Exploring Familiarity and Destination Choice in International Tourism

Geunhee Lee
School of Tourism & Hospitality Management
Temple University

and

Iis P. Tussyadiah
School of Tourism & Hospitality Management
Temple University

ABSTRACT

In order to successfully market a destination to international visitors and fully meet their needs, it is vital to understand the characteristics of prospective visitors. The aim of this study is to identify the characteristics of prospective tourists to a foreign country. More specifically, this study examines how the differences in the level of familiarity with the destination country (i.e., language proficiency of a host destination, culture acquaintance with a host destination, and previous travel experiences to a host country) influence destination choices in terms of scale and popularity. A survey was conducted with Korean Nationals as prospective visitors to tourism destinations in Japan. Six one-way ANOVA tests and two chi-square tests were performed to identify the relationships and differences between their characteristics and the destination choices. The results indicate that (1) teens and ones who are in their 50s and more are interested in visiting the most popular places than others are, (2) prospective tourists who are more familiar with Japan tend to visit less popular destinations, and (3) prospective tourists with more frequent travel experiences to the country tend to visit destinations with bigger scales and less popular. Managerial implication for each destination with different scales and popularities to customize their service for prospective visitors based on the result will be suggested.

Keywords: *Familiarity, Language proficiency, Culture acquaintance, Previous travel experience, Destination choice*

INTRODUCTION

It is of a vital importance for destination marketers to understand the characteristics of prospective and experienced tourists in order to successfully drive tourists' motivations to visit and revisit the destinations. Especially in the international tourism market, meeting the needs and wants of inbound visitors is key. . The tourist characteristics also need to be understood not only at the level of a host country but also at the level of sub-areas in a country as most inbound visitors only travel in limited regions of the country at a time, due to the time and expense constrains. Therefore, marketers for each sub-area in a country need to have their own destination promotion strategies in accordance with visitors who travel to the very destination.

The aim of this study is to identify the characteristics of prospective tourists visiting tourism destinations in a foreign country. More specifically, this study mainly examines how the

differences in the level of familiarity with the destination country (i.e., language proficiency of a host destination, familiarity with a host destination culture, and extent of previous travel experiences to a host country) influence destination choices. This study attempts to achieve the goal by surveying Korean nationals who visit Japan. The two countries, Korea and Japan, have unique and interesting interdependency as international tourism destinations for each other's residents. In 2009, both Korea National Tourism Organization (KNTO) and Japan National Tourism Organization (JNTO) report that the two countries are the biggest inbound and outbound markets for decades. Especially for Japan, which has promoted Visit Japan Champaign since 2003 to invite as many tourists as possible from countries worldwide, understanding the characteristics of prospective Korean tourists is extremely important for the success of inbound tourism market in Japan.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Familiarity as personal factors for prospective travel

Along with the typical personal characteristics such as age, gender, and occupation, which have been used to examine their significant influences on destination choice (Beerli & Martín, 2004), tourists' familiarity with a destination is equally important due to its vital role in destination choice process (Baloglu, 2001). Indeed, familiarity with a destination is often emphasized by many studies due to its significant impact on destination image and possible connection to destination choice. Although there are some debates that familiarity has both positive and negative influence on destination choice decision, it still stands as a powerful factor to predict tourist future intention.

