THE INFLUENCE OF PERSONALITY ON TOURIST BEHAVIORS: THE STUDY OF MOTIVATIONS, SATISFACTION, AND LOYALTY

Issara Kaewumpai[1]

Abstract: This study aims to reveal the influence of tourist personality on key interrelated factors in the visitation process including tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, and destination loyalty, and to investigate the relationships among these factors. The sample population includes first-time American tourists who visited the three locations in Thailand. The study findings indicate that (1) Psychographic personality and Allocentric personality positively influence tourist motivation; (2) only the motivation of Psychographics and the motivation of Allocentrics influenced destination satisfaction; (3) only the destination satisfaction of Mid-Centrics and the destination satisfaction of Allocentrics influenced destination loyalty; and (4) Psychocentric personality negatively influenced and Allocentric personality positively influenced destination satisfaction. The results of this study help to bridge academic gaps in tourism as well as help to provide more insight for the DMOs that work to promote these three destinations to develop superior destination marketing plans.

Keywords: tourist personality, tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, destination loyalty, American tourists, Thailand.

1. Introduction

Personality is a group of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that are performed consistently by a person and do not typically change over time (Aronoff, Rabin, & Zucker, 1987). It can help to predict several behaviors, for example, academic performance (Chamorrow-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003), alcohol drinking and cigarette smoking (Paunonen, 2003), and leadership type (Judge & Bono, 2000). In the area of tourism marketing, tourism academics use tourist personality types by adapting the concept of personality to the tourism context in order to explain tourist activities that are related to personality type

(Gretzel, Mitsche, Hwang, & Fesenmaier, 2004). Marketing researchers have changed their attention from using demographic, geographic, and behavioral characteristics of buyers as key variables for segmentation to the use of less tangible characteristics such as image (Sirgy, 1982), benefit (Myers, 1976), and personality (Alpert, 1972) instead. This was the result of a subsequent popular notion that individuals segmented within the same group may differ in their needs due to different types of personality (Fuller, Hanlan, & Wilde, 2005).

Though several scholars have generated a broad range of tourist personality types to predict tourist behavior (Jackson, 2006), the most well known one is still the first tourist typology developed by Stanley C. Plog in 1972, which classifies tourists into five groups ranging from Psychocentric or Dependable (prefers mass tourism and buys package tours) at one end of the spectrum to Allocentric or Venturer (prefers to be independent and travel without plans) at the

---

[1]Issara Kaewumpai earned her M.Econ in 2005. Currently, she is a Ph.D. (Candidate) in Hospitality and Tourism Management at Graduate School of Business, Assumption University of Thailand.

other end with the three remaining groups located in between, including Near Psychocentric (Near Dependable), Mid-Centric, and Near Allocentric (Near Venturer) (Litvin, 2006). However, further research should limit the use of this model to American tourists only because most of the empirical evidence of success employed this model with American tourists (Plog, 1974; Plog, 2001; Plog, 2002, Chandler & Costello, 2002; Enz, Liu, & Siguaw, 2008; Weaver, 2012).

The key interrelated factors in the tourism product consumption process include tourist motivation, destination satisfaction and destination loyalty (Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Chindaprasert, Yasothornsrikul, & Esichaikul, 2015). Generic personality, which is well-known for its predictability power, is a contributor of the tourist personality (Jackson, 2006). For this reason, Plog's tourist personality typology tends to have the ability to predict several behaviors including these important factors. The literature review has failed to reveal the influence of Plog's tourist personality types on these key behaviors in the visitation process. Moreover, even though some studies found relationships among tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, and destination loyalty when studying Cypriot tourists and Thai tourists (Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Chindaprasert *et al.*, 2015), it has failed to reveal the relationship of these constructs with other nationalities.

If conducting a study to reveal the influence of Plog's tourist personality types on tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, and destination loyalty and to investigate the relationships of these key important factors by focusing on American tourists in three important tourism destinations of Thailand, namely Bangkok, Phuket, and Chiang Mai. Apart from understanding the characteristics, destination preferences, and activities preferences of

American tourists who visit the destination, destination marketing organisations (DMOs) will also gain more insight related to the motivation to visit destinations, the destination satisfaction tendencies, and the destination loyalty tendencies of each tourist personality. Moreover, it would help to confirm the interrelation among these key important factors when studying the American tourists by separating each type of tourist personality. Consequently, this study aims to reveal the influence of tourist personality on tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, and destination loyalty; and to investigate the relationships of tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, and destination loyalty.

2. Literature Review

This study employed Plog's psychographic model by using a modified version of Plog's ten questions with a three-choice scale that classifies tourists into three groups, which are Psychocentrics, Mid-Centrics, and Allocentrics. In destinations choice map (Plog, 2001), Thailand is placed as a destination for Near Venturer tourists. For the tourist motivation construct, this study employed the push-pull motivation model (Crompton, 1979). This model posits that people decide to take a trip because they are pushed by internal psychological forces, and pulled by destination attributes and facilities.

Tourists are more pushed by their intrinsic desires than pulled by destination attributes to visit destinations (Iso-Ahola, 1982; Krippendorf, 1987). Consumers make choices of products by considering the overall congruence between the products and their desires (Payne, Bettman, & Johnson, 1993). Destination features which tourists expect to respond to motivations occurred and approach which tourists use to make choice on destination will be kept in tourists' mind and will be used when evaluating their

satisfaction. Since push motivation plays a major role in the destination choice process, tourists will assess their push satisfaction by considering at what level the destination responds to their push motivation and assess pull satisfaction by comparing it with their initial expectations as tourists generally assess destination attributes by comparing them with their initial expectations (Westbrook & Reilly, 1983; Olson & Dover, 1979). Consequently, this study has based push satisfaction on the Self-Congruity model (Sirgy, 1982), and pull satisfaction on the Expectancy-Disconfirmation model (Oliver, 1980).

Due to the attitudinal approach being the most suitable approach to employ in studies related to investigating the relationships among variables (Riley, Niininen, Szivas, & Willis, 2001; Dick & Basu, 1994), this study employed the attitudinal approach for the destination loyalty construct. Intentions to revisit and recommend are used as two sub-dimensions to measure loyalty.

Tourist Personality and Tourist Motivation

Some tourism researchers conducted their studies and found that that personality influences motivation and tourists' destination choices (Pizam *et al.*, 2004; Abbate & Di Nuovo, 2013). Although these researchers did not employ tourist-specific personality, their studies at least support that tourist personality influences tourist motivation. Tourists choose a destination that they believe can respond to their push and pull motivation. Some tourism academics have generated tourist typologies to describe tourist characteristics and tourism related behaviors, especially destination choices (Plog, 1974; Cohen, 1979; Loker-Murphy, 1997).

