

Role of Decision Making Styles in Post-Purchase Evaluation of Cultural Destinations

Antónia Correia

CASEE - Faculty of Economics
University of Algarve, Portugal

Metin Kozak

School of Tourism Management
Mugla University, Turkey

Abstract : Decision making styles are the fundamentals of a certain choice that is made under a certain context that leads to an emphasis on some factors rather than others while evaluating choices. Therefore, this study aims to explore how decision making styles influence the post-purchase evaluation of a cultural destination. The empirical study is supported through data from a sample of 400 individuals visiting Lisbon in December 2008. Results of exploratory factor analysis reveal that vacation decision making is based on brand, quality and confusion by over choice styles whereas satisfaction determinants include cultural knowledge, novelty physical assets and facilities. A correlation analysis within DMS and satisfaction constructs suggests that the way tourists decide is likely to influence the way they evaluate the destination. The study also discusses the strategic implications.

Keywords : Decision making styles, cultural tourism, satisfaction, Portugal.

Introduction

According to the expectation-disconfirmation model (Oliver, 1980), satisfaction is a result of consumers' expectations, formed prior to purchasing and travelling. Furthermore, satisfaction may have different intensities and standards (Yoon & Uysal, 2005) as it derives from the tourist experience and the diversity of destinations' attribute assessment (Alegre & Garau, 2010). Destination variables do not have a homogeneous impact on the tourist overall satisfaction (Alegre & Garau, 2010), probably because it depends on the attributes' perceived importance accounted by tourists. Also, different decision-making styles (DMS) trigger diverse patterns of behaviour (Decrop & Snelders, 2005; Hsieh, O'Leary & Morrison, 1992; Moscardo

et al., 1996), meaning that the way individuals experience destinations emerge from their own decisions. Thus, it can be argued that decision making styles (DMS) impacts the way individuals assess their tourist experiences and may be a variable that accounts to shape tourist satisfaction.

The measurement of customer satisfaction has been extensively researched in the generic marketing literature during the last four decades (e.g. Cadotte *et al.*, 1987; Churchill & Suprenant, 1982; Fornell, 1992; Spreng *et al.*, 1996; Oliver, 1980). A review of the literature indicates that there has been a significant increase in the number of studies on the measurement of customer satisfaction in tourism and the related areas over the past few years (Kozak, 2001; Kozak & Rimmington, 2000; Alegre & Garau, 2010; Neal et al., 1999; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). The majority of these studies have been limited to the inclusion of sample destinations with their focus on mass tourism.

Satisfaction is a complex construct that until now is not clear. Furthermore, the decision-making process does not end in the choice. As emphasized above, a considerable amount of research has been devised to independently analysing decision making styles or satisfaction. Nevertheless, little is known about the influence of the decision making style adopted on satisfaction, largely because the topic has received little attention. This study aims at enhancing the knowledge about the relationship between the way individuals decide and their subsequent satisfaction. To achieve this objective, the study anchors on the assumption that the way individuals form their decisions account for understanding how they assess their experiences at the end of their vacations.

Literature Review

The history of decision making dates back to the beginning of human-beings who might need to make a decision among alternatives to have a better and continuous life. This is a term that we talk about several times a day from a very simple to a very complex stage in our routine life. Thus, all may agree with the statement emphasizing how important decision making in one's routine social life to have a better quality of life by solving its complexities in an effective manner. People sometimes have the intention to reach a solid conclusion by categorizing the meaning of life and/or objects-subjects into two extreme groups such as "good enough" and "not good enough". In particular reference to the evaluation of tourism and leisure

literature on decision making, one may see an increasing number of both conceptual and empirical studies in the last two decades. The most favourable one is the context of decision sets (i.e. consideration set, evoked set etc.) applied into tourism and leisure in late 1970s (Woodside & Lysonski 1989). This line of research was then developed by Crompton and his colleagues in early 1990s (Um & Crompton 1990). The other one is more specific seeking the influence of external factors on decision making to vacation, e.g. marital status, gender.

Most studies of choice behaviour have been related to investigating the relationship between the attitude towards a particular target and preferences for it (Mayo & Jarvis 1981; Um & Crompton 1990). In this sense, three components of attitude are considered by McDougall & Munro (1994). First, the cognitive component consists of individuals' beliefs and knowledge about a particular object. For example, a couple may perceive a particular destination as being relatively expensive and being appropriate to the needs of their younger children. However, a person could have a prior perception of this destination even without visiting it. This perception could be formed by reading about the destination, watching or talking with friends. Second, an individuals' feelings of likes or dislikes for a particular destination encompasses the affective component of an attitude. A person might be unlikely to have a particular attitude towards a destination which in turn affects the overall evaluation or perception of the destination. Third, the behavioural component seems to be more objective evaluation or judgment about the object and reflects the consequences of experiences derived from actual visits to a destination. A strong relationship between attitude and behaviour has been confirmed. The former proves to be a good predictor or indicator of the latter (Assael, 1987).

Sproles & Kendall (1986, p. 268) define decision making styles (DMSs) as "a mental orientation characterizing a consumer's approach to making choices" and develop a taxonomy of DMSs called the Consumer Styles Inventory (CSI). The CSI comprises eight styles of decision-making. The different DMSs differ from each other by means of a fundamental characteristic that represents independent and important mental approaches to consumption. The present study adapted the CSI to the cultural tourism context and it encompasses five of the eight DMSs, which are: quality

consciousness, price consciousness, brand consciousness, confusion by overchoice and brand-loyal orientation. The five DMSs built-in the research are in accordance with the literature review on tourism DMSs and decision typologies.