Familiarity in consumer research starts as a unidimensional construct related to the amount of time spent for processing information about products and services (Baker, Hutchinson, Moore, & Nedungadi, 1986; Srull, 1983). The concept of familiarity in tourism, however, has been improved as a multidimensional construct with additional and segmented types to the amount of information consumers have acquired. For example, Hu and Ritchie (1993) note that familiarity with a destination incorporates geographic distance, previous visitation to a specific destination as well as the level of knowledge. The previous destination experience is emphasized again with level of knowledge as one of the familiarity constructs in the other studies (Baloglu, 2001; Tideswell & Faulkner, 1999). Moreover, Prentice (2004) attempt to further develop and extend the construct to seven different types of familiarity, namely (1) informational, (2) experiential, (3) proximate, (4) self-described, (5) educational, (6) self-assured, and (7) expected. Of all those additive constructs to the familiarity concept, previous destination experience is indeed a unique factor that can only be found in tourism research. It has been used as a significant measurement for tourists' familiarity to a destination in many studies revealing the positive relationship between familiarity and destination image (Ahmed, 1991; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Chon, 1991; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Milman & Pizam, 1995). These studies using the number of previous destination experience as experiential familiarity measurement often separate the prospective and experienced tourists into non-visit, one-time, and repeat visit groups (Kozak, 2001; Litvin & Ng Sok Ling, 2001). These studies examine how destination images vary in accordance with the group segments, but they fail to further investigate its influence on tourist destination choice process.

Since Goodrich (1978) had stated that the preference and likelihood of choice for a product can be influenced by knowledge of the product, the amount of information or level of knowledge that tourists have has long been noticed as an important factor for destination choice. Baloglu (2001) also suggests that the amount of information used (informational familiarity) must be considered along with the number of previous destination experience (experiential familiarity) in order to thoroughly measure tourists' familiarity to a destination. The concept of information familiarity, in part, comes from the role of awareness in the process of tourist destination choice. As Milman and Pizam (1995) early argue, even though familiarity with a destination has a great impact on the consumers' destination image formation and on the interest and likelihood to visit, familiarity needs awareness ahead of it so consumers have the initial idea of what the destination is. Thus, the level of knowledge also has its impact in the initial formation of familiarity with a destination.

In the international tourism market, the level of knowledge about a destination can be measured by culture acquaintance with al host destination and language proficiency of a host destination. Even though substantial time has passed since an initial claim by Cohen and Cooper (1986) arguing that the language of the host destination can extremely influence tourists' prospective destination choices was made, studies on the relationship between language of host destination and destination choice have been still under-investigated. The relationship among previous international travel experiences, higher communication skill, and future travel behavior intention has been once supported significantly by Sönmez and Graefe (1998), but their study only examines tourists' return intention influenced by perceived risk and safety from their experience and communication skill. Basala and Klenosky (2001) also note that tourists' proficiency with the language spoken in a particular host destination can serve as an important factor in the international travel decision making process, but their study only illustrates how two different groups (i.e., novelty-seeking and familiarity-seeking) vary in their preferences of a destination where either their own native language or different language is spoken. Therefore, a further investigation to verify the relationship between the destination familiarity measures (i.e., language proficiency of a host country, culture acquaintance with a host country, and previous travel experiences to a host country) and destination choice is needed.

Destination Choice

Destination choice is a complex process and the studies of destination choice have focused on the impacts of the attributes such as basic tourist personality traits (Lepp & Gibsonb, 2008), distance to or prices of a destination (Nicolau & Más, 2006), and climate information in a destination (Bigano, Hamilton, & Tol, 2006). Yet, while those studies examine the impacts of the attributes on tourists' intention to visit, revisit, or never visit a destination, the importance of destination choice to sub-areas in a given destination is still underestimated. How familiarity is connected to choices of different areas in a chosen destination (i.e., sub-choices) , needs more attention and examination as well.

The relationship between previous visit experience and a sub-choice in a given destination is once examined by Crompton and Ankomah (1993). In the research on three choice sets (i.e., early set of possible destination, late consideration set of probable alternatives, and final selection), they argue that the size of the early consideration set of tourism destination

within a given geographical area is likely to be larger for those prospective tourists who have visited the geographical area than for those who have never visited there and also larger for frequent visitors to the area than for infrequent visitors. Using Mallorca and Turkey for his case studies, Kozak (2001) also examine the determinants of the intention to revisit the same destination or to visit similar destinations in the same area (or country) related to previous visits. The results suggest that repeat tourists who visited a particular destination more than once have a higher loyalty to the destination than first-timers who are more likely to switch to other destination in the same area.