Plog's psychographic model explains the tourist characteristics, preferred destinations, and preferred activities of each personality type. Tourist characteristics described in the typology description can infer relevant push motivation, and destination preference and activity preference described in the typology description can infer relevant pull motivation (Plog, 1991; Plog 1995). For example, the Powerless characteristic of Psychocentric tourists may cause them to visit a destination in order to escape from the stress found in daily life; and the Intellectually Curious characteristic of Allocentric tourists may cause them to visit a destination in order to see people from diverse ethnic backgrounds. The Mid-Centric is a combination of these two extreme personalities, and does not exhibit an intense enough degree of characteristics to correlate with any specific motivation. For this reason, the study proposed the hypotheses as follows:

H1a: Psychocentric personality positively affects the motivation of tourists.
H1b: Mid-Centric personality has no effect on the motivation of tourists.
H1c: Allocentric personality positively affects the motivation of tourists.

Tourist Motivation and Destination Satisfaction

The interrelationship between tourist motivation and destination satisfaction refers to a non-linear relationship. Using the Assimilation-Contrast theory and the effects of their great effort, Babin, Griffin and Babin (1994) posited that consumers tend to demonstrate extreme reactions to consumption outcomes on what they perceive as important. When consumers come with high motivation, consumers increase their likelihood of contrast, resulting in more extreme satisfaction level in the direction of contrast.

When a destination has strong enough performance until the level is above the positive contrast zone of tourists, the stronger the intrinsic desire (push motivation) and extrinsic desire (pull motivation) toward destination features that are expressed by tourists the higher the degree of destination satisfaction the tourists receive (positive

correlation), as found in the results from the works of Qiao, Chen, Guan, and Kim (2008); and Correia, Kozak, and Ferradeira (2013). If the destination has a weak performance until it falls below the negative contrast zone of tourists, the stronger the intrinsic desire (push motivation) and extrinsic desire (pull motivation) toward destination features that are expressed by tourists; the lower the degree of destination satisfaction the tourists receive (negative correlation), as indicated in the results from a study by Yoon and Uysal (2005).

McCrae and Costa (1991) used the five-factor model to investigate the relationships between personalities and psychological well-being and reported that Neuroticism negatively influenced psychological well-being and Extraversion positively influenced psychological well-being. This study could be linked to a previous study that used the five-factor model of personality traits to explain the influence of Plog's tourist personality on the interrelation between tourist motivation and destination satisfaction because a generic personality trait is an element of tourist personality (Jackson, 2006). Extraversion and Allocentrism have some commonalities, which are being active and enjoyment of meeting and dealing with others. Psychocentrism and Neuroticism have several similarities, which are nervousness and vulnerability (Plog, 2001; Costa & McCrae, 1992). Consequently, Allocentric tourists tend to assess better destination performance due to their positive affection and generating condition that stimulates happiness, leading to greater propensity to make destination performance rise above the tourists' positive contrast zone, which makes tourist motivation positively affect destination satisfaction.

Psychocentric tourists tend to assess the worse destination performance due to their negative affection and generating condition

that stimulates unhappiness, resulting in a greater tendency to make destination performance fall below the tourists' negative contrast zone, which makes tourist motivation negatively influence destination satisfaction. Motivation of Mid-Centric tourists will not be influenced by any characteristic as it is an average personality that is not be intense enough to influence the specific motivation. Prior studies aiming to measure the destination satisfaction of tourists visiting these three destinations found that tourists felt highly satisfied with their visitation in most of the studied locations (Promsiwapanlop, Pechwaroon, & Pangudruer, 2005; Bangkok Metropolitan Administration, 2011; Siri, Josiam, Kennon & Spears, 2012). Therefore, Mid-Centric tourists visiting the three locations tend to have a satisfaction level above the positive contrast zone, resulting in tourist motivation positively affecting destination satisfaction. For this reason, the study proposed the hypotheses as follows:

H2a: Motivation of Psychocentrics negatively affects destination satisfaction.

H2b: Motivation of Mid-Centrics positively affects destination satisfaction.

H2c: Motivation of Allocentrics positively affects destination satisfaction.

Destination Satisfaction and Destination Loyalty

The literature review suggests that the most accepted determinant of loyalty is satisfaction. Generally, the relationship between destination satisfaction and destination loyalty is found to progress in the positive direction. However, it is a non-linear relationship. Consumers have their own loyalty threshold. If satisfaction increases above this threshold, the level of loyalty will increase rapidly. Similarly, if satisfaction drops under this threshold, loyalty will decrease rapidly (Oliver & Swan, 1989; Oliva, Oliver, & MacMillan, 1992).

Allocentric tourists are likely to have a loyalty threshold higher than Mid-Centric tourists and Psychocentric tourists as they do not tend to revisit destinations and do not tend to be sociable people (Plog, 1991; Plog, 1995; Plog, 2001), which results in a lower propensity to generate word of mouth (Ferguson, Paulin, & Bergeron, 2010). Psychocentric tourists are likely to have a loyalty threshold lower than Mid-Centric tourists and Allocentric tourists as they tend to revisit destinations and tend to be sociable people (Plog, 1991; Plog, 1995; Plog, 2001), which results in a higher propensity to generate word of mouth (Ferguson *et al.*, 2010). Nevertheless, at all levels of satisfaction and at all levels of loyalty threshold; the relationship of destination and destination loyalty appears in the positive direction. For this reason, the study proposed the following statements as the hypotheses:

H3a: Destination satisfaction of Psychocentrics positively affects destination loyalty.

H3b: Destination satisfaction of Mid-Centrics positively affects destination loyalty.

H3c: Destination satisfaction of Allocentrics positively affects destination loyalty.

Tourist Personality and Destination Satisfaction

Only a few studies have been conducted to investigate the influence of personality and satisfaction on product and service consumption. In these studies, scholars employed generic personality, especially the five-factor model; and found a relationship between personality and satisfaction (Mooradian & Olver, 1997; Heller, Watson, & Ilies, 2004; Hendriks, Smets, Vrielink, Van Es, & De Haes, 2006; Siddiqui, 2012). However, the literature has failed to reveal the interrelationship between tourist personality and destination satisfaction. Aforementioned studies on product and service consumption can support that two constructs tend to have an interrelationship when exploring with a tourism product that is more well-known for its complexity than others.

McCrae and Costa (1991) conclude that personality influences satisfaction in two ways, which are the temperamental view (generating by their own emotion) and the instrumental view (the generating condition that stimulates happiness or unhappiness). Mooradian and Oliver (1997), Hendriks *et al.* (2006), and Siddiqui (2012) investigated the correlation with product and service consumption, and found that Agreeableness and Extraversion positively influence satisfaction, and Neuroticism negatively influences satisfaction.