Tourists who are conscious about quality (QC) are more likely to make their decisions based on preconceived ideas about certain merits of tourism products or destinations. Although the emphasis is on quality, these individuals are careful and systematic decision makers who embrace on comparisons so they can choose the very best quality product (Sproles & Kendall, 1986) or at least an alternative that is good enough, as the rational vacationer characterized by Decrop & Snelders (2005).

Those who are price conscious (PC) give more emphasis on travel costs. Price is the most important attribute accounting for the decision. This group of tourists looks for the best value for money and so that their decisions rely mostly on information search and comparison between diverse product/destination alternatives. This is the case of the constrained decision makers that, according to Decrop & Snelders (2005), face contextual inhibitors which make them prioritize value for money options. Also, low cost tourists are highly price sensitive (Correia & Pimpão, 2008) and may be considered as another example of price consciousness decision makers.

The brand conscious (BC) tourists equal price and quality attributes while making a decision, i.e. this group of consumers associates quality with expensiveness and well-known brands. For those tourists who face high levels of uncertainty and prefer safer destinations, as the psycho-centric type of tourists defined by Plog (1974), travelling to well-known and more advertised places is a way of deciding and avoiding risk. This category of tourists decide based on destination representations and image perceptions created in their mind due to external sources such as promotional campaign and events.

Those tourists who face confusion by overchoice (CC) have difficulty on making a decision because they embrace in great information search and evaluation. They "experience information overload" (Sproles & Kendall, 1986, p.274) and thus they feel confused to make a decision. This may be the case of both rational and hedonic vacationers as the typology of Decrop

Role of Decision Making Styles in Post-Purchase- Antónia Correia, Metin Kozak & Snelders (2005), as both decision makers commit themselves with high learning processes deriving from information search and high involvement with the travel decision.

Finally, brand-loyal (BL) tourists use their habits as the main driver of their decisions. In other words, they have favourite brands and stores (Sproles & Kendall, 1986), and therefore well-established tourist destination preferences. According to the literature, people who undertake routine decisions tend to embrace on more limited decision-making processes and are less susceptible to tourism marketing campaigns and promotions (Bargeman & van der Poel, 2006).

Despite the importance of typifying tourists according to the DMSs, it is also pertinent to acknowledge how and in which way those decisions may influence satisfaction; being this the purpose of this research. As a post-consumption judgment of a product or service, satisfaction is one of the widely investigated themes in the area of consumer behavior. This area also has caught the attention of many tourism researchers over the last few decades and attracted a fast growing body of literature. Much research has focused on studying the factors that contribute to positive or negative satisfaction evaluations by tourists. Traditionally, satisfaction is considered to be a cognitive state, influenced by cognitive evaluations such as expectations and perceptions of attributes performance (Oliver, 1980; Parasuraman *et al.*, 1985; Pizam & Millman, 1993; Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991). More recently, also the influence of emotions has been recognized and a cognitive-affective view has been proposed (Bigné *et al.*, 2005; Bosque & Martín, 2008; Lee *et al.*, 2008; Matilla & Wirtz, 2000; Oliver, 1997; Rojas & Camarero, 2008). Previous research is more than consensual that there are several variables influencing the formation of satisfaction as a direct outcome of vacation experiences. Nevertheless, the influence of DMSs in tourism assessment of their vacation experiences is far from being researched.

Decision Making Styles and Satisfaction

As a post-consumption judgment of a product or service, satisfaction is one of the widely investigated themes in the area of consumer behavior. This area also has caught the attention of many tourism researchers over

the last few decades and attracted a fast growing body of literature. Much research has focused on studying the factors that contribute to positive or negative satisfaction evaluations by tourists. Traditionally, satisfaction is considered to be a cognitive state, influenced by cognitive evaluations such as expectations and perceptions of attributes performance (Oliver, 1980; Parasuraman et al., 1985; Pizam & Millman, 1993; Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991). More recently, also the influence of emotions has been recognized and a cognitive-affective view has been proposed (Bigné et al., 2005; Bosque & Martín, 2008; Lee et al., 2008; Matilla & Wirtz, 2000; Oliver, 1997; Rojas & Camarero, 2008). These propositions suggest that not only cognitions but also emotions can play an important role in the formation of satisfaction as a direct outcome of vacation experiences.

Since decisions direct one's behaviour (e.g. expectations, experiences, intentions), their investigation is worthwhile. The decision-making and satisfaction must be correlated since decision making leads to the formation of expectations and tourist expectations influence tourist satisfaction. In fact, according to the cycle of consumer behaviour model, the tourist experience begins long before the trip (Pearce & Lee, 2005). The phase of decision requests a high involvement from the individual because it involves deciding on many aspects, in an uncertainty context that brings about risk and anxiety. Most of the time, tourists are not familiar with the place they are travelling to, the hotel they are staying at, the activities they are enrolling in, and the transport they are being driven on, but they still need to make a decision out of all the available alternatives. Furthermore, as proposed to the evidence in the literature (Sirakaya & Woodside, 2005), buying vacations is not the same as buying a product.

One series of current research suggests that developing a model that fits all decision-makers and every decision situation in a vacation evaluation may not be realistic as a vacation (leisure travel, tour or trip) involves a lot of decisions and sub-decisions (Decrop & Snelders, 2004, 2005; Sirakaya & Woodside, 2005). One useful approach is the segmentation of travel markets by taking into account their trip purposes (such as taking a pleasure vacation versus visiting family and friends, or leisure travel versus business travel). According to this line of argument, decision makers in different segments might have dissimilar approaches to solving their decision problems.

