the importance of six different constructs to achieve the final decision and to predict the post-purchase behaviour. The tourist decision process can be analyzed in two phases: the pre-decision phase, which ends with the choice, and the post-decision phase, in
which emotional and cognitive satisfaction determines future behavioural intentions. In the pre-decision process, external stimuli and motivations determine the final perceptions about the destination, and this leads to the final choice.

This model, which combines the two different phases of tourist behaviour, shows tangible results in an empirical field, and can be considered a step forward in the tourist behaviour literature. Even though each of the constructs has been widely discussed and tested in the literature, as far as we know, the causal relationships among them has not been examined. This model has only been tested on Portuguese tourists travelling to exotic places, and it is believed that it could be applied and tested in a wider spectrum.

The major findings of this study have some significant managerial implications, especially for the marketers who promote exotic places.

This study provides evidence of the importance of the different information sources to the tourists’ decision making processes. The main information sources used to activate the need to travel in the tourist’s mind were movies, news reports, promotion, and brochures, as these positively influence push motivations. For the purposes of gathering of information about the attributes of the destination (pull motives), these sources, and particularly brochures, appear to be insufficient as the structural model shows a negative path between information sources and pull motives (figure 2). This result suggests that the existing information has been designed to “sell dreams”; in other words, to activate the need for the holiday, rather than to provide information about the tourism resources of the destination. Managers should include more information in brochures about the core product in order to allow the tourist to decide what they could do during their holiday. Since selling dreams is so important as selling products, the information sources should separate these issues in two kinds of promotional brochures. One should be designed to appeal to the need for travel, depicting beautiful
scenery and other attractive attributes in order to sell the product – the holiday, while the other should provide information about the core attractions and facilities provided.

The mean scores for the importance of each information source allow marketers to prioritize the means they have at their disposal to approach the tourist. Since the most important sources of information are brochures and news reports, they should be the first to be organized and developed according to the expectations of tourists.

The EFA performed on the motivations showed that tourists perceive three different push motivations and three pull motivations, although only the push motivations contribute to the tourists’ perception of the selected destination, and consequently, influence satisfaction and future behaviour. Thus, managers should consider these variables as determinants to improve satisfaction and consequent future behaviour. The knowledge motivations are fundamentally related to amusement, visiting new places, encountering different cultures and doing different things. The social motivations are related to developing friendships and social acceptance, while the recreational motivations are related to stress relief and escape from the daily routine. These results constitute important evidence which could be used to improve marketing strategies.

The means scores of these motivations show that the most important factors that motivate Portuguese tourists to travel are related to social status and knowledge. Core attractions are not relevant, but landscape and facilities are important.

Most tourists have highly developed perceptions about the destinations they are travelling to, although these perceptions are based only on push motives, as shown in the structural model. Furthermore, the perceptual map (figure 5) shows that the more motivated the tourist is, the more favourably he or she perceives the destination. These perceptions are especially high due to the social connotations that these destinations have. These results suggest that
managers should encourage tourists to perceive these destinations as a core product in which the facilities and quality are also competitive advantages that can be put together with the achievement of the “social dream” of travelling to an exotic far-away destination.

The EFA performed on the satisfaction demonstrates highlighted variables that tourists evaluate the destination on two dimensions: emotional (push) and cognitive (pull). The emotional dimension relies on three evaluation factors: recreation, knowledge, and adventure. The cognitive evaluation appears to be related to facilities, core attractions, and sun and sand attributes. The mean scores obtained by each factor suggest that the competitive advantages perceived by tourists in exotic destinations are weather, beaches, landscape, and hospitality. These destinations are also perceived as ideal places in which to do different things, to rest, to learn about different cultures and to meet different people. The significant path between perceptions, push satisfaction, and the related perceptual map (figure 6) confirms that this kind of destination is seen as the ideal place in which to fulfil a dream as well as to pursue the sun and sand facilities (figure 7). The structural model also shows a significant path between emotional satisfaction and cognitive satisfaction, which means that the greater the personal satisfaction, the better will be the evaluation of the services received during the stay. The perceptual map (figure 8) reinforces this result, showing which push satisfaction factors are more correlated with which pull satisfaction factors. It seems that knowledge satisfaction is correlated with core attraction satisfaction. On the other hand, satisfaction with recreational is connected to the facilities evaluation. Sun and sand satisfaction are uncorrelated with the others, probably because it is something obviously expected. These factors are fundamental for tourism managers when positioning exotic tourist destinations.