The Generic personality trait is a contributing factor of tourist personality (Jackson, 2006). Being active and enjoyment of meeting and dealing with people are common characteristics of Allocentrism and Extraversion. Nervousness and vulnerability are the key characteristics of Psychocentrism and Neuroticism (Plog, 1991; Costa & McCrae, 1992). The Mid-centric personality is a combination of the two extreme groups, which is flexible. For this reason, an Allocentric personality tends to positively influence destination satisfaction because Allocentrism and Extraversion have common characteristics, and previous studies found that Extraversion is positively correlated with satisfaction (Hendriks *et al.*, 2006; Siddiqui, 2012). In contrast, Psychocentric personality tends to negatively influence destination satisfaction because Psychocentrism and Neuroticism have common characteristics, and previous studies found that Neuroticism is negatively correlated with satisfaction (Hendriks *et al.*, 2006; Siddiqui, 2012), while Mid-Centric does not tend to correlate with destination satisfaction because it cannot be compared with any personality due to its flexibility ,and does not generate an intense enough degree of characteristics to influence

destination satisfaction. The hypotheses are proposed as follows:

H4a: Psychocentric personality negatively affects destination satisfaction.

H4b: Mid-Centric has no effect on destination satisfaction.

H4c: Allocentric personality positively affects destination satisfaction.

Tourist Personality and Destination Loyalty

Several studies found that personality is a determinant of loyalty (Kim, Suh, & Eves, 2010; Durukan & Bozaci, 2011). Although the literature search has failed to reveal this relationship in the tourism domain, there has been the support that the two constructs have a propensity to be interrelated if the research is in a tourism environment. This study employed two observable variables which were the intention to revisit and the intention to recommend to others to support the destination loyalty construct, and Plog (1974, 2001) described the characteristics and behaviors of Psychocentrics and Allocentrics which were relevant to the intention to revisit and the intention to recommend the destination to others, the current study used these descriptions to create the hypotheses. The Mid-Centric personality is an average personality (Plog, 1991). Therefore, it cannot generate behaviors strong enough to influence destination loyalty.

Psychocentric tourists prefer destinations to which they are accustomed and to avoid risky conditions, while Allocentric tourists prefer new and different destinations, and are able to take risks at a moderate level (Plog, 1991; Plog, 1995; Plog, 2001). Consequently, tourists with higher levels of Psychocentrism are more likely to revisit a destination, while tourists with higher degrees of Allocentrism are less likely to revisit destinations. As Ferguson *et al.*, 2010 concluded, socially oriented persons have the greater propensity to engage in positive word-of-mouth. Psychocentrics are sociable and like to keep company with others at their home, while Allocentrics are unsociable and seek a personal space (Plog, 1991, 1995, 2001). Consequently, tourists with higher degrees of Psychocentrism are more likely to recommend a destination and tourists with higher degrees of Allocentric are less likely to recommend it. For this reason, the hypotheses can be generated as:

H5a: Psychocentric personality positively affects destination loyalty.

H5b: Mid-Centric personality has no effect on destination loyalty.

H5c: Allocentric personality negatively affects destination loyalty.

3. Methodology

The numbers of tourists traveling to Bangkok, Phuket, and Chiang Mai during the month of the survey in the year 2015 were used to forecast the population of American tourists traveling to these locations. As this study conducted the questionnaire survey in Chiang Mai (June 2016), and Phuket and Bangkok (July 2016), the forecasted number of the population was 56,757 for Bangkok, 4,657 for Phuket, and 2,818 for Chiang Mai. This study first employed the purposive sampling method, and afterward employed the convenience random sampling method. The researcher asked prospective respondents who were waiting for their departure flight at the three airports whether they were American citizens who had visited the three studied locations for leisure purposes, and then asked whether they agreed to participate in the survey. Boomsma and Hoogland, (2001) and Kline (2005) suggest that the minimum sample size for conducting SEM is at least 200 samples to attain stable test results. This study applied this rule to all three of the types of personalities (Psychocentric, Mid-Centric, and Allocentric) were the main focus of the study.

A self-completion questionnaire developed from the existing tool and relevant literature was used as a data collection

instrument. The questionnaire was comprised of five sections which aimed to measure and collect data related to the four constructs and the demographics and trip-related data of the respondents. The first section was the modified ten- question version of Plog's allocentric/psychocentric scale which helped to categorize tourists into Psychocentric, Mid- Centric, and Allocentric. The second section was adapted from previous studies that collected data related to tourist motivation (Sangpikul, 2008; Dejtisak, Hurd, Elkins, & Schlatter, 2009; Lusby & Story, 2013; Hsieh & Park, 2008; Mechinda, Serirat, & Gulid 2009; Yiamjanya & Wongleedee, 2014). This section measured the push motivation and pull motivation of tourists. The third section measured overall destination satisfaction of tourists in three perspectives, which were overall satisfaction by comparing with the initial desire to take a vacation, overall satisfaction by comparing with expectations, and overall satisfaction in general. The fourth section measured the tourists' destination loyalty by asking about the tourists' intention to revisit in two years, their intention to revisit in four years, and their intention to recommend the destination to others. The last section asked tourists to provide their demographic information and trip-related data.

At the beginning of the survey, the study tested the developed questionnaire with 30 tourists visiting each location, resulting in a total number of 90 tourists from three locations. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient values of all sections were higher than the recommended level of 0.70 (Creswell, 2005) as the value of the tourist motivation dimension, destination satisfaction dimension, and destination loyalty dimension were 0.87, 0.91, and 0.83, respectively. All respondents understood all of the questions, and could complete the questionnaire in 10 - 25 minutes.

As Americans tourists were the main focus of this study, the study administered the questionnaire survey at the Suvarnabhumi International Airport for Bangkok, the Phuket International Airport for Phuket, and the Chiang Mai International Airport for Chiang Mai. Collecting data from a specific nationality at the airport by screening flights tended to allow the study to access more samples in a shorter period. This study set the target amount of results from first- time tourists for each destination at 550 results with the anticipation that the summed amount of questionnaires for each tourist personality from these three studied locations would reach the acceptable minimum sample size for conducting SEM analysis, which is at least 200 samples for each tourist personality type. After collecting the data, the study received 1,650 results from first- time American tourists visiting all three studied locations and achieved 221 results from Psychocentric tourists, 1,217 results from Mid- Centric tourists, and 212 results from Allocentric tourists. All these results were adequate for conducting the SEM analysis.

To analyze the data, this study used the manual calculation to obtain descriptive statistics; and used the Mplus software to complete the purposes of this study. Vinokur and Radcliff (2005) suggests five major steps to conduct the SEM analysis, which were used as the data analysis approach of this study and include: (1) model specification, (2) model identification, (3) model estimation, (4) model valuation, and (5) model re- specification. In the model specification stage, the researcher creates the measurement model, identifies the observable factors used to measure each latent factor and identifies the causal relationship among all latent constructs which were the focus of that research by reviewing the previous theories and literature. In the model identification stage, the researcher determines whether the created

model can provide a unique solution to the group of equations received from the variances and covariance of the observable variables. The rule for obtaining the unique solution is to provide at least three observable variables for each of the latent constructs. The next stage is the model estimation in which researcher employs statistical procedures by using software to estimate the model's parameters from data received from the samples, for example, factor loading, and coefficient of correlation. After estimating the model's parameters, the researcher conducts the model valuation stage by considering the parameters to measure how well the collected empirical data fit the hypothesized model.