For example, a potential traveller who is interested in visiting friends and relatives might lean towards applying a different decision-making strategy (i.e., low-involvement, less-risky conditions) than a person who is taking a pleasure vacation trip to an unfamiliar destination (i.e., high-involvement, high perceived risk). This example points to the notion that decision strategies may be varied across those vacationers with different interests and reasons which needs further investigation of the vacation decision making behaviour.

Tourism is a living experience, and this makes all the difference because, as Pine & Gilmore (1999, p. 3) advocate, "experiences are as distinct from services, as services are from goods". An experience implies emotions and feelings, which are not of great importance in goods and has attracted little attention from researchers of consumer behaviour literature so far, but it is a critical factor in the tourism field. In fact, the emotional component is transversal to the travel experience as it is present before, during and after each and every trip. Prior to travelling, people put great efforts into collecting information about the tourist destination and day dream for weeks, months, even years, with their holidays and travel experiences. Tourists plan in advance of their travels and fantasise about their experiences just before leaving home and during travelling because tourists interact with the destination, in a mutual influence process, which demands great involvement of the participant. After travelling, the post-purchase/experience phase is long lasting, as tourists recall their travel experiences for ages, remembering their holidays with friends and family, telling stories and adventures to others, (re)seeing photographs, and writing travelogues (Pearce & Lee, 2005). The overall experience in a destination is the basis for tourist satisfaction and the image of that destination.

Therefore, this research attempts to explain how decision-making styles influence satisfaction. Satisfaction has been widely recognized and explained as a consequence of quality (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Bigné et al., 2001; Bosque & Martín, 2008; Cadotte *et al.*, 1987; Oliver, 1997), being that quality is a positive antecedent for satisfaction. Those tourists who put an emphasis on quality may be expected to highlight this attribute as a major one having a positive direct effect on their satisfaction evaluation.

Money is also one of the major determinants for tourists when deciding their travel options before the actual tourism experience (Morley, 1992; Nicolau & Más, 2005; Papatheodorou, 2001; Woodside *et al.*, 2006) or the length of stay during the vacation (Alegre & Pou, 2006; Gokovali *et al.*,

2007; Martinez-Garcia & Raya 2008). Additionally, according to the equity theory (Oliver & Swan, 1989), satisfaction may be triggered by the relationship between expenses and benefits and rewards attained. The role of travel costs on satisfaction is though a limited topic of research. The study of Hui et al. (2007) undertaken in Singapore concludes that price has no significant effect over tourist satisfaction, and even if the authors argue that this is probably due to the fact that tourists set a budget prior to travelling and by the end of the trip they do not question it. This topic needs further empirical investigation as tourists contain a heterogeneous characteristic.

Due to an extensive capacity of information sources, consumers are now able to receive similar type of information from different sources. Such a development may sometimes be an advantage both for the consumers and suppliers as well as a disadvantage for some other times. In saying so, information overload may lead to confusion in the tourists' mind, being a source for embracing in extensive choice processes (Bargeman & van der Poel, 2006). If information may lead to misunderstanding and uncertainty in the pre-purchase phase, it can also be present at the post-purchase moment of developing satisfaction judgments, at least for those tourists whose decisions rely heavily on external information.

Destination loyalty anchors on positive experiences that enhance the repeat purchase of destinations (Bello & Etzel, 1985; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Gitelson & Crompton, 1983; Opperman, 1998, 2000). However, tourists may have a varying level of loyalty. The novelty-seeking aspect associated with many tourists may prevent them to repurchase destinations while for others, who favour to be safe and sound at well-known areas, revisiting destinations is a typical option (Plog, 1974). As a consequence, understanding how those tourists who decide based on their loyalty towards tourism products and places is a way to underpin satisfaction and further behavioural intentions.

According to the expectation-disconfirmation model (Oliver, 1980), satisfaction is a result of consumers' expectations, formed prior to purchasing and travelling. Furthermore, satisfaction may have different intensities and standards (Yoon & Uysal, 2005) as it derives from the tourist experience and the diversity of destinations' attribute assessment (Alegre & Garau, 2010). Destination variables do not have a homogeneous impact on the tourist overall satisfaction (Alegre & Garau, 2010), probably because it depends on the attributes perceived importance accounted for by tourists.

Also, different decision-making styles trigger diverse patterns of behaviour (Decrop & Snelders, 2005; Hsieh, O'Leary, & Morrison, 1992; Moscardo, Pearce, Lang, & O'Leary, 1996), meaning that the way individuals experience destinations emerge from their own decisions. Thus, it can be argued that DMS impacts the way individuals assess their tourist experiences and may be a variable that accounts to shape tourist satisfaction.

The survey instrument comprises three groups of questions according to the purpose of this research. The first subject set concerns socio-demographic variables, travel experience and purpose of the visit. The second encompasses 26 items of Sproles & Kendall (1986) scale adapted for tourism decisions. The scale proposed is in accordance with the literature review on tourism decision typologies (Decrop & Snelders, 2005; Plog, 1974). The third group is related to satisfaction factors. Measurement of the latter set was assessed by three main questions: the first attempts to measure the desire congruency and was assessed as: "*During this holiday I was able to ...*". This category includes a total of 21 statements and is structured with a 5-point scale ranging from "1- totally disagree" to "5- totally agree". These statements were commonly used in the literature in the form of push motivation scales (Dann, 1977; Crompton, 1979; Mo, Howard, & Havitz, 1993; Ryan & Trauer, 2005). Second, expectancy congruency was assessed with questioning tourists about "*How do you evaluate each of the following attributes accordingly to your early expectations?*" and measured through a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from "1 - much worse than I expected" to "5 - much better than I expected".