The studies on the relationship between previous destination visit experience and visit intention have their own limitations. They only examine the impact of previous destination experience as tourist familiarity to a destination on visit or revisit intention. Thus, the present study extends familiarity using both experiential familiarity and informational familiarity and examines its relationship with the tourists' destination choice of sub-areas within a given destination country considering their popularity level and scale based on the following propositions.

P1: People with different informational familiarity levels will tend to choose destination with different scales in a given destination country.

P2: People with different informational familiarity levels will tend to choose destinations with different popularity levels in a given destination country.

P3: People with different experiential familiarity levels will tend to choose destination with different scales in a given destination country.

P4: People with different experiential familiarity levels will tend to choose destination with different popularity levels in a given destination country.

METHODOLOGY

To carry out this study, a survey was conducted by means of a structured questionnaire on non-experienced and experienced Korean tourists to Japan. The data was collected through members of an online travel community that provides a variety of information on Japanese language, culture, and travel tips to its members. The questionnaires were answered by newly registered members as a way of permission to gain membership. The survey was conducted from September 24 to November 14, 2009 resulting in 391 responses. Twenty one responses were eliminated later due to some missing answers, leaving 370 as final data set.

The first part of the questionnaire includes informational familiarity attributes, comprising levels of Japanese language proficiency and Japanese culture acquaintance using self-rating 5-item Likert scale ranging from one for 'cannot speak Japanese at all' and 'do not know about Japanese culture at all' to five for 'can speak Japanese very fluently' and 'know about Japanese culture very well.' In the second part, respondents were required to select one destination in Japan where they want to visit in future. The questionnaire was open-ended, thus respondents could choose any name of tourism destination regardless of the scales (i.e., island,

prefecture, city, town, and attraction). Finally, general demographic information such as age, gender, and occupation was collected along with the questions about their desire to travel to Japan with 5-item Likert scale and the number of travel experience to Japan.

Japan is an island country in East Asia comprising 6,852 islands, but the four largest islands, which are Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, and Shikoku account for 97% of Japan's land area. Japan has 47 prefectures: one metropolis Tokyo, one circuit Hokkaido, two urban prefectures Osaka and Kyoto, and 43 other prefectures. For grouping respondents in accordance with the scale of the destination that they chose, five group categorization was used: (1) Island for four largest islands, (2) Prefecture for the 47 prefectures, (3) City and town for Sapporo, Harajuku, Akihabara, etc., (4) Attraction for Mr. Fuji, Disney Land, Tokyo Tower, etc., and (5) the others, such as castle, hot spring, theme park, etc. The number of inbound visitors in 2009 provided by JNTO was used as one of the indicators for popularity of the destinations.

The differences of tourists' informational familiarity levels among the groups with different scale and popularity of destination are examined with four one-way ANOVA tests. The differences of tourists' experiential familiarity levels among the groups with different scale and popularity of destination are also examined with two one-way ANOVA tests and, additionally, they are examined with two chi-square tests to group the experiential familiarity (i.e., previous travel experience) into three levels (i.e., non-visit, one-time, and repeat visit groups) as utilized in other studies (Kozak, 2001; Litvin & Ng Sok Ling, 2001).

RESULTS

In terms of demographics, most members are in their 20s (42.4%), followed by ones in 30s (32.2%) and 10s (12.4%). Female members count 75.9% of the respondents. Office workers (36.5%) are the highest in occupation, followed by students (34.9%) and housewives (9.2%). Also, over half of respondents stated that they have traveled to Japan at least once (52.0%), while 48.0% have never been to Japan (M=1.56, SD=2.029). Of the ones who have traveled to Japan (192 respondents), while the number of people who have traveled to Japan from one to four times declines gradually (64, 31, 27, and 16, respectively), respondents who have traveled to Japan five times and six times or more are 20 and 34 respectively. Both levels of Japanese language proficiency (M=2.23, SD=.930) and Japanese culture understanding (M=2.57, SD=.834) are normally distributed, but the level of travel desire to Japan is (M=4.72, SD=.545) negatively skewed.