Anderson and Gerbing (1988) suggest that the researcher should evaluate and re-specify the confirmatory measurement models before examining structural equation models to ensure that the observed indicators extracted to reflect the same latent constructs are truly interrelated and therefore reliable. The last stage is the model re-specification stage. When the researcher considers the parameters and finds that the collected empirical data does not fit the hypothesized model, the researcher improves the parameters in the model by using the Modification Indices (MI) suggested by the software. This index suggests what parameters should be added or omitted and which variables the researcher would allow the error to co-vary in order to improve the discrepancy between the empirical data and the hypothesized model.

4. Results

The results of this study provided strong evidence that American tourists visiting the three studied locations in Thailand possessed a homogenous psychographic profile as the majority of respondents from all three locations were Mid-Centrics (80% for Bangkok, 71% for Phuket, and 70% for Chiang Mai). The study found all three types of tourist at all three provinces. In Bangkok and Phuket, the study found Mid-Centrics most (80% for Bangkok and 71% for Phuket), followed by Psychocentrics (19% for Bangkok and 21% for Phuket) and Allocentrics (1% for Bangkok and 9% for Phuket); while, in Chiang Mai, the study found Mid-Centrics most (70%), followed by Allocentrics (29%) and Psychocentrics (1%). By examining the combined results from the three locations, there were quite equal percentages of male and female respondents as 52% were male and 48% were female. Around half of the respondents (49%) reported their age between 22 to 34 and the second largest group of participants (22%) reported their age as between 35 to 44. Most of respondents were well educated people as they had earned a college degree (51%). The majority of respondents (43%) had monthly household income between $4,000 and $8,500. Most of the tourists (81%) stayed at the destination between 1 - 7 days.

Data analysis and results of Psychocentric personality

The CFA is a method employed to evaluate whether the measures of latent construct are consistent with the study's understanding of the characteristics of that latent construct. This study first employed the pooled-CFA for the tourist motivation construct, destination satisfaction construct, and destination loyalty construct; and omitted the variables which had non-significant factor loading (p-value greater than 0.05). The study omitted the variables and conducted the pooled-CFA for all three constructs again. The P-value of all factor loading coefficients are less than 0.05, which means that the factor loading of all variables are significant at the 0.05 level (confidence level is 95%).

After testing the CFA in the previous stage, the study conducted the SEM analysis on the overall model by using the fit indices

to measure the overall fit, which were χ2, χ2/df, RMSEA, SRMR, TLI, and CFI. The results from testing the initial theoretical model showed that the χ2 value was significant (539.123 with p-value at 0.000), and other fit indices were not acceptable (χ2/df = 5.391, RMSEA = 0.141, SRMR = 0.132, TLI = 0.587, and CFI = 0.656). When the model does not fit well, it is possible to improve the fit by freeing parameters in the model by using the modification indices suggested by the software. This function suggests what variables that researcher would allow the error to co-vary in order to make the model fit considerably well. The study revised the model by following the suggested modification indices and found that results showed better fit for most measures (see Table 1).

Hooper, Coughlan, and Mullen (2008) suggested that when the model fits, the χ2 value is likely to be relatively small and the corresponding p-value must be greater than 0.05. The model had a χ2 value of 176.536 with p-value of 0.000, which indicated a poor fit. As the Chi-square test is a sensitive measure which is frequently significant when employed with large samples, the researcher should consider other fit indices in accompaniment with this measure. The results showed that the χ2/df was 2.053, which indicated a good fit based on the suggestion of Gefen, Straub, and Boudreau (2000) that the acceptable level was equal to or less than 3. The results of TLI value (0.901) and CFI value (0.929) reached the acceptable threshold, as Hu & Bentler,

(1995) suggested that TLI and CFI should be greater than 0.90. Also, the results of RMSEA value (0.069) and SRMR value (0.069) reached the acceptable threshold, as Sharma, Mukherjee, Kumar, & Dillon, (2005) recommended that RMSEA should be lower than 0.10 and Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested that SRMR should be lower than 0.08. The hypothesized model structure fits well with the empirical data.

Ćurković (2012) suggested that during conducting of the SEM analysis, research should balance between good fitting models and parameters that provide support for the hypothesized model, rather than confirming model fit only. By considering the coefficients and p-value received from the SEM analysis, the study was able to examine the relationships among constructs which were the focuses of this study (p-value < 0.05 was considered as significant). As presented in Table 2, the results appear to support that Psychographic personality positively influences the motivation of tourists (H1a), as indicated by the coefficient value of 0.451 at p-value of .000; the motivation of Psychocentrics negatively affects destination satisfaction (H2a), as indicated by the coefficient value of -1.093 at p-value of .000, and Psychographic personality negatively influences destination satisfaction (H4a), as indicated by the coefficient value of -0.790 at p-value of .000. However, the relationship between destination satisfaction of Psychocentrics and destination loyalty (H3a), and the relationship between Psychocentric personality and the destination loyalty (H5a) are not significant;

Table 1: Goodness of fit of the Psychocentric personality model

Fit Statistics	Results	Acceptable Threshold
χ2	*176.536 (p=0.000)*	*(p> 0.05)* (Hooper *et al.,* 2008)
Df	86	
χ2/df	2.053	≤ 3.00 (Gefen *et al.,* 2000)
RMSEA	0.069	< 0.10 (Sharma *et al.,* 2005)
SRMR	0.069	< 0.08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999)
TLI	0.901	> 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995)
CFI	0.929	> 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995)

Table 2: Results of testing hypotheses for the Psychocentric personality model

Hypotheses		β Coefficient	p-value	Test Results
H1a	Psychocentric personality positively affects the motivation of tourists.	0.451	0.000	Supported
H2a	Motivation of Psychocentrics negatively affects destination satisfaction.	-1.093	0.000	Supported
H3a	Destination satisfaction of Psychocentrics positively affects destination loyalty.	-0.168	0. 140	Not supported
H4a	Psychocentric personality negatively affects destination satisfaction.	-0.790	0.000	Supported
H5a	Psychocentric personality positively affects destination loyalty.	-0.014	0.898	Not supported

as indicated by the coefficient value of -0.168 at p-value of 0.140, and the coefficient value of - 0. 014 at p- value of 0. 898, respectively.