A total of 11 attributes were used accordingly with a pull motivation approach (Kozak, 2002; Nicolau & Más, 2005) and consider the classification proposed by Mo, Howard & Havitz (1993). The cultural destination attributes were based on previous studies (Andersen, Prentice & Guerin, 1997; Janiskee, 1996; Huh & Uysal, 2004; Sofield & Li, 1998) and adapted for the Portuguese capital specificities as a cultural destination. To assess attributes performance a 5-point Likert scale was used, ranging from "1- strongly disagree" to "5- strongly agree". Overall satisfaction was measured by a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "1- totally dissatisfied" to "5- very satisfied", by asking "*How do you rate your overall satisfaction with the destination?*"

The study is based on a survey carried out at the Airport of Lisbon, the capital of Portugal and one of the most visited cities within Europe, mainly

due to its cultural attractions. The data used was obtained from a survey administered in December 2008, to a stratified random sample of Lisbon tourists. To assure a level of precision of 5% in a confidence interval of 95%, it was decided to collect data from 400 tourists, with the central aim of determining the influence that DMSs has over the post purchase evaluation of Lisbon's tourism experiences. While waiting for check-in in the departure lounge, respondents were requested to complete the questionnaire form which was presented in English. A total of 324 tourists were interviewed, which represents a response rate of 81.0%. This figure corresponds to a sampling error of 2.7%, with a confidence interval of 95.0% that is an acceptable standard (Dillman, 1978). Remaining questionnaires were not considered for the present research as they were discarded because of uncompleted fields and incorrect completion. The software SPSS 14.0 was implemented to ensure data validity.

Moreover, several steps were taken to ensure the generalizability, validity and reliability of the data. First, the questionnaire applied concur with the five precedent identified and detailed DMSs of Sproles and Kendall (1986) and the emotional and cognitive satisfaction usually used in the literature to assess post-purchase evaluations. In doing so, the authors guarantee that prior research in the field of consumer behaviour and tourism was considered and face validity established. Second, the research opted for a random sample, with an acceptable sample of respondents (Dillman, 1978) as previously mentioned and survey was pre-tested with a sub-sample of 50 respondents. Finally, the reliability of the data was examined, analyzing it extensively with alternative methods and reaching the same conclusion. The extensive examination of the survey validity, reliability, and generalization leads to the inference that there is nothing in the evaluation to suggest that it is either invalid or unreliable. The distribution of the sample is reported in Table 1.

Table 2 suggests the homogeneity of the sample, presenting its trip characteristics. Tourists visit Lisbon for a week period, and having a holiday is the major motive for visiting the capital. Trips are planned within a month prior to departure. This short time planning may be explained due to the fact that the majority (61.3%) of tourists is repeaters, having been here over the last two years (56.8%).

Table 1 - Sample Characterization

<i>Gender</i>		
Male		57.0%
Female		43.0%
<i>Age</i>		
		42.6 (Mean)
<i>Education Level</i>		
Secondary		20.1%
Undergraduate		18.4%
Postgraduate		42.5%
Doctor		14.6%
Other		4.4%
<i>Social Status</i>		
Single		30.5%
Married/Living Together		62.0%
Divorced/Widowed		7.5%
<i>Employment</i>		
Employed		
	Full Time	66.6%
	Part Time	16.9%
Unemployed		11.1%
Retired		5.4%
<i>Average Salary</i>		
Less than 2000€		18.0%
2001 to 3500€		29.8%
3501 to 5000€		23.9%
5001 to 8000€		16.1%
More than 8000€		12.2%
<i>Nationality</i>		
UK		33.4%
USA		15.2%
French		35.3%
Nordic countries		16.1%

Table 2 - Trip Characterization

<i>Trip Characteristics</i>	
Length of stay average	7.2 days (Mean)
Days before booking the trip	37.3 days (Mean)
<i>Main purpose of the trip</i>	
Holidays	41.8%
<i>Type of visitor</i>	
First-time visitor	38.7%
Repeat visitor	61.3%
<i>When have you been in Portugal</i>	
This year	22.4%
Last year	34.4%
Other year	43.2%

Results

The research underlines that DMSs and satisfaction are multidimensional constructs inter-related. Furthermore, significant differences in satisfaction could be explained by the decision-making style adopted. On this assumption, the data analysis develops in three steps. First, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is applied to reveal the underlying dimensions in both constructs. Second, the dimensions found on EFA were subjected to a reliability test (Cronbach, 1951) to evaluate the internal consistency of the scale items. Third, a Kendall correlation analysis test was performed to understand the role of different DMSs of satisfaction traits and on overall satisfaction. The EFA measures the latent variables, DMSs and satisfaction. The development of the measurement scales was performed in order to reduce the dimensionality of the data and to identify the main factors relating to DMSs and satisfaction. The study proceeds with reliability tests to check for the validity of the latent constructs found. Further correlation analysis was performed to test the hypothesis.

From the application of EFA to the variables utilized to define DMSs with the principal components and the varimax rotation methods, four factors have arisen, which together accounted for 69.5% of the total variance (KMO

Role of Decision Making Styles in Post-Purchase- Antónia Correia, Metin Kozak

= 0.81; Bartlett test: $p = 0.00$). Also, the internal consistency of these factors was measured by the corresponding Cronbach's alpha coefficients, which are good (i.e., they are at least equal or superior to 0.80 in all cases). The DMs with a reliability score lower than 0.60 were eliminated for further analysis, that was the brand loyal style in the scale of Sproles & Kendall (1986). This factor in the previous study of Sproles & Kendall (1986) already showed a low reliability coefficient. The remaining constructs associated with DMSs were grouped into four factors labelled as follows: quality, brand, price, and confusion by over choice. The decision items most strongly associated with each factor appear in the loadings listed in Table 3.