The destination names chosen by the respondents for their future travel are collected. Of all 63 destinations stated by respondents, the names of prefectures are stated the highest (from 225 respondents, 60.8%), followed by island names (from 61, 16.5%), the others such as castle, hot spring, and theme park (from 43, 11.6%), town and city names (from 21, 5.7%), and attraction names (from 20, 5.4%). Tokyo is the most chosen destination by the respondents (100 answers, 27.0%), followed by Hokkaido, Osaka, Okinawa, Hot Spring, Sapporo, and Kyoto. Since five of the seven most chosen destination names are prefectures, excluding Hot Spring (the others group) and Sapporo (City and town group), they were chosen for the different popularity group after compared with the data from 2010 JNTO data (see Table 1).

Table 1. Most popular prefectures chosen by respondents and from JNTO data

	Most chosen by respondents (%, (number))		Most visited prefectures (2010 JNTO data, % overlapped)	
1st	**Tokyo**	27.0% (100)	**Tokyo**	58.9%
2nd	**Hokkaido**	14.6% (54)	**Osaka**	25.0%
3rd	**Osaka**	9.7% (36)	**Kyoto**	21.4%
4th	**Okinawa**	6.5% (24)	Kanagawa	16.0%
5th	Hot Spring	5.7% (21)	Chiba	11.8%
6th	Sapporo	4.1% (15)	**Hokkaido**	8.1%
7th	**Kyoto**	3.8% (14)	**Okinawa**	5.1%

At first, correlation coefficient tests for demographic profile variables (i.e., age and travel desire) and familiarity variables (i.e., language proficiency, culture acquaintance, and previous travel experience) were conducted. The respondents' age was positively correlated with previous travel experience ($r = .307$) and negatively correlated with both culture acquaintance ($r = -.138$) and travel desire ($r = -.142$), but not with language proficiency. It can be assumed that the older the respondents are, the more travel experiences they have. Both negative correlations between age and culture acquaintance/travel desire reflects the interests with Japan and Japanese culture of younger generation.

Demographic information (i.e., age and gender) was examined for its possible difference in terms of scale and popularity of destinations. Chi-square tests were conducted for two demographic information and two destination related variables. The relationship between age and scale of destination was investigated first with Pearson chi-square [c^2 (20, N=363) = 31.037, p=.055], which turned not to be a significant relationship. However, the significant differences was found in age groups in terms of popularity of destination, c^2 (16, N=223) = 33.598, p=.006. While respondents who are in their 10s and 50s want to visit Tokyo more (74.1% and 77.8% respectively) than the other 4 prefectures, respondents in their 20s, 30s, and 40s are less eager to visit Tokyo (36.5%, 36.6%, and 40.0%, respectively) since they know other attractive prefectures for future visit. Respondents who are in their 20s also chose to visit Hokkaido (25.0%) and Osaka (19.8%). For others in their 30s, Hokkaido is the second most popular destination (32.4%), almost the same with Tokyo (36.6%), followed equally by Osaka and Okinawa (11.3% for each). For respondents in their 40s, Kyoto was the second most popular prefecture (20.0%), while Osaka and Hokkaido were in the third position (15.0% for each). Two additional chi-square tests were conducted to examine the relationship between gender and scale/popularity of destination. The results show that neither of the relationship showed significant differences, c^2 (4, N=367) = 3.328, p=.504 for scale of destination and c^2 (4, N=226) = 6.934, p=.139 for popularity of destination, which explains that the difference in gender is not necessarily related to the preference of destination in terms of scale and/or popularity.

Informational familiarity & experiential familiarity

To examine the difference among groups (i.e., scale and popularity of destination) in terms of tourists' familiarity, two types of familiarity, which are informational familiarity (i.e., language proficiency of a host destination and culture acquaintance with a host destination) and

experiential familiarity (i.e., previous travel experiences) are used for the tests. Table 2 shows the descriptive data for scale and popularity of destination in terms of three measurements.