Data analysis and results of Mid-Centric personality

This study first tested the constructs of tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, and destination loyalty by employing the pooled- CFA and omitted observable variables which had p-value of factor loading greater than 0. 05 as non–significant factor loading which meant that the observable variable was not a good variable to measure the latent construct. The study omitted variables from the measurement model and conducted the pooled- CFA for all three constructs again. Then, p- value of all factor loadings coefficient are less than 0. 05 which means the factor loadings of all variables are significant at the 0.05 level (confidence level is 95%).

After testing measurement models in the previous stage, the study evaluated the overall model by using fit indices to test goodness-of-fit of the overall model. The results from testing the initial theoretical model showed that the χ2value was significant (5605.321, p = 0.000), and other fit indices did not reach the acceptable levels (χ2/df = 20.68, RMSEA = 0.127, SRMR = 0.105, TLI = 0.485, and CFI = 0.535). By examining the modification indices, the study revised the model by following the suggested modification indices and found that the results showed better fit for most measures. The results of the modified model appear in Table 3. The χ2 value was 854.688 and was still significant as p-value was 0.000, and the χ2/df value did not reach the acceptable threshold as the recommended threshold for χ2/df is equal to or greater than 3.00 (Gefen *et al.*, 2000). However, RMSEA, SRMR, TLI and CFI were at the acceptable threshold with the value of RMSEA = 0.049, SRMR = 0.059, TLI = 0.922 and CFI = 0.944 as the recommended values for these fit index were RMSEA < 0.10 (Sharma *et al.*, 2005); SRMR < 0.08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999); TLI > 0.90; and CFI > 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995). The hypothesized model showed an acceptable fit to the observed data.

As presented in Table 4, the relationship between Mid-Centric personality and the motivation of tourists (H1b), the relationship between Mid-Centric personality and destination satisfaction (H4b), and the relationship between Mid-Centric personality and destination loyalty (H5b) are not significant; as indicated by the coefficient value of -0.027 at p-value of 0.164, the coefficient value of -0.021 at p-value of 0.493, and the coefficient value of -0.027 at p-value of 0.395, respectively. Consequently, H1b, H4b, and H5b are supported by the empirical data. Additionally, the study found that the destination satisfaction of Mid-Centric

positively affects destination loyalty (H3b) as indicated by the coefficient value of 0.665 at p-value of 0.000. However, the relationship between the motivation of Mid-Centrics and destination satisfaction (H2b) was not significant, since the results showed a coefficient value of 0.020 at p-value of 0.308.

Data analysis and results of the Allocentric personality

This study evaluated the tourist motivation construct, destination satisfaction construct, and destination loyalty construct by employing the pooled-CFA, and then omitted non-significant variables which had p-value of factor loading greater than 0.05 as these variables were redundant measures for the measurement model. The study conducted the pooled-CFA for all three constructs again after removing the insignificant variables from the measurement models, making the p-value of all factor loadings coefficient less than 0.05, which means the factor loadings of all variables are significant at the 0.05 level (confidence level is 95%).

The study used the SEM analysis to evaluate the overall model, which is comprised of modified constructs of tourist motivation, destination satisfaction, and destination loyalty to evaluate the goodness of fit and relationships among constructs. The results from evaluating the initial theoretical model showed that all measures did not reach the acceptable level. The χ2 value was significant (696.713, p = 0.000), and other fit indices were not acceptable (χ2/df = 6.967, RMSEA = 0.168, SRMR = 0.139, TLI = 0.611, and CFI = 0.675). By examining the modification indices, the study modified the model by following the suggested modification indices and found

Table 3: Goodness of fit of the Mid-Centric personality model

Fit Statistics	Results	Acceptable Threshold
χ2	*854.688 (p=0.000)*	*(p> 0.05)* (Hooper *et al.,* 2008)
df	215	
χ2/df	3.97	≤ 3.00 (Gefen *et al.,* 2000)
RMSEA	0.049	< 0.10 (Sharma *et al.,* 2005)
SRMR	0.059	< 0.08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999)
TLI	0.922	> 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995)
CFI	0.944	> 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995)

Table 4: Results of testing the hypotheses for the Mid-Centric personality model

Hypotheses		β Coefficient	p-value	Test Results
H1b	Mid-Centric personality has no effect on the motivation of tourists.	-0.027	0.164	Supported
H2b	Motivation of Mid Centrics positively affects destination satisfaction.	0.020	0.308	Not supported
H3b	Destination satisfaction of Mid Centrics positively affects destination loyalty.	0.665	0.000	Supported
H4b	Mid Centric personality has no effect on destination satisfaction.	-0.021	0.493	Supported
H5b	Mid-Centric personality has no effect on destination loyalty.	-0.027	0.395	Supported

that results showed a better fit for most measures. Though the results showed that the χ2 value was still significant (156.829, p = 0.000), and the SRMR value (0.107) did not fall within acceptable range (< 0.08) as recommended by Hu and Bentler (1999); all results of remaining four fit indices reached the acceptable threshold (χ2/ df = 2.341, RMSEA = 0.080, TLI = 0.912, and CFI = 0.951) as the recommended value for χ2/df = ≤ 3.00 (Gefen *et al.*, 2000); RMSEA < 0.10 (Sharma *et al.,* 2005); TLI > 0.90;

and CFI > 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995). The hypothesized model showed an acceptable fit to the observed data (Table 5).

As presented in Table 6, the results appear to support most hypotheses that Allocentric personality positively affects the motivation of tourists (H1c) (indicated by the coefficient value of .190 at p-value of .000), motivation of Allocentrics positively affects the destination satisfaction (H2c) (indicated by the coefficient value of 0.487 at p-value of .000); destination satisfaction

Table 5: Goodness of fit of the Allocentric personality model

Fit Statistics	Results	Acceptable Threshold
χ^2	*156.829 (p=0.000)*	*(p> 0.05)* (Hooper *et al.,* 2008)
df	67	
χ^2/df	2.341	$\leq$ 3.00 (Gefen *et al.,* 2000)
RMSEA	0.080	< 0.10 (Sharma *et al.,* 2005)
SRMR	0.107	< 0.08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999)
TLI	0.912	> 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995)
CFI	0.951	> 0.90 (Hu & Bentler, 1995)

Table 6: Results of testing hypotheses for the Allocentric personality model

Hypotheses		β Coefficient	p-value	Test Results
H1c	Allocentric personality positively affects the motivation of tourists.	0.190	0.000	Supported
H2c	Motivation of Allocentrics positively affects destination satisfaction.	0.487	0.000	Supported
H3c	Destination satisfaction of Allocentrics positively affects destination loyalty.	0.635	0.000	Supported
H4c	Allocentric personality positively affects destination satisfaction.	0.582	0.000	Supported
H5c	Allocentric personality negatively affects destination loyalty.	-0.181	0.067	Not supported

of Allocentrics positively affects destination loyalty (H3c) (indicated by the coefficient value of 0.635 at p-value of .000); and Allocentric personality positively affects destination satisfaction (H4c) (indicated by the coefficient value of 0.582 at p-value of .000) (p-value < 0.05 was considered as significant). However, the relationship between Allocentric personality and destination loyalty (H5c) was not significant as indicated by the coefficient value of -0.181 at p-value of 0.067.