Table 3 - Principal components of DMS factors (after varimax rotation), means and ranks

<i>Decision-making Styles</i>	<i>Loadings</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Reliability (Cronbach Alpha)</i>
Quality Consciousness (QC)				22.09	0.85
Q1 - It is important to me buy a good quality destination	0.80	3.60	1.01		
Q2 - When I choose I try to get the best or the perfect destination	0.81	3.59	0.87		
Q3 - I usually buy the very best overall quality destination	0.88	3.31	0.91		
Q4 - I make special effort to choose the best quality destination	0.81	3.25	0.88		
Brand-consciousness (BC)				20.03	0.84
B1 - Well known tourism brands are the best for me	0.72	2.54	0.96		
B2 - More expensive destinations are usually my choice	0.80	2.46	1.06		
B3 - Higher is the price of a destination the better is the quality	0.81	2.54	1.08		
B4 - I prefer buying the best destination selling brands	0.79	2.61	0.93		
B5 - Most advertised destination brands are a very good choice	0.65	2.68	0.93		
Price consciousness (PC)				15.70	0.71
P1 - I usually buy holidays at sales prices	0.86	2.71	1.02		
P2 - Lower price holidays are usually my choices	0.87	2.64	1.12		
Confusion by over choice (CC)				11.69	0.82
C1 - There are so many brands from that I often feel confused	0.80	2.80	1.09		
C2 - More I learn about destination, harder it seems to choose the best	0.83	2.85	1.06		
C3 - All the information I get on different destination confuses me	0.82	2.56	1.08		
KMO = 0.81		Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = 1874.73		p = 0.00	df = 91

Table 3 also presents the mean importance level of decision making styles. Quality decision is highly related with the certainty of having bought the very best destination. For those groups of tourists who emphasize brand in the destination choice, price and publicity are mostly accounted for their DMSs, which is the corollary of Heider balance theory (1958) which states that consumers try to establish a degree of balance between affective and cognitive components. For price consciousness tourists, the lower costs are the main drivers to make a decision on visiting Lisbon; and for the confused by over choice is the uncertainty that comes from the difficulty of evaluating all the alternatives available that triggers their decision. As Miller (1956) mentions, generally speaking, consumers demonstrate a limited memory and perform a learning process which means that consumers tend to sustain their decision through a simplification process. Therefore, individuals change the attitudes to adjust the state of harmony. The brand perception can change if something interferes positively or negatively with the cognitive and/or affective component of individuals. For instance, a brand destination primarily perceived as negative can shift to positive if individuals cognitively or affectively associate brand with something positive.

The satisfaction construct was assessed by intrinsic and extrinsic factors that were considered as relevant within the cultural features of Lisbon. To find the underlying constructs associated with satisfaction, the research involved an EFA with a Varimax rotation in order to reduce the 32 variables to a more manageable number. The factors grouped in four factors which together explain 81.5% of the total variance. The factors found were labelled as culture knowledge, novelty at the intrinsic level and facilities and physical assets at the extrinsic level. The satisfaction variables most strongly associated with each factor appear in the loadings listed in Table 4. Reliability coefficients were computed for each factor, all with a good reliability coefficient above 0.85, ranging from 0.88 to 0.96. Furthermore, with respect to the reliability of the scale, the KMO equals to 0.930 and the Bartlett test of sphericity is significant ($p = .00$).

Table 4 - Principal Components of Satisfaction (after varimax rotation), means and standard

<i>Satisfaction Components</i>	<i>Loadings</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Reliability (Cronbach Alpha)</i>
Cultural Knowledge				25,48	0.955
Learn Culture	0.786	2,15	1,377		
Learn Music	0.765	1,94	1,260		
Learn Art	0.796	2,07	1,336		
Learn Urban Design	0.830	2,04	1,334		
Learn about Historical Urban Places	0.731	2,24	1,488		
Learn about Museums	0.712	2,04	1,337		
Novelty				21.62	0.846
Do what other have not done	0.802	1,69	1,105		
Talk about the experience	0.659	1,81	1,178		
Experience Unexpected	0.724	1,82	1,182		
Facilities				18.16	0.941
Accessibilities	0.668	1,88	1,196		
Services	0.738	1,90	1,199		
Safety and Security	0.751	1,99	1,271		
Available Information	0.772	1,95	1,241		
Entertainment	0.730	1,94	1,232		
Nightlife	0.603	1,82	1,243		
Physical Assets				16.28	0.948
Standard of Living	0.765	2,34	1,447		
Climate	0.832	2,72	1,689		
Hospitality	0.788	2,70	1,661		
KMO=0,926	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = 4252.678		p = 0.00	df = 55	

Once determined the structure of satisfaction factors and its reliability, the factor scores were stored to proceed with correlation analysis, presented in Table 5. To examine the nature of the relationships among decision making styles and satisfaction, the study estimates Kendall correlation tests. The results suggest that DMS and evaluation are an intertwined process where the way they decide is likely to influence satisfaction whether it is measured by a single indicator or by traits. Furthermore, it is also suggested that some DMS are correlated with other DMS giving rise to Decrop & Snelders (2005) arguing that DMS is also a multidimensional process. Overall satisfaction is also a composite indicator where satisfaction traits play a role.