As the measurement model demonstrates, it was possible to estimate the structural model that empirically tests the conceptual model with an adequate degree of reliability, and it was
possible to verify 14 hypotheses of the 17 proposed. The hypotheses that could not be verified were the path between information sources and perceptions, between pull motives and perceptions, and between push and pull motives. Since these hypotheses have not been verified, we can conclude that tourists do not understand the destination’s attributes, but simply decide and evaluate according to emotional feelings.

Finally, satisfaction determines future behavioural intentions, since we have established a significant path between push satisfaction and behavioural intentions, as well as between pull satisfaction and future behaviour. The perceptual maps (figure 9 and 10) go deeper into these relationships, showing that the main leading satisfaction factors that determine future behaviour are facilities and recreational. This means that exotic destinations, as well as providing a tranquil environment which encourages tourists to perceive them as predominantly recreational, also have good tourism infrastructures that are only perceived during the stay because of the lack of information about them.

7. Conclusions

It can be concluded that tourists’ behavioural intentions have causal relationships with information sources, motivations, perceptions and satisfaction. The model divides these motivations into push and pull concepts, and shows evidence of each of push motives positively influencing the perceptions about the destination, which in turn, determine different levels of emotional and cognitive satisfaction after the trip, both of which influence future behaviour.

In the literature, although the importance of these constructs has been widely discussed, little has been done to test the reliability and structural relationships of all the constructs within the same model. Evidence from the literature is used to define the whole conceptual model that
appears in these sources as a strong but only theoretical base. Several interesting and useful managerial insights and implications arising from this study have been discussed. The general conclusion is that future behaviour is determined by emotional and cognitive satisfaction, which in turn is affected by perceptions which are determined by the emotional motivations stimulated by the existing sources of information.

The model was tested on a specific tourism destination and market – that of Portugal, and this is the main limitation of this study. The replication of this model for other destinations is suggested as a way to generalize its findings more widely. Further research is necessary to ascertain the degree to which sources of information influence post-purchase satisfaction. Finally, the risk inherent in the decision should be included in the model, as well as the attitude towards the destination, in order to measure tourist loyalty.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Variables</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Response Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Sources Constructs</strong></td>
<td>How important is each source of information when choosing a destination?</td>
<td>1- Not important; 2- Not very important; 3- Of very little importance; 4- Important; 5- More than important; 6- Very important; 7- Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency; Brochures; Family; Promotion; Movies; News; Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pull Motives Constructs</strong></td>
<td>How important is each of the factors when choosing a destination?</td>
<td>1- Not important; 2- Not very important; 3- Of very little importance; 4- Important; 5- More than important; 6- Very important; 7- Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastronomy; Social environment; Accessibilities; Relaxing atmosphere; Security; Weather; Information; Landscape; Natural environment; Cultural attractions Shopping facilities; Night-life; Sports equipment; Transports; Accommodations; Beach; Hospitality; Exoticness; Ethnicities; Lifestyles; Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Push Motives Constructs</strong></td>
<td>How important is each of the factors when choosing a destination?</td>
<td>1- Not important; 2- Not very important; 3- Of very little importance; 4- Important; 5- More than important; 6- Very important; 7- Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing different cultures and lifestyles; Increasing knowledge; Enriching myself intellectually; Visiting new places; Amusement; Going places my friends have not been; Telling my friends about the trip; Developing close friendships; Relieving stress; Escaping from the routine; Physical relaxation; Getting away from crowds; Meeting interesting people; Doing different things; Stimulating emotions and sensations; Being an adventurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>What are your perceptions regarding the destination?</td>
<td>1-Very low; 2- Low; 3-Quite low; 4-Average; 5- Quite high; 6- High; 7-Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastronomy; Social environment; Accessibilities; Relaxing atmosphere; Security; Weather; Information; Landscape; Natural environment; Cultural attractions Shopping facilities; Night-life; Sports equipment; Transports; Accommodations; Beach; Hospitality; Exoticness; Ethnicities; Lifestyles; Distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pull Satisfaction Constructs</strong></td>
<td>How would you classify your level of satisfaction regarding the following factors?</td>
<td>1- Worse than I expected; 2- Lower than I expected; 3- Below average than I expected; 4- As expected; 5- Above what I expected; 6-Better than I expected; 7- Surpassed my expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing different cultures and lifestyles; Increasing knowledge; Enriching myself intellectually; Visiting new places; Amusement; Going places my friends have not been; Telling my friends about the trip; Developing close friendships; Relieving stress; Escaping from the routine; Physical relaxation; Getting away from crowds; Meeting interesting people; Doing different things; Stimulating emotions and sensations; Being an adventurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Push Satisfaction Constructs</strong></td>
<td>How would you classify your level of satisfaction regarding the following factors?</td>
<td>1- Worse than I expected; 2- Lower than I expected; 3- Below average than I expected; 4- As expected; 5- Above what I expected; 6-Better than I expected; 7- Surpassed my expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention Constructs</td>
<td>Do you intend to visit this destination again?</td>
<td>1- Never again; 2 Absolutely not; 3- No; 4-Probably; 5- Very probably; 6- Almost certainly; 7- Certainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you intend to recommend this destination to friends and family?</td>
<td>1- Absolutely not; 2- As a possible destination; 3- As a good destination; 4- Probably; 5- Very probably; 6- Almost certainly; 7- Certainly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.
Table 2 Sociodemographic characterization of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average age</strong></td>
<td><strong>35.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social status</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Medium</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-low</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With young children</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundary school</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