5. Conclusion and implications

The results of this research indicate that the majority of respondents from all three destinations in Thailand were Mid-Centric tourists. Plog (2001) placed Thailand as a destination with Near-Venturer tourists. This study grouped Near-Venturer personality into Mid-Centric as the appropriate scale used in this study classifies tourists as Psychocentric or Dependable, Mid-Centric, Allocentric or Venturer only and Plog

classified Near-Venturer as a sub-group of Mid-Centrics. Plog's tourist personality and destination choice map appears in the study by Plog (2001) that was conducted approximately 15 years ago. The placement of Thailand on this map tends to move from a destination for Near-Venturer tourists to a destination for Mid-Centric tourists because as time passes, most destinations are likely to become developed. Consequently, the major psychographic profile of tourists visiting the three locations is comparable to the expected results derived from tourist personality and the destination choice map in the study by Plog (2001).

The findings of this study indicate that Psychographic personality and Allocentric personality positively influence tourist motivation, which are consistent with the initial expectations of the study. When employing tourism-specific personality as in this study, the results are in agreement with previous studies employing generic personality in that there is a relationship between personality and tourist motivation (Pizam et al., 2004; Abbate & Di Nuovo, 2013). The results moreover indicate that Mid-Centric personality has no effect on tourist motivation, which also supports the initial expectations of this study generated by the inconsistent and flexibility characteristics of Mid-Centric personality (Plog, 1991).

As the study expected the existence of a relationship between the tourist motivation of all three personalities (Psychocentric, Mid-Centric, and Allocentric) and destination satisfaction; the results indicated that only the motivation of Psychographics and the motivation of Allocentrics influenced destination satisfaction, while the motivation of Mid-Centrics had no impact on destination satisfaction. The findings of Psychographics and Allocentrics provide empirical evidence that support, while the findings of Mid-Centrics provide empirical evidence that contrasts previous studies that found an

interrelationship between tourist motivation and destination satisfaction (Yoon & Uysal, 2005, Qiao et al., 2008, Correia et al., 2013).

As the study expected the existence of a relationship between destination satisfaction of all three personalities (Psychocentric, Mid-Centric, and Allocentric) and destination loyalty; the results indicated that only the destination satisfaction of Mid-Centrics and the destination satisfaction of Allocentrics influences destination loyalty, while the destination satisfaction of Psychocentrics has no impact on destination loyalty. The findings on Mid-Centrics and Allocentrics provides empirical evidence that support this, while the findings on Psychocentrics provide empirical evidence that contrast previous researches that found a relationship between destination satisfaction and destination loyalty (Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Chi & Qu, 2008; Maas, 2013; Chindaprasert et al., 2015).

The results of this study indicated that Psychocentric personality negatively influenced and Allocentric personality positively influenced destination satisfaction, which were consistent with the initial expectations of this study. When tourism-specific typology is employed as in this study, the results are in agreement with previous studies employing generic personality to investigate the relationship with consumer satisfaction in that there is a relationship between personality and consumption satisfaction (Mooradian & Oliver, 1997, Hendriks et al., 2006 and Siddiqui, 2012). Additionally, the results indicated that Mid-Centric personality has no effect on tourist motivation, which also supports the initial expectations of this study generated by the inconsistent and flexible characteristics of the Mid-Centric personality (Plog, 1991).

Although the study expected that only Mid-Centric personality would not have a relationship with destination loyalty as it was

an average personality which does not generate any degree of characteristics intense enough to influence any factor, the results of this study showed that it was not only Mid-Centric, but also Psychocentric and Allocentric personality that had no impact on destination satisfaction. The findings on Psychocentrism and Allocentrism provide empirical evidence that contrast previous studies which found an interrelation between personality and loyalty (Kim *et al.*, 2010; Durukan & Bozaci, 2011), and rejected the interrelationship between tourist personality and destination loyalty of this study which was inferred from the relevant behaviors of Psychocentrics and Allocentrics described in Plog's typology descriptions (Plog, 1991).

The results of this study provide several managerial implications for DMOs who are responsible for promoting and conducting marketing activities for Bangkok, Phuket and Chiang Mai. First, the results showed that the majority of respondents from all three locations were Mid-Centrics (76% for Bangkok, 67% for Phuket, and 66% for Chiang Mai). Therefore, the DMOs of all three destinations should conduct targeting of Mid-Centric American tourists as a major target for the American tourist market. The DMO of Chiang Mai province should also focus on Allocentrics as a minor target due to the results indicating that 34% of the respondents were Allocentric tourists, while the DMO of Bangkok province and Phuket province should also focus on Psychocentrics as a minor target due to the results showing that 24% of the respondents from Bangkok and 23% of the respondents from Phuket were Psychocentric tourists. Targeting of specific groups after conducting segmentation helps DMOs to better communicate critical destination attributes to appeal to and pursue targeted tourists (Gartner, 1989; Kotler, Bowen, & Makens, 2006; Pike, 2012). It also makes the destination able to specialize in the needs of

a specific group and become the greatest in supplying for that group (Dolničar, 2008).

Second, the results of the Psychocentric model demonstrated that (1) Psychographic personality positively influences the motivation of tourists by having "to spend time with friends/family", "to enjoy and have fun", "nightlife activity and entertainment", "to escape ordinary or routine environments at home", "shopping malls and night markets" as the most five important observable variables to measure motivation construct; (2) Psychocentric personality negatively affects destination satisfaction; and (3) motivation of Psychocentrics negatively affects destination satisfaction. These results mean that (1) Psychocentric tourists have the five most important motives to visit the studied locations which are "to spend time with friends/family", "to enjoy and have fun", "nightlife activity and entertainment", "to escape ordinary or routine environments at home", "shopping malls and night markets" and tourists with higher degree of Psychocentrism tend to have a higher level of these motives; (2) Psychocentric tourists with a higher degree of Psychocentrism tend to be more difficult to satisfy; and (3) Psychocentric tourists who have a higher level of motivation tend to have a lower level of destination satisfaction due to the impact of Psychocentrism and destination performance that is below their acceptable level. Therefore, if DMOs conduct targeting on this segment, DMOs should generate marketing initiatives that correspond to the motivation of Psychocentrics by paying more attention to the details of the created marketing initiatives due to the hard-to-please characteristic of Psychocentrics. For example, the DMO of Bangkok may create temporary Thai night markets by focusing on international tourists which includes American tourists as a part of the target group. During the event, the organizer should provide several forms of

assistance that correspond to the characteristics and preferences of Allocentrics, for instance, having proactive tourist service officers who can speak fluent English and making hamburger stands available. The reason is that this type of tourist expects foreigners to speak English, and prefers a familiar atmosphere which is similar to their home country (Plog, 1991).