As for a comparison between DMS and individual satisfaction items, the study confirms statistically meaningful results (Table 5). Here we are trying to prove that the way we decide influence the way we evaluate even if this form of evaluation is quite directed to the factors that we most value on our decision. This means that when we focus our decision on the basis of quality, our evaluation will be in the same direction so physical assets (.123, $p < .05$) such as climate, security and the surrounding environment are positively evaluated. This leads to a positive evaluation of the destination since this is one of the most competitive factors in Lisbon (.177, $p < .001$). If our decision is focused on brand names, cultural knowledge (-.204, $p < .001$) and novelty (.140, $p < .01$) are the main drivers of our evaluation even if the city does not correspond to our expectations.

Third, as expected, the price decision has a negative correlation with both culture (-.188, $p < .001$) and overall satisfaction (-.149, $p < .001$). Those who seem to be sensitive about any change in the level of prices show lower levels of overall satisfaction and are likely to be satisfied with cultural knowledge, but in a negative direction. In other words, the more sensitive the people are about price levels, the less they are satisfied with cultural knowledge. Also, they are less satisfied with their overall vacation experiences. Finally, decisions made based on confusion focus their evaluation on physical assets (.130, $p < .05$) and facilities (-.111, $p < .05$). In other words, tourists with their confused feelings seem to be very satisfied with physical assets while less satisfaction appears with facilities.

In what concerns with satisfaction the results show that all the four evaluations are closely associated with the overall satisfaction of tourists, e.g. cultural knowledge (.416, $p < .001$), novelty (.274, $p < .001$), facilities (.381, $p < .001$), and physical assets (.445, $p < .001$). That suggests that tourists who travel for cultural purposes to Lisbon assess the destination based on cultural knowledge they are able to achieve, the novelty they found as well as physical assets and facilities. This result, aside from showing that tourism satisfaction is purposive and intertwined construct, reveals that satisfaction relies on cognitive and emotional factors. Decision making styles seem to be very specific and the only styles that seem to be correlated are brand and quality (.272, $p < .001$). As such, quality is a marketing concept. Tourists that would like to outstand for quality decisions should rely on choosing

Role of Decision Making Styles in Post-Purchase- Antônia Correia, Metin Kozak
 brands. This is the way to alleviate the learning process that tourists must engage on making decisions consciously.

Table 5 - Correlation Analysis between DMSs, Satisfaction and Overall Satisfaction (n=323)

	<i>DMS</i>				<i>Satisfaction</i>				
	<i>QC</i>	<i>BC</i>	<i>PC</i>	<i>CC</i>	<i>OS</i>	<i>CKS</i>	<i>FS</i>	<i>PAS</i>	<i>NS</i>
Quality Consciousness (QC)	1								
Brand Consciousness (BC)	.272**	1							
Price Consciousness (PC)	.0695	.029	1						
Confusion by over choice (CC)	.044	.089	.029	1					
Overall satisfaction (OS)	.177**	.057	-.149**	.035	1				
Cultural knowledge (CKS)	.070	-.204**	-.188**	-.029	.416**	1			
Facilities (FS)	.073	.056	-.044	.111*	.381**	.221**	1		
Physical assets (PAS)	.123*	-.056	-.027	.130*	.445**	.110**	.148**	1	
Novelty (NS)	.074	-.140*	-.002	.095	.274**	.134**	.138**	0,068	1

** significant at $p < .001$.

* significant at $p < .05$.

Conclusion

Giving the significance of decision making styles while making a certain part of choices in our daily life, this study was designed to explore how decision making styles were likely to influence the tourists' post-purchase evaluation of a cultural destination. The empirical study has the evidence to suggest that the level of overall satisfaction with vacation decision making is based on consumers' evaluations of quality and price. Those who are conscious about quality are more likely to be satisfied with macro-atmosphere. Tourists do not seem very satisfied with micro-atmosphere whereas satisfied with macro-atmosphere. The micro atmosphere is composed by a set of amenities the destination has, being the most important available information, safety and security and services.

On the other hand, the warm climate and hospitality determine the level of satisfaction with macro-atmosphere. As for the relationship between confusion for over choice and satisfaction items, tourists with their confused feelings seem to be very satisfied with physical assets while less satisfaction appears with facilities. These findings are associated with the fact that the more people are confused the more they are satisfied with such general factors as climate, hospitality and standard of living while the less they are satisfied with more specific-oriented factors such as services, entertainment, nightlife, and so on. The former factors can be attributed to the quality of destinations while the latter is more facility-oriented quality indicators. This type of DMSs has no evidence to impact the level of overall satisfaction.

Having the link between theoretical and practical implications, we say that comparing DMSs with the individual factors of satisfaction allows us to understand the main characteristics of a destination that are perceived as a meaning of brand, quality of price. For example, those who are conscious about the destination brand lead to a negative evaluation of their cultural knowledge about the same destination. Such a result may be considered as the way to lead the practitioners to reposition their brand. In addition, the relationship between quality consciousness and macro environment could be given another example. In this example, quality is positively associated with the standard of living, climate and hospitality. As a result, the meaning of quality in Lisbon is perceived by its climate (suitability of weather conditions), hospitality (level of social interaction) and cost of living (level of prices or value for money).