Table 3 Characterization of the touristic experience and logistics of the trip

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Touristic Experience</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Logistics of the Trip</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School holidays</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Marroco</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family restrictions</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposed by job</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enticing prices</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>The Dominican Republic</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather conditions of the destination</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>Less than 1000 €</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>From 1000 € to 1499 €</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>From 1500 € to 1999 €</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than three times a year</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>From 2000 € to 2499 €</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500 € or more</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>Holiday booking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>Travel Agency</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Directly with the operator</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booking in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operator’s Call Centre</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15 days</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 days or more and less than a month</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month or more and less than 3 months</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months or more</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Booking regime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Half Pension</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everything Included</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bed and breakfast</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of stay</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of family elements</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of accommodation booked</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel in the city</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Hotel</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aparthotel in the city</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beach Aparthotel</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.
Table 4 The results of EFA for information sources construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>% Variance Explained</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movies</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>53.415</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

Table 5 The results of EFA for motivations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>% Variance Explained</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Push Motivations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing different things</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating emotions and sensations</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an adventurer</td>
<td>0.519</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing knowledge</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing different cultures and life styles</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.394</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching myself intellectually</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting new places</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting interesting people</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going places my friends have not been</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling my friends about the trip</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing close friendships</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieving stress</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical relaxation</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaping from routine</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>1.424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pull Motivations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Motivations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibilities</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastronomy</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing atmosphere</td>
<td>0.672</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social environment</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exoticness</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Attractions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-life</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports equipment</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transports</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Motivations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.
Table 6 The results of EFA for satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>% Variance Explained</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Push Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Satisfaction</td>
<td>33.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieving stress</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Relaxation</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting away from crowds</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaping from the routine</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Satisfaction</td>
<td>24.334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing knowledge</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing different cultures and lifestyles</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching myself intellectually</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting new places</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting interesting people</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going places where my friends have not been</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing different things</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulating emotions and sensations</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an adventurer</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pull Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>18.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social environment</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing atmosphere</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastronomy</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>1.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exoticness</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Attractions Satisfaction</td>
<td>17.736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night-life</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping facilities</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural attractions</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports equipment</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transports</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun and Sand Satisfaction</td>
<td>12.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

Table 7 The results of EFA for behavioural intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>% Variance Explained</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>79.254</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.
### Table 8 Results of the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability (Alpha Cronbach)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push motivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull motivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural intentions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

### Table 9 Goodness of fit measures for the structural equation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute fit measures</th>
<th>Incremental and Parsimonious Fit Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GFI=0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGFI=0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square = 139.339 (df = 125; p=0.180)</td>
<td>NFI=0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSR=0.016</td>
<td>TLI=0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA=0.021</td>
<td>IFI=0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CFI=0.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.
Figure 1 Theoretical model of consumer behaviour

Figure 2 Structural model of consumer behaviour

Note: All the coefficients have a t-value significant at 1% significance level (p < 0.001); Hypotheses rejected

Source: Own elaboration.
Figure 3: Information sources and push motivations

Source: Own elaboration.

Figure 4: Information sources and pull motivations

Source: Own elaboration.
Figure 5 Perceptions and push motivations

Source: Own elaboration.

Figure 6 Perceptions and push satisfaction

Source: Own elaboration.
Figure 7 Perceptions and pull satisfaction

Source: Own elaboration.

Figure 8 Push and pull satisfaction

Source: Own elaboration.
Figure 9 Push satisfaction and behavioural intentions

Figure 10 Pull satisfaction and behavioural intentions

Source: Own elaboration.