Third, the results of the Mid-Centric model demonstrated that (1) the five most important observable variables that measure motivation constructs were "spa and massage", "interesting rural countryside", "nightlife activity and entertainment", "to enhance my knowledge", and "to see and experience something new and exciting"; and (2) the destination satisfaction of Mid-Centrics positively affects destination loyalty. These findings mean that (1) Mid-Centric tourists have the five most important motives to visit the studied locations which are spa and massage", "interesting rural countryside", "nightlife activity and entertainment", "to enhance my knowledge", and "to see and experience something new and exciting"; and (2) Mid-Centric tourists who have higher level of destination satisfaction tend to have a higher level of destination loyalty. To make this type of tourists, who are flexible and the most easy to motivate compared to Psychocentrics and Allocentrics, have destination loyalty, DMOs should focus on improving destination features that can respond to the motivation of Mid-Centric tourists in order to satisfy them.

Fourth, the results of the Allocentric model demonstrated that (1) Allocentric personality positively influences the motivation of tourists by having "historical places, cultural places, and temples", "to see and experience something new and exciting", "Thai food and local cuisine", "to enhance my knowledge", and "to find thrills and being adventuresome" as the five most important observable variables to measure the motivation construct, (2) Allocentric personality positively affects destination satisfaction, (3) motivation of Allocentrics positively affects destination satisfaction, and (4) the destination satisfaction of Allocentric positively affects the destination loyalty. These results mean that (1) Allocentric tourists have five important motives to visit the studied locations, which are "historical places, cultural places, and temples", "to see and experience something new and exciting", "Thai food and local cuisine", "to enhance my knowledge", and "to find thrills and being adventuresome" and tourists with a higher degree of Allocentrism tend to have a higher level of these motives; (2) Allocentric tourists with a higher degree of Allocentrism tend to be much easier to satisfy; (3) Allocentric tourists who have a higher level of motivation tend to have a higher level of destination satisfaction due to the impact of Allocentrism and destination performance that are higher than their acceptable levels; and (4) Allocentric tourists who have a higher level of destination satisfaction tend to have a higher level of destination loyalty. For this reason, DMOs that focus on this segment should create marketing initiatives that correspond to the motivation of Allocentric tourists by giving moderate attention to details of created marketing initiatives due to the easy-to-please characteristic of Allocentrics. For example, the DMO of Chiang Mai may create Thai art and antiquities events by focusing on international tourists which include American tourists as a part of the target group. During the event, DMOs can provide only photo captions under the pictures and history brochures without providing any assistance from the tour guides due to the fact that Allocentrics are self-confident, enjoy a sense of discovery, and learn about destinations before and during their travels (Plog, 1991).

DMOs should generate marketing initiatives that correspond to the motivation of Psychocentrics by giving more attention to the details of created marketing initiatives due to the hard- to- please characteristic of Psychocentrics. For example, the DMO of Bangkok may create temporary Thai night markets by focusing on international tourists which include American tourists as a part of the target group. During the event, the DMO should provide several forms of assistance that correspond to the characteristics and preferences of Allocentrics, for instance, having proactive tourist service officers who can speak fluent English and making hamburger stands available. The reason is that this type of tourist expects foreigners to speak English, and prefers a familiar atmosphere which is similar to their home country (Plog, 1991).

References:

Abbate, C. S., & Nuovo, S. D. (2013). Motivation and personality traits for choosing religious tourism. A research on the case of Medjugorje. *Current Issues in Tourism, 16*(5), 501-506.

Alpert, M. I. (1972). Personality and the determinants of product choices. *Journal of Marketing Research, 9*, 89-92.

Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(3), 411-423.

Aronoff, J., Rabin, A. I., & Zucker, R. A. (1987). *The Emergence of personality*. New York, NY: Springer.

Babin, B., Griffin, M., & Babin, L. (1994). The effect of motivation to process on consumers' satisfaction reactions. *Advances in Consumer Research, 21*, 406-411.

Bangkok Tourism Development Plan (Rep.). (2011). Bangkok: Bangkok Metropolitan Administration.

Boomsma, A., & Hoogland, J. J. (2001). The robustness of LISREL modeling revisited. In R. Cudeck, S. Du Toit, & D. Sörbom (Authors), *Structural equation modeling: Present and future: A Festschrift in honor of Karl Jöreskog* (pp. 139-168). Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.

Chandler, J. A., & Costello, C. A. (2002). A profile of visitors at heritage tourism destinations in East Tennessee according to Plog's lifestyle and activity level preferences model. *Journal of Travel Research, 41*(2), 161-166.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality predicts academic performance: Evidence from two longitudinal university samples. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*(4), 319-338.

Chindaprasert, K., Yasothornsrikul, P., & Esichaikul, R. (2015). The effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty at the Thailand -Laos (PDR) border. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism, 4*(1), 1-17.

Cohen, E. (1979). Rethinking the sociology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 6*(1), 18-35.

Correia, A., Kozak, M., & Ferradeira, J. (2013). From tourist motivations to tourist satisfaction. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research, 7*(4), 411-424.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.

Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 6*(4), 408-424.

Ćurković, N. (2012). Using of Structural Equation Modeling Techniques in Cognitive Levels Validation. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems, 10*(3), 270-283.

Dick, A. S., & Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: Toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 22*(2), 99-113.

Dejtisak, M., Hurd, A. R., Elkins, D. J., & Schlatter, B. E. (2009). A comparison of travel decisions between U.S. and international students. *LARNet; The Cyber Journal of Applied Leisure and Recreation Research,* (January). Retrieved from http://larnet.org/2009-02.html

Dolničar, S. (2008). Market segmentation in tourism. In A. G. Woodside & D. Martin (Eds.), *Tourism Management: Analysis, Behavior and Strategy* (pp. 129-150). Cambridge, United Kingdom: CAB International.

Durukan, T., & Bozaci, I. (2011). The role of individual characteristics on customer loyalty. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(23), 213-218

Enz, C. A., Liu, Z. ,& Siguaw, J. A. (2008). Using tourist travel habits and preferences to assess strategic destination positioning: The case of Costa Rica. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 49*(3), 258-281.

Ferguson, R. J., Paulin, M., & Bergeron, J. (2010). Customer sociability and the total service experience. *Journal of Service Management, 21*(1), 25-44.

Fuller, D., Hanlan, J., & Wilde, S. (2005). *Market segmentation approaches: Do they benefit destination marketers?* [Scholarly project]. In *Southern Cross University ePublications*. Retrieved from http://epubs.scu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1146&context=comm_pubs

Gartner, W. C. (1989). Tourism image: Attribute measurement of state tourism products using multidimensional scaling techniques. *Journal of Travel Research, 28*(2), 16-20.

Gefen, D., Straub, D., & Boudreau, M. C. (2000). Structural Equation Modeling and Regression: Guidelines for Research Practice. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 4*(7), 1-70.