References

- Alegre, J. and Pou, L. (2006) 'The Length of Stay in the Demand for Tourism', *Tourism Management* 27(6): 1343-1355.
- Alegre, J. and Garau, J. (2010) 'Tourist Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction', *Annals of Tourism Research* 37(1): 52-73.
- Andersen, V., Prentice, R. and Guerin, S. (1997) 'Imagery of Denmark among Visitors to Danish Fine Arts Exhibitions in Scotland', *Tourism Management* 18(7): 435-464.
- Assael, H. (1987) *Consumer Behavior and Marketing Action*. New York: Kent Publishing.
- Baker, D. and Crompton, J. (2000) 'Quality, Satisfaction and Behavioural Intentions', *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(3): 785-804.
- Bargeman, B. and van der Poel, H. (2006) 'The Role of Routines in the Vacation Decision-Making Process of Dutch Vacationers', *Tourism Management* 27: 707-720.
- Bello, X. and Etzel, X. (1985) 'The Role of Novelty in the Pleasure Travel Experience',

Role of Decision Making Styles in Post-Purchase- Antónia Correia, Metin Kozak

Journal of Travel Research 9(1): 20-26.

Bigné, E., Andreu, L. and Gnoth, J. (2005) 'The Theme Park Experience: An Analysis of Pleasure, Arousal and Satisfaction', *Tourism Management* 26(6): 833-844.

Bigné, J., Sánchez, M. and Sánchez, J. (2001) 'Tourism Image, Evaluation Variables and After Purchase Behaviour: Inter-Relationship', *Tourism Management* 22(6): 607-616.

Cadotte, E., Woodruff, R. and Jenkins, R. (1987) 'Expectations and Norms in Models of Consumer Satisfaction', *Journal of Marketing* 24(August): 305-314.

Churchill, G. and Surprenant, C. (1982) 'An Investigation into the Determinants of Customer Satisfaction', *Journal of Marketing Research Special Issue on Causal Modeling* (Nov. 1982). 19(4): 491-504.

Correia, A. and Pimpão, A. (2008) 'Decision-making Processes of Portuguese Tourist Travelling to South America and Africa', *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research* 2(4): 1750-6182.

Crompton, J. L. (1979) 'An Assessment of the Image of Mexico as a Vacation Destination and the Influence of Geographical Location upon the Image', *Journal of Travel Research* 18(4): 18-23.

Cronbach, L.J. (1951) 'Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests', *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297--334.

Dann, G. (1977) 'Anomie, Ego-Enhancement and Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research* 4(4): 184-194.

Decrop, A. and Snelders, D. (2004) 'Planning the Summer Vacation - An Adaptable Process', *Annals of Tourism Research* 31(4): 1008-1030.

Decrop, A. and Snelders, D. (2005) 'A Grounded Typology of Vacation Decision-Making', *Tourism Management* 26(2): 121-132.

del Bosque, I.R. and Martín, H. S. (2008) 'Tourist Satisfaction: A Cognitive-Affective Model', *Annals of Tourism Research* 35(2): 551-573.

Dillman, D. (ed.) (1978) *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. New York: John Wiley.

Fakeye, P. and Crompton, J. (1991) 'Image Differences between Prospective, First-Time and Repeat Visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley', *Journal of Travel Research* 29(2): 10-16.

Fornell, C. (1992) 'A National Customer Satisfaction Barometer: The Swedish Experience', *Journal of Marketing* 56(1): 6-21.

Gitelson, R. J. and Crompton, J. L. (1983) 'The Planning Horizons and Sources of Information Used by Pleasure Vacationers', *Journal of Travel Research* 2(2): 2-7.

Gokovali, U., Bahar, O. and Kozak, M. (2007) 'Determinants of Length of Stay: A Practical Use of Survival Analysis', *Tourism Management* 28: 736-746.

Heider, F. (1958) *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: John Wiley.

Hsieh, S., O'Leary, J. T. and Morrison, A. M. (1992) 'Segmenting the International Travel Market by Activity', *Tourism Management* 13(2): 209-223.

Huh, J. and Uysal, M. (2004) 'Satisfaction with Cultural/Heritage Sites Virginia Historic Triangle', *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism* 4(3): 177-194.

Hui, T. K., Wan, D., & Ho, A. (2007). 'Tourists' satisfaction, recommendation and revisiting Singapore'. *Tourism Management*, 28, 965-975.

Janiskee, R. (1996) 'Historic Houses and Special Events', *Annals of Tourism Research* 23(2): 398-414.

Kozak, M. (2001) 'Repeaters' Behaviour at Two Distinct Destinations', *Annals of Tourism*

Research 28(3): 784-807.

Kozak, M., and Rimmington, M. (2000) 'Tourist Satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an Off-Season Holiday Destination', *Journal of Travel Research* 38(1): 260-269.

Kozak, M. (2002) 'Comparative Analysis of Tourist Motivations by Nationality and Destinations', *Tourism Management* 23(3): 221-232.

Lee, Y., Lee C., Lee S. and Babin, B. (2008) 'Festivalscapes and Patron's Emotions, Satisfaction, and Loyalty', *Journal of Business Research* 61(1): 56-64.

Martinez-Garcia and Raya (2008) 'Length of Stay for Low-cost Tourism', *Tourism Management* 29(6): 1064-1075.

Mattila, A. and Wirtz, J. (2000) 'Congruency of Scent and Music as a Driver of In-Store Evaluations and Behavior', *Journal of Retailing* 77(2): 273-289.

Mayo, E. and Jarvis, L. (1981) *The Psychology of Leisure Travel. Effective marketing and Selling of Travel Services.* CBI Publishing.

McDougall, G. H. G. and Munro, H. (1994) *Scaling and Attitude Measurement in Travel and Tourism Research.* In: Ritchie, J. R. B. and Goeldner, C. R. (eds.) *Travel and Hospitality Research: A Handbook for Managers and Researchers.* Second Edition, NY: Wiley.