Table 2. Descriptive data for scale and popularity of destination

	Groups	Sample Size	Language		Culture		Experience	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Scales of Destination	Island	61	2.41	1.04	2.74	0.89	2.39	2.01
	Prefecture	225	2.20	0.91	2.58	0.81	1.49	2.09
	City&Town	21	2.52	0.98	2.67	1.02	0.90	1.37
	Attraction	20	2.15	0.88	2.35	0.88	1.45	2.28
	The others	43	2.00	0.85	2.30	0.67	1.12	1.56
Popularity of Destination	Tokyo	100	1.98	.804	2.39	.886	.94	1.621
	Osaka	36	2.31	1.064	2.69	.749	1.31	2.040
	Kyoto	14	2.21	.579	2.71	.469	1.00	1.617
	Hokkaido	54	2.41	1.055	2.74	.915	2.52	2.026
	Okinawa	24	2.75	.794	2.96	.550	3.25	2.231

Four one-way ANOVA tests were conducted to examine the differences in language proficiency and culture acquaintance levels among the five groups for each scale and popularity of destinations. First, the homogeneity of variance assumptions were assessed using the Levene statistic (LS). The results show that the homogeneity of variance assumptions were not violated for language proficiency ($LS(4,365)=1.931$, $p>.05$) and culture acquaintance level ($LS(4,365)=1.879$, $p>.05$) in scales of destination groups, but were violated for language proficiency ($LS(4,223)=3.844$, $p<.05$) and culture acquaintance level ($LS(4,223)=5.490$, $p<.05$) in popularity of destination groups. However, ANOVA test results illustrate that two ANOVA tests examining the differences in language proficiency and culture acquaintance level among five groups for destination scale were not significant ($F(4,365) = 1.865$, $p > .05$ and $F(4,365) = 2.180$, $p > .05$, respectively). Table 3 illustrates the other two one-way ANOVA test results for two measurements of informational familiarity among five groups for destination popularity.

**Table 3. One-way ANOVAs for informational familiarity
in popularity of destination group**

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY					
Between Groups	14.647	4	3.662	4.499*	.002
Within Groups	181.493	223	.814		
Total	196.140	227			
CULTURE ACQUAINTANCE					
Between Groups	9.065	4	2.266	3.333*	.011
Within Groups	151.615	223	.680		
Total	160.680	227			

*p<.05

The ANOVA tests revealed significant differences both in language proficiency ($\eta^2=.07$) and culture acquaintance ($\eta^2=.06$). Scheffe was selected as a post hoc analysis to help determine where the significant differences occur. Table 4 illustrates the comparisons among the two different groups.

Table 4. Comparison Table

Comparison Group	Mean Difference	Sig.
Tokyo / Okinawa (Language Proficiency)	0.770*	.008
Tokyo / Okinawa (Culture Acquaintance)	0.568*	.05

This result offers evidence showing that respondents who choose Okinawa as their future destination have significantly higher language proficiency and culture acquaintance level than the ones who chose to visit Tokyo. As also seen in the mean scores in table 2, it can be stated that the more a destination is visited by tourists, the less informational familiarity the tourists who chose to visit it have. Thus, from the four one-way ANOVA test results, P1 was not supported while P2 was, which means differences were not found in informational familiarity levels among respondents who chose destination with different scales, but were found among respondents who chose destination with different popularity.

Two one-way ANOVA tests were conducted to examine the differences in previous experience level among five groups for each scale and popularity of destination. Both homogeneity of variance assumptions were violated for scales of destination ($LS(4,364)=3.023$, $p<.05$) and popularity of destination ($LS(4,222)=4.389$, $p<.05$). However, ANOVA test results show that two ANOVA tests were significant ($F(4,364) = 3.837$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2=.04$ and $F(4,222) = 11.700$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2=.17$, respectively). Scheffe post hoc tests were again followed. In scale of destination groups, respondents who chose an island name have significantly higher previous visit experience than those who chose a prefecture name. In destination popularity groups, people who selected Tokyo for their future travel have less previous experience than those who are interested in visiting Hokkaido and Okinawa. More interestingly, people who intend to visit Okinawa for their future travel have significantly higher previous experience than ones who want to travel Tokyo, Osaka, and Kyoto.