Gretzel, U., Mitsche, N., Hwang, Y., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2004). Tell me who you are and I will tell you where to go: Use of travel personalities in destination Recommendation Systems. *Information Technology & Tourism, 7*(1), 3-12.

Heller, D., Watson, D., & Ilies, R. (2004). The role of person versus situation in life satisfaction: A critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*(4), 574-600.

Hendriks, A. A., Smets, E. M., Vrielink, M. R., Van Es, S. Q., & De Haes, J. C. (2006). Is personality a determinant of patient satisfaction with hospital care? *International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 18*(2), 152-158.

Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural equation modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Journal of Business Research Methods, 6*, 53-60.

Hsieh, C., & Park, S. (2008). A comparison of motivations between island tourists visiting Penghu, Taiwan, and Phuket, Thailand. In Klenosky, D.B., & Fisher C. L. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 2008 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium.* Paper present at the 2008 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium, U.S. Department of

Agriculture, North Research Station, Pennsylvania, 30 March – 1 April, 2008 9pp. 229 – 235). Bolton Landing, NY: Gen Tech.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues and application* (pp. 76-99). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*(2), 256-262.

Jackson, M. (2006). *Development of a tourist personality inventory to evaluate parameters associated with tourist crime victimization* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). RMIT University.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-Factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 751-765.

Kim, Y. G., Suh, B. W., & Eves, A. (2010). The relationships between food-related personality traits, satisfaction, and loyalty among visitors attending food events and festivals. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 29*(2), 216-226.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kotler, P., Bowen, J., & Makens, J. C. (2006). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Krippendorf. (1987). *The holiday makers: Understanding the impact of leisure and travel*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Heinemann.

Litvin, S. W. (2006). Revisiting Plog's model of Allocentricity and Psychocentricity... one more time. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 47*(3), 245-253.

Loker-Murphy, L. (1997). Backpackers in Australia: A motivation based segmentation study. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 5*(4), 23-45.

Lusby, C., & Story, M. (2013). Perceived motivations, barriers and benefits of young African Americans to travel. *Consortium Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Management, 18*(1), 17-39.

Mccrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1991). Adding liebe und arbeit: The full Five-Factor model and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*(2), 227-232.

Mechinda, P., Serirat, S., & Gulid, N. (2009). An examination of tourists' attitudinal and behavioral loyalty: Comparison between domestic and international tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 15*(2), 129-148.

Mooradian, T. A., & Olver, J. M. (1997). I can't get no satisfaction: The impact of personality and emotion on post purchase processes. *Psychology & Marketing, 14*(4), 379-393.

Myers, J. H. (1976). Benefit structure analysis: A new tool for product planning. *Journal of Marketing, 40*(4), 23-32.

Paunonen, S. V. (2003). Big Five factors of personality and replicated predictions of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(2), 411-424.

Payne, J. W., Bettman, J. R., & Johnson, E. J. (1993). *The adaptive decision maker*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Pike, S. (2012). Destination positioning opportunities using personal values:

Elicited through the Repertory Test with Laddering Analysis. *Tourism Management, 33*(1), 100-107.

Pizam, A., Jeong, G., Reichel, A., Boemmel, H. V., Lusson, J. M., Steynberg, L., Montmany, N. (2004). The relationship between risk-taking, sensation-seeking, and the tourist behavior of young adults: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*(3), 251-260.

Plog, S. C. (1974). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 14*(4), 55-58.

Plog, S. C. (1991). A carpenter's tools re-visited: Measuring Allocentrism and Psychocentrism properly ... the first time. *Journal of Travel Research, 29*(4), 51-51.

Plog, S. C. (1995). *Vacation Places Rated*. Redondo Beach, CA: Fielding Worldwide.

Plog, S. C. (2001). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity: An update of a Cornell Quarterly Classic. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 42*(3), 13-24.

Plog, S. C. (2002). The power of Psychographics and the concept of Ventursomeness. *Journal of Travel Research, 40*(3), 244-251.

Promsiwapanlop, P., Pechwaroon, K., & Pangudruer, C. (2005). *Tourist satisfaction with tourism products in Phuket, Phang Nga, and Krabi*. [Scholarly project]. In *Ministry of Tourism and Sports Knowledge Management Database*. Retrieved from http://www.mots.go.th/ewtadmin/ewt/mots_km/ewt_dl_link.php?nid=168

Olson, J. C., & Dover, P. A. (1979). Disconfirmation of consumer expectations through product trial. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 64*(2), 179-189.

Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research, 17*(4), 460-469.

Oliver, R. L., & Swan, J. E. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interpersonal equity and satisfaction in transactions: A field survey approach. *Journal of Marketing, 53*(2), 21.

Oliva, T. A., Oliver, R. L., & Macmillan, I. C. (1992). A catastrophe model for developing service satisfaction strategies. *Journal of Marketing, 56*(3), 83-95.

Qiao, G., Chen, N., Guan, Y., & Kim, S. (2008). Study on Chinese tourists' motivation and satisfaction to visit South Korea. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences, 8*(1), 17-38.

Riley, M., Niininen, O., Szivas, E. E., & Willis, T. (2001). The case for process approaches in loyalty research in tourism. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 3*(1), 23-32.

Sangpikul, A. (2008). A Factor-Cluster analysis of tourist motivations: A case of U.S. senior travelers. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal, 56*(1), 23-40.

Siddiqui, K. (2012). Personality influences on customer satisfaction. *African Journal of Business Management, 6*(11), 4134-4141.

Siri, R., Josiam, B., Kennon, L., & Spears, D. (2012). Indian tourists' satisfaction of Bangkok, Thailand. *Journal of Services Research, 12*(1), 61-79.

Sirgy, M. J. (1982). Self-concept in consumer behavior: A critical review. *Journal of Consumer Research, 9*(3), 287-300.

Sharma, S., Mukherjee, S., Kumar, A., & Dillon, W. R. (2005). A simulation study to investigate the use of cutoff values for assessing model fit in

covariance structure models. *Journal of Business Research, 58*(7), 935-943.

Vinokur, A. D., & Radcliff, B. (2005). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). In S. J. Best (Author), *Polling America: An encyclopedia of public opinion* (pp. 800-805). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Weaver, D. B. (2012). Psychographic insights from a South Carolina protected area. *Tourism Management, 33*(2), 371-379.

Westbrook, R. A., & Reilly, M. D. (1983). Value-percept disparity: An alternative to the Disconfirmation of Expectations theory of consumer satisfaction. *Advances in Consumer Research, 10*, 256-261.

Yiamjanya, S., & Wongleedee, K. (2014). International tourists' travel motivation by push-pull factors and the decision making for selecting Thailand as destination choice. *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering, 8*(5), 1348-1353.

Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management, 26*(1), 45-56.