Miller, G. (1956) 'The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on Our Capacity for Processing Information', *Psychological Review* 63: 81-97.

Mo, C., Howard, D. and Havitz, M. (1993) 'Testing an International Tourist Role Typology', *Annals of Tourism Research* 20(2): 319-335.

Morley, C. (1992) 'A Microeconomic Theory of International Tourism Demand', *Annals of Tourism Research* 19: 250-267.

Moscardo, G., Morrison, A. M. Pearce, P. L., Lang, C.-T. and O'Leary, J. T. (1996) 'Understanding Vacation Destination Choice Through Travel Motivation and Activities', *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 2(2): 109-122.

Neal, J., Sirgy, M. and Uysal, M. (1999) 'The Role of Satisfaction with Leisure Travel/ Tourism Services and Experience in Satisfaction with Leisure Life and Overall Life', *Journal of Business Research* 44(3): 153-163.

Nicolau, J. and Más, F. (2005) 'Stochastic Modelling: A Three Stage Tourist Choice Process', *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(1): 49-69.

Oliver, R. (1980) 'A Cognitive Model of Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction Decisions', *Journal of Marketing Research* 17(11): 460-469.

Olivier, R. and Swan, J. (1989) 'Consumer Perceptions of Interpersonal Equity and satisfaction in Transaction: A Field Survey Approach', *Journal of Marketing* 53(2): 21-35.

Olivier, R. (1997) *Satisfaction: A Behavioural Perspective on the Consumer.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oppermann, M. (1998) *Farm Tourism in New Zealand.* In: Butler, R., Hall, C.M. and Jenkins, J. (Eds), *Tourism and Recreation in Rural Areas* (pp. 225-233). Wiley, Chichester.

Oppermann, M. (2000) 'Tourism Destination Loyalty', *Journal of Travel Research* 39(1): 78-84.

Papatheodorou, A. (2001) 'Why People Travel to Different Places', *Annals of Tourism Research* 28(1): 164-179.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. and Berry, L. L. (1985) 'A Conceptual Model of Service Quality and Its Implications for Future Research', *Journal of Marketing* 49(Autumn): 41-50.

Pearce, P. and Lee, U. (2005) 'Developing the Travel Career Approach to Tourist Motivation', *Journal of Travel Research* 43: 226-237.

- Role of Decision Making Styles in Post-Purchase- Antónia Correia, Metin Kozak*
- Pine, B. J. II, and Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The Experience Economy*. Harvard VBusiness School press, Boston, M.A.
- Pizam, A. and Milman, A. (1993) 'Predicting Satisfaction Among First Time Visitors to A Destination by Using the Expectancy Disconfirmation Theory', *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 12(2): 197-209.
- Plog, S. C. (1974) 'Why Destination Areas Rise and Fall in Popularity', *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 14: 55-58.
- Rojas, C. and Camarero, C. (2008) 'Visitor's Experience, Mood and Satisfaction in a Heritage Context: Evidence from an Interpretation Center', *Tourism Management*, 29(3): 525-537.
- Ross, L. D. and Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1991) 'Sightseeing Tourists' Motivation and Satisfaction', *Annals of Tourism Research* 18(2): 226-237.
- Ryan, C. and Trauer, B. (2005) Visitor Experiences of Indigenous Tourism: Introduction. In C. Ryan, and M. Aicken, (Eds.), *Indigenous Tourism: The Commodification and Management of Culture* (pp. 223-245). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Sirakaya, E. & Woodside, A. (2005) 'Building and Testing Theories of Decision-Making by Travellers', *Tourism Management* 26(6): 815-832.
- Sofield, T. and Li, F. (1998) 'Tourism Development and Cultural Policies in China', *Annals of Tourism Research* 25(2): 362-392.
- Spreng, R. A., Mankenzie, S. B. and Olshavsky, R. W. (1996) 'A Re-examination of the Determinants of Consumer Satisfaction', *Journal of Marketing* 60(3): 15-32.
- Sproles, G. and Kendall, E. (1986) 'A Methodology for Profiling Consumers Decision-Making Styles', *The Journal of Consumer Affairs* 20(2): 267-279.
- Sproles, G. and Kendall, E. (1986) 'A Methodology for Profiling Consumers' Decision-Making Styles', *Journal of Consumer Affairs* 20(2): 267-279.
- Um, S. and Crompton, J. (1990) Attitude Determinants in Tourism Destination Choice', *Annals of Tourism Research* 17(3): 432-448.
- Woodside, A. G. and Lysonski, S. (1989) 'A General Model of Traveller Destination Choice', *Journal of Travel Research* 27(4): 8-14.
- Woodside, A., Krauss, E., Caldwell, M. and Chebat, J. (2006) Advancing Folk Theory of Behaviour Explanation, Ecological Systems Theory and the Fit-like-a-glove for Understanding Lifestyle, Leisure, and Travel Behaviour. In March, R. and Woodside, A. (Eds.), *Tourism Behavior: Travelers' Decisions and Actions* (pp. 73-111). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- Yoon, Y. and Uysal, M. (2005) 'An Examination of the Effects of Motivation and Satisfaction on Destination Loyalty: A Structural Model', *Tourism Management* 26(1): 45-56.

About the Author

Antónia Correia is Assistant Professor at Faculty of Economics (University of Algarve, Portugal). Her main research interests focus on consumer behaviour, tourism economics and models. Email: acorreia@ualg.pt

Metin Kozak is Professor of Marketing in the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Mugla University, Turkey. His main research interests focus on consumer behavior, benchmarking, and competitiveness. Email: M.Kozak@superonline.com