To examine the difference between experiential familiarity and preference of destination selection both in terms of scale and popularity in another way, two chi-square tests were conducted separating the number of previous travel experience to Japan into three groups (i.e., non-visit, one-time, and repeat visit) as adopted in previous studies (Kozak, 2001; Litvin & Ng Sok Ling, 2001). Two Pearson chi-square show both significant differences between three experience groups and scale/popularity of destination, $c^2 (8, N=369) = 29.712$, $p=.000$ and $c^2 (8, N=227) = 49.048$, $p=.000$, respectively. For the scale of destination, while the percentages of respondents who chose prefecture names did not vary significantly but gradually decreased (66.1%, 57.8%, and 54.7% for non-visit, one-time, and repeat visit groups), the portions of those who chose island names were significantly different and gradually increased among the groups (6.8%, 20.3%, and 28.1% for non-visit, one-time, and repeat visit groups). Also for the popularity of destination, while respondents in non-visit group and one-time group are highly motivated to visit Tokyo (57.8% and 50.0%, respectively), those in repeat visit groups only show small interest in visiting Tokyo (22.9%). However, for Hokkaido and Okinawa, as the previous

travel experience grows from non-visit group to repeat visit group, so does the intention to visit the destinations among the groups (9.8%, 23.8%, and 41.0% for Hokkaido and 3.9%, 7.1%, and 20.5% for Okinawa). Interestingly, the percentage for intention to visit Hokkaido (41.0%) was almost twice higher than the percentage for Tokyo (22.9%) in repeat visit group. From the results of two ANOVA tests and two chi-square tests, it was confirmed that both P3 and P4 were supported.

CONCLUSION

For destination marketers to successfully meet visitors' needs and wants, it is vital to understand visitors' characteristics and provide appropriate marketing strategies accordingly. Especially for international visitors who are typically associated with high uncertainty when visiting foreign countries, understanding the different needs and wants when selecting and visiting a destination in a foreign country will only benefit the destination managers. This study attempts to figure out the differences in informational and experiential familiarity categorized by Baloglu (2001) among groups who are different in destination preferences in terms of scale and popularity, so as to suggest some managerial implications for destination marketers in destinations with various scales and popularity levels.

From the results of this study, it is found that informational familiarity does have impact on the destination choice according to its popularity level, while it does not when considering the scale of the destination. The relationship between the informational familiarity and destination choice confirmed by this study supports the previous studies (Basala & Klenosky, 2001; Cohen & Copper; 1986; Goodrich, 1978; Sönmez & Graefe; 1998), which argue that preference and likelihood of choice for tourists' prospective destination can be influenced by informational familiarity, especially language and culture of a host country. It is also assured that experiential familiarity has influence on destination choice in accordance with its scale and popularity. The results from this study on the relationship between the experiential familiarity and destination choice also support the previous studies (Crompton & Ankomah, 1993; Kozak, 2001; Sönmez & Graefe, 1998) by confirming that travelers with less travel experiences tend to choose small scale and more popular destinations than those who have more travel experiences to the host country.

The results derive important implications for marketers of destinations with different scale and popularity levels. Prospective visitors to popular destinations tend to have low informational familiarity with the host country. In other words, travelers might not be fluent in the language and familiar with the culture of the host country. This suggests the marketers to reduce prospective travelers' level of anxiety by providing on-site supports for potential problems that might occur due to their limited knowledge of host country's language and culture. It can be also suggested that small scale destinations with high popularity need to understand that their prospective visitors have less previous experiences=. Hence, it is suggested that marketers in less popular destinations and big scale destinations need to provide ways to fully satisfy the demand of more experienced travelers.

In spite of straightforward suggestions acquired by this study, some limitations still remain. First, because this study only use Korean nationals and Japanese tourism destinations as subjects, the possible cultural differences still need to be examined using different subjects in

order to confirm the results in other settings. Also, as found significant in the relationship among demographic information (i.e., age), other familiarity variables, and destination choice, the correlation between age and familiarity must be considered in conjunction. By conducting several separate ANOVA tests, the possible covariance impacts among the variables on the result were not examined thoroughly. Other statistical solutions such as multinomial logistic regression can be adopted for the further investigation of the study.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Z. U. (1991). The influence of the components of a state's tourist image on product positioning strategy. *Tourism Management, 12*(4), 331-340.

Baker, W., Hutchinson, J. W., Moore, D., & Nedungadi, P. (1986). Brand Familiarity and Advertising: Effects on the Evoked Set and Brand Preference. *Advances in Consumer Research*, *13*, 637–642.

Baloglu, S. (2001). Image variations of Turkey by familiarity index: informational and experiential dimensions. *Tourism Management, 22*(2), 127-133.

Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999). U.S. International Pleasure Travelers' Images of Four Mediterranean Destinations: A Comparison of Visitors and Nonvisitors. *Journal of Travel Research, 38*(2), 144-152.

Basala, S. L., & Klenosky, D. B. (2001). Travel-Style Preferences for Visiting a Novel Destination: A Conjoint Investigation across the Novelty-Familiarity Continuum. *Journal of Travel Research, 40*(2), 172-182.

Beerli, A., & Martín, J. D. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(3), 657-681.

Bigano, A., Hamilton, J. M., & Tol, R. S. J. (2006). The Impact of Climate on Holiday Destination Choice. *Journal Climatic Change, 76*(3-4), 389-406.

Chon, K. S. (1991). Tourism destination image modification process: Marketing implications. *Tourism Management, 12*(2), 68-72.

Cohen, E., & Cooper, R. L. (1986). Language and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 13*(4), 533-563.

Crompton, J. L., & Ankomah, P. K. (1993). Choice set propositions in destination decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*(3), 461-476.

Fakeye, P. C., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image Differences between Prospective, First-Time, and Repeat Visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research, 30*(2), 10-16.

Goodrich, J. N. (1978). The Relationship Between Preferences for and Perceptions of Vacation Destinations: Application of a Choice Model. *Journal of Travel Research, 17*(2), 8-13.

Hu, Y., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1993). Measuring destination attractiveness: A contextual approach. *Journal of Travel Research, 32*(2), 25-34.

Kozak, M. (2001). Repeaters' behavior at two distinct destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research, 28*(3), 784-807.

Lepp, A., & Gibsonb, H. (2008). Sensation seeking and tourism: Tourist role, perception of risk and destination choice. *Tourism Management, 29*(4), 740-750.

Litvin, S. W., & Ng Sok Ling, S. (2001). The destination attribute management model: an empirical application to Bintan, Indonesia. *Tourism Management, 22*(5), 481-492.

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1995). The Role of Awareness and Familiarity with a Destination: The Central Florida Case. *Journal of Travel Research, 33*(3), 21-27.

Nicolau, J. L., & Más, F. J. (2006). The influence of distance and prices on the choice of tourist destinations: The moderating role of motivations. *Tourism Management, 27*(5), 982-996.

Prentice, R. (2004). Tourist familiarity and imagery. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(4), 923-945.

Srull, T. (1983) The Roll of Prior Knowledge in the Acquisition, Retention, and Use of New Information. *Advances in Consumer Research, 10*, 572–576.

Sönmez, S. F., & Graefe, A. R. (1998). Determining Future Travel Behavior from Past Travel Experience and Perceptions of Risk and Safety. *Journal of Travel Research, 37*(2), 171-177.

Tideswell, C., & Faulkner, B. (1999). Multidestination Travel Patterns of International Visitors to Queensland. *Journal of Travel Research, 37*(4), 364-374.